

## The Emergence of the Replica Model? An Analysis of the Question of the ‘Copies of Rome’ in Late Republican Colonization Through Three Case-Studies

Carlos ENRÍQUEZ DE SALAMANCA<sup>1</sup>

**Abstract:** *The debate around the replica model of Roman colonization has traditionally been focused on the early to mid-Republican colonial foundations in Italy. In this context, scholars have, in the last decades, rightly challenged the former orthodoxy to assert that these colonies were not, as was previously assumed, replicas of Rome. These same scholars, however, have often stated that these replicas were the result of later Republican and imperial colonial practices that emerged in this period. This paper puts this assumption of the ‘emergence of the replica model’ to the test to show that this is not the case. Through an examination of the elements of the replica model, as well as a series of three case-studies (Corinth, Urso, and Pompeii), the present work will show that there is no evidence to suggest a replica model in the colonies of the Late Republic and Early Empire, but rather, at most, an inspiration taken from Roman institutions that can hardly be identified with the traditional arguments of the simulacrum.*

**Rezumat:** *Dezbaterea în jurul modelului de replică al colonizării romane s-a concentrat tradițional asupra fundațiilor coloniale din perioada începutului până la mijlocul Republicii în Italia. În acest context, cercetătorii au contestat pe bună dreptate, în ultimele decenii, ortodoxia anterioară, afirmând că aceste colonii nu erau, așa cum se presupunea anterior, replici ale Romei. Totuși, aceiași cercetători au susținut adesea că aceste replici au fost rezultatul practicilor coloniale târzii republicane și imperiale, care au apărut în această perioadă. Această lucrare pune la încercare această presupunere a „emergenței modelului de replică” pentru a demonstra că nu este așa. Printr-o examinare a elementelor modelului de replică, precum și printr-o serie de trei studii de caz (Corint, Urso și Pompei), prezentul studiu va arăta că nu există dovezi care să sugereze un model de replică în coloniile din perioada târzie a Republicii și începutul Imperiului, ci mai degrabă, în cel mai bun caz, o inspirație preluată din instituțiile romane, care cu greu poate fi identificată cu argumentele tradiționale ale simulacrului.*

**Keywords:** Replica model, Roman colonization, Late Republic, colonies, Capitolium, forum, comitium-curia complex.

### Introduction

#### Scope and Structure

In the present paper, I will be discussing the assumed emergence of the replica model of Roman colonization in the late Republic and early Empire. The main aim of this endeavour is to follow what is the apparent logical continuation of the research into the replica model debate by looking at whether we can affirm that this replica model began to emerge in the colonies of

---

<sup>1</sup> Universiteit Leiden, Nederland: [ceses2000@hotmail.com](mailto:ceses2000@hotmail.com). ORCID-ID: 0009-0001-7339-8780.

the later Roman Republic and early Principate. Therefore, it is important to note at the very outset that I will not be delving into the ideologies or reasoning behind the Roman colonial practices that drove this shift into model replicas of Rome. That is, my concern is with the specific cases of emergence of this phenomenon, not its motivations or even its consequences. The latter aspect would necessitate its own separate research and analysis that does not fit the scope of the present paper.

Given this scope and the aims of this essay, I have decided to structure it into two main sections. The first section of the essay will focus on establishing a standard by which to judge the emergence of the replica model of Roman colonies. It would be very difficult to tackle the issues this paper wishes to address without first proposing some sort of standard against which to compare those developments. Therefore, section one will focus on analysing the works of previous scholars in order to ascertain what has traditionally been seen as evidence of model replica instances. Aspects like topography, capitolia, fora, institutions, etc. will have to be accounted for, and will offer some sort of benchmark for the following study in the next section. However, due to space constraints, it will be impossible to tackle *all* elements that have been related to the model replica. Therefore, I will select those which are most conspicuous and significant, and other elements will have to be considered where relevant in each case-study. The later section will then focus on the direct evidence of the colonies. The aim will be to take three case-studies: Corinth, Urso, and Pompeii, given that space constraints make it impossible to tackle *all* Roman colonies, and extrapolate in order to offer some sort of conclusion on the development of replica model practices. These colonies have been chosen due to their similar chronology, but also because they present a diverse geographic distribution, which will allow for better extrapolation of any findings.

### **Status Quaestionis**

Salmon, in his 1969 classic work *Roman Colonization Under the Republic* stated that “a colonia was a city-state”,<sup>2</sup> that it was not simply a territory or a geographical location, but rather, for Salmon a Roman colony’s key characteristic was its urbanism and self-governance.<sup>3</sup> But, more importantly for this paper, he also went on to echo the words of Gellius<sup>4</sup> about Roman colonies being “miniatures” or “reproductions” of Rome itself.<sup>5</sup> He stated that Roman colonies followed a “uniform tendency to imitate Rome”,<sup>6</sup> and his assertions have had tremendous influence on the study of Roman colonization since, and until not too long ago.<sup>7</sup> Recently, however, Pelgrom

---

<sup>2</sup> SALMON 1969, 14.

<sup>3</sup> PELGROM 2014, 73.

<sup>4</sup> GELL., NA 16.13.9: “colonies seem to be miniatures, as it were, and in a way copies [of Rome]”.

<sup>5</sup> SALMON 1969, 18.

<sup>6</sup> SALMON 1969, 18.

<sup>7</sup> SEWELL 2014, 125.

and Stek have succinctly shown the nuances of Salmon's view, both good and bad, as well as the work of other scholars that should also receive the historiographic attention Salmon has enjoyed.<sup>8</sup> Despite this, the figure of E.T. Salmon still towers over the historiography of the field. In fact, even archaeologists such as Frank Brown, having excavated Cosa in the 70s, that what he had found in the colony was a prototype of "Rome itself".<sup>9</sup> But, even though this perception of Roman colonization practice became the orthodoxy, it was eventually shown to be imprecise, and in recent years many scholars have criticized and outright rejected that view,<sup>10</sup> stating that later sources are unreliable in their recounting of earlier colonial practices.<sup>11</sup>

The new orthodoxy prevails: Rome, in Italy and in the early to mid-Republic, did not found colonies as miniatures of itself; the replica model understanding of Roman colonization is overcome. However, some issues prevail. As Edward Bispham states: "[the replica model] is all very well for the Augustan period, and, with qualifications, for the late Republic".<sup>12</sup> It is, however, true as he states, that these colonies did not look like Rome very much, but the important aspects is that their foundation were meant to recall Rome,<sup>13</sup> they recalled an archaic form of Rome and the basic topographic and infrastructural aspects; a process which Bispham calls "late-republican and Augustan discourses, which evolved in the context of re-shaping an identity for a far-flung and recently divided empire".<sup>14</sup> His article, however, goes on to discuss the realities of middle-republican colonization, and to criticize further the issues with the Gellian model.

Thus, on the one hand, we find that scholars have rightly pointed out the faults with the replica model for early Roman colonization, but at the same time, they seem to indicate that these replica models do appear later on, i.e., they are a later invention. Despite this, very little attention has been given to this fact, with most efforts directed towards stomping the Gellian model to the ground, but the later-republican and Augustan discourses and colonial replications of Rome being almost completely ignored. It is, therefore, my aim here to offer a first glimpse into whether we can truly say that these 'copies of Rome' emerged in the context of late-republican and Augustan colonization. This paper will show, I hope, that we should not be so confident in these assumptions, and that the picture is much more complex and nuanced than previously thought. Perhaps this paper might serve to stimulate further discussion in what seems to be the logical continuation of a topical debate.

