CONSTRUCTING ROME:
THE POLITICS OF PUBLIC BUILDING IN REPUBLICAN
ROME

By
Tania Hayes

A thesis
submitted to Victoria University of Wellington
In fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts in Classics

Victoria University of Wellington
(2011)

ABSTRACT

This thesis explores Rome's built environment from its early republican foundation to the period of the late republic and demonstrates that monumental construction remained an embedded and integral element of Roman society throughout this period. Public buildings and civic space played a significant role in shaping the cultural and political identity of early republican Rome. As an outward manifestation of the unification and urbanization of the city-state, these monumental structures represented and advertised the civic superiority of the great city over the wider Mediterranean. For the city's elite, this monumental domain provided the ideal venue to display their own civic superiority, advertising the *dignitas*, *gloria*, and *honor* of individual men through the medium of Rome's built environment. The embedded nature of Roman religion and politics further augmented the importance of many of these public buildings. In particular, temple structures provided magistrates with the platform from which to express highly personal - yet legitimate - glorifying and propagandist messages through the use of inscriptions, architectural innovation, and divine representation. Increasing political competition in the late republic saw the significance of public construction, both temporary and permanent, increase dramatically as magistrates strove to outshine their peers through the provision of public works. By the close of the republic, the city's built environment came to represent the individual power and superiority of a wealthy and select few, signalling a new direction for Rome the city-state.

A closer look at the various building projects of individual men confirms the significance of monumentalization for Roman republican society. Caesar's *forum Iulium*, for example, clearly illustrates the immense potential such spaces held for the self-aggrandizement and personal glorification of these elite individuals. Situated at the intersection between republican and imperial Rome, the Caesarian phase of the *forum Iulium* provides a valuable insight into this important period of Roman politics and cultural development. This thesis will also demonstrate that smaller individual building projects, such as temporary theatres and temple refurbishments, served to provide significant political utility for the less powerful, yet elite, men of Rome.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

In writing this thesis I have received help from a great number of people, in a great number of ways, all of whom deserve special acknowledgement: the Classics Department at Victoria University Wellington have provided me with the support and encouragement needed to not only complete this academic process, but to enjoy it, particularly Hannah Webling; Judy Deuling for her assistance with Roman Art and Architectural matters; Matthew Trundle for his assistance with my scholarship for fees; my dear and incredible friends Belinda and Kevin McGuire-Smith, and Brenda McGuire, who have been a constant support - caring for Harper – allowing me to focus; my long suffering office mate, Alex (i-app) Wilson, who has provided much needed and appreciated technical support; Dan Diggins, who helped me when it was just too embarrassing to ask Alex again; Sheryn Simpson agent of Bacchus and Mens; Christabel Marshall for her keen eye; Jason Morris for scanning countless texts, endless reading suggestions, and providing all the inspiration in the world to get the job done; Professor Jeffrey Tatum for his invaluable guidance and expertise; to my fantastic friends for never expecting anything less from me; and finally to Dad and Rachel for being so proud of me.

In memoriam mei cari Patris

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	1
INTRODUCTION	3
CHAPTER ONE DOWN AT THE FORUM	7
CHAPTER TWO JULIUS AND CAESAR: SPACIAL SPECIALIZATION AND THE INDIVIDUAL IN THE LATE REPUBLIC	54
CHAPTER THREE BUILDING ALLIANCES: THE POLITICS OF PUBLIC BUILDING PROJECTS AT ROME.	98
CONCLUSION	138
APPENDIX 1: FIGURES	141
BIBLIOGRAPHY	147

INTRODUCTION

Iuppiter arce sua totum cum spectat in orbem, /
nil nisi Romanum, quod tuebatur, habet.

Jupiter, when looking out over the whole world from his citadel,
sees nothing that is not Roman.¹

Like the monuments and statues celebrating the greatness of Rome and her citizens, Roman public buildings stood for much more than the bricks and mortar with which they were constructed. As Christopher Smith, discussing sixth century Rome, states: ‘the cultural choice to move to expenditure on conspicuous buildings is deeply bound up with the evolution of an urban society.’² From Rome’s inception her built environment and public spaces played an integral role in the urbanization and unification of the republican city as the outward manifestation of Rome the city-state,³ symbolizing the formation of her religious, economic, political, and cultural identity. For Rome’s elite, awareness of the potential to gain lasting power and prestige through personal association with public buildings and monuments, advertising one’s individual *dignitas*, *honor*, and *gloria*, ensured that many of the city’s central spaces continued to hold great political and cultural significance throughout the republican period. The embedded nature of Roman religion and politics further augmented the importance of temple structures for Rome’s individual magistrates, providing the platform from which to express highly personal, yet legitimate, glorifying and propagandist messages through the use of inscriptions, architectural innovation, and divine representation. By the close of the republic, the city’s built environment came to represent the individual power and superiority of a wealthy and select few, signalling a new direction for Rome the city-state, as the Great Man emerged and the new imperial order established itself.

Scholars have tended to focus on individual aspects of public building and monumentalization such as: the litigious or fiscal implications of their construction,⁴ art and

¹ Ovid, *Fast.* 1.85-86.

² Smith (1996) 187, also, 151-165: discusses fortifications, the *pomerium*, festivals, sacrifice and ritual as important aspects of a city’s unification process. While I acknowledge the importance of such aspects, this thesis is primarily concerned with public buildings and civic space at Rome.

³ For the concept of the city-state at Rome as a central component of the *mos maiorum* as a conscious construction, see: Cornell (1994) 56-60 and 67-68.

⁴ Israël Shatzman (1975) and Koenraad Verboven (2002) have informed my study greatly in the area of senatorial wealth and money lending among magistrates in Chapter Three. Susan Martin’s (1989) examination

architectural considerations,⁵ their religious and political utility and significance,⁶ and their role as public benefactions.⁷ A synthesis of these individual aspects is lacking. The issue of funding for vowed temples with *manubiae* (hence the term *manubial temple*) remains a controversial issue. Eric Orlin,⁸ Bradford Churchill,⁹ and Adam Ziolkowski¹⁰ offer differing and tendentious opinions regarding this topic and highlight the ambiguous and problematic nature of the primary evidence. Issues such as construction costs and the organization of builders, architects, and allied staff are similarly not well-understood topics. Many issues regarding public buildings and civic space often appear as smaller, one dimensional, sections of larger studies and while much scholarly attention has been paid to specific public buildings and monumental structures such as individual temples, theatres, fora, and tribunals, less consideration has been given to their overall significance and context in Roman society. Interestingly, the *forum Iulium* is often not included in such studies.

The aim of this thesis is to present a synthesis of the various aspects of public building and civic space during the republican period, considering the economic, social, political, religious, and cultural significance of such structures to Rome and her inhabitants.¹¹ To accomplish this aim, this study will draw on a variety of sources, scholarship, and scholarly approaches. In doing so, this study covers three main areas: Chapter One explores the development of Rome's topographical environment with particular emphasis on the Capitoline hill, *forum Romanum*, and surrounding area as the outward manifestation of Rome the city-state, starting from the mid-seventh century BCE. Discussion will focus primarily on the city's public buildings and monuments as indicators of the process of the urbanization and unification of Rome and their significance to Rome's citizenry as markers

of the legal requirements generated by such building activities lends further importance to such 'reciprocal' relationships and alliances.

⁵ Katherine Welch (2003, 2007, and 2006): provides much analysis of the city's art and architecture as well as important discussion regarding the structure and function of Rome's basilicae.

⁶ Most scholars in relation to Rome's public buildings cover both aspects, although the work of Mary Beard, John North and Simon Price: *Religions of Rome* (1998) remains an important authority regarding Roman religion. Likewise, in relation to the utilization of political space, particularly in relation to the problem of popular political participation, I have made extensive use of the works of Robert Morstein-Marx (2004); Henrik Mouritsen (2001); and Fergus Millar (1998).

⁷ Paul Veyne's 1976 *le Pain et le cirque* remains the seminal work regarding euergetism. Specific reference to public buildings as benefactions is surprisingly limited. I have used the 1990 abridged version, translated by Brian Pearce with an introduction by Oswyn Murray. This area of study is also assisted greatly by Katherine Lomas and Tim Cornell (2003), particularly in regards to municipal euergetism.

⁸ Orlin (1997).

⁹ Churchill (1999).

¹⁰ Ziolkowski (1992).

¹¹ The period for this study is restricted to the republican period, although reference is made to a few early imperial structures where relevant to the discussion.

of a collective cultural identity. Chapter Two shifts focus from the unification and urbanization of a city-state to present the highly personalized and monumental space of the *forum Iulium*, reflecting a period of rapid political change and transition from the republic to empire. As the precursor to the imperial fora, this complex is important for analysing the significance of Rome's topographical development. Careful analysis of the limited evidence regarding this forum complex will demonstrate that while it does not appear to have replaced the *forum Romanum*, it surely challenged the way in which Rome's citizens interacted and participated within the space and provides a clear indication of the social and political role such structures played for individual magistrates. Continuing the theme of individual gain through personal association with public buildings, Chapter Three examines the role of euergetism (the act of public beneficence) in relation to public building at Rome, considering the impact of increasing competition between magistrates in the period toward the late republic, and the political implications of money lending by wealthy individuals to fund bigger and better building projects, leading finally to specific analysis of both Pompey's theatre complex and the *forum Iulium* as significant, yet architecturally conventional, public benefactions for the late republic.

The primary evidence for this study is somewhat limited and problematic in places.¹² Much of the evidence for Rome's early topographical development is attested only by meagre archaeological remains or by later sources such as Livy and Dionysius of Halicarnassus. Fortunately, inscriptions shed valuable light on the importance of public buildings to republican society, reflecting aspects such as state control of public buildings, the civic duty of magistrates, funding of construction/refurbishment, as well as assisting with dating.¹³ Many primary sources for Rome's public buildings are listed in the topographical dictionary of Samuel Platner, making this an invaluable reference tool even today.¹⁴

Evidence for the Caesarian phase of the *forum Iulium* presents a particularly challenging picture since much of the archaeological material for this period is complicated and concealed by subsequent building phases.¹⁵ In regard to the Caesarian complex this thesis

¹² Unless otherwise stated, all translations are my own.

¹³ In addition to the *CIL*, many inscriptions have been well catalogued and analysed by such scholars as Crawford (2000); Pobjoy (2000); and Cooley (2000).

¹⁴ Platner (1929), see also: Claridge (2007).

¹⁵ For the purposes of this thesis all reference to the *forum Iulium* encompasses the Temple of Venus Genetrix, surrounding portico, tabernae, and forecourt space. Where discussion relates to individual components they are

draws predominately from the contributions of C. Morselli, Nicholas Purcell, and P. Gros in the *Lexicon Topographicum Urbis Romae* (a most valuable and important topographical reference tool) and especially from the work of Roger Ulrich.¹⁶ Archaeological evidence is only partially supplemented with scant literary information from Cicero, Suetonius, Dio, and Appian, all of which present their own contextual challenges. This paucity of evidence means that it is not possible at this stage to determine Caesar's true intentions for the functionality of the space and it is therefore important to resist the temptation to draw definitive conclusions.¹⁷

While significant buildings such as the sanctuary precinct of Jupiter Optimus Maximus on the Capitoline symbolized the unification of Rome the city-state, Sullan colonization of this prestigious precinct presented a powerful individual altering the late republican landscape. Responding to this architectural ensemble, Caesar's *forum Iulium* and Pompey's theatre complex, responding to this new monumental form, pointed the way to a new age and new way of being for Rome. The process of Rome's topographical development reflects the ever-changing political and cultural landscape of the city. Analysis of the assembly spaces, temples, monuments, and public buildings traces this continual development, providing a valuable platform from which to study the interconnection between society and its built environment.

referred to specifically. The term 'Caesarian period' covers Caesar's first dictatorship up to his death in 44 BCE.

¹⁶ Ulrich (1993) 49-80; Morselli (1995) 299-306; Purcell (1995) 325-342; Gros (1995) 306-307. In addition to the important work of Steinby, editing the *LTUR*, and Ulrich, the work of Filippo Coarelli (1985, 1986, 1989, 1995, 2010) and other works of Purcell (1989, 2007, and 2010) have provided much needed information and analysis of the archaeological remains and the significance of both the *forum Romanum* and *forum Iulium* to the city of Rome, as well as discussion of the topography of the wider city. John Patterson's (2010) survey study of recent work at Rome demonstrates the potential for new discoveries and analysis in this field.

¹⁷ Where there is insufficient primary evidence to establish fact, every attempt is made to avoid presenting unsubstantiated claims, while matters of scholarly contention are highlighted and considered as they arise. At times, in lieu of archaeological or literary data, it is also necessary to draw on comparative evidence. For example, in considering the possibility of judicial activities in the *forum Iulium* it seems entirely sensible to look both back to such activities in the *forum Romanum* and forward to that of the *forum Augusti* as possible evidence for continuity of function.

CHAPTER ONE

DOWN AT THE FORUM

Quo conferrent suas controversias et quae vendere vellent quo ferrent, forum appellarunt. Ubi quid generatim, additum ab eo cognomen, ut forum Bovarium, forum Holitorium...Secundum Tiberim ad <Por>tunium Forum Piscarium vocant: ideo ait Plautus: Apud <forum> Piscarium. Ubi variae res ad Corneta forum Cuppedinis a <cuppedio, id est a> fastidio, quod multi forum Cupidinis a cupiditate.

The place where they might *conferre* (direct) their disputes and *ferre* (bring) articles, which they might want to sell, they called a *forum*. Where there was one type of thing brought, a name was associated from that, as in the *forum Boarium* (Cattle Market), the *forum Holitorium* (Vegetable Market)... Along the Tiber, at the sanctuary of Porunus, they call it the *forum Piscarium* (Fish Market); therefore Plautus says: Down at the market that sells the fish. Where things of various kinds are sold, at the Cornel-Cherry Groves, is the *forum Cuppedinis* (Luxury Market), from *cuppedium* (delicacy), that is, from *fastidium* (fastidiousness); many call it the *forum Cupidinis* (Greed Market), from *cupiditas* 'greed.' (Varro *LL* 5.145-146)

In the broadest sense, the *forum*, as the focal point of the city, provided a central location for the trade and exchange of goods and services: market places, as Varro clearly sets out in his *Lingua Latina* (c.43 BCE), addressed the basic needs of the citizens. While this descriptive presentation does provide a valuable insight into the utilitarian nature of Rome's urban center, analysis of the archaeological, epigraphic, and literary evidence regarding Rome's individual buildings, monuments, and structures reveal that in reality the republican city centre was a far more complex and nuanced civic space.

The aim of this chapter is to review some of the ways in which Rome's citizens interacted with and related to the buildings, monuments, and structures within their city and to explore the social, political, and cultural significance of these civic structures. Section One will examine the process of Rome's urbanization and political unification through the development of public buildings and civic space. Particular emphasis will be given to the Temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus on the Capitoline Hill in order to demonstrate the vital role religion played in this unification process. Section Two will then discuss the gradual development and monumentalization of Rome's civic centre, considering the relationship between the city-state and the individual. Discussion will include the process of monumentalization from the early foundation myth of the Lacus Curtius, creating an heroic, yet generic, symbol of Rome's citizenry, to the deliberate and open political use of public

construction by individual magistrates. Aspects such as the development of epigraphy, ritual, oratory, and the *salutatio* will be considered as part of this development of monumentalization, increasing the importance and significance of civic space and monuments at Rome for the elite individual. Section Three will consider the degree to which the buildings and monuments within this civic space shaped the cultural and civic identity of Rome's citizens as distinct markers of exclusive membership in civilized society. Here the literary narrative of exile will also be considered in order to demonstrate that the structures, monuments, and civic spaces of Rome stood as tangible and ideological symbols of Roman citizenship and belonging. Lastly, this section will consider the problem of popular participation in Rome's civic space. The much-debated change in orientation of the *forum Romanum* from the early to late republic will be discussed. Here it will be argued that, although the architectural evidence is unclear, the increasing importance of popular support, nevertheless, increased the political significance of public (and private) space, buildings, and monuments in Rome's city centre as individuals sought to advertise their superiority through the public recognition of the late republican crowd. This analysis will form the basis of discussion in Chapters Two and Three as the greatness of the collective *Rome* gave way to that of the Great Man under Caesar's dictatorship, reflected in the monuments and public buildings of the city.

SECTION ONE

ROME'S DEVELOPMENT OF PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND CIVIC SPACE: THE EMBEDDED NATURE OF RELIGION, POLITICS, AND CULTURE.¹

Development of Public Buildings and Civic Space at Rome: Civic Identity and the City-State Emerge

The physical development of Rome from a primitive hut settlement to an urban community appears to have begun in the later seventh and sixth centuries BCE. Communal religious activities in and around the area of the *forum Romanum* contributed to this urban development (and eventually to the rise of the city-state) through the construction of religious buildings associated with public cults which symbolized the civic unification of the region and the governing role of the Senate, overseeing such activities. While public squares and communal sanctuaries appear to have dominated this space in the early stages, increasingly larger, more elaborate and diverse public buildings gradually replaced them, as the process of Rome's urbanization and civic (and political) unification developed.² The Temple of Vesta in the *forum Romanum* dates as far back as the mid-seventh century BCE. Certainly, the early construction of the Curia Hostilia in the mid-seventh century BCE as a symbol of the civic authority of its members, and its subsequent inauguration as a *templum* illustrates the embedded nature of religion and politics in the civic space of Rome from its inception.³ The erection of such monumental public buildings played a vital role in forming Rome's political community. The first paving of the Comitium and *forum Romanum* took place around 625 BCE and is understood to have facilitated the gradual development of Rome's political community through definition of civic space.⁴ The Comitium itself became a tripartite seat of political and judicial activity in the city, incorporating the people through the popular assemblies, individual magistrates on the Rostra, and the Senate by association with the Curia Hostilia.⁵ The political use of temple space early on, coinciding with these

¹ The aspect of military association and war in relation to public buildings and civic space at Rome is discussed in Chapter Two with respect to *manubiae*: 75-82.

² Cornell (1995) 92-97, and 102.

³ Varro, from Gell. (14.7.7). See, also: Zanker (2000) 33-37.

⁴ Cornell (1995) 100-103; Coarelli (2007) 44-45. For a detailed outline of the six phases of paving down to 80 BCE, see: Coarelli (2007) 52-53. See: Purcell, *LTUR* II, 326: for discussion regarding the close relationship between the spaces of Rome's topography and the social and political workings of its institutions from the inception of the city. Cf. the work of Patterson (2010) 217-220: opposing the common conception that the space of the Comitium was reconfigured to form a circle, arguing that it remained a triangle shape until the reorganization instigated by Caesar in the late republic. The space of the Comitium is discussed below: 47-51.

⁵ Coarelli (2007) 54.

major developments in the organization of urban space, further contributed to this process of civic organization and identity.⁶

As the physical formation of the area developed, trade and commerce further shaped the greater area of the city confirming its status as city-state. The *forum Romanum* became a multifarious market place in the sense that Varro (*LL* 5.145-146) describes it around the end of the sixth century BCE to the beginning of the fifth century, coinciding with the period when the necropolis in the area ceased to be used, as evidence of tombs indicates.⁷ In fact, Smith, in discussing the social stratification and conspicuous consumption of wealth among Rome's sixth century aristocracy, suggests that the cessation of wealthy burials is connected with new forms of expenditure and that for social reasons wealth was redirected into public buildings.⁸ In a commercial sense, the city grew from having its first forum, the *forum Boarium*,⁹ situated between the Palatine hill and the Tiber river, to a centralized and bustling urban business center at the foot of the Capitoline hill. As Purcell states, the 'gateway-function' of the navigable Tiber allowed Rome to participate in a network of exchange with outsiders, including the Etruscan coastal cities, Greek overseas settlements, and Corinth.¹⁰ As forum space developed it provided a central point for Romans and rural farmers from further afield to bring their wares to sell and to purchase necessities, further augmenting the city's economic and civic importance. It is from this point that Rome emerged as an economic centre through provision of goods and services and a fixed point for trade.

The space of the Forum was further formalized by the increasing construction of basilicae around 184 BCE,¹¹ reflecting a considerably more sophisticated business centre. Recent

⁶ Cornell (1995) 103. Discussed further below: 15-18.

⁷ For discussion of these tombs in the valley and their dates of use, see: Huelsen (1909) 4-5; Planter (1929) 230-231; Coarelli (2007) 43-44.

⁸ Smith (1996) 186-187: shows a similar process moving away from individual burial to communal sanctuaries was occurring in Greece in the eight century BCE, citing Corinth and the reduction of individual burials coinciding with the foundation of the temples of Apollo and Poseidon.

⁹ Dating for this site is unclear. See: Coarelli (2007) 307-309: for discussion regarding the dating of the area. Coarelli suggests the first large-scale organization of the area took place under the Etruscan kings; Smith (1996) 179-183: discusses the likely possibility that this forum had an early association with the trade of salt, resulting in the naming of the Via Salaria (running NE along the Tiber from Rome). Salt was a vitally important commodity used for the nutrition of animals and the preservation of animal products – linking Rome to the pastoralists of Sabina. The dates for such trade and the existence of a port at the *forum Boarium* can only be determined from the fourth century BCE, although Coarelli (Rome 1998 *Il Foro Boario*) pushes for as early as the archaic period (Smith sees this as unlikely).

¹⁰ Purcell (2010) 581.

¹¹ The dates for the exact appearance of basilicae are unclear. Livy (39.44.7) reports that M. Porcius Cato (184 BCE) built the first basilica, the Basilica Porcia, in the year of his consulship. However, see: Welch (2003) 6-8: arguing for the third century appearance of basilicae, citing Duckworth (1955) 58-65, as the first to seriously consider Plautus' mention of basilicae in his *Curculio* (472) and *Captivi* (815) as evidence for the earlier

studies regarding the Basilica Aemilia suggest that banking and finance were central activities in this particular building.¹² These structures provided shelter for *negotiatores* to engage in commercial activities (*Arch.* 5.1.4), followed later by law courts, as well as *tabernae* providing additional retail space in the substructures. Such commercially focused buildings formalized the forum as *the* business centre for Roman citizens and those subject to her administration.¹³ The architectural design of these two storied structures also provided raised platforms that allowed citizens to gather and view any entertainment or spectacles being performed in the Forum below,¹⁴ augmenting their place in Roman civic society. The public funding of these structures advertised their civic nature and State-sanctioned place in the central administration of Rome.¹⁵

Given the topographically centralized and multifarious nature of Rome's late republican city, it is hardly surprising that this civic space became the natural location where political figures could contend for status and display their civic success through the monumentalization of public buildings¹⁶ and the provision of public entertainment, emphasizing the socio-political aspect of Rome's civic centre.¹⁷

Caput Orbis Terrarum

The Capitoline Connection: State Religion, State Control.

From the early development of the city, State religion sanctioned and legitimized Rome's civic space. The temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus on the Capitoline hill was dedicated c.509 BCE and helped shape Rome's new republican identity through the shared activities

existence of basilicae in the Forum. Welch 5-34 argues for the Atrium Regium as being the first basilica, serving as a space for banquets and receptions for foreign embassies. Coarelli (2007) 45-48: names four second century basilicae that replaced a third century basilica - Basilica Porcia, Fulvia-Aemilia, Sempronia, and Opimia.

¹² Patterson (2010) 219, citing: Ch. Ertel and K. S. Freyburger, 'Nuove indagini sulla Basilica Aemilia nel Foro Romano.' *Archeologia Classica* 58 (2007) 109-142; K. S. Freyburger, C. Ertel, J. Lipps and T. Bitterer, 'Neue Forschungen zur Basilica Aemilia auf dem Forum Romanum.' *Röm. Mitt.* 113 (2007) 493-552.

¹³ For general discussion, see: Welch (2003) 9; Planter (1929) 232. For the *forum Romanum* at this period, see: Huelsen (1909) 12, fig 4, and Plaut. *Curc.* 4.1.10-24; Plaut. *Mostel.* 844: as a place of business with 'negotium'.

¹⁴ Patterson (2010) 219; Welch (2003).

¹⁵ Patterson (2006) 347.

¹⁶ Discussed below: Chapter One, 25-39; Chapter Two, regarding the *forum Iulium*: 84-91.

¹⁷ Various aspects of public entertainment are discussed later in this chapter and particularly, Chapter Three.

held there, serving both a religious and political function for the community.¹⁸ The Temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus housed the oracular Sibylline Books, which were consulted by the Senate in times of crises. The Senate exercised tight control over the consultation process of these books and the administration of any resulting action. Such tight control presumably strengthened the concept of a State-sanctioned religion for Rome, for it is not until the individual rule of Augustus that the books were transferred to the Temple of Apollo at his instigation (Virg. *Ecl.* 4.4).¹⁹ The Etruscan-influenced, three-cella structure of the temple places it among an established tradition of monumental religious buildings.²⁰ Furthermore, the massive scale of this monumental hilltop sanctuary of Jupiter, Juno, and Minerva rivaled the largest shrines of the archaic Greek cities, presenting a dominant religious and political body.²¹

¹⁸ All references to 'Capitol' in this thesis refer to the southern part of the Capitoline hill, incorporating the Temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus, in contrast to the northern part. See also: Platner (1929) 96: citing Livy 1.55.5-6 and Varro *LL* 5.41, reporting that the site for the temple was named the *Capitolium* by the Romans after a very large human skull was found when the foundations were being dug for the temple, which was taken as prophetic for the future greatness of the city; also: Edwards (1996) 84-85. Purcell (2003) 30: gives this date for the dedication and emphasizes this event as the significant point of constitutional change at Rome. See also: Feeney (2007) 88-89, citing Mommsen (1859) 197-200. Smith (1996) 164-165: for the social cohesion resulting from the shared activities of such cults associated with the many temples instigated in the sixth century BCE, particularly the Temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus on the Capitoline.

¹⁹ The Sibylline Books are thought to date to the regal period and where placed in the Temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus upon its completion, moving to the Temple of Apollo under Augustus in 28 BCE. For in-depth discussion of their function and place in the state religion of Rome and their religio-political significance, see: Orlin (1997) 76-115. Beard, *et al.* (1998) I, 124: discuss the prestigious nature of the Temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus as an object of competition between leading magistrates vying for the responsibility of its repair and upkeep (Caesar 62 BCE in Suet. *Iul.* 15). On this point, see also: Morgan (1973) 222-223.

²⁰ This is an interesting point for establishing a long Italic tradition linking religion and monumentalization, since the origin for this temple has been linked with a much earlier sacred monumentalizing building complex in Murlo, near Siena which includes a temple originally set up with statues on the ridge of the roof. For further discussion regarding the choice to adopt this Etruscan model by Tarquinius Priscus, see: Bonfante (1986) 193-196. See also: Temelini (2006) 82: discussing the intense public building in Rome and other Latin cities, including Etruria in the early fifth century, characterized by mostly sacred buildings. Temelini points out that this sacred nature of buildings is reflective of the competition between aristocratic *gentes* at the end of the monarchy as they strove to secure their own political preeminence. Purcell (2003) 26-32: discusses the deliberate use of this cult to establish Rome among the milieu of historical myth 'in which they were formulated, propagated and received', creating an historical consciousness. He claims the scale and scope of the cult in Rome in the late sixth century was crucial in promoting and transforming this historical consciousness, 32: discusses the ways in which the dedication of the temple created a political narrative that signalled the constitutional revolution as Rome rejected the regal state for a new religious and political order.

²¹ Purcell (2010) 581-582: states that the obvious parallel for this sanctuary is the mid-sixth century reworking of the Athenian Acropolis and its associated temples, linked with the processional way and that the sheer size of the structure expressed a particularly aggressive dynamic, 579-592: for discussion regarding the role of the formation of public institutions, monuments, and buildings at Rome and in *colonia* and *municipia* in forming Roman civic identity. See also: Rea (2007) 45; Edwards (1996) 85: for the Roman Capitol as a citadel or acropolis, characteristic of Greek cities of the sixth century BCE; Patterson (2006) 346: gives the dimensions for the podium at 72 x 54 m in length; Smith (1996) 164: gives the dimensions of the temple at 61 x 55 m (does not specify if this is the podium). Torelli (2006) 81: tradition records that the dedication of this temple was one of the most important signs of the birth of the republic.

Of particular importance is Coarelli's recent (2010) claim for a triple-temple structure and adjoining tabularium on the Capitoline instigated by Sulla (who died before its completion) and dedicated by Quintus Lutatius Catulus. Here, Coarelli rejects the long-held idea that the building known by scholars as the 'Tabularium' at the foot of the Capitoline hill functioned as a tabularium, claiming instead that it functioned as a base structure for a sizeable Sullan triple-temple complex.²² This hypothesis has important implications for understanding the significance of the site (and the greater Capitoline area) and its role as the central sanctuary at Rome. As Coarelli states: "If we consider the fact that this complex flanked the Temple of Jupiter Capitolinus...we begin to appreciate the dimensions and extraordinary impact of the entire programme, and of its ideological and political assumptions."²³ Taking this view, the sheer scale and imposing nature of such a complex must surely have presented a dominating backdrop to the entire political centre of Rome (a significantly prestigious position for any magistrate associated with such a complex).²⁴

In terms of the site's religious and political significance it is also worthwhile briefly considering the processional route of the ritual of the triumph. The actual route (or routes) is particularly unclear and controversial however, the Capitoline hill is considered the most likely termination point, where it is thought sacrifices would be made to the god at the Temple of Jupiter.²⁵ If this is correct, the Capitoline complex then linked the *forum Romanum* and its associated buildings to the divine *Pater* of the Roman people, as well as to the Senate, mediating between the gods and the republic.²⁶

The importance of this temple as a representation of the cultural values, religious ceremony, and political authority of the Roman state continued through the late republic,²⁷ uniting all public works in this area under the auspices of the state religion and therefore, state control. It is clear that the collective area of the Capitol-Forum simply mattered more than other

²² Coarelli's (2010), see below: 35-37.

²³ Coarelli (2010) 129.

²⁴ For discussion of this complex in relation to Caesar's forum complex and Pompey's Theatre complex, see: Chapter Two 68, 80, 88, 91, 95-96; Chapter Three 98-103, 128-130.

²⁵ Beard (2007) 92-105; Purcell (2007) 186. Discussed further, below: 30.

²⁶ For further discussion on the role of the Senate, see: Beard (1990) 19-48, for the view that the Senate was ultimately responsible for matters of public religion; priestly colleges advised them, but senators made final decisions.

²⁷ Weinstock (1971) 83. Edwards (1996) 3-4, 69-94: as a symbol of Rome, including discussion of the hill's significance into the imperial period (indeed as a symbol of the inevitability of Roman 'imperialism' and the empire) as evidenced by writers such as Tacitus and Livy, 70-71, n.7: for other temples situated on the hill and the rituals associated with the hill.

areas of the city where such state control appears less stringently enforced as Pliny's (*NH* 34.30-31) reporting of the exertions of the censors of 158 BCE demonstrates. Here Pliny has the censors removing all statues of magistrates except those sanctioned by 'either the People or the Senate'.²⁸

The protective significance of the Capitol through association with Jupiter is evident in Roman legend: Roman insistence that this hill alone remained immune from the Gallic invasion of 390 BCE augmented the god's role as divine protector of Rome and emphasized the site's preeminence (Livy 5.39.9-40.6). Livy's presentation of Camillus' speech in favour of retaining the city at Rome after the Gallic attack highlights the protective and sacred nature of the hill when he presents it as home to Roman religion and their gods: *nullus locus in ea non religionum deorumque est plenus* (Livy 5.2.1-2). The claim (Livy 5.54.7) that the hill was sacred to Jupiter and therefore the seat of imperial power signified the tie between the sacred space of the hill and the superiority of the surrounding city space as a whole, incorporating the area of the *forum Romanum* and its associated public buildings, at the foot of the hill, under the protective umbrella of this leading deity.²⁹ The (re)foundation of the city and its near extinction by the Gauls as symbolically linked events provided 'historians' such as Livy with the annalistic tool to reinvent the city and its self-image as a way to move forward after calamity.³⁰ Furthermore, Livy's Camillus (5.32-55) uses the history of the city's physical site and its buildings to show that such concrete symbols *are* their identity, and are therefore inseparable.³¹

The area beneath the Capitoline is also linked to the distant past through early cult activity evidenced by the Lapis Niger or Sepulcrum Romuli, a square made of black marble stones. This important find was discovered on the boundary line between the Comitium and the *forum Romanum*. The site itself is thought to date to around the fifth century BCE by

²⁸ Morstein-Marx (2004) 105, n.170.

²⁹ Rea (2007) 48. Despite the contentious nature of Livy's account of Camillus here, the point remains salient for this thesis as a representation of Roman sentiment regarding the connection between the divine protector Jupiter Optimus Maximus and the sacred nature of the hill and, by association, the city of Rome. 44-63: the middle cella of the temple was also thought to occupy the site of an older shrine to Terminus, protector of boundaries, emphasizing the link between the cult of Jupiter and the protection of the city's borders. Roman legend reinforced this protective aspect of the site. See also: Cic. *Cat.* 3.22: recalling the protective nature of Jupiter in early Rome.

³⁰ Feeney (2007) 100-104: discusses the use of the theme of the re-founding of the city by Ennius, Livy, and Virgil.

³¹ See: Spencer (2010) 33. For discussion regarding the importance of remembering the past as a contributing factor to forming a sense of nationality, see: Jones (1997) 1.

association with inscriptions on a stele found underneath the stone and illustrates the association of religion with the site from early on.³² The excavation of the *sacellum* revealed a group of earlier artifacts lying beneath it: dedicatory gifts, small clay, bone, and bronze idols, terracotta bas-reliefs, vase fragments and bones from animal sacrifices – dating roughly from the eighth to the sixth centuries BCE. The votive fragments are an important consideration as they provide evidence of cult activity in the area at this early period,³³ possibly influencing the decision to pave and develop the site as the Comitium. It is the development of civic space, imbued with Rome's divine origins (and adopted Etruscan traditions standing in for Rome's) that would begin the process of the monumentalization of Rome.

The significance of the Capitoline hill and its connection with the *forum Romanum* is an important consideration because as will be seen in Chapter Two, in choosing a site and designing his own forum, Caesar undertook to exploit and manipulate Roman religion and civic space to his own political advantage.

Political Unification and the Appropriation of Temple Space

The political use of temple space was an important factor in the urbanization and unification of Rome. Aside from the individual significance of its constituent parts (market places, Curia, Rostra, Comitium, etc), the Forum as the religious and political centre had cultural meaning in its totality.

Following the symbolic nature of the Temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus, political unification is also evident in temples at Rome from the fifth century BCE. The political messages expressed in both the Temple of Saturn (c.499 BCE) and the Temple of Castor and Pollux (484/3 BCE) affirm the preeminence of Rome in the Latin world, celebrating the

³² Huelsen (1909) 109-110; Cornell (1995) 94-95; Coarelli (2007) 44-45; Smith (1996) 166-169: for further discussion on the proposed translation of the inscription and its implications, also: 170-171: for his discussion regarding the suggested connection between the area of the Lapis Niger/Comitium and an area called the Volcanal, as representative of an early definition of paved public space.

³³ Cornell (1995) 94-95, and n.41: although much of the details surrounding the site, stone, and artefacts are unknown, Cornell suggests the cult may have been that of Romulus who is thought by the Romans to have met his death at the site and the inscription that of a monument made at his request to commemorate his good deeds.

new republican order.³⁴ For example, the Temple of Saturn, placed in the southwest corner of the developing Forum, signaled political unification of the area by establishing Saturn, the primitive god and founder of the Latin peoples, at *Rome*.³⁵ This temple, on the same axis as the Curia and Comitium sat adjacent to another significant landmark, a pit known as the *mundus*, considered the *umbilicus* or centre of the city. The central placement of this temple functioned to symbolize the incorporation of the Latin peoples into the Roman political sphere (under Roman control).³⁶ The second temple, The Temple of Castor at the southeast corner of the Forum, celebrated victory over the Latin peoples, associating the order of the *equites* with the mythological twins Castor and Pollux through reference to their intervention in the Battle of Lake Regillus against the Latini (Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 6.13.1-2).³⁷ In this respect, the Forum not only presented a religious topography of historical victory monuments for the State, it symbolized both the religious and political subjugation of the Latin peoples and their incorporation into the wider civic sphere of Rome.

The political importance of the Forum as Rome's civic centre increased significantly when legislation by the tribes eventually moved away from the traditional Capitoline to the Forum in the late second century BCE, resulting in a shift of contional venue.³⁸ By the late first century BCE clear evidence of the political appropriation of other temple space can be seen as the tribunes delivered *contiones* preceding their legislative assemblies (*comitia*) from the high podium of the Temple of Castor and Pollux.³⁹ Plutarch's *Sulla* (33), discussing the dictator addressing a legislative assembly, and his *Cato* (27) in 62 BCE, describing a tribune

³⁴ Torelli (2006) 83-84. See: Muccigrosso (2006) 181-206: for his discussion of the politicized building projects from the years around 300 BCE in relation to the placement of temples. For discussion regarding the central place of religion in politics in the late republic, see: Beard *et al.* (1998) I, 134-140; Orlin (2007) 65-67; for discussion of the religio-political nature of early festivals and games, see: Veyne (1990) 208-214.

³⁵ Torelli (2006) 83.

³⁶ Torelli (2006) 83.

³⁷ Hornblower and Spawforth (2003) 301-302; Platner (1929) 102-103; Coarelli (2007) 45-46. Orlin (1997) 22, n.36: regarding Castor as the patron of healing and the associated healing powers of the temple therefore fulfilling a public service for the Romans, citing: Schilling 1979, 344-47 based on scholia in *Ad Persium* (2.56) in connection with the healing powers of the spring, Varro (*LL* 5.71) and Propertius (3.22.6), 25-26: for Orlin's discussion of the Temple of Ceres on the Aventine hill as being representative of the *Plebs*, therefore offsetting the Temple of Castor and as patron to the wealthier *equites*, citing: Schilling (1976) 59-60, n.51 and 111-112.

³⁸ Mortstein-Marx (2004) 57-60. Discussed below.

³⁹ For an in-depth discussion on the evolution of the *forum Romanum* in relation to topography, orientation and *contiones*, see: Mortstein-Marx (2004) 34-67, 57-60: citing Plut. *Cat. Min.* 26-29 as the earliest certain evidence for the use of the podium to deliver a *contio* with the possibility of App. *BC* 1.64: providing the date of 87 BCE. Mortstein-Marx also suggests that senatorial meetings were increasingly held here at this time. He also states that it is not before 44 BCE that we see *contiones* not related to legislative assemblies held at the temple. Also: Purcell, *LTUR* II, 327; Sumi (2007) 167-186.

reading text to a crowd from the Temple of Castor, illustrate the political use of temples in this late republican period. Caesar is also reported to have proposed his agrarian bill from the steps of the temple.⁴⁰ Such choice of venue could be argued to simply reflect the need for more space, as numbers attending *contiones* increased. However, delivering a speech from the steps of a chosen temple gave speakers the opportunity to evoke strong emotions in their audience.⁴¹ Functionality and space (temples provided a high platform from which to speak and open space for the audience to assemble) no doubt played a role in this spatial shift. However, it would be foolish to claim that magistrates did not take great care in the selection of venues for their speeches and that the significance of individual temples did not assist them in the delivery of their political messages. It is in this respect that the appropriation of temple space for *contiones* could be argued to be part of the process of the internal political unification of Rome, incorporating both the Senate and the People, as the importance of popular opinion emerged in Roman politics and magistrates sought to curry popular support.⁴²

The appropriation of temple space for the purposes of storing *rationes* (accounts), and perhaps forms of money not only further confirms the central role of the Forum as a commercial centre, but the sacrosanct nature of the temples themselves emphasizes the importance of the business activities conducted there, linked to Rome's state religion (and senatorial control). The holding of accounts in Rome in such 'banks'⁴³ increased the importance of these temples for Rome's citizens as Cicero's reference to the Temple of Castor and Pollux (in 81 BCE) implies:

Cum pecuniam C. Quinctius P. Scapulae debuisset, per te, C. Aquili, decidit P. Quinctius quid liberis eius dissolveret. Hoc eo per te agebatur quod propter

⁴⁰ Dio 38.6.1-3; Suet. *Caes.* 20.1; App. *BC* 2.38-41.

⁴¹ For discussion regarding the speakers' deliberate use of space and monuments to evoke particular emotions, see: 29-35.

⁴² The process of the changing political focus from the early to late republic, from senatorial to popular focus is discussed more fully below in: 47-51. For in-depth discussion of the setting for *contiones*, see: Morstein-Marx (2004) 34-67, 57-59, for the setting of the *contio* as an ideologically contested space, 63-64: compares senatorial speeches requiring rhetorical and stylistic restraint due to the learned audience and public speeches that needed to evoke high emotion relying heavily on oratorical mode and setting. For the purposes of this section, it is enough to acknowledge the political appropriation of temple space as a reflection of the overall process of political unification of not just the peoples outside of the city of Rome travelling to hear the speeches, but of the broader bodies within the city.

⁴³ Evidence for Rome's system of 'banking' or money management is unclear and problematic. The use of cheques, orders for payment, and transfers addressed the problems associated with transporting coinage by reducing the need for counting and carrying coins. See: Hollander (2007) 1-14, 31-56, particularly 54-56; Bogaert (1968) 1- 60.

aerariam rationem non satis erat in tabulis inspexisse quantum deberetur, nisi ad Castoris quaesisses quantum solveretur.

Since Gaius Quinctius had owed money to Publius Scapula, Publius Quinctius decided that he would distribute anything of his to his children through you, Gaius Aquilius. In this instance he was doing this through you because it was not sufficient (just) to have seen in his books how much he owed on account of the treasury reckoning (exchange rate), unless you had inquired how much should be paid at the Temple of Castor. (Cic. *Quinct.* 17)

This passage implies that the temple held official public accounts, available for public inspection. The central importance of these ‘public’ services (financial account keeping and administration) incorporated such temples into the commercial fabric of the city, and combined with their position as sacred buildings under the administration of Rome’s state religion, increased their political significance. This connection between the commercial activities of state temples and their increasing political significance is clearly evidenced by the case of Verres in his supervision of the letting of the contract for the restoration of the Temple Of Castor. Here, Verres is shown by Cicero manipulating the terms of the temple’s construction contract in order to ensure it goes to his colleague Harbonius. Construction contracts often stipulated a completion date for the building work, set out as a clause in the contract. Cicero (*Verr* 1.1.130-150) claimed that Verres in his urban praetorship of 74 BCE, as the magistrate in charge of letting this contract, made use of this clause by deliberately setting a very short date for the completion of the work in order to discourage others from bidding and to award the contract to his associate Harbonius.⁴⁴ This case, probably colored to a certain extent by the invective of Cicero, does demonstrate that contracts for important temples were highly prized and held significant political prestige for successful bidders.⁴⁵

Public Venues: Public Buildings and State Sanctioned Entertainment

Public entertainment in fora formed a significant part of republican life and represented the civic unification of the city, incorporating both the People and the Senate.⁴⁶ As public performances were held in the city centre, these events also unified the city

⁴⁴ For further discussion of this event, see: Brenner (2000) II, 446, n.30.

⁴⁵ The most obvious case, is that of the Temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus on the Capitoline when Pompey and Caesar tried to have the contract for the temple transferred from Quintus Lutatius Catulus to Pompey in 62 BCE, motivated by the political significance of the temple, discussed in Chapter Three.

⁴⁶ See: Vit. *Arch.* 10.pr. 3; Cic. *Mur.* 72. For discussion of gladiatorial games associated with the Forum during the Republic, see: Coleman (2003) 62; Welch (2007) 52; Wiseman (2009) 153-175.

topographically.⁴⁷ It is likely that gladiatorial displays were funerary before the late republic; one of the first gladiatorial games was held in the *forum Boarium* in 264 BCE (Liv. *Per.*16; Val. Max. 2.4.7); another early celebration took place in 216 BCE in the *forum Romanum*, in connection with the funeral of Marcus Aemilius Lepidus (Liv. 23.30.15), forming the principle setting for such spectacles.⁴⁸ The majority of references to republican gladiatorial games after 264 BCE refer to the *forum Romanum*.⁴⁹ By the mid to late republic, games and spectacles had become a major part of the socio-political fabric of the city. Vitruvius (*Arch.* 5.1.2-3) sets the parameters for planning and laying out fora space to allow for games and festivals, even suggesting that silversmith's shops and balconies be placed *publica recta...disposita* (placed directly in public/open).⁵⁰ Although, he states that temples and shrines to the deities Venus, Vulcanus, and Mars should be situated outside the city walls so as not to encourage activities of *veneria libido* (venereal pleasure 1.7.1), *munera* and *ludi* were held in the civic space of the Forum. Vitruvius depicts an idealized picture here. However, he does disclose the Roman's conceptual link between games and the Forum. These events, provided for the People under the name of individual magistrates, were funded through the State and, as such, represented the unification of the city's inhabitants, its leaders, and their civic space.⁵¹ The restriction on permanent theatres at Rome prior to 55 BCE made open areas such as fora important venues, utilized *ad hoc* to provide games and festivals in honour of various deities to mark special occasions. Since

⁴⁷ Patterson (2006) 349: discusses banquets and gladiatorial games held in and around fora. He discusses the fact that these occasions provided opportunities for the families or patrons putting on the games and shows to demonstrate their generosity to the People. Events held in these public spaces such as the Rostra and forum of the city along with the public audiences they afforded were a significant factor in obtaining the necessary glory for aristocrats and in turn in canvassing for votes since they relied heavily upon the People for election to office, a vital step toward higher distinction within the Roman state. See also: *CIL* 4.1189; Mouritsen (2001) 97; Shatzman (1975) 159-167; for reports of Caesar and his impressive spectacles, see: Plut. *Caes.* 5.3, Plut. *Iul.* 5, Plin. *NH* 33.53 (using silver equipment, demonstrating the competitive nature of these shows), and Suet. *Iul.* 10. Gruen (1992) 188-97: asserts that there is little evidence to support a connection between the provision of *ludi* and election to office. Cf. Bell (2004) 190: pointing out that Gruen concentrates mostly on the dramatic performances of the second century BCE; for discussion of the 'ruinous obligation' of these games for the less wealthy host magistrate, particularly in second century BCE, see: Veyne (1990) 208-209.

⁴⁸ Purcell, *LTUR* II, 331.

⁴⁹ Welch (2007) 30-31. See also: Cic. *Sest.* 124-126; Millar – review (1989) 149: discusses the institution of the funeral oration appearing at least by the second century, delivered to the people from the Rostra, indicating the importance of combining distinctive political and military roles in a public forum/ public politics.

⁵⁰ By Vitruvius' time Pompey's theatre was established. This perhaps reflects the way in which the republican Romans circumvented the ban on permanent theatres, as the constructions in the forum would be permanent anyway, although temporary staging would still be required. Later construction of the Temple of Caesar, the new Rostra Augusti and the enlargement of temples such as Castor, Concordia, and Saturn all impacted on available space and the sources no longer report games being held in the forum. After the imperial fora were built in the *forum Romanum* space was significantly reduced, along with the opportunity for individuals to advertise themselves.

⁵¹ See: Chapter Three.

such events were associated with state religion, this official authorization provided the individual hosting magistrates, such as aediles and praetors (men of comparative significance), the opportunity to showcase their *legitimate* civic duty and generosity to the *populus Romanus*. Toward the late republic these *munera* became significantly more grandiose as elite competition increased and magistrates strove to gain the favour of the *populus Romanus*.⁵² In turn, public buildings in the city provided young aspiring magistrates with a central location to memorialize these gifts of entertainment with publicly erected inscriptions: [---]r mag(ister) ludos / [--- Her]colei magno / [---]neo fecit. (*ILLRP* 703)⁵³

Similarly, the forum as a civic centre and socio-political stage provided a location for the performance of plays, while the relationship between the playwrights, ambitious magistrates and the public, hungry for entertainment, gave individual magistrates further opportunity to advertise themselves and strengthen their reputation as providers of this civic service. Magistrates paid producers to put on the theatrical performances, paid for with state funds, which the magistrate would supplement with his own money and duly advertise to increase his personal prestige.⁵⁴ The fine line between entertainment and politics and their shared spaces is expressed often in our sources. Cicero (*Clu.* 93), for example, likens the *Gradus Aurelii* (a platform named after an Aurelius) to a theatre, a political stage.⁵⁵ Similarly, Suetonius (*Gram.* 2.4) reports public readings of poems taking place on the steps of significant buildings from around the second century, citing Quintus Vargunteius' recitation of Ennius' *Annales*. Horace (*Sat.* 1.4.74-76), although writing under Augustus, discusses his dislike of the usual custom of reading one's poems to the crowds in the forum.⁵⁶ Just as it mattered where one gave a political speech, the magistrate's choice of venue for his entertainment events must surely have required serious consideration.

