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After the Roman conquest of the Balearic Islands in 123 BC, the cities of Palma and Pollentia were founded respectively in the SW and NE of the island of Mallorca respectively. The first structures documented archaeologically in Pollentia date to 70/60 BC. The city had its largest development between the 1st century BC and the 3rd century AD, reaching an extension close to 20 ha. Archaeological excavations have uncovered the remains of the forum with a Tuscan temple, an insula of tabernae and small temples and monuments, residential areas, a theater and necropolises. In the late 3rd century (270/280 AD) a fire destroyed a large part of the city. After this episode, Pollentia was still occupied, but many areas were never re-habitated and the building activity decreased. The aim of this paper is to analyze the remains of two small temples in the northern area of the forum that were discovered in the 1980s. A first approach to the architecture of these temples and the small monuments related to them will consist of a close view of their particular features, including building techniques, decorations and other remains. The buildings will be contextualized in the western Mediterranean through their comparison to similar buildings from Spain and Italy. Reconstruction proposals will be provided as a result of this research, but also as a means of studying the elevations that these buildings may have had. Some considerations will be made on the functions that every element could have had. A new interpretation of the area where the small temples are located as a transitional area is proposed, affecting urban design plan and the topography of the city.
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The Balearic Islands (Mallorca and Menorca) were conquered by Rome in 123 BC. This military action, led by the consul Quintus Caecilius Metellus, was a response to pirate raids in the area (Strab. 3.5.1; Flor. 1.43; Oros. 5.13.1), and it brought the archipelago into the Roman political structure.

The founding of the cities (fig. 1) of Palma (probably modern Palma, on the south-western bay of Mallorca), and Pollentia (beside modern Alcúdia), between two bays in the NE (Strab. 3.5.1) was a direct consequence of the conquest. Previous studies have suggested that these cities had coastal control purposes. The oldest Roman structures found at these sites date back to 50/40 BC in Palma and to 70/60 BC in Pollentia.

In Pollentia, from the first century BC onwards, the forum square (fig. 2) was defined by the great Tuscan temple (or Capitolium) on the N side, and the Insula 1 of tabernae with a front portico to the W. The eastern and southern areas remain unknown as they have not been excavated. Some observations will be made in this text concerning the configuration of this main forum square.

Two small temple-like buildings (Temple I and Temple II) were raised in the early Empire, to preside over the area immediately to the E of the Tuscan temple. Some other features, such as pedestals, bases, a portico and remains of mortar, that belong to a series of small monuments, were gathered together in this confined area, which suggests that it was an area of civic and religious importance. All these elements and their surrounding area will be analysed here.

PREVIOUS WORK

The area of temples I and II was discovered in the early 1980s. Temple I was first excavated between 1982 and 1988. The building had been extensively plundered, and the remains of its podium were preserved to a maximum height of 0.92 m. While the rear (N) and W façades had almost disappeared, the lower moulding and parts from the dado of the podium were found in the S and E sides. The construction of the building was then dated to the first century AD.

Two notable elements were found near the temple. The first was discovered in front of the building: an incomplete monumental dedicatory inscription (54 x 127 cm) mentioning two Imperial charges:

\[
\text{[--]}\text{Aug(usti) leg(atus) pro pr\textit{(aetore) f(aciendum) c(u-rauit)}
\]

\[
\text{[--]}\text{ro leg(ate) dedicauit}
\]

A Flavian (AD 69-96) or later chronology of the inscription has been proposed that is not compatible with the provided chronology of Temple I, which seems to have already been in

disrepair by the end of the first century AD\textsuperscript{10}. The second element found was a pediment crowning length made of sandstone\textsuperscript{11}. It was interpreted as the crowning of Temple I, but due to its large dimensions – 0.55 m tall – we believe that it rather belonged to the Tuscan temple\textsuperscript{12}.

The building was initially interpreted as a small temple \textit{in antis}\textsuperscript{13}. A hypothesis regarding its dedication arose following this interpretation. The inscription naming Imperial charges, and the dating in the early Imperial period, would suggest that the temple was dedicated to the Imperial cult\textsuperscript{14}. Moreover, some remains of Imperial sculptures\textsuperscript{15} and other inscriptions suggest that the Imperial cult did certainly exist in \textit{Pollentia}\textsuperscript{16}.