---

<sup>8</sup> PELGROM, STEK 2014.

<sup>9</sup> BROWN 1980, 12.

<sup>10</sup> e.g.: BRADLEY 2006; PELGROM 2008; SEWELL 2014, to name just a few.

<sup>11</sup> BRADLEY 2006, 163.

<sup>12</sup> BISPHAM 2006, 75.

<sup>13</sup> BISPHAM 2006, 75.

<sup>14</sup> BISPHAM 2006, 75.

### The replica model

The debate on the processes of emergence of the model replica cannot be properly started without contending first with what, precisely, should be understood as representing a replica or a likeness of Rome within a colonial foundation. In short, we ought to, firstly, establish some sort of standard of a 'model replica' against which to hold Roman colonies. The best way to go about this will be to analyse the secondary literature and the historiography of the debate, in order to ascertain what elements have traditionally been seen as elements of the *simulacrum*, and subject those to rigorous analysis. As will be made evident, there is no consensus on this topic, but some general outline can be somewhat ascertained that will, at least, allow for some key elements to be highlighted as significant in looking at their emergence for the replica model in later Republican and imperial colonial contexts. We may do well to begin with the physical aspects of the replica model. Bispham himself stated that every colony is easily recognisable through its urban 'kit'.<sup>15</sup> This 'kit' was composed of the following elements: a citadel with a Capitolium temple, a forum as the main political space, and, within it, a *comitium*, and a *curia*. Despite the fact that we now know that this is a late-Republican and Augustan discourse of colonial re-shaping, these 'kits' of standard urban elements do make up, and have traditionally been seen as, key elements of the replica model, whether for early colonies, or for later re-formulations of these colonial settlements.<sup>16</sup>

Of these elements, the one that has recently been subjected to the most scholarly analysis and discussion has, undoubtedly, been the Capitolium, so I will begin by examining its connection to colonialism.<sup>17</sup> The issue with Capitolia temples has been brought to the fore by Quinn and Wilson in their *JRS* article from 2013, in which they discussed the assumption, accepted by most scholars, that these temples were a part of that aforementioned urban 'kit' either for early Roman colonies, or later imperial ones. Frank Brown et al., in their 1960 study of Cosa's Arx temples, were proponents of the theory that the Capitolium at Cosa was a clear instance of the Gellian *simulacrum* model: "[the Capitolium's] presence in the colony is warranted by Gellius' definition of the *effigies parvae simulacrae* of the metropolis."<sup>18</sup> And while there has been some pushback against this notion, it has not escaped the association with the replica model.

The Oxford Classical Dictionary's (OCD) entry for 'Capitol/Capitolium' makes a quick survey over the facts and history of the Roman Capitolium both as one of the seven hills, as well

---

<sup>15</sup> BISPHAM 2006, 74.

<sup>16</sup> QUINN, WILSON 2013, 117, 126.

<sup>17</sup> Note that the discussion of Capitolia takes a significant amount of space here, as it offers one of the most important aspects of the replica model, and which has been discussed thoroughly. As such, it offers a great starting point in offering both an understanding of how the replica model has been constructed, and why we should be cautious with our assumptions regarding it.

<sup>18</sup> BROWN *et alii* 1960, 106.

as the temple on it. But most importantly for our purposes here, a final, brief note is added that states that “[b]oth hill and the temple of Jupiter were reproduced in many cities of Italy and the western provinces”.<sup>19</sup> Furthermore, Brill’s *New Pauly* also explicitly buys or subscribes to this replica model understanding of the Capitolium for Roman colonies and cities in Italy and the western provinces: “[The Capitolium was] the temple complex for the divine triad of Jupiter, Juno and Minerva in the cities of Italy and the (mainly western) provinces of the Roman Empire, in imitation of the *Capitolium* in the city of Rome, which thus became the *Capitolium vetus*” and then continue by saying that “[i]t is probable that *capitolia* were originally erected only in those Roman colonies laid out on the pattern of Rome [...], then in cities that wished or were obliged in particular to emphasize their adherence to the empire.”<sup>20</sup> Even authors who are significantly critical of the replica model, or who advise great caution, have still maintained the importance of the Capitolium within Roman colonies and provincial settlements. Zanker notably still assumes *Capitolia* as a defining feature of Italian Republican and Augustan colonies in an article from 2000,<sup>21</sup> and Bispham, despite rejecting that relationship for the mid-Republic, argues that, for later periods, “it was becoming unthinkable that a Roman colony should not have a temple to the Capitoline Triad.”<sup>22</sup>

More recently, however, these discourses have faced severe pushback, and the seemingly inseparable relationship between *Capitolia* and colonial foundation/status has been thrown into question. As previously mentioned, Quinn and Wilson have spearheaded the opposition to this assumption. Their argument, however, is *not* “to suggest that *Capitolia* were not of great importance or that they did not display a strong symbolic link with Rome”, but rather that it had “nothing to do with Republican or early Imperial colonization, or with the colonial status of cities” and that “the idea of a Capitolium on a high point of town, or dominating the forum, was not the standard, centrally propagated, item of Roman town planning that it has frequently been presented as being.”<sup>23</sup> The point that they make is, therefore, that scholars are right in emphasizing the importance of *Capitolia*, where they exist, but their existence was much more scarce than previously thought,<sup>24</sup> and had nothing to do with colonial status or foundation.<sup>25</sup> In this vein, Mario Torelli also discussed the apparent lack of Capitolium at Leptis Magna, which became a colony at the beginning of the II century AD. In this article, however, Torelli diverges from Quinn and Wilson in that he posits the possibility of a Capitoline Triad cult that followed non-traditional forms, and thus a Capitolium temple as such would not be strictly necessary in

---

<sup>19</sup>  *OCD* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.), s.v. *Capitol/Capitolium*.

<sup>20</sup> Brill’s *New Pauly*, s.v. *Capitolium*, section II.

<sup>21</sup> ZANKER 2000, 27-28.

<sup>22</sup> BISPHAM 2006, 122.

<sup>23</sup> QUINN, WILSON 2013, 128.

<sup>24</sup> QUINN, WILSON 2013, 142 ff, especially outside of Roman North Africa.

<sup>25</sup> QUINN, WILSON 2013, 167-168.

its typical form.<sup>26</sup> All in all, the key reflection we ought to take from this rather long incursion into the discussion of the relationship of Capitolium and colonial foundation/status is that we should be wary of straightforward assumptions. It is undeniable that a Capitolium, as Quinn and Wilson themselves admit, gave the colony a stronger relationship with Rome, but its existence was not necessary nor as widespread as previously imagined. In other words, a Capitolium might provide strong evidence of the *simulacrum* model, but its relative rarity to what was often assumed means that its relationship to colonial status is not a direct correlation, which should raise a point of caution for the following elements.