⁵² Purcell, *LTUR* II, 332. See also: Orlin (1997) 70-71 citing Cicero's discussion of the importance to aediles of hosting games for future electoral campaigns: *Ad Fam.* 8.2.2, 8.4.5, 8.6.5, 8.8.10; Nicolet (1980) 361-373; Veyne (1990) 208-214. This matter is discussed fully in Chapter Three.

⁵³ The fragmentary nature of this inscription (found at Rome) makes exact translation difficult; Degraffi n.703 states that J. Whatmough suggests 'in circo Flamineo', and that, Mommsen suggests 'in theatro ligneo'. For my point regarding the public display of an individual's public service and good deeds, the inscription is sufficient either way. See, also: *ILLRP* 701, and for a similar inscription advertising the provision of theatrical games, see: *ILLRP* 727. Epigraphy is discussed further below: 35-37.

⁵⁴ For further discussion regarding the use of *lucar*, a fee paid directly to the actors by the Senate, see: Veyne (1990) 210. It is not always clear whether or not magistrates paid for spectacles and games with their own money or public funds, or a combination of both; see: Chapter Three 109-112.

⁵⁵ For discussion on recitation of poems and songs in the Forum in areas such as the *Gradus Aurelii* and the terraced steps of the Comitium, see: Wiseman (1982) 28-49, particularly 36-38.

⁵⁶ See: Wiseman (1982) 36-37.

Vitruvius: A Civic Template

The process of Rome's topographical development, incorporating aspects of religion, politics, and culture, reflected the urban unification of Rome, culminating in a strong sense of cultural identity toward the end of the late republic. By the end of the late republic-early empire fixed ideas regarding Roman-styled public building and civic space had developed at Rome, reflected in the *De Architectura* of Vitruvius.⁵⁷ Here (*Arch.* 1.7.1), he provides evidence of the specific architectural expectations for Roman fora space. In this prescriptive treatise he outlines the necessary steps involved in laying out a city, breaking down areas to cover 'sacred buildings, the forum proper, and other public spaces'.⁵⁸ He also states (*Arch.* 5.2.1) that the senate house should adjoin the forum in the same style, scale, and proportion.⁵⁹ Other passages prescribe the spacing of columniations to allow for viewing spectacles, the dimensions of the forum in relation to the audience, and the avoidance of cramping (*Arch.* 5.1.2-3). Similarly, his discussion of basilicae for business and law (*Arch.* 5.1.4) recommends they adjoin fora, even suggesting that they be situated in a warm area since *negotiatores* meet there in winter. However, it is the multiplicity of function that dictates the importance of the area as a civic center:

Primumque forum uti oporteat constitui dicam, quod in eo et publicarum et privatarum rerum rationes per magistratus gubernantur.

But first I should explain how the forum ought to be laid out, since it is there that plans of both public and private matters are dealt with by magistrates. (*Vitr. Arch.* 5.1.5)

The overlapping nature of Rome's private and public activities remained a salient feature of Roman culture throughout the republic, reflected in activities such as the daily *salutatio* and the placement of private homes around the forum.⁶⁰ Such scripting of building practices presented the Roman (idealized) way of doing things, defining and creating a form of abstract cultural identity in the concrete form of the construction.⁶¹ Although Rome's own

⁵⁷ Purcell (2010) 579-592: provides good discussion on this point.

⁵⁸ Although Vitruvius wrote c. 27 BCE, holding an official position under Augustus' rebuilding of Rome, his work *De Architectura* can be viewed as largely republican in nature, since he served under Caesar in Gaul and draws heavily on Varro and Lucretius, see: Wallace-Hadrill 2008, 149-153. Furthermore, neither Caesar nor subsequent emperors follow Vitruvius' architectural prescript in laying out their fora, indicating his traditional republican, rather than emerging imperial, style.

⁵⁹ This caution regarding the forum not out-shining the senate house was certainly not adhered to by Caesar in his own *forum Iulium*, or by subsequent emperors.

⁶⁰ Discussed below: 33-34.

⁶¹ See: Spencer (2010) 33-41: discussing the idea of farming handbooks as the ultra-Roman way of life and its contribution to forming a sense of cultural identity, separate from the rest of the Mediterranean.

ad hoc topographical development did not allow for such strict execution as described by Vitruvius, these principals of town planning and building were strictly upheld in many of Rome's municipalities and *coloniae*, reflecting a formalized concept of civic space in Roman imagination.⁶²

The Morals of Public Construction

While Vitruvius demonstrates an idealized prescriptive approach to public building,⁶³ Cicero's philosophical *De Officiis* reflects his own moralizing attitude towards public building. In fact, he is very specific in his description of such public works, listing walls, docks, harbors, and aqueducts among the worthy services to the public and hinting that colonnades, theatres, and new temples were, by their grandeur, less justified forms of spending:

Atque etiam illae impensae meliores, muri, navalia, portus, aquarum ductus omniaque, quae ad usum rei publicae pertinent. quamquam, quod praesens tamquam in manum datur, iucundius est; tamen haec in posterum gratiora. Theatra, porticus, nova templa verecundius reprehendo propter Pompeium, sed doctissimi non probant...

And moreover, walls, docks, harbours, aqueducts and all those expenses that relate to some public use are more appropriate. Although, that which is given out as a gift is more immediately gratifying; nevertheless these things (public amenities) bring more thanks in the future. Out of respect for Pompey I am more modest in my criticism of theatres, colonnades, and new temples; however the wisest of men do not approve of them... (*Off.* 2.60)

Cicero's passage suggests that while more immediate prestige could be gained by providing works serving a symbolic or monumentalizing purpose, those built to serve the community, providing a practical benefit, conferred longer lasting prestige on the donor. Practical constructions like aqueducts, harbors, and fortifications were frequently (but not exclusively) financed by public funds and overseen by magistrates,⁶⁴ whereas buildings for entertainment were often paid for with private money,⁶⁵ suggesting less prestige was attached to the former. Rather than reflecting an established Roman attitude regarding the

⁶² See: Chapter Three 133-135.

⁶³ Edwards (1993) 141: warns that scholars should not dismiss the moralizing tone of Vitruvius' work simply because it is ostensibly technical and prescriptive in nature.

⁶⁴ Liv. 6.32, 40.46.16, 44.16.9.

⁶⁵ Lomas (2003) 40; Shatzman (1975) 90-91: aediles could partially or fully fund buildings by the fines they imposed. Orlin (1997) 141; Livy 25.12.12, 40. 52.1.

morals of public building, it is possible that Cicero's negative attitude toward less practical construction is reflective of his insecurities about his own meager expenditure during his aedileship, as competition increased to provide bigger and better public benefactions.⁶⁶ This is not to say that Cicero was not appealing to the 'Romanitas' of his audience, since public structures like aqueducts were considered to be distinctively Roman (at least by the imperial period).⁶⁷ In any case, a building, according to many Romans, was not always simply a building. Varro (*RR* 2.16) presents similar sentiments in his discussion of the ideals of private *villae* when he juxtaposes the aspects of rustic usefulness and urban luxury, perhaps reflecting a late republican attitude.⁶⁸ Clearly, the views of Cicero and Varro are those of the minority since regardless of such moralizing sentiments, competition between magistrates to construct magnificent temples and theatres was extremely intense during this period.

Until Pompey's monumental theatre complex, public works had been relatively modest (with the possible exception of 'Sulla's' building program). This theatre complex signaled a new era for 'public' buildings as they became national monuments that reflected the individual power and prestige of their patrons.⁶⁹ Such issues will be discussed in Chapter Three where the concept of euergetism in connection with public buildings is investigated.

In Sum

The topographical development of Rome's civic centre in the area of the *forum Romanum* is evidenced as early as the mid-seventh century with construction of the Temple of Vesta and

⁶⁶ For Cicero's awareness of his own meagre spending, see below: 104. Catharine Edwards (1993) 157: takes this passage as reflective of the growing competition between the elite, which influenced writers such as Cicero and Pliny to present such public buildings as sources of corruption. See also: Dyke (1996) 448-449: pointing out that Cicero was himself involved in building projects, including the restoration of the Temple of Tellus in 54 BCE, which possibly influenced his choice of *nova templa* to avoid implicating himself in such moralizing. Here Dyke also discusses the influence of Panaetius, favouring longevity of results over the superficially glamorous. 37-38: for the moralizing tendency of Cicero's work.

⁶⁷ See: Edwards (1996) 105-107, citing Frontinus, *Aq.* 1.16; Dion. Hal. 3.67.5

⁶⁸ In keeping with the idea of late republican competition as a driver of such attitudes towards public buildings, Vitruvius (1.1.1-2), writing at a time when the opportunity for individual glory through public benefaction had been curtailed by the age of the emperor, praises the emperor Augustus for making the State greater by the provision of dignified public buildings that will correspond to the grandeur of Rome's history. Ramage (1929) 27-29: for the contrast between city and country; Edwards (1993) 137-143, particularly 139, n.5: for moralizing sentiments regarding private spending and luxury during the first centuries BCE and CE, citing Cato the Elder *ap. Festus* 282 ed. Lindsay (= 185) Malcovati); Horace in his *Odes* 2.15.1-5; Spencer (2010) 10-11 and 16-30: literary pastoral, playing with themes of rusticity, was newly fashionable at Rome in the late republic.

⁶⁹ Veyne (1990) 259-260. The Theatre of Pompey will be discussed specifically in Chapter Three: 129-134.

the paving of the Comitium. Urbanization and political unification emerged concurrently with construction of the Curia Hostilia as the inaugurated home of the Roman Senate. The presence of a state-sanctioned religion formed the basis for all subsequent activities in the area, including public buildings, structures, and monuments. The Forum's connection with the Capitoline hill and the Temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus further augmented this unification process, providing divine protection for the surrounding area and symbolizing the State's role in governing the city. Appropriation of temple space can also be seen as a continuation of the process of political unification as magistrates conducted political activities in these state-sanctioned venues, further embedding religion and politics. The introduction of *basilicae* in the late republic suggests a level of sophistication for Rome in terms of the commercial importance of the area, while the prescriptive treatise of Vitruvius' *De Architectura* and the moralizing sentiments of Cicero can also be seen as evidence of Rome's maturing, as the city established its identity in the surrounding world and as the importance of public building and civic space took on greater significance and magistrates realized their potential for political gain.

SECTION TWO

THE MONUMENTALIZATION OF ROME

State Religion and Monumentalization

The religious origins of Rome's civic center are reflected in the foundation myth of the Lacus Curtius associated with the site of the *forum Romanum*. This myth is interesting for the study of public works and monumentalization since it suggests an early Roman *concept* of the heroic individual and the monumentalization of the city, linking individual to location. Varro (*LL* 5.147-149) for example, discusses this myth and the three versions of its origin. His treatment of the first version of the myth (*LL* 5.147-149) states that it is Marcus Curtius' body interred in the ground that creates this monument:

eo facto locum coisse atque eius corpus divinitus humasse ac reliquisse genti
suae monumentum.

In fact right there, the ground closed up and divinely interred his body, and left behind a memorial for his people. (Varr. *LL* 5.148)

Likewise, Pliny presents the death as heroic and memorialized, in his discussion of the civic space of the Comitium:

Colitur ficus arbor in foro ipso ac comitio Romae nata sacra fulguribus ibi
conditis magisque ob memoriam eius qua nutrix Romuli ac Remi conditores
imperii in Lupercali prima protexit...eadem fortuito satu vivit in medio foro, qua
sidentia imperii fundamenta ostento fatali Curtius maximis bonis, hoc est virtute
ac pietate ac morte praeclara, expleverat.

A fig-tree is worshipped in the very Forum and Comitium at Rome, made sacred by the lightning-struck objects buried there and (worshipped) to a greater extent as a memorial of the tree under which the nurse of Romulus and Remus first protected the founders of the Empire on the Palatine Hill...The same (tree) survives in the middle of the Forum, by accidental seeding, where, when the foundations of the Empire were sinking by deadly portents, Curtius filled (the hole) with the greatest goods, that is with bravery and piety and a splendid death. (Plin. *NH* 15.77-78)⁷⁰

⁷⁰ For further discussion on this myth and its significance as a *monumentum*, see: Diana Spencer (2007) 62-71. I owe my list of sources for the myth of the Lacus Curtius to Spencer: Plautus, *Curc.* 466-82; Varro; 5.149: memorializing Curtius' fall into a the swampy site in Romulus' city, 5.150: a *puteal* (wellhead or low kerb) marking the site of a lightning strike during the consulship of C. Curtius, in 445 BCE; Dionysius, *Ant. Rom.* 14.11.3-4 (chasm), 2.42.5-6 (swamp); Valerius Maximus 5.6.2 (chasm); Pliny, *NH* 15.78 (chasm); Dio 30.1-2; Plutarch, *Romulus* 18.4 (swamp). See also: Ovid, *Fasti* 6.401-4; Suetonius, *Augustus* 57.1; Coarelli (2007) 70-71.

Pliny emphasizes the Roman virtues of bravery and piety in order to enhance the heroic quality of the individual and in doing so augments the monumentalizing nature of the civic space of the Comitium. His characterization of Marcus Curtius as the ultimate Roman citizen presents him as the ‘seed’ of Rome’s future greatness, creating an established tradition and birthplace for the city’s *auctoritas* and *imperium*. In this respect, the myth allows Pliny to anchor the abstract quality of Rome’s greatness in the concrete or actual space of the Comitium. The story is not attestable before the late third century since Plautus (*Curc.* 477) is the earliest extant reference. Presumably Plautus’s audience understood his reference to this myth, suggesting it had been around before this time and indicating that the process of monumentalization of civic hero figures had begun at least from the third century BCE.

Behind Every Great Man is a Great City

The *forum Romanum* experienced an architectural revolution towards the end of the fourth century BCE, instigating the true monumental record of the space.⁷¹ The first known self-glorifying monument was the Rostra (beaks) mounted on the existing Speaker’s Platform by Gaius Maenius.⁷² What monumentalized this structure was not the base itself but the prows of the ships captured by Maenius in the Battle of Antium of 338 BCE. This monument stood as a symbol of power for both the State and the individual; the victory belonged to Rome; however, individual glory belonged to Maenius.⁷³ In this respect the public buildings and monumental structures at Rome served to advertise and glorify the city by the celebrating the individual achievement of exemplary citizens.

This process of glorification of the city developed gradually as Rome established herself as leader in the Mediterranean, starting from the development and definition of civic space – in and of itself symbolic of Rome and the citizen - to the eventual military and civic

⁷¹ Purcell, *LTUR* II, 327; The shift in political and architectural focus of the Comitium is discussed below: 47-51.

⁷² The original stone platform marked the area between the Comitium and the greater forum and is referred to as ‘Suggesto C’ for its archaeological phase, thought to date to the early fifth century BCE. Morstein-Marx (2004) 45: suggests Gjerstad (1941) as an essential authority for the Rostra; also: Coarelli (1986) and (2007); Welch (2006) 500; Pina Polo (2011) 161.

⁷³ Cic. *Sest.* 8.18; Livy 8.13.9. For a full discussion on the origin of victory monuments and their development in the *forum Romanum*, see: Welch (2006) 496-542, particularly 500-501.

aggrandizement of individuals.⁷⁴ The appearance of religious scenes in the late second century BCE enhanced and shaped the iconographic tradition in the late republic with public monumentalization becoming one of the driving forces of state ideology and the initiator of individual self-assertion in public.⁷⁵

The Senate maintained a supervisory position over the monumentalization of the city, at least until the mid republic. As discussed, Pliny (34.20, 34.30) highlights this senatorial control and legitimization when he discusses the censors of 158 BCE causing all statues not sanctioned by the Senate to be removed from the Forum.⁷⁶ This passage is informative for the study of monumentalization in the mid-to-late republic since it illustrates senatorial awareness of the significance and power of statuary and other monumental pieces in public space for individuals and highlights the Senate's active interest and need for control over public monumentalization. Although this incident refers to *ars statuaria*, it highlights the ultimate authority and sovereignty of the Senate regarding monumentalization within the city boundaries, emphasizing the potential political power of imagery.

While it can be argued that individual monuments glorified individual men, the incident of 158 BCE demonstrates an overall senatorial control of public space in this period (perhaps weakening gradually toward the end of the republic) and highlights the fact that it is often difficult to separate Rome, the city, from her citizens, the individuals, since one required the other to exist. It was the individual citizen that achieved glory through individual action, yet it was the development of political and cultural unification that gave meaning and importance to Roman citizenship for the individual and their manipulation of the city's meaningful spaces and buildings.

⁷⁴ For late republican and early imperial consciousness regarding monuments and the preservation of memory, see: Varro *LL* 6.49. Holscher (2005) 476: claims that it is only by stressing the fact that in Rome all kinds of political representation and commemoration were employed, having much more public and therefore more aggressive and challenging character than in the provinces or neighbouring states, that important insights will be gained into the basic aggressive forces behind Rome's ascent to world rule (and a greater understanding of the communicative force of Roman public monuments within public life). Holscher's stance reinforces the idea of the *forum Romanum* as Rome's stage.

⁷⁵ Holscher (2005) 475.

⁷⁶ Wiseman (2009) 48-49: discusses the People claiming back the *forum Romanum* since it was the elites who had erected so many honorific statues. For discussion of this incident, see also: Bell (2004) 183-186; Wallace-Hadrill (1990) 146, 157, 162-163, 173.

The desire to win political support and to display individual power and prestige became a clear political strategy in the last two centuries of the republic.⁷⁷ However, it is in the first century BCE that construction projects most reflect this change, significantly altering the political landscape of Rome. As mentioned, recent rethinking of the so-called ‘Tabularium’ by Coarelli provides new and important considerations for understanding this situation, demonstrating the central role of public buildings in shaping and advertising the identity of powerful individuals.⁷⁸ Coarelli makes two important points. Firstly, he argues that the structure, widely accepted as the ‘Tabularium’, was not a tabularium, but actually a large substructure for a triple-temple complex initiated by Sulla. His interpretation of the inscription associated with this structure,⁷⁹ identifies the term *substructionem* as the substructure for this triple-temple complex. He divides this substructure into two parts: a grandiose concrete base with covered gallery (*via tecta*), linking the Capitolium to the Arx, and a windowed corridor underneath this, linking the Capitolium with the Atrium Vestae. Archaeological analysis of the substructure, according to Coarelli, reveals traces of a larger central temple, likely dedicated to Venus Victrix, and two smaller temples flanking: the left temple possibly honouring the Genius Publicus Populi Romani and the right temple honouring Fausta Felicitas.⁸⁰

Secondly, by further analysis of the inscription Coarelli argues for another important Sullan building on the Capitoline: here he identifies the term *tabularium* as a tabularium situated *adjacent to* this triple-temple complex (not the substructure itself as is widely accepted), functioning as an archive for the Atrium Vestae.⁸¹ Thus, if we are to accept Coarelli’s analysis of the evidence (which seems entirely sensible at this stage), *substructionem et tabularium* refer to two clearly distinct buildings: a triple-temple complex and a tabularium. Such a significant and centrally positioned architectural ensemble must surely have portrayed Sulla in a position of considerable influence, glorifying his achievements (planned

⁷⁷ Coarelli (2007) 4.

⁷⁸ Coarelli (2010) 107-132. Coarelli’s claims are explained here through analysis of archaeological, epigraphic, and literary evidence, as well as consideration of the scholarly findings of von Hesberg (1995); Purcell (1993); and Tucci (2005). This significant work greatly informs my analysis of both Caesar’s forum complex and Pompey’s theatre complex, both in terms of their choice of deities and architectural design, discussed in Chapters Two and Three.

⁷⁹ *CIL* 6.1314, 6.1313. See below: 36.

⁸⁰ Coarelli (2010) 126-127, fig. 15: for triple-temple layout, and 124-129: for evidence regarding the cult divinities.

⁸¹ Coarelli (2010) 107-132, particularly 122-124: citing six military diplomas (c. CE 85-89) as evidence for the existence of a tabularium, the *Tabularium Publicum* on the Capitoline where these were displayed – *CIL* XVI 35.

after his triumph of 81 BCE) and acting as patron to some of the most significant civic buildings at Rome. As Coarelli states, the prestigious position of the temple complex on the Capitoline hill, dominating the Forum and the spaces of traditional politics, represents a clear testimony of power and Sullan ideology.⁸² Sulla's (and ultimately Catulus'⁸³) Capitoline project (as a sanctuary styled precinct⁸⁴) stood as a monumental backdrop for the west forum and would begin the process of the complete rethinking of the area by Caesar and Augustus.⁸⁵ In fact, this Sullan building program is vitally important for understanding the architectural choices of later men. Certainly Caesar and Pompey, with their choice of Venus to represent their significant architectural precincts understood the benefits of monumentalization and religious representation.⁸⁶

The Action of Memory

Civic activities such as the triumph, public oratory, and the *salutatio* utilized the monumental space of Rome's civic centre to evoke traditional republican ideals. Karl Hölkeskamp's discussion of Rome's monumentalized history in the mid-republic presents Rome as a stage of history, both as an urban space where events took place under the gaze of her citizens and the space where events were remembered, through staged ritual and festival, as well as through permanent monuments and buildings.⁸⁷ He describes monumental memory as a fundamental feature of the Roman republic which developed in the third and second centuries, asserting that it was the aim of various groups to 'colonize' specific meaningful public locations through spatial occupation (monuments and buildings)

⁸² Coarelli (2010) 129.

⁸³ Catulus completed and dedicated these buildings after Sulla's death.

⁸⁴ Coarelli (2010) 115 and 129: stresses the similarities between the temple rooms of the main Sullan temple with that of the contemporary Temple of Hercules at Tivoli locating the 'Tabularium' complex within the 'coherent and diffused topology of sanctuaries of late republican Latium.' This will be an important consideration in Chapter Three regarding the traditional Italic nature of both Pompey and Caesar's complexes.

⁸⁵ Coarelli (2007) 46.

⁸⁶ Caesar's *forum Iulium* is discussed fully in Chapter Two. Chapter Three argues for traditional Italic influences in Pompey's theatre complex and Caesar's forum, including discussion of a clear Sullan influence in both projects.

⁸⁷ Hölkeskamp (2006), 482: 'This evolving relationship between history and its transformation into memory finds material articulation in monuments of all types, such as temples and other public buildings, equestrian and other honorary statues, as well as the texts that can be found *in situ*: dedicatory inscriptions on buildings that evoke the memory of the dedicant, specific events and their concomitant stories, or the explanatory inscriptions (*tituli*) on statues of different types.' Also, for discussion regarding the entire forum as a political stage and the importance of a rapport between an elected office holder and the crowd for political survival, see: Millar (1998) 57; Flower (2010); Hölkeskamp (2010). For the significance of inscriptions and memory, see: Woolf (1996) 22-39; Cooley (2000) 7-20.

as fixed points of reference, creating a landscape of memory.⁸⁸ The connection between monuments and conquest maintained the focus of Rome and her collective achievement while celebrating the individual citizen. Victorious generals took advantage of civic space with dedications on temples, either built or restored by these eminent men.⁸⁹

Hölscher reinforces Hölkeskamp's ideas regarding the active use of monumental space through state-sanctioned ritual, stressing the importance of including festival and triumph (the ultimate self-aggrandizement) in the discussion of republican monumentalization.⁹⁰ The triumphal route itself, lined with arches, temples, and victory monuments,⁹¹ reinforced the significance of the Forum by association with such state-sanctioned ceremonial activities.⁹² As stated the exact route is unclear. However, it is thought to have started somewhere outside the *pomerium* (perhaps the Campus Martius via the *porta triumphalis*) and to have terminated at the Capitoline Hill.⁹³ It is the termination point which is most important to this particular discussion as it can then be assumed that the route, regardless of individual variations, passed through the *forum Romanum* on route to the Capitol, expressing the greatness of Rome and her civic centre through the great deeds of individuals.⁹⁴

In the same way, the action of oratory incorporated the public space and civic buildings of the city centre into Rome's political and cultural sphere. As the civic centre of Rome, the dense and public nature of the Forum provided a natural platform for the action of oratory,

⁸⁸ Hölkeskamp (2006) 482.

⁸⁹ See: Chapter Two for further discussion of this point, particularly Manubial Construction.

⁹⁰ Hölscher (2005) 472-478: states that Holiday concentrates almost exclusively on monuments that refer directly to historical events at the expense of many other important means of public commemoration: the fleeting triumph and the lasting memories of its showpieces preserved in public sanctuaries or private homes; statues erected in public places honouring the leaders of successful military campaigns; the semi public display of ancestral images brought out during the *salutatio* and their more public display during the ritual of the *pompa funebris*; booty monuments reflecting military expansion; temples erected from the *manubiae* of military campaigns, dedicated to specific divinities, reflecting particular historical events or linked to political virtues and ideals - fusing the State's great achievements with the religious topography of the City and the cultural practices of the society's ritual calendar. Similarly, Hölkeskamp (2010) 74-75: discusses private houses owned by *triumphatores* which were often adorned with the weapons and spoils of the vanquished enemy, attached at their doors, remaining in place even once the house was sold on. This monumental feature connected the surrounding atrium houses to the civic space of the forum as a public display of private accomplishments, serving as honorific monuments to these elite men and providing further opportunity for the public display of one's *honos*, *dignitas* and *auctoritas*.

⁹¹ On the monumentalization of the triumphal route (taken from Morstein-Marx (2004) 105, n.169), see: Favro (1994) 151-64; Hölscher (2001) 194-98; Maria (1998) 31-53, 262-66, n. 49-54.

⁹² See also: Morstein-Marx (2004) 68-118.

⁹³ Beard (2007) 92-96: for full discussion of the problems with establishing a definite route.

⁹⁴ For the triumphal procession going through the *forum Romanum* and round toward the Capitol, See: Cic. *Verr.* 5.76; Wiseman (2009) 153-175. Edwards (1996) 86.

labeled by Cicero (*Planc.* 34) as the ‘real work of the forum’. In turn, this highly specialized occupation lent further significance to the buildings and spaces in which such activities were performed. Oratory developed in a highly public manner to reflect Roman identity. For example, Romans selectively fashioned Greek educational principles into a uniquely Roman form of citizen training, choosing aspects that fitted their own developing society. Cicero outlines late republican consciousness regarding the oratory of these two cultures in specific terms:

Ipsi enim Graeci magis legendi et delectationis aut hominis alicuius ornandi quam utilitatis huius forensis causa laudationes scriptitaverunt; quorum sunt libri quibus Themistocles, Aristides, Agesilaus, Epaminondas, Philippus, Alexander aliique laudantur; nostrae laudationes, quibus in foro utimur aut testimonii brevitatem habent nudam atque inornatam aut scribuntur ad funebrem contionem, quae ad orationis laudem minime accommodata est.

For the Greeks themselves have traditionally written many panegyrics, more of reading and pleasure or of honouring some man or other than of this public use as in our case; There are books of these types in which Themistocles, Aristides, Agesilaus, Epaminondas, Philip, Alexander, and others are praised; our panegyrics; which we use in the forum (in public) have either the brevity of testimony, bare and plain, or the speech which is written for a funeral, which (occasion) is not at all suited to speech of praise. (*De Orat.* 2.341)⁹⁵

This ‘hybrid’ form, described by Cicero, created and validated those characteristics constituting a proper Roman male of the urban elite.⁹⁶ His comparison with the Greek style of oratory, allowed Cicero to express the specifically Roman elements of his own style and to signal its superior importance in politics. Unlike the ‘recreational’ style of Greek Panegyric, the functional Roman practice of speaking words publicly in fora and temples to establish agreements and ritual actions, such as swearing oaths, meant that words became a form of public action that resulted in specific outcomes such as the determining of events.⁹⁷ In the same way, the togate orator represented Roman identity and citizenship delivering a powerful visual and aural performance enhanced by the monumental surroundings of the civic (and public) space of the Forum.⁹⁸ In this respect the performative nature of oratory meant that the space in which this action took place took on more significance for the orator

⁹⁵ It is difficult to know the exact intention for Cicero’s use of *in foro* here since his use of *testimonium* alludes to the law courts while funeral speeches were often given in the Forum, therefore he could be meaning in the actual Forum or ‘in public’.

⁹⁶ Corbeill (2001) 261-288: Corbeill’s argument is a challenge to Morrou’s (1956) claim that the Romans adopted the Hellenistic model of education.

⁹⁷ Harries (2010) 640-643. For the ‘banqueting’ tradition of Greek oratorical education, see: Corbeill (2001) 263-266.

⁹⁸ Davies (2010) 51-72: for discussion regarding the costume of the Roman orator.

in his effort to connect with his audience.⁹⁹

Scholars disagree on the degree of impact of monuments and statuary in the everyday lives of their viewers. Holscher claims that Roman people viewed public monuments in the course of other activities, such as visiting a theatre, and their symbolic construction were therefore viewed with much less intensity than is often imagined.¹⁰⁰ Zanker, who claims the reverse, states that people experienced monuments in a particularly direct way and that this vital relationship between people and monuments made them an effective resource in political confrontations by recalling the past deeds of the individual or Rome as a unified people.¹⁰¹ Sumi also discusses the idea that Romans used monuments as aids and props when seeking to manipulate the audience's memory and thoughts, citing Cicero giving his first speech against Catiline from The Temple of Jupiter Stator in order to elicit memories of Rome's early history. Here Cicero (*Cat.* 1.33) made direct reference to the temple by discussing Romulus as its founder, drawing comparisons with himself.¹⁰² In the same way, Morstein-Marx presents a compelling argument for the direct influence of monuments on visitors to the Forum in his discussion on civic knowledge and the *contio*. Here, he claims that during the course of interaction between orator and citizen, monuments and speech came together as mnemonic cues creating, sustaining, and reshaping cultural memory through the process of reference to specific events associated with the collective memory embedded in the monuments.¹⁰³

Great care and expense went into the strategic planning of monuments and events and presumably when the elements of speaker, location, and cause came together they could, at times, produce a powerful and evocative message. Sulla's statue in the *forum Holitorium*, for example, honouring his capture of Jugurtha, played an essential part in his propaganda and is reflected in the coin struck by his son Faustus Sulla in 56 BCE in a form of political branding.¹⁰⁴ This does not prove, however, that one could not simply stroll past these areas

⁹⁹ This point is important for the discussion of popular participation in the city of Rome discussed below.

¹⁰⁰ Holscher (2005) 478.

¹⁰¹ Zanker (2009) 289.

¹⁰² Sumi (2009) 168; Bell (2004) 183; *Phil.* 6.12-15, *Sest.* 83; Cooley (2000) 8.

¹⁰³ Morstein-Marx (2004) 32-33, 77-92, 68-118, especially: 107. Morstein-Marx also discusses the significance of eulogies at funerals in the Forum in the same context through reference to its monuments during the enumeration of the great deeds and glory of men. See also: Pina Polo (2011) 286-303, particularly 290-292: discussing the use of topography in oratory to reflect qualities of *dignitas*, *potestas*, and *auctoritas*.

¹⁰⁴ Santangelo (2007) 206. For further discussion regarding the culture of memory in rituals, monuments, and inscriptions for the purpose of commemorating individual as well as familial stories, see: Flower (2010),

in the course of one's daily activities without contemplating them and the argument is perhaps a moot point. However, orators referring to particular statues and monuments during their speeches brought surrounding structures to life. Caesar's careful branding through familial links to the goddess Venus Genetrix and the naming of his forum after his family's *maiores* ensured that he would be associated by default with every important activity conducted there.¹⁰⁵

The buildings and public spaces associated with the daily activities of Rome's citizens also provided an important stage from which to advertise one's social and political superiority - their *dignitas*. Cicero was aware of the public aspect of the Forum as evidenced in a letter to his secretary Tiro:

Te, ut dixi, fero <in> oculis. Ego vos a. d. III Kal. Video tuosque oculos, etiam si te veniens in medio foro videro, dissaviabor.

[...] As I have said, I shall see you all on the 30th and smother your eyes in kisses, even though I first sight you in the middle of the forum... (Cic. *Epist.* 16.27.2)

Here Cicero's self-awareness and sense of propriety regarding his public image leads him to justify himself by stating that he does not care if he is in the middle of the Forum (a place of business and civic activity) he will openly show his emotions.

The blurring of public and private space allowed individuals to display their civic superiority in the architecture of their homes, as reflected in the design of elite private dwellings in the late republic. As Harriet Flower states, the private houses of the elite formed a significant element of public identity as an outward manifestation of one's wealth and power.¹⁰⁶ Such private homes were divided architecturally into *privata* (private) and *communia* (public) spaces, extending the activities of the civic centre into the domestic

especially: 39-40. Also the gilded equestrian statue of Sulla erected on the Rostra in 81 BCE presented him as dictator, teamed with a coin struck in 80 BCE *RRC* 381: App. *B. Civ.* 1.97; Vell. Pat. 2.61.3; Cic. *Phil.* 9.13.

¹⁰⁵ Discussed in Chapter Two.

¹⁰⁶ Hales (2003) 40-60, particularly interesting for her discussion of the link between the house and self-identity and public image in Rome; Flower (1996) 185-122. See also: Patterson (2010) 222-224: for discussion of recent work on this topic; Patterson (2006) 348-349; Edwards (1993) 137-143, particularly: 138-139: for discussion regarding the manifestation of one's wealth and the house as the domain of the *paterfamilias*, 150-160: for the house as a symbol of wealth; Velleius Paterculus 2.14.2-4: for the desire by the elite to be seen even in the 'private' sphere of their homes; Cic. *De Off.* 1.138-9: for the public role of a politician's house (and as the duty of prominent men to provide adequate space to accommodate clients and friends).

sphere and reflecting the *honos* and *dignitas* of the elite individual back upon the community.¹⁰⁷

By the late republic it was important for the elite to have houses surrounding the Forum (Cic. *Cael.* 7; *Dom.*101). As the forecourt to the domestic zone, the domain of the Forum and its associated buildings and monuments became increasingly important real estate for Rome's elite.¹⁰⁸ The daily walk from the *domus* to the Forum with a large retinue provided the best opportunity for public display of one's *magna dignitas* (Quintus Cic. *Com.* 37), making domestic proximity to this public space vital. Quintus' (*Com.* 34-38) categorization of a patron's *tenuiores amici* (less influential friends/clients) presents the civic space of the forum and the city centre as an important political tool for demonstrating one's loyalty to their patron: *salutatores* who would come in the morning to the patron's house to pay their respects in the daily ritual of the *salutatio*, the *deductores* who would escort the patron down to the forum, remaining often to walk once round the basilica, then leaving to conduct their own business, and *adsectatores* who would remain by his side all day, having only the needs of the patron to attend to.¹⁰⁹ In the same way, Cicero (*Mur.* 70) measuring his public standing by the size of his retinue, maintained that this process was the only way *homines tenues* (lesser men) could repay their patrons – men of substance.¹¹⁰ It is the highly public nature of such activities that gave meaning and importance to, not only public buildings and

¹⁰⁷ For in-depth discussion on this point, see: Wallace-Hadrill (2008) 144-212; Mouritsen (2001) 136; Hölkeskamp (2010) 74-75; Welch (2006) 501. On houses surrounding fora, see: Welch (2003) 17-19; Cic. *Cael.* 7; Muccigrosso (2006) 181-206; Purcell, *LTUR* II, 329. For the practice of canvassing candidates by visiting the houses of citizens and the relationships built in and around the forum in 64 BCE, see: Cic. *Mur.* 44.

¹⁰⁸ Purcell, *LTUR* II, 329: for discussion of the link between domestic and business spheres in this area.

¹⁰⁹ Mouritsen (2001) 3, 67-78, 107-108. For discussion of Quintus' categorization of men, see: Wiseman (1982) 29. See also Deniaux (2006) 401-420 for her discussion on the Roman citizen as subject to the law but also a member of a network of personal relations that the law recognized such as the client-patron relationship. For the *salutatio*, see: Cic. *Com.* 34-35; Patterson (2007) 130-131: for the existence of a type of courtly system in the late republic through the daily ritual of the *salutatio* and the public/private aspects of homes. Brunt (1986) 47-49; Brunt (1988) 350-442: the constitutional upheaval of the so-called Conflict of the Orders between patricians and plebeians beginning in the late fifth century and culminating in the Licinian-Sextian legislation of 367 BCE reflects a society in which the distribution of economic and political power was significantly uneven. Despite Mouritsen's argument for an almost non-existent and at best 'weak' system of political *clientela* 'grossly overstated by modern scholars', the existence of the relationship is implied repeatedly by the sources and is also defined by various laws (Dion. Hal. *AR* 2.10. 1-3; *RS ii* 40, *Tab. VIII.10* (689-90) = *FIRA*, *Tab.VIII.21* and the *Lex Repetundarum* outlining obligations of both patron and client, from Lintott (1999) 179 n.55). Brunt (1986) 47-50: strictly speaking, the relationship of patron and client meant that they were obliged to assist each other wherever legally possible, forming strong bonds through reciprocity and moral obligation.

¹¹⁰ Rosenstein (2006) 369. This public display of power and superiority is something that Caesar and other influential men would come to manipulate and utilize within the Forum for self-aggrandizement. Mouritsen (2001) 77: suggests that the use of *tenues* does not strictly imply 'poor' as these men would still have been well disposed enough to attend the assemblies.

monuments, but to the private space of domestic homes as tangible markers of individual importance and prestige.

Similarly, Cicero's treatise on old age demonstrates the embedded socio-political nature of public space:

haec enim ipsa sunt honorabilia, quae videntur levia atque communia – salutari appeti decedi assurgi deduci reduci consuli, quae et apud nos et in aliis civitatibus, ut quaeque optime morata est, ita diligentissime observantur.

For these things themselves are signs of honour, which seem light and unremarkable - to be greeted, to be sought, to be given way to, to have people rise at your approach, to be escorted back and forth, to be consulted, such civilities thus diligently observed both here at Rome and in other states (in proportion as to their good character and manners). (Cic. *Cato* 18)

The older citizen escorted to the forum is shown respect and honour through such acts as rising at his approach or being asked for advice, staged repeatedly through the practice of this daily ritual. This practice upheld in *aliis civitatibus* (other Roman states) presents the process as a thoroughly Roman activity, indicative of Rome's cultural expansion towards the late republic. Cicero's use of *honorabilia* stresses the open and ritualistic manner in which deference is to be paid to the elder citizen and it is in this respect that the public nature of the civic space becomes important for the public expression of individual prestige. In the same way, the meritocratic system of the *cursus honorum* meant that *boni* made use of the legitimized stage of the Forum to advertise and augment their superiority through the public display of their *dignitas* and *auctoritas* in course of their duties.¹¹¹

The Epigraphic Tool: Labeling Space.

In addition to the temporary or fleeting actions of public commemoration, such as the triumph and the performance of oratory, inscriptions on public buildings and in public space provided the opportunity for individuals to monumentalize their social and political superiority, *dignitas*, and *honor* permanently in the course of their civic duties and as such increased the political significance of such structures. The early republic saw the introduction of Latin inscriptions, and by the late republic, Italy had experienced a boom in

¹¹¹ See also: Hölkeskamp (2010) 98-106, discussed in Chapter Two, 113, regarding the system of meritocracy and 'consensus'.

epigraphic material, featuring not only inscriptions as vows to gods and dedications to public buildings, but naming and honouring individuals as well:¹¹²

Q(uintus) · Lutatius · Q(uintus) · f(ilius) · Q(uintus) · n(epos) · Catulus ·
co(n)s(ul / substructionem et tabularium · de · s(enatus) · s(ententia) ·
faciundum · coeravit · (ei)demque / pro(bavit).

Quintus Lutatius Catulus, son of Quintus, grandson of Quintus, when consul [in 78 BCE] undertook by senatorial decree the construction of the substructure and record office (*tabularium*), and approved/examined the work. (*CIL* 6.1314)¹¹³

Again, Coarelli's recent work sheds more light on the overall significance of this (and another similarly worded) inscription. As discussed, Coarelli argues convincingly that this particular example, referring to the work instigated by the dictator Sulla and completed by Catulus in 78 BCE, must refer to construction of two distinct structures, contrary to accepted scholarly opinion.¹¹⁴ Coarelli argues that one inscription belonged to the base of Sulla's triple temple complex (labeled incorrectly by modern scholars as the 'Tabularium') and the other to a tabularium situated next to (or close by) this triple-temple complex.¹¹⁵ It seems Quintus Lutatius Catulus, consul of 78 BCE, chose two similarly worded inscriptions on two closely situated structures to advertise his involvement in this prestigious building project. The phrase *de senatus sententia* increased this prestige and honour further for Catulus, sanctioning his civic actions and advertising his accord with the Senate of Rome. Given the political nature of such inscriptions (particularly one in the most prestigious precinct of Rome), it is little wonder building projects became the object of increasingly fierce competition toward the late republic as individuals sought to immortalize themselves in the bricks and mortar of the city.¹¹⁶

Inscriptions on public buildings belonging to the city of Rome gave individual families the opportunity to advertise their superior civic standing and worthiness and, in some cases (as in the Basilica Aemilia), provided these magistrates with the opportunity to appropriate the

¹¹² Woolf (1996) 22-24: for his interesting discussion of the epigraphic boom coinciding with the rise of the individual and the autocrat.

¹¹³ *CIL* 6.1313 is partially preserved and appears to reiterate the words of 6.1314. Both inscriptions were placed on new buildings (the 'Tabularium' and another undetermined structure.). See: Broughton *MRR* II, 173; Coarelli (2010) 117- 123, particularly 122-124.

¹¹⁴ Coarelli (2010) 107-132.

¹¹⁵ Coarelli (2010) 117- 123, particularly: 122-124.

¹¹⁶ For further discussion on this point, see: Cooley (2000) 14-15. An Attempt by Caesar and Pompey to secure the contract for the maintenance and refurbishment of the Capitolium, which would have stripped Catulus of his right to it, is discussed in Chapter Three, 102.

space by filling them with monuments to their families' glory.¹¹⁷ In this sense, the inscriptions represented a form of state approval for individual families to appropriate these public structures. The Roman tradition of constantly restoring, maintaining, and refurbishing temples and other public structures ensured the founder's memory remained in the minds of the living and retained the memory of the events associated with the monument, as well as promoting those individuals involved with its upkeep.¹¹⁸ This reciprocity between State and magistrate appears to have ensured the maintenance of many important buildings and monuments at Rome and abroad, as individuals competed to gain the contracts for their upkeep.¹¹⁹

The Politics of Memory

Public buildings and monuments also provided individuals with the opportunity to present their own political messages to the city's inhabitants. An interesting example of this deliberate use of public space is the case of the consul Opimius. In 121 BCE, perhaps acting under a *senatus consultum ultimum*,¹²⁰ Opimius killed Gaius Gracchus and his supporters occupying the Aventine hill. His use of foreign forces against Roman citizens in conjunction with the senatorial force of the decree (if Appian, *BC* 1.26 is correct) undermined the effectiveness of the existing norms of the very republican government that it purported to uphold.¹²¹ In order to appease the enraged and distressed *Populus*, Opimius erected (or possibly restored) a temple to the goddess Concord (Concordia) at the northwest end of the Forum, adjacent to the Curia, in acknowledgement of the bloodshed and civil strife.¹²²

¹¹⁷ Plut. *NH*. 35.13 discussing the Basilica Aemilia filled with shields (from Purcell, *LTUR* II, 331); cf. The Temple of Bellona vowed by Ap. Claudius Caecus *cos.* 296 BCE and filled with shield-portraits of his ancestors by the later Ap. Claudius Pulcher when *cos.* in 79 BCE, turning the temple into a family *monumentum*. See: Wiseman (1985) 21 and (2004) 60: regarding Pliny's (*NH* 35.12) mistaken attribution of this to Ap. Claudius Caecus; also: The Fornix Fabianus, built 121 BCE by Q. Fabius Maximus Allobrogicus, celebrating victory over the Allobroges, decorated with several statues of his family members (*ILLRP* 392, 57 BCE). For further discussion regarding the significance of inscriptions for individuals, see: Meyer (2011) 191-226; Cooley (2000) 7-20.

¹¹⁸ Sumi (2009) 169; Morgan (1973) 222-223. The importance of personal association with public buildings forms the basis of Chapter Three.

¹¹⁹ Competition between magistrates for building contracts and to provide bigger and better public benefactions in the form of public buildings and monuments is discussed fully in Chapter Three, 103-107.

¹²⁰ The sources for this are unclear: App. *BC* 1.26: reports that the temple was ordered by the Senate; Plut. *C. Grach.* 17: claims Opimius instigated its erection.

¹²¹ Flower (2010) 86.

¹²² See: Appian *BC* 1.25 The site chosen for the temple is thought by some scholars to have been the location of an older temple. Coarelli (2007) 67: states that the temple was thought to have been vowed by M. Furius Camillus in 367 BCE to celebrate the end of troubles between the *plebs* and patricians culminating in the formation of the Licinian laws. The authenticity of this episode is unclear and it is possible it was not actually

Plutarch (C. Grach. 17) reports that Opimius was acting in a manner of a triumphator in his choice to erect a temple after such a battle, indicating that Plutarch saw the temple as a victory (manubial) structure.¹²³ In any case, the events had taken place within the sacred boundary walls of the city, bringing bloodshed to the inner sanctum of Rome and breaking the republican rules of conduct. Opimius' need to restore the city to peace (and more importantly restore his reputation with the People) necessitated the erection of the temple, in order to appease his republican audience and repair his own standing within the community.¹²⁴ Importantly, the Temple of Concordia stood as an official symbol of the Senate's victory over the social reformers, Tiberius and Gaius Gracchus, as well as promoting the peace and stability of the traditional hierarchy.¹²⁵ Opimius' choice to restore that particular temple (for its association with the deity Concordia), in order to suggest that his own situation and that of Rome's was resolved, illustrates the deliberate manipulation of public space and republican religion by individuals for political gain. It is precisely this point that again demonstrates that religion and temples served as a powerful propagandist tool from the mid to late republic and that the spheres of politics and religion were deeply embedded in Roman society.

In Sum

From the initial paving of the civic space of the *forum Romanum* to the subsequent temples, public buildings, and statuary, early monumentalization appears to have been first and foremost about advertising and consolidating the *urbs Romae* as a social and political construct, a sum of the achievements of her individual inhabitants. The foundation myth of Lacus Curtius, if the story is accepted, represents possibly the city's earliest example of the process of monumentalization for the city and her achievements that would continue throughout Rome's history. The gradual development and monumentalization of the city's

built first until 218 BCE by L. Manlius commemorating the reconciliation between patricians and plebians. Ziolkowski (1992) 22-23: states there is no evidence for structural elements below the foundations of Opimius' temple. See also: Orlin (2010) 195-198. In any case, the salient point for this thesis is his choice of the goddess Concordia as a political tool.

¹²³ Orlin (2010) 195: suggests that as a quasi-manubial structure the temple advertised the vanquished as non-Romans, as the enemy of a Roman victor. Manubial structures will be discussed in Chapter Two 75-83.

¹²⁴ Flower (2010) 85-87. Cf. T. Didius *cos.* 98 BCE and his restoration of the Villa Publica (using *manubiae* from Hither Spain to fund it) and invocation of Concordia, discussed at length by Morgan (1973) 215-331.

¹²⁵ Stamper (2004) 56: the temple was actually received badly by the plebeians; Morstein-Marx (2004) 102-103, however the example stands. For discussion of the abstract qualities of deities and late republican consciousness of their significance see: Cic. *Nat. D.* 2.60-2.

civic centre created a landscape of memory and fixed points of reference for the glory and achievement of Rome as a collective whole as well as for great individuals, assisted by the development of inscriptions naming those involved in the construction, refurbishment, and maintenance of such monuments which peaked in the late republic. Memory was created and controlled through state-sanctioned activities held in the civic centre, creating an established tradition for individuals to follow, while public buildings and monuments provided the arena to press political messages and to display one's personal *dignitas*. Against such a *popular* and diverse social backdrop, Rome's civic space provided Rome's elite with a platform to advertise their social and political superiority, as seen through the action of the daily ritual of the *salutatio*. The incorporation of both private and public space, for the display of one's *magna dignitas*, confirmed the importance of civic space and buildings as an avenue for the expression of Roman identity.

As shall be seen in the following chapters, Caesar (and Pompey) invested a great deal of money and resources in creating the ultimate monumental space for the purposes of self-promotion and one presumes Caesar expected the impact of these innovations to bear immediately and directly upon the citizens of Rome.