An alternative interpretation of the building was provided by the American team working on

\textsuperscript{11} Arribas – Tarradell 1987, p. 127.
\textsuperscript{12} Vallori – Cau – Orila 2015, p. 303.
\textsuperscript{13} Arribas – Tarradell 1987, p. 131.
\textsuperscript{15} Moreno Pérez 2007, p. 92-93.
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The site\(^{17}\). They proposed that it was a base for an equestrian sculpture that had been found in old excavations. The sculpture\(^{18}\) was found in 1923\(^{19}\) in an area as far as 130 m S of this building\(^{20}\), and it is unlikely that it had any relation with this structure. On the other hand, the features of the building and the parallels found in *Hispania* and Italy tip the balance in favour of the temple hypothesis, as we will see later on in the text.

Temple II was excavated between 1982 and 1991\(^{21}\). As in the case of Temple I, the remains had been plundered and were also altered by several tombs. Only the base and lower moulding are preserved, with a transversal (N-S) wall dividing it into two square spaces.

The chronology of Temple II has always been problematic as only part of the foundation trenches have been excavated, and no dating materials appeared. In an initial phase of research, it seemed to be clear that the temple was built after Augustus\(^{22}\), dating to the first century AD\(^{23}\), but a date of the third century AD has also been suggested\(^{24}\).

The elevation proposal of this building has normally been as a tetrastyle or distyle temple *in antis* with a 1 m pronaos and a 3 m cela\(^{25}\). An interpretation as a *nymphaeum* has been suggested due to the presence of the stone channel and a hypothetical relationship of the building with water\(^{26}\). All these issues will be discussed later on in this paper.

THE TEMPLE I

The remains of Temple I consist of the lower remains of a *podium* (fig. 4), with a maximum height of 0.92 m preserved. The *podium* measures 19 x 25 Roman feet (5.62 x 7.37 m), which approaches a proportion of 3:4. A plan of the building based on a Pythagorean triangle 3:4:5 can be proposed, as it has also been proposed for the Tuscan temple\(^{27}\) and for other buildings in the city\(^{28}\).

Dating

There are certain features that enable us to date the construction of Temple I. A layer covering its eastern foundation trench contained amphorae fragments (Pascual I), dated between 40 BC and AD 60\(^29\). In addition, a pavement to the S was built jointly with Temple I, to unify the monuments in the area. It has been dated between the end of the first century BC and AD 60 (African cooking ware Ostia II and an amphora Pascual I)\(^30\). The dating for the construction at the beginning of the first century AD that was previously proposed\(^31\) seems feasible in the light of this new evidence.

Architectural features

Podium

The infill of the podium is a combination of square blocks and *opus caementicium*, made with mortar and small pieces of sandstone. It constitutes a strong base that indicates the presence of a corresponding upper structure. As we will see shortly, the parallels for this building correspond to *podia* with upper structures, identified as temples.

We have enough elements to deduce the total height of the *podium* when it was first built. The bottom of the *podium* is a row of rusticated ashlars, still buried in the foundation trenches up to half their height. On this row lays a moulding in *cyma reversa* (fig. 5.3 and 5.5) upon which part of the dado still stands. This composition can be found in the sanctuary of San Giovanni in Galdo (Samnium, Italy)\(^32\), where the lower and upper mouldings were of the same height, and the dado between them was as tall as both. If we follow this example as a guide, therefore, with a one Roman foot tall (0.30 m) bottom moulding, we can propose a total height of the *podium* of 1.20 m.

Mouldings

The lower moulding (fig. 5.3 and 5.5) is, as seen before, a *cyma reversa*, a type related to the Tuscan torus. It was widely used in the mid and late Republican periods in the entire Italian peninsula, but also in the rest of the Roman area of influence\(^33\). In the second and first centuries BC, the *cyma reversa* coexisted with the more Greek *cyma recta*\(^34\) which finally replaced it in the mid first century BC in Italy\(^35\). The *cyma reversa* was still in use until the Augustan era in the West, particularly in *Hispania, Africa* and *Gallia*, the last examples being found in *Hispania*.