Moving on from the Capitolium, I will briefly go over the remaining physical elements of the replica model. The New Pauly defines fora as “the mercantile and administrative centre of a Roman city [...] which took the form of a large open space framed by buildings”, the location – at the crossing of the *cardo* and *decumanus* – function, and architecture of which was modelled after the *Forum Romanum*,<sup>27</sup> Similarly, the OCD states that fora “formed the focal point of most Roman towns” and that “[t]he imperial fora at Rome provided models for more monumental complexes”.<sup>28</sup> It is clear that fora are widely regarded as a defining feature of the *simulacrum* of Rome in the colonies, and very little nuance or pushback has been levelled against this archaeologically well-established fact. Even Sewell, who is notoriously opposed to the replica model argument, preferring notions of adaptation, rather than replication, admits that the fora of Italian cities throughout the mid-Republican period and beyond seem to be modelled on the layout of Rome’s own forum, with their functions also similar, even the same, to those of the *Forum Romanum*, too.<sup>29</sup> On the other hand, Mouritsen does throw into question the idea that these Italian fora were copies of the Roman institution.<sup>30</sup> His reasoning is that the “heterogeneous and unstable nature of the structures means that they cannot be direct copies of any Roman institution.”<sup>31</sup> However, he himself admits that the inspiration ‘may’ have come from Rome and Latium,<sup>32</sup> and, furthermore, the fact that the *comitium-curia* complexes also presented diverse sizes and layouts – which does not constitute a challenge to their addition to the *simulacrum* model (see below) – evidences that Mouritsen’s argument does not constitute a strong enough challenge to disregard fora as an adaptation or replication of Roman institutions.<sup>33</sup> This re-shaping of the fora for different communities, however, should remind

---

<sup>26</sup> TORELLI 2014.

<sup>27</sup> Brill’s *New Pauly*, s.v. *Forum*.

<sup>28</sup> *OCD* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.), s.v. *Forum*.

<sup>29</sup> SEWELL 2014, 129.

<sup>30</sup> MOURITSEN 2004.

<sup>31</sup> MOURITSEN 2004, p. 64.

<sup>32</sup> MOURITSEN 2004.

<sup>33</sup> SEWELL 2014, 128.

us of Torelli's argument regarding Capitolia, and lead us to think about these adaptations as, perhaps, precisely that, rather than strictly copies or replications.

Within the forum we find the *comitium* and the *curia*. These *comitium-curia* complexes have also been taken as a defining feature of the model replica since Richardson Jr. argued for it in his 1957 article on the forum of Cosa:<sup>34</sup> “[e]xcavations in the forum of the Latin colony of Cosa [...] have brought to light the *comitium* [...], and *curia* [...]. These buildings show in a new and striking way how intense the imitation of Rome in the colonies could be.”<sup>35</sup> Furthermore, we find that, as with the fora or the Capitolium, Brill's *New Pauly* takes these complexes as being a feature of the city of Rome that was copied to its colonies: “The building structures of the city of Rome were transferred to the newly founded colonies”,<sup>36</sup> further evidence of their importance for the *simulacrum* model. The *comitium-curia* complexes were the central element of the city's political system adapted from Rome (on which, see below),<sup>37</sup> and they evidence their importance in the fact that these complexes “are to be found in all the Latin colonies that have been excavated adequately”.<sup>38</sup> Coarelli has reconstructed the *comitium* in Rome as having a ‘circular’ shape,<sup>39</sup> an argument which stems from an extrapolation of other findings in Latin colonies which present similar *comitium* shapes, given the difficulty of excavating in Rome itself due to later and modern buildings obstructing these efforts<sup>40</sup> and the insufficiency of extant material.<sup>41</sup> This argumentation, however, has been criticized by some scholars as circular,<sup>42</sup> and poses a problem towards the interpretation that colonial *comitia* were copies of the Roman *comitium*. Sewell has offered some sort of middle-ground in that these *comitia* of the colonies do seem to be taking inspiration from Rome, but perhaps as a form of adaptation of a general idea of what this institution was, following some general policy of *comitium* building that followed patterns that show themselves across the colonies.<sup>43</sup> I, however, believe that Coarelli's point that the archaeology of Rome's *comitium* does seem to point towards a curvilinear shape is enough to warrant the belief that Rome's *comitium* was the standard which other Latin colonies followed, and the opposing arguments are not strong enough to dispose of this argument.<sup>44</sup> In

---

<sup>34</sup> RICHARDSON 1957.

<sup>35</sup> RICHARDSON 1957, 49.

<sup>36</sup> Brill's *New Pauly*, s.v. *Assembly Buildings*, section III. Rome.

<sup>37</sup> SEWELL 2014, 126.

<sup>38</sup> COARELLI 2005, 25.

<sup>39</sup> COARELLI 1983, 119-160; COARELLI 1985, 11-21.

<sup>40</sup> RICHARDSON 1957, 49.

<sup>41</sup> SEWELL 2014, 126.

<sup>42</sup> Most notably MOURITSEN 2004, but also CARAFA 1998, 150-151. SEWELL 2014 also seems to share some doubts as to the strength of this argument.

<sup>43</sup> SEWELL 2014, 126-127.

<sup>44</sup> COARELLI 2005, 25-26.

fact, Sewell himself admits that “since this architecture was apparently derived from Rome, the processes involved seem to have been centripetal in character.”<sup>45</sup>

While the *comitium* served as the meeting place for the people, the *curia*, or senate-house of Rome, which was (originally) situated at the north of the *comitium*, served as the meeting place for the Senate. Seemingly, this would later serve as a model for other Roman towns, which would set aside a place in their fora for their very own *curia* in order to hold municipal council meetings.<sup>46</sup> The discussion on the *curia* and its relationship to the replica model has followed very similar lines to that of the *comitium* due to their aforementioned ties (hence, *comitium-curia* complexes). That is, we find that, even though there definitely are *curia* in some of the colonies, an undeniable fact, these present different layouts, shapes, and sizes.<sup>47</sup> In conclusion, *comitium-curia* complexes are a key element of our survey in this section. They seem to be one of the more clear or straightforward elements of the *simulacrum*, as most scholars agree that the Roman versions of these inspired later adaptations in the colonies. However, caution must be advised against taking these, alone, as evidence of *simulacrum*. They are one element that ought to be taken contextually, and the heterogeneity of the shapes, sizes, layouts, etc. of these should strike us as critical in not assuming a direct, un-nuanced copy of the Roman institutions.

One note before moving on. Du Cange notoriously paraphrased Gellius' words (but presented it as a direct quotation of his statement regarding the replica model)<sup>48</sup> and stated that these colonies, as copies of Rome, would have, by right, not only Capitolia, but also baths and theatres.<sup>49</sup> Due to space constraints, and the fact that these sorts of buildings are not key elements of the *simulacrum* model, I will not discuss them here. However, it is important to note that, in the following sections on the case-studies, if/when these sorts of buildings arise, they will be discussed in the context of what they might tell us about the colony replicating Rome's topographical institutions or taking inspiration from the metropolis. The basilica or the rostra are, alongside the *comitium* or the *curia*, part of the political life of Rome that might show an attempt at replication in the colonies, so they will also be analysed where pertinent.

A final aspect of the model replica debate requires analysis. Thus far we have focused on the physical, topographical elements of the debate (due to the importance given to the urbanism of the colonies),<sup>50</sup> but some scholars have also argued that the Gellian model must

---

<sup>45</sup> SEWELL 2014, 127.

<sup>46</sup> Brill's *New Pauly*, s.v. *Curia*.

<sup>47</sup> Esp. SEWELL 2014, 128.

<sup>48</sup> On the confusion regarding this see QUINN, WILSON 2013, 118-119.

<sup>49</sup> DU CANGE 1737, s.v. *Capitolium*.

