Physical Memories, Eternal City:
Sourcing Collective Identity in the Topography of Rome's Campus Martius

by

Sarah Marie Fassio

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for graduation with Honors in History.

Whitman College
2020

Certificate of Approval

This is to certify that the accompanying thesis by Sarah Marie Fassio has been accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for graduation with Honors in History.

_____

Sarah H. Davies
Associate Professor

Whitman College
May 20, 2020

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Professor Sarah Davies for so truly excelling in her role as thesis advisor. Her steady support, thoughtful advice, and endless enthusiasm were invaluable throughout this process. Also, to my family and friends – thank you for listening to me talk about the Campus Martius for a year. I appreciate all the love and encouragement more than you know.

Abstract

The physicality of a landscape and its architecture has the powerful ability to serve as a tangible source of collective memory. Such is the case with Rome's Campus Martius (or, 'Field of Mars') – a space filled with monuments, temples, theaters, and columns located at the city's northern edge. This research analyzes how these enduring physical structures perpetuate ideologies that influence a collectively remembered 'Roman identity.' To this end, the impact of Roman military culture is considered, as are traditions of public dedications, immortalizing monuments, and sacred rituals. By evaluating monuments existing in both the Republican and Imperial periods and in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries, this research presents a fluid perspective of time, uniquely diverging from traditional historical differentiations between 'antiquity' and 'modernity.' The Campus Martius embodies the multi-faceted nature of Roman memory, stabilized and perpetuated via its monuments and topography.

Introduction

The physicality of a landscape and its architecture has the powerful ability to serve as an ever-enduring source of shared remembrance. It forms tangible memories that, rather than fading after the conclusion of a mortal lifespan, remain to create a larger narrative: one of a consolidated, immortal community able to transcend time. Ancient Romans in particular were interested in how monuments, temples, and columns served to document their experiences and positions in the world to future generations. In the Republican and Imperial periods, Roman identity was most explicitly expressed – and expanded – in the physical topography of one region of the cityscape: the Campus Martius, or 'Field of Mars.'

Spatially situated as a point of entrance to and departure from the northern end of the city, the land of the Campus Martius was as the name might suggest – a large, level-grounded field.[1] During the early Republic, the area was primarily an open expanse of occasionally-swampy grass,[2] but it would eventually develop with a grandeur that could "declare the rest of the city a mere accessory"[3] by the early Imperial period. In relation to Rome, the Campus was geographically bounded by "the Capitoline Hill to the south, the Tiber River to the west, [and] the Pincian and Quirinal Hills to the east."[4] Such a location positioned the Campus outside of the *pomerium* – the "sacred furrow that delineated the

---

[1] Samuel Ball Platner and Thomas Ashby, *A Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome* (London: Oxford University Press, 1929), 91.
[2] Platner and Ashby, *A Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome,* 92.
[3] Strabo, *Geography,* ed. and trans. A. Meineke (Leipzig: Teubner, 1877), Perseus Digital Library, 5.3.8.
[4] Paul W. Jacobs and Diane Atnally Conlin, *Campus Martius: The Field of Mars in the Life of Ancient Rome* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2014), 2.

city limits"[5] as drawn by Rome's mythic founder and namesake, Romulus.[6] As such, the region existed fundamentally as a uniquely transitional space, able to host activities forbidden within the city proper, such as certain religious rites or the mustering of military troops. Other practices like voting also occurred upon the Campus Martius. It was a Roman space distinct from the regulations of Rome the city-proper.

The Field of Mars was deeply intertwined with critical hallmarks of Roman history, tracing back to the city's founding. It was the location of Romulus' divine ascension, his apotheosis. According to Livy, Romulus was holding muster in the Campus Martius when "suddenly a storm came up, with loud claps of thunder, and enveloped him in a cloud so thick as to hide him from the sight of the assembly; and from that moment Romulus was no more on earth."[7] This myth contributed to the land's perceived sacred value for centuries. The Campus was also related to the establishment of the Roman Republic. Following the famous defeat of the Tarquin kings in 509 BCE,[8] "the land of the Tarquinii, laying between the City and the Tiber, was consecrated to Mars and became the Campus Martius."[9] The Field of Mars also became public land during that time – a status nearly as significant as its liminality. Throughout the Republican and Imperial periods, the Campus retained its religious and militaristic features, but became an area of social interaction. The Greek geographer Strabo, writing in the early Imperial period, describes the space's multi-faceted use best:

> τούτων δὲ τὰ πλεῖστα ὁ Μάρτιος ἔχει κάμπος πρὸς τῇ φύσει προσλαβὼν καὶ τὸν
> ἐκ τῆς προνοίας κόσμον. καὶ γὰρ τὸ μέγεθος τοῦ πεδίου θαυμαστὸν ἅμα καὶ τὰς

---

[5] Jacobs and Conlin, *Campus Martius: The Field of Mars in the Life of Ancient Rome,* 2.
[6] Platner and Ashby*,* 393.
[7] Livy, *Ab Urbe Condita,* trans. B. O. Foster (Harvard University Press, 1924), Loeb Classical Library, 1.16.
[8] Jacobs and Conlin, 3.
[9] Livy, *Ab Urbe Condita,* 2.5.

ἁρματοδρομίας καὶ τὴν ἄλλην ἱππασίαν ἀκώλυτον παρέχον τῷ τοσούτῳ πλήθει τῶν σφαίρᾳ καὶ κρίκῳ καὶ παλαίστρᾳ γυμναζομένων: καὶ τὰ περικείμενα ἔργα καὶ τὸ ἔδαφος πόᾳζον δι᾽ ἔτους καὶ τῶν λόφων στεφάναι τῶν ὑπὲρ τοῦ ποταμοῦ μέχρι τοῦ ῥείθρου σκηνογραφικὴν ὄψιν ἐπιδεικνύμεναι δυσαπάλλακτον παρέχουσι τὴν θέαν.

The greater number of these [decorations] may be seen in the Campus Martius, which to the beauties of nature adds those of art. The size of the plain is marvelous, permitting chariot-races and other feats of horsemanship without impediment, and multitudes to exercise themselves at ball-playing, in the circus, and the palaestra. The structures which surround it, the turf covered with herbage all the year round, the summits of the hills beyond the Tiber, extending from its banks with panoramic effect, present a spectacle which the eye abandons with regret.[10]

This is not even to speak of the theaters, temples, baths, tombs, and other commemorative monuments that defined the topography of the Campus Martius. Clearly, the area was one of both practical purpose and eye-catching splendor in a way that facilitated public movement and presence.

In recognition of such societal interaction, this thesis is especially interested in how the Campus Martius functioned as a conduit of memory and collective identity during the Republican and Imperial periods with unique resonances into the twentieth and twenty-first centuries. In support of this interest, this thesis explores several approaches to the understanding of the relationship between space and memory. How did the physical features and landscape of the Campus function – both individually and cohesively – to contribute to a carefully cultivated image of what it meant to be Roman? How did the monuments conceptualize and present Roman understandings of time and immortality? How did the intertwined presence of war and the divine characterize elements of the Roman consciousness? How did the relationship between public and private space create tension in the position of the Campus Martius? In what format do

---

[10] Strabo, *Geography,* 5.3.8.

these ideologies manifest over time? Ultimately, this thesis will argue that Romans acquired and reinforced a transcendent sense of collective identity from the publicly accessible, spatially formalized, and sacred topography of the Campus Martius, with far-reaching influences.

Underpinning this argument is the connection between physical space, visual appearance, and ideological meaning in the Roman mind. To characterize a landscape as significant is to pull again on the narratives of Livy and Strabo. Of Rome as a whole, Strabo claims "that it was founded there as a matter of necessity, not as a matter of choice."[11] The physical landscape of the city was thus established as a blank slate, bearing no previous meanings or significance. It was wholly unexceptional, only to be made such by the Romans' presence. Roman interactions with physical space imbued it with intentionality and value. The story of Camillus, as told by Livy, reflects this result. Speaking to his devastated countrymen following the 390 BCE sack of Rome by the Gauls, Camillus asserts that "not without good reason did gods and men choose this spot as the site of a City."[12] He believes that "the good Fortune of this place [Rome] cannot be transferred,"[13] and thusly chastises those who advocated relocation: "Have the soil of our native City and this land which we call our mother so slight a hold on us? Is our love of country confined to buildings and rafters?"[14] Rather than man-made constructions, it is the physical, tangible, natural space of Rome that is significant. This is not to claim that buildings are without value, but rather to assert the primacy, first and foremost, of the *space of Rome.* The value of all other topographical elements – like the monuments upon

---

[11] Strabo, *Geography,* 5.3.7.
[12] Livy, *Ab Urbe Condita,* 5.54.
[13] Ibid.
[14] Ibid.

which this thesis relies – are allowed to have meaning, to perpetuate ideological narratives, *because* the land upon which they stand is significant.

Placing value in the city's landscape logically relates to the perception of meaning in the land's topography; the Roman mindset was programmed to interact with the physical space around them. Historian Diane Favro has analyzed Rome's urban imagery to a similar effect. She has maintained that "the Romans read environments experientially," so builders and patrons "naturally considered how their urban projects conveyed meaning kinetically and haptically."[15] In this view, the physical "space conditions human activity"[16] and vice versa, establishing a framework through which collective identity may be sourced via the Roman landscape – which in turn can retroactively reveal the make-up of that identity.

In viewing monuments as ideological beacons of collective memory and identity, this thesis works to combat the separation of *past* and *present* in rhetoric surrounding 'ancient' civilizations. To speak of Rome as inherently within *the past* and unable to extend across time to *the present* is to fundamentally misunderstand the permanence of physical space. The ideologies embedded within the monuments of Republican and Imperial structures continually shape twentieth- and twenty-first-century interactions with Rome's cityscape. This is not to assert the unchanging nature of those ideas over time, but to comment on their transcendent ability to impact modern perceptions of the city – particularly within the Campus Martius. That modern understandings differ significantly from those of ancient Rome provides the basis for the first chapter of this thesis. The

---

[15] Diane Favro, *The Urban Image of Augustan Rome* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 10.
[16] Amy Russell, *The Politics of Public Space in Republican Rome* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), 17.

central concern of "Understanding Ancient and Modern Memory" is to compare ancient definitions of memory with those of modern scholarship. By looking at the works of Vergil, Livy, Ovid, Cicero, and Vitruvius, memory is defined as at once mutable and fluid, and yet also concrete and organized around tangible structures. Such forms of memory could grant immortality, link past and present, and ultimately required public viewership. By contrast, modern academics like Nora and Freud have defined memory as spontaneous, vague, and tied to the past. The first chapter concludes by re-aligning the definition of memory – and thus, identity – with the understandings of ancient authors themselves.

The following three chapters are organized according to thematic pairs: time and space, sacred and war, and public and private. Within each chapter, monuments and practices from Rome's Republican and Imperial periods are considered for their contributions towards a collective Roman identity. These ideologies are then linked to relevant points in twentieth and twenty-first century interactions with, and appropriations of, these identities. As such, the second chapter – "Time and Space: Ideologies of Immortality" – weighs the necessity of mortality upon the existence of immortality. Through Augustus' urban renovations – specifically the Mausoleum of Augustus and the Ara Pacis Augustae (Altar of Augustan Peace) – the presence of death is viewed as an immortalizing agent capable of asserting the eternal nature of Rome. This concept, of Rome's permanence, would later be appropriated and manipulated by Benito Mussolini in accordance with an expression of mid-twentieth-century Fascist ideologies. Ultimately, the second chapter defines Roman identity upon an awareness of individual mortality and a belief in the greater immortality of Rome.

The third chapter – "Divinely Sanctioned War and Triumph" – considers the prominent relationship between warfare and religiosity on the Campus Martius. The traditions of the Roman military triumph, the symbolism of the Column of Marcus Aurelius, and the practice of pledging temples in battle are analyzed for their characterization of the Roman self as divine and unswervingly victorious. This association of Roman victory with godly approval would then transfer to Christian frameworks, as evident, for example, in the monotheistic purpose of the Pantheon building in Rome.

Lastly, the fourth chapter, entitled "Movement in Public and Private Space," blurs the opposition between 'public' and 'private' to understand movement within the Field of Mars. Here, the Thermae Agrippae (Baths of Agrippa) is shown to embody both public and private qualities so as to dictate and limit movement through space. The idea of modern patronage within the city of Rome references a similar conflation between public and private in the twenty-first century. This chapter examines how the imposition of limitations and boundaries characterize and influence Roman identity.

Overall, the topography of the Campus Martius defines Roman collective identity as immortal, triumphant, fated, and limited. These qualities are reflected in modern interactions with the city of Rome in a manner that erases the constraints of time. This immortalizing effect can be credited to the absolute distinctiveness of the Field of Mars as a space. Because it had served – and continues to serve – a variety of situations from a place of military muster to a locale of Christian worship, the Campus is a uniquely flexible zone in the cityscape. Its landmarks and features have conveyed their memories and sense of Roman identity in an ongoing story of reuse, reshaping, and re-appropriation

of 'Rome.' The identity of ancient Rome is nuanced, somewhat contradictory, and eternally reflected in the physical landscape of the Campus Martius.

Chapter One. Understanding Ancient and Modern Memory

To view the Campus Martius as a significant space in antiquity is to interact with commemorative monuments and buildings; the same viewpoint in modernity necessitates an examination of ruins, renovation, and remembrance. Underpinning both is a continual reliance upon memory, which influences the space's constructions, alterations, and preservations. Memory is a deceivingly complex concept, and debates about its definition and value have been the subject of scholarship for centuries. However, when analyzing how perceptions of space constructed identities in Republican and Imperial Rome, the voices that hold the most value originate from a contemporaneous context. These ancient authors speak of memory as structured and organized, mutable and fluid, able to grant immortality and define history and identity. They understood memory to be tied to physical, tangible works and as necessitating a public audience. Under Roman thought, memory was a useful way to consider both the past and the future – a particularly relevant point within the context of this research. To avoid using memory anachronistically and to intentionally circumvent modernist analysis, this research understands memory according to these ancient definitions.