Considering the chronologies in the western and central Mediterranean, the *cyma reversa* was relatively common in *Hispania* even during the early Empire\(^36\), as the examples of *Barcino, Emerita,*

\(^{29}\) Rivas \emph{et al.} unpublished-c.
\(^{30}\) Rivas \emph{et al.} unpublished-c.
\(^{31}\) Orfila 2000, p. 144.
\(^{33}\) Shoe Meritt 1965 and Shoe Meritt – Edlund-Berry 2000.
\(^{34}\) Shoe Meritt 1965, p. 32-33.
and the present Temple I show, but it was already an old fashioned feature in that period. The use of archaic mouldings has been proposed as a way to bestow embellishment and prestige on buildings in other places such as Athens in the fourth century BC. In the case of Baelo Claudia, a similar problem has been found, with examples built in the second half of the first century AD, with an architectural style datable to the period of Augustus. A reuse of previous materials and architectural decoration after an earthquake in the mid first century AD has been proposed. However, more recently, it has been argued that the local elite chose a workshop with a solid tradition and non influenced by new fashions for the rebuilding of the city. A similar attitude on the part of the elite pollentina would be suitable both in this particular case and in general terms, as very few cases of architectural orders other than Tuscan have been found in the entire city so far.

Stairs

The front façade of the podium is defined by the cyma reversa moulding. It is preserved for 3.5 m, including the central part, and it would have originally run across its entire width. Therefore, this building did not have front stairs, as they are incompatible with the existence of this moulding. The lack of access to a podium is not very common, but we can find some examples, such as the sanctuary of San Giovanni in Galdo (Samnium), built between 104 and 91 BC where wooden temporary steps would have been necessary to reach it. This lack of a permanent access facilitates its interpretation as a thesauri where valuable objects were stored.

Lesenes

Another feature of the front façade is a lesene on its right side. It is a projection of the moulding 10 cm to the front, 1 m wide. This feature is normally a complement for upper structures, especially columns. The lesene probably had a symmetrical twin on the left side of the façade, although that side has been completely plundered; together they would have enhanced a front colonnade standing on the podium, close to its front edge.

Elevation

Any proposal for the upstanding architecture of this building is risky. Leaving aside the inscription already mentioned, not a single architectural element of the elevation has been preserved or identified, at least until now. We will use the remains of the podium already analysed, together with some parallels from the western Mediterranean and Vitruvius work De architectura, to make a proposal for the elevation as a tetrastyle in antis temple.

The massive structure of the podium itself indicates an upstanding structure; any other use would make this effort on its foundations completely unnecessary.

Another feature that indicates an upper structure is the lesene in the front already mentioned, which presumably had a symmetrical one to the left. Two columns or semicolumns attached to antae would stand above these lesenes. The distance between the corner columns, more than 5 m, would be too long for a single architrave supporting an entablature and pediment, and two more columns were needed to support it. As no elements from these columns have been identified, we need to turn to the Vitruvian rules to get an idea of their proportions. To do so, we will use the Tuscan-Doric style, as it is the best documented order in the city, and Temple I has archaic elements that fit with it, as we have seen with mouldings.

Following Vitruvius as a guideline for the Doric style (De arch. 4.3), the module of the building is 1/27 the width of the temple. The resulting height for Temple I (fig. 6) is 3.9 m (5.1 m adding the podium height calculated). The external shape (fig. 6) would be similar to other examples that we can find across the western Mediterranean.

41. Some cabled fluted column drums and attic bases that have been found in the building E of the forum square are the only architectural elements that can not correspond to Tuscan order. Cau et al. 2013, p. 156.
43. La Regina 1976, p. 238.
44. It is possible that some materials from this building were reused in the late Antique fortification running W-E just N of it. The construction of this fortification is posterior to the third quarter of the fifth century AD. Riera – Cau – Orfília 1999, p. 339-342; Orfília et al. 2000, p. 231-233 and Cau – Mas Florit – Lladó 2005, p. 219-223.
Regarding architectural remains, the best preserved parallel for this type of building is the Mausoleum of Fabara (second century AD) (Zaragoza, Spain), which reproduces the architecture of Roman small temples in a funerary context. Despite of being built more than a century after Temple I in Pollentia, the example of Fabara illustrates well the proportions and height that this kind of building had, with a podium enhancing the proper temple, or rather shrine. Pictorial examples come from Pompeii and they represent small shrines with front stairs (IX, VII, 7).