<sup>50</sup> SALMON 1969, 14. Cf. also PELGROM 2014, 73 on urbanism and self-government as the essential components of a city-state for Salmon.



be/can be interpreted not as literal, physical copies of Rome,<sup>51</sup> but rather, a replication of Rome's political and juridical institutions<sup>52</sup> or of its majesty more generally.<sup>53</sup> As for the political institutions, Salmon famously stated that the Latin colonies "preferred to order themselves according to the forms of Roman political organization",<sup>54</sup> showing, in the author's view, a 'readiness' or 'eagerness' "to imitate Rome" politically.<sup>55</sup> Hardy, in his discussion of three charters in Roman Spain, famously stated that "[t]he ordinary magistracies, limited to three, duoviri, aediles, and quaestors, no doubt owe their origin to the time when at Rome too the ordinary magistrates were consuls, curule aediles, and quaestors".<sup>56</sup> It should not surprise us, at this point, that this is a contentious assertion. Curchin rejects Hardy's statement on the basis of a lack of evidence in regard to the consular, aedile, and quaestor inspiration for the local magistracies.<sup>57</sup> However, he does grant the possibility that the early Roman judicial magistracy of duovir could have been the real inspiration for the local ones, but once again, the evidence is slim at best.<sup>58</sup> It is interesting that Quinn and Wilson, while flatly rejecting the idea that Gellius was referring to a physical copy of Rome in the colonies, assert that he meant a juridical and institutional one, which seems to be both more difficult to ascertain, and presents less evidence for the assertion than the physical elements, as evidenced above. In any case, given the difficulty of unearthing the institutional realities of the colonies, or even those of early Rome, this aspect of the replica model is much more difficult to confidently tackle. Given the scant evidence, it is best to discuss these institutional aspects in their respective colonial contexts, if and where they can be properly examined.

### **Three case-studies: Corinth, Urso, and Pompeii**

For this second and final section, I propose to look at three case-studies of later-Republican Roman colonies which will hopefully offer a general understanding of whether we can hold the assertion of there being colonial replications/adaptations of Rome. I will discuss whether these colonial topographies and institutions, following the standard features discussed in the previous section, and focusing more on the physical elements, do or do not convincingly evidence the model replica narrative. I will begin with a discussion of each colony separately, with a final conclusion at the end which will attempt to bring the findings together into a cogent and coherent final determination regarding the research question.

---

<sup>51</sup> This is not, however, the majority view, although it has gained considerable traction in recent years. As has been shown, there is still considerable evidence to see the physical aspects as important in this debate.

<sup>52</sup> QUINN, WILSON 2013, 118. As evidenced by SALMON 1969, 85-87 discussion of the magistrates of the colonies.

<sup>53</sup> ZANKER 2000, 41.

<sup>54</sup> SALMON 1969, 85-86.

<sup>55</sup> SALMON 1969, 86.

<sup>56</sup> HARDY 1912, 69.

<sup>57</sup> CURCHIN 1990, 5-6.

<sup>58</sup> CURCHIN 1990, 6.

## Corinth

The city of Corinth was famously sacked and destroyed by the Romans in 146 BC, only to later be re-founded as a Roman colony, not once, but twice: the first time in 44 BC as *Colonia Laus Iulia Corinthiensis*, and the second in the time of Vespasian as *Colonia Iulia Flavia Augusta Corinthiensis*.<sup>59</sup> Notably, it has been said that, following these re-foundations into colonies, “[t]he physical manifestations of Romanization were evident in the urban center of Corinth”<sup>60</sup> and that it was “a self-conscious enclave of *Romanitas*”,<sup>61</sup> but we shall subject this view to analysis in the light of the previous section’s discussion, and ascertain whether this holds for the replica model, not just ‘romanization’. This discussion will be limited to those aspects discussed in the previous section for obvious reasons, with some allowance for any specific elements that might shed further light on the debate. The destruction of Corinth by L. Mummius in 146 BC has traditionally been described, following ancient sources, as complete, to the point where it was said to have been uninhabited for the next century.<sup>62</sup> However, more recent scholarly work has pointed out that “[t]he destruction of Corinth was far less extensive than scholars have preferred to believe”,<sup>63</sup> and that said destruction was mostly partial and selective.<sup>64</sup> Despite this, all things considered, “Greek Corinth had ceased to exist with the destruction of its political functions and civic buildings”,<sup>65</sup> which meant that what the Romans did in 44 BC, in their eyes, was found a completely new urban centre, not rehabilitating the old Corinth.<sup>66</sup>

To begin with, let us consider the issue of the Capitolium. As has been stated above, the Capitolium temple has significant importance in regard to the replica model. Quinn and Wilson have shown that these were not as widespread as scholars may have assumed, but its symbolic importance to highlight the relationship or link between colony/town and Rome is clear and accepted even by these authors.<sup>67</sup> Therefore, to positively conclude that Corinth did possess a Capitolium is a crucial first step. Temple E at Corinth has been described as “one of the most tantalizing problems in Corinthian topography”,<sup>68</sup> and it has been identified as, possibly, the city’s Capitolium. This is not without controversy, however. This Temple has received comparisons to Pausanias’ descriptions of the Temple to Octavia,<sup>69</sup> and authoritative accounts

---

<sup>59</sup> On both colonies, see especially ROMANO 2003.

<sup>60</sup> ROMANO 2010, 155.

<sup>61</sup> *OCD* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.), s.v. *Corinth, Roman*.

<sup>62</sup> Str. 8.6.23.

<sup>63</sup> WISEMAN 1979, 494.

<sup>64</sup> WISEMAN 1979, 491-496.

<sup>65</sup> WALBANK 1997, 107.

<sup>66</sup> WALBANK 1997.

<sup>67</sup> QUINN, WILSON 2013, 128.

<sup>68</sup> WALBANK 1989, 363.

<sup>69</sup> Paus. 2.3.1.

such as that of Wiseman have supported this hypothesis.<sup>70</sup> It seems, however, much more likely that it was, indeed, the Capitolium. Firstly, its elevation. Walbank has rightly pointed out that the hill upon which the temple stood had been artificially elevated to give Temple E a dominating position over other temples, making it “the chief religious centre of the city”.<sup>71</sup> Furthermore, it was situated in a way so as to overlook the forum of the city, adding to this interpretation of it being the Capitolium.<sup>72</sup> These facts, along with the size of the temple, present a very strong argument to positively identify not only that Temple E was the Capitolium, but therefore that Corinth had one of the key elements which we identified as part of the model replica.<sup>73</sup>

Another element, which we have already mentioned above in passing, was the forum, a key part of the model replica, as discussed above. In the case of Corinth, no doubt exists as to whether it had a forum. In fact, Romano succinctly argues that “[i]t is virtually certain that the Forum, as the political, social and, and economic center of the urban town, was planned for and reserved in the earliest design of the colony”.<sup>74</sup> This would, at first, seem to support the thesis of a replica model at the site. However, the *New Pauly* states that, in Corinth, “the old agora was remodelled into a *forum*”,<sup>75</sup> which at first might not seem like a significant statement, but, if this forum was, indeed, a remodelling of the agora, which are usually seen as Greek-Roman equivalents, it could indicate that it was a natural development of Corinth’s newly ‘Romanized’ status, rather than a simple attempt to replicate Roman institutions. Already the fact that there was an agora is a problem for the forum aspect of the replica model, but to positively identify the Corinthian agora as standing in the same site as the later forum would pose an even bigger challenge for the replica model in this regard. The issue of locating the agora, however, has been described as “one of the more persistent problems in Corinthian studies.”<sup>76</sup> Up until recently, it had been widely accepted that the agora of Corinth was located north of the archaic temple,<sup>77</sup> so not under the forum, but the archaeological evidence for this is rather scant. On the other hand, Donati undertook an archaeological survey looking at marks of state ownership that “suggest that the Corinthian agora lies beneath the Roman forum.”<sup>78</sup> His approach furthermore considers the diversity of Greek agorae, and within the context of the findings presented in his paper, Donati poses a strong argument to place the agora beneath the forum. This being the case, then, any assumption that the construction of a forum at Corinth served a

---

<sup>70</sup> WISEMAN 1979, 522, *contra* FREEMAN 1941, 166. The latter published the first discussion of Temple E (166-236).