Ancient Historiography

One of the most easily identifiable interactions with memory can be found in Vergil's *Aeneid*, an epic poem that consumed the author's later years until his death in 19 BCE. The *Aeneid* was written in the aftermath of Rome's transition from Republic to Empire, and thus reflects themes of endurance, legacy, and continued survival despite struggles. These themes become especially clear during the journey to the Underworld

when Aeneas is shown the future of Rome – a city his descendants were yet to found – by his father, Anchises. Anchises calls upon Aeneas to "behold these people, your own Roman people,"[1] extending the identity of 'Roman' to his son. Rome had not yet been founded and would not be within Aeneas' lifetime, and – because of this – Aeneas cannot technically be a Roman. However, in viewing the memory of Roman existence, he is invited to partake in that identity, in that legacy. Here, Vergil situates memory as intermarried with identity; memory also becomes something that does not necessitate lived experience, only viewership. This allows memory to extend as much forward as it does backwards. When Anchises reviews Rome, he runs through a litany of names – Caesar Augustus, Cato, the Gracchi, Marcellus – that would have been as unknown to Aeneas as they were recognizable to Vergil's audiences in 19 BCE. Everything Aeneas witnesses extends into the future, but had already occurred from an authorial standpoint; both Aeneas and the audience experience historical memory in different directions. Roman memory is depicted as valuable to share identity, define history, and transcend time.

Furthermore, Vergil embeds memory in space – particularly the landscape of Rome. Anchises directly addresses Aeneas:

> *tu regere imperio populous, Romane, memento;*
> *hae tibi erunt artes; pacisque inponere morem,*
> *parcere subiectis, et debellare superbos.*
>
> "But you, Roman, remember, rule with all your power,
> the peoples of the earth – these will be your arts:
> to put your stamp on the works and ways of peace,
> to spare the defeated, break the proud in war."[2]

---

[1] Vergil, *The Aeneid,* trans. Robert Fagles (New York: Penguin Classics, 2006), 6.910.
[2] Vergil, *The Aeneid*, 6.981-984.

Significant here is the call to *remember* the duty of Rome, defined here as rulership. Implicit in this rule is the creation of peace and order for 'the peoples of the earth,' which uses memory as a tool for facilitating societal order. In this directive, Aeneas is again addressed as Roman, but the use of the second-person pronoun 'you' (*tu*) also addresses each individual who hears and re-experiences Aeneas' journey in the *Aeneid.* Thus, the call to remember applies to all Romans. Memory is defined as a public formulation, one with the ability to organize and order society.

The *Aeneid* thus gives shape to memory using the events and interactions of the figures within and beyond the narrative, thereby revealing just how embedded these understandings of Roman memory were in Vergil's society. Other Roman authors also used literature to speak to similar ideas of Roman memory, but they did so in a way that centered more on explicitly addressing their audiences. Typically, this direct, authorial address serves to open the work or in conclusion; the former is the case in Livy's *Ab Urbe Condita* and the latter occurs in Ovid's *Metamorphoses.*

Livy's *Ab Urbe Condita* – or, *From the City Founded* (more commonly, but inaccurately, referred to in English as *The History of Rome*) – consisted of one hundred and forty-two books and covered the Roman narrative from the city's origins to the author's own time (ca. 753 BCE – 9 BCE).[3] In such a large and expansive anthology of Roman history, it is crucial that Livy's opening lines recognize his role as the author in relation to memory:

> *Facturusne operae pretium sim, si a primordio urbis res populi Romani perscripserim, nec statis scio... Utcumque erit, iuvabit tamen rerum gestarum memoriae principis terrarium populi pro virile parte et ipsum consuluisse...*

---

[3] Valerie M. Warrior, "Introduction," *The History of Rome: Books 1-5* by Livy (Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company, 2006), xi.

> Whether I am going to receive any return for the effort if I record the history of the Roman people from the foundation of the city, I do not really know... it nevertheless will be a pleasure to have celebrated, to the best of my ability, the memory of the past achievements of the greatest people on earth.[4]

The word 'memory' (*memoria*) literally translates as "memory, remembrance, recollection" – applying here to mean "collective memory, tradition, and also history."[5] Livy associates the relaying of historical fact with memory, conventionally gesturing towards personal modesty for the sake of the greater Roman Empire. When read with an eye towards understanding Roman memory, this overture alludes to the mortality of the author and to the immortality of Rome. While Livy himself cannot know what 'return' he might receive, the 'pleasure' of celebrating Roman successes satisfies him. Additionally, memory here is connected to 'past achievements;' Rome's past is thus assumed to be full of victory and success. While Rome's continued existence indicates their overall victory, it should be noted that during the Republic, the "majority of Rome's wars included at least one defeat incurred by Roman soldiers."[6] However, the recollections of memory and history were not guaranteed to reflect this reality. In fact, "defeated generals could be encouraged to... 'rewrite' their losses into setbacks along the road to ultimate success"[7] in the context of a military triumph – a performance discussed in depth in Chapter Three. It may be assumed that the same processes that reconfigured temporary defeats as mere roadblocks to eventual victory during a triumph also applied to those writing histories. Regardless, simply the embarkation on the project and the act of memory here takes on a

---

[4] Livy, *Ab Urbe Condita,* trans. B. O. Foster (Harvard University Press, 1924), Loeb Classical Library, 1.1.
[5] Warrior, "Introduction," 1.
[6] Jessica H. Clark, "Defeat and the Roman Republic: Stories from Spain" in *Brill's Companion to Military Defeat in Ancient Mediterranean Society,* eds. Jessica H. Clark and Brian Turner (Boston: Brill, 2018), 191.
[7] Jessica H. Clark, *Triumph in Defeat: Military Loss and the Roman Republic* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2014), 134.

distinctly positive and self-aggrandizing perspective, one that speaks more to Rome's

conceptions of their empire rather than to the inaccuracy of recollection. Livy's

seemingly conventional preface reveals what is in fact a complex understanding of

Roman memory rooted in history that alludes to the immortal permanence of writing and

is closely connected with visions of a victorious, successful Rome.

By comparison, the conclusion of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* likewise appreciates the

limits of the author and the immortality of writings. However, Ovid does so in a way that

connects the permanence of his work to his own poetic, authorial persona. As a work, the

Metamorphoses is a fifteen-book poem written in approximately 8 CE that

chronologically relays myths from the world's creation to Caesar's apotheosis. After

predicting the eventual deification of Augustus, Ovid's writes:

> *iamque opus exegi, quod nec Iovis ira nec ignis*
> *nec poterit ferrum nec edax abolere vetustas...*
>
> *parte tamen meliore mei super alta perennis*
> *astra ferar, nomenque erit indelebile nostrum,*
> *quaque patet domitis Romana potentia terris,*
> *ore legar populi, perque omnia saecula fama,*
> *siquid habent veri vatum praesagia, vivam.*
>
> Now I have finished my work, which nothing can ever destroy –
> not Jupiter's wrath, nor fire or sword, nor devouring time. ...
>
> But the finer part of myself shall sweep me into eternity, higher than all the stars.
> My name shall never be forgotten.
> Wherever the might of Rome extends in the lands she has conquered,
> the people shall read and recite my words. Throughout all ages,
> if poets have vision to prophesy truth, I shall live in my fame.[8]

Ovid as a poet thus achieves the final transformation through his epic, a work that gives

expression to the permanence of impermanence in unraveling the universe-as-Rome. The

---

[8] Ovid, *Metamorphoses,* trans. Frank Justus Miller, ed. G.P. Goold (Harvard University Press, 1916), Loeb Classical Library, 15.871-879.

poem itself transcends, becoming positioned as something permanent and indestructible, able to withstand that which has the power to erase: the gods, war, nature, and time. The *Metamorphoses* become not just immortal, but everlasting and rises above the forces that influence mortality. This alludes to memory as something larger, more overarching – an ascension that influences the work's author as well. Ovid acknowledges his physical mortality, but explicitly charges memory with preserving his name, allowing a form of immortality. This power of remembrance, however, is recognized to rest upon the readership and recitation of 'the people;' again, memory is positioned as dependent upon a faceless, timeless, and all-encompassing "Roman" public and is only able to be formed via ongoing viewership.

Such ideas regarding the written word echo Cicero's understanding of the spoken word in his *De Oratore* (or, *On the Orator*), written in 55 BCE. Cicero asks the rhetorical question:

> *Historia vero testis temporum, lux Veritatis, vita memoriae, magistra vitae, nuntia vetustatis, qua voce alia, nisi oratoris, immortalitati commendatur?*
>
> And as History, which bears witness to the passing of the ages, sheds light upon reality, gives life to recollection and guidance to human existence, and brings tidings of ancient days, whose voice, but the orator's, can entrust her to immortality?[9]

Aside from further intertwining history and memory, Cicero characterizes orators as imbuing immortality to history; implicit in the profession of 'orator' is the presence of an audience. Again, words are permanent and also something that oblige public consumption. In this light, memory is defined as an active process, one that builds in the present and requires action. It may include elements of the past, but it is not passive and

---

[9] Cicero, *De Oratore,* trans. E. W. Sutton and H. Rackham (Harvard University Press, 1942), Loeb Classical Library, 2.36.

stagnant. Memory requires upkeep, aided by tangible sources like writings and speeches.

Cicero's *De Oratore* also makes explicit the connection between memory and space, a relationship thus far only briefly recognized in the previous sources. Understanding that "the best aid to clearness of memory consists in orderly arrangement,"[10] Cicero explains one method of memorization:

> *Itaque eis qui hanc partem ingeni exercerent locos esse capiendos et ea quae memoria tenere vellent effingenda animo atque in eis locis collocanda: sic fore ut ordinem rerum locorum ordo conservaret, res autem ipsas rerum effigies notaret, atque ut locis pro cera, simulacris pro litteris uteremur.*

> ...persons desiring to train this faculty must select localities and form mental images of the facts they wish to remember and store those images in the localities, with the result that the arrangement of the localities will preserve the order of the facts, and the images of the facts will designate the facts themselves...[11]

Implicit in this method are two crucial assumptions about Roman space: its ordered nature and its familiarity. Significantly, Roman space becomes defined as ordered, a descriptor that connotes intentionality and logic. This reveals how Romans perceived the world around them – which has particular relevance within the scope of this research – and also alludes to a general awareness of space. To be useful in memorization, space must be easily recalled and familiar enough to act as a foundation upon which to learn new information. Thus, space becomes a point of common reference to the Roman mind. While this method does apply to an individual mind, it does so in the context of oration, an act into which the collective is assumed (as explained earlier). Thus, the role of individual memory is established as necessary to the creation of collective memory. Cicero's method critically characterizes space as an ordered, familiar, tangible locus of memory.

---

[10] Cicero, *De Oratore*, 2.354
[11] Ibid.

The intentionality and orderliness of space is further defined in the mid-20s BCE by Roman architect Vitruvius in *De Architectura* (or, *On Architecture*). This comprehensive and detailed work opens in dedication to Imperator Caesar with Vitruvius establishing the purpose of his treatise: "I have drawn up definite rules so that by observing them you might understand what previous works were like and what future works will be like."[12] From the outset, architecture – used here to speak of the alteration of land and space – is confirmed to be ordered by rules. These rules are not arbitrary, but instead are drawn from years of past precedents. To this end, Vitruvius cites innumerable tangible examples for the concepts he describes, referencing sites everywhere from Rome[13] to Athens in Greece[14] to Teos in Asia.[15] In such thorough references, Vitruvius solidly embeds his architectural recommendations across time and space; the ordered construction of buildings thus become timeless. Furthermore, Vitruvius judges that "a wide knowledge of history is required because architects often include many ornaments in their works, and they should be able to explain to inquirers the underlying ideas for employing them."[16] This necessity offers further evidence of the idea that Roman buildings were constructed with intentionality and gained significance because of it. Beyond that, it indicates that buildings were constructed with an understanding that the past can (and must, inherently) be observed. From its very beginnings, Roman space is therefore proven to be planned with ordered reason drawn from the past: a form of active, tangible memory in and of itself.

---

[12] Vitruvius, *On Architecture,* ed. and trans. Thomas Gordon Smith (New York: The Monacelli Press, 2003), 59.
[13] Vitruvius, *On Architecture,* 96.
[14] Vitruvius, 94.
[15] Vitruvius, 97.
[16] Vitruvius, 60.

Lastly, a more thorough examination of the Latin language itself becomes crucial to the consideration of Roman memory studies, especially given the translation between Latin and English. The interaction of language with perception originates with the much-debated hypothesis of linguistic relativity, which claims that the features of a language directly shape the thoughts of its speakers.[17] Although now largely dismissed as too extreme, linguistic anthropologists have proven that "at higher levels, language appears to exert considerable influence on how people categorize, evaluate, and remember the world."[18] As a result, this thesis views Latin as influencing and reflecting but not solely determining Roman thought. As defined earlier in Livy as memory and remembrance, the noun *memoria* was used by Romans to denote "the sum of all traditions."[19] It can be found on funerary inscriptions as an "obligation to remember the dead,"[20] and also in the uniquely Roman practice of *damnatio memoriae* – the complete erasure of a person from public memory. In both cases, however, *memoria* relates to the shaping of collective memory. Similarly, the verb *monere* translates as 'to remind,' but carries connotations of warning and instruction; *monere* also links to the word *monumentum,* meaning 'that which brings to mind, a memorial, a monument'.[21] Monuments can thus be viewed as irrevocably linked with memory and as a "deliberately designed" alteration of space that

---

[17] Delaney Michael Skerrett, "Can the Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis Save the Planet? Lessons from Cross-Cultural Psychology for Critical Language Policy," *Current Issues in Language Planning* 11, no. 4 (2010): 332. doi:10.1080/14664208.2010.534236.

[18] Skerrett, "Can the Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis Save the Planet? Lessons from Cross-Cultural Pschology for Critical Language Policy," 338.

[19] Karl Galinsky, "Memoria Romana: Memory in Rome and Rome in Memory," *Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome* 10 (2014): 2. www.jstor.org/stable/44423154.

[20] Galinsky, "Memoria Romana: Memory in Rome and Rome in Memory," 2.

[21] Charlton T. Lewis and Charles Short, *A Latin Dictionary* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1879), s.v. "monumentum," Perseus Digital Library Word Study Tool.

aimed "to change the picture of the past."[22] Memory is mutable, yet able to be made concrete when embedded in tangible space.