The inscription found very close to Temple I would have originally been placed either in its epistyle (fig. 6) or on its lintel. It is made of local sandstone, measuring 54 cm tall and 127 cm wide preserved, with two rows of letters, and the left part is missing. The entire width would be much longer than the fragment preserved, in order to house the complete names of the two imperial charges, approaching to 2.5 m. It has a Lesbian cyma reversa with tulips between arches. We will come back to this inscription when discussing the dedication of the temple.

No internal divisions can be seen in the podium indicating upright structures. The parallels identified do not really help in establishing an accurate approach to the internal divisions that this building may have had, but they support a main distribution of the space between a pronao at the front, and a back room or cela. We find the division between pronao and cela right behind the front colonnade in Temple A in Ardea (Latium, Italy) (end of third century-first half of second century BC); and almost in the geometric centre in the Sacellum of Huesca (Spain) (first half or third quarter of the first century BC). In the sanctuary of San Giovanni in Galdo the internal divisions are not clear. The elevation proposed here for Temple I (fig. 6) has a wall dividing pronao and cela roughly in the middle of its length.

---

49. Mayer 2013, p. 159-160.
50. di Mario 2007, p. 65.
When exactly Temple I fell into decay is unclear. The first publications on the excavations suggest that, being built in the first century AD, it was partially plundered by the end of the same century\textsuperscript{52}, but this issue is under revision.

Small monuments related to Temple I

The area immediately S of Temple I (ig. 3, 4 and 6) is defined by a pavement of flagstones, the construction of which is dated with a \textit{terminus post quem} at the end of the first century BC\textsuperscript{53}. It does not currently cover the whole square, as it has been eroded and underwent many alterations. Three small monuments, that we identify as two pedestals (fig. 3.F and G), and the marks and some remains of a probable altar (fig. 3.H) are connected to this pavement. We interpret all these features and Temple I as a single project that was executed at the same time, probably by the early first century AD.

A structure attached to the temple that we identify as a pedestal (fig. 3.F and 4), is a narrow wall 1.7 m N-S and 1 m W-E, coinciding with the leseine in the front of the \textit{podium} already mentioned. Its two faces are shaped with a moulding in \textit{cyma reversa} reproducing and linked to the one in the \textit{podium} (fig. 5.3 and 5.5). This reflects a desire for unity within the group, and the direct relationship between this small structure and the temple. We consider that it also had a dado and an upper moulding, probably of the same height as the \textit{podium} (fig. 6). It is rather unlikely that it had a symmetrical one on the left side of the front, because another structure (fig. 3.G) does not leave room for it. Similar features are found in front areas of temples, attached to \textit{podia}, like a small structure in the main temple of Carteia (San Roque, Cádiz, Spain)\textsuperscript{54}, or the Roman phase of the temple of Fiesole in Italy (after 90 BC)\textsuperscript{55}. This was not an uncommon element of Roman temples, as these examples show, but their real purpose is only noticeable in two structures in temple B of Largo di Torre Argentina (Rome), where some statues were placed (Plin. XXXIV,54) in two oblong structures still standing\textsuperscript{56}. Hence, the pedestal of Temple I could have supported some form of decoration such as a sculpture.

Next to this pedestal, S of the Temple, a very poorly preserved structure stood directly upon the pavement (fig. 3.H and 4). Some mortar, with straight edges to the N and S, remains on the same axis as the temple and a medium block stands in the NW corner of the mortar. They possibly belonged

---

\textsuperscript{52} Equip \textit{Pollentia} 1994, 217.

\textsuperscript{53} Rivas \textit{et al.} unpublished-c.


\textsuperscript{55} Martinelli – Donati 2004, p. 35.

\textsuperscript{56} Coarelli 1995, p. 270.
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to the altar of the temple (fig. 6), but unfortunately
there is no architectural element or decoration to
help us understand these remains.

The third element to be analysed stands next
to the SW corner of Temple I. It consists of a N-S
1.87 x 0.95 m base attached to the E wall of the
Tuscan temple (ig. 3.G and 4)\(^{57}\), upon which
we find the corner of a moulding in cyma reversa
and the bottom part of the dado. The geomet-
rical proportions of this wide pedestal, 1:2.06,
and the fact that it is attached to a wall, make
it a distinct element. Following this analysis, a
feasible hypothesis for the elevation of this monu-
ment is an aedicula (fig. 6), a wide pedestal upon
which a small shrine stood, with a distyle façade
supporting an entablature and pediment\(^{58}\). More
than one representation was usually placed inside,
whether in sculpture or painted. We find parallels
in an aedicula from Munigua (Spain) that was dedi-
cated to Mercurius\(^{59}\), and also in the aedicula in the
House of the Vestals in Rome (Hadrian period, AD
117-138), consecrated to the Lares Praestites\(^{60}\).