SECTION THREE

CENTRALIZATION: *CIVIS ROMANUS SUM*

Roman Identity and Civic Space

While many non-Romans inhabited the *forum Romanum*, this civic space remained synonymous with Roman identity and citizenship and many of the structures and monuments within this space stood as symbols of the civilization and tradition of Roman cultural ideology. Cicero linked the idea of cultural identity and belonging with civic space in his discussion of *civitas*:

Gradus autem plures sunt societatis hominum. Ut enim ab illa infinita discedatur, propior est eiusdem gentis, nationis, linguae, qua maxime homines coniunguntur; interius etiam est eiusdem esse civitatis; multa enim sunt civibus inter se communia, forum, fana, porticus, viae, leges, iura: iudicia, suffragia, consuetudines praeterea et familiaritates multisque cum multis res rationesque contractae.

But there are many positions in the society of men. For, to be divided up from that boundless (category), the closest is of the same tribe, nation, language, by which men are chiefly joined; it is even more intimate to be of the same state; for among themselves there are many commonalities for citizens: the Forum, sanctuaries, porticoes, roads, laws, oaths, courts, voting rights; moreover, not just their customs and friendships, but also their close business ties with many people. (Cic. *Off.*1.53)

His explanation of the degrees of human relations is based on a fixed set of criteria, the closest being *civitas*. Here, Cicero suggests that it is the shared institutions such as the public buildings and civic space as tangible symbols that help shape and define the civic identity of these fellow statesmen. The Roman concept of *civitas* offered its members exclusive identity within the forum, temples, colonnades, monuments, and law statutes, bonding this exclusive group. Andrew Dyck considers Cicero's choice of the Roman concept of *civitas* to express the State significant since Cicero's presentation of the State highlights the institutions rather than the common interests or rights of the citizens. It is this point that is interesting for this discussion as the use of public space and public structures constitute a part of Cicero's structural definition of *civitas*:

Use of public space

Meeting places: *forum, fana*

Places for movement: *porticus, viae*

Juridical ties among citizens

Leges, iura

Their use: *iudicia, suffragia*

Private relations

Relations based upon personal inclination: *consuetudines et familiaritates*

Relations based upon shared interests: *multisque cum multis res rationesque contractae*.¹²⁶

Here Dyck suggests that this passage, in discussing the degrees of *οἰκείωσις* ranking societies from broad to narrow, can be read as a simplified presentation of established Stoic philosophy. However, it is the Roman institutions and practices that form the overall definition.¹²⁷ Roman concepts such as *civitas*, embodying the State, citizenship, and citizen rights, were vital political tools. Orators constantly played on the comparisons of rustic versus city lifestyles, and citizens versus foreigners, to elicit feelings of exclusive membership and belonging to the State in order to connect with their Roman audience.¹²⁸ In this respect, space and buildings as markers of citizenship and civic identity stood as static reminders of the traditions and activities associated with this exclusive membership. As Chapter Two will show, powerful individuals like Caesar narrowed this principal of belonging and citizenship through creation of highly personalized public space.

The idea of belonging and membership to this cultured society shaped the Roman Republic through established traditions and identity. Roman concepts of belonging, as opposed to *otherness*, justified, defined, and elevated Roman citizens in their dealings with other people and their interactions with the space around them. Notions of Roman citizenship and belonging allowed Cicero to define such relationships in more exclusive and specifically Roman terms than that of a general global organization. Similarly, Caesar's ethnographic description of the Gauls in his *commentarii* varied as it suited his needs. Caesar chose to compare his opponents to the *cultus* and *humanitas* of Rome appealing to the sentiment of

¹²⁶ Dyck (1996) 172: the list of goods by Dyck, citing: E.Rémy, 'Du groupement des peuples en états d' après le De Officiis de Cicéron I, 53,' *Mélanges Paul Thomas* (Bruges 1930) 587. Dyck (1996) 31 and 58: although Panaetius is given by Dyck as the primary model for Cicero's *De Officiis*, influencing a large part of the first book, he explains that Cicero adapted his political and ethical writings to a Roman model and suggests such a divergence from Panaetius' model in 1.50-58

¹²⁷ Dyck (1996) 171.

¹²⁸ As an early example of such concepts, the fifth century BCE comedian Titinius' *Comoedia Togata* (Frag. 61-62): 'Hortensius: in foro aut in curia posita potius quam rure apud te in clausa!<--->.' 'Hortensius: better situated in the forum or the senate house than shut away in the countryside at your place!<--->.' Skutsch (1985) 454-455: the juxtaposition of rural and city life, demonstrated in this early passage, shows the serious nature of civic space compared to the relaxed and unregulated nature of the country side, remote from the *cultus* of the city. For further discussion regarding this concept by the late republic, see: Connors (1997) 72-76; Corbeill (2002) 204-205. For the Forum as the topographical centre of Rome acting for the political unification of the city, see: Plin. *NH* 5.109.2

his Roman audience.¹²⁹ The combination of the refined, civilized condition of *cultus* and the quality of *humanitas* distinguished civilized man from savages by way of refinement or culture imbued in the spaces of the city, establishing a strong civic identity at Rome.¹³⁰

Exile and the Expression of Cultural Identity through Public Buildings.

In the same way that membership to the institutions of the Forum shaped Roman civic identity, exile or distance from Rome elicited a sense of the loss of connection to Roman institutions and society. From the Roman perspective, distance from Rome (and its public institutions such as the *forum Romanum*, the Senate and her law courts) meant distance from civilized culture. Catherine Edwards, describing the narrative of exile as ‘a literary tradition of responses to exile’, emphasizes the sense of alienation and loss of cultural identity expressed by those forced outside the familiar bounds of their homeland.¹³¹ This literary perspective offers a useful means of analyzing the complexities of public buildings and civic spaces and their significance for Roman society. The study of public spaces and their role in constructing Roman identities tends to be focalized from a perspective within the city. This view can be enhanced, however, by considering the feelings and meanings expressed by Romans for whom such public space and civic structures were prohibited and yet remained vital to their sense of cultural self-identity. Ovid’s (*Trist.* 3.1) tour of the city by his anthropomorphized book of poems exemplifies the usefulness of such narrative for understanding the significance of the city to these disconnected individuals. Here, the visit to the city by the personified book provides a highly detailed poetic itinerary of the city’s monumental centre, describing everything from the oldest shrines of republican Rome to the newly erected Augustan buildings. What is interesting for this study is that Ovid stresses his disconnection from the civic institution that most identifies him, the public libraries of Rome. When he sends his little book to find his *fratres* (Ovid’s other works) it is denied entry to the libraries, symbolizing the loss of his civic rights. He identifies most with the library because he is a poet and his relatives (his poems) reside in the library. Prohibiting access to this civic institution prohibits him from expressing his cultural identity.

¹²⁹ Caes. *BG* 1.1.3, 7.4.1: for Caesar’s characterisation of Vercingetorix as a most evil and uncivilised barbarian, far from the civilizing influence of Rome. See, also: Kirk Freudenburg’s comments regarding Cicero’s deliberate intent to show himself as truly Roman by his attack on the un-Roman activities of Verres (in his review of Corbeill’s work: 97.3.25 *Bryn Mawr Classical Review* 251).

¹³⁰ For further discussion regarding *cultus* and *humanitas*, see: Woolf (1998) 54-60.

¹³¹ Edwards (1996) 110-133, particularly 111-112.

Certainly, the space of the Forum was synonymous with the male Roman citizen, shaping and forming his Roman identity through notions of citizenship and membership: *in foro operam amicis da, ne in lecto amicae, ut solitus es*. ('Serve your men friends in the forum, not a woman friend in bed, as you are used to.' Plaut. *Trin.* 651).

Plautus (*Mostel.* 1051) also presents this membership and belonging using specific language: *ubi ego me video venire in meo foro*,... (since I see they have sold me off in my own forum...). The possessive pronoun *meus* makes it clear that his character feels the forum is his space, part of *his* personal identity.¹³² Even Vitruvius (5.6.8) states that stage scenery must include an entrance to both the country and the forum, illustrating its centrality to Roman life (a synonym of civilization).

Such sentiments are important for understanding the significance of civic space and public buildings at Rome in forming and maintaining one's Roman identity. The desperation of homesickness is a common theme in ancient literature and is vital for understanding what Romans considered the most quintessential and salient aspects and features of their homeland.¹³³ For example, Catullus' poem about Attis, a Greek who rejects his former way of life, is a poem about contrasts:¹³⁴

egone a mea remota haec ferar in nemora domo? / patria, bonis, amicis,
genitoribus abero? / abero foro, palaestra, stadio et gymnasiis?

Shall I, from my own home, be borne far away into the forests? From my
homeland, my possessions, my friends, my parents, shall I be absent? Absent

¹³² As a synonym and symbol of public life, see: Nep. *Cato* 1.1; Francese (2007) 64-65: *in foro* (in public) or (outside one's house); *forum attingere* (to arrive at the forum) meaning to take part in public life; *forum deducere* (to escort a young man to the forum on his assumption of the *toga virilis* and formally introduce him to public life); and finally, *foro cedere* (to leave the forum) meant to go bankrupt; Greenwood (1966) 286-287: *in foro* as 'in the heart of Rome' (Cic. *Verr.* 2.154). Again, see: *Verr.* 5. 97: where Cicero says the pirate Heacleo had sailed right up to the forum at Syracuse: *usque* gives the sense of as far as one can go or as close as one can get to something – so the heart of the city. Also further in this passage: *in moenibus suis, in urbe, in foro*... gives the sense that the most inner part is the forum 'in the walls, in the city, in the forum (itself!).'

¹³³ For further discussion on homesickness as a literary theme, see: Edwards (1996) 110-133; Green (2005) 238-239; Godwin (1995) 128; Morisi (1999) 36-38 (cf. Perutelli (1996) 259).

¹³⁴ This is a retelling of the story of Attis, who castrates himself in order to become a slave to the goddess Cybele, the Good Goddess however, by the end of the poem he has changed his mind and realizes it is too late and he must spend the rest of his days in the forests of Phrygia. Cybele, the Magna Mater was worshipped in Rome from the third century BCE, with a temple dedicated to her in 204 BCE. See: Godwin (1995) 121-131; Borgeaud (2004) 57-71. For a similar (but later) catalogue of buildings and civic space in the context of exile and cultured city, see: Ovid *Pont.* 1.18.35-36: listing fora, temples, theatres, and porticoes.

from the market, the wrestling-place, the racecourse, and the playground?
(63.58-60)

This isolation in the narrative of exile presents remoteness in an unrecognizable land (Phrygia), void of the civilized institutions of home. The forum (strictly *agora*) with its associated buildings and monuments is the first institution Attis lists as missing in this barbarian land.¹³⁵ While the central character and homeland of Catullus' poem are Greek, it is the contrast of civilized city and barbarian wasteland that emphasizes the buildings and civic spaces as markers of the *cultus* and *humanitas* of civilized society. In any case, Phrygia, according to Hardie, is both a label for the Trojan origins of Rome and a term for the barbarian *Other*.¹³⁶

The literary tradition of letter writing from abroad often expressed longing for the city's physical environment. Cicero states that he misses the Forum in a letter to Atticus from Laodicea (*Att.* 5.15): *denique haec non desidero, lucem, forum, urbem, domum, vos desidero...* (Actually, I do not miss these things, I miss the light, the Forum, the city, my home, you...).¹³⁷ Propertius (4.1.134), writing c.16 BCE after Caesar's addition of his own *forum Iulium*, states that it is not the ivory temple that he needs, but that it is *satis* (enough) that he can see the Forum. Similarly, Pliny's (*NH* 6.89) imperial ethnographic description of the customs and manners of the Ceylon people, employing the evocative phrase *extra orbem*, presents them as remote and removed from Roman identity and custom, geographically *and* culturally distant from the *civitas* of Rome with their lack of fora and law courts. The imperial dating of Pliny's work demonstrates the importance of these institutions in Roman society despite Rome's increasing domination and incorporation of foreign peoples into its citizenry. Such accounts of isolation and exile, removing them physically from their civic environment, demonstrate the significance of the civic space of the *forum Romanum* and its associated buildings and monuments as an integral component of the expression of their Roman identity. It is in this respect that public buildings and monuments can be understood as part of the cultural fabric of Rome, fulfilling not just a utilitarian, but also a cultural, purpose for the city's inhabitants.

¹³⁵ Hardie (2006) 93. See, also: Grebe (2010) 491-510. Cf. Ovid's *Ex Ponto* 1.8.33-8: listing the fora, theatres, and temples, discussed in Edwards (1996) 123-124 as representative of civilization with the fora representing business, the temples - respect for the gods, and the theatres - entertain the citizens.

¹³⁶ Hardie (2006) 93.

¹³⁷ For further reference to the Forum as a specifically Roman institution in juxtaposition to foreign lands, see: *Cic. Agr.* 2.27.

The Problem of Popular Participation: Symbolic or Real?

Having established the importance of civic space and public buildings for Rome's elite, it is now necessary to consider Rome's wider population and their participation in these spaces. In doing so, it is necessary to acknowledge the controversial nature of evidence regarding popular political participation. Scholars disagree on the role of the *Populus* and their level of participation in political discourse. Mouritsen heavily criticizes Millar's 'democratic' interpretation of Roman politics in which he says Millar wrongly interprets the people's ideological importance as a true reflection of their actual political powers. He claims that a firm democracy centered on the political institutions and the paradox of an elite 'aristocracy' cohabitating with a democracy is simply untenable given the evidence.¹³⁸ Mouritsen also states that the great distance between the elite and the populace meant that the scale of popular political participation in assemblies and meetings in the late republic was largely symbolic.¹³⁹ Similarly, Morstein-Marx warns that Millar's interpretation is too simplistic in its acceptance of the idea that the Roman political system was based on popular power that pushed orators to seek popular gratification and that he 'presumes' a relationship between the orator and audience.¹⁴⁰ However Morstein-Marx does accept that popular favour played an important role in the formation of legislation and that forms of audience manipulation such as *claqueurs*, used to present a veneer of the voice and the will of the People, prove the importance of popular legitimation.¹⁴¹ Importantly, his discussion on the civic knowledge of the people and the orator's adaptation of historical details and events to suit his popular audience acknowledges and successfully demonstrates some degree of participation.¹⁴² This point also weakens Mouritsen's argument for a purely symbolic participation of the people, since adaptation of historical material in speeches would not be required if the speaker was not concerned with his popular audience understanding him.

¹³⁸ Mouritsen (2001) 3.

¹³⁹ Mouritsen (2001) 34.

¹⁴⁰ Morstein-Marx (2004) 14.

¹⁴¹ Morstein-Marx (2004) 33.

¹⁴² Morstein-Marx (2004) 68-118: argues that while there was a disparity in knowledge between the Senate and People, this adaptation of reference to historical events by the orator for his audience's benefit is evidence that they were not totally ignorant. See also: Flower (2011) 271-285, particularly 271-275: discussing the ever changing and evolving system of republican (and imperial) government. However citing the importance of group deliberation (at least nominally) and the consensus of the crowd for elite self-representation as a consistent feature throughout the republican period.

Hölkeskamp, while acknowledging that access to public speaking was restricted to an elite few, presents the institutions, rituals, and procedures associated with the public nature of Roman politics as evidence for a tangible and engaged public audience, incorporating a wider scope than simply magistrates and senators.¹⁴³ Although Mouritsen does not deny an increase in popular focus in the late second century BCE, he views the idea of an increase in their *actual participation* in political assemblies and meetings as problematic. He maintains that this was largely driven by factions, led by elites and champions of the people, rejecting Meier's claim for a *plebs contionalis*.¹⁴⁴ Morstein-Marx while accepting a large participation by urban *plebs*, argues for a highly variable crowd at *contiones*, incorporating a wider portion of Rome's social spectrum.

Mouritsen also questions the accuracy of the diverse social group inhabiting the forum in Plautus' *Curculio* and suggests it is too idealized; the basis of his principal thesis that the Forum was occupied primarily by the elites and the wealthy and therefore popular participation was minimal. In addition Mouritsen compares Plautus' passage with the energetic and industrious *boni* of Quintus Cicero's *Commentariolum Petitionis*, which he cites as partial evidence for the cleaning up of the Forum, leading to the exclusion of the *plebs*.¹⁴⁵ In contrast, Morstein-Marx's acceptance of the passage as evidence for diversity highlights the problem of differing opinion in the interpretation of primary evidence.

A lack of precise evidence regarding exactly who constituted 'The People' makes the problem of popular participation almost impossible to determine at this present time. Presumably, in order for Plautus to connect with his audience, there needed to have been some degree of accuracy in his presentation of the Forum and its inhabitants, but again, 'who' were his true audience? Given the multiplicity of function of the *forum Romanum*, there is certainly no evidence for a monoculture or a purely elite inhabitation of this space in the mid-late republic. It is clear that the political nature of this civic space was in a constant state of renewal from its very inception and that the size of its political inhabitants grew over time, requiring an architectural shift in *contional* space.¹⁴⁶ Furthermore, there is no

¹⁴³ Hölkeskamp (2010) 71-75.

¹⁴⁴ Mouritsen (2001) 39. For pro-*plebs contionalis* cf Morstein-Marx (2004) 128, n.52; see: Meier (1966) 114-115; Brunt (1966) 24-25; Perelli (1982) 207-15; Vanderbroeck (1987) 83-84, 86-93; Pina Polo (1996) 129-33; Tatum (1999) 143.

¹⁴⁵ Plaut. *Curc.* 466-484; Cic. *Comm.* 29; Mouritsen (2001) 43-45.

¹⁴⁶ Discussed below: 47.

evidence to suggest that one had to be actively involved on a continual basis to ‘participate’ within the civic space of Rome. The degree to which one interacted with these institutions, public buildings, and structures must surely have varied, depending on a multitude of factors.¹⁴⁷ Drawing on the following discussion regarding a shift in political focus, this study will take the cautious approach between the polarity of Millar’s largely democratic (untenable) view and Mouritsen’s purely symbolic view of the People’s participation, since although the actual degree of political participation is impossible to discern, Romans did acknowledge a popular *right* to participate.

Shifting Political Focus

In order to understand the social, political, and cultural significance of civic buildings, structures, and public space at Rome, it is important to consider *how* and to *what degree* they were utilized. Changing political focus from the early to late republic dictated changes to the orientation and significance of public space. This political shift is an important consideration for this study since an understanding of the relationship and interaction between the politically elite and their mass audience helps shape our understanding of the significance of the spaces involved in activities of mass communication.¹⁴⁸

The exact configuration of the Comitium (and Curia) during the republican period is controversial and has significant implications for understanding the elite/popular nature of the space. Coarelli suggests a complete reconstruction of the Comitium in the first half of the third century BCE, resulting in the circular shape and tiered seating that would last until the end of the republic, with the configuration corresponding respectively to the Rostra and the Graecostasis.¹⁴⁹ Carafa instead argues that the Comitium of the mid-to-late republic retained its triangular shape and remained largely unchanged until the major reconstructions initiated by Caesar (with the exception of the construction of the speaker’s platform in the early/mid second century BCE), meaning less space for gatherings.¹⁵⁰ Again problematically, Carafa in his topographic and stratigraphical analysis of the area suggests that the Curia was constructed on a ten-metre high rock outcrop overlooking the

¹⁴⁷ For discussion regarding the multifarious nature of such considerations, see: Tatum (1999) 30-31.

¹⁴⁸ Caesar’s forum complex, as an expression of his autocratic dictatorship, illustrates this point well and is discussed in the following chapters.

¹⁴⁹ Coarelli (2007) 53.

¹⁵⁰ Carafa (1998) 132-155, and (2005) 135-149: summarized in English in Morstein-Marx (2004) 42-60.

Comitium.¹⁵¹ Carafa's claims are important as the combination of the limited triangular space (allowing for some 3000 voters compared to a suggested 5000¹⁵²) and dominating Curia would indicate a continued elite authority throughout this period.

Fortunately details regarding the Rostra appear to be less problematic and provide some evidence for a shift toward a more popular political focus. The Rostra, built in 338 BCE, between the Comitium and Forum on the existing platform, symbolised victory against the rebellious Latins (*rostra* from captured ships from Antium).¹⁵³ Importantly, the *rostra* were not erected in the Curia, but in the Comitium (on the Speaker's Platform) where speakers would deliver important speeches and address the people gathered to vote there (and eventually in the forum proper in 145 BCE). This significant event does represent a period of rapid political change at Rome, resulting in a shift in architectural focus, suggesting that the Comitium became the spatial epicentre of political life with magistrates addressing crowds from the Rostra. While this choice of location for the display of Roman victory does not prove Millar's claims for a functioning political body, exercising fully its sovereign powers, it does indicate an increasing significance in the ostensible role of the *Populus* in mid-late republican politics by the increased space provided for their assembly. If Carafa's claims are correct, it is worth considering that the Rostra was a deliberate move by the elite to encourage a popular venue from which to advertise their *popular* causes and legislation – hence its elaborate monumentalization.

Crowds gathered in the forum for *contiones* had the opportunity to increase their political knowledge through listening to orators. This was one of the few avenues for many citizens to gain political knowledge and information on which to base their votes.¹⁵⁴ In this sense, the *contio* provided the platform for the point of contact between the two political entities of the republic: the elite and the people.¹⁵⁵ Since all legislation was passed by popular vote in the republic, the *contio* functioned as a vital means for the politically elite to impress their

¹⁵¹ Carafa (1998) 140, n. 50.

¹⁵² Carafa (1998) 140; Mouritsen (2001) 19; Patterson (2010) 217-218.

¹⁵³ Morstein-Marx (2004) 42-60.

¹⁵⁴ Morstein-Marx (2004) 71. The role of orator as a public figure was considered vitally important for obtaining many of the senior positions of the *cursus honorum* and as such was deeply embedded in the political climate of the Republic, making venues of public speaking vitally important spaces also.

¹⁵⁵ Morstein-Marx (2004) 6-7.

cause upon the citizens and for the citizens to express their voice.¹⁵⁶ Of course the unevenly divided and timocratic class system of the *comitia centuriata* meant voting for such legislation was also categorically uneven in favour of the elite. However, the open and public nature of the Comitium provided the space for at least a partial representation of their voice. Furthermore, this shift away from the Curia, and therefore away from the Senate, would continue as the development of the *forum Romanum* progressed and venues for the delivery of political speeches became monumentalized and legitimized:

Manius mane suscitāt, rostrum sub rostra adfert, populum in forum conducit.

Manius rises early, alights the platform under the ship prows, he draws the people into the forum. (Varro. *Men.* (Manius XI (16) [Riese 158])

Varro's wordplay of *rostrum* and *sub rostra* makes a linguistic distinction between the Speaker's Platform and the monumental ships' beaks adorning the area, highlighting their symbolic significance to Rome as Victor. As discussed, this manipulation and adornment of public space to deliver a political message began the process of monumentalization in the area.¹⁵⁷ This important point highlights the significance and incorporation of public politics into Roman identity and daily life, eventually leading to monumentalization and spatial manipulation for individual political gain.

In the same way, the political use of temple space for the delivery of *contiones* further increased the significance and focus of the Forum as a popular assembly point, moving away from the senatorial space of the Curia. Gatherings shifted focus in c.200 BCE from the meeting places of the Senate (Curia and Comitium), to the more popular focused assemblies of public meetings and legislative assemblies. Crowds now convened at the Temple of Castor, after orators had begun to turn away from the Curia-Comitium complex to address the people gathered in the Forum itself for *contiones*. Finally, the construction of the *Gradus Aurelii* (Tribunal Aurelium) in c.74 BCE cemented the changes away from a senatorial, to a

¹⁵⁶ See: Morstein-Marx (2004) 1-33, 119-159; Mouritsen (2001) 45- 61: for discussion regarding current debate over the degree of sway held by the people's voice. The salient point for this discussion is the importance of fora providing public space for such vital activities in the Republic.

¹⁵⁷ Morstein-Marx (2004) 34-67, particularly 47; Millar (1989) 141, 59-60: for the Rostra as the favoured location for *contiones*.

more popular, focus.¹⁵⁸ It is hard to imagine that such topographical and architectural changes could have occurred without some element of functional purpose.

The mid-republican *Lex Latina Tabulae Bantinae* 17 (c.133-100 BCE), stating that magistrates are to swear ‘at the steps of the Temple of Castor, facing the forum in the presence of the gods’, as well as the *Lex Gabina Calpurnia de Insula Delo* 2 (58 BCE), also discussing oath-taking at the Temple of Castor, coincide with the shift of focus within the civic space of the Forum. Standing at the steps of the temple meant that the magistrate would be swearing an oath in one of the most public places in Rome, not in the enclosed space of the Curia or a temple.¹⁵⁹ Here, such actions took place in full view of the gods and the men of Rome.

Much of the historical tradition regarding the political history of early Rome is unclear and problematic, making it difficult to accurately account for the exact reason/s for such a political shift. A possible contributing factor to the earlier shift in architectural orientation and political focus are the developments of the fifth and, more likely, the fourth centuries (beginning c.449 BCE), remembered - perhaps anachronistically - by ancient historians (particularly Livy, Dionysius of Halicarnassus) as a significant period of social unrest between patricians and plebeians. The so-called Conflict of the Orders over the Licinio-Sextian Rogations is thought to have resulted in the creation of an independent plebeian assembly (*concilium plebis*) and a new set of annual officials for the plebeian movement, including the tribune of the *plebs*, sanctioned by the *Lex Sacrata*, and the office of the aedile, creating an important political body. Although there is much controversy regarding actual events and details, this plebeian movement is thought to have instigated many significant political changes throughout its gradual development and scholars do agree that the *real* struggle appears to have been between the very rich and the poor, rather than between patricians and plebeians.¹⁶⁰ The fact that Livy and Dionysius chose to emphasize

¹⁵⁸ Sumi (2009) 170. For the changing political focus of the Forum in the late republic, see also: Hölkeskamp (2004) 12-22; Mouritsen (2001) 43-44, for debate regarding the ‘cleaning up of the Forum, excluding *plebs* and encouraging business, see particularly 44; Morstein-Marx (2004), particularly: 34-67 and 119-158.

¹⁵⁹ Crawford (1996) 207.

¹⁶⁰ Cornell (1995) 242-245, 327-344: suggests the aediles of the plebs were associated with the Temple of Ceres, Liber and Libera on the Aventine. Dionysius of Halicarnassus (6.17.2-4): claims that the temple was vowed by a patrician after the battle of lake Regillus and that it was dedicated in the year following the first secession by the consul Sp. Cassius, a popular leader, as a consequence of a food shortage. Cornell suggests the aediles of the plebs were associated with the Temple of Ceres, Liber and Libera on the Aventine. Cornell draws this conclusion from association with Ceres as the goddess of grain, stating that food shortages were a

the polarity of power of the two parties in their accounts of these events is important for this thesis since, regardless of the reality, their accounts do represent a tradition and ideology of popular (rather than purely plebeian) political struggle and eventual influence against a patricio-plebeian nobility in the early-mid republic. The chronology for the gradual development and shifting orientation of the Comitium is more reliable, as discussed above, with the major turning point being 338 BCE when construction of the Rostra influenced the third century reconstruction of the Comitium, completing the shift in orientation away from the Curia to face the Forum and 'The People'. The dates for the Conflict of the Orders, as modern scholars understand them, coincide with the architectural shift in orientation found in the Forum, strengthening an argument for an element of popular participation in the development of Roman politics.¹⁶¹ It seems unlikely that the Conflict of the Orders was a complete fabrication, and the argument for a struggle between a wealthy nobility and a poor majority appears well supported. Although the exact details of Rome's early history make definitive statements impossible it seems entirely logical that such a struggle should be reflected in the architecture of the city's political center, demonstrating an established tradition and a popular political presence at Rome.

In Sum

Cicero's expression of the *civitas*, *cultus*, and *humanitas* of the great city demonstrates the importance of this civic centre and its structures as a tangible expression of Roman identity, membership, and belonging in late republican society. Similarly, this Roman identity is juxtaposed with the *otherness* of those outside this civic sphere in discussions of exile, again highlighting the buildings and institutions of Rome as markers of civic identity. The changing spatial focus of the forum in the late second century BCE, while controversial, does signify the emerging role of the People in Roman politics towards the late second century, whether as a deliberate 'construction' by the elite or as a consequence of their actual emerging active political role. Regardless of the degree to which they actively participated this spatial shift does demonstrate what an important political tool the *Populus* had become for magistrates as a public expression of support for their individual causes and

big concern at Rome between 508-384 BCE, affecting particularly the plebs. Raaflaub (2005) 31: believes the evidence for such record keeping is lacking and questions the validity of a debt crisis. Cornell's claims that after 449 BCE decrees of the Senate were entrusted to the plebeian aediles and stored in the temple (Liv. 3.55.13) are disputed by Kurt Raaflaub (2005) 1-46, 31.

¹⁶¹ See: Purcell (1995) *LTUR* II, 327.

more importantly for this discussion, what an important political tool public buildings and civic space had become for individual magistrates in pursuit of popular support for their causes. Such a change in topographical focus is difficult to accept without acknowledgement of some degree of popular participation.

CONCLUSION

The topographical development of the *forum Romanum* from the mid-seventh century began the process of the urbanization and economic, political, religious, and cultural unification of Rome. The Curia Hostilia as the official home of the Senate defined the civic space of the early Forum politically, while the protective role of Jupiter Optimus Maximus on the Capitoline, overlooking this space, defined and sanctioned the sacred nature of the city centre. As a topographic representation of the cultural values, religious ceremony, and political authority of the Roman State, this temple unified and defined the city, providing the basis for the creation of a powerful civic identity. The embedded nature of politics and religion evident in Roman civic construction, continued throughout the republic resulting in the development of a fixed civic template regarding public building, reflected not so much in Rome but in many *Roman* cities outside of Rome itself. The process of monumentalization at Rome also reflects the embedded nature of Roman politics and religion, beginning with the celebration of Rome's collective greatness through state-sanctioned structures, to the eventual personalization of public works through the development of inscriptions for self-promotion and the appropriation of particular divinities (by association with particular buildings) by individuals in order to press specific political messages. It is this process of urbanization and unification that ultimately defined and shaped the cultural and civic identity of Roman citizens, reflected in their personal identification with the city's buildings and monuments. Finally, the shifting architectural orientation of the civic centre from Curia-Comitium to Comitium-Forum, coinciding with the political events of the fifth-fourth centuries BCE, strongly suggests an ostensible incorporation of a popular body into the political arena of Rome and their accommodation within the built environment of the city. Such considerations inform the following chapters as discussion narrows to focus on the late republican precinct of the *forum Iulium* in Chapter Two, considering its social, political, and cultural significance, before turning to the place of

public buildings as benefactions and their significance to individual magistrates in Chapter Three.

CHAPTER TWO

JULIUS AND CAESAR: SPACIAL SPECIALIZATION AND THE INDIVIDUAL IN THE LATE REPUBLIC

The devolution of the retail function was assisted by the ‘imperial’ fora: with the new political significance of the cultivation of *forensis dignitas*...¹

Chapter One demonstrated that the *forum Romanum* symbolized the collective power of Rome, expressing notions of belonging and membership. The multiplicity of function of the forum space served Rome’s citizens in practical and varied ways, reflecting disparities in the wealth, status, and social standing of its inhabitants. Monumentalization of the Forum advertised Rome the city-state, highlighting the individual as a reflection of a collective civic-pride and cultural identity. This chapter will outline key aspects of Caesar’s *forum Iulium* in order to determine the degree to which it departed from the traditional institutions of Roman civic architecture, shifting focus from Rome the city-state to that of the individual. A brief outline of the suggested layout of Caesar’s forum-temple complex based on archaeological evidence from the Caesarian period will form the beginning of this study and will draw predominately from the contributions of Morselli, Purcell, and Gros in the *Lexicon Topographicum Urbis Romae* II, as well as the work of Ulrich.² Considering this archaeological picture in combination with the scant literary evidence,³ Section One will attempt to determine the possible activities and functions of this complex during the late republican period (particularly the Caesarian period). Specific attention will be given here to analysis of the architectural features of the portico, forecourt, and the so-called ‘tabernae’ in understanding this space.⁴ Section Two will discuss Rome’s tradition of manubial construction, placing the forum and its temple in the context of this long established Roman tradition. The highly individualized nature of this complex challenged the traditional relationship of vowing general and sanctioning Senate, shifting focus from senatorial control to that of the individual. Section Three will then address the issue of civic identity within the *forum Iulium* with emphasis on Caesar’s use of monumentalization to advertise his unique

¹ Purcell, *LTUR* II, 334. McGinn (2007) 248, n.35: describes the phrase *forensis dignitas* as the social and moral stature of the Forum.

² For further discussion regarding this point, see: Purcell, *LTUR* II, 336.

³ Vitruvius, Cicero, Augustus, and Ovid are the only contemporary (or near contemporary) literary sources for the complex, while Suetonius, Pliny the Elder, Appian, and Dio Cassius provide some later evidence.

⁴ The exact function of these chambers is not known however, they are often referred to as ‘tabernae’. I shall refer to them as such in this thesis.

relationship to Venus. Discussion will then consider the ways in which this personalized space may have challenged the traditional institutions of the republic by altering how Roman citizens participated and interacted culturally and politically within this civic space.

ARCHAEOLOGICAL PICTURE

Investigation of the *forum Iulium* is complicated since very little original archaeological material exists. Most remains date to the first century CE or later, and any attempt to reconstruct the original appearance in its entirety with complete certainty is impossible at this stage.⁵ Caesarian construction appears to have occurred in two successive phases: 54-46 BCE (phase one) and 46-44 BCE (phase two).⁶ This section will provide a brief survey of what is known of the archaeological remains of the complex, including aspects of the temple and podium, portico, forecourt, and tabernae, in order to understand its basic structural layout.

Podium and Temple of Venus Genetrix

The podium, dominating the northwest (short-end) of the *forum Iulium*, appears to have been constructed mainly in concrete. It was faced with ashlar of reddish 'Anio' tufa towards the front and un-faced at the rear, as it was embedded into the hillside.⁷ Much of the façade and partition walls of the ground-level chambers appear to date to the Caesarian phase.⁸ The podium itself stood 5 metres from the level of the forecourt, constructed of tufa faced in marble.⁹ The façade is thought to have acted as a speaker's platform, standing

⁵ Ulrich (1993) 49.

⁶ See: Appendix 1, figs. 1 and 2. A detailed discussion of the first and second phases of Caesarian construction is outside the remit of this thesis. Where necessary I will discuss dates and phases in discussion below. However, for a schematic outline of the two Caesarian phases, see also: *LTUR* II, fig. 130, 468, showing the plan of reconstruction of the south corner of the *portico*.

⁷ Ulrich (1993) 58-59, figs. 3 and 5: the rear of the podium remained engaged with the hill (concrete simply poured into the ground at the rear) and un-faced during the Caesarian period. It was finished sometime after the Caesarian period when a proper right angle was added, exposing the rear of the podium (Ulrich, 1993, fig. 4) and facing stones finished the corners. Later imperial construction is indicated by the variety of materials used: un-bonded seams of concrete, embedded features, the facing stones, and revetment traces; later additions to the rear of the podium seem to include ashlar of travertine.

See also: Appendix 1, figs. 1 and 2.

⁸ Ulrich (1993) 50.

⁹ Morselli, *LTUR* II, 302. Ulrich (1993) 75: gives the height of the podium from the top of the temple stylobate at almost 6 metres. The complexity of such assessments, construed from scant remains, means that it is nearly impossible to be exactly accurate. For the purposes of this discussion I have taken the height from Morselli, *LTUR* II, 299-306 at 5 metres from the level of the forum forecourt.

approximately 3.5 metres high at the front of the temple structure, unencumbered by frontal stairs.¹⁰

The nucleus of the podium, a stairway and a small portion of the cella are all that remain of the temple.¹¹ The apse of the posterior portion of the temple spanned the land between the Capitoline and Quirinal hills. Fortunately, Vitruvius (*Arch.* 3.3.1) talks about the dimensions of the columns of the temple and their spacing in reasonably specific terms. He discusses the closely set columnisation (*pycnostyle*), which he states restricted access, a configuration of eight columns (*octastyle*) across the front of the temple and eight along the sides, with the back side blind (*peripteros sine postico*), built into the slopes of the Capitoline. Access to the temple was via two lateral stairs recessed into the podium in *opus caementicium*, leading into the *pronaos* of the temple.¹² Evidence for the cella consists of very few tufa foundations and plinths of the supporting columns.¹³

Evidence for the possible substructure of a fountain in the form of shallow beddings preserved in the travertine paving stones at the front-base of the podium is thought to date to the Augustan period.¹⁴ Ovid (*Ars Am.* 1.79-88, 3.447-452) discusses the Appiades nymphs and maritime associations such as shells, tridents, and acanthus foliage on the sculpture of the *sima* (upturned roof edge), as well as mention of the actual spraying fountains. Both reports complement the story of the birth of Venus and suggest a possible late republican-early imperial dating as a realization of Caesar's original plans.¹⁵

Portico

The raised portico formed a roofed colonnaded walkway surrounding the rectangular complex on three sides, completed by the temple at the northwest end.¹⁶ Access to the

¹⁰ Ulrich (1993) 59. 75. See, also: Appendix 1, fig. 6.

¹¹ Morselli, *LTUR* II, 302.

¹² From here additional stairs led to the frontal steps of the *pronaos*, although the date is unclear. Morselli, *LTUR* II, 302; Gros, *LTUR* II, 307; Appendix 1, fig. 6.

¹³ Morselli, *LTUR* II, 302, fig. 139.

¹⁴ For reconstruction, see: Appendix 1, fig. 5.

¹⁵ Ulrich (1986) 405-423. Although the actual remains of the fountain are thought to date roughly to the first and second centuries CE, Ovid provides good reason to suggest at least an Augustan dating, if not part of the original paving, with a later reconstruction providing the later remains. Ovid and the fountain are discussed below in relation to the judicial activities of the *forum Iulium*: 71-73.

¹⁶ See: Appendix 1, fig. 4.

portico appears to have been via steps, with traces of a drain system for collecting and channelling rainwater, evidenced by small channels and drain lids found behind the first step.¹⁷ Although only traces of the portico remain (Corinthian columns spaced 4.45 or 4.55 metres apart in the internal columns and 1.5 metres in diameter), indicated only by modest amounts of fragments of white marble, Morselli discusses the probability that two naves were situated on the long sides of the rectangle and one nave on the short side. The nave on the short side appears to have functioned as the principal access onto and from the Argiletum.¹⁸ On the two long sides of the portico there is evidence of a continuous basement running underneath. Travertine or marble walls, necessary to sustain the cover of the naves, closed off the long sides of the portico from the outside. It is assumed that this cover was formed by the entablature, which Morselli claims functioned to give a complete sense of a new complex, separate from the republican forum on the south side.¹⁹ The block walls of the chambers of the tabernae formed the parameter wall of the northwest portico. The portico then concluded at the North end with an apse preceded by four pillars and another apse of smaller dimensions occupied the residual space of the forecourt/piazza between the portico and the podium of the temple.²⁰

Forecourt

The floor of the forecourt or forum proper spanned approximately 110 x 45 metres and was constructed of travertine slabs of variable dimensions, thickness, and size. These features were well connected with each other by their similarity in design.²¹ Its main axis ran northwest to southeast and terminated at the Northwest end at the podium of the Temple of Venus Genetrix.

¹⁷ Morselli, *LTUR* II, 302.

¹⁸ Morselli, *LTUR* II, 302. Amici, discussed by Morselli (*LTUR* II, 468, fig. 129), provides a different reconstruction: that there were actually two naves on the short side of white marble and that all the columns on the Argiletum side supported the naves. Amici states that the exterior columns on the Argiletum side were different to the internal columns of the portico.

¹⁹ Morselli, *LRUR* II 302, figs.130-132. The foundations of the tabernae were built in cement similar to the external wall running along their length and are thought to be of a later date.

²⁰ Morselli, *LTUR* II, 302, fig.131, 469.

²¹ For discussion of the stone, see: Morselli, *LTUR* II, 302; Claridge (2010) 164: gives the rectangular space as 115 x 45 metres which appears to include the Augustan extension. I have 110 metres in length excluding this. Corelli (2007) 105: gives 160 x 75 metres to include both the rectangular space of the forum proper, inclusive of both the width of the portico on either side, *and* the temple space.

Tabernae

The dating for these structures is unclear. Morselli and Ulrich, from the reckonings of Amici, state that the chambers were formed in the second Caesarian phase of construction (after the portico) by cutting into the slopes of the Capitoline hill on the west side of the Forum, suited to a hurried form of construction.²² Ulrich gives the block wall construction in ashlar of Gabine stone, a material known for its strength and fireproof qualities, used from the period of Caesar onwards.²³ Morselli states that the walls were built in Peperino stone. The foundations of the chambers were built in cement in common with the external wall with imprints of the big blocks still visible.²⁴

In Sum

The Caesarian phase of construction reveals a rectangular-shaped, axial-oriented precinct of at least 110 x 45 metres. The complex was comprised of a large open rectangular floor space (forecourt) as the forum proper, a raised continuous portico surrounding three sides of the entire complex, in addition to several chambers or *tabernae* running along the north-west parameter wall, and an *octostyle* temple, dedicated to Venus Genetrix, on a high, unencumbered podium. The rectangular form of Caesar's forum is not in itself surprising; it looked like a forum. As Morselli states, however, the rigidly frontal and axially oriented complex provides clues to Caesar's intentions, capturing the verticality and height of the building as a dominant element and central feature of the entire *forum (Iulium)*.²⁵

²² Ulrich (1993) 70; Morselli, *LTUR* II, 302: Both give Amici's (1991) dating of this (46-44 BCE).

²³ Ulrich (1993) 79: discusses evidence of square cuttings in the partition walls of the chambers and a second story of chambers communicating with the Clivus Argentarius (street), rather than the Forum that appears to have been constructed in reddish Anio tufa. Ulrich states both levels date to the first century BCE, however, he does not offer a precise date.

²⁴ Morselli, *LTUR* II, 302.

²⁵ Morselli, *LTUR* II, 302.

SECTION ONE

FORENSIS DIGNITAS: UNDERSTANDING THE SPACE

Evidence for how the Temple of Venus Genetrix itself functioned in the Caesarian period is also limited and little is known about *who* used the space of the *forum Iulium* or *how* it was utilised. Ostensibly, the temple functioned as a victory monument, vowed by Caesar before the battle of Pharsalus, celebrating Caesar's (and Rome's) victory.²⁶ As a public building, the temple also provided a place of worship as Vitruvius's (*Arch.* 3.3.1) mention of matrons paying respects there demonstrates.²⁷ However, this cannot have been Caesar's only intention for the space. Dio (44.8) and Suetonius (*Iul.* 78) provide the literary reference to the political use of the *forum Iulium*, reporting that Caesar received the Senate in the vestibule of the Temple of Venus Genetrix when they had come to present him with honours: *cum plurimis honorificentissimisque decretis*. Anderson cites these passages from Dio and Suetonius as evidence for the temple as a meeting place for the Senate. However, since the Senate were only able to meet in temples, any temple could be labelled a meeting place. Furthermore, the passages could be referring to a one-off event since reference to Caesar seated before the Temple of Venus Genetrix means he was on the high podium in front of the temple chamber and suggests an official or ceremonial occasion, rather than the daily political administration of the *res publica*.²⁸ Additionally, there is no support for the total transference of political function to Caesar's complex in the dictator's lifetime, since political affairs and matters of business were still being conducted in various other parts of the city.²⁹

²⁶ Discussed below: 81-82.

²⁷ The first known temple to Venus, 'Venus Obsequens', was vowed in 295 BCE. The goddess' role grew during the Punic wars and by the first century BCE her political value is evidenced by Sulla, Pompey, and Caesar: Hornblower and Spawforth (2003) 1587; Orlin (2007) 67-70; Beard *et al.* (1998) I, 114-166; Wallensten (2010) 269-284.

²⁸ Anderson (1984) 52; Patterson (2010) 227: states that by contrast to the *forum Romanum*, activities in imperial fora were predominately ceremonial, however he adds that judicial and business matters were conducted in them. As discussed, activities in the *forum Iulium* are particularly difficult to determine due to a paucity of evidence. Caesar was perhaps sitting on a gold curule chair and wearing a purple toga if the passage from Nicholas of Damascus (*Aug.* 21), describing Caesar in the *forum Romanum*, is correct. Suetonius' treatment of this incident is discussed below.

²⁹ The most notable of course would have to be the senate house at Pompey's theatre where Caesar was assassinated while meeting with the Senate.

The Specialization of Space

As a contemporary of Caesar and one involved personally in the project, Cicero provides surprisingly limited discussion of the project's function and political significance:

Paulus in medio foro basilicam iam paene texerat isdem antiquis columnis, illam autem quam locavit facit magnificentissimam. Quid quaeris? Nihil gratius illo monumento, nihil gloriosius. Itaque Caesaris amici, me dico et Oppium dirumparis licet, <in> monumentum illud quod tu tollere laudibus solebas, ut forum laxaremus et usque ad atrium Libertatis explicaremus, contempsimus sescenties sestertium; cum privatis non poterat transigi minore pecunia. Efficiemus rem gloriosissimam.

Paulus has nearly covered his basilica now in the middle of the Forum, with the same antique pillars. However, the one that he contracted out, he is making most magnificently. Why do you ask? Nothing is more pleasing, or more glorious than that monument. Anyway, friends of Caesar (as in Oppius and I - you can laugh out loud if you want) easily spent sixty million sesterces on that monument which you were holding up in praise to expand the Forum and extend it right up to the Hall of Liberty; since it was not able to be finished with less funds by the (other) individuals. We will produce a most glorious structure. (Cic. Att. 4.16.8.1-12)³⁰

His use of *laxare* and *explicare* suggests that the project involved simply expanding and extending the *forum Romanum*, not creating an entirely new one. Importantly, Cicero is writing in 54 BCE, before the advent of the spatially separate precincts of the imperial fora. Therefore if Caesar had intended to construct an entirely new and separate forum, separate from the city's politically and socially central *forum Romanum*, one would expect Cicero to mention such an innovation in this particular passage, which he does not.³¹ Cicero is also writing before Caesar had vowed the Temple of Venus Genetrix in 48 BCE and makes no mention of it. If Cicero *had* known about Caesar's intentions for a temple before Caesar had openly vowed it (if that is what Cicero means by *monumentum*), it is odd that he does not mention it, given that the temple would become the dominating feature of the *forum Iulium*. Perhaps his silence on the matter suggests its later conception.³² Similarly, the fact that Cicero does not discuss its social and political significance would indicate that the *forum Iulium in toto* was not considered a separate or distinctly independent civic space from the *forum Romanum* until closer to, or after, Caesar's death (coinciding with his increased political authority reflected in his dictatorships of 49 and 44 BCE). Purcell's suggestion that

³⁰ Shackleton Bailey (1965) vol. 2, 205, n. 5: takes *illud monumentum* as 'memorial', referring to the *forum Iulium* and states that it need not apply to a 'positive building'.

³¹ See also: Purcell (1993) 125-130; Millar (1998) 176-177; Ulrich (1993) 49-80; Zanker (2009) 290.

³² This is the view of both Purcell (1993) and Ulrich (1993).

monumentum may actually refer to Caesar's intention for some form of structure commemorating his Gallic campaigns must also be considered a strong possibility.³³

Of course it is important to consider Cicero's presentation of this project in its full political context since his reliance at this time on Pompey and Caesar for his political survival must surely have coloured his presentation of it. For example, his choice of the verbs *laxare* and *explicare*, in conjunction with the adjective *gloriosius* that describe the project, also function to emphasize Caesar's euergetism to Rome by presenting his venture as a beneficial development of Rome's existing civic space, rather than the exclusive domain of a rising dictator.³⁴

In contrast to Cicero's presentation, Appian, drawing from Herodotus' (1.153³⁵) description of the Persians, provides the only specifically descriptive account of the utility of the space, emphasizing its official and specialized nature:

Καὶ τέμενος τῷ νεῷ περιέθηκεν, ὃ Ῥωμαίοις ἔταξεν ἀγορὰν εἶναι, οὐ τῶν ὀνίων, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ πράξεσι συνιόντων ἐς ἀλλήλους, καθὰ καὶ Πέρσαις ἦν τις ἀγορὰ ζητοῦσιν ἢ μανθάνουσι τὰ δίκαια.

He laid out ground around the temple, which he intended to be a forum for the Roman people, not for buying and selling, but a meeting-place for the transaction of public business, like the public squares of the Persians, where the people assemble to seek justice or to learn the laws. (BC 2.102)³⁶

Here Appian describes the forum-temple complex functioning as a commercial and judicial centre. Problematically, it is unclear how much of Appian's description of these activities applies to the Caesarian period.³⁷ While providing clues for the *eventual* use of the space, Appian does not indicate whether such specialized activities were actually underway during Caesar's lifetime. As discussed, the complex was actually completed by Augustus, not Caesar.

³³ Purcell (1993) 129. Below: 90; also: 81-82: artwork in Temple of Venus Genetrix from Gallic campaign.