The entrenchment of Roman remembrance in visible topography becomes even more complicated in light of change via "renovation" – an English word with application to the verbs *renovare, restaurare, reficere,* and *restituere*. Both *renovare* and *restaurare* deal with the maintenance of an existing, older building, although in different ways. While *renovare* speaks to renewal and restoration in the sense of adding newer, fresher additions to an existing building,[23] the verb *restaurare* implicates a restoration completed with its original materials.[24] Despite opposing methods, both verbs similarly value the original building, unlike *reficere* – a way of making anew via destruction and reconstruction.[25] Implicit in the meaning of *reficere* is the importance of the space over the physical building; the converse mentality applies to the verb *restituere*, which translates as 'to set up again'.[26] Here, rearrangement is acceptable. The variety and nuances in these four verbs relay the frequency and acceptability of topographical change,[27] while simultaneously alluding to their awareness of the past in these renovations. The insertion of change onto the Roman landscape thus involves "self-conscious efforts to situate present circumstances against the backdrop of the recent or distant past, as continuations, rejections, or nuanced redefinitions."[28] The variety in

---

[22] Galinsky, "Memoria Romana: Memory in Rome and Rome in Memory," 2.
[23] Diana Y. Ng and Molly Swetnam-Burland, "Introduction: Reuse, Renovation, Reiteration," in *Reuse and Renovation in Roman Material Culture: Functions, Aesthetics, Interpretations*, ed. Diana Y. Ng and Molly Swetnam-Burland (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018), 9.
[24] Lewis and Short, *A Latin Dictionary,* s.v. "restaurare."
[25] Lewis and Short, *A Latin Dictionary,* s.v. "reficere."
[26] Lewis and Short, *A Latin Dictionary,* s.v. "restituere."
[27] Ng and Swetnam-Burland, *Reuse and Renovation in Roman Material Culture: Functions, Aesthetics, Interpretations,* 8.
[28] Ng and Swetnam-Burland, 16.

vocabulary and nuances within each word provides insight into how vibrantly memory was conceived as an whole menu of actions related to the construction, reconstruction, and renovation of the future via the present's use of the past. Memory was all-pervasive and all-important in the Roman worldview.

Memory was so deeply and irrevocably embedded in Roman society that its existence was almost at times assumed. Through Vergil and Ovid, memory was used to speak of immortality as an active process – one requiring communal efforts according to Ovid and Cicero. Here, we see memory defined as a reflection of reality, of truth and history; Livy reflects this idea, upholding memory in the greatest esteem. It is in Cicero that memory attaches to tangible space, a connection that finds further purchase in Vitruvius' writings. Vitruvius also emphasizes the timelessness of memory as able to apply as much to the past as to the future – an assertion echoed in turn by Vergil. The concepts of time, space, and memory are further nuanced and defined within the structure of the Latin language itself. Overall, Romans perceived memory as a credible, immortalizing, tangible, mutable, active, collective, and timeless process. Rooted in ancient sources, this thesis will therefore continue to be guided by this multi-faceted definition, rather than by the confusing contribution added by modern memory studies.

Modern Historiography

The nineteenth through twenty-first century has hosted an immense amount of scholarship surrounding the concept of memory, its manifestations, and applicability in academic fields. Throughout this cornucopia of perspectives, it becomes immediately evident that most modern analysis diverges sharply from the perspectives of Roman antiquity. Memory becomes a vaguely defined construct, one firmly rooted in the past

with very little credible bearing on reality or history. It appears spontaneously without cultivation; memory is treated as an outdated vestige in its individualism and subjectivity. There still exists a connection between space and memory, but the latter is a passive process complete and isolated in the past. These conclusions almost directly contradict those drawn by ancient Roman authors and thus are considered to lack both validity and applicability in the context of this thesis. It bears recognition that these aforementioned weaknesses are strictly situational and do not apply wholesale to the field of modern memory studies. Rather, the following analysis intends to show an awareness of the anachronistic influence of modernist ideas upon ancient identities and perspectives through intentionally enumerating the dichotomies between the ancient and modern minds.

Despite many contributions to modern 'memory studies', one in particular has achieved notoriety: French historian Pierre Nora. In his 1989 work entitled, "Between Memory and History: Les Lieux de Mémoire," Nora introduces the idea of 'sites of memory' (*lieux de mémoire*) as places "where memory crystallizes and secretes itself" due to an absence of "real environments of memory."[29] Immediately, memory is characterized through tangible space to form a sort of artificial, secondary transmission of sentiment. Lacking lived experiences, such spaces intentionally consolidate heritage[30] in a conscious and primarily archival[31] effort to legitimize the present and future via the past.[32] Because they work towards preservative ends, these *lieux* have a powerful

---

[29] Pierre Nora, "Between Memory and History: Les Lieux de Mémoire," *Representations* 132, no. 26 (1989): 7. www.jstor.org/stable/2928520.
[30] Nora, "Between Memory and History: Les Lieux de Mémoire," 12.
[31] Nora, 13.
[32] Nora, 11.

"capacity for metamorphosis."[33] In other words, Nora determines memory to be intentionally cultivated and able to be transformed over time. These conclusions do appear to align with antiquity's categorization of memory as active and flexible. However, the comparison is not that simple; Nora's twentieth-century ideas stem from the understanding of memory as an absolute and history as relative.[34] He explicitly claims that memory is "a bond tying us to the eternal present" while "history is a representation of the past."[35] This distinction diverges sharply from a Roman consideration, in which history and memory were not seen as separable constructs. In this way, although some similarities exist, the foundations upon which they rest – an understanding of how memory relates to the past – differ greatly and reveal Nora's modernist lens. Ideas built upon a foundation that diverges so critically cannot be applied to the understanding of antiquity. Thus, to use Nora's 'sites of memory' thesis in this case would be to fundamentally misconstrue Roman thought to satisfy a modern perspective.

While Nora conflicts with Roman understandings of memory and history, the late nineteenth-century psychoanalysis of Sigmund Freud interacts with ancient ideas in other ways. Freud operated under a unique brand of literalism and believed that objects could be imbued with "literally preserved pieces of the mind."[36] He considered the attachment of memories to tangible spaces to be less intentional and more the spontaneously expected outcome of the work of remembrance. In an 1896 letter, Freud wrote of a new theory of psychoanalysis: "Thus what is essentially new about my theory is that memory

---

[33] Nora, 19.
[34] Nora, 9.
[35] Ibid.
[36] Donald Kuspit, "A Mighty Metaphor: The Analogy of Archaeology and Psychoanalysis," in *Sigmund Freud and Art: His Personal Collection of Antiquities*, ed. Lynn Gamwell and Richard Wells (New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1989), 142.

is present not once but several times over, that it is laid down in various species of indications."[37] This alludes to memory as an active process – a judgement with which the Romans might have loosely concurred – and views it as the cohesive mean of similar ideologies, events, and mentalities. Yet, this perspective must be reconciled with Freud's idea of memory as occurring unconsciously – and, thus, individually, organically and unaided. To be clear, Romans conceived of memory as requiring intention rather than believing it to manifest spontaneously, especially in the public sphere. We can clearly see the connection between unconscious and layered memory: if one cannot control when memory arises, it would necessarily become fluid and multitudinous. Because Freud's understanding of fluid memory stems from his views of the spontaneous and unconscious mind, it cannot be reconciled with the perspectives of antiquity. Although Freud usefully links memory to space, he does so with logic rooted in psychoanalysis that would have been unfamiliar in ancient Rome, rendering Freudian conclusions inapplicable in this context.

The difference between ancient and modern thought further solidifies when memory is considered as a mode of transmission. In Vergil's *Aeneid* and Ovid's *Metamorphoses,* memory acts as a valid and uncompromised form of communication. However, modern scholars appear to refute the idea of memories as cohesive narratives, like psychoanalyst Werner Bohleber in his 2007 article, "Remembrance, Trauma, and Collective Memory." Bohleber maintains that "there is a danger that the difference between remembrance and interpretation is almost completely eliminated"[38] by viewing

---

[37] Kuspit, "A Mighty Metaphor: The Analogy of Archaeology and Psychoanalysis," 140.
[38] Werner Bohleber, "Remembrance, Trauma, and Collective Memory: The Battle for Memory in Psychoanalysis," *The International Journal of Psychoanalysis* 88, no. 2 (2007): 336. https://doi.org/10.1516/V5H5-8351-7636-7878.

memories as narratives. This 'danger' stems from the variability of memories as a mode. Not all memories can be recalled with the same amount of detail or relative precision – qualities that vary depending on the memory's emotional intensity, personal significance, and visual representation.[39] In other words, personal biases influence a memory's recollection enough so as to compromise its integrity. This concern is fascinating, but relies implicitly upon a sort of hierarchical system for memories that did not exist within the Roman conception. While Bohleber appears to assert that narratives must be free from interpretive biases, the Romans recognized and openly commented on the intentionality and fluid memory behind their narratives. Thus, this concern fundamentally emerges from the assumptions of modernity, not antiquity, and would be anachronistic if applied to the Roman perspective.

Extending the idea of memories creating unreliable narratives, modern scholarship also contends with the vagueness of memory. In a 1997 work entitled, "Collective Memory and Cultural History: Problems of Method," author Alon Confino asserts that "a great appeal of the history of memory appears to be its vagueness"[40] and therefore claims that memory risks becoming a self-affirming historical device.[41] The perception of memory as vague is problematic only when history separates from memory, which – as mentioned in relation to Nora's *lieux de mémoire* – is a modernist perspective. Indeed, this also speaks to memory's manipulative potential, but such is the nature of any narrative. The colloquialism 'history is written by the victors' seems incredibly apt in this

---

[39] Bohleber, "Remembrance, Trauma, and Collective Memory: The Battle for Memory in Psychoanalysis," 336.
[40] Alon Confino, "Collective Memory and Cultural History: Problems of Method," *The American Historical Review* 102, no. 5 (1997): 1389. www.jstor.org/stable/2171069.
[41] Confino, "Collective Memory and Cultural History: Problems of Method," 1387.

case. Ultimately, Confino's analysis works to "distinguish between memory as a heuristic device and memory as part of the mental equipment of a society, of an age."[42] In other words: memory as an imperfect yet helpful device with which to view the past, or memory as intrinsic to societal viewpoints. Again, because ancient scholars viewed memory and history as operating nearly interchangeably, both of the aforementioned modern dichotomies were assumed in antiquity. In addition, Confino's need to define both the method and application of memory ultimately alludes to an insecurity regarding the construction of time in relation to the present. In his thesis, he assumes memory to exist only within the landscape of *the past*, thus isolating it as complete. This diverges greatly from the Roman application both to the past and the future. Overall, Confino's concerns over memory are valid within a modernist context, but appear redundant or unnecessary to an ancient Roman mindset.

Memory-studies scholarship from the late nineteenth century through the twenty-first century diverges critically from the ancient point of view. It assumes a separation of history and memory and operates under a fundamental distrust of the latter's interpretive authenticity. The vagueness and malleability of memory becomes its weakness rather than its strength, and time is constricted to linear movement. Most significant, however, of these conclusions is not that they diverge from the suppositions of antiquity; it is that they all operate under the implicit understanding of 'memory' as needing to be quantified. Scholars like Nora, Freud, Bohleber, and Confino treat memory as if it may be divorced from the context in which it formed. The Romans never conceptualized memory in this manner; from their works, memory is understood to act as an integral part of time,

---

[42] Confino, 1403.

space, history, and society. Here marks the central conflict: modern perspectives view memory as an *other*, while antiquity embraced memory as fully permeating both the physical and mental landscapes of Rome. Recognizing this difference is crucial for attempting to understand the perceptions of antiquity and any study involving Roman memory must therefore begin with a conscious awareness of the modern assumptions that could otherwise get in the way. For this reason and to avoid the conflicts of anachronistic application, memory – as a central concept to this research – is defined, in the remainder of this thesis, solely in alignment with Roman antiquity.

Chapter Two. Time and Space: Ideologies of Immortality

To build a monument is to permanently alter physical space. The act attaches intentional, manufactured significance to that space; it allows landscapes to speak, to transmit narratives with immortal permanence. A monument is "powerful because it stimulates meanings that are grandiose and communal,"[1] enacting a certain ideological timelessness in its enduring visibility. However, this immortality uniquely necessitates a mortal catalyst; Romans constructed commemorative buildings in honor of singular, temporal events like an emperor's life or a victorious military campaign. In both examples, death – the marker of the human condition – facilitates commemorations in this enduring, permanent form. When viewed with an awareness of death, Roman monuments position Rome as larger than life, able to exist *because of* – not despite – death. This chapter looks at death as an immortalizing agent, one that underpins the motivation for construction while simultaneously situating Roman ideologies as eternal. This is especially true on the Campus Martius (in part a traditional place of burial) with its Mausoleum of Augustus and the Ara Pacis Augustae (Altar of Augustan Peace), and continues into the twentieth century to inform Fascist ideologies. In their awareness of death, the spatial permanence of Roman monuments embodies ephemeral and eternal time, speaking to Rome's identity as a true *urbs aeterna.*

In the context of monuments, death acquires a nuanced definition. It references a physical loss of life, but also significantly applies more broadly to periods of *ending* and *loss.* When understood as such, the theme of death begetting continued existence

---

[1] Michael J. Kolb, *Making Sense of Monuments: Narratives of Time, Movement, and Scale* (New York: Routledge, 2020), 161.

characterizes the period in which the Mausoleum and Ara Pacis originated, and centers

around the namesake of both monuments: Augustus. Augustus' leadership emerged out

of a tumultuous period of civil unrest loosely characterized on one end by the death of

Julius Caesar in 44 BCE and on the other with the Battle of Actium in 31 BCE and the

eventual death of Mark Antony a year later. It would not be inappropriate to denote this

period – which would come to mark the transition from Republic to Empire – as one of

endings and losses, both physical and metaphorical.

In the decades that followed, Augustus held repeated consulships, during which

he loudly maintained "the institutional apparatus of the Republic"[2] – a façade repeatedly

reiterated in the first-person account of the *Res Gestae.* Throughout this narrative,

Augustus brands himself as a leader concerned with upholding stability through "the

traditions of our ancestors" by thrice refusing the Senate's offer to be "elected overseer of

laws and morals, without a colleague and with the fullest power."[3] In a 27 BCE

senatorial meeting, he goes a step further: "I transferred the Republic from my own

control to the will of the Senate and the Roman people."[4] Henceforth, "I took precedence

of all in rank, but of power I possessed no more than those who were my colleagues in

any magistracy."[5] Pointedly avoiding claims of dictatorship, Augustus became *pontifex*

maximus in 12 BCE[6] and would be unanimously named instead *pater patriae* ("Father of

the Fatherland") in 2 BCE.[7] Thus, having "extinguished the flames of civil war" and

[2] Karl Galinsky, *Augustus: Introduction to the Life of an Emperor* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012), 63.

[3] Augustus, *Res Gestae Divi Augusti,* trans. Frederick W. Shipley (Harvard University Press, 1924), Loeb Classical Library, 35.

[4] Augustus, *Res Gestae Divi Augusti,* 34.

[5] Ibid.

[6] Galinsky, *Augustus: Introduction to the Life of an Emperor,* 153.

[7] Augustus, *Res Gestae Divi Augusti,* 35.

received "by universal consent the absolute control of affairs"[8] as *pater patriae*, Augustus

worked to perpetuate a narrative of restoration (even using the verb, *restituit*), alongside

peace and order. Out of the death of the Roman Republic there arose a new iteration of

Rome's immortal existence: the Roman Empire. The same analysis that views

monuments of death on the Campus Martius as commemorating enduring ideologies

holds even more profound application during the Augustan period (seen also in the

literary sources analyzed in the previous chapter).