**TEMPLE II**

Temple II (fig. 3 and 8) stands at the S limit of
the area, measuring 30 x 16.5 Roman feet (8.80 x
4.90 m). Only the lower part of the walls remains,
but we can see the main features of the building,
which belong to a single constructive phase. The
building has a cyma reversa moulding on the W,
S and E sides (fig. 5.1 and 5.2), and an internal
wall dividing it into two halves (fig. 3)\(^{61}\). A stone
channel that collected water from the roof runs
along the E and S sides. To the N there are two
small platforms, (ig. 3.J and 3.K). To the E of this
feature stands a N-S portico line with an ending
pillar attached to the N wall of Temple II.

**Dating**

As we have seen, the dating for Temple II is
not clear. We think that the termini post quem (t.p.q.)
and ante quem (t.a.q.) can be addressed if we analyse
some features. The S and middle walls were built in
a foundation trench filled with hand-made indig-
enous pottery, which usually suggest early dates.
The stone channel that is clearly related to the
building of Temple II was placed over a structure
dated to the first century BC\(^{62}\). As we have seen
previously, the mouldings in cyma reversa were used in Hispania during the reign of Augustus at the
latest. The mouldings of Temple II could have
been reused, as they only cover three of the four
sides of the temple. Some reused materials can
be found consisting of column drums, architraves
and cornices, some of them with mouldings. The
parallels found suggest a dating at the beginning of the early Empire (Augustus-Tiberius)\(^{63}\). Based
on this evidence, we can define a t.p.q. at the first
half of the first century AD. On the other hand, a
pavement was built in the beginning of the fourth
century attached to the temple, which gives us a
t.a.q.\(^{64}\).

Given these observations, Temple II was
built between the first half of the first century
AD and the beginning of the fourth century AD.
Stratigraphically speaking, either proposed dating
for its construction – the first century AD\(^{65}\) or the
third century\(^{66}\) – is possible. In the light of paral-
lels, we propose a dating in the first century AD,
but with the building still in use when the fourth
century pavement was built.

**Architectural features**

Temple II (fig. 8) does not have any remains of
a standing podium. However, a podium probably
existed in order to maintain a unitary composition
between the temple and a portico that existed at
some point attached to it.

The mouldings of Temple II run across the
W, S and E sides. As they are in cyma reversa, like
the ones analysed in Temple I, they must have
been made during the early Empire. However,
their shape is slightly different, their proportions
being much lower than in Temple I (fig. 5.1 and

---

63. de la Barrera 2000, p. n° 47, 48.
64. Cau – Chávez 2003, p. 34; Orfila 2004, p. 173 and Orfila –
Chávez – Cau 2006, p. 137.
66. Cau – Chávez 2003, p. 34; Orfila 2004, p. 173 and Orfila –
Chávez – Cau 2006, p. 137.
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5.2), resembling that from the temple A in Largo Argentina in Rome\textsuperscript{67}, the temple of the Decumanus in Ostia (80–50 BC)\textsuperscript{68} and the minor temple of the Augustan forum in Ostia\textsuperscript{69}.

There is a problem with stairs as in Temple I. The mouldings cover the short sides of the building, which makes the presence of stairs unlikely, but in this case they could have been placed in the N side as will be seen below.

Elevation

The closest and clearest parallels for Temple II come from Emporitae, and stand in the N side of the forum square (temples 1, 2, 5 and 6). They are proposed to be tetrastyle temples \textit{in antis}, and they are dated in the first century AD, some of them being dedicated to Roma and Augustus, and to the goddess Tutela\textsuperscript{70}. The plan of Temple 2\textsuperscript{71} is very similar to Temple II in Pollentia.