<sup>71</sup> WALBANK 1989, 363-365. Quote from p. 365.

<sup>72</sup> WALBANK 1989, 366,393.

<sup>73</sup> Notably, QUINN, WILSON 2013, 149 accept, with some reluctance, that Corinth boasted a Capitolium temple.

<sup>74</sup> ROMANO 2003, 287.

<sup>75</sup> Brill’s *New Pauly*, s.v. *Forum*, section I-A.

<sup>76</sup> DONATI 2010, 3.

<sup>77</sup> Following, mainly: WILLIAMS 1970, 38. For other scholars who agree with Williams see DONATI 2010, n. 10.

<sup>78</sup> DONATI 2010, 6.

purpose of replicating Rome must be taken with a grain of salt, given the tendency to adapt agorae to new Roman realities.<sup>79</sup>

There are other Roman-type buildings in Corinth that deserve some analysis. In the context of the political life and landscape of the new colony, the basilica and the rostra are significant to our model replica discussion, and both buildings have been identified in Corinth.<sup>80</sup> Despite the fact that neither a *comitium* nor a *curia* seem to appear in the city, these other buildings being extant does point toward some sort of replication of Roman institutions. The rostra is situated as “the central feature of both the Forum and the city”,<sup>81</sup> showcasing its importance in the political life of the city, in lieu, it would seem, of a *comitium-curia* complex as such. Therefore, regardless of the lack of such a complex, the appearance of a rostra at Corinth does point towards an element of the replica model. Furthermore, this point is strengthened by the basilica.<sup>82</sup> As Weinberg has pointed out, the basilicas of Corinth present the same type and general location in relation to the forum as those in Rome and other Roman cities.<sup>83</sup> It also seems that these basilicas follow the sort of function that Vitruvius sets out in his *De Architectura* as a place for business,<sup>84</sup> which Weinberg confirms,<sup>85</sup> and which replicates those of Rome itself more generally. It would seem, then, that these buildings strengthen the replica model for Corinth given that basilicas are a feature of Roman architecture.<sup>86</sup>

Finally, we must discuss another building that has been uncovered at Corinth: the baths. There are a grand total of nine Roman baths at Corinth,<sup>87</sup> plus two, previous, Greek ones.<sup>88</sup> Following what Du Cange had said regarding the Gellian model, we might be tempted to see this proliferation of baths in Corinth as evidence of the *simulacrum* model. However, this is not an easy assertion. First and foremost, there is good evidence of Greek baths predating the Roman ones,<sup>89</sup> which already contradicts this assertion and should increase our caution. However, the archaeology does point towards a “connection with Italy [...] in the plans of two baths at Corinth”,<sup>90</sup> those being the earlier ‘Republican’ ones. Despite this, one cannot easily maintain that the baths are unequivocal evidence for the *simulacrum*.

---

<sup>79</sup> On this phenomenon, see EVANGELIDIS 2014.

<sup>80</sup> On the rostra see ROMANO 2010, 161; on the basilica see PAWLAK 2013, 146; also, WEINBERG 1960.

<sup>81</sup> ROMANO 2003, 287.

<sup>82</sup> Note that there are two twin basilicas at Corinth (WEINBERG 1960).

<sup>83</sup> WEINBERG 1960, 105.

<sup>84</sup> Vitr. *De Arch.* 5.1.4-5.

<sup>85</sup> WEINBERG 1960, 107.

<sup>86</sup> KLEINER 2010, 22-23.

<sup>87</sup> BIERS 2003, 303.

<sup>88</sup> BIERS 2003, n. 7 with bibliography.

<sup>89</sup> BIERS 2003.

<sup>90</sup> BIERS 2003, 311

In conclusion, we might say with some confidence that Corinth presents elements and indications of a replica model in its foundation and early development. However, not all elements are present, nor are all easily attributable to an attempt to copy Rome, but rather, some (like the forum) can be explained away as the natural development of Greek institutions into their more ‘Romanized’ forms. Thus, to assert that it became an enclave of *Romanitas*, perhaps, taking these assumptions too far.

### Urso

The Roman colony at Urso (modern Osuna), despite not being a large settlement to the extent of others such as Corinth, or a municipal capital, is especially interesting because of the prevailing charter or *Lex Ursonensis* that details the institutional aspects of the colony and the different dispositions that the Romans saw fit to provide for this process. The city sided with Pompey during the Caesarian Civil War and, following a siege, was eventually taken by Caesar in 45 BC.<sup>91</sup> For being on the losing side of the war, Caesar decided to turn the city into a *colonia civium romanorum* under the name of *Colonia Genetiva Iulia Urbanorum Urso*. Despite the fact that, as some scholars have pointed out with noticeable frustration, there has not been proper archaeological attention paid to this site,<sup>92</sup> still some important conclusions can be extracted from an analysis of what we do know of its topography through an analysis of its foundation charter.

To begin with the topography, it has been said, not without controversy, that Urso is one of the Iberian settlements from Roman times which might have had a Capitolium.<sup>93</sup> The evidence used to sustain this assertion is not, as with, for instance, Corinth, archaeological in nature, given the scarce surveys conducted on site. Rather, epigraphic evidence, and mentions of the Capitoline Triad in the Urso charter have been given as sufficient evidence to affirm that Urso must have had a Capitolium. However, even on this, other scholars have raised their doubts; Cagianò de Azevedo famously said that “essa, pur non essendo da sola sufficiente a dimostrare l'esistenza di un Capitolium, costituisce tuttavia un indizio”,<sup>94</sup> showing that it might be a rather weak argument, but still one that indicates some sort of trace of a Capitolium or a Capitoline cult. What the *Lex Ursonensis* does is it mentions the Triad in two chapters. It instructs first the duumvirs<sup>95</sup>, and then the aediles<sup>96</sup> to conduct gladiatorial shows or dramatic spectacles in honour of Jupiter, Juno, and Minerva. This does, undoubtedly, give us enough evidence to assert that there was a Capitoline cult, but not whether this meant that a temple was built. Even so, I argue that this does not pose as serious a problem as it might seem for the replica model.

---

<sup>91</sup> Plin. *HN* 3.3.2.

<sup>92</sup> PACHÓN 2011, 187-188.

<sup>93</sup> BENDALA GALÁN 1990, 12 on the bibliography for the debate.

<sup>94</sup> CAGIANO DE AZEVEDO 1940, 37.

<sup>95</sup> *Urs.* 70.

<sup>96</sup> *Urs.* 71.

Torelli, as discussed above, already showed how the cult of the Capitoline Triad might follow non-traditional forms, such as through a lack of a Capitolium temple as we imagine it to be, as is the case in Leptis Magna.<sup>97</sup> Therefore, we might argue that the existence of a Capitoline cult, as is evident, in Urso, points us toward the implication that there must have been some sort of cult practice that would serve, in general terms, the same function as the Capitolium. In any case, even if this is not as a defeater as it might seem at first, it also cannot be taken to be as strong a piece of evidence as, for instance, the evidence of a physical Capitolium in Corinth. In other words, Urso seems to have had enough of a link to the Roman Capitoline cult to say that something of the replica model remains, but the lack of evidence for a physical Capitolium takes away from its strength.