Augustan Urban Renovation

Potentially the most visible hallmark of Augustan restoration was his urban

renovation projects. According to the later Roman historian, Suetonius, Augustus

recognized that the visual aesthetics of the cityscape were able to influence the perception

of Rome's power, of Roman identity:

> *Urbem neque pro maiestate imperii ornatam et inundationibus incendiisque obnoxiam exoluit adeo, ut iure sit gloriatus marmoream sse relinquere, quam latericiam accepisset. Tutam vero, quantum provideri humana ratione potuit, etiam in posterum praestitit.*

> Since the city was not adorned as the dignity of the empire demanded, and was exposed to flood and fire, he [Augustus] so beautified it that he could justly boast that he had found it built of brick and left it in marble. He made it safe too for the future, so far as human foresight could provide for this.[9]

To Augustus, the tangible, physical space of Rome was not reflective of the city's

character – which was one of imperial dignity, domination over the landscape, and

stability for the present and future. Rome needed to be put on display "as the

architecturally worthy city" of an immortal empire.[10] The act of Augustan renovation

---

[8] Augustus, *Res Gestae Divi Augusti,* 34.

[9] Suetonius, *Lives of the Caesars: Divus Augustus,* trans. J.C. Rolfe (Harvard University Press, 1914), Loeb Classical Library, 28.

[10] Galinsky, *Augustus: Introduction to the Life of an Emperor,* 155.

therefore re-invoked the city's visual significance as rooted in space and as transcendent across time. Additionally, it must be understood that "the Roman bond between meaning and places" made alterations to the Roman cityscape highly memorable.[11] It is simply unfathomable that people would fail to notice the changes to the topography of Rome – especially on the Campus Martius, where it is said that "architects and planners had a free hand."[12] This locale is also where the Augustan presence could be felt most explicitly through monuments such as the Mausoleum of Augustus and the Ara Pacis Augustae. In the end, the realities of urban restoration under Augustus serve to reflect the significance of visual space in shaping perceptions of Roman identity across time. The following will examine the Mausoleum and the Altar of Peace as key examples of the impacts made by urban renovation in conveying imperial ideologies and framing Roman identity – in particular, through the relationship between death and immortality.

The Mausoleum of Augustus

When considering monuments associated with death on the Campus Martius, the inclusion of funerary buildings – like mausolea – appears fairly obvious. However, the Mausoleum of Augustus was much more than a final resting place. It was (and is) a monument that notably alters the physical space of the northern Campus Martius, explicitly and implicitly marking the life and accomplishments of an individual man. Through its architectural style, spatial position, and relationship to preexisting Roman funerary traditions, the Mausoleum monumentalizes an individual's mortal life as emblematic of that of the greater empire. It also permanently reminds of Roman triumph, greatness, and imperialism. Simultaneously, it evokes themes of the past to stretch across

---

[11] Diane Favro, *The Urban Image of Augustan Rome* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 141.
[12] Galinsky, *Augustus: Introduction to the Life of an Emperor,* 153.

time; in its twenty-first-century existence, the Mausoleum's ruins continue to prominently diverge from the aesthetic of the modern city to remind of Rome's Augustan past. Although construction was catalyzed by the eventuality of Augustus' death, the Mausoleum of Augustus ultimately situated the Campus Martius at the epicenter of Roman identity – reinvented and refurbished under the new *pater patriae.*

Located in the northern Campus Martius, construction on the Mausoleum began when Augustus was thirty-five years of age. While this early start is sometimes attributed to the emperor's poor constitution, the Mausoleum was "intended purely as propaganda for an ambitious general,"[13] commissioned at a time when, during his emergent conflict with Marcus Antonius, the latter was rumored to have requested burial in Alexandria. In fact, Augustus would not become the tomb's first occupant – that claim would belong to his nephew, Marcellus, who would meet a premature death in 23 BCE (Augustus himself passed much later in 14 CE).[14] As mentioned above, the Mausoleum was part of Augustus' renovation schemes and, as such, was as obtrusive as it was symbolic. The Greek geographer Strabo characterized the monument's placement on the Campus Martius as the "holiest of all," located on "a great mound near the river on a lofty foundation of white marble, thickly covered with ever-green trees to the very summit."[15] Standing at forty meters high and stretching eighty-seven meters wide, the Mausoleum was the tallest structure on the Roman skyline.[16] Strabo's contemporary account of the Mausoleum speaks to its visual impact.

---

[13] Paul Zanker, *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus*, trans. Alan Shapiro (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1990), 24.

[14] Penelope J. E. Davies, *Death and the Emperor: Roman Imperial Funerary Monuments from Augustus to Marcus Aurelius* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2004), 13.

[15] Strabo, *Geography,* ed. and trans. A. Meineke (Leipzig: Teubner, 1877), Perseus Digital Library, 5.3.8.

[16] Zanker, *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus,* 75.

ἐπ᾽ ἄκρῳ μὲν οὖν εἰκών ἐστι χαλκῆ τοῦ Σεβαστοῦ Καίσαρος, ὑπὸ δὲ τῷ χώματι θῆκαί εἰσιν αὐτοῦ καὶ τῶν συγγενῶν καὶ οἰκείων, ὄπισθεν δὲ μέγα ἄλσος περιπάτους θαυμαστοὺς ἔχον: ἐν μέσῳ δὲ τῷ πεδίῳ ὁ τῆς καύστρας αὐτοῦ περίβολος καὶ οὗτος λίθου λευκοῦ, κύκλῳ μὲν περικείμενον ἔχων σιδηροῦν περίφραγμα, ἐντὸς δ᾽ αἰγείροις κατάφυτος.

Upon the summit is a bronze statue of Augustus Caesar, and beneath the mound are the ashes of himself, his relatives, and friends. Behind is a large grove containing charming promenades. In the centre of the plain, is the spot where this prince was reduced to ashes; it is surrounded with a double enclosure, one of marble, the other of iron, and planted within with poplars.[17]

Despite this description, scholars have debated the overall design of the monument, but usually agree that it "consisted of two concentric cylinders... between which trees were planted on the sloping terrain."[18] The Mausoleum was "materially modest, built of concrete and reticulate faced with travertine"[19] – a durable limestone formed by natural springs near Tivoli, Italy and used during the Imperial period for grandiose public monuments.[20] It simultaneously indexed newness and yet appeared natural. Architecturally, the Mausoleum resembled influences other than Roman, including "the kingly tombs of the Hellenistic east: the royal Lydian mounds of Anatolia, and the famous circular tomb of Alexander the Great."[21] At the same time, it evoked the style of ancient tumulus burials still visible at sites in Etruria, and even more tellingly, at Lavinium, with its Heroön (or heroic cult-site) commemorating the purported tomb of none other than Aeneas.[22] In summary, the Mausoleum was a structure of nuances – one of prominent location, ostentatious size, practical materiality, great antiquity, and more recent sophistications of imperial Hellenistic influence – all mantled under the name

---

[17] Strabo, *Geography,* Book 5.3.8.
[18] Zanker, 75.
[19] Favro, *The Urban Image of Augustan Rome,* 186.
[20] M.D. Jackson, F. Marra, R.L. Hay, C. Cawood, "The Judicious Selection and Preservation of Tuff and Travertine Building Stone in Ancient Rome," *Archaeometry* 47, no. 3 (2005), 486.
[21] Favro, 117.
[22] Ross Holloway, *The Archaeology of Early Rome and Latium* (Taylor & Francis, 1991), 134.

'Augustus.'

As a funerary monument on the Campus Martius, the Mausoleum of Augustus had no contemporary equal. Its singularity was emphasized by the lack of comparative buildings in the cityscape and by the mythic nature of its design. This was in part because of the political nature of Augustus' project; following the Mausoleum's completion, "other patrons gradually realized that self-aggrandizement through funerary architecture was both pointless and a political liability."[23] Understandably, others were hesitant to appear in competition with the emperor, elevating the Mausoleum simultaneously as the exception and the albeit unattainable rule. The stylistic details of the monument reflected Augustus' mythic persona, further augmenting the building's distinctive *oneness.* To Strabo's contemporaries, the Mausoleum's visual profile would have indexed similar styles to a *tumulus,* or grave mound, associated "with ancient graves of heroes, such as were still visible in the necropolis of Etruria."[24] In stylistically referencing heroic architecture, the Augustan persona implicitly became larger than life.

The posthumous presence of Augustus' *Res Gestae* (or *Things Achieved*) inscribed on two pillars outside the Mausoleum's entrance[25] even more explicitly gave expression to the emperor's unique position. The Mausoleum reflected the mythic singularity of an individual person; now, at the moment of that person's mortality realized, he became directly connected to the immortality of the Roman Empire through the *Res Gestae.* The 'things achieved' belongs to those within the empire, just as they in turn belong to Rome. The mythic singularity of Augustus – as epitomized in the

[23] Favro, 166-167.
[24] Zanker, 75.
[25] Davies, *Death and the Emperor: Roman Imperial Funerary Monuments from Augustus to Marcus Aurelius,* 13.

Mausoleum – allowed him to become the quintessential "representative of the collective."[26] In exemplifying the marriage between individual and empire, mortality and immortality, the Mausoleum fostered a greater sense of collective unity in newly "refounded" Imperial Rome. Because Augustus' "fame belonged likewise to all Romans,"[27] his mausoleum simultaneously appealed to broader identities of the Roman collective – like those of an individual's relationship to the immortal empire. The emblematic nature of Augustan singularity coalesced within the Mausoleum to emphasize the connection between mortality and immortality, and between an individual Roman and the greater Roman Empire.

In connecting the individual with the empire, the Mausoleum likewise made allusions to Roman triumphs, victories, and accomplishments; to be Roman was to belong to a unified, immortal, *accomplished,* and *triumphant* empire. It was to be *great.* This effect was influenced through the building's situation within the broader political and social contexts of Augustan Rome. Romans contemporaneous with the Mausoleum's construction, which began in the wake of Antonius' defeat, must have understood the building as "a triumphal monument, one erected by the victor himself."[28] To read victory and triumph into the Mausoleum is also to potentially justify the building's unique placement on the Campus Martius. The Field of Mars was generally accepted to be a sacred, public space upon which the construction of a private tomb would have required senatorial permission – even for Augustus. Presenting the Mausoleum in the guise of a commemorative victory trophy and public-heroic tomb circumvented that need entirely.[29]

---

[26] Favro, 119.
[27] Ibid.
[28] Zanker, 76.
[29] Davies, 67.

It became a physical display of the power of its patron[30] – a power that transferred to the greater strength and eminence of Rome. Within the building's political context and locational significance, the Mausoleum of Augustus identified the persona of Augustus with the overall emergence of Imperial Rome.

The Mausoleum of Augustus boldly demonstrates that to be Roman is to be immortal, triumphant, and larger than any one individual. The Mausoleum's role as a monument of death speaks to the first point; its funerary function addresses the mortality of all individual Romans, while the permanence of its construction and the multiple ancestries is claims allude to an overarching immortality. Its very existence into the twenty-first century speaks to this longevity. Despite "its present ruined state, lying well below the modern street level, the nine-meter-high walls of the exterior cylinder make a powerful impression."[31] The Mausoleum continues into the present to diverge from surrounding architecture, and it continuously reminds of Imperial Rome's everlasting presence. The building operates as a monument of triumph as well, evident in its contemporary context and its location within the Field of Mars. To read victory upon a building emblematic of Rome's greater immortality marries the two identities – Roman identity is as eternal as it is successful (and vice versa).

The Ara Pacis Augustae

While not funerary in function, understanding the Ara Pacis Augustae (Altar of Augustan Peace) as another monument of death further nuances the interplay between time and space in the formation of a collective Roman identity. Here, death is defined by the physical loss of life, but also importantly references a more symbolic loss of culture,

---

[30] Zanker, 73.
[31] Zanker, 74-5.

autonomy, and choice. Both of these losses are recast as necessary for the enduring

immortality of Rome, irrevocably marrying the concepts of death and continued life

within the monument. In doing so, the Altar extends beyond linear, mortal time. The

following section examines the physical and symbolic presence of death on the Ara Pacis,

paying special attention to themes of domination, benevolence, abundance, and

immortality – all of which influence the formation of a shared Roman narrative.

First and foremost, the Ara Pacis is a monument of commemoration. Augustus

himself relays this much in his *Res Gestae,* highlighting the reason, location, and purpose

of the Altar:

> *Cum et Hispania Galliaque, rebus in iis provincis prospere gestis, Romam redi, Ti. Nerone P. Quintilio consulibus, aram Pacis Augustae senatus pro reditu meo consacrandam censuit ad campum Martium, in qua magistratus et sacerdotes virginesque Vestales anniversarium sacrificium facere iussit.*

> When I returned from Spain and Gaul, in the consulship of Tiberius Nero and Publius Quintilius, after successful operation in those provinces, the Senate voted in honor of my return the consecration of an altar to Pax Augusta in the Campus Martius, and on this altar it ordered the magistrates and priests and Vestal virgins to make annual sacrifice.[32]

Construction of the monument took over three years to complete[33] and was finally

dedicated by the Senate on 30 January, 9 BCE.[34] Carved entirely from Luna marble,[35] the

Ara Pacis was wrapped in decorative friezes of "mythological, sacrificial, vegetal, and

processional scenes."[36] When approached along the Via Flaminia, the eastern side of the

---

[32] Augustus*, Res Gestae Divi Augusti*, 12.

[33] Paul Rehak, *Imperium and Cosmos: Augustus and the Northern Campus Martius* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2006), 97.

[34] John Elsner, "Cult and Sculpture: Sacrifice in the Ara Pacis Augustae," *The Journal of Roman Studies* 81 (1991): 50. https://www.jstor.org/stable/300488.

[35] Rehak, *Imperium and Cosmos: Augustus and the Northern Campus* Martius, 98.

[36] Diana E.E. Kleiner and Bridget Buxton, "Pledges of Empire: The Ara Pacis and the Donations of Rome," *American Journal of Archaeology* 112, no. 1 (2008): 57. https://www.jstor.org/stable/40037244.

altar presented "Roma and another female personification"[37] surrounded by curling vegetation. Immediately, themes of the "peaceful abundance"[38] resulting from Roman *pax* are explicitly articulated. The western wall depicts Aeneas performing an animal sacrifice and "the she-wolf suckling Romulus and Remus in the presence of Mars."[39] Both the north and south panels portray processional scenes "in which Augustus, Agrippa, and the imperial family participate."[40] Any interpretation of these reliefs must be reconciled with preceding scholarly approaches – particularly that of naturalism. A naturalist perspective "assumes that a naturalistically painted or sculpted image refers back specifically to a real object or situation."[41] This allows scholars like Kleiner and Buxton to potentially identify the person of Augustus or a historically occurring parade within the carved reliefs. Some academics, like Zanker and Elsner, find this method limiting. Zanker in particular insists that "the sculptural style and composition, inspired by Classical reliefs, elevates the scene beyond the historical occasion into a timeless sphere."[42] Recognizing the benefits of both methodologies, the following analysis adopts a combined perspective, willing to historically label some features while always mindful of the overarching representative symbolism.