³⁴ Euergetism is discussed at length in Chapter Three. See, particularly 117-119: Cicero's presentation of Caesar's project in relation to his political reliance on Caesar and Pompey.

³⁵ Herodotus is comparing the public spaces of Greeks and Persians here. Greeks had market places, unlike the Persians, who, according to Herodotus, 'never buy in open markets' and 'do not have a single market place'.

³⁶ I have followed the translation from White (1979) 414-417. Interestingly Cicero, in his *Pro Flacco* (57), uses the east as a comparison to highlight the *forum Romanum* as a much more dignified space: 'plenum optimorum virorum et civium'.

³⁷ For discussion regarding the shift in control of courts and law to the emperors and their followers, resulting in new venues, and for evidence of this shift occurring during Caesar's life, see: Patterson (1997) 121-156.

In any case, this distinctive use of space calls for comment, and Appian's use of οὐ 'not' in this passage is particularly interesting here. While he is probably explaining the nature and function of Caesar's forum to his Greek readership, accustomed to the multifarious market places in their Greek *agora* (Herod. 1.153)³⁸, his passage is of particular importance as it provides a *terminus post quem* from which Rome begins to separate everyday market places from the important civic and political spaces of the city, regardless of Caesar's original intentions.³⁹ Appian's emphasis on this aspect, whether intended as an explanation for his Greek audience or not, does signal an innovation for *Roman* civic space. This is not to say that everyday markets of some sort did not function in the complex. However, Appian uses his audience's own familiarity with their multi-functional *agora* to highlight the exclusive nature of this new civic space, demonstrating a more specialized and narrow focus for Caesar's complex. Besides Appian's passage, there is no supporting evidence to suggest Caesar's conscious attempt to exclude everyday retail activities from his space or his intention to build a separate forum. It is possible Appian, as a later source, simply assumed this was Caesar's intention since it had become an entirely independent complex by the time he was writing, with single temple fora well established at Rome.

It is also important to consider that, since Appian (*BC preface* 15) states that he himself was involved in politics in the city of Rome as pleader of causes in the court of the emperors until being made *procurator*, he is also likely to have been familiar with the republican history and the multiplicity of the *forum Romanum*.⁴⁰ In this respect, Appian's emphasis of judicial activities as the principal function of Caesar's complex could also indicate his understanding and acknowledgement of the space as an innovation for Rome. In fact, in writing about the civil wars, it is significant that Appian takes the time to outline Caesar's complex at all since, as stated, he is writing in a period when imperial fora were well

³⁸ Bucher (2000) 438-439: for discussion of Appian's intended Greek audience; Appian (*preface* 13): explains the system of names in Rome: *praenomen*, *nomen*, and *cognomen* - evidence that his Greek readership were at least partly ignorant of some aspects of Roman culture and systems (from Duff. (2003) 118; Carter (1996) xi: for discussion of Appian's Greek audience as generally ignorant of Rome's history and institutions. Although, he does state that some of its members had become Roman senators and consuls, benefiting from imperial patronage, suggesting they had some knowledge of the history of the *forum Romanum* and its multiplicity. See discussion below for Appian's own bicultural (Greek and Roman) background.

³⁹ Below: 64-66: regarding the portico and its function in separating the *forum Iulium* from the rest of the city, particularly the *forum Romanum*.

⁴⁰ See: White (1972) vii: court of the emperors at Rome = probably an *advocatus fisci*. He also states that Appian must have been a Roman citizen of equestrian rank in order to qualify for the position of procurator. Also, see: Gowing (1995) 9-18.

established. His digression here suggests he considered the complex significant in the context of the late republic.⁴¹

Varro's (ap. Non. Marc. 853 L) reference to the replacement of butchers with bankers in the *forum Romanum*, stating that it improved the social and moral stature of the forum - the *forensis dignitas* - reflects a negative and moralizing attitude toward some commercial activities in the late republic.⁴² Although it is difficult to determine, it is possible that Appian was aware of such negative mid-late republican attitudes regarding retail activities when he stressed the specialization of Caesar's precinct and its benefit to the Roman people.

The difference between Appian's presentation of a specialized and separate space, written when imperial fora were already well established and Cicero's (*Att.* 4.16.8.1-12) report of Caesar simply expanding and extending (*laxare* and *explicare*) the existing forum demonstrate the significant political changes that occurred between the end of the republic and the early empire. These changes impacted not only on political processes at Rome, but also the nature and significance of civic space. Although Caesar's own intentions for the space cannot be determined, such developments represent the process of continual political change at Rome, from city-state to increasing individual powers as a precursor to the imperial age of the ruler.⁴³ Furthermore, while Cicero could not know the impact this *extension* would have on Rome's topographical development, Caesar's separate and highly personalized space formed part of an emerging architectural template representing Rome's Great Men (Sulla and Pompey), a template that would greatly influence the architectural choices of Rome's future emperors.

Delineating Space: The Portico as Evidence

Closer analysis of architectural clues such as the portico offers some assistance in understanding the function of the *forum Iulium*. Although porticoed rectilinear urban

⁴¹ Appian (*BC* 2.115, 118.) mentions Pompey's theatre complex (which seems the more radical construction given the opposition to permanent theatres at Rome), only in passing.

⁴² See also: Livy (44.16.10): discussing earlier (pre 310 BCE) attempts to remove butchers from the Forum and their long survival there. Purcell, *LTUR* II, 334: states this earlier attitude described by Livy predates c.310 BCE. *Forensis dignitas*: McGinn (2007) 248.

⁴³ For further discussion of this gradual and continuous cultural and political shift from the late republic to imperial period, see: Wallace-Hadrill (2005) 55-84.

enclosures reflected Hellenistic market buildings and complexes to ruler cults,⁴⁴ the portico as an architectural type was not new to Roman architecture. In fact, Caesar had created similar enclosures for the purpose of his own worship at Alexandria and Cyrene.⁴⁵ Columnar porticoes had increased in number around the mid-republican period as generals began placing them around their manubial temples.⁴⁶ These structures served multiple functions, forming frames for various displays, providing roofed space for social activities, forming backdrops for urban activities, and formally defining the edges of open spaces, as well as combining with other buildings and structures to form architectural ensembles.⁴⁷

Early examples of Roman generals appropriating colonnaded space for self-aggrandizement and preservation of their deeds demonstrate this function of public display,⁴⁸ and suggest a similar function for Caesar's portico. Although we have no extant references to the portico of Caesar's complex, an abundance of contemporary examples of temples and colonnades demonstrate their function as locations for display.⁴⁹ One obvious example is the portico attached to Pompey's theatre, housing many statues, including the famous statue of Pompey at the site of Caesar's assassination (Plut. *Caes.* 66).⁵⁰ Considering this tradition in conjunction with the self-aggrandizing nature of the Temple of Venus Genetrix,⁵¹ it is reasonable to assume that Caesar maximized the use of the space of the portico, adorning it with reminders of his own supremacy as victorious general, in order to press his own propagandist messages and remind the public using it that they were in his domain. Conversely, this type of manubial building project provided the opportunity for Caesar to

⁴⁴ See: Castrèn-Pietilä (1987) 118-122, particularly 121-122: discussing Hellenistic kings impressing the inhabitants of the old centres of Greece with the gift of a stoa.

⁴⁵ Favro (1996) 71, n.113, 72: points out that it is important to remember that placement of the temple at the end of the complex rather than in the middle of the square (as in Hellenistic complexes) gave the complex an Italic feel.

⁴⁶ Welch (2007) 502-502. First attestation is the *Porticus Metelli*: Coarelli (1997) 452-84, figs. 112-114.

⁴⁷ Favro (1996) 169-170. The Theatre of Pompey is a good example of such an architectural ensemble, discussed in Chapter Three: 129-134.

⁴⁸ Livy (40.51.2-8) reports Lepidus (aedile of 179 BCE) removing statues, shields, and standards from numerous colonnades in meaningful locations. See also: Frakes (2009) 25-26: for discussion of this point and the importance for generals in finding places that were already established as meaningful to display their names and images.

⁴⁹ Frakes (2009) 23-25: a function that he points out lasted well into the Imperial period.

⁵⁰ Cic. *Rab. Post.* 42: states that great virtues had to be displayed in great public theatres; (Plin. *NH* 36.4.41): the portico of Pompey's theatre was referred to as *porticus ad nationes* displaying the nations conquered under Pompey's command, similarly, Pliny (*NH* 31.3-6): discusses Cicero erecting statues and colonnades in his name in various locations.

⁵¹ Also discussed below in relation to Monumentalization: 84-91.

advertise his *dignitas* further, not only as savior of Rome, but also as the provider of public beneficence.⁵²

Another important function of the portico may have been its role in isolating Caesar's construction from the rest of the monument-packed *forum Romanum*.⁵³ The long sides of the two-storied portico, closed off from the outside by travertine or marble walls, provide evidence of this function.⁵⁴ Once inside the complex, citizens would be closed off from external contact with the *forum Romanum* and the rest of the city, both visually and physically. The glorifying and propagandist messages of such competing monuments would also be removed from view. Here, Caesar could advertise himself, his achievements, and divine familial ties completely free of external competition.⁵⁵

The size of the forecourt framed by the portico is also an important consideration when analysing the function of this space and the implications for Roman citizens. Firstly, at 110 x 45 metres, this large open space eclipsed the tripartite political structure of the Comitium/Curia Hostilia/Rostra (the late republican political hub), measuring approximately 65 by 48 metres with the actual diameter of the assembly space of the circular comitial area at 30 metres.⁵⁶ Besides the fact that Caesar's forum had appropriated much of the area of the Comitium complex, its ability to accommodate large crowds would give Roman citizens a logical and legitimate reason to assemble in his space, challenging the significance of alternative sites for political gatherings. The implications of the size of this space are intensified when comparing the forecourt of the *forum Iulium* to other porticoed civic

⁵² See: Muccigrosso (2006) 191; See also: Cic. *Phil.* 2.116 :for his listing of the ways Caesar bound the people to him through his beneficence, including buildings; Manubial construction is discussed below: 75-83. Euergetism is the topic of Chapter Three; with particular focus on Caesar lending money to magistrates for acts of euergetism and the associated *gratia* such loans incurred: 113-121.

⁵³ For further discussion regarding the 'delineating' function of porticoes, see: Nünnerich-Asmus (1994) 78, in Frakes (2009) 8. James Frakes argues for the treatment of porticoes as a single phenomenon and architectural type in architectural literature. Annette Nünnerich-Asmus affirms the multi-functionality of the portico and uses the terms *assimilate* and *differentiate* to define those porticoes built to assimilate varied structures to one another and those built to differentiate them, and as such, argues that they influenced the individual in potentially significant ways.

⁵⁴ Morselli, *LTUR* II, 302.

⁵⁵ Favro (2009) 71-71.

⁵⁶ Taken from *LTUR* I, 469, fig. 182. To give scale to these measurements the original space of the *forum Romanum* (excluding the Comitium/Curia complex) measured approximately 115 x 57: taken from Macadam and Barber (2010) 65.

structures within the *pomerium*, particularly within the *forum Romanum* itself.⁵⁷ For example, Caesar's structure was larger than the rectangular hall of the Basilica Aemilia, which measured only 70 by 29 metres,⁵⁸ and the Basilica Julia, measuring 82 by 18 metres.⁵⁹ These broad, elongated structures were large within the context of the *forum Romanum*, particularly when compared to the size of their much smaller predecessor, the Basilica Porcia. In fact, both basilicae dwarfed their neighbouring structures.⁶⁰

As public works, colonnaded spaces also provided a location for Rome's elite to see and be seen, a particularly important social function. Vitruvius' (*Arch.* 5.1.1) contrast of Greek and Roman colonnaded space in fora indicates that an important function of these Roman columnar spaces was to allow for the viewing of spectacles, as evidenced by the wider spaced columns in Caesar's portico. This function is particularly evident in the second century BCE, in the case of *ludi scaenici*, where these games often appear to have been held in the precinct of the particular god that was being honoured.⁶¹ These wider spaces would also allow for people on the portico to view those assembled or engaged in activity in the forecourt space below. As discussed, in the Caesarian phase of construction the two long sides of the colonnades were widely spaced at 4.5 metres, which would allow for clear viewing into and out of the structure, although the nature of the spectacle intended for viewing is not clear from the evidence.

Tabernae

As stated, the dating of these chambers is unclear, making definitive analysis of their precise function particularly difficult. Appian (*BC* 2.102), once again, provides the only hint of their

⁵⁷ While the rectangular precinct of Pompey's theatre portico measured an impressive 180 x 135 metres (Claridge 2010, 241), I have not included it in this comparison due to its positioning outside the *pomerium* of the city.

⁵⁸ Claridge (2010) 70.

⁵⁹ Claridge (2010) 76. Begun by Caesar in 54 BCE and completed by Augustus. Built on the site of the former Basilica Sempronia.

⁶⁰ See: Ulrich (1993) fig. 1, 52: for scale of basilicae compared to neighbouring structures.

⁶¹ Goldberg (1998) 1-20, particularly, 2-3: cites the *ludi Florales*, *Ceriales*, *Apollinares*, and especially the *ludi Megalenses* of 56 BCE, performed before the Temple of Magna Mater, as examples of games held in the precinct of the god being honoured. Goldberg highlights the accommodation of audiences for such performances as the real challenge in the early-mid Republic (there was an absence of permanent theatres in the period of Terence and Plautus), interpreting the actions of the censors of 179 BCE as examples of porticoes being used to accommodate audiences: Aemilius Lepidus modernizing the columns of the Temple of Jupiter on the Capitol and removing cluttered statues and Fulvius Nobilior building porticoes by the Temple of Hercules, Spes, and Apollo for the *ludi Apollinares* to accommodate the growing crowds.

purpose by suggesting that the principle function of the forum was for business and judicial activities, much like that of the Persians. It is this point that defines the corporate nature of the forum space in general, separating it from the multiplicity and diversity of the neighbouring *forum Romanum*. In this respect the tabernae may have functioned as a component of such judicial or administrative business activities. Suetonius (*Iul.* 20) reports that from the time of Caesar's first consulship transactions of the Senate, previously recorded as informal minutes, began to be recorded in writing. This advent would suggest the need for an official storage site - a point that leads Ulrich to argue for their function as official archives, even if only for a short time.⁶² Ulrich also makes a case for the topographical suitability of such an arrangement, emphasizing the proximity of the *forum Iulium* to the Curia Hostilia and its subsequent contiguity with the later Curia Iulia.⁶³ Ulrich strengthens his claims for an archival function for the tabernae with reference to the fire-resistant quality of the Gabine stone and its suitability for housing important documents.⁶⁴ However, as Ulrich himself states, the chambers were cut so deeply into the Capitoline hill that it is likely they were reasonably damp. Again, due to the difficulty of dating, Ulrich is unable to resolve this issue and it is important to refrain from making assumptions, given the meagre evidence available. It is tempting to suggest however, that Caesar would have been concerned with fire resistance, especially after the Temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus on the Capitoline (known to have housed many documents⁶⁵) was destroyed by fire in 83 BCE and the Temple of the Nymphs, which housed the so-called citizen records, was also burnt down in 58 BCE (Cicero, *Cael.* 78, *Mil.* 73, alleges by Clodius).⁶⁶ Airspace extending behind the rear walls of the rooms and rectangular openings above the flat lintels of the doorways, possibly once filled with grills to allow for airflow (which would deal with Ulrich's problem) cannot be definitively dated to the Caesarian phase.⁶⁷

⁶² See: Ulrich (1993) 79, 97-98: for discussion regarding the traditional storage of public records and their transference to various sites. Ulrich suggest two alternate functions: offices for the Senate and storage facilities for public furniture, however, due to a paucity of evidence this thesis acknowledges, but will not address directly, these suggestions.

⁶³ Ulrich (1993) 78.

⁶⁴ Ulrich (1993) 79.

⁶⁵ Documents stored in the Temple of Jupiter Capitolinus (cited in Culham (1989) 111): instructions for the marking of years (Livy 7.3.5-8), military diplomas (Dio 44.7.1; possibly Livy 40.51.3); decrees (Cic. *Phil.* 2.37); *senatus consulta* (Dio 44.7.1), treaties (Livy 26.24.14); and the Sibylline Books (prior to being moved to the Temple of Apollo under Augustus: Tac. *Ann.* 6.12.3; Suet. *Aug.* 31).

⁶⁶ Cic. *Cael.* 78, *Mil.* 73.

⁶⁷ Ulrich (1993) 79, n.170.

Proving an archival function for Caesar's *tabernae* is made more difficult by our understanding of republican archiving in general. While it is accepted that public documents were usually stored in religious buildings, it is unclear how the archiving process actually worked in the late republic *and* to what degree those archives were made available to the public. P. Culham's article, *Archives and Alternatives in the Late Republic*, argues that republican Romans lacked modern archival systems (for retrieval, providing an original text, serving the public) and that a single archive is not likely. He points out that many documents were even stored in the private homes of the elite and that public access to many archives were heavily restricted by those in possession of them.⁶⁸ Furthermore, Culham states that storage of these public transactions and *access to them* are not the same thing. In this respect, he suggests that the documents themselves became a source of great political power for those in possession of them, restricting access to them.⁶⁹ However, the idea that one or more of the *tabernae* in Caesar's forum functioned as some form of public archive is tempting if we accept Coarelli's hypothesis for a Sullan tabularium within the Capitoline precinct.⁷⁰ Presumably, Caesar was mindful of the political significance of Sulla's powerful Capitoline complex and aimed to respond to this through the ideological and political impact of his own building programme. If we accept Ulrich's hypothesis for the *tabernae* as space for the storage of Senatorial transaction records, then controlling access to such documents would have placed Caesar in a position of significant political power. Apart from Suetonius's claim that Senatorial transactions began to be written down in Caesar's time, it is unclear if a separate public archive was even required. However, as shall now be discussed, there is evidence for significant judicial activity in the *forum Iulium*, and presumably such activities would have generated a need for the storage of resulting documentation.⁷¹

⁶⁸ Culham (1989) 100-115. See also: Clarysse and Vanderpe (2008) 715-739, particularly, 729-730: discussing senatorial decrees being copied for the first time by consuls as *commentarii* and kept by these magistrates as their private journals and taken home by them; Coarelli (2010) 109: points out that there were many sites for tabularia at Rome.

⁶⁹ Culham (1989) 110-113; Cic. *Leg.* 2.46: complaining about difficult access to public records and too much control of them by the *apparitores* (clerks/magisterial assistants).

⁷⁰ See: Chapter One, 28-29.

⁷¹ *Leges* and *senatus consulta* were stored in the Aerarium in the republic (cited by Culham (1989) 103, n.12): on the deposition of *senatus consulta* at the Aerarium, see: Livy 39. 4. 8; Cic. *Fam.* 12. 1. 1; Plut. *Cat. min.* 17; for the deposition of *leges*, see: Suet. *Iul.* 28. 3, Sisenna *HRR* 117.

Judicial Space

Given that Roman legal and judicial activities could be conducted in a variety of locations, including the *forum Romanum* and the *forum Augusti*, it seems entirely reasonable to conclude that there was also judicial activity in the *forum Iulium*.⁷² Evidence, while limited and problematic, is reflected in the works of Suetonius (*Aug.* 29, *Claud.* 33.1) discussing the *forum Augusti*; Appian (*BC* 2.102), equating it to the legal centers of the Persians; and Ovid's (*Ars Am.* 1.79-86 and 3.449-452) references to divorce courts in relation to the Appiades. The complexity and uncertainty of the material, particularly for the Caesarian phase, cannot be overstated, but is nonetheless worthy of consideration.

Analysis of the *forum Augusti* (even after Augustus' lifetime) offers potential clues regarding legal activities in Caesar's *forum* if one accepts a certain degree of continuity throughout the republican and early imperial fora. Legal activities in the *forum Augusti* are clearly evidenced. Suetonius (*Claud.* 33.1) demonstrates that the *forum Augusti* was an important legal centre in the first century CE, describing the emperor Claudius deserting his tribunal in the middle of a case. A wax tablet discovered at Herculaneum (Tablet XIV, CE 75) records the legal proceedings *in foro Augusto* of the court of the praetor urbanus.⁷³ Similarly, another from Agro Murecine, refers to the trial of a C. Sulpicius (Cinnamus), arranged to take place *in foro Augusto ante statuam / Cn. Senti Saturnini triumphal(I)em...*⁷⁴ This information indicates that legal activities were considered an everyday function of early imperial fora, which may be useful for understanding Caesar's complex.⁷⁵ Although this transitional period is one of immense change for Rome's administration, making a comparison with the Caesarian phase problematic, nevertheless it possibly reflects a continuity of function in all three fora (*forum Romanum*, *Iulium*, and *Augusti*). In fact, further evidence from Suetonius does indicate that Augustus followed the example established by Caesar in his complex:

⁷² For further discussion regarding the locations of legal activities, see: Bablitz (2007) 13-50 13-50: including basilicae, porticoes, temples, fora.

⁷³ Anderson (1984) 91-92: "The praetor urbanus set up his tribunal at first in the Comitium and after its destruction at the Rostra Divi Juli, prior to the building of the Forum Augustum."; A. Maiuri, 'Tabulae Ceratae Herculaneensis' *PP*. I (1946), 373-9: for the original publication of the Herculaneum tablets.

⁷⁴ Anderson (1975) 92, citing: V. Arangio-Ruiz, *PP* 3 (1948) 141. Anderson takes the specification of location *ante statuam*...as evidence for several courts being held in this forum, since the prepositional phrase *in foro Augusto* appears to be insufficient.

⁷⁵ Weinstock (1971) 81: the porticoed precinct and axial temple plan; Anderson (1984) 9-62, 179-182; Ulrich (1993) 77.

Fori exstruendi causa fuit hominum et iudiciorum multitudo, quae videbatur non sufficientibus duobus etiam tertio indigere; itaque festinatius necdum perfecta Martis aede publicatum est cautumque, ut separatim in eo publica iudicia et sortitiones iudicum fierent.

His reason for extending the forum was due to the great number of men and courts, which with the two fora not sufficient, seemed to require a third: and so, with the Temple of Mars not yet finished, it was publicly sanctioned hurriedly as public trials and selection of jurors by lot would take place there. (Suet. *Aug.* 29)

Suetonius' *non sufficientibus duobus* suggests that the *forum Iulium*, as the 'second' forum, after the *forum Romanum*, also provided legal activities at Rome during the late republic. The *iudicia publica* 'public courts', a type of state-sponsored criminal court system mentioned here by Suetonius, were established in the early first century BCE to deal with a variety of major offences such as extortion in the provinces, poisoning, and treason.⁷⁶ Suetonius does not say which of the two fora the *iudicia publica* shifted from. However, it remains a possibility that they did function in Caesar's complex. Just as the *secretarium senatus*, dealing with trials of senators, was thought to have occupied one of the tabernae of the *forum Iulium* well into the fourth century CE, it is entirely possible other such courts operated there too.⁷⁷ Furthermore, if judicial activities had not occurred at some point in Caesar's forum it seems unlikely that Suetonius would have mentioned the 'two' fora in the first place. The issue instead is whether or not Suetonius means these activities were occurring in the *forum Iulium* throughout the Caesarian phase or after his death. This evidence seems enough to confirm the view that judicial activities were occurring in Caesar's forum and this important text should shape our reading of both Appian and Ovid's evidence.

Just as Suetonius' evidence suggests a continuity of function throughout all three fora, Appian's passage (*BC* 2.102⁷⁸) also suggests judicial activity continued in Caesar's new forum, a place where the Roman people could come to "seek justice or to learn the laws". Like Suetonius, Appian (second century CE) is writing a considerable time after the Caesarian phase and it is therefore difficult to assess how much of the content of his statement holds for this timeframe. However, he implies the judicial nature of the space was

⁷⁶ Beard *et al.* (1998) II, 83; Aubert (2005) 98; Robinson (1998) 229-230: during the second century BCE some courts became permanent, *quaestiones perpetuae*, as standing courts specializing in certain cases and brought about by private individuals, different from the criminal cases heard before republican popular assemblies called the *iudicia populi*.

⁷⁷ For discussion of the *secretarium senatus*, see: Nash (1976) 191-204; Anderson (1984) 52-53.

⁷⁸ See above: 61.

Caesar's intention and gives no suggestion of its function changing at all from the inception of the complex.⁷⁹

Somewhat more contemporary, is Ovid's discussion of divorce courts, which appears to describe the features of the *forum Iulium*:

Et fora conveniunt (quis credere posit?) amoris /Flammaque in arguto saepe
reperta foro: /Subdita qua Veneris facto de mamore templo /Appias expressis
aera pulsat aquis: /Illo saepe loco capitur consultus Amori, /Quique aliis cavit,
non cavet ipse sibi: /Illo saepe loco desunt sua verba disertis, /Resque novae
veniunt causaque agenda sua est.

Even for a (courts) are fitting for love (who would believe it?): and many times
have obtained their desire in the eloquent court, where situated under the temple
of Venus fashioned from marble, the nymph beats the air with its sprayed
waters. Often a lawyer is captured by love in that place, and he who took
precautions for others does not look out for himself: often in that place their own
words lack in eloquence, and new matters appear and their own lawsuit is
fought. (*Ars Am.* 1.79-86)⁸⁰

Redde meum! clamant spoliatae saepe puellae, /Redde meum! Toto voce boante
foro. /Has, Venus, e templis multo radiantibus auro /Lenta vides lites
Appiadesque tuae...

Give me back my things! Young women, robbed, often cry, Give me back my
things! Crying out in loud voice throughout the whole forum. Venus inactive,
you and your Appian nymphs see these disputes, from temples, radiating with
much gold. (*Ars Am.* 3.449-452)⁸¹

Linguistic analysis of the first passage (*Ars Am.* 1.79-1.86) demonstrates the nature of the
trial, suggesting at least one legal function for the *forum Iulium*. The subject of the passage,
the *consultus* (jurist/lawyer) in addition to the *patronus* (defender/advocate) mentioned later

⁷⁹ See discussion above regarding interpretation and reliability of Appian.

⁸⁰ See also: *Ars Am.* 3.449-452; Hollis (1977) 48: takes the change from the plural *fora* to *foro* in this passage to signal the specification of the *forum Iulium*; Bablitz (2007) 44-46: discusses this passage as a possible indication of judicial activity in the *forum Iulium*, also considering Ulrich's (albeit problematic) claims for the temple podium of the Temple of Castor and the Temple of Divus Julius in the *forum Romanum* and the Temple of Venus Genetrix serving as possible venues for conducting law courts; Brandt (1963) 12-13: takes the marble temple construction here to mean the Temple of Venus Genetrix and the *forum Iulium*.

⁸¹ Gibson (2003) 282-283: takes the location as that of the *forum Iulium*, situating the Appiades fountain there. He takes the cries here by the *puellae redde meum* (referring to their dowry) as indicative of a court situation, as a reversal of the usual situation whereby women are accused of habitual petty theft (also: *Rem.* 659-660); Bablitz (2007) 45: while warning that the exact nature of the courts in the *forum Iulium* cannot yet be accurately determined, points out that the nature of the cases that Ovid mentions in relation to Caesar's forum tend to focus on 'relations between the sexes' linking them to Venus.

(*Ars Am.* 1.88), suggest a full trial before a jury.⁸² Of course jurists and patrons could be anywhere, and in isolation do not prove a great deal. In both passages here Ovid makes topographical reference to Venus, a temple (Venus Genetrix?), Appiades, and a forum. While Ovid could be referring to the *forum Romanum* and the temples given in plural as the various temples there, his inclusion of their radiating gold (3.449-452) in conjunction with the Appiades collectively seems to suggest Caesar's forum complex.⁸³ Furthermore, Ovid's specific reference to *subdita Veneris...templeo* (1.79-86) seems to signal the specific location of the Appian fountain proposed by Ulrich, at the foot of the temple's high podium.⁸⁴

While most scholars seem to agree on the *forum Iulium* as the location of Ovid's passages, James C. Anderson claims that Ovid's repeated references to the Appiades do not mean that Ovid's court was held in the *forum Iulium*. Instead, he argues for it being held in the adjoining Atrium Libertatis and attributes the Appiades to a single statue, the sculptural work of Stephanus, as part of Asinius Pollio's library collection there.⁸⁵ He also claims that Ovid's use of *subdita* (underneath or subordinate to) probably refers to the fact that the Temple of Venus Genetrix stood on a higher position and therefore dominated the Atrium Libertatis.⁸⁶ This hypothesis seems unproblematic in isolation from reference to the Temple of Venus Genetrix, such as in the case of Ovid's *Remedia Amoris* (660): *Non illas lites Appias ipsa probat* (The Appian herself does not sanction those lawsuits). However it becomes problematic when one considers the collective significance of Ovid's references: Venus, the forum, the temple shining in gold, and the Appiades. Besides the Appiades, no other specific topographical reference is given to single out the Atrium Libertatis as the location of the trials. One would assume if Ovid had meant the Atrium Libertatis he would have provided a more specific clue to avoid ambiguity given the proximity of Caesar's

⁸² Anderson (1984) 24-25. Kennedy (1972) 13-14: a *patronus* was a professional orator who Kennedy claims developed from an extension of the patron-client relationship in the early republic and that by the late republic was anyone who undertook to plead a case on behalf of another.

⁸³ Hollis (1977) 48-49 and 68, plate II: citing a coin of Trajan depicting the same scene described by Ovid: the temple, fountain, portico, and forum. He also states that Ovid was 'temperamentally ill-suited' to the law (*Tristia* 4.10.17; *Amores* 1.15.5-6) but nevertheless had considerable understanding of legal terminology and greatly enjoyed mocking the profession; Armstrong (2005) 118: takes *Appiades* to mean the 'fountain' in Caesar's forum. Brandt (1963) 12-13: for the gold shining; Dio (51.22.3) describes the Cleopatra statue in the Temple of Venus Genetrix as being covered in gold and the golden curule chair used by Caesar is also reported (*Cic. Phil.* 2.85; *Nic. Dam. Aug.* 21) although talking about the *forum Romanum* we know that Caesar received the Senate seated in his own forum presumably under no less grand circumstances.

⁸⁴ For in-depth discussion of the proposed fountain, see: Ulrich (1986) 405-423.

⁸⁵ Anderson (1984) 24-25.

⁸⁶ Anderson (1984) 24.

complex to the Atrium Libertatis and the fact that the portico divided Caesar's complex from outside areas, possibly visibly as well as spatially, especially since he also mentions the Temple of Venus in this passage. One further point strengthens the argument for Caesar's complex as the location of Ovid's poems: Pliny (*NH.* 36.33) in listing Asinius Pollio's art collection does not state that his Appian Nymphs are part of a water fountain, an aspect emphasized by Ovid's (*Ars Am.* 1.82) *expressis...aquis* to describe what is most likely referring to the spraying water of the *forum Iulium's* fountain. Since Pliny was stressing the elaborate nature of Pollio's art collection, one would expect an elaborate fountain would have been worthy of special mention if it existed. Furthermore, Pliny (*NH* 36.23-25, 33-34) describes Asinius' library as a *monumenta*, and states that he went to great lengths to make it as stunning as possible, but Pliny only mentions marble, describing the statues and collection. Nowhere does he mention gold in association with this collection, despite emphasizing gold in other areas of the *forum Romanum*, such as a gold statue of Janus in the Temple of Janus. While this proves there were temples in the *forum Romanum* that could be the temples 'radiating gold', they are not connected with the Appiades. Unfortunately it is not known what material covered the cult statue of Venus Genetrix, if anything. However gold and ivory remain a possibility.

The idea that each forum served different legal roles simultaneously into the Principate is also a possibility. Tablet XIV, discussed earlier, specifically discusses the court of the praetor urbanus.⁸⁷ The praetor urbanus had originally set up his tribunal in the Comitium, then after its destruction, at the Rostra Divi Iuli, and finally in the *forum Augusti*, not the *forum Iulium*.⁸⁸ A praetor urbanus had the authority to judge cases of equity, different from the legal activities of the divorce courts in the *forum Iulium* described by Ovid. There is no evidence for a total transference of legal functions from the *forum Romanum* to the imperial fora, since trials continued to take place in other areas such as the Basilica Julia.⁸⁹

So it seems highly likely, despite the scant and problematic material, that Caesar's forum was the site of some degree of judicial activity. Of course the activities discussed by Ovid may reflect a later period than Caesar's (although a continuation of function for all three fora seems more likely). Ovid was writing the *Ars Amatoria* in the early Principate under the

⁸⁷ See above: 69.

⁸⁸ Richardson (1973) 219-34, from Anderson (1984) 92.

⁸⁹ Beard *et al.* (1998) II, 84.

administration of Octavian/Augustus. It is also possible that Ovid and his readership had access to first hand information from the Caesarian period regarding the space and its judicial use and that he would expect his audience to connect with the content of his poems. In any case, discussion of Ovid's references here is important for this study because if they do refer to Caesar's forum (which seems likely), they provide some of the few pieces of evidence from the late republic-early Principate of judicial activity (or indeed of *any* activity) in this space.

In Sum

Clearly Caesar's forum complex, as more than simply a monument to his greatness and superiority, served as a bona fide civic centre in its own right. In considering how the space was utilized, it is important not to read too much into the meagre evidence and to consider each source in the context of its social, political, and chronological setting, since the late republic represents a period of significant and constant political change for Rome. Cicero provides evidence of Caesar's complex expanding and extending the *forum Romanum*, presenting a beneficent Caesar - patron to Rome. His language presents the project in a most favourable light and is perhaps reflective of his own political needs, as much as a true reflection of the project itself.⁹⁰ Appian, whether consciously or not, signals an innovation for Roman civic space, but only by emphasizing the specialized nature of the *forum Iulium* that differed from the multiplicity of the *forum Romanum*, regardless of the latter's true inhabitants. Architectural analysis of the portico indicates it played an important role not only in the display of important artworks, advertising Caesar's superiority, *dignitas*, and *gloria*, but also in delineating and separating this important civic space. While Suetonius and Dio's passages suggest some form of political business occurring in the space, its exact nature and frequency is unclear. Ovid's passages do appear to support Appian's claim for a judicial centre and as such it is tempting to suggest that Caesar's complex functioned as an extension of the traditional activities of the original forum, only in a more specialized setting, fitting comfortably with both Cicero and Appian's presentations of the complex.

⁹⁰ See: Chapter Three for further discussion of this point.

SECTION TWO

MANUBIAL CONTRUCTION AND THE TEMPLE OF VENUS GENETRIX

The Manubial Tool

Vowed to Venus Genetrix on the eve of the Battle of Pharsalus, Caesar's temple stood as a monument to his victory. As Chapter One has discussed, the city's temples reflected the embedded nature of Roman religion, politics, and culture. Many temples in their inception, construction, and location were also the products of war.⁹¹ Manubial construction played an important role in the social and political advancement of individuals and their families in republican Rome,⁹² with temple construction utilized increasingly as part of the arsenal of political competition toward the late republic.⁹³ Livy's (1.38.7) claim that L. Tarquinius Superbus funded the construction of the Temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus out of the *manubiae* from Pometia (vowed in the Sabine war) demonstrates that Romans believed that manubial construction dated from the beginning of the development of the *forum Romanum* and the formation of the city-state. For them, as a long-standing tradition, manubial construction predated the political appropriation of temples such as Castor or Saturn in the early fifth century BCE, as one of the earliest forms of personal self-aggrandizement for the contemporary individual at Rome.⁹⁴

⁹¹ Erskine (2010) 78.

⁹² See, particularly: Morgan (1973) 215-245.

⁹³ Muccigrosso (2006) 190; For discussion of the effect of Rome's imperialistic expansion after the Second Punic War resulting in increased military glory and wealth for individuals and the subsequent increase in the erection of monuments recording their achievements, see: Castrn-Pietil (1987), particularly: 15-156, for the temple as the most popular type of public monument of Roman generals for this period. The practice of temple building resulting from generals' vows (made on his own authority, not by *senatus consultum* or by Sibylline consultation/religious colleges) and the display of *manubiae* to advertise their successes were well established at the time of Caesar's construction: Temple of Quirinus 293 BCE - vowed by the dictator L. Papirius Cursor in the war against the Samnites and dedicated by his son; Temple of Fors Fortuna - vowed by consul Sp. Carvilius Maximus during war against Samnites/Etruscans 293 BCE; Temple of Juno Sospita - vowed and dedicated by consul C. Cornelius Cethegus 194 BCE at war against the Gauls; Temple of Pietas - vowed by consul M. Acilius Glabrio at battle of Thermopylae 181 BCE, dedicated by his son. More innovatively: Temple of Fortuna Primigenia - vowed by consul P. Sempronius Tuditanus 204 BCE before battle with Hannibal. This aspect of Primigenia was considered foreign but Fortuna herself was well established in Rome, making it more acceptable; Temple of Hercules Musarum - vowed by consul M. Fulvius Nobilior in c.187 BCE in campaign against the Ambraciots. The cult of the muses presented a Hellenistic culture juxtaposed with the cult of Hercules, well established at Rome. All references here come from Orlin (1997), particularly Appendix 1.199-202 and Ziolkowski (1992) Catalogue 17-185. See also: Morgan (1973) 223-224: for discussion of the correlation between vowing temples and political advancement, providing a comprehensive list of men between 207-168 BCE. Cf. Temple of Bellona, as a family *monumentum* 79 BCE, see: Chapter One, n.117.

⁹⁴ Edwards (1996) 83.

Generals vowed temples to specific deities (*vocatio*), in order to either gain their divine assistance in battle or afterwards as thanks for such assistance, dedicating part of the *manubiae* to be displayed in the temple,⁹⁵ followed by the eventual letting of the contract (*locatio*), and the dedication of the temple (*dedicatio*).⁹⁶ The *dedicatio* as a public ceremony provided the dedicant with the opportunity to publically display his *dignitas* as host of this significant festive event, and his *gloria* in the advertisement of his military achievements.

The Manubial Temple: A Problem of Interpretation

While it seems clear that *manubiae* funded the construction of many monuments, statues, aqueducts, and public buildings, the issue of manubial *temple* construction is problematic. Eric Orlin states that there are very few incidences of true manubial temples (paid for by the proceeds of *manubiae*) and that the term ‘manubial temple construction’ as an established practice at Rome is therefore somewhat of a misnomer.⁹⁷ In fact, he lists only five temples (from a possible 80 or more constructed) from the republican period actually attested as paid for by *manubiae*,⁹⁸ citing this issue of attestation as the main problem in determining their frequency at Rome.⁹⁹ Cicero’s *De lege Agraria* provides evidence that generals often used *manubiae* to fund construction projects. Here (*De Leg. Agr.* 2.59-62, 63 BCE), he discusses a proposed law (Rullan Law) to establish a board of ten commissioners (*decemviri*) with extensive and unprecedented powers to buy, sell, confiscate, or give away public land. Cicero quotes Rullus saying that generals in receipt of gold and silver *ex manubiis*, *ex praeda*, and *ex coronario* must account for anything left over after building public monuments, statues, or the like and that after placing a portion of it into the public treasury must give the rest to the *decemviri*. Whether the details Cicero claims about the Rullan

⁹⁵ Orlin (1997) 132-134.

⁹⁶ Muccigrosso (2006) 191; Orlin (1997) 11-33; Beard *et al.* (1998) I, 32-35: for discussion of the ‘contractual’ nature of the generals’ vows highlighting a process of ‘negotiation’ with their chosen gods, 88: for the involvement of the priests, Senate, and censors in the dedication process and their controls and limitations within the sacred laws; Pina Polo (2011) 135-168: discusses this process in relation to consuls and their relationship to the Senate.

⁹⁷ Orlin (1997) 116-161.

⁹⁸ Orlin (1997) 130-131: 293 BCE Temple of Fors Fortuna by the consul Sp. Carvilius Maximus *de manubiis*, Livy 10.46.14; 3rd century Cn. Papirius Maso dedicated a shrine to Fons *ex Corsica* Cic. *ND* 3.52; Mid 2nd century L. Licinius Lucullus funded the Temple of Felicitas from Iberian war monies, Dio 22, frag. 76.2; 138 BCE D. Iunius Brutus funded the Temple of Mars *de manubiis*, Val Max 8.14.2; the Temple of Honos and Virtus by Marius *de manubiis Cimbris et Teutonibus*, *ILS* 59.

⁹⁹ Orlin (1997) 128, 117-122: cites the ambiguity of meaning regarding *manubiae* and *praeda* as a contributing factor to this problem, stating that the ancient sources often used the terms interchangeably. He goes on to explain that no actual constitution or specific law existed to state what should or should not be done with these monies.

legislation were true or not, this passage implies that generals could use their *manubiae* to partially or fully fund the construction of monuments and buildings. Orlin argues that Cicero's use of 'public monuments' is simply insufficient to prove an established tradition of manubial *temple* construction.¹⁰⁰

Orlin states that contributing to the confusion regarding manubial temple construction is the ambiguity regarding generals dedicating part or all of their *manubiae* to a deity, such as artwork displayed in the temple, and the actual funding of the temple's construction with *manubiae*. In the same way, he states that failure to differentiate between generals vowing temples before (or after) battle and those actually funding them with the proceeds (as opposed to the Senate funding them) has led many modern scholars to assume that vowed temples were simply manubial constructions.¹⁰¹ Orlin's argument that manubial temple construction was rare is based on the absence of explicit evidence. However, an absence of evidence is not evidence for an absence of manubial temple construction. Problematically, his use of the lack of evidence to prove his case ultimately leaves more questions than solid answers and does not deal with the fact that it may not have been considered an important point to mention for ancient writers/historians. It is important to consider that it is possible not all manubial temples were recorded as accurately as we would like and that while the distinction was clearly important for the individual generals funding these projects, it may not have been as important for those recording them.

In the case of the Temple of Venus Genetrix the issue of funding for the actual temple (as opposed to the complex as a whole) is also slightly ambiguous. Suetonius (*Iul.* 26.2) claims that the *forum* was funded *de manubiis* but is not clear if this includes the temple.¹⁰² Certainly the *forum Iulium* incorporated the entire precinct by Suetonius' time. Details such as the disparate reports of money spent on Caesar's complex mean it is unclear whether or not Caesar funded his own temple construction, although both Cicero (*Ad Att.* 4.16.8.1-12) and Suetonius' (*Iul.* 26.2: *Forum de manubiis incohavit*) reports indicate that he used his

¹⁰⁰ Rullan law: Orlin (1997) 126,

¹⁰¹ Bardon (1955); Bona (1960); Strong (1968); Morgan (1973a); Shatzman (1975) 90-91; Stambaugh (1978); Pietilä-Castrén (1987); Ziolkowski (1992). This list is cited in Orlin (1997) 124, n.28.

¹⁰² Given the controversy regarding the term 'manubial' in relation to the construction of vowed temples, it is perhaps sensible to take a wider view on its interpretation and definition. For the purposes of this study, the Temple of Venus Genetrix will be considered manubial in the sense that it was dedicated to Venus Genetrix for her assistance in the Battle of Pharsalus and represented Caesar's victory through the *manubiae* displayed there, regardless of who actually funded the build. It is likely that the temple was also largely funded from funds gained in his Gallic campaigns.

own money to at least create the forum space. Suetonius' use of *forum* does not explicitly highlight the temple, but does not rule it out either, since the labels *forum Augusti*, *forum Iulium et al.* stood for the complexes *in toto*. Given the vast wealth gained by Caesar during his campaigns, it seems most likely the temple was also a manubial construction.

Manubial Construction: a State Institution

Cicero's (*Mur.* 75-76) claim that "The Roman People hate private luxury, but love public magnificence" demonstrates late republican ideology concerning the importance of the appropriate display of success, power, and wealth within the public institutions of Rome in the late republic.¹⁰³ Such sentiments are helpful for understanding manubial structures, particularly their role in representing both the individual *and* State. Display of private wealth and superiority lay outside of the traditional framework of Rome's civic institutions (as a harm to the community¹⁰⁴) and more importantly outside of senatorial control. Manubial temple construction however, served both the individual and the State. The individual general benefited since the temple space allowed for the display of *manubiae* in the form of artworks and expensive items associated with their victorious deeds, conferring significant political benefits on them personally by advertising their military success. The State also benefitted through advertising Rome's collective victory, success, and superiority as expressed by the temple.¹⁰⁵ Similarly, the Senate's role in approving (and sometimes partially or fully funding) vowed temples (whether partially paid for by *manubiae* or not) and appointing commissioners to let the construction contracts, as well as the extremely litigious processes involved in such public works,¹⁰⁶ advertised the general's alignment with the Senate and the interests of the State, just as the Senate's refusal to assist advertised their disapproval.¹⁰⁷ In this respect, it is the Senate's involvement that signals the public nature of these projects. Of course, it is important to consider that the proceeds of *manubiae* could also be used for the restoration of existing temples, conferring similar benefits upon the

¹⁰³ For discussion of the *invidia* (jealousy, hatred) resulting from conspicuous display of wealth, see: Hales (2003) 58-59.

¹⁰⁴ For further discussion of the recurring theme of invective against private luxury as destructive to the community, as well as the importance of matching the degree of luxury displayed to the status of the individual displaying it, see: Edwards (1993) 153-156.

¹⁰⁵ McDonnell (2006) 68-90; Muccigrosso (2006) 181-206. This point will be expanded in Chapter Three with particular emphasis on the case studies of Caesar and his forum complex and Pompey's Theatre.

¹⁰⁶ Discussed further in Chapter Three, 118.

¹⁰⁷ Orlin (1997) 48-49. For approval by the Senate of public buildings, see: Hölkeskamp (2010) 27.

general.¹⁰⁸ J. Bradford Churchill argues strongly (albeit controversially¹⁰⁹) that *manubiae* remained public property from beginning to end and that at least some part of it remained in the general's 'custody' only. As such, it was the responsibility of the general holding *imperium* at the time the goods were seized, or his heir if he died, to use such monies in the public's interest. As public property, any act resulting from its use, such as the provision of public games or public (re)building projects, either in Rome or the provinces, were considered acts of public beneficence on behalf of the generals, even if no personal expense was necessarily incurred.¹¹⁰ Suetonius (*Aug.* 29) categorizes the *forum Augusti* as *publica opera* (public works), suggesting the euergetic nature of such complexes, providing additional and specialized civic space. His language however, does demonstrate that although imperial fora played an important and significant political role for their patrons, Roman society still viewed them as an extension or development of the public works found in the traditional republican forum, and it is in this respect that the public nature of the Temple of Venus Genetrix can be viewed.

War, State Religion, and the Man: the rise of the human idol

The association of victorious generals and their great deeds with these religious buildings showcased their strong relations with the Senate in accordance with Rome's state religion and the tradition of the *mos maiorum*. Although the process of how each god was selected for manubial temples or what obligations the general or Senate were under regarding such decisions is not fully understood, the continued practice of vowing temples highlights the significance of religion, deeply embedded in the social, political, and military fabric of republican Rome. By the late republic this symbiotic relationship between magistrates vowing temples and the Senate accepting them on behalf of the State (reflective of the

¹⁰⁸ The Temple of Magna Mater on the Palatine for example, restored by Metellus Caprarius in 101 BCE from: Morgan (1973) 215-245.

¹⁰⁹ Many scholars believe wrongly that *manubiae* became the private property of the general, to do with as the saw fit. See: Churchill (1999) 85, n.2: for the list of proponents of this view, including Shatzman (1972), drawing from the work of Vogel (1948, 1953)

¹¹⁰ Churchill (1999) 85-116, particularly: 100. Churchill also makes the distinction that *manubiae* tended to be used for the provision of public games and public works by the general with the *imperium* at the time the booty was taken, and that the term *praeda* tends to be used on dedications, such as *ex praeda*, when these things were provided by magistrates without *imperium*, as in a military tribute. Churchill makes the distinction that *praeda* appears to refer to all that was looted, shared among the soldiers, and *manubiae* being all that remained that was not looted but that fell under Roman claim, often surrendered to the general but remaining public property. This was not given to the soldiers, but remained under the control of the general who used his discretion as to how it was used. As public property, it was expected that *manubiae* be displayed in the triumph and recorded in the treasury. See also: Veyne (1990) 235.

republican system of government) had begun to shift as individuals spent more money on developing entire political centres.¹¹¹ Answering Sulla's significant triple- temple Capitoline precinct (accepting Coarelli's hypothesis¹¹²) and Pompey's theatre complex, Caesar's temple-forum precinct provides another leading example of such a political centre:¹¹³

Quod ut adeptus est, altiora iam meditans et spei plenus nullum largitionis aut officiorum in quemquam genus publice privatimque omisit. Forum de manubiis incohavit, cuius area super sestertium milies constitit. Munus populo epulumque pronuntiavit in filiae memoriam, quod ante eum nemo.