Given the lack of topographical surveys of Urso, the evidence for a *comitium* is also dependent on its mention in the charter but, in this case, it is far less controversial than the Capitolium argument. Both in chapter 101 and chapter 105 of the *Lex Ursonensis* we find mentions to the *comitium* in the context of the political life of the city.<sup>98</sup> These sections present instructions to the magistrates of the city on who, while 'holding' the *comitia*, they should not allow to nominate themselves for office on the basis of their previous conduct or unsuitability to hold a magistracy. With this context in mind, we are able to discern an aspect of the political life in Urso where an assembly place, or *comitium*, would be necessary given that elections are to be held for magistracies. This poses a different sort of argument to that of the Capitolium. While the cult to the Capitoline Triad is clear, this does not necessarily imply that the building itself was also erected,<sup>99</sup> but the wording of the charter in mentioning the *comitium*, as well as the apparent lively political life of the city, leaves little doubt as to the fact that a physical space for assembly meetings and voting must have existed.

A similar argument can be made for other buildings that evidence the replica model at Urso. For starters, the forum is clearly attested in the charter.<sup>100</sup> Firstly, the author instructs that the aediles must organize games in honour of Venus in the forum or in the circus, and secondly, the duumvirs and aediles are also required to swear an oath to Jupiter to conduct themselves properly in the handling of the treasury of the colony in the forum. Given that the forum has been defined as "the administrative centre of a Roman city",<sup>101</sup> these mentions in the charter and the context in which it is mentioned provides enough evidence to support the assertion that a forum must have been present at Urso. The *curia* is slightly more problematic.

---

<sup>97</sup> TORELLI 2014. See above for the discussion.

<sup>98</sup> *Urs.* 101, 105.

<sup>99</sup> As mentioned above, see TORELLI 2014.

<sup>100</sup> *Urs.* 71, 81.

<sup>101</sup> Brill's *New Pauly*, s.v. *Forum*.

There are several mentions in the charter to meetings of the decurions, or local senate.<sup>102</sup> The *curia* being the meeting place of the local council,<sup>103</sup> it would be easy to assert, from this evidence alone, that a building of this sort must have been present at the colony. It does not seem too far-fetched to propose that, in a colony where political life was so dependent on the meetings of these magistrates and decurions, a building for their meetings must have existed, but the fact is that this is a feature not of Roman political institutions, but of many other societies. In order for the *curia*, or any meeting place for the council to evidence any sort of replica model, it must bear resemblance to the Roman institution itself, whether it be in its location, size, shape, or layout. The fact is that, for Urso, none of these can be verified, and so while such a building might be obvious, its support of the replica model is not.

Finally, some analysis is required on the politics at Urso. Unlike in many cities of the ancient world, with the *Lex Ursonensis* we have the opportunity to discern what its political system was like. Its likeness has been compared to the early Roman Republican system in a way that clearly ties in with the replica model.<sup>104</sup> However, it has already been discussed above how this assumption is not widely accepted nor without its problems.<sup>105</sup> In the case of Urso, it has been held that “[i]n general, political institutions are modeled on those of Rome itself”,<sup>106</sup> but the issue is not so clear. It is true that, at first glance, there is some resemblance with early Roman politics. Two collegial magistrates (duumvirs/consuls), two aediles, and a council (senate) made up of decurions or local senators.<sup>107</sup> However, there are also notable problems with this model. Why would the duumvirs be called such and not consuls, just like aediles received the same name as their Roman counterparts?<sup>108</sup> Furthermore, the powers of the duumvirs were also (understandably) restricted, whereas the consuls were not, and the duties of the former were mainly concerned with judicial and civil matters.<sup>109</sup> All in all, it is a flimsy argument at best, for the reasons given here and above<sup>110</sup> to argue that the political system at Urso replicated the early Republic. At most one might be able to say that there seems to be some parallels which hardly support the replica model.

In conclusion, Urso, like Corinth, does present some elements of the replica model, but there are others which are notably contentious or absent. Nevertheless, the aspects that do seem to replicate Rome (i.e. the *comitium* and forum) are well attested and we should bring note to the fact that they are key elements in the replica model.

<sup>102</sup> *Urs.* 64, 81, 92, 103.

<sup>103</sup> Brill's *New Pauly*, s.v. *Curia*.

<sup>104</sup> HARDY 1912, 69.

<sup>105</sup> See CURCHIN 1990, 5-6. Also, discussion above on magisterial replication.

<sup>106</sup> SÁNCHEZ-MORENO 2013, 4038.

<sup>107</sup> *Urs.* 129 on the importance of the decurions and the local council.

<sup>108</sup> Cf. CURCHIN 1990, 6.

<sup>109</sup> *Urs.* 61, 77, 100.

<sup>110</sup> See the discussion on the magisterial replica model above.

### Pompeii<sup>111</sup>

The colony of Pompeii shares with Urso a similar foundation story. Following its declaration of allegiance to the losing side of the Social War, Pompeii was besieged and taken by the Romans, who eventually turned it into a colony under the name of *Colonia Cornelia Veneria Pompeianorum* and granted Roman citizenship to its inhabitants. However, opposite to the situation at Urso, the eruption of Vesuvius in 79 CE and later excavations have turned Pompeii into one of the best-preserved and well-known cities of the ancient world, which allows us to look at its topography much more closely. This means, though, that I will need to be more selective with the elements to analyse here, especially those which are not the key replica model institutions discussed in the previous section.

Beginning with the Capitolium, Brill’s *New Pauly*, in stating that “*capitolia* were originally erected only in those Roman colonies laid out on the pattern of Rome”<sup>112</sup> goes on to give Pompeii as an example of such a colony. There seems to be little controversy regarding the existence of a Temple of Jupiter at Pompeii and has been positively identified at region VII.8. However, the issue for the Pompeian Capitolium rests not on the question of its existence, but rather on when it was built.<sup>113</sup> If we posit that the Capitolium/Temple of Jupiter was constructed before the city was turned into a colony, then our argument regarding the *colonial* replica model does not stand. Therefore, in order to argue that Pompeii’s Capitolium is a feature of the *simulacrum* we ought to positively date it to the colonial period. On this issue, Quinn and Wilson have pronounced themselves, stating that “[t]he phasing [of the Capitolium] is very complex” but that according to them, the evidence does not support the dating of the temple to the post-colonial foundation period, and it “cannot therefore be used to identify the temple as Capitolium connected with that colony.”<sup>114</sup> Indeed, the phasing is complex, but there seem to be good arguments to date the Capitolium to the colonial period, at least in its later form which resonated with Roman-type building. For instance, Ball and Dobbins have argued that the typical Roman design pattern present in the Capitolium endorse a dating that is post-colonial during the I century BC,<sup>115</sup> but also the fact that if one were to date the Capitolium at an earlier, Samnite, period, this would be both very close to the colonization of the city, and would present “an atypical and precocious example” that would also fit “rather badly” with what we know about Samnite architecture patterns.<sup>116</sup> These arguments, although not definitive,

---

<sup>111</sup> For a map of the city, see <http://pompeiiites.org/en/pompeii-map/>.

<sup>112</sup> Brill’s *New Pauly*, s.v. *Capitolium*.

<sup>113</sup> BEARD 2009, 64 on doubts about when it was built. Please note this is the Spanish translation of the book.

<sup>114</sup> QUINN, WILSON 2013, 138-139.

<sup>115</sup> BALL, DOBBINS 2013, 469.

<sup>116</sup> BALL, DOBBINS 2013, 478-479.



do seem to make it more plausible to date the Capitolium at a colonial date, which considerably strengthens the replica model interpretation.