Looking thematically, the establishment and implied continuation of "Peace" underpins the Altar as a whole. From the monument's very name – Ara Pacis Augustae – Peace specifically indexes Augustan Rome. Thus, Pax itself becomes something Rome *bestows* upon the world, either after military conquest or through performative

---

[37] Kleiner and Buxton, "Pledges of Empire: The Ara Pacis and the Donations of Rome," 59.
[38] Kleiner and Buxton, 59.
[39] Ibid.
[40] Ibid.
[41] Elsner, "Cult and Sculpture: Sacrifice in the Ara Pacis Augustae," 51.
[42] Zanker, 121.

benevolence. The presence of children on the Altar's north and south panels implicates this idea. There is some scholarly debate over the identity of those children; some claim they represent Augustus' heirs, while others maintain they depict foreign children from conquered lands. It is, however, most useful to consider the children as non-Romans in this case – and it is within the bounds of plausible reason to do so. In fact, "one of Augustus' foreign policy innovations was to use women and children as guarantees for the proper behavior of the peoples on the frontiers of the empire."[43] The display of foreign individuals in public spectacle was foregrounded by long-standing traditions,[44] but Rome was particularly sensitive to the treatment of children.[45] Thus, while their very presence denotes Rome's imperial domination and conquest, any visual depictions of children must have intended to showcase Augustan benevolence. Through this light, the children depicted become emblematic of Roman clemency and symbolize "allied partners" with Rome in a "peaceful new world order."[46] This created an "overarching message of friendship and harmony"[47] – but one that foundationally relied upon the simultaneous emphasis and erasure of the children's non-Roman origins. It is for this reason that modern viewers have trouble viewing whether the children are 'Roman' or 'non-Roman': they are ultimately both, on the threshold (and the symbolic future) provided by this very commemorative act of peace/pacification. As such, any foreignness was necessary to perpetuate Rome's benevolent domination, but that is the extent of its importance. In other words, the foreign children are viewed as specifically *non-Roman*

---

[43] Kleiner and Buxton, 59.
[44] Kleiner and Buxton, 77.
[45] Kleiner and Buxton, 67.
[46] Kleiner and Buxton, 77.
[47] Kleiner and Buxton, 63.

Romans; they only have importance insofar as they relate to Rome. Nonetheless, to Roman audiences, the children would have represented the benevolence (and future) of Roman domination.

The carvings upon the Ara Pacis also illustrate Roman abundance and immortality – specifically through depictions of animal sacrifice and vegetal embellishments. The scene of Aeneas' sacrifice of a sow decorating the Altar's western wall is ritualistic; its foundational act of death creates "a kind of insurance for the continuation of that life."[48] This cycle of mortality-immortality is completed by the presence of cow skulls in the frieze's garland. This acted as a visual *memento mori*, a physical reminder that "the fruitfulness of life [had been] brought at the ritual cost of death."[49] As evidenced by the presence of Aeneas, the practice of animal sacrifice pre-dates – and even presages – the existence of Rome itself. Yet in this context it directly implicates life,[50] speaking to Rome's abundance and power. In addition to the garland, the flora adorning the Altar similarly speaks to Rome's abundance and immortality. Plants are inherently ephemeral; their presence on the durable marble translates into a "visual 'eternalization' of the impermanent."[51] More specifically, the immortalizing of the acanthus plant, which held funerary associations, calls further attention to these themes.[52] As with the *memento mori* of the sow, such imagery speaks simultaneously to death and to eternal life. In both the instances, perishable flora and fauna are immortalized upon the permanence of the Ara Pacis. The abundance of Rome, the lifecycles of sacrifice, victory, peace, and renewal,

---

[48] Elsner, 57.
[49] Elsner, 58.
[50] Elsner, 60.
[51] Davies, 95.
[52] Rehak, 135.

are everlasting, and they are driven by death as the omnipresent engine of rebirth.

The Ara Pacis is therefore another monument of death – both physical and metaphorical – that illustrates Rome to be a benevolently dominant and eternally abundant entity. It does so through the inclusion of intentionally timeless scenes as well as non-Roman/Roman children along the processional friezes to the north and south walls and through the flora and fauna on the western panel. It also speaks to the perpetuation of peace; in creating a monument to *pax,* Rome asserts peace everlasting. In doing so, the identity of Roman domination hinges upon the justifications present in the Altar of Augustan Peace – those of Rome's clemency, benevolence, abundance, and pacification.

Mussolini's *Romanità* Campaign

Through the context of *endings* and *loss,* monuments like the Augustan Mausoleum and the Altar of Peace characterize Roman identity as founded upon the juxtaposition between mortality and immortality, crossing the boundaries of time through the permeable bounds of space. This narrative was justified via assertions of victory, triumph, benevolence, and abundance – themes which surface in the mid-twentieth century with the Italian Fascism of Benito Mussolini. As seen through Il Duce's thirty-four volume *Opera Omnia* (*The Complete Works*), political speeches, and spatial actions, Fascism "placed itself ideologically in history as the fulfilment of Italy's destiny"[53] to heavily cite antiquity. To this end, Mussolini enacted his *romanità* ("Roman-ness") campaign – which similarly appropriated time and privileged space to intentionally evoke a sense of the Roman *self* in modern Italy. The following examines Mussolini's attempts at resurrecting Roman identity in twentieth-century Italy for his own political gain

---

[53] Jan Nelis, "Constructing Fascist Identity: Benito Mussolini and the Myth of 'Romanità'," *The Classical World* 100, no. 4 (2007): 399. https://www.jstor.org/stable/25434050.

through conversations about time and space. Through this reiteration, Roman identity is revealed to be continually hinged upon ideas of durability and glory.

Italian Fascism of the twentieth century represented an act of appropriative reframing, something reflected in its particular relationship with time. Mussolini "insisted that celebration of *romanità* was oriented toward the future, not the past."[54] This claim situated attempts at appropriating Roman identity for the cause of Fascism as justified; it was not simply gazing upon a glorious past, but rather activating it and *improving* upon it in service for Italy's future. In the thirty-first volume of Mussolini's *Opera Omnia,* Il Duce ("the *dux*") declares: "For the Italian people all is eternal and contemporary. For us, it is as if Caesar was stabbed just yesterday. It is something proper to the Italian people, something which no other people have to the same extent."[55] This intentionally blurs – and more accurately, collapses – time; chronology suddenly is enacted instantaneously. To encapsulate time is a very Roman notion, and evokes a similar simultaneity to the mortality-immortality embodied within the Mausoleum of Augustus. It is significant that Mussolini considered history as a largely mythic narrative – a perspective more in alignment with the modernist thought of the previous chapter. The eighteenth volume of the *Opera Omnia* reveal as much:

> Rome is our point of departure and reference; it is our symbol or, if you wish, our myth. We dream of a Roman Italy, that is wise and strong, disciplined and imperial. Much of what was the immortal spirit of Rome, resurges in Fascism: Roman is the Lictor, Roman is our organization of combat, Roman is our pride and courage: *Civis Romanus sum.*[56]

Modern and ancient Italy are depicted as characteristically similar; the same tenants of

---

[54] Julia Hell, *The Conquest of Ruins: The Third Reich and the Fall of Rome* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2019), 320.
[55] Nelis, "Constructing Fascist Identity: Benito Mussolini and the Myth of 'Romanità'," 396.
[56] Nelis, 403.

identity belonging to the Romans – power, strength, immortality, pride – are thus situated as intrinsically Italian. This is further reflected in the Latin quotation in reference to Cicero's orations: I am a Roman citizen. Overall, Fascism's relationship to time is an act of mimesis, collapsing time so as to reference the identity of ancient Rome, and make it serve, reductively, as a starting point.

In this light, it is significant that Mussolini "viewed the manifestation of *romanità* in archaeology and aesthetics."[57] Physical, tangible space – like monuments and buildings – were significant ways to imprint Fascism upon the Italian population using the existing blueprints to be provided by ancient structures. Under Mussolini's leadership, the modern topography of Rome was drastically changed; they "demolished the vernacular architecture that had grown up around the ruins of ancient Rome" to create a "city-wide stage" out of the space.[58] One historian has termed this impulse as "space lust"[59] – but this preoccupation with the Roman past was not without selectivity. When molding the physical imagery of Fascist Italy, "only the most impressive remnants of this [the Roman] era were judged to be valuable."[60] For example, the Ara Pacis Augustae underwent significant renovations and was even moved from its original location on the Campus Martius to a newly constructed Piazzale Augusto Imperatore, built to reframe Augustus' Mausoleum.[61] The Mausoleum of Augustus, too, received special attention, and was used as the backdrop for several of Mussolini's public addresses.[62]

In referencing and re-harnessing Italy's Roman ancestry, Mussolini intended to

---

[57] Nelis, 393.
[58] Hell, *The Conquest of Ruins: The Third Reich and the Fall of Rome,* 317.
[59] Ibid.
[60] Nelis, 410.
[61] Hell, 319.
[62] Ibid.

lend credibility and a sense of renewal to his Fascist agenda. This was enacted through a preoccupation with time and space. Linear time was collapsed in order to more easily identify Rome as truly eternal and space was privileged as emblematic of that durable past to be resuscitated through 'modernization'. By interacting with the Roman space, Mussolini both highlighted ancient Rome's contributions to the physical landscape as well as imprinting his own mark. Indeed, he claimed to have "brought life to the emblems of the ancient Roman Empire."[63] Through the rhetoric and actions of Il Duce, the pillars of Roman identity evident in the Mausoleum of Augustus and the Ara Pacis Augustae were tangibly reinforced, reiterated, and appropriated in ways that oddly continued and yet discontinued their original contexts and meaning. Under both Augustus and Mussolini, the Roman cityscape in the Campus Martius was simultaneously identified and shaped as triumphant, eternal, and justified, extending an expression of time across the span of many mortal lives. In this interaction between time and space, mortality and immortality, Roman identity projects the city as a true *urbs aeterna.*

---

[63] Nelis, 402.

Chapter Three. Divinely Sanctioned War and Triumph

The previous chapter explored the spatial recognition of death, linking individual ephemerality and Rome's immortality together in a commentary on Roman unity and expressions of grandeur across time. This chapter similarly speaks to the perception of Rome's excellence as rooted in tangible monuments, but does so through the marriage of warfare and religiosity. This connection again refers to perceptions of *self* in relation to the greater collective body of Rome; individual actions in battle extend first to the glory of Rome and then second to the individual. Once the influence of divine power is considered, the individual's military victory is even further rewritten as emblematic of Rome's divine favor. In much the same way that the Mausoleum of Augustus became symbolic of individual mortality at large, the connection between sacred ritual and military triumphs significantly characterized Roman identity. This was affected through the construction of permanent monuments, such as the Column of Marcus Aurelius or the temples to Bellona and Apollo Medicus, within the Campus Martius. To different degrees, these monuments engaged with religiosity and the act of war to reaffirm victories as divinely sanctioned and belonging to the collective (and confirm individual achievement in codependency with these terms). The association of Roman victory with godly approval would ultimately transfer to Christian frameworks, with the latter being most continually evident in the Pantheon's monotheistic appropriation. As a whole, then, monuments on the Field of Mars crucially characterized Roman identity as divine and unfailingly victorious.

The religiosity of the Campus Martius has thus far referenced the *pomerium,* Romulus' apotheosis, and its divine namesake – but its sacred and ritual roles in the

Roman narrative of warfare cannot be overstated. Due to its situation outside the *pomerium,* the Field of Mars could be interpreted as concerned with Rome's external affairs – like the waging of military campaigns. In fact, some of the earliest mentions of the area (other than as a pasture for sheep!) document the Campus as a space for athletic and military activity.[1] Under this logic, any monuments and rituals relating to war thus belong in the uniquely liminal space of the Campus. Romans during the Republican and Imperial periods felt similarly, as expressed in Vitruvius' architectural guide: "Mars outside the city but at the training ground."[2] To support this claim, Vitruvius cites the conclusions of Etruscan diviners and reasons: "As for Mars, when that divinity is enshrined outside the walls, the citizens will never take up arms against each other and he [Mars] will defend the city from its enemies and save it from dangers of war."[3] From this assertion, the spatial location of a temple – of a divine presence – is revealed to be significant and influential. Further, the Campus Martius is characterized as a space of divine protection and ritual enacted on the behalf of Rome as a whole. These were rituals of great power. For example, the custom of throwing the fetial spear into the symbolically 'foreign' territory of the Temple of Bellona[4] was traditionally done to sanction the act of war. Thus, the Field of Mars spatially connected religiosity to warfare with significant impact to Roman landscape and behaviors.

---

[1] Horace, *Odes and Epodes,* ed. and trans. Niall Rudd (Harvard University Press, 2004), Loeb Classical Library, 3.7.

[2] Vitruvius, *On Architecture,* ed. and trans. Thomas Gordon Smith (New York: The Monacelli Press, 2003), 1.7.1.

[3] Vitruvius, *On Architecture*, 1.7.1.

[4] Paul Zanker, *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus*, trans. Alan Shapiro (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1990), 103.

Battlefield Pledges and Temple Construction

The relationship between religion and militaristic action can be credited with literally implanting the presence of the divine upon the landscape of the Field of Mars. To ancient Romans, this would have been visually apparent by the sheer number of religious temples constructed within the area. Approximately speaking, of the "eighty temples constructed in Republican Rome, about twenty were built in the Campus Martius" – most of which originated in the period of the Punic Wars.[5] That number would continue to rise into the Imperial period, frequently stemming from the practice of battle pledges. At its most basic, pledges involved a military general invoking divine intervention during an external conflict on the behalf of Rome; this godly influence would then be recognized through a temple dedication upon the return home. These vows could occur at any point during a battle, and could be declared out of actual or feigned necessity, but were ubiquitously considered to be a deeply sacred act.[6] In fact, "a general who was cavalier in his obedience to religious ritual risked dire consequences on the battlefield."[7] This practice fundamentally characterizes Roman military might with divine intervention – which is an act that assumes godly favor. Such vows and their resulting temples were self-referential by nature; Roman victory increased the divine presence in the Campus Martius, which in turn could be relied upon in future campaigns. The tradition of pledging temples thus served as accumulative proof of Rome's belief in their own fated success. Battle vows therefore provide a physical link between divinity and war on the

---

[5] Paul W. Jacobs and Diane Atnally Conlin, *Campus Martius: The Field of Mars in the Life of Ancient Rome* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2014), 49.
[6] Jacobs and Conlin, *Campus Martius: The Field of Mars in the Life of Ancient Rome,* 47.
[7] Jacobs and Conlin, 47.