As in the case of Temple I of Pollentia, no architectural elements from the elevation have been found for Temple II. Thus, the proposed elevation for the Temple II façade will also rely heavily on Vitruvius’ description of Tuscan-Doric temples (\textit{De arch.} 4.3). Using the same proportions already described, with a façade 4.3 m (14.5 Roman feet) wide, Temple II would be around 3.23 m (11 Roman feet) high. We propose a tetrastyle façade rather than the previously proposed distyle one, as a distance of 4.3 m would be too wide for a single architrave leaning only on two columns (fig. 8 and 9).

Regarding the plan of the temple (fig. 3), the W half can be interpreted as a \textit{pronaos} behind the front colonnade and in front of the \textit{cella}. It could be flanked by \textit{antae}, as it has been already suggested\textsuperscript{72}, but it could be also open on its sides, with two columns between the \textit{cella} and the front colonnade (fig. 9). In the middle of the building, a N-S wall corresponding to the N-S foundations mentioned divided the \textit{pronaos} from the \textit{cella}. This room measured 10 x 12 Roman feet (2.9 x 3.5 m).

Elements around Temple II

Some other elements were part of the Temple II group. A stone channel (fig. 3) runs beside the S and E façades, where only a narrow 0.5 m corridor divides the temple from surrounding structures (fig. 2.D and 3.D). The channel was intended here to collect the water from the temple roof, to avoid problems with water drainage and humidity in such a narrow area. The N and W façades, as they are in an open area, do not need any specific draining system. The channel seems completely functional this way, and there appears insufficient evidence to interpret the temple as a \textit{nymphaeum}.

Attached to the N of Temple II (fig. 8) there are two small platforms, the W one measuring 1.4 x 2.1 m (fig. 3.J), and the E one 1 x 2 m (fig. 3.K). The former is built with square blocks, and at least three holes with a diameter of 15 cm were carved into them, probably with a fourth now missing, forming a rectangle. A smaller hole is carved between two of them. The purpose of these holes was probably to hold some wooden structure such as a rail to protect some decoration or sculpture. This platform could have supported different decorations or public texts such as news, laws, prices or

---

weights (fig. 9). Similar features discovered in *Cosa* are interpreted this way\(^\text{73}\). The E platform could have had the same function, but it could also have been a lateral flight of stairs oriented E-W, leading to the *podium* (fig. 9).

To the E of these elements, a portico can be found (fig. 3.1), of which two column bases and one pillar base have been discovered. Attached to a commercial building to the E, this portico was bounding the transitional area on the E side and it reached the N wall of Temple II, where two lesenes on a pillar indicate that the portico finished. The column bases have an uncommon shape consisting of a bottom block 15 cm tall and a narrower one 25 cm tall, upon which the first column drum is placed. A similar composition can be found in the N portico of the forum in *Tusculum*, dated to the end of the first century AD\(^\text{74}\). This does not follow any classical order, and it is probably a local solution to create very simple columns that did not require the same technical skills as classical orders. This structure was embellished with a rendering, some remains of which are still preserved.

**WHICH GOD WAS WORSHIPPED?**

The dedication of Temple I has been a matter of some debate between scholars\(^\text{75}\). The main source for the dedication is the inscription found just in front of the building, already commented on\(^\text{76}\). It names two Imperial charges, but there is no indication of the worshipped deity. Imperial charges, especially the governor of a province (*legatus Augusti*), could be involved in promoting the Imperial cult, though the initiative normally arose from local communities, as happened in *Tarraco* and *Emerita*. The emperor and his governors only promoted the Imperial cult personally in areas where loyalty to the new state was weak\(^\text{77}\). This is especially true for the eastern provinces of the Empire, but there are also some examples in *Hispania*\(^\text{78}\).

The inscription has been dated, with palaeographical criteria, as Flavian (AD 69-96)\(^\text{79}\) or later\(^\text{80}\) and also specifically in the Antonine era, probably in Hadrian’s reign\(^\text{81}\). Taking into account that the building of the temple is dated in the first century AD, and that its dismantling has been suggested to have started in the end of the same century, the date of the inscription seems to conflict\(^\text{82}\). We propose that the signs of alterations at the end of the first century AD could rather correspond to a refurbishment, and the inscription may refer to its promoters\(^\text{83}\).

Temple I was built in a secondary position of the *forum*, very close to the main Tuscan, or Capitolian, temple, forming part of the architectural background in the noble side of the *forum*. This kind of satellite position in relation to a main – and older – temple was very common in the early Empire for small religious structures related to the Imperial cult. Small structures were added representing the new Imperial order, but always respecting the old Republican faith.