Moving on to the forum more generally, it has been convincingly argued that it was of Samnite origin, but the greater development of its neighbouring buildings and its expansion was Roman.<sup>117</sup> Here, rather than discussing the forum itself, given that it is a feature of Samnite building, it is more interesting to look at the layout and buildings around it. Firstly, the *comitium*. Several scholars have identified, in the southwestern region of the forum (VIII.3.32), Pompeii's *comitium*.<sup>118</sup> However, this has not been without controversy, and other interpretations have been put forward that challenge that view,<sup>119</sup> despite the fact that the official Pompeii site website cites it as a *comitium*.<sup>120</sup> The solution does not seem an easy one, but no clear alternative has been widely accepted, and the location of the proposed *comitium*, as well as its correspondence with the adjacent buildings strongly points towards this interpretation.<sup>121</sup> Even if the question remains as to whether this was surely a *comitium*, a broader consideration of the other elements around it does evidence a civil function similar to what a *comitium* could be. This *comitium*, assuming now that it was so, might also correspond with a wider element of the replica model in that it seems to be part of a *comitium-curia* complex. The southernmost part of the forum presents three buildings side by side which, by virtue of their location have traditionally been identified as civic elements of the colony.<sup>122</sup> None of these can be positively identified as the *curia* in detriment of the other two, and so scholars have debated this very issue and attempted to give reasonable arguments for one, the second, or the third.<sup>123</sup> Despite this, it is not our objective to positively identify *one* of these buildings as being the *curia* of Pompeii, it is sufficient to ascertain whether one of these could have, most likely, been it. Beard criticized the argument from location, asserting that one can easily imagine the local senate meeting in any other temple or public building,<sup>124</sup> but this argument does not stand alone. When coupled with the Vitruvian narrative of how a *curia* should be set up, and the archaeological findings within one of the buildings, Van Buren made a compelling argument for its identification as the Pompeian *curia*.<sup>125</sup> This identification presents an even stronger argument for the replica model when considered alongside the *comitium* given the discussion above.

---

<sup>117</sup> DOBBINS 1994, 629–632.

<sup>118</sup> LING 2005, 55; DOBBINS 1994, n. 3 is not as convinced regarding the function of that space, but seems to generally agree with its identification with the *comitium*.

<sup>119</sup> E.g. RICHARDSON 1988, 145–147.

<sup>120</sup> See <http://pompeiiites.org/en/archaeological-site/comitium-and-municipal-buildings/>.

<sup>121</sup> DOBBINS 2007, 169–172.

<sup>122</sup> This has followed the Vitruvian narrative (Vitr. 5.2). Cf. also BEARD 2009, 283.

<sup>123</sup> HORROCKS 2000, 158 on this debate.

<sup>124</sup> BEARD 2009, 283.

<sup>125</sup> VAN BUREN 1918, 73.

Finally, another building warrants analysis in the context of the *simulacrum* at Pompeii: the basilica. This building has traditionally been dated around the second century BC,<sup>126</sup> during the Samnite period, which would automatically dispel any notion that its existence could support the replica model. However, new and novel works have thrown this dating into question, posing that it could actually be a Sullan-period development,<sup>127</sup> a fact that, if true, changes the perception of this building in relation to the topic of this paper. This latter interpretation does seem much more compelling. Firstly, the graffito found at the basilica<sup>128</sup> provides a date that ought to be *before* 78 BC, when Pompeii was already a colony. Furthermore, recent excavations have provided topographical evidence that do not seem to point towards a date during the second century BC, but rather, it seems much more likely that the basilica's foundations were worked into the topography at a later date, much closer to Sullan times.<sup>129</sup> In the end, as Ball and Dobbins argue: “[a] date for the Basilica in the Sullan period reflects the available data and should be a chronological “default setting” until any actual evidence for a Samnite date can be found.”<sup>130</sup> As for the replica model implications, it has already been discussed, in the context of Corinth, that these buildings are emblematic of Roman architecture,<sup>131</sup> and its dating to the colonial foundation of Pompeii further points toward a ‘Romanization’ of the city which should not be taken lightly.

In conclusion, Pompeii's topography, of which we possess great deals of information, seems to present a significantly strong argument for the replica model. It is true, and should be taken into account, that some of these elements are contentious, but the general outline does seem to be supporting the *simulacrum* to a more convincing extent than the previous two case-studies.

### Conclusion

The aim of this paper has been to critically examine and consider the idea that later Republican and Augustan colonization saw the emergence of the replica model. Bispham famously argued that, while one cannot sustain the Gellian model for mid-Republican colonization (never mind earlier colonies), this *simulacrum* was a feature of later discourses from the period this paper has contended with. The findings above have attempted to show that this argument cannot be held to be as clear or as straightforward as it has been proposed. Through an analysis of the replica model key elements, and the following case-studies, it has been shown that the elements of the replica model do appear to some extent, and especially

---

<sup>126</sup> RICHARDSON 1988, 95-99.

<sup>127</sup> BALL, DOBBINS 2017, 484-485.

<sup>128</sup> CIL IV 1842.

<sup>129</sup> BALL, DOBBINS 2017, 484-485.

<sup>130</sup> BALL, DOBBINS 2017, 486.

<sup>131</sup> KLEINER 2010, 22-23.

compared to earlier colonies. However, it has also hopefully been shown beyond reasonable doubt that these elements are not as conspicuous or overarching as one might have expected to see given what other scholars have assumed. Corinth, Urso, and Pompeii were chosen for their similar chronology but also for their diverse geographical distribution. This decision stems from an attempt to provide as wide a picture as possible within the context of these 'later Republican' and/or 'Augustan' discourses. What these have shown is that, despite the geographical differences, various elements of the replica model do seem to appear, but never all at the same site, nor do we find a non-controversial element across the board.

This should lead us to reconsider the ways in which we conceptualize Roman colonization, especially in regard to any sort of 'replica' model. Replica seems to imply an unnuanced copy of the metropolis, and local contexts and pre-existing elements of the cities might both prevent elements from arising or prevent them from being identified as elements of any sort of replication of Rome (as with the forum at Corinth). Perhaps Sewell's<sup>132</sup> contention was right in that we should be thinking about adaptations, rather than literal copies, but we should not lose sight of the fact that the physical likeness with Rome was significant in some of these cities (especially Pompeii), and the influence of the *urbs* would have definitely been felt in the topography and political organization of colonies. All in all, if we were to support 'an emergence of the replica model', it would have to be a 'soft' emergence where specific institutions of Rome might be copied or adapted to highlight the links to the metropolis, and never as an all-encompassing or comprehensive/explicit policy.

**Acknowledgements:** I would like to give special thanks to Dr. Jeremia Pelgrom (Rijksuniversiteit Groningen) for his invaluable comments and continuous encouragement throughout the writing and research process of this article. His expertise and guidance have been key in shaping this paper. I am also grateful to my colleagues at Leiden and Groningen, and to my new department at Warwick for their unending support.

### References

BALL, L.F., DOBBINS, J.J. 2013. Pompeii Forum Project: Current Thinking on the Pompeii Forum, *American Journal of Archaeology* 117: 461-492.

BALL, L.F., DOBBINS, J.J. 2017. Pompeii Forum Project: Excavation and Urbanistic Reappraisals of the Sanctuary of Apollo, Basilica, and Via della Fortuna Neighborhood, *American Journal of Archaeology* 121/3: 467-503.

BEARD, M. 2009. *Pompeya. Historia y Leyenda de una Ciudad Romana*. Trans.: T. de Lozoya, J. Rabasseda. Barcelona.

BENDALA GALÁN, M. 1990. Capitolia Hispaniarum, *Anas*, 2/3: 11-36.