So that he achieved this, thinking grander thoughts and full of hope, he left out no sort of generosity or service to anyone, publicly or privately. He established a forum from the spoils (of his campaigns), the land of which cost over one hundred million sesterces. He proclaimed a show for the people as well a feast in memory of his daughter, which no one before him had done. (Suet. *Iul.* 26.2)

Suetonius presents Caesar here as determined to please all through public euergetism, including his grand forum complex.¹¹⁴ Presumably, Caesar intended his centre to answer both Sulla and Pompey's grand complexes (particularly evident in the use of Venus by all three), creating a type of architectural dialogue between Rome's powerful men.¹¹⁵ His use of *spes* in this passage refers to Caesar's political aspirations and demonstrates the importance of personal association with political space and public buildings in projecting a powerful and magnanimous public image. The permanency of buildings and monuments such as the temple and its surrounding structures allowed further displays and activities to occur within *his* space and functioned as a continuation of the general's involvement in civic activities, regardless of his actual presence or absence at Rome.¹¹⁶

¹¹¹ See: Muccigrosso (2006) 181; Orlin (1997) 197-198; Welch (2006) 502: states that temples started to become increasingly inventive from the second century BCE, as the political stakes increased. For further discussion of this point, see: Chapter Three 103-107; The gradual shift of political focus away from the Senate and the Curia toward the Comitium and the *Populus* is discussed at length in Chapter One of this thesis.

¹¹² As discussed: Chapter One 13, 28-29.

¹¹³ Pompey's theatre complex housed its own senate house and engaged in political activities throughout the late republic, a point that is not controversial but does illustrate the beginnings of the personalization of civic space and the traditional institutions of Rome (such as the civic space of the Forum) beginning in the late republican period. The architectural aspects of this theatre complex, as well as Coarelli's (2010) hypothesis for a Sullan complex are discussed in: Chapter Three 129-134.

¹¹⁴ Caesar's political standing and the ephemeral nature of late republican politics are discussed further in terms of public buildings and euergetism in Chapter Three.

¹¹⁵ Discussed further: Chapter Three 128-129.

¹¹⁶ Monumentalization and politics are discussed further below in this chapter: 84-91. Euergetism and public works, as well as Caesar's need to periodically reassert his place in Roman politics, are discussed in Chapter Three, particularly: 86-87.

Similarly, while Venus was an ancestor of the Roman people on a national level, the temple indicated that she was more significantly the ancestor of the Julian clan, and as such, the temple served as a powerful and personal symbol of Caesar's divine connections and elevated social status.¹¹⁷ Furthermore, since Roman religion placed few constraints on the location of newly vowed temples, builders could site their constructions to the best political effect.¹¹⁸ This careful and deliberate placement is clearly emphasized in the Temple of Venus Genetrix. For example, the topographical, social, political, and religious centrality of the site, reinforced by that fact that Caesar chose such an expensive and uneven piece of land, highlights his conscious concern with securing a prominent site.¹¹⁹

While manubial construction (and vowed temples not funded by *manubiae*), as a form of public building, ostensibly honoured individual gods for their martial assistance and advertised Roman victory through this state-sanctioned institution, there can be no doubt these temples served to celebrate and decorate the individual achievements of their vowing generals. Hölscher claims that besides the money gained in the Gallic wars that probably funded Caesar's forum, unlike subsequent imperial fora, his was almost free of the martial representations and semantics associated with manubial construction.¹²⁰ Given the paucity of evidence however, particularly in the Caesarian phase, it is important to consider the possibility that there were indeed martial representations within Caesar's complex not surviving in the sources. Furthermore, closer analysis of the contents of the temple and forum demonstrates that the manubial (and propagandist) display in and around the temple complex advertised Caesar the victorious general and represented his conquest of the known world, highlighting his prolific and victorious martial achievements and unrivaled success as commander and general:¹²¹ display of six *dactyliothecas gemmas* (gemstones Plin. *NH*.

¹¹⁷ Orlin (1997) 197. This point is expanded below in relation to the concept of the 'symbolic capital' gained through personal association with Venus: 84-91.

¹¹⁸ Muccigrosso (2006) 193-195.

¹¹⁹ For the significance of the expense and difficulty of the site, see: Ulrich (1993) 56. See also: Muccigrosso (2006) 191: for discussion regarding the placement of manubial buildings along the triumphal way in order to maximize the glorification and victorious associations of the general

¹²⁰ Hölscher (2006) 42.

¹²¹ Zanker (2009) 292. Dio (51.22.3) contradicts Appian's (*BC* 2.102) claim that Caesar placed the statue of Cleopatra in the temple, stating that Augustus did it. Both state that the statue was placed in the shrine of Venus. Appian goes so far as to state that it was placed next to the cult statue, a very prominent position for a foreign queen. The statue presumably represented Egypt's subordinate place in the world under Rome's (Caesar's) power and is in keeping with the theme of Caesar's global conquests represented in the various artworks in the temple space. Besides this display of artworks, the only individuals given monumental space in Caesar's forum complex appear to be the goddess Venus Genetrix and Caesar himself.

37.11), two paintings by Timomachus: Ajax and Medea (Plin. *NH* 7.126, 35.26, 136),¹²² a breastplate made of British pearls (Plin. *NH* 9.116),¹²³ and a statue of Cleopatra (Dio 51.22.3; App. *BC* 2.102). This collection also reflects the enormous wealth gained in Caesar's campaigns, celebrating his success over the known world, as far as Britain. Britain not only lay beyond the *oikoumene* (inhabited world) (Vell. *Pat.* 2.46.1, Florus 1.45.16), it lay beyond the realms of the mythical world. This was further than any Roman had traveled (not even mythological heroes had traveled so far¹²⁴), a fact Caesar would have been very keen to exploit in this monumental space. As Hölscher himself states, celebrated works by significant artists were not valued for their own sake, they served specific functions as seen by their placement in temples, giving significance to the space.¹²⁵ Given that the Battle of Pharsalus was a civil war, it is entirely possible that Caesar preferred to highlight other more palatable aspects of his military career in the temple precinct.

In Sum

Ambiguity aside, as a political tool, the tradition of manubial construction (and other vowed temples) provided victorious generals with the opportunity to legitimately advertise their glorious deeds and civic superiority, tangibly represented through the state-sanctioned erection of a monumental temple. As arguably one of the earliest forms of personal and state celebration, it can be argued that these temples played an integral role in the development of the city's civic identity and sense of unification. Strictly speaking, *manubiae* from successful campaigns were considered public funds, and as such were held in generals' 'custody' only, although temples, feasts, games, and other public provisions resulting from such funds were still effectively considered acts of public benefaction by the general, conferring much prestige on these individuals. As sacred buildings, manubial temples fell under the ultimate governance of the Senate. The Senate's role in approving and funding (or not) the construction of vowed temples upon the general's return demonstrated this

¹²² Plin. *NH* 35.24: for discussion of the prestige of foreign paintings in Rome beginning c. 190 BCE by Lucius Mummius.

¹²³ For discussion of the breastplate as an offering of thanks to Venus Genetrix by Caesar for his victory over the ocean (the pearls representative of the ocean) having made his mark in Britain, see: Flory (1998) 498-504.

¹²⁴ Braund (1996) 42: not even Odysseus (nor any Greek or Roman hero) had reached such distant shores.

¹²⁵ Hölscher (2006) 41-42. This is not to say that artworks were not enjoyed for their own sake in the private homes of Romans, however, political space was surely constructed with careful and deliberate consideration to the political messages represented in the displayed artworks. Spencer (2010) 135-171: argues that the public domains of private space also utilized specific artworks to craft specific messages, discussing the villas of Livia and Sallust.

governing role and advertised the accord of general and Senate as part of a cohesive and unified civic institution. It is the Senate's control over the general's choice of deity that most demonstrates the relationship between the two parties, regardless of the degree of manubial funding from the general. As well as symbolizing the general's congruence with the Senate, vowing and dedicating such temples also advertized the general's pious relationship with the gods, further legitimizing his elevated position within Roman society. Towards the end of the late republic however, wealth from successful campaigns abroad increased the size and scale of manubial construction, resulting in the development of extensive and elaborate, highly individualized complexes such as the Theatre of Pompey and the *forum Iulium*. Such complexes still advertised the generals' divine relationships with their chosen gods but as the following discussion will demonstrate, the politically independent nature of such immense precincts (complete with *curiae* and assembly spaces) shifted the focus firmly from the Senate to the individual.

SECTION THREE

CONSTRUCTING CAESAR: CHALLENGING COLLECTIVE IDENTITY

The *forum Iulium* did not replace the *forum Romanum*, adopting many traditional architectural and functional elements of this Roman civic space.¹²⁶ However, it did shift focus *away* from it. This section, rather, deals with the potential social and political implications of Caesar's forum complex and considers its departure from the traditional institutions of the *forum Romanum*. Emphasis is given to the nature of Caesar's relationship to Venus Genetrix and his manipulation and presentation of this through public monumentalization of the space as well as looking at how this complex may have challenged the way in which Rome's citizens participated and interacted politically and culturally within this forum.

Monumentalization and the Man: Our Venus

As discussed above, by the first century BCE the *forum Romanum* had developed from a basic marketplace to an all encompassing, sophisticated business centre and the judicial seat of Rome. As the centre of the city, its monumentalization functioned to provide a landscape of memory and a fixed point of reference for the glory and achievements of Rome as a collective whole and for individuals as citizens of Rome. The relationship between monumentalization and civic space developed throughout the republican period and often benefited individual men in association with the greatness of Rome, reflective of their individual relationships with the State. The 'colonization' of certain areas of the *forum Romanum* by particular people was occurring in the third and second centuries BCE, however, enormous wealth pouring into the city in the late republic for particular nobles, equites, and propertied classes in general resulted in huge fortunes for these political classes, allowing them to spend vast amounts in pursuit of their political careers.¹²⁷

Thus, the use of monumental space to advertise social and political status became an extremely powerful tool for individuals of the late republic. Public exhibition of noble connections through display of one's *maiores* played an important role in republican society

¹²⁶ Demonstrated in Chapter Three, particularly: 134-135.

¹²⁷ Mouritsen (2001) 134. Discussed further throughout Chapter Three.

and, as Hölkeskamp discusses, the ‘symbolic capital’ gained from the good deeds and honours of one’s ancestors became a type of ‘social credit’ used by individuals for political advancement.¹²⁸ This type of capital, although powerful, was short lived and could die out within a generation or two. It is this point that is interesting in the case of Caesar’s use of Venus Genetrix. For example, Caesar was perhaps conscious of his family’s recent political shortcomings before his Gallic successes and subsequent alliance with Pompey and Crassus, as reflected in the reports of both Suetonius and Plutarch. Suetonius (*Caes.* 1.1) states that Caesar put off his marriage to a girl of equestrian rank to marry the daughter of Cinna (four times consul), suggesting he made strategic attempts to improve his social standing. Furthermore, Plutarch (*Caes.* 1.1-2) reports that while Sulla considered Caesar a political danger, due to his family connection to Marius, many others no longer considered this connection significant. In fact, as early as 67 BCE Caesar was finding other ways to legitimize his family’s (and therefore his own) rightful place in society, as is evidenced by the eulogy given for his aunt Julia linking the lineage of his family to that of the goddess Venus:

Amitae meae Iuliae maternum genus ab regibus ortum, paternum cum diis immortalibus coniunctum est. Nam ab Anco Marcio sunt Marcii Reges, quo nomine fuit mater; a Venere Iulii, cuius gentis familia est nostra. Est ergo in genere et sanctitas regum, qui plurimum inter homines pollent, et caerimonia deorum, quorum ipsi in potestate sunt reges.

The family of my aunt Julia on my mother’s side is descended from kings, on my father’s side, it is linked with the gods. For the Marcii Reges (her mother’s name) are (descended) from Ancus Marcius, and the Iulii, of whose clan our family are (descended), from Venus. It (our family) therefore has the sanctity of the kings in lineage, who hold the sort of power among men, and the reverence of the gods, in which power the gods themselves rule. (Suet. *Lives: Iul.* 6.1)¹²⁹

This point is not surprising since Caesar was still a young man, establishing his political authority, and despite ancient patrician lineage his immediate family members had not risen

¹²⁸ Hölkeskamp (2010) 107-124. For further discussion of the importance of the display of ancestral deeds, particularly through rituals such as the parading of wax images of ancestors in the funeral parade and the importance of the funeral speech in order to advertise and recount their noble deeds, see: Wallace-Hadrill (2008) 213-258.

¹²⁹ The tradition is that the Iulii *gens* were direct descendants of Aeneas through his son Ascanius (Iulus), although the exact date of origin for this tradition is problematic. For further discussion, see: Smith (2006) 37-45, particularly: 37, n.93; Smith (1996) 3: proffers the idea that the most likely transmission route for the myth of Aeneas is from the Greeks via the Etruscans. See also: Wiseman (2005) 153-164; Feeney (2007) 88-89; Bremmer and Horsfall (1987) Ch. 2.

higher than praetorship.¹³⁰ It would be sometime before Caesar called attention to these divine affiliations again as events throughout the late 50s saw him grow in military and political stature. It is tempting to conclude that Caesar was simply confident enough at this stage not to need to advertise his ancestry in this way.¹³¹

By the time Caesar purchased the land for his complex in 54 BCE, as ex-consul, conqueror of Gaul,¹³² and at the peak of his political influence, strengthened by his alliance with Pompey and Crassus, he had amassed significant symbolic capital. However, events leading up to the civil war demonstrate that despite his significant achievements, Caesar's position in Rome was not unassailable. His alliance with Pompey had weakened after the deaths of his daughter Julia (Pompey's wife) in 54 BCE, and Crassus in 53 BCE. Pompey's reforms instigated during his sole consulship in 52 BCE weakened Caesar's position at Rome (and threatened to complicate his return from Gaul) and furthermore, strengthened Pompey's own position. Ultimately Caesar's efforts to resist subordination to Pompey failed and Rome was thrown into civil war.¹³³ It is not surprising then that Caesar again drew attention to his connection with Venus when he vowed the temple at the start of the Battle of Pharsalus in 48 BCE.¹³⁴ Caesar's conscious use of Venus Genetrix to advertise divine familial associations in this civic space legitimized his superior social standing and right of (permanent) monumental abode at the political and topographical centre of Rome.¹³⁵ The cult statue of Venus Genetrix by Arcesilaus, housed in the temple and dedicated to her (App. *BC* 2.102; Plin. *NH* 35.156), advertised this familial link to visitors.¹³⁶ The symbolic capital gained from the powerful invocation of his hieratic familial ties through erection of the Temple of Venus Genetrix provided Caesar with more social credit than anyone else in

¹³⁰ Although Caesar was born into an ancient patrician family and had ties to the military hero Marius, the Iulii had reached high office in the third, fourth, and fifth centuries and his immediate ancestors had not risen higher than praetorship. For discussion on the topic of nobility and patrician status in regards to the Iulii, see: Meier (1995) 51-55; Tatum (2008) 6-7, 18-41; Badian (2009) 11-22. For more discussion regarding Caesar's familial link to Marius, see especially: Tatum (2008) 18-41; Bell (2004) 30-31.

¹³¹ This is a markedly different situation to Caesar's earlier years - evidenced spending great sums of money during his aedileship – see: Chapter Three 105-106, n.27.

¹³² Caesar was mid-campaign at this point, however, his *commentarii* served to report his continued successes to Rome. See, particularly: Welch *et al.* (1998).

¹³³ See: Meier (1995) 349-366; Carter (1997) *xvi-xxi*; Tatum (2008) 122-144. Pompey's wife Julia (Caesar's daughter) died in childbirth; a marriage that had tightly bound Caesar and Pompey.

¹³⁴ Appian *BC* 2.102.

¹³⁵ For discussion regarding the republic as a high period for temple building compared to the Imperial period, see: Wallace-Hadrill (2005) 79. For discussion of the importance of building location for political significance, see: Muccigrosso (2006) 187-191. Chapter One 21, 33-35: discussed the importance of building homes around the forum and the role of high visibility in the political life of republican Rome.

¹³⁶ Also, for a sitting Venus, see: BM Rep. 1.583.4277.

Rome at this time. It was one thing to gain prestige by association with a temple complex. However, it was quite another to share the divinity of the deity (through lineage), setting Caesar apart from other Roman citizens.¹³⁷

Cicero's discussion of the existence of gods and their role in caring for mankind is interesting for analysis of Caesar's use of the aspect of 'Genetrix'. Cicero (through the character of Balbus) highlights late republican (stoic¹³⁸) attitudes to man's relationship to the gods as *receiver* of the benefits the gods bestow upon mankind, signaling Caesar's unique relationship with his deity:

Multae autem aliae naturae deorum ex magnis beneficiis eorum non sine causa et a Graeciae sapientissimis et a maioribus nostris constitutae nominataeque sunt. Quicquid enim magnam utilitatem generi adferret humano, id non sine divina bonitate erga homines fieri arbitrabantur. Itaque tum illud quod erat a deo natum nomine ipsius dei nuncupabant, ut cum fruges Cererem appellamus vinum autem Liberum, ex quo illud Terenti "sine Cerere et Libero friget Venus", tum autem res ipsa, in qua vis inest maior aliqua, sic appellatur ut ea ipsa vis nominetur deus, ut Fides ut Mens, quas in Capitolio dedicatas videmus proxime a M. Aemilio Scauro, ante autem ab <A.> Atilio Catalino erat Fides consecrata. Vides Virtutis templum vides Honoris a M. Marcello renovatum, quod multis ante annis erat bello Ligustico a Q. Maximo dedicatum. Quid Opis quid Salutis quid Concordiae Liberatis Victoriae; quarum omnium rerum quia avis erat tanta ut sine deo regi non posset, ipsa res deorum nomen optinuit. Quo ex genere Cupidinis et Voluptatis et Lubentinae Veneris vocabula consecrata sunt, vitiosarum rerum neque naturalium – quamquam Velleius aliter existimat, sed tamen ea ipsa vitia naturam vehementius saepe pulsan. Utilitatum igitur magnitudine constituti sunt ei di qui utilitates quasque gignebant, atque is quidem nominibus quae paulo ante dicta sunt quae vis sit in quoque declaratur deo.

However, it is not by accident that many divine characteristics have been established and named after their great benefactions by the wisest of the Greeks and by our ancestors. They believed that whatever bestowed great advantage on the human race, this did not come about without divine favour towards men. And so, then, they referred to that which was produced by a god by the name of the deity itself. Just as when we refer to crops as Ceres or wine as Liber, from which we get that line of Terence <*The Eunuch* 732>: "without Ceres, without Liber, Venus is cold." But, on the other hand, the circumstance in which there is some greater power present, the deity is named just as that quality itself is defined, such as in Fides <Faith> or Mens <Mind>, which we can see on the

¹³⁷ As discussed, Caesar was not the first to claim 'association' with Venus, Sulla was the first with his epithet of Felix (favoured by Venus) and if Coarelli's (2010) claims are correct his Temple of Venus Victrix on the Capitoline, followed by Pompey (in his Temple of Venus Victrix) are other examples. However, Caesar's claim for familial ties with the goddess set him apart. See: Coarelli (2010) 107-132; Orlin (2010) 201; Keaveney (1983) 60-64.

¹³⁸ Beard *et al.* (1998) 34-35.

Capitoline, recently dedicated by Marcus Aemilius Scaurus, but before that, Fides was dedicated by Aulus Atilius Catalinus. You can see the Temple of Virtus <Virtue>, you can see the Temple of Honos <Honor>, renovated by Marcus Marcellus, which was vowed many years before in the Ligurian War by Quintus Maximus. But what about Ops <Wealth>, Salus <Health>, Concordia <Concord>, Libertas <Liberty>, and Victoria <Victory>: of these things, because the quality was such that it could not be controlled except by a god, the quality itself takes on the name of the gods. The names of Cupido <Desire>, Voluptas <Pleasure>, and Venus of Pleasure are dedicated according to the same principle, sinful and unnatural qualities (although Vellius thinks otherwise), nevertheless, these very vices themselves often overpower natural instinct. Therefore, those gods who bestowed certain qualities were deified because of the magnitude of those advantages. This power, which resides in each god, is clearly indicated by those names just mentioned. (Cic. *Nat. D.* 2.60-62)¹³⁹

Here, Cicero emphasizes that the power resides in the god, not the individual vowing or dedicating the temple. The most a magistrate could hope for would be to associate himself with the important function of the particular temple¹⁴⁰ and/or the particular quality or aspect of the god, but only as a quality *given* to him by the god. It could be argued that even the Temple of Venus Victrix in Pompey's theatre complex (as with Sulla's too) advertised Pompey as the passive receiver of victory bestowed by the goddess (significant in itself), but certainly not as divine, *himself*. Despite Pompey's powerful political position at this time, since the power resided with the gods, presumably Cicero also understood that they could revoke their gifts (as they appear to do with his defeat at Pharsalus). By claiming ancestry to this principal deity, Caesar could assert that any qualities of Venus were in effect qualities of his own - elevating Caesar above both Pompey and Sulla. Furthermore, the aspect of ancestry could not be taken away (by mortal or deity), establishing Caesar's position in a considerable state of permanence.

The significance of this point is more obvious when considering the case of Metellus Caprarius and his temporary associations with Magna Mater. Metellus Caprarius was associated with the goddess Magna Mater through Marcus Metellus, who had helped bring

¹³⁹ See also: Hölkeskamp (2010) 61: for the abstract qualities of these gods.

¹⁴⁰ The Temple of Vesta was associated with important political activities from early on; Temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus housed the Sibylline Books; Temple of Castor and Pollux used for meetings of the Senate and contained many fine artworks (Plin. *NH* 34.73, 77, 80, 89); Temple of Saturn housed the official State Treasury, the *aerarium Saturni*. For aspects of the gods and their role in forming a type of state ideology, rather than reflecting the characteristic of the individual, and for forming collective models of normative political conduct, see: Hölscher (2006) 27-48.

the goddess to Rome.¹⁴¹ Despite reaching the censorship in 102 BCE, and dedicating the Temple of Magna Mater in 101 BCE, the political advantage of this association with the goddess was ultimately short-lived for Caprarius. The arrival of the high priest of Cybele, Bataces, into Rome in 102 BCE, saw the priest align with the Marians and not the Metelii, which in turn, confirmed Marius' superior standing with the goddess, a significant loss for Caprarius. The patronage of the goddess and the devotion of her followers were transferred to Marius,¹⁴² along with all the political advantages that came with the divine association.¹⁴³ Caesar's construction of a temple and his claim to a legendary genealogy were not innovations (both are attested traditions in republican Rome¹⁴⁴), nor was his choice of Venus as his deity,¹⁴⁵ however, by association, Rome's new civic centre now effectively paid homage to a *human* individual (Suet. *Div. Iul.* 78.2).¹⁴⁶ Additionally, as a political construct, Caesar's choice of Venus, particularly 'Genetrix', can also be seen in part to be reflective of his need to legitimize his role in the civil war.¹⁴⁷ The established tradition of Venus as ancestress of the Roman people would have allowed Caesar to appeal to their sentiment of kinship¹⁴⁸ and shared history when vowing his temple, encouraging their support.¹⁴⁹ By

¹⁴¹ Livy 29.11.4-8 and 6-14.

¹⁴² The principal followers of the goddess came from the lower orders and constituted a considerable group of extreme worshippers. See: Bömer (1964) 130ff, (cited in: Morgan (1973) 235, n. 101).

¹⁴³ See: Morgan (1973) 231-245; Orlin (2010) 200-201.

¹⁴⁴ See above: 75-83 for discussion on manubial construction. For discussion of claims to divine and heroic genealogies, termed 'legendary genealogy' by Wiseman, see: Wiseman (2005) 153-164.

¹⁴⁵ Orlin (2010) 202: "Sulla was among the first Roman politicians to claim a direct personal relationship with a divinity, and the first to claim Venus in that role." He used the cognomen *felix* at Rome; Coarelli (2010) 107-132: for his hypothesis of a Sullan triple-temple complex, dedicated to Venus Victrix, Genus Publicus, and Faustus Felicitas.

¹⁴⁶ See also: Dyson (2010) 108. For other examples of magistrates linked to the divine status of their vowed deities (albeit in a much more oblique fashion than Caesar's claim to Venus Genetrix), see: Beard *et al.* (1998) I, 89-90: discussing the innovations of the personifications of *Pietas* ('Piety') vowed by Manius Acilius Glabrio before the battle against King Antiochus 191 BCE (dedicated 181 BCE by his son) and *Felicitas* constructed by Licinius Lucullus from booty gained on his Spanish campaign 151-150 BCE. Here the qualities received divine status possibly deifying the qualities of the generals themselves. All other temples vowed in the third and second centuries followed the traditional groups of Juno, Diana, Fortuna, Jupiter and Mars despite the growth in temple building during this period; Beard *et al.* (1998) 145-149: for discussion regarding this unique presentation of his relationship to Venus, outstripping both Pompey and Sulla.

¹⁴⁷ For Caesar's awareness of the need for justifications of war, see: Caes. *BC* 1.7, whereby Caesar, after explaining the corrupt position threatening the State, goes on to describe his own 'defensive' position protecting the *res publica*. It is hardly surprising that it is also at this point that Caesar points out his good deeds having pacified all of Gaul and Germany, using fear as a tool for justification of war. For their various discussions of Caesar's use of *commentarii* as tools for justification to his Roman audience, see also: Welch and Powell (1998) introduction; Barlow (1998) 139-170; Rawlings (1998) 171-91; and Wiseman (1998) 1-10. Although these chapters deal predominately with Caesar's *BG*, they are of value to this discussion in regards to Caesar's utilization of *commentarii* on his Roman audience as a means of constant reporting and manipulation of the presentation of events from his perspective.

¹⁴⁸ Smith (2006) 41: discusses the Roman idea of genealogy and explains that kinship between members of a gens was viewed less in terms of being considered biologically real and more in terms of relationships to a

appealing to the shared ancestry of Rome's people with Caesar, a direct descendant of the goddess, he could show his right to fight for Rome and her people, while the protection afforded Caesar through his personal association with the goddess offered protection to the people. This point could help explain Appian's (*BC* 2.68) report of Caesar's vow to Venus 'Victrix' before the battle of Pharsalus. As he strove to exhort his men to fight for him, his appeal to the aspect of 'Victrix' would have allowed Caesar to appeal to his soldiers' sense of *dignitas* and *gloria*. Similarly, his subsequent dedication to Venus 'Genetrix' in the wake of the upheaval of the civil war, would have allowed Caesar to appeal to the Roman sense of kinship to garner support at home. Furthermore, associating the temple with the goddess also attributed the victory to her, further justifying his part in the war by suggesting the war had the support of the goddess (and suggesting that Pompey had lost the quality of 'Victrix').¹⁵⁰ Of course, there are no reports of Caesar vowing any temples during his campaigns in Gaul, Germany, or Britain. The question of why not is an interesting one. Perhaps he felt sufficiently justified in protecting Rome against such barbarian threats (ethnographically fashioned, emphasized, and continually reported by Caesar, through his *commentarii*). Since Caesar was buying the land in 54 BCE, before the civil war, it is likely he intended to use this space to glorify his earlier campaigns.¹⁵¹ However, by 48 BCE the civil war would have required much more explanation and this presumably influenced his choices in monumentalizing his deeds and in choosing a deity and the associated attribute.¹⁵²

mythical ancestor, not to each other. It is this point that is important for this thesis, since kinship seems to form part of Caesar's two-pronged use of 'Genetrix', binding all Romans to Caesar through kinship.

¹⁴⁹ Wallensten (2010) 269-284: discusses Aphrodite as a means of interaction between the Greeks and Romans in the wake of Roman expansion. She demonstrates the way the Greeks saw their goddess, affecting both Greek religious and political spheres and the way they acknowledged and communicated with Roman power. Wallensten also acknowledges differences of scholarly opinion regarding when the idea of Trojan roots became commonplace among Romans (sixth–second centuries BCE). She uses Homer's *Iliad* (5.247, 311-317) to demonstrate Greek knowledge of familiarity with the Trojan connection as early as the fifth century BCE; Pliny (*NH* 28.39): discusses the sacred objects housed in the Temple of Vesta, including a statue of Athena (the Palladium) said to have been carried to Rome from Troy by Aeneas, cited in: Beard *et al.* (1998) 93, n.11. This adds weight to the argument for an earlier awareness of Venus as the ancestress of Rome by association with her son, since the temple is one of the earliest there. For families adopting Venus, see also: Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 1.85. For Sulla's propagandist appropriation of the Venus, see: Temelini (2006) 7-8. For discussion in general of Venus, Aeneas, and Rome, see: Galinsky (1969); Coarelli (2010), particularly 127: attributing the introduction of Venus Victrix at Rome to Sulla rather than Pompey.

¹⁵⁰ See, discussion above regarding the divine attributes of the gods as gifts to men: 87-88. Meier (1995) 445: for discussion on the consecration of the temple and the attribution of victory; Beard *et al.* (1995) I, 144: for discussion regarding association with the gods as a form of protection. Bremmer and Horsfall (1987) 12-24: discuss the uncertainty of dating for this concept, and Caesar's programmatic politicization of this mythology. Also, *cf.* the discussion earlier in Chapter One regarding Opimius and his use of the goddess Concordia as an appeasement for bringing bloodshed within the *pomerium*: 37-38.

¹⁵¹ Also, the view of Purcell (1993) 129.

¹⁵² See: Caes. *BC* 1.22: for Caesar fighting for the *libertas* of himself and the People of Rome, presumably a cause worthy of Venus' support. For Caesar's awareness of such concepts as a political tool for the

Welcome To My World

As discussed, a paucity of evidence makes it unclear as to what degree Caesar's forum actually functioned as an active political space during his lifetime. While this fact remains, it is still important to consider how this space may have impacted Rome's citizenry under Caesar's dictatorship had it been utilized as a regular political venue. Having created such a highly personalized 'civic' space, interaction and participation within this forum was surely altered for many of Rome's citizenry. Chapter One discussed the increasing role of the people in late republican politics and their use as a tool for magistrates in advertising symbolic support for their causes. This perceived growth in popular participation, attracting larger crowds, instigated a gradual shift in focus and orientation from the Curia outward to the Comitium and forum space. Ulrich cites the architectural similarities of the Temple of Castor with the Temple of Venus Genetrix as evidence that Caesar's overall building program at Rome reflected a sustained effort to provide suitable places for the congregation of his popular support.¹⁵³ To a large extent Ulrich appears to be right. After all, Caesar's complex does seem to follow many of the established architectural and political traditions of the *forum Romanum*, suggesting its intention as an extension of the former's political and administrative activities.¹⁵⁴ None of the sources appear concerned with any dynastic implications of Caesar's forum, suggesting that the complex may have simply marked him out as a generous benefactor to Rome (in the prestigious company of men such as Sulla and Pompey). However, several aspects of the complex surely challenged the traditional institutions of the republic by altering the way in which citizens participated and interacted culturally and politically within this civic space.

The iconography and monumental reminders in the *forum Iulium* were of Caesar's past, not Rome's as a whole, reinforcing his prominent position in the assemblies held there (whether

manipulation and presentation of events it is also important to consider the events after the Battle of Pharsalus when Caesar had the equestrian statues of Sulla and Pompey restored after the populace had torn them down (Suet. *Iul.* 57.4; Dio 43.49). This action by Caesar resulted in the Senate decreeing a temple to the Clemency of Caesar (Suet. *Iul.* 57.4), discussed in: Zanker (2009) 294.

¹⁵³ Ulrich (1993) 75: support through the tribal vote of the *comitia tributa* that allowed him to pass his most controversial legislation, the agrarian bill. Architectural similarities - both temples *octastyle* and *peripteros sine postico*, and evidence of speaker's platforms.

¹⁵⁴ Continuity of function, particularly judicial: 69-74; Architectural traditions: Chapter Three 134-135; Sulla, Pompey, Caesar: Chapter Three 128-129.

Caesar was present or not).¹⁵⁵ Traditionally, public institutions such as the Comitium, as a place of public assembly, had been embellished with the iconography of Rome's success and glory, allowing individuals to identify with their great city through the course of their daily activities in this civic space, as citizens and members. The Rostra, for instance, with its symbols of victory over the Latins monumentalized the city-state and reminded viewers of their civic identity and collective pride. While the change in orientation in the *forum Romanum* from the Curia to the Comitium, as the spatial epicentre of Rome (first half of the third century BCE), had shifted political focus from the Curia (and Senate) towards the *populus*, it had not challenged Rome's collective authority. By providing an official space for the people, it created a stronger collective unit by strengthening the symbolism of the people in Roman politics. Similarly, the subsequent shift from the Curia-Comitium complex to the appropriation of temple space for political use toward the late republic had maintained this popular focus.

The existence of a speaker's platform in Caesar's complex implies that he was still ostensibly intending it as a public gathering space.¹⁵⁶ However, his authority expressed through the new complex, despite allowing for larger assemblies, presented the *home* of a divinely associated individual. Despite the symbolism of the speaker's platform on the Temple of Venus Genetrix as a space for public assembly and participation, the actual level of 'public participation' allowed in such a carefully constructed and personalized space is an important consideration. In keeping with Mouritsen's claims that late republican crowds at *contiones* were largely organised to be supportive of the speaker,¹⁵⁷ presumably, Caesar could use his 'public' space to mobilize favourable crowds. Given that the forum itself carried the name of the dictator and his divine ancestry, it would hardly seem the place to hear anti-Caesarian sentiment. After all, Cicero had already demonstrated a loss of political freedom in his letter to Lentulus Spinther early in 55 BCE well before Caesar's dictatorships:

¹⁵⁵ There is no direct evidence of assemblies held in this forecourt. However, based on the fact that the Comitium and *forum Romanum* had become cramped toward the end of the late republic, it is reasonable to assume they were held there. Caesar claimed direct lineage as a closer tie than that of the Roman people.

¹⁵⁶ No other temple in Imperial fora was built with a façade and speaker's platform styled base: Ulrich (1993) 80. This point, although outside the remit of this thesis, could be argued as showing Caesar's position on the eve of the fall of the republic and the rise of the imperial rule of the emperors, whereby the people lost their true power of expression.

¹⁵⁷ Mouritsen (2001) 50.

[res communes] sunt quidem certe in amicorum nostrorum potestate, atque ita ut nullam mutationem unquam hac hominum aetate habitura res esse videatur.

Public life is beyond doubt in the control of our friends, and to such an extent that it seems there will never be any change during this generation.. (*Fam.* 1.8.1)¹⁵⁸

Presumably by the 40s this lack of freedom expressed by Cicero had only intensified since Caesar, through a combination of consulships (48, 46-44 BCE) and dictatorships (49-44 BCE), either directly or indirectly controlled much of Rome's political arena.¹⁵⁹ A dictator (and possibly his master of the horse) could convene assemblies (although it is unclear whether or not they could put legislation to them), and as Caesar (*BC* 3.2) states, in his consulships magistrates could enact laws on his behalf.¹⁶⁰ Since Caesar was absent from Rome much of the time, his emphasis on the role of other magistrates in enacting legislation and convening assemblies on his behalf underscores the potential significance for the assembly space of the *forum Iulium* as a political tool, as Caesar could utilize this location for constant self-promotion even in his absence.

Caesar's new civic space appears to have given little authority to the Senate or the urban masses, presenting Caesar as the one in full political control. His intense building activity in the NE corner of the *forum Romanum*, between 54 and 44 BCE, would have eclipsed the traditional space of the Comitium, removing any meaningful function. The institution that had provided independent and legitimate voice to the people of Rome ceased to exist as an independent and recognizable structure.¹⁶¹ By Caesar's instigation in 45 BCE, radical reshaping of the tripartite institution of the Comitium, Rostra, and Curia changed the political landscape of the *forum Romanum* entirely. The permanent removal of the Graecostasis, relocation of the traditional Rostra to the north of the *forum Romanum*, and the replacement, relocation, and reorientation of the Curia Cornelia (with the Curia Iulia) restructured the spatial face of politics.¹⁶² It is important to note that the Curia Iulia was

¹⁵⁸ Cited from: Fantham (2004) 11, 1-25: Fantham also provides in-depth discussion of this period and the significant shift of political control to Caesar and Pompey. See, also: Cic. *Fam.* 1.8. 3-4.

¹⁵⁹ Gardner (2009) 57-71: for in-depth discussion of Caesar's consulships and dictatorships, 57-58: The precise dates of appointment, and duration, of the dictatorships, and their relation to his consulships, are problematic and cannot be established. For the evidence, and its problems, see: Broughton, *MRR* II, under the years 49-44 BCE, especially 284-5, n. 1, and also: 3.106-8.

¹⁶⁰ For further discussion regarding this matter, see: Gardner (2009) 58.

¹⁶¹ Coarelli, *LTUR* IV, 312.

¹⁶² Zanker (2009) 293; Coarelli, *LTUR* IV, 212-214.

completed under Octavian and it is unclear how far Caesar had progressed with this project before his death. However as an architectural adjunct to the *forum Iulium* (see fig. 1), ostensibly this new curia annexed the Senate to Caesar's domain (responding to Pompey's theatre senate house).¹⁶³ These topographic alterations represented significant political and social change for late-republican Rome. More importantly, this reorientation connected these new institutions topographically and probably ideologically with the *forum Iulium*.¹⁶⁴ If Caesar's forum was used for political assemblies, then unlike previous shifts in political focus this final phase in the life (and death) of the Comitium would have meant the transference of popular assembly from a truly civic Roman space to a new narrowly and individually focused domain in Caesar's complex. Audiences symbolising the collective voice of the Roman people would be gathered under the name of Caesar.¹⁶⁵

Similarly, the imposing nature of the high podium (and possible fountain structure) would mean that the speaker was considerably distanced from his audience, presumably reducing their capacity for participation. As Favro states, the elevated podium was more than a mere speaker's platform - it was a Caesarian stage.¹⁶⁶ The 5-metre high podium was fronted by a 3.5-metre high façade, serving as a speaker's platform for addressing a frontally focused audience.¹⁶⁷ Although the height of the speaker's platform was no higher than previous republican speaker's platforms in the *forum Romanum*, which seem to have been between 2.5-4.3 metres high, the unencumbered nature of the façade platform with its side stairs restricting access, in conjunction with the elevated temple stylobate (which would then elevate the speaker to 6 metres above the forum), combined to present an imposing and dominant structure.¹⁶⁸ It is known that the Romans made linguistic distinction between the

¹⁶³ Zanker (2009) 293; Coarelli, *LTUR* IV, 212-214.

¹⁶⁴ Tortorici (1995) 332. While the topographical connection of the two fora is important, a lack of evidence regarding specific activities and their frequency within the *forum Iulium* means it is currently impossible to quantify the actual degree to which focus shifted to Caesar's complex.

¹⁶⁵ This is not to suggest the *forum Iulium* took over from the *forum Romanum* and other locations. As noted earlier, there is abundant evidence to suggest political activities continued in various locations at Rome.

¹⁶⁶ Favro (1996) 72-72.

¹⁶⁷ See: Appendix 1, fig. 6.

¹⁶⁸ The original height of the republican Rostra was somewhere between the height of the podium in the late-republican Temple of Castor and Pollux that was 2.5-4.3m high (due to the gradually sloping level of the forum) and the Caesarian-Augustan rostra (3.5m) that eventually replaced it. Morstein-Marx (2004) 50-51. Even the Temple of Juno Moneta which is understood to have acted as a backdrop to the Forum is thought to have been 4 metres high, although this remains unclear: Tucci (2005) 13. For height of the stylobate, see: Ulrich (1993) 76.

orators speaking *de loco superiore* to an audience in *loco inferiore*.¹⁶⁹ Cicero (*Att.* 2.24.3, *Vat.* 24) discusses the ranking of speakers stating that some speakers invited by the presiding magistrate could talk on the rostra proper, whilst those office holders who had not called the assembly spoke from the lower steps of the speaker's platform.¹⁷⁰ It is unclear to what degree the physical elevation of the speaker actually reflected his superior status or Rome's political hierarchy. Since the *forum Iulium* 'belonged' to Caesar one would assume that it was only proponents of Caesar who spoke from the stage and as such it was only them that benefited from the increased status of their elevated position on the podium. In addition, the lack of frontal stairs removed any opportunity for those of lower rank to speak from a lower position; one was either on the podium or not. Although it can be argued that all speakers outranked the majority of their audience, the imposingly high podium and restricted access distanced both parties further, symbolically and physically.

Narrow architectural design focused the visitor to Caesar's complex on the temple and speakers platform, as a dominant feature of the space. Although Caesar was not the first to use side stairs on a speaker's platform, it was the combination of narrow temple front and large forecourt, high podium, and narrow lateral stairs - restricting access to all but a select few - that would have purposely focused the audience exclusively on the speaker.¹⁷¹ This combination of temple and forecourt (forum) space combined with the imposing backdrop to the speaker's platform reshaped the use of space in the closing stages of the republic (as evidenced by subsequent imperial fora at Rome and in provincial towns), which allowed for large crowds to gather for public address while monumentalizing their donors.¹⁷² Just as the vast dimensions and imposing topographical position of Sulla's triple-temple/tabularium complex on the Capitoline dominated the spaces of traditional politics in and around the *forum Romanum*, Caesar's Temple of Venus Genetrix presented an immense and formidable monument to his central position at Rome by the time of his death. It can be argued that

¹⁶⁹ Cic. *Att.* 2.24.3; Livy 8.32; 8.33.9; Cic. *Vat.* 24; Fronto, *Ep.* 1.2.7. This point is emphasized by Pina Polo who contrasts the Greek practice of raising the speaker only marginally or having to look up to their audience. (1996) 23-25 *Contra Arma Verbis*.

¹⁷⁰ Morstein-Marx (2004) 51: Morstein-Marx states that he is tempted to agree with Pina Polo (1996) in his correlation between the elevated speaker as a reflection of the political hierarchy of Rome.

¹⁷¹ Podium height: Corbeill (1996) 127-128. For the relationship to heights of podiums in relation to the audience, see: Polo (1996) 23-25; Corbeill (2002) 182-251, 199-200. The Temple of Castor and Pollux was rebuilt sometime in the second century and the frontal stairs transformed into a platform accessed by lateral stairs: Mouritsen (2001) 21. Tucci (2005) 22: discusses the possibility of the combination of podium and side stairs on the Temple of Juno Moneta.

¹⁷² Ulrich (1993) 77; Tucci (2005) 22.

Caesar was forced to build in a narrow and focused style by the topographical restrictions of the area. The back of the temple was indeed built right up to the base of the Capitoline hill and remained engaged until the Augustan period. It would be difficult, however, to argue that Caesar did not (in the end) gain from such an opportunity and that he was not well aware of the benefits of building in this manner – a problem Caesar seems to have embraced in constructing his monumental and significantly personal ‘civic’ space.

In Sum

As a manubial structure, Caesar’s complex ostensibly represented the symbiotic relationship between vowing general and approving Senate (although we have no proof of who actually paid for the construction itself.). Deliberate advertisement of his unique relationship to Venus Genetrix, however, served to increase the symbolic capital of his family and ultimately of himself, as the most prominent member of this illustrious family. Cicero’s discussion of the temples and gods of Rome present man as the receiver of their divine qualities even in the late republic, whereby Caesar’s temple dedicated to his direct *relative* Venus presented him on equal footing with the goddess. This aspect of familial relationship in combination with the simple yet dominating architectural features of the complex personalized the space for Caesar, presumably altering the way in which citizens participated and interacted culturally and politically within this space, placing the citizenry in second position to Caesar as somewhat outsiders. Like Sulla and Pompey, Caesar had monumentalized his relationship to Venus, and hence, his prominent position in Rome, placing him in the company of Rome’s powerful men. However, Caesar’s unique relationship to the goddess set him apart. The link between the shift in political focus (from the Senate to the People) and the spatial shift (from Curia to Comitium) that saw the *populus* become an increasingly important aspect of republican politics (whether symbolic or not) does pose interesting considerations for the political impact of Caesar’s complex (even if the evidence is lacking). If a move from the internal focus of the Curia to the open area of the Comitium/forum could create such a significant shift in political focus, then presumably the more specialized domain of Caesar’s space had the potential to influence the political situation to some degree (at least eventually).

CONCLUSION

Due to the paucity of evidence regarding this site and its structures there are more questions than answers when considering the full social, political, and cultural significance of the *forum Iulium*. Evidence for Caesar's intentions is lacking. Ulrich (1993) does address this issue, arguing that Caesar could not have known about events such as the civil war or the riots of 52 BCE during Clodius' funeral, which resulted in the burning of the Curia Hostilia that allowed him to transfer the Senate to his own Curia Iulia.¹⁷³ His discussion does highlight the difficulties of analysis of the Caesarian phase but is lacking in sufficient cultural and political discussion. Questions also remain regarding the full extent of the artwork and iconography in this complex. For example, given Caesar's use of the familial tie to Venus Genetrix, should we expect other representations such as Romulus, said to be the grandson of Aeneas or was this the idea of Augustus? It is therefore with caution that one should approach the evidence for this complex. Chapter Three will look at this forum complex in the context of euergetism in comparison to Pompey's significant theatre-temple complex, where it will be shown that despite such a significantly personalized, self-aggrandizing and self-serving complex, the *forum Iulium* did fit within Rome's traditional architectural framework.

¹⁷³ Finished by Augustus. Of course, Pompey's theatre complex also filled the role of replacement Curia, but not within the sacred boundary of the *pomerium*.

CHAPTER THREE

BUILDING ALLIANCES: THE POLITICS OF PUBLIC BUILDING PROJECTS AT ROME.

The city of Rome provided the arena in which the social and political relations of the elite played out against a backdrop of the Roman populace. In this urban setting social distinctions could be advertised by elite individuals through display of their good deeds toward the community at large. Big buildings conferred big kudos upon the donor thus providing a significant opportunity to display one's *dignitas*, *auctoritas*, and *honor*. This required great wealth to execute. This chapter examines the significance and role of euergetism in relation to public buildings at Rome and attempts to demonstrate that financial control of such benefactions became a significant political tool for wealthy *triumphatores* towards the end of the republic. Section One will briefly explore the increasingly competitive nature of euergetism for magistrates toward the end of the late republic in order to explain why magistrates would seek sometimes-difficult political alliances with wealthy individuals in order to provide bigger and better benefactions. Particular emphasis will be given to public buildings as a form of public munificence. Section Two will argue that wealthy individuals like Pompey, Crassus, and Caesar not only drove building projects at Rome by providing necessary loans and political influence, but, in doing so, appropriated a significant proportion of influence and authority within the instruments of government through the accrued *gratia* of these transactions. Finally, Section Three will present two case studies: the Theatre of Pompey and the *forum Iulium*. Chapter Two discussed the highly personalized nature of the iconography in Caesar's forum, emphasizing his unique relationship to Venus and his great achievements. However, here consideration of the *forum Iulium* and Pompey's theatre will demonstrate that despite the significant wealth, power, and political superiority of both Pompey and Caesar, and despite the grand scale on which they built, both men chose to incorporate many traditional architectural features in their designs, providing familiar civic gifts to the city. Discussion will also include consideration of the influence of the Sullan Capitoline complex (as proposed by Coarelli¹) on both projects, reflecting an architectural and political dialogue between these men. These case studies illustrate the deeply embedded and traditional nature of civic buildings in Roman culture. I will argue that although both complexes were unique in Rome (Rome's first permanent

¹ Coarelli (2010) 107-132, see: Chapter One 13, 28-29.

theatre and first single-temple forum precinct), an established architectural tradition in Italy meant that they were not entirely new to Romans.

Scholarship

Scholarship tends to focus primarily on the provision of entertainment and cash or food handouts as forms of euergetism. Public buildings as public benefactions were more expensive and complex projects meaning that only a wealthy few could afford to undertake such projects. As a result, this form of benefaction has received far less attention from scholars. Similarly, the political and economic alliances that made these buildings possible are often sidelined or assumed in many discussions. Paul Veyne, in his 1976 *le Pain et le cirque*, highlights the oligarchic nature of the Roman senatorial and magisterial body that drew exclusively from the ranks of the upper class, explaining that this elite group held the exclusive right to perform public benefactions and did not act as servants of the State in performing them. Rather, they choose to perform public functions primarily as a point of personal honour.² Veyne has argued that public benefactions therefore served primarily to *display* rather than to *gain* power for these men. Similarly, he suggests that this form of benefaction lacked appeal for magistrates. However, as will be demonstrated, this view is too simplistic to explain the complexities of actual elite practices and does not fully account for those willing to enter into sometimes-difficult relationships with wealthier individuals to provide public buildings. A lower level magistrate with everything to gain was often prepared to risk their financial security to make such projects happen and his view does not always account for the significance of competition *between* these magistrates, particularly at the lower political echelon.³

² Veyne (1990) 204-207.