Examples for this phenomenon are found in the cities of *Minturnae* (Italy), *Lunae* (Italy), *Pula* (Croatia) and *Emporiae* (Spain). In both places, Republican temples dominated the *forum* square from the second century BC, and smaller temples or shrines were built at their flanks in the early Empire. Two shrines *in antis* (a and b) were added to the sides of the *Lunae* temple\(^\text{84}\), one of them being definitely dedicated to Roma and Augustus\(^\text{85}\). In *Minturnae*, a temple also dedicated to Roma and Augustus\(^\text{86}\) was raised beside the *Capitolium*\(^\text{87}\), of the state. At the same time, the Capitolian cult, which may also have been present in *Pollentia*, was a national cult.

---


\(^{76}\) Arribas – Tarradell 1987, p. 127.

\(^{77}\) Fishwick 1978, p. 1208-1209 and Lozano – Alvar 2009, p. 431. We prefer to use the concept of loyalty to the state, rather than Romanisation, because this is a modern concept unrelated to the Ancient Roman mind, and the Imperial cult was a political cult that reinforced the power of the state. At the same time, the Capitolian cult, which may also have been present in *Pollentia*, was a national cult.

\(^{78}\) Lozano – Alvar 2009, p. 432.

\(^{79}\) García Riaza – Sánchez León 2000, p. 90-91.

\(^{80}\) Sanz 1990, p. 33.

\(^{81}\) Mayer 2013.

\(^{82}\) García Riaza – Sánchez León 2000, p. 90-91.

\(^{83}\) Despite being from the second century AD, it could even be naming the first promoters of the temple, as happened with the dedicatory inscription of the *Pantheon* in Rome. Di Stefano Manzella 1987, p. 188, n. 453.

\(^{84}\) D’Andria 1973, p. 643.

\(^{85}\) Rossignani 1995, p. 449.

\(^{86}\) Gros 1987, p. 115.

\(^{87}\) Johnson 1935, p. 61-65.
flanked by two fountains. In Croatia, in the city of Pula, two twin temples that may have been related to the Imperial cult were built flanking the main temple. In Emporiae (Catalonia), in the early Empire, two twin shrines linked to the Imperial cult (1 and 6) were built at the flanks of the temenos of the main temple. Later, six more temples were added during the first century AD, until a complete façade of shrines covered this side of the forum. In all the previous examples and also in Temple I in Pollentia, the new shrines, normally related to the Imperial cult (Roma et Augustus), complemented a main Republican temple. The coexistence of both cults in the same space is a response to the political changes that Rome was experiencing. On the one hand, a previous Republican cult, especially the Capitolian cult that was national, related to the Roman character of the city almost from an ethnic point of view. On the other hand, the Imperial cult was a state cult related to loyalty to the current emperor, and it was organized by provinces, not by cities as the Capitolian cult. It embraced all the different ethnic groups within the Empire under a single political unity based on the power of the emperor. From this point of view, the two cults do not overlap.

A TRANSITIONAL AREA ON THE EDGE OF THE FORUM

The forum of Pollentia is dominated on its N side by the great Tuscan temple, or Capitolium. This building had been previously interpreted as the axis of symmetry for the forum, but the finds on both sides are not symmetric. This forced an interpretation of the forum having an asymmetrical layout in order to house the two temples and a portico analysed in this paper. The area, however, may be interpreted as a transitional area or pathway between the forum square limited to the south of the Capitolium and some surrounding streets and buildings (fig. 2). If seen this way, the main forum square to the south of the Capitolium could still be symmetric.

The transitional area connected this main forum square to the N with one of the decumani of the city (fig. 2 and 3), and probably to a cardo. This area (fig. 3) was delimited to the W by the Tuscan temple (fig. 2 and 3), by a first century BC ashlar wall (fig. 2.D) to the S and by a building, possibly dedicated to commerce, to the E. This transitional area measures 44 by 85 Roman feet (12.9 by 25.3 m) which corresponds to a proportion of 1:2. To the E of the forum square, the ongoing excavations have uncovered the remains of a large building, with cabled fluted columns and an opus sectile pavement. Its location and size may indicate a possible basilica that would limit the forum square to the E, leaving the transitional area to the N. Further research on this edifice will be essential to understand the evolution of the forum.