Campus, and at the same time, reveal a significant facet of Rome's identity: victory as proof of godly approval.

Between the end of the sixth century and the middle of the first century BCE, "more than half" of the temples built in Rome originated out of battlefield vows.[8] However, emphasizing the concentrated quantity of sacred buildings is not to diminish their individual importance. In fact, the temple to one of the Campus' more essential divinities originates from a pledge in battle: the Temple to Bellona. Not only is this temple crucial for long-cherished traditions (like the fetial spear), but it was also the first performative invocation of a deity upon the promise of a spatial dedication. Livy recounts the moment with a speech attributed to the consul Appius Claudius Caecus in 296 BCE just prior to a battle with the Etruscans and Samnites: "The story runs that he lifted up his hands to heaven so as to be visible to those about the foremost standards and uttered this prayer: 'Bellona! If thou wilt grant us victory today, I, in return, vow a temple to thee.'"[9] From that moment, Roman victory was to become, in the Roman mindset, inextricably connected with the landscape. In the construction of temples, the divine influence was grounded, on the most basic level, within the very thing Rome stood to lose in battle: the ground itself. Rome's position, both figuratively and literally, was thereby credited to the gods. To safeguard Roman land was to act *for Rome;* the act of temple building imbued the Campus Martius with the presumption, and reaffirmation, of Rome's divine qualities. Thus, in simultaneously acting as "thank offerings to the gods, which also provide a

---

[8] Jacobs and Conlin, 46.

[9] Livy, *Ab Urbe Condita,* trans. B. O. Foster (Harvard University Press, 1924), Loeb Classical Library, 10.19.

locus"[10] for the display of spoils, temples on the Campus Martius evoke "Roman memories and Roman history."[11] They attached a larger-than-life quality to Roman identity: they physically demarcated collective sacredness.

Temples thus acted as both religious sites and *historical* monuments, evoking a divine presence – and presumed approval – upon the act of war, upon the outcome of *Roman victory.* However, as much as these spaces referenced the gods, they also visually spoke of more mortal identities through "inscriptions that indicated the man who had vowed the temple and under what circumstances."[12] To contemporary Romans, the individual's name "reminded of the accomplishments of their ancestors and of what it means to be Roman."[13] More specifically, it was to clearly define the role of *the self* in relation to the broader collective. As has been discussed, these temples spoke to the fated and godly-sanctioned victory of Rome – enacted at the battle-fueled request of an individual. By connecting that individual's name to the fruits of his labor, *the one* is positioned as acting in the service of the collective good. Through personal inscriptions on battle-vowed temples, Roman identity was understood to hinge upon the actions of individuals, but to always apply first to the overarching collective, in a higher-order definition of time and space.

This establishment of roles accrued additional layers of complexity under the leadership of Augustus. As seen in the previous chapter's discussion of his urban renovation scheme, Augustus additionally influenced Rome's religiosity through the

---

[10] Valerie M. Hope, "Trophies and Tombstones: Commemorating the Roman Soldier," *World Archaeology* 35, no. 1 (2003):83. https://www.jstor.org/stable/3560213.
[11] Eric M. Orlin, "Augustan Religion and the Reshaping of Roman Memory," *Arethusa* 40, no. 1 (2007): 83. doi:10.1353/are.2007.0004.
[12] Orlin, "Augustan Religion and the Reshaping of Roman Memory," 82.
[13] Orlin, 83.

"restoration of temples."[14] Employing the same logic of creating a visual embodiment of Roman eminence, Augustus was concerned with the visual aesthetics of temples as meaning-laden nodal points. Where temples previously embodied Rome's collective, divine, and victorious identity, they now spoke, in a centralized fashion, of Augustan influence as the next, fated chapter. This addition worked 'organically' and was therefore accepted as imbuing greater sacredness into the temples, as a 'restoration' of Rome's "traditional religion."[15] Under the mantle of visually resuscitating Roman religion, Augustus literally reshaped the visual and spatial landscape of temples within the Field of Mars – as well as in the city proper. The buildings still embodied collective identifiers, but they did so through in a manner that made Augustus' presence at once natural and all-pervasive. If Augustus is considered to be a similarly larger-than-life persona to those of the Republican-era gods, then the temples continued to act as symbols of Rome's overarching greatness. The cycle kept repeating.

The Column of Marcus Aurelius

Among the monuments of military commemoration, the Column of Marcus Aurelius further exemplifies the tangible relationship between warfare and the sacredness of Rome. The Column was located in the northern Campus Martius, and received the descriptor of *columna cochlis* – or, 'snail column,' in reference to its sequence of relief scenes recounting Aurelius' campaigns in an upwards, scroll-like spiral.[16] In accordance with the "increasingly purpose-designed arches and columns" of the Imperial period, the Column of Marcus Aurelius was "adorned with reliefs of defeated enemies, spoils,

---

[14] Orlin, 82.
[15] Zanker, 103.
[16] Martin Beckmann, *The Column of Marcus Aurelius: The Genesis and Meaning of a Roman Imperial Monument* (University of North Carolina Press, 2011), 55.

winged victories, and campaign scenes."[17] The monument indeed represents a visual

tribute to the military 'exploits' of Marcus Aurelius (emperor, 161-180 CE). More

specifically, it depicts the efforts mobilized "against barbarians across the Rhine and

Danube," as evidenced by "the adherence of the depicted enemy to standard stereotypes

of northern barbarians."[18] As such, the Column establishes Romans as visually distinct

from non-Romans – a differentiation intended to implicate the inherent superiority (and

inevitability) of Rome's eventual victory. The Column of Marcus Aurelius implicates a

militaristic, and thus divinely sanctioned, superiority to comment on Rome's unfailingly

victorious nature. These themes are most visible in the monument's architectural design

and via the contents of its visual illustrations.

Looking first to its architectural qualities, the Column of Marcus Aurelius

intentionally invites attention. This is partially affected through its structural design; as a

column, it noticeably protrudes from the ground, creating a cylindrical narrative

wrapping upwards. Such a monument then seems to 'naturally' invite circular movement,

even necessitate it (and hence, another rationale behind its ancient nickname *columna

cochlis*). This latter point raises additional questions regarding the inaccessibility of the

column's height. Some scholars have postulated that the exterior decoration of the

column even attempted to structurally accommodate for this reality for on-the-ground

viewers: "the height of the spirals is taller; the scene layouts are often more open; the

depth of carving is greater; and the compositions are regularly arranged to draw more

---

[17] Hope, "Trophies and Tombstones: Commemorating the Roman Soldier," 83.
[18] Elizabeth Wolfram Thill, "Setting War in Stone: Architectural depictions on the Column of Marcus Aurelius," *American Journal of Archaeology* 122, no. 2 (2018): 278. https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.3764/aja.122.2.0277.

attention to the emperor."[19] The structural awareness of audience viewership speaks to the creation of memory as understood by the Romans to necessitate an external gaze. Thus, the column's architecture relates to its role as a locus of memory and identity.

Also of note are the formulaic themes of columns themselves, as an architectural-type intended to commemorate military victory; Romans would not have necessarily needed to view each minute detail, but the upwards-looking impression of the massive, visual story itself was more than enough to understand the full monument's meaning. External appearance aside, the architectural quality of primary interest was "the stairway, cut inside the otherwise solid shaft of [the] column."[20] Spiral staircases were a rarity in Roman building design, which further highlights the Column's "two hundred-step spiral staircase, lit by fifty-six small rectangular windows"[21] as "a remarkable technical achievement."[22] Admittedly, the Column of Marcus Aurelius borrowed its staircase design from that of Trajan's Column, but this point hardly diminishes the staircase's relative novelty (and greater comparative accessibility within the cityscape). The stairs in Aurelius' column led up to a viewing platform at the top of the structure, although the regularity with which they were used – and by what demographic of patron – is unknown.[23] In a very literal way, the staircase (another iteration of the *columna cochlis* moniker) introduced the possibility of vertical movement *through* the monument. These quasi-interactive modes would have situated the Column of Marcus Aurelius as proof in and of itself of Roman intellectual superiority – an identity further reflected in the visual

---

[19] Thill, "Setting War in Stone: Architectural depictions on the Column of Marcus Aurelius," 282.
[20] Beckmann, *The Column of Marcus Aurelius: The Genesis and Meaning of a Roman Imperial Monument*, 63.
[21] Penelope J. E. Davies, *Death and the Emperor: Roman Imperial Funerary Monuments from Augustus to Marcus Aurelius* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2004), 46.
[22] Beckmann, 63.
[23] Beckmann, 64.

imagery of the monument.

The scenes depicted on the Column of Marcus Aurelius reveal the difference between Romans and non-Romans via a backdrop of military conflict that, compounded by the presence of victory personified, works to visually identify Rome as superior. This differentiation relates to the depictions of architecture upon the frieze, which set "generic Roman fortifications" in contrast to the "barbarian huts" of the enemy.[24] Even if the eventual outcome was unknown, the comparative rhetoric of 'fortification' versus 'huts' is indicative of a perceived cultural and military dissonance between the 'two' sides in the visually-constructed binary. In addition, the imposition of superiority influences the illustration of human subjects as well. The scenes on the Column of Marcus Aurelius are known for being "strikingly brutal: women and children are assaulted by Roman soldiers; fields are put to the flame; and warriors are forced to watch the decapitation of their compatriots."[25] All of this is to emphasize the enemy's lack of humanity and the "remoteness of the depicted conflict," while shunning any potential "messages of peaceful integration" such as can be read into the Ara Pacis Augustae.[26] Contrasting these illustrations of violence is the figure of Victory personified; she is prominently placed halfway up the column and directly faces outward at the viewer.[27] Romans and the city of Rome were distinct from the acts of foreign war; to emerge victorious out of the fray was to thus be superior in military skill and in cultural civilization. To quite literally top it all off, the Column was originally crowned by a bronze statue of the emperor, Marcus Aurelius. Eventually destroyed and replaced with a statue of Saint Paul in the sixteenth

---

[24] Thill, 278.
[25] Thill, 278.
[26] Thill, 303.
[27] Beckmann, 87.

century,[28] there was a reason why: the carved figure of the emperor atop a "sculpted helical frieze"[29] of Roman superiority had further epitomized Rome as the shining ideal, as well as every ancient individual's role – be it on-the-ground viewer, in-the-scenes participant, or up-the-stairs panoptic spectator – in the making, (re)affirmation, and retelling of the entire process.

Overall, the Column of Marcus Aurelius speaks to themes of Roman superiority and continual victory, while additionally seeking to widen the difference between visual representations of Romans and non-Romans. Such representations visually and spatially impacted the collective memory of military campaigns – victory was intrinsically associated with divine influence. Because godly interventions worked on behalf of Rome, the Republic and Empire identify as favored, sacred, and fated. Roman identity thereby re-rooted itself in the Campus Martius by correlating victory with superiority claimed as grounded in the divine landscape.

The Roman Military Triumph

Lastly, the importance of the Campus Martius as a space for military rituals was articulated through the tradition of military triumphal processions. Occurring with the highest frequency during the Republic, Roman triumphs could be generally considered ostentatious and imposing processionals, both commemorating and ritually exorcising acts of mass bloodletting and sacrifice. As one of the highest rewards,[30] these parades involved cartloads of spoils, "often including statues and paintings, animals for games

---

[28] Davies, 46.
[29] Thill, 278.
[30] Miriam R. Pelikan Pittenger, *Contested Triumphs: Politics, Pageantry, and Performance in Livy's Republican Rome* (Berkley: University of California Press, 2008), 5.

and sacrifices, and foreign captives, followed by the general atop his chariot."[31] The

group would then wind through the city, always in the same order: Campus Martius,

Palatine, Capitol.[32] Through these patterns of movement, triumphs "helped define the

sacred topography of the city"[33] and were "one of ancient Rome's most important

institutions, a ritual at once religious and political, military and spectacular."[34] The

importance of ritual and of reiterative space is evident here, particularly in regard to the

Campus Martius. The Field of Mars was not only the triumphal parade's origin point,

marking the transition from *outside* to *inside* Rome, but it was also a place of senatorial

and collective decision and reaffirmation. Upon returning from battle, "a would-be

triumphator met with the Senate outside the *pomerium* – often in the Temple of Bellona

or of Apollo Medicus nearby – because it was taboo for anyone with *imperium militiae* to

cross the sacred boundary."[35] Again, the Campus' liminality aided in its applicability to

rituals of external activities – such as foreign military campaigns. In the ritual order of the

triumphal procession, Roman identity was highlighted as grounded within the topography

of the Field of Mars.

Such topography also meant that triumphs reiterated the individual's positioning

of *self* with respect to – and only ever in terms of – a greater collective body, history, and

experience of Rome, as both 'Roman' and 'emergent Roman.' This phenomenon was

firmly entrenched in the ritualistic landscape of the Campus Martius through the

distribution of war spoils. Traditionally, "the ceremonial distribution" of spoils to the

---

[31] Maggie L. Popkin, *The Architecture of the Roman Triumph: Monuments, Memory, and Identity* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2016), 10.
[32] Pittenger, *Contested Triumphs: Politics, Pageantry, and Performance in Livy's Republican Rome*, 281.
[33] Pittenger, 5.
[34] Popkin, *The Architecture of the Roman Triumph: Monuments, Memory, and Identity,* 2.
[35] Pittenger, 36.

soldiers took place in the southeastern Field of Mars.[36] The space of the Campus thus

marked one of personal gain, but was at the same time strictly preceded by the rewards

granted to Rome as a whole. This practice tangibly exemplifies the underlying principle

of Roman triumphs; by focusing public "attention on the achievements of a single

individual in service to the community at large,"[37] Roman identity becomes exponentially

larger than any one person. The tangible proof of this paradigm found its place in war and

its ritual departure and return within the Campus Martius, further solidifying the region as

a central, unceasing heartbeat of Roman identity.

The Pantheon in Christian Rome

To connect warfare and religiosity within the landscape of the Campus Martius

during the Republican and Imperial periods is to understand the significance of battle-

pledged temples, commemorative columns, and the practice of the Roman military

triumph. All identify Rome with narratives of divinely sanctioned victory and within a

greater collective. Similar identities continued, albeit with new frames, in Christian Rome

– specifically through appropriations of the spatial topography, like those that occurred

with the Pantheon on the Field of Mars. Under the polytheism of Imperial Rome, the

original Pantheon structure was constructed between 27 and 25 BCE by Marcus

Agrippa.[38] The word 'pantheon' ("all-gods-place") itself is indicative of the building's

original purpose as a space for multiple deities. In fact, the concept of a divine pantheon

---

[36] Pittenger, 281.
[37] Pittenger, 76.
[38] Samuel Ball Platner and Thomas Ashby, *A Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome* (London: Oxford University Press, 1929), 382.