³ Israel Shatzman (1975) in his *Senatorial Wealth and Roman Politics* and Koenraad Verboven (2002) in his *The Economy of Friends* provide clear examples of the way personal loans influenced political activities in Rome's late republic. However, they provide only brief discussion regarding the function of, and motivations for, these relationships in regard to public building activities.

SECTION ONE
LET THE GAMES BEGIN: INCREASING COMPETITION IN LATE
REPUBLICAN ROME

Why Public Buildings?

Public building projects were a significant tool for gaining and displaying prestige for those that could afford it or those lucky enough to secure public funds.⁴ This prestige is evidenced by expressions such as *de sua pecunia* and *ob honorem* on inscriptions associated with the structures, which advertised those responsible for the construction or refurbishment.⁵ Ambiguity on many inscriptions also illustrates the prestige gained by association with such projects, since the inscriptions often *suggest* the magistrate was personally responsible, even if, in fact, they used public funds.⁶ Pobjoy explains that inscriptions are often difficult to interpret due to this ambiguity and that ascertaining whether or not they were privately or publicly funded is not always possible. Magistrates are often recorded on inscriptions merely as dating tools, not because they were personally responsible for the buildings, or simply fulfilling their magisterial duties. This is precisely the point according to Pobjoy, who explains that in the administration of one's duties the qualities of *honestas*, *integritas* and *probitas* of the magistrate were emphasized, increasing the prestige of the individual.⁷ It is in this regard that the creation of the inscriptions themselves was a monumental act for these individuals.⁸

By their sheer expense and conspicuous presence, public buildings gave tangible proof of their patrons' importance through such inscriptions. The extent to which these civic patrons

⁴ For discussion of buildings as an outward manifestation of wealth and power, see: Edwards (1993) 137-143.

⁵ Lomas 2003 28-45: provides the following explanation of epigraphic terminology regarding *tituli operum publicorum* 'inscriptions on public works': *De pecunia publica* - public project undertaken at 'public expense' as a public service, rather than outright benefaction; *De sua pecunia* - project financed by private individual as an act of euergetism; *DD /de decreto decurionum*, *DSC /de senatu consultu*, or *SS / De senatus sententia* - work carried out by decurions or the senate of the city. Lomas states that this last category could also indicate the permission given, rather than the actual payment for the building; Cf. Hölkeskamp's discussion of "symbolic capital" as a type of social credit gained from one's good deeds and recent ancestry, see: Chapter Two 85; below: 113.

⁶ Pliny *NH* 36.42: also mentions the honour associated with temple building when he discusses the rich Spartans Sauras and Batrachus, who built temples enclosed by the Portico of Octavia in the hope of gaining honour from the inscriptions.

⁷ Pobjoy (2000) 77-92.

⁸ For further discussion on the significance of inscriptions for monumentalizing individuals, see: Woolf (1996) 22-39; Cooley (2000) 7-20.

viewed their buildings as advertisements is evidenced by the care they took to design the inscriptions. An obvious example of this concern is Pompey's apparent angst over the wording of the inscription on the Temple of Venus Victrix in his theatre complex. Pompey, seeking the advice of Cicero on the use of *tertium* or *tertio* in regards to his consulship, deliberated for some time.⁹ If the theatre had not been intended as a monument to Pompey's greatness, as well as his public benefaction, he would not have scrupled about the wording or indeed the erection of such an inscription. Furthermore, Pompey's consciousness regarding the wording of this inscription suggests he expected it to be subjected to the close scrutiny of his peers, highlighting the significance and power of inscriptions as a highly visible political tool.

Public buildings were expensive to construct, restricting this form of public benefaction to a wealthy and elite (and often well connected) few.¹⁰ Both inside and outside of Rome, few were wealthy enough to fund such projects themselves, as evidenced by the existence of municipal laws and decrees such as the *Lex Tarentina* of 67 BCE, obligating magistrates to engage in public building activities.¹¹ Of course, these laws could suggest that magistrates preferred to spend their money on providing more immediate pleasures, such as gladiatorial shows, but it is important to consider that they were in place simply because of the greater costs of these building projects and not always because they preferred to give games. In this respect, the prestige gained by building projects is again represented as largely the domain of the wealthy. Cicero, in his *De Officiis* (2.60), addresses this issue of obligation confirming that while there were more immediate gains to be made from handing out cash or by the provision of games and festivals, greater lasting prestige lay in the provision of public utilities, perhaps due in part to the considerable costs involved.

Besides erecting new buildings and monuments, personal association with existing public structures also conferred significant prestige for magistrates. An obvious example of this

⁹ Gell. *NA* 10.1.10 (quoting Varro's *Disciplinae*, Book Five): Pompey finally chose '*TERT.*' to avoid the problem, since Gellius explains through Varro that *tertium* referred to 'a third time' and *tertio* referred to order, meaning that two others were elected before him.

¹⁰ Such costs are reflected in the need for magistrates to take personal loans for building projects. See: 113-121.

¹¹ Pobjoy (2000) 84: explains that the existence of local regulations such as decrees or charters of the Senate requiring magistrates to spend money specifically on buildings, which might not otherwise have been built/restored, was a significant factor in the development of public buildings in the municipalities; Crawford (1996) 307-308: points out that this late republican (c. 68 BCE) law shows the tight control of the townships and their public *opera*.

prestigious association is demonstrated in the case of the Temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus Capitolinus and the machinations of Pompey and Caesar (and probably Crassus) in 62 BCE. Their political interference nearly robbed Quintus Lutatius Catulus of the significant honour and right of completing the rebuilding and restoration the temple, in an effort to have the honour of the inscription transferred to Pompey (Dio 37.44.1-2). The original temple on the Capitol was burnt down (July 83 BCE) during the civil war between Marius and Sulla.¹² It is thought that Sulla undertook the project with most of the building work completed by Quintus Lutatius Catulus, who was awarded the prestigious contract by senatorial decree.¹³ Catulus dedicated the new temple in 69 BCE and an inscription bearing his name was erected over the entrance.¹⁴ As the governing deity of Rome, this particular temple held significant prestige for those personally associated with it:¹⁵

Hoc loco, Q. Catule, te appello; loquor enim de tuo clarissimo pulcherrimoque monumento. Non iudicis solum severitatem in hoc crimine, sed prope inimici atque accusatoris vim suscipere debes. tuus enim honos illo templo senatus populi que Romani beneficio, tui nominis aeterna memoria simul cum templo illo consecratur; tibi haec cura suscipienda, tibi haec opera sumenda est, ut Capitolium, quem ad modum magnificentius est restitutum, sic copiosius ornatum sit quam fuit, ut illa flamma divinitus exstitisse videatur, non quae deleret Iovis optimi maximi templum, sed quae praeclarius magnificentiusque deposceret.

And it is from this spot that I appeal to you, Quintus Catulus; since it is your most honourable and most illustrious monument that I am talking about. You ought to take up not only the severity of a judge in this charge, but also almost the force of an opponent and an accuser. For, it is by the kindness of the Senate and the Roman people that your honour is associated with that temple. The eternal memory of your name is consecrated together with that temple. It is by you that this task is to be accepted; by you, that this work is to be undertaken, so that the Capitol, as it has been restored more magnificently, may thus be adorned more elaborately than it was; so that that fire may seem to have come from heaven, not as to destroy the Temple of Jupiter Best and Greatest, but to demand a more striking and more magnificent (temple). (Cic. *Verr.* 2.4.69)

Even when one takes into account Cicero's rhetorical bias, this passage makes it clear that Catulus' association with the temple conferred significant honour and *dignitas* upon him (and his family into the future¹⁶), and that it is through the authority of the Senate and the

¹² Platner (1929) 297-302: Cic. *Cat.* 3.9; Sall. *Cat.* 47.2; Tac. *Hist.* 3.72; App. *BC* 1.83, 86; Plut. *Sull.* 27.

¹³ Platner (1929) 297-302: Cic. *Verr.* 4.69; Varro *ap.* Gell. 2.10; Lactant. *De ira dei* 22.6; Suet. *Caes.* 15.

¹⁴ For the dedication date, see: Platner (1929) 297-302: Liv. *Ep.* 98; Plut. *Popl.* 15; cf. Plin. *NH* 7.138, 19.23; Suet. *Aug.* 94.

¹⁵ For discussion of related matters, see: Broughton *MRR* II, 173.

¹⁶ Cooley (2000) 14-15.

Roman people that he has received this honourable duty – a state-sanctioned honour. Catulus even received the honorific name ‘Capitolinus’ (Suet. *Galb.* 2), further cementing his prestigious association with the most important public building at Rome. Given the importance of such a project, it is hardly surprising that Caesar and Pompey agitated to secure this honour for themselves. On the first day of Caesar’s praetorship he attempted to have the commission to complete the rebuilding transferred to Pompey. Suetonius (*Iul.* 15) says that Caesar was unsuccessful in this due to united opposition of the *optimates* (*optimatum conspirationi*) and that Catulus retained the honour of the inscription. According to Dio (43.14; *cf.* 37.44), this inscription remained there until 69 CE. However, the incident demonstrates how hotly contested such civic duties could become. Presumably for Catulus, association with the combined projects of the Capitolium restoration, the tabularium flanking this, and the triple-temple complex of Sulla placed this magistrate in an extraordinarily prestigious position.¹⁷ Pliny (*NH* 34.77¹⁸) states that Catulus even dedicated a statue of Minerva *infra Capitolium* (below/near the Capitoline).

To Be The Best

To understand the full significance of public buildings and monuments at Rome it is important to discuss the increasingly competitive nature of euergetism during the late republic that drove many magistrates to seek alliances with more powerful individuals.

Lower magistrates, needing to continually reassert their popularity among the masses through spectacles and gifts of food, in the hope of gaining their favour, juxtapose those at the opposite end of the wealth-power spectrum, such as Pompey and Caesar, who were able to construct magnificent and lasting monuments, advertising their social and political superiority.¹⁹ Conversely, young politicians could be very wealthy but not yet in a position

¹⁷ Although the evidence is lacking, one wonders if the agitations of Pompey and Caesar to secure this building contract had anything to do with Pompey’s desire to maintain strong Sullan relations. Faustus was too young to inherit the contract at the time of his father’s death (only eight years old when his father died in 78 BCE and only 17 years old at the time Catulus dedicated the temple in 69 BCE). This meant Faustus could not inherit this prestigious contract. At the time of this incident, Pompey and Faustus enjoyed a strong relationship. Faustus was 24 years old and had already served under Pompey in the Judaeae campaign the previous year. For Pompey’s efforts to maintain strong Sullan relations, see: Gruen (1969), particularly 75-76.

¹⁸ *CIL* I₂725, 730-732 = VI.30920; Coarelli (2010) 129-130.

¹⁹ In fact, Purcell (1993) 125-126 cites Aemilius Paullus’ Basilica responding competitively to Pompey’s theatre, as well as Caesar’s forum complex, as a type of competitive *aedificatio*. Of course, Aemilius Paullus borrowed from Caesar to complete his project. See: 114-115.

to engage in such senior level benefactions as significant public works. For instance, public works were mostly at the initiative and under the control of the censors (and to a lesser degree the aediles) and consuls.²⁰ In any case, Cicero (*Mur.* 38) states that the elections belonged to the people and the masses, and it is this ideology that presumably drove competition at lower levels, as magistrates strove for bigger and better gifts in their quest for popular approval toward the end of the republic.

Cicero (*Off.* 2.57) presents his own meager spending as an exception to this rule since he had attained high office without spending a great deal, despite previously explaining the established tradition of spending on magnificent entertainments expected in one's aedileship:

Nam pro amplitudine honorum, quos cunctis suffragiis adepti sumus nostro quidem anno, quod contigit eorum nemini, quos modo nominavi, sane exiguus sumptus aedilitatis fuit.

For considering the honour of my public offices, which I secured by unanimous votes, at first opportunity – which happened to none of the others who I have just named – the expense in my aedileship was quite meagre. (*Off.* 2.59)

In this passage Cicero draws a direct parallel between one's personal spending and their attainment to higher office, an expectation that presumably precluded many young men without the means or the socio-political connections from full participation within Rome's political sphere towards the late republic. In fact, when earlier scorning the competitive nature of public spending between aediles, Cicero (*Off.* 2.57-58) presents a dichotomy inherent in Roman politics by citing the wealthy Mamercus' refusal of the aedileship as the reason for his failure to be elected consul. Writing in 30 BCE, Horace expressed similar sentiments regarding the fiscal obligations and responsibilities of gaining office:

Uter aedilis fueritve / vestrum praetor, is intestabilis et sacer esto. / In cicere atque faba bona tu perdasque lupinis, / latus ut in circo spatieri aut aeneus ut stes, / nudus agris, nudus nummis, insane, parentis?

Whichever of you becomes aedile or praetor let him be outlawed and accursed.
Would you waste your wealth on vetches, beans, and lupines, that you may play

²⁰ Pina Polo (2010) 135-190, particularly, 160-165: discusses this issue in regards to pre-Sullan public works projects, 275: states that there are few public works constructed under consular care in the post-Sullan period, other than restorations of existing buildings such as the Temple of Jupiter on the Capitoline, the Portico of Catulus, and possibly the Basilica Aemilia.

the swell and strut in the Circus, or be set up in bronze, though stripped of the lands, stripped, madman, of the money your father left? (*Sat.* 2.3.168-172)²¹

Horace's unfavourable view regarding the expenses associated with gaining and holding office, do, however, hint at the potential for personal gain, through the public display of *dignitas* and the potential for personal commemoration and monumentalization (bronze inscriptions, statues). In fact, during the electioneering process lavish expenses for public games or civic construction given to one's own clients or tribe were seen as respectable donatives and as such were entirely unobjectionable.²² Moreover, such expectations by the *plebs urbana* for both public benefactions and private *liberalitas* only increased in the last half of the first century BCE.²³ Much could be gained from publically demonstrating care for the interests of the urban population and by advertising one's popularity and potential for political success.²⁴

Those prepared to exhaust their personal funds in struggling to meet their obligations of office and to outdo their peers demonstrate the political significance of performing public benefactions for these men.²⁵ For example, the aedile Livius Drusus is reported to have run into debt by providing games in 91 BCE, despite having considerable inherited wealth.²⁶ Similarly, Plutarch (*Caes.* 5) and Suetonius (*Iul.* 18.1) report that Caesar had debt of around 1300 *talents*, even before he gained office, and that he spent recklessly during his aedileship (65 BCE) in order to gain popularity.²⁷

²¹ Cited in: Yakobson (1999) 202.

²² Tatum (1999) 26: provides useful discussion regarding the role of the *divisor* as a type of distributor of largesse to the busy magistrate's *tribules*, and the changing meaning of the term as competitive magistrates strove to gain support from other tribes through the use more professional agents in the form of the *divisor*.

²³ Millar (1999) 60-61: claims that this demand for greater largesse increased specifically over the last three decades of the republic. Although it is probably sensible to view increasing competition between magistrates as part of a larger chronological continuum, this chapter will demonstrate that this situation appears to increase significantly from the 60s BCE.

²⁴ Millar (1999) 61: gives the example of two magistrates in the mid-seventies (a time marked by food shortages and angry demonstrations), citing Hortensius (aedile 75 BCE) giving lavish shows and grain to the people at a reduced price, and the aedile of 74 BCE, M. Seius, providing grain and oil at a reduced price. For general discussion regarding political rivalry at Rome, see: Patterson (2006) 346-350.

²⁵ For personal expenditure by magistrates on games, see: Shatzman (1975) 84-98, particularly 86-87, citing: Cic. *Off.* 2.55 and Val. Max. 2.4.6 – for the burden of the expense, Suet. *Iul.* 10.1 – on Bibulus having to add his money, Dio 37.8.2 and Cic. *Off.* 2.57 – discussing the obligation of aediles having to add their own money to the fund for provision of games when grants by the Senate proved insufficient.

²⁶ Pliny *NH* 33.141; Dio, fr. 96.2; Diodorus 37.10.1; *Vir III* 66.5. For further discussion regarding the 'ruinous obligation' of these games for the less wealthy host magistrate, particularly in the second century BCE, see: Veyne (1990) 208-209.

²⁷ Crassus is understood to have given surety for Caesar's debts in 61 BCE: Plut. *Caes.* 11.1 and *Crass.* 7.6; Suet. *Iul.* 18.1. Consider also: the case of L. Aemilius Paullus, consul 50 BCE, who ran into debt in 55 BCE when rebuilding the Basilica Aemilia (Cic. *Att.* 4.17.7). Caesar is reported to have loaned him the money to

Scenes erected for performances undergo major development in the first century BCE, indicative of increasing competition.²⁸ Such competition between magistrates is evident in the case of the curile aedile Marcus Scaurus in 58 BCE. Holding public games, Marcus Scaurus built an enormous wooden theatre, which is described by Pliny (*NH* 36.115) as the “the greatest of all works ever to be built by man.” He reports that it was big enough to seat 80,000 men and compares it to Pompey’s, which could seat only 40,000, and states (Plin. *NH* 34.36) that this monument was famed for its 3000 bronze statues and 360 columns of marble, glass, and gilded wood – a significant display. Eight years later, Gaius Curio (tribune 50 BCE) under the pretence of honouring his father at his funeral built two revolving wooden theatres, side by side, that turned to make an amphitheatre. Pliny (*NH* 36.116-120) is horrified by the ridiculous, rickety, carnival-like quality of the contraption, unfit for the *dignitas* of the Roman people (such a nation, as conqueror of the world), as much as by the unsafe nature of it.²⁹ This is an interesting passage for demonstrating the potential for gaining popularity through construction of even temporary public works, and not just through the provision of games. Pompey’s theatre was in existence by 50 BCE, so one would assume that Curio’s relationship with Pompey was insufficient to allow him to use his complex as a venue.³⁰ In any case, Curio most likely felt greater personal political capital could be gained by constructing his own extravagant and highly innovative monument, presumably at great expense to himself, since as we will discuss, Curio borrowed heavily from Caesar for the project. The temporary nature of the expensive benefaction further emphasized Curio’s generosity to his community. In fact, Pliny’s (*NH*

complete it. Discussed below. See also: Verboven (2002) 150-152: for these, and more examples, of political debt accrued in the course of one’s earlier career.

²⁸ Sear (2006) 55: increased competition among magistrates is reflected in theatre construction, evidenced by major improvements and development in the first century BCE from plain (Valerius Maximus 2.4.6), to varied and elaborate (Pliny *NH* 35.7, Vit. *De Arch.* 7.5.5, Val Max. 2.4.6). Scenes covered with gold, silver, revolving awnings appear providing shade (Val. Max. 2.4.6; Plin. *NH* 19.6, 36.24.). Pliny *NH* 34.36, 36.5, 50. 113-115: also mentions bronze statues, marble, and columns adorning *scaenae frons*.

²⁹ Pliny uses this example to label his own generation as *maiores*, since they no longer behaved in such undignified and grotesque ways. Of course, by Pliny’s time, spectacles appear to have been more tightly controlled by the emperor.

³⁰ Rawson (1978) 108, n.50: says Curio had been in opposition to Caesar and his associates in the beginning of the year of 50 BCE, but when tribune, he was an avid supporter of Caesar; Gruen (1974) 94-95: discusses the ongoing enmity between Pompey and Curio. See also: Broughton *MRR* II, 249; Shatzman (1975) 396-397. Holleran (2003): permanent theatres and entertainment venues were banned in Rome as they would inhibit elite competition for the prestige associated with hosting events using temporary theatres, so permanency and monopoly for individuals is seen as the main problem. (Holleran shuns the usual explanation about theatres being banned in Rome as too Greek and pandering to a lazy, soft crowd). However, Curio’s extravaganza and later examples of temporary theatres seem to provide evidence against this claim.

36.120) language to describe the event suggests the tribune had high hopes for gaining much influence by provision of such a novel public gift:

et per hoc quaeritur tribuniciis contionibus gratia, ut pensiles tribus quatiat, in
rostris quid non ausurus apud eos quibus hoc persuaserit!

And by this (gift/theatre) he sought influence in his tribunician speeches, so that
he could sway the swinging voters, since on the rostra what would he not dare in
front of those whom he had persuaded onto this! (Plin. *NH* 36.120)

Pliny's description of the structure presents Curio in control of a swinging majority seeking to gain their favour by coercing them to listen to his speeches as tribune, and that on the speaker's platform he would hold their attention as he had not been able to before. By providing the temporary theatre, Curio appears able to gain popular *gratia*, which may help explain why many aediles during the late republic were prepared to exhaust their private funds to build them. However, Cicero (*Off.* 2.56) describes the unlimited expenditure of such competing aediles as an enormous waste in light of the fleeting nature of their benefits. Such condemnations do not appear to have had much influence on late republican magistrates, striving to outdo one another. Perhaps Curio felt the erection of a temporary theatre would emphasize his position as an upholder of tradition, emphasizing the somewhat controversial nature of Pompey's permanent theatre.³¹ In order to compete on the political stage at Rome, aediles and younger magistrates reacted to the competitive and ephemeral nature of Roman politics as they strove to continually reaffirm their presence and public identity in the minds of the Roman people.³²

In Sum

The significance of personal association with public buildings, structures, and monuments is demonstrated through the use of inscriptions, advertising those responsible for their upkeep or construction. The inscriptions were themselves monumental acts and tangible proof of the donor's beneficence, a vehicle for the display of individual *dignitas*, *auctoritas*, and *honor*.

³¹ Permanent theatres at Rome were banned until Pompey's construction. See: Holleran (2003) 46-60; Sear (2006) particularly 50-56: discussing a ban on seating at theatres; Goldberg (1998) 1-5.

³² Cf. Cicero: *Planc.* 9.24-25: for Plancius' candidature of the aedileship of 54 BCE, *Fam.* 2.6: Milo's consulship, whereby Cicero claims Milo will have the support of the multitude on account of his spectacular gladiatorial games, *Fam.* 11.16, 11.17: writing to Brutus in support of the praetorship for 42 BCE for L. Lamia, he highlights the spectacular games Lamia gave when aedile in 45 BCE, 12.29: writing to Q. Cornificius, again in support of L. Lamia. See also: Chapter Two, regarding the fleeting nature of good deeds and one's family's recent achievements with regard to Hölkeskamp's discussion on "symbolic capital" and "social credit".

Such construction established relationships between the benefactor and the people at Rome, creating a space where the donor and the people could interact through the activities held there. Municipal laws requiring magistrates to engage in public building activities demonstrate that public buildings were largely the domain of the wealthy, while incidences such as Pompey and Caesar's attempt to rob Quintus Catulus of his 'right' to refurbish the Temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus further emphasize Roman awareness of the importance of public buildings as a considerable political tool. Although aediles were expected to take responsibility for the maintenance and construction of public buildings and structures through public funds, increasing competition toward the late republic between magistrates, striving to gain popularity and showcase their influence, drove the need for greater and greater personal expenditure.

SECTION TWO

DRIVEN TO EXTREMES: PUBLIC BUILDINGS, NETWORKS, AND LOANS

Cicero in his *Philippics*, dramatically lamenting the loss of *libertas* under the dictator Caesar, describes Rome's citizens in servitude under a tyranny of benefaction:

Fuit in illo ingenium, ratio, memoria, litterae, cura, cogitatio, diligentia; res bello gesserat, quamvis rei publicae calamitosas, at tamen magnas; multos annos regnare meditatus, magno labore, magnis periculis, quod cogitarat, effecerat; muneribus, monimentis, congiariis, epulis multitudinem imperitam delenierat; suos praemiis, adversarios clementiae specie devinxerat; quid multa? attulerat iam liberae civitati partim metu, partim patientia consuetudinem serviendi.

In him there was genius, calculation, memory, literary skill, industry, thought, diligence; he had done in war things, although calamitous to the State, yet at least great; having for so many years aimed at a throne, he had by great diligence, great dangers, achieved his object; by shows, buildings, largesses, banquets he had conciliated the ignorant crowd; his followers, he had bound to him by rewards, his adversaries, by a show of clemency: in brief, he had now brought to a free community –partly from fear, partly from endurance – a habit of servitude. (Cic. *Phil.* 2.116)

Although Cicero's polemical passage, aimed at presenting Caesar's career in the worst possible light as destroyer of the *libertas* of the Roman people, can hardly be read as probative evidence of the actual state of affairs, it is, useful for understanding not only the political role of public benefactions for individuals, but also for appreciating the fears held by the Roman Senate and the political dangers inherent in the accumulation of individual wealth for late republican Rome. In fact, the hostility in this passage emphasizes the normative expectations of the Roman people regarding magistrates and the potential to gain power through their public benefactions.

The Perfect Storm

The increased competition, evident between magistrates, to provide bigger and better public monuments meant that more money was required to fund them. Magistrates were not expected to pay for public buildings; they financed them out of state funds.³³

³³ Veyne (1990) 208-214, 234; Orlin (1997) 141; *Publicani* (tax collectors) helped provide for the upkeep of public buildings: Liv. 23.48 and 24.18.10; Andreau (1999) 114-115; Shatzman (1975) 90; Lomas (2003) 40: states that practical constructions like aqueducts, harbours, and fortifications were frequently (but not exclusively) financed by public funds and overseen by magistrates, whereas buildings for entertainment were

Problematically for many magistrates, the budgetary allowance given to censors, praetors, and aediles was insufficient for great public works meaning that *triumphatores* were predominately the ones with the ability to instigate more significant projects and to outshine their peers.³⁴ This is interesting since Pompey had contributed to state funds through the exceptional wealth gained in his campaigns in the East, paying 20,000 talents into the treasury,³⁵ as well as securing a new source of tax revenue into Rome, alleviating the Treasury's burden of funding Italian municipal civic building projects. Veyne states that it was the Senate's wariness of largesse resulting from the internal rivalries and power struggles of Rome's oligarchy that contributed to these budgetary restraints, as each protected their own vested interests and restricted the initiatives of others, meaning very few magistrates undertook simple, less prestigious building projects.³⁶ It is hardly surprising that individuals such as Pompey and Caesar, in possession of significant wealth from the *manubiae* of their campaigns, were able to exploit this situation at Rome.³⁷ Veyne suggests that besides Pompey and Caesar, the only edifice built by a *euergetês* who was not a *triumphator* was the Basilica Aemilia. As seen, manubial construction was not new to Rome, however; the sheer scale of both Caesar and Pompey's projects exceeded the means of others. The length of time these great works took to complete meant that prolonged expenditure was necessary, further excluding less wealthy members of the ruling elite whose funds were exhausted in single, one-off benefactions.³⁸

usually paid for with private money; Shatzman (1975) 90: aediles could partially or fully fund buildings by the fines they imposed; Livy 40. 52.1: discusses the censor Marcus Aemilius (179 BCE) asking the Senate for money to celebrate games in connection with the dedication of the temples he had vowed to Juno and Diana eight years previously. Presumably the Senate had also funded the erection of the temples.

³⁴ Veyne (1990) 207, 234: the Senate's reluctance to finance large largesses, 253: stating that the budgetary allowance given to magistrates in the republic had been insufficient for great works, and private euergetism was restricted to *triumphatores*.

³⁵ Shatzman (1975) 391, cites: Strabo 11.14.10; Plin. *NH* 37.16; Joseph. *AJ* 14.35-36; Plut. *Pomp.* 36.6-7, 45; App. *Mith.* 114-116.

³⁶ Veyne (1990) 234: states that this resulted in many of Rome's public buildings and roads becoming run down.

³⁷ For full discussion regarding *manubiae* and the general, see: Chapter Two 75-83. Of course, loans were not the only generator of building projects. Political alliances also resulted in the accumulation of wealth, which was spent on building projects. For example, Pompey's freedman Demetrius, who through Pompey's connections, obtained significant wealth in the period of Sulla's proscriptions (Plut. *Pomp.* 40), purchased a large urban section in Rome, building an extensive complex, including entertainment areas, gardens, and walks. Of course, Crassus benefited financially from the proscriptions of the ultimate *triumphator* Sulla (Plut. *Crass.* 3), buying up as many of the properties belonging to those people Sulla had put to death around 80 BCE, as did Marcus Aemilius Lepidus cos. 78 BCE which enabled him to start the reconstruction of the Basilica Aemilia.

³⁸ Pompey began his theatre complex in 61 BCE (Plut. *Pomp.* 40.5: indicates that Pompey began this project after his third triumph in 61 BCE). See also: Rawson (1978) 108-109. The Temple of Venus Victrix at the theatre was dedicated in 55 BCE (Plin. *NH* 8.7.20). Likewise, Caesar's forum complex began in 54 BCE (Cic. *Att.* 4.16.8.1-12) and was not complete at the time of his assassination, 10 years later in 44 BCE.

The combination of increased competition between magistrates placing larger financial demands on these individuals and an apparent reluctance by the State to provide funds for such projects appears to have amplified the importance of developing influential connections with those able to offer political, financial, and legal assistance in projects of euergetism. Wealthy *triumphatores* such as Pompey and Caesar, who acquired massive wealth from the *manubiae* of their campaigns, were able to exploit this situation to the detriment of the Roman State; essentially these wealthy men could act as a quasi-state treasury, giving loans to individuals to fund benefactions (including public buildings) and in return received *gratia* in the form of political favours, gaining considerable political influence in the process. Although money acquired through activities of war was considered ‘public’ money, and anything left over after erecting manubial temples, feasts, or games was strictly meant to be deposited in the *Aerarium*, loans made by these *triumphatores* are not reported to have been funded through ‘public’ money in their possession, but as private loans – hence they benefited privately from the *gratia* of the loan through the use of public funds. It is from this point that I would argue these men were able to undermine the authority of the government at Rome, who appear reluctant to fund individuals in larger public works projects.³⁹ In principle, public works projects were no different than other benefactions provided by aediles, perhaps it was the scale and prestige of building projects that the Senate disliked.

In the case of Caesar, this situation of increasing control seems to develop toward the late 60s BCE after the development of his coalition with Pompey and Crassus, since before this time Caesar was still heavily dependent on the financial support of others in order to provide benefactions to the city. For example, Suetonius presents Caesar’s manipulation of his alliance with Bibulus during his aedileship in 65 BCE:

³⁹ Generals, in successful campaigns had other avenues of income, such as interest from indemnities, taxes or other failed payments. For further discussion of monies exacted from vanquished peoples as one off payments and the interest gained by generals from the loans, given to cover these payments, which allowed generals to maintain control over the money, see: Tan (2011) 105-113, citing: Broughton 1938, 552-4; Badian (1968) 73-4; Jones (1974) 118-9; Hopkins (1978) 47; Bernhardt (1985) 190-4; Mitchell (1993) 30; Schulz (1997) 193-9; Livy 32.2.1. Tan uses the example of the considerable sum lent to Ariobarzanes by Pompey and the significant interest gained by him through provision of the loan (which did not fall under ‘public’ control: Cic. *Att.* 6.1.3. See also Cic. *Att.* 6.3.5). This system decentralized the money from campaigns by preventing it from being deposited into the state treasury and therefore under State control. This is an important point for this thesis as successful generals in possession of decentralized funds did not come under state scrutiny and could therefore lend to private individuals for significant political and personal gain.

Aedilis praeter Comitium ac Forum basilicasque etiam Captiolium ornavit porticibus ad tempus exstructis, in quibus abundante rerum copia pars apparatus exponeretur. Venationes autem ludosque et cum collega et separatim edidit, quo factum est, ut communium quoque impensarum solus gratiam caperet nec dissimularet collega eius Marcus, evenisse sibi quod Polluci; ut enim geminis fratribus aedes in Foro constituta tantum Castoris vocaretur, ita suam Caesarisque munificentiam unius Caesaris dici.

Moreover, when aedile, Caesar decorated the Comitium and the Forum and the basilicas, even the Capitol, with temporary colonnades erected, fitted out in copious abundance in which a part of his collection was displayed. Moreover, he gave wild beasts hunts and games, both with his colleague and on his own, as a result of this it came about that he took all the credit, even for their joint expenses, and nor did his colleague Marcus Bibulus hide this, saying that he had been treated like Pollux: so that even though the temple was erected in the Forum on behalf of the twin brothers it is called only by the name of Castor, and so the munificence of him and Caesar is given to Caesar alone. (*Iul.* 10)

Bibulus complains that Caesar assumed all the glory for these constructions and benefactions, and that it is Caesar that gained the goodwill of the people (*Iul.* 11). What is evident in this passage is that Caesar appears to have utilized money from Bibulus to fund part of the venture, for which Caesar takes the majority of the credit, a fate that appears to befall Bibulus on more than one occasion in his dealings with Caesar. Suetonius (*Iul.* 20.2) provides an amusing anecdote about the pair in their joint consulship of 59 BCE, where once again, Caesar appears to have manipulated things to maximise his own reputation and Suetonius states that all matters were administered “not in the consulship of Caesar and Bibulus, but in that of Julius and Caesar.”⁴⁰ If Suetonius is correct, this is not the only occasion of Caesar taking advantage of the financial means of other magistrates during these early years in order to burnish his own reputation: Suetonius (*Iul.* 19) also reports that Caesar sought an alliance (60 BCE) with a candidate for consulship Lucius Lucceius, pitching his proposal to him on the basis that he (Caesar) had the required influence (*gratia*), while Lucius had the ready funds to provide largess to the masses to gain consulship for them both. This passage is interesting since it demonstrates some degree of reciprocity, suggesting the importance of political networks, while highlighting the power of *gratia* gained through benefaction and political manipulation.⁴¹

⁴⁰ Presumably Bibulus’ references here served to publicly emphasize the imbalance of power resulting from the coalition of Pompey, Caesar, and Crassus.

⁴¹ In the end, all those against Caesar (and his coalition) donated money to the cause of Bibulus to allow him to compete against Caesar and Lucius – ending in a consulship of Caesar and Bibulus. Once again, the importance of partnerships to gain popularity through public benefaction is clearly demonstrated in this passage. For further discussion regarding the relationship between reciprocity and *dignitas*, *auctoritas*, and *honor* for the giver over the recipient, see: Hölkeskamp (2010) 51-52.

The True Cost of a Loan

Hölkeskamp's discussion of 'consensus' and 'meritocracy' inherent in Roman society explains the importance of networks for gaining and maintaining 'social credit' resulting from one's 'symbolic capital'.⁴² The imbedded nature of relationships and politics dictated that much of this social and symbolic capital relied on one's membership to a group for further advancement and for the maintenance of one's *dignitas*, *auctoritas*, and *honor*. In the case of provision of benefactions, especially involving larger sums of money, reliance on individuals for their financial and political support was vital for social and political advancement. Provision of large largesse would further signal the donor's membership to the elite group of public benefactors, enhancing the personal virtues of influence and authority within their community. This point is helpful for understanding what drove magistrates to seek financial assistance from others for their public building projects - sometimes from their political adversaries.

From the first century onwards, the number of individuals involved in money lending increased significantly.⁴³ Plutarch (*Crass.* 6-7) discusses Crassus' enormous wealth, stating that this meant he had significant influence over many senators who had loans with him and that they could not ignore their personal obligations to him when debating subjects in the Senate: in fact he helped them in order to gain their support. The relationship between benefactor and recipient rendered the recipient in a state of *beneficio obligatus* and placed an expectation on the recipient to return the favour by some type of service – *officia* - further empowering the benefactor.⁴⁴ Return of a favour did not necessarily end the obligation, this obligation continued to bind the two into the future – the debt was dissolved but the *gratia* remained.⁴⁵ As a form of *beneficia*, loans (especially interest free) from private individuals served as a powerful political tool for these benefactors since the political benefits gained

⁴² Hölkeskamp (2010) 107-124. See also: Chapter One 85.

⁴³ Morley (1996) 163; Andreau (1984) 104-105.

⁴⁴ For full discussion of the implication of this type of debt, see: Shatzman (1975) 136-137; Andreau (1999) 139-158, for loans as a manifestation of the power of the giver: 144-145. For the burden of debt and the difficulty the recipient had freeing themselves of the obligation of *gratia* associated with loans, see: Cic. *Fam.* 1.9.12, 7.17.2, *Att.* 4.19.2, 5.1.2, 5.43, 5.5.2, 5.6.2, 5.9.2, 5.10.4, 5.13.3, 7.3.11, 7.8.5; Suet. *Iul.* 27.1: regarding the political influence gained by Caesar through interest free loans, including a loan to Cicero of 800,000 HS in 54 BCE. For the political power gained by loaning, see: Plut. *Crass.* 6-7.

⁴⁵ Verboven (2002) 37-38.

through these transactions often far outweighed the financial outlay.⁴⁶ Despite the obligation such loans placed on the recipient, and regardless of the individual motivations to lend monies, as will be seen, evidence suggests these private loans also enabled and stimulated economic activities such as the construction and refurbishment of other public buildings in and around Rome.

Public building, according to Veyne, had slowed in the last half of the first century BCE as the credit advanced to magistrates became less adequate to ensure the upkeep of Rome's regular institutions.⁴⁷ This situation is interesting since, as discussed, competition between magistrates to provide bigger and better public benefactions in the form of public buildings and monuments intensified greatly during the same period, a state of affairs that Pompey and Caesar, owing to their immense personal wealth could exploit to their political advantage.

The most obvious example of this obligation and political manipulation with regards to loans for public buildings is the case of the aedile Lucius Aemilius Paullus and the refurbishment of the Basilica Aemilia. Here, the importance for magistrates (and their families) of being associated with public buildings, which allowed them to advertise their families' *dignitas*, is apparent since Paullus was prepared to incur significant debt from a man he did not previously support in order to accomplish his project.⁴⁸ Cicero (*Att.* 4.16.8.1-12) reports that Paullus (cos. 50 BCE) had begun the re-roofing of the Basilica Aemilia when he wrote to Atticus about Caesar's project in 54 BCE. Additional evidence shows that the expenses incurred by this project caused Paullus to seek the financial assistance of others in order to complete it.⁴⁹ In fact, Paullus sought this help from Caesar, who lent him enough to finish the project. This case is interesting for several reasons. Firstly, Cicero (*Fam.* 8.10.3 51 BCE) and Appian (*BC* 2.26) indicate that Caesar and Paullus were political opponents and that Caesar bought his favour, indicating that the indebted magistrate considered completion of the project more important than the burden of obligation to an opponent (at

⁴⁶ See: Verboven (2002), particularly 116-182; Andreau (1999) 139-158, for interest free loans as a political tool in the late republic: 144-145.

⁴⁷ Veyne (1990) 234, citing Mommsen *Staatsrecht*, II, 452. Veyne does not cite any primary evidence for the state of the city or the rate of public buildings at Rome. Given the state of the present evidence, Veyne may be wrong here.

⁴⁸ Shatzman (1975) 127: for anti-caesarian sentiments of Paullus: Cic. *Fam.* 8.10.3; App. *BC* 2.26.

⁴⁹ Cic. *Fam.* 8.10.3; App. *BC* 2.26; Plut. *Caes.* 29; *Pomp.* 58.1; Suet. *Iul.* 29.1; Dio 40.63.2. Shatzman (1975) 96: 100,000 HS to build it, but Caesar lent him 36 million HS.

least prior to the loan) that would be incurred through the debt of a loan. Of course, this event should not be taken in isolation, since it is likely that Caesar and Paullus made additional deals in reaching an agreement (such as securing a provincial command for Paullus),⁵⁰ but the value of the loan must surely have contributed to this process of reconciliation. Presumably, the importance Paullus attached to this project stemmed from his familial association with the basilica, having been erected by his great-grandfather Marcus Aemilius Lepidus in 179 BCE,⁵¹ meaning that failure by Paullus to complete the reconstruction would mean risking the transference of this prestigious association to someone outside the family, permanently.⁵²

Secondly, Caesar maximized his position as benefactor by lending the necessary 1500 talents and negotiating that in return Paullus would refrain from political attack since Caesar wanted to avoid having his proconsulship in Gaul terminated – a crucial appointment for Caesar.⁵³ As Suetonius (*Iul.* 29) says: “Caesar again won over the other consul – Aemilius Paullus – with a heavy bribe.” Suetonius (*Iul.* 29) had already pointed out that Caesar (late 50s BCE) used free and low interest loans to gain significant political influence over all of Pompey’s friends and many senators, so his negative presentation of Caesar’s loan to Paullus reinforced the picture Suetonius was creating of Caesar’s growing power.⁵⁴ While it

⁵⁰ The exact details surrounding the friendship/relations of Caesar and Paullus at the time of the loan are unclear. Gruen (1972) 475: states that it is unclear how much the loan played a part in Paullus’ switch of allegiance, stating that a promise of a provincial command was also an important contributing factor. Scholar’s have tended to accept that Paullus’ support of Caesar was ‘purchased’: Lacey, *Historia* 10 (1961) 318-329; Syme, *Rom. Rev.* 69 (cited in Gruen 1972, 475, n.91).

⁵¹ Varr. *LL* 6.4; Liv. 40.46.16, 51-52.

⁵² In the end, the project was actually completed by Paullus Aemilius Lepidus in 34 BCE. Presumably if Paullus had abandoned the project due to lack of funds this would have meant forfeiting this familial right to its completion. Interesting to note that Broughton *MRR* I, 392: discusses this building project as being one of the uniting factors for Lepidus and his co-censor Nobilior (previously enemies), who publicly reconciled upon being elected. For considerations of such familial ties, see: Pina Polo (2010) 269-271, 156-159: for discussion regarding the family continuity in the process of temple construction (ensuring the prestige remained with the family from *locatio* to *dedicatio*), 159-160: for families’ ongoing relationship and cooperation with the Senate regarding their role in completing the building process in the event the vower/magistrate died, 168: restoration/maintenance by family members. Also: Cooley (2009) 192: even Augustus emphasizes the central position and respect afforded previous builders/founders of buildings when in 19.1 he stresses that he called the portico near the Flaminian Circus after the man who had built an earlier one (albeit the name Octavian was the same, but the point of respecting the builder’s remains), and in 20.1 he states that he restored the Capitoline temple (preserving the name of Quintus Lutatius Catulus) and Pompey’s theatre at his own expense without a single inscription bearing his own name. Below, 120-121: Sulla’s reconstruction of the Curia Hostilia in 80 BCE and his son Faustus Sulla’s reconstruction of it in 52 BCE is a good example of this familial continuity.

⁵³ Plut. *Caes.* 29; *Pomp.* 58.1; Suet. *Iul.* 29.1; App. *BC* 2.26: suggests that Caesar silenced Paullus with this money; Dio 40.63.2. See, also: Shatzman (1975) 289-290; Verboven (2002).

⁵⁴ Hurley (2011) 1: points out that Suetonius presents his *Life of Julius Caesar* chronologically until chapter 44, whereby he presents various aspects of Caesar’s life: his physical appearance, habits, oratory, writing,

is important to take care when considering hostile sources, the negative cultural capital of this passage must not be ignored. As stated, private loans were a particularly powerful political tool for wealthy individuals and this is precisely why Suetonius chose to include them in his discussion of Caesar. Even if his account of how many people Caesar tied to himself through his financial assistance is exaggerated, the potential influence generated by such arrangements holds nevertheless. In this respect, the competition that drove public building projects in the late republic provided political leverage to wealthy individuals who could make loans for such projects, gaining influence through the *gratia* of those in their debt, *and* in helping others. Such actions also served as a useful vehicle for the expression of their own power and *beneficia*:

Paulus in medio foro basilicam iam paene texerat isdem antiquis columnis, illam autem quam locavit facit magnificentissimam. Quid quaeris? Nihil gratius illo monumento, nihil gloriosius.

Paulus has nearly covered his basilica now in the middle of the Forum, using the same antique pillars. However, the one that he contracted out, he is making most magnificent. What more do you want? Nothing is more pleasing, or more glorious than that monument. (Cic. *Att.* 4.16.8.1-12)

Interestingly, Purcell cites this passage as evidence of competition between Rome's elite, suggesting that Paullus was responding to Pompey's temple-theatre complex, dedicated the year before (55 BCE).⁵⁵ While there seems little doubt that awareness of the important architectural projects of others spurred magistrates on to deliver bigger and better, Cicero's discussion of Paullus' project nearing completion also demonstrates an awareness of the significance of Paullus' magnificent basilica among Rome's elite. It is this point that is important here, since Caesar's assistance in loaning the money to help complete the project (four years later 50 BCE) not only advertised his *beneficia* and ostensible accord with Paullus, but also tied Caesar personally to another significant public work.

military skill and bravery, and finally aspects of his physical appearance. Arrogance is one of the traits discussed which Suetonius is at pains to point out as leading to his assassination.

⁵⁵ Similarly, Shackleton Bailey (1965) vol.2, 204-205, n.8: explains that this passage refers to two basilicae. The first of the two buildings mentioned by Cicero being the old Basilica Fulvia (or *Aemilia et Fulvia*, Varro *LL* 6.4) erected by Paullus' ancestor M. Lepidus (censor 179 BCE) and restored by Paullus and the second being the new Basilica Aemilia. He rejects T. Frank's claim (*Am. Journ. Phil.* 44, 1923, 355 f.) that Paullus decided to build the Basilica Aemilia as a bigger and better replacement of the old one when he heard Caesar was planning his forum close by. Instead he states that the old one must have been removed at some stage. In any case, Paullus seems to be busily engaged in more than one public work during this period.

In the same year, Cicero also took a loan from Caesar for the amount of 800,000 HS, indebting Cicero to him.⁵⁶ The loan was for his private, rather than public, buildings. However, the loan had interesting ramifications for another significant public project, Caesar's *forum Iulium*. This is interesting because we see Cicero in charge of buying land for the project (Cic. *Att.* 4.16.8.1-12). Presumably, Cicero's loan from Caesar and its associated *gratia* influenced Cicero's decision to get involved with such a public venture, a venture that would benefit Caesar greatly.⁵⁷ In fact, analysis of the passage shows some interesting language regarding Cicero's friendship with Caesar: *Itaque Caesaris amici, me dico et Oppium dirumparis licet*. His use of *dirumpare* (laugh out loud) indicates that Atticus would be surprised at this business union (perhaps compounded by Oppius' equestrian status, presenting Cicero as an equestrian agent).⁵⁸ Importantly, it is likely that Cicero wanted to present Caesar's project in the most positive light, since the changing political landscape from the late 60s had threatened Cicero's position in Roman political society, resulting in much reliance on Caesar and Pompey for his political standing and protection.⁵⁹ Cicero was forcibly removed from the political scene at Rome in 58 BCE as a result of the legislation of his enemy Clodius Pulcher and his ongoing conflict with Clodius continued to threaten Cicero at Rome. Additionally, Cicero was indebted to Pompey for his recall, further obligating him to both Caesar and Pompey. For Cicero, the project presumably embodied his reconciliation and association with Caesar, and as such, represented renewed participation, involvement, and membership in the elite and competitive political circle of Rome.⁶⁰ Perhaps for Caesar, Cicero's assistance secured his loyalty and advertised his political support. Cicero's exertions to pay the loan back in order to support Pompey (preserving their *amicitia*) in the civil war of 49 BCE further demonstrate the force of Cicero's *gratia* to Caesar in regards to this loan (*Att.* 7.3.11).⁶¹

⁵⁶ Cic. *Fam.* 1.9.12; 7.17.2.

⁵⁷ For the bonds of benevolent acts, see: Cic. *Off.* 2.52 and Sen. *Benef.* 2.18.5. Also, Cicero's determination to free himself from the political obligation created by his loan from Caesar, discussed below.

⁵⁸ See: Shackleton Bailey (1965) vol.2, 205, n.4: Gaius Oppius, an *eques Romanus*, was a friend and agent of Caesar.

⁵⁹ See: Mitchell (1991) 190-193; Fantham (2004) 1-25; Tatum (1999): particularly 151-158. For Cicero's attitude to Caesar's *clementia* and *beneficium* as tools for forcibly binding his enemies to him through his acts, see: Angel (2008) 114-130.

⁶⁰ For further discussion regarding Cicero's mixed relationship with Caesar, regarding Caesar as *tyrannus*, despite heavy reliance on him, see: Wiseman (2009) 177-210; Angel (2008) 114-130.

⁶¹ For discussion of Cicero's embarrassment regarding this political debt to Caesar, see: Shatzman (1975) 137: uses the passage of Cicero (*Att.* 7.3.5) whereby Cicero wants to free himself of the obligation of his political debt to Caesar, created by Caesar's loan to him, to show that financial aid resulted in political obligations; also: Suet. *Iul.* 27.1; Verboven (2002) 153.