The area had a flagstone pavement, which was built together with the Temple I group, indicating the importance of this pathway. The thin flagstones with which it was built were not suitable for heavy traffic, and so the pathway was probably for pedestrian use. The area seems to have still been frequented at least until the end of the fourth century. Some repairs of the previous slab pavement, and a levelling and new pavements were built in this area attached to both temples. This refurbishment may correspond to the introduction of heavy traffic, which damaged the previous thin slab pavement. The latter was first repaired, and finally the area was levelled and paved again.

Similar open spaces can be found in other Roman cities close to forum main squares, and they function as distributors. We find an example in Munigua (Sevilla, Spain), where a small square leads to both a sanctuary and the forum. In that case, the urban grid is conditioned by the irregular topography of the site. In the forum of Cosa an open space in the SW side of the square was found.
Interpreting this area in Pollentia as a transitional area, we can propose a possible function of the aedicula. One popular feature in Rome were the aedicularae devoted to the Lares Compitales, also known as Compita. They were placed in or near the crossroads (compita) protected by these lares. The transitional area can function as a crossroad linking the main forum square to some adjacent streets and buildings. This position is similar to that of the Compitum to the Lares Praestites in the House of the Vestals (Roman forum), near the via Sacra and the vicus Vestae, the Compitum in the agora of the Hermaistai in Delos, and the Compitum Acili in Rome.

This configuration may result in a forum with satellite open spaces separated from the main square, like the transitional area. This distribution of public spaces in enclosed divided units is a common feature in Roman urbanism. Squares and great monuments were not conceived to be perceived as a whole in a linear perspective system, but as closed entities unconnected to their surroundings.

CONCLUSIONS

Temples I and II (fig. 3, 6 and 9) were placed in a transitional area linking the main forum square with important features of the city. Given its situation, the area was heavily used, as shown by the fact that the first pavement with flagstones was repaired repeatedly.

This interpretation of the area E of the Tuscan temple sheds some light on the earliest arrangement of the forum and its square. One of the issues of urban studies in Pollentia has been to define the E side of the forum square, while the W side was already defined by Cardo 1 and the Insula 1. In the lack of a symmetric façade to the E, it had been proposed that the forum was not symmetrical with the Tuscan temple, in order to house Temples I and II. Since we have interpreted the area of the temples as a transitional area, the main forum square could still be symmetrical in relation to the Tuscan temple.

Temple I was part of a first century AD monument building project that included a flagstone pavement, and some elements that we have identified as a pedestal, an aedicula, and a probable altar. All these elements contributed to the prestige of this area, which had Temples I and II as its main features.

The Imperial cult spread throughout the Roman Empire in the first century AD, especially after Augustus’ death in AD 14. The inscription found close to Temple I, which refers to provincial and local governors, indicates that the dedication of the temple was related to some official cult. Some scholars have previously suggested a dedication to the Imperial cult, specifically as an aedes Augusti or to some of the Imperial attributes. Along with the inscription, the dating of Temple I in the first half of the first century AD and Temple II in the early Empire, their satellite location in relation to an older Republican temple, and their resemblance to other Imperial cult shrines and temples, support the hypothesis that these temples were possibly related to the Imperial cult.

The coexistence of a possible Capitolium and the Imperial cult fits with the Augustan conception of the state. After the last Civil wars, the old Republican principles were being restored, while at the same time a new order was arising. This is exactly what we can see in the architectural landscape that was created in Pollentia. The Imperial cult shrines were built in a secondary position around an old Republican temple.

On the other hand, the architectural style of the remains of Temple I finds its most similar parallels in older buildings (second to first centuries BC) in Italy and Spain. This old fashioned shape could be to reinforce the prestige of these buildings, but it could also correspond to the presence of workshops with a solid old fashioned tradition in Pollentia, as other finds in the city may suggest.

This set of monuments reveals the nature of the new order arising after the crisis of the Republic. The new regime nevertheless showed respect for the old Republican principles of which it was – theoretically – a restoration, a renewal of good morals – of the mos maiorum. That is why new Imperial cult temples were built alongside Republican ones, respecting their prominence. This was the Imperial syntax of the urban landscape.
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