"is one of the most fundamental" to traditional Greek and Roman culture.[39] In its original iterations, the space of the Pantheon inherently encompassed a polytheistic society, but was not without its alterations – even within the purview of ancient Rome. Agrippa's original construction burned in 80 CE and was restored by Domitian, only to be struck by lightning and be burned for a second time under Trajan.[40] In 126 CE, the emperor Hadrian rebuilt the Pantheon; it rested upon the same location, but was in fact "an entirely new construction."[41] The following section grounds the Pantheon's physical and symbolic transformation from a space of traditional Roman polytheism to a basilica of Christian worship within the Campus Martius to consider the continuance of narratives of divine fate.

The physical appearance of the Pantheon building follows a narrative of appropriation, alteration, and supposed restoration – all of which reveal a preoccupation both with Rome and with religious space. As a point of transformation, simplistically speaking, from poly- to mono-theism, the Pantheon was converted into a Christian church in the early seventh century[42] under the leadership of Pope Boniface IV.[43] This moment marked both a symbolic and physical transformation for the Pantheon; the monument was re-dedicated as "the church of S. Maria ad Martyres"[44] and it would undergo several remodeling additions that "altered the original appearance of the Pantheon considerably"

[39] Edmund Thomas, "From the pantheon of the gods to the Pantheon of Rome," in *Pantheons: Transformations of a Monumental Idea*, ed. Richard Wrigley and Matthew Craske (Burlington: Ashgate, 2004), 12.
[40] Platner-Ashby, 383.
[41] Ibid.
[42] Tod A. Marder and Mark Wilson Jones, eds. *The Pantheon: From Antiquity to the Present* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), 258.
[43] Frances J. Niederer, "Temples Converted into Churches: The Situation in Rome," *Church History* 22, no. 3 (1953):177. https://www.jstor.org/stable/3161858.
[44] Niederer, "Temples Converted into Churches: The Situation in Rome," 176.

in the following centuries.[45] These 'considerable' physical alterations to the building may have shifted the Pantheon's external appearance away from its 'original' Roman aesthetic, but this is not inherently a negative act. Remembering that Romans considered memory to be fluid and mutable, shifting the structure – but not the space – ascribes this transformation to a very "Roman" thought pattern. The physical space of the Pantheon – the ground itself, the materiality upon it, and the people and their stories through it – remained the same, and so the 'transmigration' of the Pantheon demonstrates how a characteristically Roman interest in space and religion transferred into Christian thought.

Examinations of the Pantheon reveal Christian narratives to be keenly aware of the historical presence of the space they currently occupied. According to one historian, "even Christian writers extolled the wonders of Rome as precursors to the beauties of the heavenly Jerusalem."[46] It was this sort of reverence for Rome's "past glories embodied in tangible form" that influenced efforts at preservation of Roman aesthetics within the landscape.[47] Eventually, even the Christianized additions to the Pantheon were removed in an attempt to revert the structure to its original state (at least according to a depiction by Raphael).[48] While these movements at restoration privileged Roman architecture in a distinctly un-Roman manner, they are illustrative of the power of physical space, in very ancient Roman terms, to carry meaning and identity. Within the 'Christianization' of the Pantheon, the site physically shifted but symbolically continued to identify a very familiar brand of spatial religiosity. The Pantheon's transformations thus track, in an all too symbolic fashion, the pervasive continuation of Roman identity, as branded within

---

[45] Marder and Jones, *The Pantheon: From Antiquity to Present*, 258.
[46] Niederer, 176.
[47] Niederer, 176.
[48] Marder and Jones, *The Pantheon: From Antiquity to Present*, 263.

the physical space of the Campus Martius.

Overall, the Field of Mars is a region strongly tied to the practice of warfare. Due to the ritualistic nature of Roman conquest, the Campus hosted temples vowed on the battlefield, accomplished through the spoils of victory, and re-performed in the special celebratory processions of the triumph. Again, the liminality of the area is crucial; in relation to religiosity and military action, the Campus Martius implicates the overall greatness of Rome through external acts of divinely sanctioned victory. Each triumph, in turn, embedded itself within the Campus' topography, recreating a cycle of reciprocal reference: war begot ritual spaces, and the presence of the divine sanctioned war. At its very core, there on the field of Mars Roman identity was irrevocably rooted within sacred space, and this *groundedness* carried and was re-projected to the Christian city. Roman identity in and of itself acquired a ritualistic quality within the space of the Campus Martius.

Chapter Four. Movement in Public and Private Space

Monuments on the Campus Martius asserted Rome's immortal and sacred greatness as an overarching, collective identity – yet one's place within that collective was highly conditional and spatially regulated. In other words, in the same physical, spatial way that the Field of Mars commemorated the collective body of Rome, so did it too impose hierarchies and boundaries upon Roman society. Most prominently, such delineations were created via the manipulation of the landscape, through the complex and overlapping labels of 'public' and 'private' space. On the Campus Martius, private individuals utilized public space to construct ostensibly public buildings with prescribed patterns of movement. The Thermae Agrippae (or Baths of Agrippa) is considered in this chapter as a monument intended to *control*. In this way, Roman identity becomes increasingly defined through physical interaction and movement through space. Through the relationship of public and private space on the Campus Martius, this chapter analyzes the creation of boundaries and divisions to further situate topography as central to the creation of Roman identity.

Within the context of ancient Rome, setting public space as fundamentally oppositional to private space is to substitute twenty-first century understandings of English words in place of their Latin equivalents: *publicus* and *privatus.* According to Roman architect Vitruvius' treatise entitled *De Architectura* (On Architecture), the labels of *publicus* and *privatus* were not inherently mutually exclusive. Vitruvius organized his analysis according to building type, "the first of which is the construction... of works for general use in public places, and the second is the erection of structures for private

individuals."[1] The aforementioned 'works for general use' include defensive structures, religious temples, and utilitarian buildings – like "harbors, markets, porticoes, baths, theaters, promenades, and the rest."[2] In summation, the Latin word *publicus* "as applied to space implies a community,"[3] situating societal interaction as both assumed and inherent to public spaces. Regarding *privatus,* it is significant that Vitruvius singularly classifies places of residence within the private sphere; however, the architect himself admits that even one's *domus* was not completely private. Within the home, "private rooms are those that require an invitation to have the right to enter, such as bedrooms, dining rooms, [and] baths," while public spaces "are those into which anyone may enter, even without an invitation" like "vestibules, courtyards, [and] peristyles."[4] While foreign to Victorian-influenced 'modern' customs, Roman thought did indeed privilege "the public over the private" such that "space not explicitly defined as private was assumed to be public."[5] More crucially, spaces could simultaneously be public and private. On the Campus Martius – an area officially classified as *ager publicus* (or 'public land') – permanent and "privately owned structures were few" until the late Republican period.[6] Thus, to construct privately owned buildings intended for public use within the Campus Martius inserted boundaries and controlled the public's movement. The same structures from which a unified, communal identity could be sourced also supported the hierarchical division of that society.

---

[1] Vitruvius, *On Architecture,* ed. and trans. Thomas Gordon Smith (New York: The Monacelli Press, 2003), 1.3.1.
[2] Vitruvius, *On Architecture*, 1.3.1.
[3] Amy Russell, *The Politics of Public Space in Republican Rome* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), 41.
[4] Vitruvius, *On Architecture,* 6.5.1.
[5] Russell, *The Politics of Public Space in Republican Rome,* 22.
[6] Diane Favro, *The Urban Image of Augustan Rome* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 206.

The Thermae Agrippae

Agrippa's bathing complex is an excellent example of a simultaneously *publicus* and *privatus* space. Initially, the Thermae Agrippae presents as an exclusively public space – even falling under Vitruvius' public buildings sub-category of 'utilitarian buildings.' However, despite Vitruvius' firmly public classification, many considered public baths to be "too luxurious or too unsavory to be granted public funds."[7] Private sponsorship of the public bathing space thus emerged out of necessity. In the rare instance in which this was not the case, "the baths provided by public investors were deemed insufficient for the Roman public's bathing needs."[8] It is understandable, then, that Rome did not have any large, public bathing establishments prior to the construction of the Baths of Agrippa in 25 BCE.[9] The following section analyzes the liminality of the Baths in light of the nuanced intersection between public and private space in the Campus Martius. To this end, the intended patrons are considered, as is the insertion of the practice of bathing into Roman social behaviors. Finally, the potential for classist divisions and the role of the public within the bathing complex is viewed in light of acquisition of resources and movement. The Thermae Agrippae existed as a tangible reminder of the public benefits of private beneficence, ultimately reinforcing societal divides through its doubly public-private qualities.

The Baths of Agrippa were built with the intent of theoretically ubiquitous public use in an unprecedented manner within the city of Rome. According to several historians, the inherently 'public' space of the Baths created a "villa for the common people" for the

---

[7]Anne Hrychuck Kontokosta, "Building the Thermae Agrippae: Private Life, Public Space, and the Politics of Bathing in Early Imperial Rome," *American Journal of Archaeology* 123, no. 1 (2019): 50.

[8] Kontokosta, "Building the Thermae Agrippae: Private Life, Public Space, and the Politics of Bathing in Early Imperial Rome," 50.

[9] Kontokosta, 55.

plebs urbana by "effectively publicizing features that had long been urban perquisites for Rome's elite."[10] Emphasizing the Baths' unique openness in relation to 'common people' reveals a societal division within Roman society. Even if baths were not explicitly said to have been a luxury of the elite, the intentional and specific linkage of the Thermae Agrippae with non-elites is significant. It speaks to identity as defined through patterns of behavior – in this case, bathing habits. For the average Roman, public baths represented the one access point to such socially accepted behaviors of cleanliness.[11] By acting under the guise of a social equalizer, the Baths of Agrippa characterized the space of the Campus upon which it stood as belonging to the free people of Rome. To claim this was to call attention to and make full use of Vitruvius' definition of a public-private space within the *domus*: namely as one where others may go without invitation. In associating the entirety of Rome with bathing and linking the space of public baths as erasing (or emphasizing) an existing social hierarchy within the city, the Thermae Agrippae entrenched the practice of bathing within the fabric of Roman behavior. To be Roman was to bathe. Identity hinged upon actions and points of access – which would appear to define the Baths of Agrippa, at least in part, as a public space.

To establish the act of bathing as necessary within Roman life was at the same time to center the importance of the collective and its particular, performed behaviors. In essence, "not only was bathing a pleasure; it was also a basic necessity."[12] As seen in the significance of rituals to the establishment of Roman collective identity in the previous chapter, the Baths created a new form of identity. Indeed, "the ritual of public bathing

---

[10] Kontokosta, 68.

[11] Garrett G. Fagan, *Bathing in Public in the Roman World* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1999), 78.

[12] Fagan, *Bathing in Public in the Roman World,* 78.

helped shape the quotidian rhythms of the city;"[13] it helped shape a source of shared community for its residents. It utilized the public access to a certain physical space to play upon the established importance of space to 'Romans' as a constructed experience. The Thermae Agrippae asserted new qualities of singularly public and communal manner.

However, the appearance of inclusivity in the outwardly 'public' nature of the Baths was limited, and it in fact served to further emphasize the presence of social divides. The Thermae Agrippae were privately funded and owned throughout Agrippa's life.[14] There is some evidence to suggest that entrance into this 'public' building was not free, in the form of an announcement generously made by Agrippa that the baths would be temporarily opened without a fee. Pliny records Agrippa offering *balneum gratuitum* to all – "a synonym for *gratuita lavation,* or 'free bathing.'"[15] Elsewhere in the empire, there is also evidence for bath attendance coming at a fee. To emphasize this fact is indeed to suggest that it deviates from the ostensibly 'open' operations of the baths, which speaks to one barrier of social movement immediately present within the structure of the Thermae Agrippae.

All the while, as owner of the complex, Agrippa was shown to be a conscientious and generous host, furnishing "the Roman people with free baths and oils (among other benefactions)."[16] Nevertheless, Agrippa continued to charge an entrance fee to the Baths until his death in 12 BCE.[17] Upon his death, "Agrippa's will transferred ownership of the

---

[13] Kontokosta, 46.
[14] Fagan, 107-8.
[15] Fagan, 42.
[16] Fagan, 50.
[17] Fagan, 108.

baths to the *populus*" and were "the only baths in Rome to undergo such 'nationalization.'"[18] The categories of 'private' and 'public' were far from oppositional in this instance. During its period of active patronage prior to 12 BCE, the Baths of Agrippa were most certainly not an indiscriminately public space. However, they did indeed function primarily *for* the public, and they were often made just that: they became more accessible through Agrippa's personal generosity and were ultimately gifted as the 'private' property of the 'public.' The Baths therefore serve to emphasize and enhance divides within while reaffirming the collective nature of the 'Roman population.' There was the individual patron and his public service, those who were able to afford the baths, and those who waited for entrance to be without cost, those who avoided the place in favor of baths back home, and those who labored to keep the kilns running and the attendants attended.

Modern Patronage

The 'public gift' of Agrippa is paralleled within twenty-first century Rome in a unique inversion of events: the request for public patronage of ancient sites. The modern city of Rome is a veritable treasure-trove of ancient history; in fact, the Italian ministry of culture on the whole requires expensive and extensive maintenance and upkeep for optimal preservation of the ancient sites under its purview. The space of the Campus Martius is no different, but it represents a relatively unique case of modern blending of public-private delineations.

Due to the expensive nature of maintaining the ancient topography, Italy has quietly put out a request for private donors to fund repair and restoration efforts of

---

[18] Fagan, 109.

Rome's ancient and public monuments. For example, a contribution of ten million euros purchases for that investor the opportunity to claim the credit for restoring eighty fountains; a more modest donation of six hundred thousand euros would allow the authorities to repair the aqueduct that supplies the Trevi Fountain.[19] While these prices are steep, they also are conditional. Officials are aware of the host of potential issues that come from utilizing the private sector in regard to famously 'public' spaces of ancient heritage. One official maintained that "the cash cannot be considered sponsorship and that promotional branding is out of the question," but 'investors' are encouraged to publicly discuss their philanthropic efforts.[20] This decision stems from public outcry that private individuals or corporations – like those of luxury fashion brands – would not complete the restoration work "to a high enough standard," but also that it "might be accompanied by unsightly advertisements."[21] While this has not been the case, it is an interesting inversion of the original narrative built into the ancient monuments. In ancient Rome, private patrons would petition to build public works; now, public officials are searching for private sponsors to maintain those same works, but with public limitations in place. The interaction between the spheres of public and private clearly are not as separate as one might assume.