While the passage (Cic. *Att.* 4.16.8.1-12) appears to present Cicero and Oppius buying land, their association with the project, in light of Caesar's absence at the time (in northern Gaul), suggests that the pair may have been overseeing other aspects of the project.⁶² Although explicit evidence of the full extent of Cicero's involvement is not clear, this business relationship between Caesar and Cicero seems hardly surprising since Cicero's many private buildings and construction projects throughout Italy meant that he had architects and specialists at his disposal. Perhaps Caesar saw this situation as an opportunity to obtain positive support from someone popular with Caesar's political adversaries, which would present his building project in a most advantageous manner, not to mention to use Cicero's extensive knowledge in matters such as the letting of contracts for public buildings and the extensive litigation generated from such activities, making Cicero an important ally.⁶³ Construction of public and private works stimulated much legal activity after the successful bidding for a contract. This legal activity included organizing the letting and terms of the contract, organizing and managing the builders, architects, and allied staff, followed by the *probatio operis* (final inspection of the work). This inspection resulted in either the granting of *probatio* (approval) or *improbatio* (failure to gain approval) for payment of services rendered.⁶⁴ Magistrates dealt with the administration of public law using their own judgement in managing the execution of contracts.⁶⁵ In addition, architects were an important component of the project, since they were consulted on matters of design and scale. Such legal and technical complexities would therefore have required those magistrates in charge of these projects to have access to the appropriate specialists. Although positive evidence for Cicero's legal assistance is lacking (besides perhaps his use of *transigi* to describe his financial settlement with the previous owners of the land: *Att.* 4.16.8), these contacts and knowledge presumably equipped Cicero well for dealing with not only the

⁶² Martin (1989) 29-40, 50-51: identifying Vettius Chryssipus (*Att.* 14.9.1; *Att.* 13.29.1; *Fam.* 7.14.1) and Cyrus (Cic. *Att.* 2.3.2; *Q. fr.* 2.2.2; *Mil.* 46), two of the architects who Cicero frequently consulted.

⁶³ For discussion of Caesar's overtures to Cicero previously in 60 BCE, including asking him to join his alliance with Crassus and Pompey, see: Kaster (2006) 6, n.10, citing: Cic., 2.2 *Att.* 2.3.(23) 3-4, for other offers by Caesar during 59 BCE: *Att.* 2.4 (24).2, 2.5.(25).1-2, 2.18 (38).3, 2.19 (39).3, *Fam.* 14.3 (9).1. For Cicero's contacts, see: Martin (1989) 51. In addition to his own legal background Cicero had access to experts on land law such as Furius and Cascellius, see: Cic. *Balb.* 45; Just. *Dg.* 1.2.1.45. For Cicero's legal involvement in building contract cases, see his case against Verres who tried to manipulate the contract for the Temple of Castor and Pollux: Chapter One 12-18.

⁶⁴ For discussion of the process, see: Martin (1989), and: for *probatio operis*, see: 103-114.

⁶⁵ Martin (1989) 20-22: Roman contracts for construction and organization of public and private works could be either by *stipulatio* (a promise) or *locatio conductio* (formal contract). Both outlined the fundamental components of the obligation for both owner/employer and builder/architect, although the later provided agreement by both parties of a fixed price and was in use by the time of Cato the Elder (*Agr.* 14) and tended to be used mainly for public works.

technical, but also the legal aspects of big projects such as the *forum Iulium*, potentially placing him in a certain position of importance and influence among those wishing to undertake complicated public construction projects.⁶⁶ Although, little else is known about the purchase of land for Caesar's project, its central location at the very political heart of Rome surely stimulated significant legal consideration, requiring careful political navigation and litigation by trusted colleagues. Moreover, one would assume Caesar's absence from Rome at the time of the purchase further increased his need for a suitably reliable, experienced, and knowledgeable associate.

Returning to the revolving theatres-amphitheatre of Curio, the project ran Curio into significant debt and was eventually made possible by a large loan from Caesar in 51 BCE, the year before Curio built it. Once again this situation involved significant benefit for Caesar, as Cicero (*Fam.* 8.4.2) reports that Caesar initially turned Curio down before negotiating a deal whereby Curio in return for the money would defend Caesar's interests in the Senate.⁶⁷

Even as late as 44 BCE, Caesar can be seen exploiting political outcomes through the use of public building and his association with other political players. For instance, Dio (43.49.1-3) reports that Caesar involved Antony in a project to move the Rostra, whereby Caesar had it rebuilt and moved, however allowed Antony's name to be inscribed on it:

And the Rostra, which was formerly in the centre of the Forum, was moved back to its present position; also the statues of Sulla and of Pompey were restored to it. For this Caesar received praise, and also because he yielded to Antony both the glory of the work and the inscription on it.⁶⁸

This point is more interesting since Antony is known to have had significant debts at this time (*Cic. Phil.* 2.77, *Att.* 12.19.2), and yet he had purchased all Pompey's assets in 47 BCE

⁶⁶ With regards to the potential for Caesar's need for good legal representation when carrying out his building projects, it is worth considering that Dio (43.49.1-3) reports that when Caesar was buying the land for his planned theatre (completed by Augustus and called the Theatre of Marcellus) on the site of the *forum Holitorium*, he caused problems by tearing down dwellings and temple sites, appropriating monies held inside the temples. Lott (2004) 12: discusses this incident, stating that the destruction of the space for the theatre was disruptive and disbanded the community of at least one *vicus*, the Vicus Sobrius. Plutarch (*Crassus* 2.4) reports that Crassus used a huge slave-labour force on redevelopment programs at Rome, suggesting his usefulness for major projects, perhaps engaging in works for Pompey and Caesar before his death.

⁶⁷ Regarding the deal that Curio defend Caesar's interests in the Senate in return for the loan, see: Shatzman (1975) 396-397, n.760, citing: *Cic. Att.* 6.3.4; *Val. Max.* 9.1.6; *Vell. Pat.* 2.48,3-3; *Lucan* 1.269, 4.820; *Plut. Pomp.* 58.1, *Anton.* 5.1; *App. BC* 2.26; *Dio* 40.60; *Serv. Ad. Aen.* 6.261.

⁶⁸ Trans. E. Cary (1969).

after his death, as a leveraged deal (buy now pay later, when resold).⁶⁹ The total of these holdings are estimated to have been worth around 200 million HS, money Antony did not have, and it would take at least a year and a half to complete the process of selling all the possessions so that the money could be deposited into the Treasury. Caesar's need to raise cash at the same time to pay his long overdue veterans which Dio (41.17.1) and Plutarch (*Caes.* 35.6-11) estimate to have been around 48 million HS, then suggests that Caesar's transference of prestige and glory for the new marble rostra to Antony served a very important purpose since cash raised from the conversion of Pompey's landed assets into state cash was vital for Caesar. Caesar also secured the consulship of 44 for Antony, even though Antony was 4 years too young.⁷⁰

Although the exact details are unknown, Faustus Sulla's (son of the dictator) reconstruction of the Curia Hostilia in 52 BCE (after it had been destroyed in riots following Clodius' funeral⁷¹) also appears to result in significant personal debt. Faustus' prior association with Pompey, serving for him in the East as a military tribune, had brought him great sums of money.⁷² However, Plutarch (*Cic.* 27.3) reports that Faustus incurred such great debts during this building project that he was forced to borrow money and to sell some of his possessions, perhaps spurred on to build bigger and better by the grandeur of Pompey's theatre and the beginnings of Caesar's forum complex. After all, completion of such an important civic building as the Curia (also restored in 80 BCE by his father Sulla⁷³) would have placed Faustus among these other great men (and not insignificantly, responding to his father's great works on the Capitoline).⁷⁴ Faustus' tenuous financial situation may have been worsened by his prior spending in 61 or 60 BCE on other acts of public beneficence, including the construction of public baths and the provision of free bathing oil for the

⁶⁹ Antony could not afford to purchase all Pompey's assets. However, he agreed to pay the *Aerarium* a vast sum of money upon completion of resale, causing Cicero to label him with the derogatory term *sector* 'liquidator'. See: Ramsey (2004) 168; *Cic. Phil.* 2.71.

⁷⁰ Ramsey (2004) 161-173.

⁷¹ *Cic. Mil.* 90, Ascon. In loc; *Cic. De Fin.* 5.2; Dio 40.49.

⁷² For his wealth gained during military service under Pompey, see: Joseph. *AJ* 14.69, *BJ* 1.7.4, 6; Plut. *Pomp.* 42.3; App. *Mith.* 104.

⁷³ Platner (1929) 143.

⁷⁴ However, it is interesting to note that when his father Sulla died in 78 BCE (still rebuilding the Temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus after it had been burnt in 83 BCE), Faustus would have been only 8 years old and therefore too young to inherit the right to the temple's maintenance, with the prestigious responsibility going to Quintus Lutatius Catulus instead.

people, as reported by Dio (37. 51.4).⁷⁵ It seems unlikely that Faustus would have borrowed money from Pompey since their relations had become strained by this time.⁷⁶ Unfortunately, Plutarch does not state whom Faustus borrowed from, just that he incurred significant debt, enough to have to sell off his own possessions, demonstrating the lengths individuals were prepared to go to in associating their names with significant public buildings.

In Sum

Whereas aediles, praetors, and censors had been responsible for the letting of contracts and funding of projects on behalf of the State, *triumphatores* now also played this role. State control had traditionally overseen, validated, and sanctioned civic buildings; even temples vowed by triumphant generals were state temples. Monumentalizing the memory of Rome and her achievements had been the job of the Senate. The restriction of state funds now meant that *triumphatores* such as Pompey and Caesar acted as the state treasury, lending money to fund public (and private) buildings and monuments, and lending political influence over important contracts for projects. Significant political influence gained through the accrued *gratia* of their debtors decentralized senatorial control into the hands of these individuals. It is this point that emphasizes the overall political, economic, and social control that had now concentrated in the hands of a few. Their ability to build bigger and better due to significant wealth acquired from successful campaigns upped the architectural ante for competitive magistrates and combined with restrictions on public funds for public building projects meant that they could make loan to others for such activities on a grand scale. The next section will look at the case studies of the Theatre of Pompey and the *forum Iulium* and will demonstrate that despite their superior political, economic and social standing at Rome, both men chose largely traditional and appropriate civic gifts for the city, highlighting their place in the traditional political framework of late republican Rome.

⁷⁵ See, also: Cic. *Att.* 9.11.3-4, for his mention of Faustus' desire for proscriptions to relieve this debt; Shatzman (1975) 335-336: he also had expenses from keeping slaves and gladiators; Verboven (2002) 151.

⁷⁶ For the strained relations in 52 BCE, see: Gruen (1969) 105, citing: Asconius 34, (1974) 94.

SECTION THREE

NEW FOR ROME, NOT FOR ROMANS

The following discussion will examine specifically the function and architectural arrangement of the Theatre of Pompey and the *forum Iulium* in order to establish how these structures benefited these *triumphatores* personally and how they fitted into the traditional framework of public gifts at Rome. It is tempting to view these magnificent public works as unorthodox in the context of the city of Rome, as simply representative of the ultimate power and influence of these two men at the peak of their careers.⁷⁷ In doing so, it would then be reasonable to agree whole-heartedly with Veyne's assertion that public benefactions served primarily to *display*, rather than to *gain*, prestige and power. This section will argue however, that the volatility of politics in the mid-late first century BCE meant that the relationship between General and People could be capricious at times, and that their benefactions, drawing influence from a well-established Italic architectural tradition, served also to reinforce their traditional republican images far more than they first appear, and hence their rightful place at the head of Rome's elite.

The Capricious Crowd

Before discussing the building projects of Pompey and Caesar specifically, it is important to briefly consider the volatile nature of late republican politics and the possible influence this volatility had on the public standing of even the greatest of men at Rome. Despite possessing significant wealth and influence (Pompey more so at this time), by 59 BCE the reputations of Pompey and Caesar had suffered significantly as dissatisfaction with the triumvirate grew,⁷⁸ assisted by the propaganda and tactics of men such as Cato and Bibulus.⁷⁹ In fact, since returning to Rome after his unmitigated success in the east, from which he had gained enormous popularity, by 59 BCE, Pompey had actually lost popular and senatorial favour by supporting Caesar (Cic. *Att.* 2.19.4). In the same year, both men

⁷⁷ The Theatre of Pompey: Rome's first permanent theatre, after long and sustained opposition; the *forum Iulium*: the first of the so-called 'imperial fora', as a single-temple - *piazza* precinct.

⁷⁸ Crassus' reputation does not appear to have suffered to the same extent.

⁷⁹ For full discussion of the political situation at Rome and the formation and reaction to the so-called (and informal) First Triumvirate, see: Gruen (1974) 83-120, especially: 90-95. For Pompeian support in the 50s, including Cicero: 106-107; Kaster (2006) 5-6.

experienced the force of this public dissatisfaction while attending the games of Apollo Diphilus:

Populi sensus maxime theatro et spectaculis perspectus est. nam gladiatoribus qua dominus qua advocati sibilis conscissi. Ludis Apolinaribus Diphilus tragoedus in nostrum Pompeium petulanter invectus est: “nostra miseria tu es magnus” miliens coactus est dicere. “eandem virtutem istam veniet tempus cum graviter gemes” totius theatri clamore dixit itemque cetera.

Popular sentiment has been particularly noticeable at the theatre and the spectacles. Take for instance the gladiatorial shows, where both the Show Master and his supporters were swamped with hisses. At the games of Apollo Diphilus the actor rudely attacked our Pompey: “by our suffering you are Great!” – many times they rallied to speak. “The time will come when you shall lament that same greatness immensely.” He spoke to the applause of the whole theatre and all the others. (*Att.* 2.19).

This passage read in its entirety has Caesar met with silence, and Pompey actively hissed at, while Curio receives a standing ovation, serving to emphasize the people’s negative feelings towards the two men. The negative reception from this vociferous crowd reflects the unpopularity of the triumvirs at all levels of Roman society in 59 BCE, reflected in Cicero’s choice of *totius theatri...itemque cetera* to describe the diverse crowd.⁸⁰ Such volatility in popular politics in Rome at the time demonstrates that the *populus* still held force in late republican politics and that Pompey and Caesar would need to work to regain their favour. As a possible motivation to re/gain popular favour, this incident is arguably as instructive for understanding the construction of Caesar’s forum complex as Pompey’s theatre.⁸¹ Cicero (*Att.* 2.19.3) reports that: *tulit Caesar graviter* (Caesar took this [negative reception] badly) and although Caesar’s reputation had improved significantly by the time he was buying land for his complex in 54 BCE, one would assume Caesar bore this incident in mind when planning his public works. Pompey was also aware of the capriciousness of Rome’s political scene. In fact, his involvement in the alliance with Caesar and Crassus confirms his awareness.⁸² It is therefore sensible to assume that both men also understood the personal benefits of providing public (and popular) benefactions when attempting to establish *and* maintain their prominent positions at Rome through the attainment of popular favour.

⁸⁰ Tatum (1990) 105.

⁸¹ Construction for the theatre had begun in 61 BCE, but the event presumably augmented his desire and need to present a popular gift.

⁸² See: n.65 above; Kaster (2006) 5-6: Pompey needed to provide land for his veterans as well as the ratification of his disposition of the eastern territories (among other things) however, his plans were met with opposition from many of the *optimates* including the Metelli, Lucius Lucullus, the orator Hortensius, and the younger Cato. The political rivalry and machinations of these men meant that a political alliance was necessary if Pompey was to achieve his aims.

Pompey's theatre provided the first permanent, official, and purpose built venue for the provision of entertainment for the people at Rome, representing the ultimate act of popular benefaction. Despite later additions such as the curia, quadriportico and gardens,⁸³ and temple structures,⁸⁴ Pompey's original intention does appear to have been to provide a theatre for the People of Rome.⁸⁵ He had the means and the *auctoritas* to build this controversial structure. However, it must be assumed that Pompey hoped such a popular benefaction would bring him greater favour with the people and restore his former reputation as the great man of Rome.⁸⁶ Despite being hissed at by the crowd at the theatre in Rome in 59 BCE, presumably Pompey (*Pomp.* 42.4) remembered his favourable reception by the grateful people at the theatre at Mitylene on the island of Lesbos (63 BCE), since Plutarch (*Pomp.* 42) reports they presented performances there in his honour to thank him for freeing their city. Plutarch goes so far as to cite this event as the impetus for Pompey to build his permanent stone theatre at Rome. In regards to euergetism, it is reasonable to assume that Pompey may have considered the complex important on two levels. Firstly, he could gain popular favour by provision of a permanent venue to host public entertainment and events – a popular gift, but also, the space would serve as a permanent monument of his benevolence to the city of Rome. Of course, this is not to say that Pompey did not benefit in other ways through his construction, since the quadriportico and temple also served to aggrandize the general and his great achievements.⁸⁷

⁸³ See: Spencer (2010) 168-171: regarding the garden providing the city with recreational public space, opening up comfortable, stimulating conversational avenues and spaces for Rome – an innovation for a city unaccustomed to having such recreational spaces. With regards to the traditional aspects of Pompey's complex, see: 170: Spencer suggests that the garden as a *rus in urbe* meant the complex might mediate between politics with its Curia, and the rustic landscape (including the cavea as a mountain) harking back to Rome's mytho-historical origins as a woodland space under the protection of the deities displayed there.

⁸⁴ The theatre was begun in 61 BCE and was dedicated in 55 BCE, marked by games held to celebrate (Dio 39.38.1; Cic. *In Pis.* 27.65; *CIL* I² p.244), whereas, the Temple of Venus Victrix on the site was arguably not dedicated until 52 BCE (Gell. *NA* 10.1.6-9; although Plin. *NH* 8.20 says it was earlier). The curia was built after the theatre, and labelled by Suetonius (*Caes.* 80.4) as: *in aditu theatri*; Frank Sear (2006) 61: for the dating of the gardens and porticus at 51 BCE. Although some dating evidence is controversial, no evidence exists for any of these elements preceding the theatre itself, implying that it was Pompey's original intention to provide a theatre; Catulus 55: presents the public nature of the space when he discusses women of low class gathered in the portico/gardens of the theatre, implying they were prostitutes who plied their trade there.

⁸⁵ Cf. Plut. *Pomp.* 42.4: states that Pompey had sketches and plans drawn up in Mitylene.

⁸⁶ Temelini (2006) 3, cites: Plut. *Pomp.* 45.5; Vell. Pat. 2.40.3-4; Manil. *Astron.* 1.793; Plin. *HN* 37.6.14; Cass. Dio 37.21.

⁸⁷ For the function of porticoes for the display of personal monuments, see: Chapter Two 54-66, particularly, Pompey's self-aggrandizing portico: 64, n.50; Holleran (2003) 50: Cicero's *Pro Murena* discussed whether or not Murena's method of seat distribution at games constituted electoral bribery. He is accused of giving tickets out to people other than his friends and associates. Presumably he would be giving them to the most influential

Later authors certainly saw this theatre as a popular benefaction, as Martial's (2.14.9) language in reference to the portico of the theatre suggests calling it: *Pompei dona* 'Pompey's gift'. Similarly, Cicero, in 56 BCE during the construction period of Pompey's theatre, gives perhaps a veiled nod to the theatre when he discusses the best locations to gauge popular opinion in his defense of Publius Sestius:⁸⁸

Etenim tribus locis significari maxime de <re publica> populi Romani iudicium ac voluntas potest, contione, comitiis, ludorum gladiatorumque consessu. Quae contio fuit per hos annos, quae quidem esset non conducta sed vera, in qua populi Romani consensus non perspicui posset?

Indeed, there are three places where the opinion and the desire of the Roman people can be shown greatly: at the assembly, the comitia, the games and gladiatorial gatherings. What assembly has there been in recent years, which was not made up of hired men, but a fair one, in which the consensus of the Roman people has not been able to be perceived? (*Sest.* 50.106)

According to Cicero, places of entertainment functioned as venues for popular gatherings, giving political voice to the people. It is in this respect that such buildings can be considered popular gifts and the provision of such a public building therefore reinforces the euergetic and popular nature of the space and its donor. This passage has been the subject of some debate regarding the true demographic of Cicero's 'people' at such gatherings.⁸⁹ Tatum rejects Vanderbroeck's claim that public demonstrations at the games and at theatre performances had an anti-*popularis*, and therefore *optimata*, tendency during the late Roman republic due to the disproportionate exclusion of the *plebs contionalis*, instead arguing that closer analysis of the limited evidence suggests their inclusion.⁹⁰ Tatum argues convincingly

people he could to encourage them to vote for him. The Murena case weakens the argument for a cross section of society at the events – possibly reflecting the 'symbolic people'. See: Chapter One for further discussion of this, whereby in the late republic *contiones* and public assemblies start to become organized gatherings, with organized claqueurs and supporters. See also: Temelini (2006) 1-14 and his discussion of the theatre complex as a manubial structure. Further analysis of the theatre-complex as a manubial structure is outside the remit of this thesis. However, there are many manubial elements evident.

⁸⁸ Temelini (2006) 4: suggests the possibility that Cicero is hinting at Pompey's theatre in this passage.

⁸⁹ Vanderbroeck (1987) 77-81, *contra* Tatum (1990).

⁹⁰ Tatum (1990) 105: argues that Cicero's ironic use of the term *Popularis* when discussing Clodius was employed to prove that Clodius was not one, pointing out that if the crowd were indeed *Optimate* by nature, this irony would have held little force. Importantly, Tatum highlights the exceptional nature of the crowds in the *Pro Sestio* due to their arranged nature for the express purpose of gathering support for Cicero's recall from exile. Cf. Kaster (2006) Preface, stating: "Because Cicero based his defence on an ample account of recent Roman political history and a 'survey' of the commonwealth's current condition, it is among the longest of his extant speeches. It is also arguably the most important of his political speeches that survive from the nearly two decades separating the Speeches against Catiline and the Second *Philippic*."... Because so much of the account concerns public meetings, demonstrations, and outbursts of violence, it is highly pertinent to the current debate on the place of the crowd in Rome in the late Republic."; Coleman (2011) 345-347: discussing the theatre as a venue for the expression of popular will, states that this passage from Cicero reflects a situation of increasingly intense political engagement among spectators at the games in the last decades of the republic.

that popular leaders expected to be cheered at *ludi* and that events such as Pompey and Caesar's negative reception of 59 BCE are mentioned because they are exceptional, not because the crowd was anti-*popularis*. Similarly, the association of theatre venues with licentious and raucous behaviour by the crowds also suggests a certain level of diversity in the crowd that further supports Cicero's popular description of the assemblies associated with these public spaces.⁹¹

Lastly, in regards to the theatre as a popular gift, it is also important to consider briefly Pompey's appointment to grain commissioner with *imperium* in charge of the grain supply in 57 BCE.⁹² This appointment is particularly interesting when considering the beneficent aspect of the theatre complex since he added the quadriportico soon after his attainment of this office and it is thought that he used several of its exterior chambers for the storage of grain.⁹³ The supply of grain to the people (a highly popular measure) is well attested in the sources, particularly during one's aedileship,⁹⁴ and Pompey's addition of such a facility must surely have increased the beneficent nature of the complex.⁹⁵ Additionally, the grain storage facility in Pompey's theatre complex advertised the increased prestige of Pompey's command and his accord with the Senate (his appointment passed by *senatus consultum*⁹⁶) and reminded the people that he was providing cheaper grain.⁹⁷

In contrast, Caesar's forum complex, rather than providing a venue for entertainment, gave to the city of Rome in a different way by addressing the increasing need for more civic space for political and administrative activities. As discussed, Ulrich uses the example of the architectural similarities of the Temple of Castor and its political use for public gatherings and the similar features of the Temple of Venus Genetrix to show that Caesar's new forum

⁹¹ See: Goldberg (1998) 10: discussing the likelihood that the Senate held political fears for a permanent theatre due to their capacity to hold large crowds.

⁹² For further discussion of this command, see: Gruen (1974) 297, 436, 536; Broughton *MRR* II, 203-204.

⁹³ According to Temelini (2006) 4-5, n.19: the interior of Pompey's portico was decorated with trophies, statues and gardens and the exterior was divided into *stationes* for the local guilds and commercial store rooms for the local distribution of grain, citing: La Rocca (1987-88) 'Pompeo Magno 'novus Neptunus', *BCAR* 92.2, 265-292. 287. *Negotiantes* showed their appreciation by honouring Pompey with a statue placed somewhere near the portico, Degraffi (1965) *Inscriptiones Latinae Liberae Rei Publicae: Imagines*. Berlin: de Gruyter 114-115 and fig. 163.

⁹⁴ Veyne (1990) provides copious examples.

⁹⁵ Temelini (2006) 4-5: points out that this quadriportico extended toward the Porticus Minucia Frumentaria, a major centre for grain distribution under the emperor Claudius, and claims both structures functioned as minor centers for grain distribution and other commercial activities from a much earlier period. The earlier dating for the Porticus Minucia Frumentaria in this capacity is controversial. However it is an interesting consideration.

⁹⁶ Gruen (1974) 542.

⁹⁷ Cicero, *De Imp. Pomp.* 44: reports the reduced corn prices.

complex provided space for popular assembly. Similarly, Appian (*BC* 2.102) presents this complex as a gift to the Roman people, extending and expanding the civic space of Rome.⁹⁸ In fact, Dio (43.22.23) reports that Caesar gave amazing games and spectacles to the People when he had completed the complex, indicating its function as a popular benefaction to Rome.

Caesar's original intentions for the structure are also less clear because the forum complex *in toto* appears to have developed over time and a lack of evidence means it is not possible to ascertain whether or not his exact intentions were to build an entirely new forum complex or enhance the existing one. In this respect, it is also difficult to precisely pinpoint the intended recipients of Caesar's euergetism. As discussed in Chapter Two, Caesar's forum signaled a change from the multiplicity of function and diversity of inhabitants at the *forum Romanum*, to a specialized judicial and political space, arguably intended for a more narrow section of Roman society. In contrast, ostensibly, Pompey's theatre provided a space for the masses.⁹⁹ Nevertheless, both *triumphatores* were gifting civic space to Roman citizens. Perhaps Pompey's choice reflects his greater need to court popular favour, more so than Caesar, in light of the events of 59 BCE.¹⁰⁰ Unlike Caesar, Pompey had not held the position of aedile and therefore missed the usual opportunities to curry such popular support.

As benefactions, Pompey's theatre complex and Caesar's specialized forum precinct were firsts for Rome: Pompey's popular gift - by virtue of its permanency in the context of its location at Rome, and Caesar's contribution - as a new single-temple enclosed forum complex. Despite their uniqueness within the city walls of Rome, architectural evidence outside the city (discussed below), in Italy and the provinces, demonstrates an established tradition for both the theatre-temple complex and the single-temple forum.¹⁰¹ In establishing these traditions and examining their influence on public buildings at Rome it can be seen

⁹⁸ For Ulrich's discussion, see: Chapter Two 91, n.153; Appian *BC* 2.102: Chapter Two 61.

⁹⁹ Pliny (8.20-22) discusses the distressed *populus* as *oblitus imperatoris ac munificentiae* 'forgetful of the general and his munificence...' happening in his theatre when the desperate elephants began to appeal to the crowd for help. The passage mentions Caesar giving public shows followed by Nero and others. In this respect, these public buildings functioned as spaces for display of their own munificence.

¹⁰⁰ Tacitus (*Annals* 14.20) is the only extant evidence of opposition for the permanent theatre, stating it was the older men, rather than the general populace.

¹⁰¹ It is this tradition that may help to explain the apparent lack of surprise at Caesar's complex (there is silence on the issue), although a paucity of evidence in general for this project would make this point difficult to prove.

that both complexes functioned as entirely appropriate and perhaps even familiar (to the people of Rome) civic benefactions.¹⁰²

Sulla, Pompey, and Caesar: Architectural Dialogue of the Late Republic

Coarelli's recent reconstruction of Sulla's Capitoline complex, in which a triple-temple honoured the principle deity Venus Victrix, sheds valuable light on the post-Sullan building projects of Pompey's theatre complex (honouring Venus Victrix) and Caesar's *forum Iulium* (honouring Venus Genetrix) when considering the traditional aspects of each.¹⁰³ If we accept this reconstruction, we accept the obvious, but important, dialogue between these three powerful men. Coarelli points out that while it has been known for a long time that Pompey's theatre has a similar cult group to the Capitoline cult (Venus Victrix, Honos et Virtus, Felicitas and perhaps Victoria)¹⁰⁴, it has generally, and wrongly, been thought that Pompey introduced the cult of Venus Victrix at Rome and that the Capitoline cult derived from that one.¹⁰⁵ Importantly, Coarelli's suggestion that Pompey took his lead from Sulla then places all three complexes in direct dialogue with each other; thus Pompey and Caesar, in choosing Venus, appear to be following a (late) republican tradition (albeit a tradition of powerful men).¹⁰⁶ This hypothesis also has important implications for understanding the actions of Pompey and Caesar in 62 BCE when they agitated to have the contract rights for the Temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus on the Capitoline transferred to Pompey.¹⁰⁷ In light

¹⁰² Discussion in this section does not argue for 'Romanization' in Roman colonies, municipalities, or provinces. However, the prescribed town planning evident in these cases is important for this thesis since they show an established and deliberate architectural configuration of both temple-forum and theatre-temple ensembles, pre-dating the construction of the Theatre of Pompey and the *forum Iulium*. Further reading on this topic is covered comprehensively by: Stek (2009); Wallace-Hadrill (2008); Bispham (2006); and Bispham (2008).

¹⁰³ See: Chapter One 13, 28-29.

¹⁰⁴ It is thought that the deities honoured in Pompey's theatre complex were honoured with shrines built into the side of the theatre, or close to it, on the cavea. Note the variations in this list of deities by scholars: Sear (2006) 58, n.105: Hercules Invictus, Honos et Virtus, Felicitas, and an unknown deity; Hanson (1959) 52-53: Honos, Virtus, Felicitas, and an unknown deity; Welch (2006) 195: Felicitas, and Honos et Virtus. The link between Sulla, Pompey, and Caesar, and their association with Felicitas, is worth considering. For in-depth discussion of Pompey and Caesar's connection to Felicitas, see: Welch (2006) 181-213. See also: Coarelli (2010) 125-132: discussing Pompey, 127; Beard *et al.* (1998) 144-145, particularly n.85: Pompey echoing the title of Sulla in his use of Felicitas.

¹⁰⁵ Coarelli (2010) 127, citing: Degraffi (1963) *Fasti Anni Numani et Iuliani (Inscriptiones Italicae XIII 2)* 493-494 and Coarelli (1997) 568-569. Cf. Hanson (1959) 50: gives Pompey as the first to use Venus Victrix, but does state that Sulla was the first to utilize Venus in a personal-political role.

¹⁰⁶ This view seems supported by Beard *et al.* (1998) 144-145: discussing an outright desire by Pompey to emulate the greatness of Sulla and ride into Rome for his triumph in a chariot drawn by four horses (a vehicle particularly associated with Venus).

¹⁰⁷ For the Catulus incident, see above: 12. For Caesar's use of Venus, see: Chapter Two 84-91.

of their unsuccessful attempts in this matter, their own choice of Venus suggests that both men understood a special significance in Sulla's personal association with the goddess, which they chose to recall in their own temples.

Welch's point that Pompey's theatre temple honoured Sulla's Venus and Felicitas and Marius' Honos and Virtus reinforces the concept of dialogue between the great men of Rome, particularly when considering all three building projects.¹⁰⁸ Responding to Sulla's significant complex, Pompey and Caesar secured their own prominent positions at Rome. Hanson's idea that Pompey inherited the concept of public works as a means of political propaganda and self-glorification (often attributed to Caesar and Augustus), citing the so-called Tabularium at Rome and the great sanctuary at Palestrina as forerunners to Pompey's theatre group,¹⁰⁹ seems most accurate in light of Coarelli's recent work.

Case Study One: The Theatre of Pompey

While Pompey's theatre complex reflected his long stay in the East, featuring imported materials such as Greek and Egyptian marbles slabs and columns, and various eastern artworks, many of the architectural features of this magnificent public work reflect a strong Italic tradition.¹¹⁰ Evidence clearly points to a long established tradition for theatre-temple complexes within Italy, dating from at least the early second century BCE.¹¹¹ This tradition pre-dates Pompey's theatre and coincides with the introduction and development of *opus caementicium* 'concrete' at Rome and in Italy, which made more complex constructions possible.¹¹² As such, Pompey's theatre complex can be seen as part of an existing arsenal of

¹⁰⁸ Welch (2006) 195.

¹⁰⁹ Hanson (1959) 47: similarities between concrete vaulting and arches of so-called Tabularium, Pompey's theatre, and the sanctuary of Fortuna Primigenia at Praeneste for links to Sulla and Pompey.

¹¹⁰ This thesis is not concerned with the Hellenistic features/artworks of Pompey's theatre complex, of which there appear to have been many (see: Packer 2010 153-159). Instead, this thesis will focus on the Italic architectural features of the complex as a significant influence in Pompey's design.

¹¹¹ See: theatre-temple sanctuary at Gabii, discussed in Hanson (1959) 29-31. Could scan picture.

¹¹² Unlike Greek theatres, which were built on the slopes of hills to support the seating, Roman theatres were mostly built on flat ground upon a man-made concrete mound. For discussion of the use of concrete in Rome toward the end of the third century/early second century BCE and its implications for building, see: Malacrino (2010) 114-120; for the qualities of this mortar/aggregate combination, not pre-mixed, and the so-called Tabularium (78-65 BCE) as one of the earliest concrete vaulted structures in Rome, see: Lancaster (2005) 3-10. Crawford and Coarelli (1977) 18: describe the development of concrete techniques as a 'functional reaction' to the increased building activity and development of higher buildings during the mid-republic to the beginning of the late republican period, linked also to the social and economic transformation of Italy at sites such as Praeneste and Pompeii were developed. For the use of concrete vaulting in Pompey's theatre, see: Sear (2006) 57; Hanson (1959) 43-55.

civic buildings from which benefactors (primarily wealthy *triumphatores*) would naturally choose when giving to their city. The connection between theatre and temple as a unified architectural form is largely not evidenced in Hellenistic theatres and it is salient features such as frontality and central axiality that identify these structures further as uniquely Italic.¹¹³

Frank Sear, discussing the theatre-temples in Latium, agrees with Coarelli's assessment that this architectural type likely influenced Pompey's design.¹¹⁴ Sear bases this on the architectural similarities between these Latium sites and the so-called Tabularium at Rome (78 BCE) such as the pavilion vaults and arched openings flanked by half columns, proving the presence of such design in Rome already (further evidence of Sullan influence on Pompey's project).

Three prominent examples clearly illustrate the long established tradition of theatre-temple construction in Italy: the sanctuary complex at Gabii, Pietrabbondante, and the sanctuary of Fortuna Primigenia at Praeneste (modern Palestrina). Remains of the theatre-temple complex/sanctuary distanced from the Acropolis of Gabii near Via Praenestina have been dated to the second century BCE. This site provides evidence of steps forming a cavea leading up to a temple podium, with a centrally axial temple positioned in the centre of a long rectangular *temenos*, a colonnade running behind the temple, and a semi-circular orchestra. Construction occurred simultaneously, demonstrating a deliberate architectural relationship between the theatre and temple.¹¹⁵ Reinforcing the theatre-temple as an established Italic civic construct, Wallace-Hadrill, discussing the theatre-temple complex at Pietrabbondante dated to c. 100 BCE, illustrates an architectural model and postulates that the same architect most likely constructed this site (91 BCE) and the small theatre at Pompeii (70s BCE), and possibly a similar one at Samno.¹¹⁶ Lastly, the sanctuary of Fortuna Primigenia at Praeneste reveals the remains of a temple, which like Pompey's temple of Venus Victrix does not dominate the monument, hidden behind the portico at the top of the

¹¹³ Hanson (1959) 29-36; Sear (2006) 44-45. While some temples are found at or near temple sites in the east, they were never centrally axial in relation to the temples' positioning within the precincts and not exclusively linked to one another. See also: Sewell (2010) 57-58: discussing forum axiality, claiming that it appears to become associated with later Roman colonies from the second century onwards.

¹¹⁴ Sear (2006) 44-45; Coarelli (1980) 191-217.

¹¹⁵ Hanson (1959) 29-39; Sear (2006) 44-45.

¹¹⁶ Wallace-Hadrill (2008) 141. For dating of this site, see: Sear (2006) 44-45; Stek (2009) 35-44; Appendix 1, fig.7.

cavea. The sanctuary was closely associated with Sulla since he made fairly extensive repairs to the site and planted a *colonia* there. Once again, axial orientation of the temple in relation to the theatre precinct, placed at the middle-top portion of the cavea, attests the Italic roots of Pompey's theatre.¹¹⁷

The obvious architectural relationship between theatre and temple in these examples not only demonstrates an established tradition within Italy but also highlights considerable weakness in the argument held by many scholars that the Temple of Venus Victrix functioned as justification for the theatre's existence in Rome, giving a religious pretext to his intentions.¹¹⁸ In forming this opinion, these scholars have principally drawn from evidence given by Aulus Gellius (*NA* 10.17) and Tertullian (*Spec.* 10.16.5),¹¹⁹ in conjunction with Rome's long-held resistance to a permanent theatre within the city.¹²⁰ Contrary to this popular view, in light of such a long established Italic tradition of combining temple and theatre, it would have seemed most conspicuous and unorthodox if Pompey had *not* provided a temple for his complex and its omission would have surely been an unusual departure from such an established convention.¹²¹ In fact, as discussed in the case of the

¹¹⁷ Hanson (1959) 35. See also: The Sanctuary of Hercules Victor at Tivoli, dated c.89-80 BCE based on an inscription, similar dating at Gabii. The site has twelve steps forming a cavea, axial orientation, a temple at the top centre of the steps, and a semi-circular orchestra. An inscription found at the site also attests its civic connection to the city, erected by the quattuorviri overseeing the project: CIL 14.3664 "porticus p(edum) CCLX et exsedram et pronaon et porticum pone scaenam long(um) p(edum) CXL".

¹¹⁸ Proponents of the temple as a justification for the theatre: Platner and Ashby (1929) 516; Ooteghem (1954) 407; Holleran (2003) 52; Brothers (1989) 101; Goldberg (1991) 12: surprisingly, Goldberg makes this claim despite acknowledging the Italian temple-theatre sanctuaries, citing the association of temples with *ludi scaenici* from early republican times as further evidence for this claim.

¹¹⁹ Tert. *spect.* 10.16.5: *itaque Pompeius Magnus solo theatro suo minor cum illam arcem omnium turpitudinum extruxisset, ueritus quandoque memoriae suae censoriam animadversionem veneris aedem superposuit et ad dedicationem edicto populum vocans non theatrum, sed veneris templum nuncupauit, cui subiecimus, inquit, gradus spectaculorum.* "And so Pompeius Magnus less great only to his theatre, when he had erected the citadel of all disgraces, fearing at some stage censorial condemnation of his memory, strategically placed the Temple of Venus at the top and calling the people by public proclamation to the dedication, he called it a temple of Venus, not a theatre, to which, he said, he had added underneath the steps of spectator seats." Gell. *NA.* 10.17: *cuius gradus vicem theatri essent.* "Of which there were steps one after the other of a theatre." Curiously, Packer (2010) 149, despite citing an Italic precedent for temple-theatre complexes, still quotes these sources as evidence for the temple as a justification.

¹²⁰ Goldberg (1998) 2: cites three main incidents of senatorial resistance reported by Livy: the censors for 179 BCE, Aemilius Lepidus and Fulvius Nobilior, letting a contract for a "theatrum et proscaenium ad Apollinis" between the Capitol and Velabrum (Liv. 40.51.3) and the censors for 174 BCE Fulvius Flaccus and Postumius Albinus initiating a theatre for use by aediles and praetors when providing the various *scaenici ludi* "scaenam aedilibus praetoribusque praebendam." (Liv. 41.27.5), neither of which are heard of beyond Livy's account; censors of 154 BCE Cassius Longinus and Valerius Messalla began and nearly completed a stone theatre in the Lupercal however, the project was stopped by senatorial decree and eventually declared it harmful to the national character by Scipio Nasica and demolished in accordance with the Senate's wishes (Liv. *Per.* 48).

¹²¹ See also: Veyne (1990) 235L for discussion of the obligation of magistrates to build monuments of religious character. See: 64, n.50: regarding the display of military achievements in the *porticus ad nationes* of Pompey's theatre and its links to the goddess Venus Victrix; cf: discussion in Chapter Two of the relationship

Temple of Venus Genetrix in the *forum Iulium*, there was much to be gained for a general in the careful selection of an appropriate patron divinity. In fact, given Coarelli's recent hypothesis, it seems in no way coincidental that Caesar and Pompey chose Venus as their representative, as Sulla had done.¹²² Furthermore, the fact that the temple itself was not dedicated until three years after Pompey's theatre was opened undermines this scholarly contention further. Goldberg provides important discussion regarding the use of temple space at Rome for the provision of games and points out that more recent archaeological evidence regarding the Temple of Magna Mater on the Palatine now strongly suggests that the steps of this temple may have been used to provide seating for the audience and the temple forecourt below used as a stage.¹²³ Given Rome's long tradition of appropriating temple space for political activities, as well as the religious origins of *ludi scaenici*,¹²⁴ it seems increasingly unlikely that Pompey built the Temple of Venus Victrix as a justification for his theatre. In terms of convention, it would seem the theatre's principal novelty (besides the sheer scale of the complex) was its permanency *in Rome*.¹²⁵

It is also important to consider the continued development of theatre at Rome when considering the uniqueness of Pompey's complex as this helps to better understand its position within the context of a continuum of theatre development at Rome. Goldberg, for instance, warns against the wholesale acceptance of the opinion that the entire aristocracy

between manubial buildings and (state) religion with regards to the Temple of Venus Genetrix and the associated areas for the display of *manubiae* advertising Caesar's exceptional achievements, 75-82; Temelini (2006) 9, 45: for discussion of the portico in the Theatre of Pompey as a victory monument advertising his campaigns. His temple to Venus Victrix thanked the goddess for his victory. This point seems far more likely since the practice of vowing temples to gods in return for divine assistance is evidenced at this time. As a manubial building dedicated to Venus Victrix the temple advertised his victory in the east; Beard *et al.* (1998) 123: views the theatre as part of this Italic tradition; Similarly, Packer (2010) 141-149: citing Gabii, Praeneste, and Tibur as examples of Italic tradition with axially central placement of their temples, providing a tradition for Pompey to follow; Sear (2006) 54 and Goldberg (1998) 1-20: for discussion regarding the established association of theatres and their association with temples demonstrated by Cic. *De Har. Resp.* 24: *ludi Megalenses* held in front of the Temple of Magna Mater on the Palatine or the *ludi Florales* in front of the Temple of Flora on the Aventine (Livy 40.51.3). Seating must have existed since there was a senatorial decree banning seating in the city for a radius of 1000 metres at these performances c. 154 BCE (Ovid *Fast.* 5.277).

¹²² Coarelli (2010) see above, 129-129: regarding the architectural dialogue between Sulla, Pompey, and Caesar. For further discussion on this point, see: Orlin (2010) 201-202; Keaveney (1983) 60-64.

¹²³ Goldberg (1998) 6, fig. 2: his hypothesis suggests that the steps provided the seating for the audience who could watch the performances being presented in the temple's surrounding plaza below, showing the steps and plaza of the republican phase of the Temple of Magna Mater.

¹²⁴ Although theatre games do appear to become more secularized from the last two centuries of the republican period, the religious associations of such games are not controversial. See: Veyne (1990) 210-212, n.23, citing: G. Dumézil, *La Religion romaine archaïque*. (Payot 1966) 545; Goldberg (1998) 11.)

¹²⁵ Spencer (2010) 169: describes the open public recreational spaces provided by the gardens in this complex as innovative for Rome, and likens these spaces to the Academy of Athens. While this point has merit, the idea of gardens in Rome was not new at this time (as Spencer herself notes), rather it is the sheer scale of the complex (including the garden spaces) that seems the novelty within the context of Rome.

was against the theatre and was therefore anxious to control it, stating that this does not accord with the striking expansion of *ludi scaenici* toward the late republic.¹²⁶ The increasingly competitive nature of euergetism by magistrates has already been demonstrated and in conjunction with the increasingly sophisticated development of theatre structures, demonstrated here by Valerius Maximus, it seems unlikely this level of development could have continued had there not been encouragement and input from Rome's wealthy elite:

Religionem ludorum crescentibus opibus secuta lautitia est. eius instinctu Q. Catulus, Campanam imitatus luxuriam, primus spectantium consessum velorum umbraculis textit. Cn. Pompeius ante omnes aquae per semitas decursu aestivum minuit fervorem. Claudius Pulcher scaenam varietate colorum adumbravit, vacuis ante pictura tabulis extentam. Quam totam argento C. Antonius, auro Petreius, ebore Q. Catulus praetexit. Versatilem fecerunt Luculli, argentatis choragiis P. Lentulus Spinther adornavit. Translatum, antea punicis indutum tunicis, M. Scaurus exquisito genere vestis cultum induxit.

With wealth increasing, elegance followed religion in the games. As a result, Quintus Catulus, imitating the luxury of Campania, covered the crowd of spectators with a shade of sail first. Gnaeus Pompeius before anyone, also reduced the heat of summer using tracks of running water. Claudius Pulcher highlighted the *scaena*, (previously its full length stretched out as empty panels), with a variety of colours: all of which Gaius Antonius clad in silver; Petreius in gold; and Quintus Catulus in ivory. The Luculli made it revolve¹²⁷; Publius Lentulus Spinther decorated it with silver stage equipment/trappings. Marcus Scaurus led in (the performers), previously dressed in purple tunics, their look transformed in exquisite attire. (Valerius Maximus 2.4.6).

Given such elaborate and sophisticated development, perhaps Pompey's permanent structure (and associated buildings¹²⁸) served to provide him with the point of difference that would set him apart from his competitors while eliminating the *need* for others to erect temporary structures.¹²⁹ In any case, the sheer scale of Pompey's project ensured he was celebrated and immortalized in this monumental structure.

Case Study Two: The forum Iulium

Chapter Two has argued that the *forum Iulium* challenged Roman civic identity by changing focus from state to individual, altering the way in which citizens interacted and participated

¹²⁶ Goldberg (1998) 2.

¹²⁷ See also: Plin. *NH* 36.116-120: for the revolving theatre.

¹²⁸ See 124: for the public amenities associated with the theatre.

¹²⁹ This is not to say that magistrates stopped erecting temporary theatre structures, as Curio's revolving theatre attests. Packer (2010) 157: the theatre became *the* venue for most public spectacles, evidenced by Suet. *Ner.* 13.2; Plin. *NH* 35.54; Dio 62.6.1-2.

within this highly personalized space. However, from a design perspective, it can be demonstrated that Caesar drew from an established architectural tradition when constructing his forum complex. Like Pompey's temple-theatre complex, Italic architectural tradition is also evident in Caesar's forum precinct. The architectural arrangement of dominant temple and forecourt of the *forum Iulium* is evidenced in earlier Italic colonial structures, demonstrating an established building model from at least the second century BCE. The forum at Rome, as an *ad hoc* development, lacked a single cohesive town plan or architectural intention, in contrast to many of Rome's colonies that seem to represent a prescribed Roman plan. Zanker presents the citizen colonies of the coast of Latium possessing specific 'Roman' elements as a model for future town planning, including: Ostia (c.380 BCE), Antium (338 BCE), Tarracina (339 BCE), Minturnae (296 BCE), and Pyrgi (264 BCE).¹³⁰ His discussion is useful since it allows for an established architectural type possibly influencing the single-temple forum established at Rome by Caesar. Zanker cites three main features of these five colonies: firstly, they lie on main roads (*cardo* north-south and *decumanus* east-west) forming a principle axis.¹³¹ Secondly, the main roads lead to or past a dominant temple, a Capitulum, situated at or near the intersection of the *cardo* and *decumanus*. Thirdly, evidence seems to suggest a gathering point in front of each Capitulum, forming a main central square for each city.¹³² Recent scholarship convincingly argues for later dating of the introduction of capitolia in Roman colonies in Italy, concluding that no Capitulum model can be securely evidenced to have existed before the Second

¹³⁰ Zanker (2000) 26-28: argues that specific 'Roman' architectural features were transplanted into these fourth century colonies as a type of cultural identity marker. Zanker's dates refer to the planting of the colonies, rather than for individual architectural features. However, this Capitulum model appears to become more clearly established and attested toward the period of the first triumvirate and beyond into the early imperial period; Purcell (2010) 579-592.

¹³¹ For discussion of the formation of Rome on axial route-ways, including the Via Sacra and its adjoining streets, see: Smith (1996) 171-173. For discussion regarding the redefinition of space as cultivated Roman territory in regards to squared-off grids (centuriation) as an imperializing practice, see: Spencer (2010) 36-37.