---

<sup>132</sup> SEWELL 2014.

- BIERS, J. 2003. Lavari est Vivere: Baths in Roman Corinth, *Corinth*, 20, *Corinth, The Centenary: 1896-1996*, 303-319.
- BISPHAM, E. 2006. *Coloniam Deducere*: How Roman was Roman Colonization During the Middle Republic? In: G. Bradley, J-P. Wilson (eds.), *Greek and Roman Colonization*, Wales, 73-160.
- BRADLEY, G. 2006. *Ancient Umbria: State, Culture, and Identity in Central Italy from the Iron Age to the Augustan Era*. Oxford.
- BROWN, F.E. 1980. *Cosa: the making of a Roman town*. Ann Arbor.
- BROWN, F. E., RICHARDSON, E.H., RICHARDSON, L., JR. 1960. Cosa II. The Temples of the Arx. *Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome*, 36, American Academy in Rome, xix + 380.
- CAGIANO DE AZEVEDO, M. 1940. *I "Capitolia" dell'impero romano*. Tipografia Poliglotta.
- CARAFÀ, P. 1998. *Il Comizio di Roma dalle origini all'età di Augusto*. Rome.
- COARELLI, F. 1983. *Il Foro Romano I: periodo arcaico*. Rome.
- COARELLI, F. 1985. *Il Foro Romano II: periodo repubblicano e augusteo*. Rome.
- COARELLI, F. 2005. Pits and Fora: A Reply to Henrik Mouritsen, *Papers of the British School at Rome*, 73: 23-30.
- CURCHIN, L.A. 1990. *The Local Magistrates of Roman Spain*. Toronto.
- DOBBINS, J.J. 1994. Problems of Chronology, Decoration, and Urban Design in the Forum at Pompeii, *American Journal of Archaeology*, 98: 629-694.
- DOBBINS, J.J. 2007. *The World of Pompeii*. Routledge.
- DONATI, J.C. 2010. Marks of State Ownership and the Greek Agora at Corinth, *American Journal of Archaeology*, 114: 3-26.
- DU CANGE, C.D.F. 1737. *Glossarium Mediae et Infimae Latinitatis*.
- EVANGELIDIS, V. 2014. Agoras and Fora: Developments in the Central Public Space of the Cities of Greece During the Roman Period, *The Annual of the British School at Athens* 109/1: 335-356.
- FREEMAN, S.E. 1941. Temple E. In: R. Stilwell, R.L. Scranton, S.E. Freeman, H.E. Askew (eds.) *Corinth, vol. 1, no. 2, Architecture*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge-Massachusetts, 166-236.
- HARDY, E.G. 1912. *Three Spanish Charters and Other Documents*. Oxford.
- HORROCKS, P. 2000. *The Architecture of the Forum of Pompeii, Volume I*. PhD Thesis Adelaide.
- KLEINER, F. 2010. *A History of Roman Art*. Boston.
- LING, R. 2005. *Pompeii: History, Life & Afterlife*. Tempus.
- MOURITSEN, H. 2004. Pits and politics. Interpreting colonial fora in Republican Italy. *Papers of the British School at Rome* 72: 37-67.
- PACHÓN ROMERO, J.A. 2011. De la Urso Tardo-Republicana a la Colonia Genetiva Iulia. Un Análisis desde la Historiografía y la Arqueología. In: J. González, J.C. Saquete (eds.) *Colonias de César y Augusto en la Andalucía Romana*, Roma, 187-222.

PAWLAK, M.N. 2013. Corinth after 44 BC: Ethnical and Cultural Changes. *Electrum* 20: 143-162.

PELGROM, J. 2008. Settlement Organization and Land Distribution in Latin Colonies before the Second Punic War. In: L. de Ligt, S.J. Northwood (eds.) *People, Land and Politics. Demographic Developments and the Transformation of Roman Italy 300 BC – AD 14*, Leiden, 333-372.

PELGROM, J. 2014. Roman Colonization and the City-State Model. In: T. Stek, J. Pelgrom (eds.) *Roman Republican Colonization: New Perspectives from Archaeology and Ancient History*, Roma, 73-86.

PELGROM, J., STEK, T. 2014. Roman Colonization under the Republic: historiographical contextualisation of a paradigm. In: T. Stek, J. Pelgrom (eds.) *Roman Republican Colonization: New Perspectives from Archaeology and Ancient History*, Roma, 11-41.

QUINN, J.C., WILSON, A. 2013. Capitolia. *Journal of Roman Studies* 103: 117-173.

RICHARDSON, L. 1957. Cosa and Rome: Comitium and Curia. *Archaeology* 10(1): 49-55.

RICHARDSON, L. 1988. *Pompeii: An Architectural History*. John Hopkins.

ROMANO, D.G. 2003. City Planning, Centuriation, and Land Division in Roman Corinth: Colonia Laus Iulia Corinthiensis & Colonia Iulia Flavia Augusta Corinthiensis. *The American School of Classical Studies at Athens*, 279-301.

ROMANO, D.G. 2010. Romanization in the Corinthia: urban and rural developments. In: A.D. Rizakis, C.E. Lepenioti (eds.) *Roman Peloponese III. Society, Economy and Culture under the Roman Empire: Continuity and Innovation*, Athens, 155-172.

SALMON, E.T. 1969. *Roman Colonization Under the Republic*. London.

SÁNCHEZ-MORENO ELLART, C. 2013. Lex coloniae Genetivae Iuliae seu Ursonensis. In: R.S. Bagnall, K. Brodersen, C.B. Champion, A. Erskine, S.R. Huebner (eds.) *The Encyclopedia of Ancient History*, Blackwell, 4037-4039.

SEWELL, J. 2014. Gellius, Philip II and a proposed end to the 'model-replica' debate. In: T. Stek, J. Pelgrom (eds.) *Roman Republican Colonization: New Perspectives from Archaeology and Ancient History*, Roma, 125-139.

TORELLI, M. 2014. Effigies parvae simulacrae Romae. La fortuna di un modello teorico repubblicano: Leptis Magna colonia romana. In: T. Stek, J. Pelgrom (eds.) *Roman Republican Colonization: New Perspectives from Archaeology and Ancient History*, Roma, 335-356.

VAN BUREN, A.W. 1918. Studies in the Archaeology of the Forum at Pompeii. *Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome* 2: 67-76.

WALBANK, M.E.H. 1989. Pausanias, Octavia and the Temple E at Corinth. *The Annual of the British School at Athens*, 84: 361-394.

WALBANK, M.E.H. 1997. The Foundation and Planning of Early Roman Corinth. *Journal of Roman Archaeology*, 10: 95-130.

WEINBERG, S.S. 1960. *Corinth: Results of Excavations Carried out by the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, vol. 1, no. 5. The Southeast Building, The Twin Basilicas, The Mosaic House*. Princeton.

WILLIAMS, C.K. 1970. Corinth, 1969; Forum Area. *Hesperia* 39: 1-39.

WISEMAN, J. 1979. Corinth and Rome I: 228 BC – AD 267. In: H. Temporini (ed.) *Band 7/1. Halbband Politische Geschichte (Provinzen und Randvölker: Griechischer Balkanraum; Kleinasien)*, Berlin, 438-548.

ZANKER, P. 2000. The city as symbol: Rome and the creation of an urban image. In: E. W. B. Fentress (ed.) *Romanization and the city: creation, transformations and failures*, Portsmouth, 25-41.



© 2024 by the authors; licensee Editura Universității Al. I. Cuza din Iași. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons by Attribution (CC-BY) license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).