The Campus Martius thus continues to trace and shape the divisions of movement and of wealth evident in the "public-versus-private" discussions of ancient patronage. As

---

[19] Agence France-Presse, "Rome Calls on Companies and the Rich to Adopt Crumbling Ancient Sites," *The Guardian,* May 24, 2016, https://www.theguardian.com/world/2016/may/25/rome-calls-on-companies-and-the-rich-to-adopt-crumbling-ancient-sites.
[20] Rosie Scammell, "Saving Italy's Cultural Heritage by Modern Means," *The Guardian,* March 19, 2015, https://www.theguardian.com/world/2015/mar/19/saving-italys-cultural-heritage-by-modern-means.
[21] Barclay Ballard, "The Cost of Restoring Italy's Historic Landmarks," *Business Destinations,* February 28, 2018, https://www.businessdestinations.com/featured/rome-wasnt-rebuilt-in-a-day-restoring-italys-landmarks/.

such, the Campus Martius remains an important locus for 'mapping' out the delineations of 'Roman' individual identity in terms of its concomitant understanding of a collective – one with apparently shared meaning but not always an all-inclusive one.

Conclusion

To claim that "the reordering of Roman topographical and chronological space has profound implications for the reshaping of Roman memory and Roman identity"[1] is to understand this thesis at its most essential level. The *space* of the Campus Martius interacted with time, divinities, and social boundaries to create a sense of the collective Rome. This sense was and is at once about both memory and identity; in this case, both hinge upon being *seen* and upon topographical physicality. Memory, as defined in the first chapter, was perceived by Imperial Roman literature as mutable and structured, fluid and organized, immortal and mortal. Above all, these qualities necessitated an audience. Memory was created out of visual stimulus. Visual markers in the form of monumentality made and remade ideologies of Roman identity, thereby entrenching the existence of an overarching 'Roman' persona. In doing so, such activity blurred time, memory, and identity as working interchangeably. In a way, memory referenced identity when coupled with time. Because this thesis works to avoid the polarizing divides of linear time to crucially bring Roman 'antiquity' into the twentieth and twenty-first centuries, the differentiating factor ceases to exist. Thus, both Roman memory and Roman identity originate from the same impulse: the desire to understand the self in relation to the whole via immediate surroundings.

Following definitions of Roman memory, the second chapter revealed identity as inherently immortal, but necessitating mortality. It is as dominant to external territories as it is benevolent and fatherly. It is to make anew and to triumph in abundance. These

---

[1] Eric M. Orlin, "Augustan Religion and the Reshaping of Roman Memory," *Arethusa* 40, no. 1 (2007): 87. doi:10.1353/are.2007.0004.

beacons of identity are understood through monuments of death, like the Mausoleum of Augustus and the Ara Pacis Augustae. Here, 'death' is defined both as a physical loss of life, but also as a period of ending, of cultural loss, and erasure. Similar themes of expiration and renewal were given new significance in the mid-twentieth century, in the works and spaces of Fascist Italy under Benito Mussolini. In short, the second chapter established the ground of the Campus Martius as a form of imbuing mortal ideologies with a certain immortal permanence, which is an idea that can be located throughout the following chapters. Roman identity was framed and reframed as immortal, expansionist, benevolent, abundant, and foregrounded on the concepts of death and mortality.

Similarly, the third chapter was concerned with the complex interrelationships between sacred rituals and the divine within the militaristic focus of Rome's outward-looking affairs. Battlefield pledges were considered, as were the construction of temples as forms of self-referential claims to rootedness within the topography. The Roman military triumph further revealed Roman identity to be larger than the individual, and indeed manifested the ritualistic nature of the space of the Campus Martius. Looking at the tenacity of the now-Christian Pantheon, these themes of larger-than-life power were demonstrated as contributing to the logic behind the building's transformation from a poly- to mono-theistic worldview. Overall, this chapter reinforced Roman identity as overarching and 'universal,' speaking to the importance of ritual and establishing how the spaces understood to be 'outside' of Rome directly impacted the identity of those 'inside' the city.

Lastly, the fourth chapter discussed the divisive way the Campus Martius contributes to the collective identity of Roman society. This is affected through the non-

oppositional relationship between public and private space, particularly through the nuances of the Thermae Agrippae and through the practice of modern patronage of ancient sites within the twenty-first century space of the Campus Martius – as well as in the broader city. In emphasizing the ability of the general public to move about space that is ostensibly intended for their consumption despite being funded by private means, divisions on the basis of wealth and social hierarchies became intentional and readily apparent. Just as the Campus Martius' topography speaks to the broader themes of Roman identity, it also speaks to those of divide and control.

The visual, spatial, temporal, and experiential elements of the Field of Mars are crucially able to serve as a station, a grounded locus of *Roman* memory and identity. Through this ability, the multi-faceted nature of Roman perception and identity is revealed – as are the nuances of the topography of the Campus Martius. As a region in the cityscape and memory-scape of Rome, the Campus Martius has retained the unique ability to encapsulate the essential elements of Roman-ness within the themes of larger-than-life immortality, dominance, control, and religiosity.

Bibliography

Ancient Sources (Listed Chronologically)

Cicero. *De Oratore.* Translated by E. W. Sutton and H. Rackham. Harvard University Press, 1942. Loeb Classical Library.

Vitruvius. *On Architecture.* Edited and translated by Thomas Gordon Smith. New York: The Monacelli Press, 2003.

Vergil. *The Aeneid.* Translated by Robert Fagles. New York: Penguin Classics, 2006.

Livy. *Ab Urbe Condita.* Translated by B. O. Foster. Harvard University Press, 1924. Loeb Classical Library.

Horace. *Odes and Epodes.* Edited and translated by Niall Rudd. Harvard University Press, 2004. Loeb Classical Library.

Ovid. *Metamorphoses.* Translated by Frank Justus Miller. Revised by G.P. Goold. Harvard University Press, 1916. Loeb Classical Library.

Augustus. *Res Gestae Divi Augusti.* Translated by Frederick W. Shipley. Harvard University Press, 1924. Loeb Classical Library.

Strabo. *Geography.* Edited and Translated by A. Meineke. Leipzig: Teubner, 1877. Perseus Digital Library.

Suetonius. *Lives of the Caesars: Divus Augustus.* Translated by J.C. Rolfe. Harvard University Press, 1914. Loeb Classical Library.

Modern Sources (Listed Alphabetically)

Ballard, Barclay. "The Cost of Restoring Italy's Historic Landmarks." *Business Destinations,* February 28, 2018. https://www.businessdestinations.com/featured/rome-wasnt-rebuilt-in-a-day-restoring-italys-landmarks/.

Beckmann, Martin. *The Column of Marcus Aurelius: The Genesis and Meaning of a Roman Imperial Monument.* University of North Carolina Press, 2011.

Bohleber, Werner. "Remembrance, Trauma, and Collective Memory: The Battle for Memory in Psychoanalysis." *The International Journal of Psychoanalysis* 88, no. 2 (2007): 329-353. https://doi.org/10.1516/V5H5-8351-7636-7878.

Clark, Jessica H. "Defeat and the Roman Republic: Stories from Spain." In *Brill's Companion to Military Defeat in Ancient Mediterranean Society,* edited by Jessica H. Clark and Brian Turner, 189-212. Boston: Brill, 2018.

Clark, Jessica H. *Triumph in Defeat: Military Loss and the Roman Republic.* New York: Oxford University Press, 2014.

Confino, Alon. "Collective Memory and Cultural History: Problems of Method." *The American Historical Review* 102, no. 5 (1997): 1386-1403. www.jstor.org/stable/2171069.

Davies, Penelope J.E. *Death and the Emperor: Roman Imperial Funerary Monuments from Augustus to Marcus Aurelius.* Austin: University of Texas Press, 2004.

Elsner, John. "Cult and Sculpture: Sacrifice in the Ara Pacis Augustae." *The Journal of Roman Studies* 81 (1991): 50-61. https://www.jstor.org/stable/300488.

Fagan, Garrett G. *Bathing in Public in the Roman World.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1999.

Favro, Diane. *The Urban Image of Augustan Rome.* New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

France-Presse, Agence. "Rome Calls on Companies and the Rich to Adopt Crumbling Ancient Sites." *The Guardian,* May 24, 2016. https://www.theguardian.com/world/2016/may/25/rome-calls-on-companies-and-the-rich-to-adopt-crumbling-ancient-sites.

Galinsky, Karl. *Augustus: Introduction to the Life of an Emperor.* New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012.

Galinsky, Karl. "Memoria Romana: Memory in Rome and Rome in Memory." *Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome* 10 (2014): 15-103. www.jstor.org/stable/44423154.

Hell, Julia. *The Conquest of Ruins: The Third Reich and the Fall of Rome.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2019.

Holloway, Ross. *The Archaeology of Early Rome and Latium.* Taylor & Francis, 1991.

Hope, Valerie M. "Trophies and Tombstones: Commemorating the Roman Soldier." *World Archaeology* 35, no. 1 (2003):79-97. https://www.jstor.org/stable/3560213.

Jackson, M.D., F. Marra, R.L. Hay, C. Cawood. "The Judicious Selection and Preservation of Tuff and Travertine Building Stone in Ancient Rome." *Archaeometry* 47, no. 3 (2005): 485-510.

Jacks, Philip. "Restauratio and Reuse: The Afterlife of Roman Ruins." *Places* 20, no. 1 (2008): 10-20. https://escholarship.org/uc/item/66n5329v.

Jacobs, Paul W., and Diane Atnally Conlin. *Campus Martius: The Field of Mars in the Life of Ancient Rome.* New York: Cambridge University Press, 2014.

Kleiner, Diana E. E., and Bridget Buxton. "Pledges of Empire: The Ara Pacis and the Donations of Rome." *American Journal of Archaeology* 112, no. 1 (2008): 57-89. https://www.jstor.org/stable/40037244.

Kolb, Michael J. *Making Sense of Monuments: Narratives of Time, Movement, and Scale.* New York: Routledge, 2020.

Kontokosta, Anne Hrychuk. "Building the Thermae Agrippae: Private Life, Public Space, and the Politics of Bathing in Early Imperial Rome." *American Journal of Archaeology* 123, no. 1 (2019): 45-77. doi:10.3764/aja.123.1.0045.

Kuspit, Donald. "A Mighty Metaphor: The Analogy of Archaeology and Psychoanalysis." In *Sigmund Freud and Art: His Personal Collection of Antiquities,* edited by Lynn Gamwell and Richard Wells, 133-151. New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1989.

Larmour, David H. J. *The Sites of Rome: Time, Space, Memory.* New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Lewis, Charlton T. and Charles Short. *A Latin Dictionary.* New York: Harper and Brothers, 1879. Perseus Digital Library Word Study Tool.

Marder Tod A., and Mark Wilson Jones, eds. *The Pantheon: From Antiquity to the Present.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015. doi:10.1017/CBO9781139015974.014.

McGregor, James H. S. *Rome from the Ground Up.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2005.

Montanari, Valeria. "Restauración del Teatro de Marcelo, Casi Cien Años Después: Restoration of the Theater of Marcellus, Almost One Hundred Years Later." *Loggia,* no. 31 (2018): 40-53. https://doi.org/10.4995/loggia.2018.8639.

Nelis, Jan. "Constructing Fascist Identity: Benito Mussolini and the Myth of 'Romanità'." *The Classical World* 100, no. 4 (2007): 391-415. https://www.jstor.org/stable/25434050.

Niederer, Frances J. "Temples Converted into Churches: The Situation in Rome." *Church History* 22, no. 3 (1953): 175-80. https://www.jstor.org/stable/3161858.

Ng, Diana Y., and Molly Swetnam-Burland. "Introduction: Reuse, Renovation, Reiteration." In *Reuse and Renovation in Roman Material Culture: Functions, Aesthetics, Interpretations,* edited by Diana Y. Ng and Molly Swetnam-Burland, 1-23. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018. doi:10.1017/9761108582513.

Nora, Pierre. "Between Memory and History: Les Lieux de Mémoire." *Representations* 132, no. 26 (1989): 7-24. www.jstor.org/stable/2928520.

Orlin, Eric M. "Augustan Religion and the Reshaping of Roman Memory." *Arethusa* 40, no. 1 (2007): 73-92. doi:10.1353/are.2007.0004.

Pittenger, Miriam R. Pelikan. *Contested Triumphs: Politics, Pageantry, and Performance in Livy's Republican Rome.* Berkley: University of California Press, 2008.

Platner, Samuel Ball, and Thomas Ashby. *A Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome.* London: Oxford University Press, 1929.

Popkin, Maggie L. *The Architecture of the Roman Triumph: Monuments, Memory, and Identity.* New York: Cambridge University Press, 2016.

Rehak, Paul. *Imperium and Cosmos: Augustus and the Northern Campus Martius.* Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2006.

Russell, Amy. *The Politics of Public Space in Republican Rome.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015. doi:10.1017/CBO9781139629041.

Scammell, Rosie. "Saving Italy's Cultural Heritage by Modern Means." *The Guardian,* March 19, 2015. https://www.theguardian.com/world/2015/mar/19/saving-italys-cultural-heritage-by-modern-means.

Skerrett, Delaney Michael. "Can the Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis Save the Planet? Lessons from Cross-Cultural Psychology for Critical Language Policy." *Current Issues in Language Planning* 11, no. 4 (2010): 331-340. doi:10.1080/14664208.2010.534236.

Terdiman, Richard. "Memory in Freud." In *Memory: Histories, Theories, Debates,* edited by Susannah Radstone and Bill Schwarz, 93-108. New York: Fordham University Press, 2010. doi:10.2307/j.ctt1c999bq.10.

Thill, Elizabeth Wolfram. "Setting War in Stone: Architectural depictions on the Column of Marcus Aurelius." *American Journal of Archaeology* 122, no. 2 (2018): 277-308. https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.3764/aja.122.2.0277.

Thomas, Edmund. "From the pantheon of the gods to the Pantheon of Rome." In *Pantheons: Transformations of a Monumental Idea,* edited by Richard Wrigley and Matthew Craske, 11-34. Burlington: Ashgate, 2004.

Trigg, Dylan. *The Aesthetics of Decay: Nothingness, Nostalgia, and the Absence of Reason.* New York: Peter Lang Publishing, 2006.

Underwood, Douglas. *(Re)Using Ruins: Public Buildings in the Cities of the Late Antique West, A.D. 300 – 600.* Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2019.

Warrior, Valerie M. Introduction to *The History of Rome: Books 1-5,* by Livy, vi-xxvi. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company, 2006.

Zanker, Paul. *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus.* Translated by Alan Shapiro. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1990.