¹³² Zanker (2000) 29: states that although these areas were not fully-fledged fora, since citizens still had to travel to Rome to conduct business in these early days, they did provide the basic principal for subsequent town planning throughout Italy and the western provinces. He also claims that the orientation of fora and capitolia found in later cities derived from this concept of a dominant setting of the principal temple and forum, as both an architectural ensemble and ideological construct, 33: The forum/gathering space in front of the principle temple (usually the Capitoline) in these early colonies formed a forecourt to these temples and the subordination of the forecourt to the temple was, in the beginning, expressed by placing these temples on a high podium – forming an enclosed monumental entity; Guitart i Duran, Josep (2006) 59: discussing the similarities in topography of the three north-eastern (Hispania Citerior) coastal towns of Roman Emporiae, Iluro and Baetulo (present-day Catalunya) that underwent urban colonization in first c BCE. All have the regular layout of an orthogonal grid and a walled enclosure with a rectangular perimeter – reproducing the typical *colonia* model, 51: this town model was created in Italy during the mid-republican period – but these coastal towns underwent this change in the first century BCE. Iluro – dating to the first half of first century BCE, Baetulo - 80s-70s BCE.

Punic War.¹³³ In any case, the later dating does not invalidate the argument for the model pre-dating Caesar's complex and a later date could in fact suggest a contemporary influence. This argument is supported by Coarelli's discussion of the remodeling of the forum at Pompeii under Sulla, whereby the Temple of Jupiter was converted into a Capitolium.¹³⁴ This is not to say that the Temple of Venus Genetrix was architecturally the same as the three cellared capitolia from the sites discussed; it is merely their axially, dominant position, and relationship to their forecourts that are salient for this thesis. The portico surrounding Caesar's complex also places this precinct among the architectural tradition of Rome's mid to late republic. As discussed in Chapter Two, generals had begun placing porticoes around their temples at Rome from the mid-republican period,¹³⁵ albeit on a much smaller scale (with the exception of Pompey's enormous quadriportico).

Outside Knowledge

Despite the uniqueness of both Caesar and Pompey's building precincts at Rome, it is likely that those living in the city had already come into contact with similar architectural complexes in the surrounding towns and cities of Italy, and perhaps beyond, in the course of their travels. That the Roman elite traveled and had connections with cities outside of Rome is not controversial.¹³⁶ Cicero, for instance, owned several properties in Italy and was *patronus* of various cities such as Atella, Capua, Locri, and Volterra. His familial ties to Arpinum meant he had personal associations in Latium and the Bay of Naples.¹³⁷ Similarly, L. Aurelius Cotta (cos. 65 BCE), the cousin of Caesar, had a villa in Ostia,¹³⁸ and M. Livius Drusus Clodianus (praetor 50 BCE) also owned land in Ostia.¹³⁹ Besides property speculation and patronage by the elite, military service was also responsible for taking a

¹³³ Stek (2009) 21-28, particularly, 26-28; Bispham (2006) 93.

¹³⁴ Coarelli (1989) 51-52, citing another possible conversion at Faesulae: *CIL* 10.1545. See also: Aquilù, Xavier, Pere Castanyer, Marta Santos and Joaquim Tremoleda (2006) 24-29: outside of Italy, the model seems to have developed in the first century BCE in places such as Hispania. The forum in the Roman republican town (formerly Greek Emporion) of Empùries attests evidence of the first phase of construction dating to the last half of first century BCE – contemporary with Caesar: a main temple, a cryptoporticus, a portico with three wings framing the religious area, and a row of tabernae marking the south end of the square (basilica, curia and other commercial areas constructed under Augustus).

¹³⁵ See: *Delineating Space: The Portico as Evidence*, Chapter Three, 9.

¹³⁶ For connections outside of Rome, see: Bispham (2008) Appendix 2, *Romans of High Status as Patrons and Magistrates of Italian Communities between the Social War and Actium*. Also: Harland (2011).

¹³⁷ Rawson (1991) 209; Zevi (2004) 29; Lomas (2004) 114.

¹³⁸ Zevi (2004) 15.

¹³⁹ Zevi (2004) 19. In his discussion on the Roman elite in Ostia, Zevi describes this group as a "club of aristocratic landowners." Stek (2009) 190-191: discussing Pompey's Alban villa. Cicero (*Att.* 2.3) discusses a villa at Antium.

variety of men below the aristocracy into such cities.¹⁴⁰ Such movement between cities suggests that Roman citizens are likely have been exposed to the architectural arrangements of the sites discussed above and were therefore familiar with their characteristics and function within civic society. It is also likely, having visited these locations, that some would have engaged in activities there also, such as attending performances at the theatres.¹⁴¹ It is difficult to say how much this awareness impacted on the expectations of Roman citizens in regards to public amenities, since many of these sites operated at sanctuaries and as such the activities presumably differed somewhat compared to the civic activities at Rome. Nevertheless, repeated attempts to build a permanent theatre at Rome, suggest that there was a desire for one there before Pompey began his project. What can be assumed is that when Pompey and Caesar undertook their building projects, such architectural ideas would not have been totally new, and as such, their function as appropriate benefactions to the city of Rome presumably served to enhance, not only the *dignitas* and *auctoritas* of the city, but reinforced the traditional republican image of both powerful benefactors.

In Sum

It would be foolish to state that Pompey and Caesar felt they had nothing to prove or to maintain in Rome. The ephemeral and unstable nature of politics in the late republic meant that alliances and relationships were also continually changing and evolving. Evidence of their involvement in providing loans for the purpose of public buildings and other benefactions appear to demonstrate the reciprocal nature of such transactions and suggest that both Pompey and Caesar felt they had much to gain from such associations. Likewise, while their magnificent and elaborate public building complexes served to advertise their social, political, and economic superiority at Rome, following in the architectural and ideological footsteps of the powerful Sulla, both appear to have followed a particularly Italic architectural tradition. A point made more noteworthy by the fact that both men had experienced dynastic cultures outside of the city of Rome in their extensive campaigns and could have chosen to build in any manner of styles.

¹⁴⁰ See: Scheidel (2005)

¹⁴¹ Cf. Pompey's visit to the theatre at Mitylene (surely not an isolated incident).

CONCLUSION

This chapter has demonstrated the significance of public building projects at Rome for magistrates as a vehicle for the display and attainment of individual *dignitas*, *auctoritas*, and *honor*. Increasing competition between magistrates to provide bigger and better public structures, forcing individuals to seek support from their financial and political superiors, further attests the significance of such benefactions as more than the mere fulfillment of one's public duty. At the same time, *triumphatores*, providing such support, gained considerable political influence, not only undermining state control of public building projects, but creating increasingly more powerful individuals. While it can be argued that both Pompey and Caesar possessed sufficient *auctoritas* to construct whatever structure they pleased, the complexity and expense of their projects meant they took considerable time to construct and closer analysis of their political standing during this period within the context of Rome's ephemeral and unstable political scene suggests each took considerable care with the selection of their public gifts. Whereas others were involved in the restoration or repetition of existing architectural types, or in innovative but temporary construction, both Pompey and Caesar combined tradition with originality in presenting their permanent and magnificent precincts, recalling the great works of Sulla. Similarly, as late republican buildings, both projects can be seen as responding to the ever-changing political needs of the day by creating much needed civic space. In doing so, Pompey and Caesar did not merely display their immense wealth and power - they monumentalized it.

CONCLUSION

Much of this thesis has focused on the political and cultural significance of Roman public building and civic space. As emphasized throughout Chapter One, construction of important civic buildings played a vital role in shaping and advertising the authority, unification, and cultural superiority of both Rome the city-state, and the city's elite citizens, making public construction and civic space a particularly significant and powerful political medium. Continued debate by Millar, Mouritsen, and Morstein-Marx regarding the nature and degree of popular *involvement* in Roman politics, and Coarelli and Carafa's opposing views regarding the configuration of the Comitium during the mid-late republic, highlight the difficulties in interpreting political space during this period. Hölkeskamp's concept of 'symbolic capital' as a form of social credit has greatly informed my discussion of monumentalization, reinforcing the significance of public buildings and monuments as a vehicle for self-aggrandizement and lasting prestige.

Chapter Two presents Caesar's *forum Iulium* as the ultimate self-aggrandizing structure of late republican Rome, as both a civic centre and a victory monument. This large-scale complex showcased his beneficence to Rome, advertized his *magna dignitas*, and monumentalized his achievements and his unique relationship with Venus. Situated at the intersection between republican and imperial Rome, the Caesarian phase of the *forum Iulium* also provides a valuable insight into this important period of Roman politics and cultural development. Certainly subsequent emperors embraced the architectural template of this spatially separate complex, as the imperial fora attest. The significance of this monumental precinct, however, has yet to be fully realized and scholarship continues to be hampered by a considerable lack of evidence, particularly with respect to Rome's reception of such a highly personalized 'political' centre, as well as the significance of Caesar's true intentions for the complex. Long-term research excavations of the Fori Imperiali, presently underway, will hopefully provide additional evidence that will further develop our understanding of the Caesarian phase of construction.¹

Chapter Three further examined the concept of public buildings and civic space as popular benefactions, considering both Pompey and Caesar's significant projects against the backdrop of Sulla's Capitoline complex and those of less influential magistrates. The gift of

¹ See: Patterson (2010): for key excavation projects planned at Rome.

public buildings or structures allowed individual magistrates to enhance and display their *dignitas* and *honor*, while improving their standing among the people through the provision of popular amenities such as theatres. On another level, the popularity of buildings as public benefactions provided wealthy elites with the opportunity to gain further prestige and influence by lending money to less affluent magistrates for such projects. The importance of these projects is attested by the aggressive and competitive approach of Rome's elite to secure (re)construction contracts and the elaborate and innovative nature of even temporary structures. As Rome's territory continued to expand in the late republican period, so did the wealth of some of the city's elite men, meaning that more money could be spent on public construction and self-aggrandizement, while further influence could be gained by the provision of loans. As a result, monumental building in this period played an increasingly important role in shaping and projecting the individual identity of these men, advertising their achievements and emphasizing their civic superiority. Caesar's forum complex and Pompey's theatre are prime exempla of the power of such benefactions.

Coarelli's recent work on the Sullan Capitoline complex has greatly informed my understanding of both Caesar and Pompey's public works, both in terms of their architectural and their iconographic choices, particularly their collective use of Venus. It is interesting to note that while influential men like Caesar and Pompey constructed highly self-aggrandizing monuments that would significantly and permanently alter the political landscape of Rome, they still chose to include many traditional Italic architectural features in the design of their complexes (despite incorporating some elements of Hellenistic architecture). The traditional architectural aspects of Caesar and Pompey's complexes suggest that Rome's elite still felt it necessary to project their wealth and superiority in a traditional Roman context. As an outward manifestation of their significant wealth and political power, these architectural choices must surely have resulted from careful consideration.

The issue of money lending for public building projects and its implications for increasing the political influence of wealthy individuals is an area deserving of further scholarship. As discussed, the Senate's sustained reluctance to lend money to individuals for public building projects in the late republic allowed wealthy individuals to exploit this situation to their own political advantage through the provision of personal loans. The true extent to which loans made for building projects influenced or weakened the decisions and actions of individual

senators remains unclear. Similarly, consideration of building projects as generators of employment might also reveal important implications for their benefactors and for Roman political life, as a further avenue for gaining influence among various constituencies.

This thesis has demonstrated that monumental construction remained an embedded and integral part of Roman society throughout the mid-late republican period despite Rome's ever-changing political environment. However, the complexities of the topic have required consultation with a vast array of specialized and disparate scholarship, highlighting the need for a more comprehensive and synthetic study in order to enhance our overall understanding.

APPENDIX 1: FIGURES

FIGURE 1: *Forum Iulium*. Plan of first Caesarian phase: 54-46 BCE. Reproduced from *LTUR* II (1995) 468, Fig. 129.

FIGURE 2: *Forum Iulium*. Plan of second Caesarian phase: 46-44 BCE. Reproduced from *LTUR* II (1995) 469, Fig. 131.

FIGURE 3: Reconstruction of Temple of Venus Genetrix. Scale 1:400. Reproduced from *LTUR* II (1995) 474, fig. 140.

FIGURE 4. Forum Iulium. Porticus: Axonometric reconstruction of the south corner. First Caesarian Phase (54-46 BCE). Reproduced from *LTUR* II (1995) 469, fig. 132.

FIGURE 5: Restored elevation of the Temple of Venus Genetrix and the fountain structures. The balustrade at forum level, standing in front of fountain structures shown on western side only. Reproduced from Ulrich (1986) 415, Fig. 6.

FIGURE 6: Reconstruction of the Temple of Venus Genetrix showing the lateral stairs of the podium, speaker's platform, and stairs leading to pronaos. Reproduced from *LTUR* II (1995) 475, Fig. 142.

FIGURE 7: Pietrabbondante, Temple B with theatre and Temple A. Reproduced from Stek (2009) 41, Fig. 3.1.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Amici, C. *Il Foro di Cesare*. (Florence 1991).
- Anderson, James C. Jr. 'The Historical Topography of the Imperial Fora'. *Latomus* 182 (1984).
- Andreau, Jean. *Banking and Business in the Roman World*. Janet Boyd (trans.) (Cambridge 1999).
- Andreau, Jean. 'Histoire des métiers bancaires et evolution économique.' *Opus* 3 (1984) 99-114.
- Angel, Natalie. 'Clementia and Beneficium in the Second Philippic.' In: Tom Stevenson and Marcus Wilson (eds.). *Cicero's Philippics: History, Rhetoric, and Ideology*. (Auckland 2008) 114-130.
- Aquiluè, Xavier, Pere Castanyer, Marta Santos and Joaquim Tremoleda. 'Greek Emporion and its relationship to Roman Republican Eupùries.' In: L. Abad Casal, S. Keay and S. Ramallo Asensio (eds.). 'Early Roman Towns in Hispania Tarraconensis.' *Journal of Roman Archaeology*. 62 (2006) 18-31.
- Armstrong, Rebecca. *Ovid and His Love Poetry*. (Oxford 2005).
- Aubert, Jean-Jacques. 'A Double Standard in Roman Criminal Law.' In: Jean-Jacques Aubert and Boudewijn Sirks (eds.). *Speculum Iuris*. (Michigan 2005) 94-133.
- Bablitz, Leanne. *Actors and Audience in the Roman Courtroom*. (New York 2007).
- Badian, Ernst. 'From the Iulii to Caesar.' In: Miriam Griffith (ed.). *A Companion to Julius Caesar*. (Malden 2009). 11-22.
- Barlow, Jonathan. 'Noble Gauls and their other in Caesar's Propaganda.' In: Kathryn Welch & Anton Powell (eds.). *Julius Caesar as Artful Reporter: The War Commentaries as Political Instruments*. (London 1998) 139-170.
- Barsby, John (trans.) *Terence: Phormio* (Cambridge MA 2002).
- Beard, Mary, John North and Simon Price. *Religions of Rome*. I (Cambridge 1998).
- Beard, Mary, John North and Simon Price. *Religions of Rome*. II (Cambridge 1998).
- Beard, Mary. 'Priesthood in the Roman Republic.' In: Mary Beard and John North. *Pagan Priests*. (London 1990) 19-48.
- Beard, Mary. *The Roman Triumph*. (London 2007).
- Beare, W. *The Roman Stage*. (London 1950).
- Beck, Hans. 'Die Rollen des Adligen und die Krise der römischen Republik.' In: Karl J. Hölkesskamp (ed.). *Eine politische Kultur (in) der Krise?* (Oldenburgh 2009) 53-72.
- Bell, Andrew. *Spectacular Power in the Greek and Roman City*. (Oxford 2004).
- Bispham, Edward. 'Coloniam Deducere. How Roman was Roman Colonization during the Middle Republic?' In: G. J. Bradley and J. P. Wilson (eds.). *Greek and Roman Colonization: Origins, Ideologies and Interactions*. (Swansea 2006) 73-160.
- Bispham, Edward. *From Asculum to Actium: the Municipalization of Italy from the Social War to Augustus*. (Oxford 2008).
- Bogaert, Raymond. *Banques et Banquiers dans les Cités grecques*. (Leiden 1968).

- Bonfante, Larissa. *Etruscan Life and Afterlife*. (Michigan 1986).
- Borgeaud, Philippe. *Mother of the Gods: From Cybele to the Virgin Mary*. Translated by Lysa Hochroth (Baltimore 1996).
- Bradley, Keith. *Slavery and Society at Rome*. (Cambridge 1994).
- Braund, David. *Ruling Roman Britain*. (London 1996).
- Bremmer, J. N. and N. M. Horsfall. *Roman Myth and Mythography*. (London 1987).
- Brenner, T. Corey. *The Praetorship in the Roman Republic*. II (2000).
- Brothers, A. J. 'Buildings for Entertainment.' In: I. M. Barton (ed.). *Roman Public Buildings*. (Exeter 1989) 97-125.
- Broughton, T. Robert S. *The Magistrates of the Roman Republic*. In collaboration with Marcia L. Patterson. (New York 1951) I, II, III.
- Brunt, P. A. 'The Roman Mob.' *Past and Present*. 35 (1966) 3-27.
- Brunt, P. A. *Social Conflicts in the Roman Republic*. (London 1986).
- Brunt, P. A. *The Fall of the Roman Republic and Related Essays*. (Oxford 1988).
- Buchen, Gregory S. 'The Origins, Program, and Composition of Appian's Roman History.' *Transactions of the American Philological Association* (1974-) 130 (2000) 411-458.
- Carafa, Paulo. *Il comizio di Roma dale origini all'età di Augusto* (Roma 1998).
- Carafa, Paulo. 'Il Volcanal e il Comizio.' *Workshop di Archaeologia Classica*. 2 (2005) 125-139.
- Carter, John (trans.) *Appian's Civil Wars*. (London 1996).
- Castrèn-Pietilä, Leena. *Magnificentia Publica: The Victory Monuments of the Roman Generals in the Era of the Punic Wars*. *Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum* 84 (Helsinki 1987).
- Churchill, J. Bradford. 'Ex qua quod vellent facerent: Roman Magistrates' Authority over *Praeda* and *Manubiae*.' *TAPA* 129 (1999) 85-116.
- Claridge, Amanda. *Rome: An Oxford Archaeological Guide*. (Oxford 2007).
- Clarysse, W. & K. Vandorpe. 'Information Technologies: Writing, Book Production, and the Role of Literacy. In: John Peter Oleson *The Oxford Handbook of Engineering and Technology in the Classical World*. (Oxford 2008) 715-739.
- Coarelli, Filippo. 'Architettura sacra e architettura privata nella tarda repubblica' *Architecture et Société de l'archaïsme grec à la fin de la République romaine* (Rome 1980) 191-217.
- Coarelli, Filippo. *Il Foro Romano* (Rome 1985).
- Coarelli, Filippo. *Il Foro Romano I: periodo arcaico* (Rome 1986).
- Coarelli, Filippo. *Minturnae*. (Rome 1989).
- Coarelli, Filippo. 'Rostra.' In: Eva Margareta Steinby (ed.). *Lexicon Topographicum Urbis Romae: D-G II* (Roma 1995) 212-214.
- Coarelli, Filippo. 'Comitium.' In: Eva Margareta Steinby (ed.). *Lexicon Topographicum Urbis Romae: D-G II* (Roma 1995) 309-314.

- Coarelli, Filippo. *Il Campo Marzio: dalle origini alla fine della repubblica*. (Rome 1997).
- Coarelli, Filippo. *Rome and Environs: An Archaeological Guide*. (London 2007).
- Coarelli, Filippo. 'Substructio et Tabularium.' *Papers of the British School at Rome*. 78 (2010) 107-132.
- Coleman, Kathleen M. 'Euergetism in its Place.' In: Katherine Lomas & Tim Cornell (eds.). *Bread and Circuses: Euergetism and Municipal Patronage in Roman Italy*. (London 2003) 61-88.
- Coleman, Kathleen M. 'Public Entertainments.' In: Michael Peachin. *The Oxford Handbook of Social Relations in the Roman World*. (Oxford 2011) 335-355.
- Connors, Catherine. 'Field and Forum: Culture and Agriculture in Roman Rhetoric.' In: W. Dominik (ed.). *Roman Eloquence: Rhetoric in Society and Literature* (London 1997) 72-76.
- Connors, Catherine. 'Epic Allusion in Roman Satire.' In: Kirk Freudenburg. *The Cambridge Companion to Roman Satire*. (Cambridge 2005) 123-145.
- Conte, Gian Biagio. *Latin Literature: a History*. Trans. Joseph B. Solodow. (Baltimore 1994).
- Cooley, Alison. 'Inscribing History at Rome. In: Alison Cooley (ed.) *The Afterlife of Inscriptions*. (London 2000) 7-20.
- Cooley, Alison (trans.) *Res Gestae Divi Augusti: Text, Translation, and Commentary*. (Cambridge 2009).
- Corbeill, Antony. 'Education in the Roman Republic: Creating Traditions.' In: Yun Lee Too (ed.). *Education in Greek and Roman Antiquity*. (Leiden 2001) 261-288.
- Corbeill, Antony. 'Ciceronian Invective.' In: James M. May (ed.). *Brill's Companion to Cicero: Oratory and Rhetoric*. (Leiden 2002) 197-218.
- Cornell, Tim. *The Beginnings of Rome: Italy and Rome from the Bronze Age to the Punic Wars*. (London 1995).
- Cornell, Tim. 'The History of an Anachronism.' In: Anthony Molho, Kurt Raaflaub, and Julia Emlen (eds.). *City-States in Classical Antiquity and Medieval Italy*. (Michigan 2004) 53-70.
- Crawford, M. H. and Filippo Coarelli. 'Public Building at Rome between the Second Punic War and Sulla.' *Papers of the British School at Rome*. 45 (1977) 1-23.
- Crawford, M. H. (ed.). *Roman Statutes*.1 (London 1996).
- Culham, P. 'Archives and Alternatives in Republican Rome.' *Classical Philology*. 83, 2 (1989) 100-115.
- Davies, Glenys. 'Togate Statues and Petrified Orators.' In: D. H. Berry, & Andrew Erskine (eds.). *Form and Function in Roman Oratory*. (Cambridge 2010) 51-72.
- Deniaux, E. 'Patronage.' In: *A Companion to the Roman Republic*. Nathan Rosenstein & Robert Morstein-Marx (eds.). (Oxford 2006) 401- 420.
- Dominik, William J. 'From Greece to Rome: Ennius' *Annales*. In: Anthony James Boyle. *Roman Epic*. (New York 1993) 37-58.
- Dyck, Andrew R. *A Commentary on Cicero: De Officiis*. (Michigan 1996).

- Dyson, Stephen L. *Rome: A Living Portrait of an Ancient City*. (Maryland 2010).
- Duckworth, G. E. 'Plautus and the Basilica Aemilia.' In: Jonge *et al.* (eds.), *Ut pictura poesis. Studia Latina Petro Iohanni Enk septuagenario oblata*. (Leiden 1955) 63, 58-65.
- Duff, Timothy E. *The Greek and Roman Historians*. (London 2003).
- Edwards, Catharine. *The Politics of Immorality in Ancient Rome*. (Cambridge 1993).
- Edwards, Catharine. *Writing Rome: Textual Approaches to the City*. (Cambridge 1996).
- Edwards, H. J. (trans.) *Caesar: De Bello Gallico* (Cambridge MA. 2004).
- Erskine, Andrew. *Roman Imperialism*. (Edinburgh 2010).
- Fantham, Elaine. *The Roman World of Cicero's De Oratore*. (Oxford 2004).
- Favro, Diane. 'The Roman Forum and Roman Memory.' *Places*. 5 (1988) 17-24.
- Favro, Diane. *The Urban Image of Augustan Rome*. (New York 1996).
- Feeney, Dennis. *Caesar's Calendar: Ancient Time and the Beginnings of History*. (California 2007).
- Flory, Marleen B. 'Pearls for Venus.' *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte*. 37, 4 (1998) 498-504.
- Flower, Harriet. *Ancestor Masks and Aristocratic Power in Roman Culture*. (Oxford 1996).
- Flower, Harriet. *Roman Republics*. (Oxford 2010).
- Flower, Harriet. 'Elite Self-Representation in Rome.' In: Michael Peachin (ed.). *The Oxford Handbook of Social Relations in the Roman Republic*. (Oxford 2011) 271-285.
- Frakes, James. F. D. *Framing Public Life: The Portico in Roman Gaul*. (Wein 2009).
- Francese, Christopher. *Ancient Rome in so Many Words*. (New York 2007).
- Frank, Tenney. *An Economic History of Rome*. (London 1927).
- Freudenburg, Kirk. *Bryn Mawr Classical Review* 97.3.25 251: Corbeill, A. *Controlling Laughter: Political Humor in the Late Roman Republic*. (Princeton 1996).
- Frier, W. Bruce. 'Law and Economic Institutions.' In: Ian Morris, Walter Scheidel & Richard Saller (eds). *The Cambridge Economic History of the Graeco-Roman World*. (Cambridge 2007) 113-139.
- Galinsky, G. Karl. *Aeneas, Sicily, and Rome*. (New Jersey 1969).
- Gardner, Jane F. 'The Dictator.' In: Miriam Griffin (ed.). *A Companion to Julius Caesar*. (Malden 2009). 57-71.
- Gelzer, M. *Caesar: Politician and Statesman*. (Oxford 1968).
- Gjerstad, Einar. 'Il comizio romano dell' età repubblicana.' *Opuscula archaeologica* 2: (1941) 97-158.
- Gjerstad, Einar. *Legends and Facts: the Political Synoikismos of the Villages in a Single Community*. (Lund 1962).
- Godwin, J. (trans.). *Catullus: Poems 61-68*. (Warminster 1995).
- Goldberg, Sander M. 'Plautus on the Palatine.' *Journal of Roman Studies*. 88 (1998) 1-20.

- Gotoff, Harold C. 'Cicero's Caesarian Orations.' In: James May (ed.). *Brill's Companion to Cicero: Oratory and Rhetoric*. (Boston 2002) 220-271.
- Gowing, Alain, M. *The Triumviral Narratives of Appian and Cassius Dio*. (Michigan 1995).
- Granger, Frank (trans.). *Vitruvius: De Architectura*. (Cambridge 1934).
- Grebe, Sabine. 'Why Did Ovid Associate His Exile With A Living Death?' *Classical World*. 103, 4 (2010) 491-510.
- Green, Peter. *The Poems of Catullus*. (London 1995).
- Greenwood, L.H.G. (trans.) *Cicero: The Verrine Orations I*. (Cambridge 1966).
- Gros, P. 'Forum Iulium: Venus Genetrix, Aedes.' In: Eva Margareta Steinby (ed.). *Lexicon Topographicum Urbis Romae: D-G II* (Roma 1995) 306-307.
- Gruen, Eric. 'Pompey, the Roman Aristocracy, and the Conference of Luca.' *Historia* 18 (1969) 71-108.
- Gruen, Eric. *The Last Generation of the Roman Republic*. (London 1974).
- Gruen, Eric. *Studies in Greek Culture and Roman Policy*. (Leiden 1990).
- Guitart i Duran, Josep. 'Iluro, Baetulo, Iesso, and the Establishment of the Roman Town Model in Catalunya. In: L. Abad Casal, S. Keay and S. Ramallo Asensio (eds.). 'Early Roman Towns in Hispania Tarraconensis.' *Journal of Roman Archaeology*. 62 (2006) 51-61.
- Hales, Shelley. *The Roman House and Social Identity*. (Cambridge 2003).
- Hall, Jon. 'The *Philippics*.' In: James M. May (ed.). *Brill's Companion to Cicero: Oratory and Rhetoric*. (Leiden 2002) 273-304.
- Harland, Phillip A (ed.). *Travel and Religion in Antiquity*. (Waterloo, Ont. 2011).
- Hanson, John Arthur. *Roman Theater-Temples*. (New Jersey 1959).
- Hardie, Philip R. 'Phrygians in Rome/Romans in Phrygia.' In: Tra Oriente e Occidente: indigeni, Greci e Romani in Asia Minore: atti del convegno internazionale : Cividale del Friuli, 28-30 settembre (2006) a cura di Gianpaolo Urso. Pisa 93-103.
- Harries, Jill. 'Law.' In: Alessandro Barchiesi & Walter Scheidel (eds.). *The Oxford Handbook of Roman Studies*. (Oxford 2010) 637-650.
- Hölkeskamp, Karl J. 'Oratoris maxima scaena: Reden vor dem Volk in der politischen Kultur der Republik', In: M. Jehne. *Demokratie in Rom? Die Rolle des Volkes in der Politik der römischen Republik*. (Stuttgart 1995). 11-49.
- Hölkeskamp, Karl J. 'History and Collective Memory in the Middle Republic.' In: Nathan Rosenstein & Robert Morstein-Marx (eds.). *A Companion to the Roman Republic*. (Oxford 2006) 478-495.
- Hölkeskamp, Karl J. *Reconstructing the Roman Republic*. (Oxford 2010).
- Hollander, David B. *Money in the Late Roman Republic*. (New York 2007).
- Holleran, Claire. 'The Development of Public Entertainment Venues in the City of Rome' In: Kathryn Lomas and Tim Cornell (eds.). *Bread and Circuses: Euergetism and Municipal Patronage in Roman Italy*. (London 2003) 46-60.
- Hollis, Adrian S. *Ovid: Ars Amatoria Book I*. (Oxford 1977).

- Hölscher, Tonio. 'Die Alten vor Augen. Politische Denkmäler und öffentliches Gedächtnis im republikanischen Rom.' (2001) 183-211.
- Hölscher, Tonio. 'The Public Monumentalization of the Roman Republic.' 472-473. Review of: Peter J. Holliday, *The Origins of Roman Historical Commemoration in the Visual Arts* (Cambridge 2002). *Journal of Roman Archaeology*. 18 (2005) 472-478.
- Hölscher, Tonio. 'The Transformation of Victory into Power.' In: Sheila Dillon and Katherine Welch (eds.) *Representations of War in Ancient Rome*. (Cambridge 2006) 27-48.
- Hornblower, Simon & Antony Spawforth (eds.). *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*. Third Edition. (Oxford 2003).
- Huelsen, H.C. *The Roman Forum*. (Rome 1909).
- Jones, S. *The Archaeology of Ethnicity. Constructing Identities in the Past and Present*. (London 1997).
- Kaster, Robert A. 'Controlling Reason: Declamation in Rhetorical Education at Rome.' In: Yun Lee Too (ed.). *Education in Greek and Roman Antiquity*. (Leiden 2001) 317-338.
- Keaveney, A. 'Sulla and the Gods.' *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History*. 3 (Brussels 1983) 44-79.
- Kelly, Douglas. 'Publishing the *Philippics*.' In: Tom Stevenson & Marcus Wilson (eds.). *Cicero's Philippics: History, Rhetoric, and Ideology*. (Auckland 2008) 22-38.
- Kennedy, George. *The Art of Rhetoric in the Roman World: 300 BC-300 AD*. (New Jersey 1972).
- Kent, Roland G. (trans.). *Varro: Lingua Latina*. (Cambridge MA 1967).
- King, Richard John. *Cicero: Philippic Orations*. (Oxford 1978).
- Lancaster, Lynne C. *Concrete Vaulted Construction in Imperial Rome: Innovations in Context*. (New York 2005).
- Lintott, Andrew. *The Constitution of the Roman Republic*. (Oxford 1999).
- Lintott, Andrew. *Cicero as Evidence: A Historian Companion*. (Oxford 2008).
- Lomas, Kathryn. 'Public Building, Urban Renewal and Euergetism.' In: Kathryn Lomas and Tim Cornell (eds.) *Bread and Circuses: Euergetism and Municipal Patronage in Roman Italy*. (London 2003) 28-45.
- Lott, J. Bert. *The Neighbourhoods of Augustan Rome*. (Cambridge 2004).
- McDonnell, Myles. 'Roman Aesthetics and the Spoils of Syracuse.' In: Sheila Dillon and Katherine Welch (eds.) *Representations of War in Ancient Rome*. (Cambridge 2006) 68-90.
- McGinn, Thomas A. J. *The Economy of Prostitution in the Roman World*. (Michigan 2007).
- Macadam, Alta & Annabel Barber. *Blue Guide: Rome*. (London 2010).
- Malacrino, Carmelo G. *Constructing the Ancient World: Architectural Techniques of the Greeks and Romans*. Jay Hyams (trans.). (Los Angeles 2010).
- Manuwald, Gesine. 'Cicero versus Antonius: On the Structure and the Function of the *Philippics* Collection.' In: Tom Stevenson & Marcus Wilson (eds.). *Cicero's Philippics: History, Rhetoric, and Ideology* (Auckland 2008) 39-61.

- De Maria, S. de. *Gli archi onorari di Roma e dell'Italia Romana*. (Rome 1988).
- Marrou, H. *A History of Education in Antiquity*. (London 1956).
- Martin, Susan D. *Building Contracts in Classical Roman Law* (diss. University of Michigan, 1981).
- Martin, Susan D. 'The Roman Jurists and the Organization of Private Building in the Late Republic and Early Empire. *Latomus*. 204, (Brussels 1989).
- May, James M. *Trials of Character*. (North Carolina 1988).
- May, James M. 'Ciceronian Oratory in Context.' In: James M. May (ed.). *Brill's Companion to Cicero: Oratory and Rhetoric*. (Leiden 2002) 49-70.
- Meier, Christian. *Caesar*. (London 1995).
- Meier, Christian. *Res Publica Amissa*. Eine Studie zu Verfassung und Geschichte der späten römischen Republik. (Wiesbaden 1966).
- Meyer, Elizabeth. 'Epigraphy and Communication.' In: Peachin, Michael. *The Oxford Handbook of Social Relations in the Roman World*. (New York 2011) 191-226.
- Millar, Fergus. Review: *Political Power in Mid-Republican Rome: Curia or Comitium?* Reviewed works: *Social Struggles in Archaic Rome: New Perspectives on the Conflict of the Orders* by Kurt A. Raaflaub. *Die Entstehung der Nobilitat: Studien zur Sozialen und Politischen Geschichte der Römischen Republik im 4. Jhdt. V. Chr* by K. J. Hölkeskamp. *The Journal of Roman Studies*. 79 (1989), 138-150.
- Millar, Fergus. *The Crowd in Rome in the Late Republic*. (Michigan 1998).
- Moore, Timothy J. *The Theatre of Plautus: Playing the Audience*. (Austin 1998).
- Morgan, Gwyn M. 'Villa Publica and Magna Mater.' *Klio*. 55 (1973) 215-245.
- Morisi, L. *Attis (carmen LXIII): introduzione, testo, traduzione e commento*. (Bologna 1999).
- Morley, Neville. *Metropolis and Hinterland: The City of Rome and the Italian Economy 200 BC – AD 200*. (Cambridge 1996).
- Morselli, C. 'Forum Iulium.' In: Eva Margareta Steinby (ed.). *Lexicon Topographicum Urbis Romae: D-G II* (Roma 1995) 299-306.
- Morstein-Marx, Robert. *Mass Oratory and Political Power in the Late Roman Republic*. (Cambridge 2004).
- Mouritsen, Henrik. *Plebs and Politics in the Late Roman Republic*. (Cambridge 2001).
- Mousourakis, George. *A Legal History of Rome*. (Oxford 2007).
- Muccigrosso, John. 'Religion and Politics: did the Romans scruple about the placement of their temples?' In: Celia E. Schultz & Paul B. Harvey (eds.). *Yale Classical Studies*. 33 (Cambridge 2006) 181-206.
- Nash, E. 'Secretarium Senatus.' In: L. Bonfante & H. von Heintze (eds.). *In Memoriam: Otto J. Brendel*. (Mainz 1976) 191-204.
- Nicolet, C. *The World of the Citizen in Republican Rome*. Trans. P. S. Falla. (Berkeley 1980).
- Noreña, Carlos F. 'The Early Imperial Monarchy.' In: *The Oxford Handbook of Roman Studies*. (Oxford 2010) 533-546.

- Nünnerich-Asmus, Annette. *Basilika und Portikus*. (Köln 1994).
- Van Ooteghem, J. *Pompée le Grand, bâtisseur d' empire*. (Brussels 1954).
- Orlin, Eric M. 'Temples, Religion, and Politics in the Roman Republic.' *Mnemosyne Supplements*. (Leiden 1997).
- Orlin, Eric M. 'Urban Religion in the Middle and Late Republic.' In: Jörg Rüpke. *A Companion to Roman Religion*. (Malden 2007) 58-70.
- Orlin, Eric M. *Foreign Cults in Rome: Creating a Roman Empire*. (New York 2010).
- Packer, James E. 'Pompey's Theatre and Tiberius' Temple of Concord.' In: Björn C. Ewald and Carlos F. Noreña (eds.). *The Emperor and Rome: Space, Representation, and Ritual*. (Cambridge 2010) 135-167.
- Parkin, Tim & Arthur Pomeroy (eds.). *Roman Social History: A Sourcebook*. (London 2007).
- Patterson, Jeremy. 'The Creation of the Court of the Roman Emperor.' In: A. J. S. Spawforth. *The Court and Court Society in Ancient Monarchies*. (Cambridge 1997) 121-156.
- Patterson, John R. 'The City of Rome.' In: Nathan Rosenstein and Robert Morstein-Marx (eds.). *A Companion to the Roman Republic*. (Oxford: 2006) 345-364.
- Patterson, John R. 'The City of Rome Revisited: From Mid-Republic to Mid-Empire.' *Journal of Roman Studies*. 100 (2010) 210-232.
- Perelli, L. *Il movimento popolare nell' ultimo secolo della Repubblica*. (Torino 1982).
- Pertutelli, A. 'Il Carme 63 di Catullo'. *Maia* 48: 255-270.
- Pina Polo, Francisco. *Las Contiones Civiles Militares en Roma*. (Saragosa 1989).
- Pina Polo, Francisco. *The Consul at Rome: The Civil Functions of the Consuls in the Roman Republic*. (Cambridge 2010).
- Pina Polo, Francisco. 'Public Speaking at Rome: A Question of *Auctoritas*.' In: Michael Peachin (ed.). *The Oxford Handbook of Social Relations in the Roman Republic*. (Oxford 2011) 286-303.
- Pitcher, Roger, A. 'The Second Philippic as a Source for Aristocratic Values.' In: Tom Stevenson & Marcus Wilson (eds.). *Cicero's Philippics: History, Rhetoric, and Ideology*. (Auckland 2008) 131-139.
- Planter, Samuel Ball. *A Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome*. Completed and revised by Thomas Ashby. (Oxford 1929).
- Pobjoy, Mark. 'Building Inscriptions in Republican Italy. In: Alison Cooley (ed.). *The Epigraphic Landscape of Roman Italy*. (London 2000) 77-92.
- Purcell, Nicholas. 'Rediscovering the Roman Forum.' *Journal of Roman Archaeology*. 2 (1989) 156-166.
- Purcell, Nicholas. 'Atrium Libertatis.' *Papers of the British School at Rome*. 61 (1993) 125-155.
- Purcell, Nicholas. 'Forum Romanum.' In: Eva Margareta Steinby (ed.). *Lexicon Topographicum Urbis Romae: D-G II* (Roma 1995) 325-342.

- Purcell, Nicholas. 'Urban Spaces Central Places.' In: Susan E. Alcock & Robin Osborne (eds.). *Classical Archaeology*. (Malden 2007) 162-202.
- Purcell, Nicholas. 'Urbanism.' In: Alessandro Barchiesi and Walter Scheidel. *The Oxford Handbook of Roman Studies*. (Oxford 2010) 579-592.
- Raaflaub, Kurt A. 'The Conflict of the Orders.' In: Kurt Raaflaub (ed.). *Social Struggles in Archaic Rome*. (Massachusetts 2005) 1-46.
- Ramsey, John T. 'Did Julius Caesar Temporarily Banish Mark Antony from His Inner Circle?' *The Classical Quarterly* 54 (2004) 161-173.
- Ramsey, John T. 'The Proconsular Years: Politics at a Distance.' In: Miriam Griffin (ed.). *A Companion to Julius Caesar*. (Malden 2009) 37-56.
- Rawlings, Louis. 'Caesar's Portrayal of Gauls as Warriors.' In: Kathryn Welch & Anton Powell (eds.). *Julius Caesar as Artful Reporter: The War Commentaries as Political Instruments*. (London 1998) 171-191.
- Rawson, E. 'The Ciceronian Aristocracy and its Properties.' In: *Roman Culture and Society: Collected Papers*. (Oxford 1991) 204-222.
- Rea, Jennifer A. *Legendary Rome: Myth, Monuments, and Memory on the Palatine and Capitoline*. (London 2007).
- Riese, Alexander. *M. Terrentius Varro: Saturarum Menippearum Reliquiae*. (New York 1971).
- Robinson, O. F. 'Criminal Trials.' In: Ernest Metzger (ed.). *A Companion to Justinian's Institutes*. (New York 1998) 229-242.
- Rosenstein, Nathan. 'Aristocratic Values.' In: Nathan Rosenstein & Robert Morstein-Marx (eds.). *A Companion to the Roman Republic*. (Oxford 2006) 365-382.
- Santangelo, Federico. *Sulla, the Elites, and the Empire*. (Leiden 2007).
- Schadee, H. 'Caesar's Construction of Northern Europe: Inquiry, Contact and Corruption in *De Bello Gallico*.' *Classical Quarterly* 58.1 (2008) 158-180.
- Scheidel, Walter. 'The Demography of Roman State Formation.' *Princeton/Stanford Working Papers in Classics*. 1.0 (2005).
- Sear, Frank. *Roman Theatres: An Architectural Study*. (Oxford 2006).
- Sewell, Jamie. 'The Formation of Roman Urbanism 338-200 BC: Between Contemporary Foreign Influence and Roman Tradition.' *Journal of Roman Archaeology*. Supplementary Series. 79, 2010.
- Shatzman, Israël. 'The Roman General's Authority over Booty.' *Historia* 21(1972) 177-205.
- Shatzman, Israël. 'Senatorial Wealth and Roman Politics.' *Latomus* 142 (Brussels 1975).
- Skutsch, Otto. *The Annals of Q. Ennius*. (Oxford 1985).
- Smith, Christopher. *Early Rome and Latium: Economy and Society c.1000-500 BC*. (Oxford 1996).
- Smith, Christopher. *The Roman Clan: The Gens from Ancient Ideology to Modern Anthropology*. (Cambridge 2006).

- Spencer, Diana. 'Rome at a Gallop: Livy, On Not Gazing, Jumping, or Toppling into the Void.' In: David H. J. Larmour & Diana Spencer (eds.). *The Sites of Rome: Time, Space, Memory*. (Oxford 2007) 61-101.
- Spencer, Diana. 'Roman Landscape: Culture and Identity.' *Greece and Rome: New Surveys in the Classics*. 39 (Cambridge 2010).
- Stamper, John W. *The Architecture of Roman Temples*. (Cambridge 2004).
- Stek, Tessa. *Cult Places and Cultural Change in Republican Italy*. (Amsterdam 2009).
- Stock, George. *M. Tulli Ciceronis: Pro Sex. Roscio*. (Oxford 1961).
- Sumi, Geoffrey. 'Monuments and Memory: The Aedes Castoris in the Formation of Augustan Ideology.' *The Classical Quarterly*. 59, 1 (2009) 167-186.
- Tan, James. *Competition Between Public and Private Revenues in Roman Social and Political History*. Unpublished PhD Dissertation, Under The Executive Committee of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, Columbia University (2011).
- Tatum, W. J. 'Another Look at Spectators at the Roman Games.' *The Ancient History Bulletin*. 4.5 (1990) 104-107.
- Tatum, W. J. 'Friendship, Politics, and Literature in Catullus: Poems 1, 65, 66, 116.' *The Classic Quarterly*, 47, 2 (1997) 482-500.
- Tatum, W. J. *The Patrician Tribune: Publius Clodius Pulcher*. (Chapel Hill 1999).
- Tatum, W. J. *Always I am Caesar*. (Oxford 2008).
- Temelini, M. 'Pompey's Politics and the Presentation of his Theatre-Temple Complex, 61-52 BCE.' *Studia Humaniora Tartuensia*. 7, 4 (2006) 1-14.
- Torelli, Mario. 'The Topography and Archaeology of Republican Rome.' In: Nathan Rosenstein & Robert Morstein-Marx (eds.). *A Companion to the Roman Republic*. (Oxford 2006) 81-101.
- Tortorici, E. 'Curia Iulia.' In: Eva Margareta Steinby (ed.). *Lexicon Topographicum Urbis Romae: D-G II* (Roma 1995) 332-334.
- Tucci, Pier Luigi. 'Where High Moneta Leads Her Steps Sublime: The Tabularium and the Temple of Juno Moneta.' *Journal of Roman Archaeology*. 18 (2005) 7-33.
- Turcan, Robert. *The Gods of Ancient Rome*. (Edinburgh 1998).
- Ulrich, Roger B. 'The Appiades Fountain in the Forum Iulium.' *RM* 93 (1986) 405-423.
- Ulrich, Roger B. 'Julius Caesar and the Creation of the Forum Iulium.' *American Journal of Archaeology*. 97, 1 (1993) 49-80.
- Vanderbroeck, P. J. J. *Popular Leadership and Collective Behavior in the Late Roman Republic*. (Amsterdam 1987).
- Vasaly, Ann. *Representations: Images of the World in Ciceronian Oratory*. (Berkeley 1993).
- Vasaly, Ann. 'Cicero's Early Speeches.' In: James M. May (ed.). *Brill's Companion to Cicero: Oratory and Rhetoric*. (Leiden 2002) 71-112.
- Verboven, Koenraad. 'The Economy of Friends: Economic Aspects of *Amicitia* and Patronage in the Late Republic.' *Latomus* 269 (Brussels 2002).
- Veyne, Paul. *Bread and Circuses: Historical Sociology and Political Pluralism*. Abridged with Introduction by Oswald Murray. (London 1990).

- Vogel, Karl-Heinz. 'Zur rechtlichen Behandlung der römischen Kriegsgewinne.' *ZRG* 66 (1948) 394-422.
- Vogel, Karl-Heinz. 'Praeda' *RE* 22.1: cols. (1953) 1200-1213.
- Wallace-Hadrill, Andrew. 'The Social Structure of the Roman House.' *Papers of the British School at Rome*. 56 (1988) 43-97.
- Wallace-Hadrill, Andrew. 'Roman Arches and Greek Honours: The Language of Power at Rome'. *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society*. 36 (1990) 143-81.
- Wallace-Hadrill, Andrew. 'Mutatas Formas: The Augustan Transformation of Roman Knowledge.' In: Karl Galinsky (ed.). *The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Augustus*. (New York 2005) 55-84.
- Wallace-Hadrill, Andrew. *Rome's Cultural Revolution*. (Cambridge 2008).
- Wallensten, Jenny. 'Greek Responses to the Idea of Aphrodite.' In: Amy C. Smith and Sadie Pickup. *Brill's Companion to Aphrodite*. (Leiden 2010) 269-284.
- Warmington, E. H. (ed. & trans.). *Remains of Old Latin III: Lucilius: The Twelve Tables*. (London 1938).
- Warmington, E. H. (ed. & trans.). *IV Archaic Remains of Old Latin*. (London 1940).
- Weinstock, Stefan. *Divus Julius*. (Cambridge 1971).
- Welch Kathryn & Anton Powell (eds.). *Julius Caesar as Artful Reporter: The War Commentaries as Political Instruments*. (London 1998).
- Welch, Katherine. 'A New View of the Origins of the Basilica: the Atrium Regium, Graecostasis, and Roman Diplomacy.' *Journal of Roman Archaeology*. 16 (2003) 5-34.
- Welch, Katherine. 'Art and Architecture in the Roman Republic.' In: Nathan Rosenstein & Robert Morstein-Marx (eds.). *A Companion to the Roman Republic*. (Oxford 2006) 496-542.
- Welch, Katherine. *Roman Amphitheatre*. (Cambridge 2007).
- Welch, Katherine. 'Nimium Felix.' In: Tom Stevenson and Marcus Wilson (eds.). In: Tom Stevenson and Marcus Wilson (eds.). *Cicero's Philippics: History, Rhetoric, and Ideology*. (Auckland 2008) .181-213.
- White, Horace (trans.). *Appian's Roman History I*. (Cambridge 1972).
- Wiedemann, Thomas. 'The Patron as Banker.' In: Kathryn Lomas and Tim Cornell (eds.). *Bread and Circuses: Euergetism and Municipal Patronage in Roman Italy*. (London 2003) 12-27.
- Wiseman, T. P. 'Pete nobiles amicos: Poets and Patrons in Late Republican Rome.' In: Barbara K. Gold (ed.). *Literary and Artistic Patronage in Ancient Rome*. (Austin 1982) 28-49.
- Wiseman, T. P. *Catullus and His World: A Reappraisal*. (Cambridge 1985).
- Wiseman, T. P. 'Afterword: the Theatre of Civic Life.'
- I. M. Barton (ed.). *Roman Public Building*. (Exeter 1989) 151-155.
- Wiseman, T. P. 'The Publication of *De Bello Gallico*.' In: Welch, Kathryn & Anton Powell (eds.). *Julius Caesar as Artful Reporter: The War Commentaries as Political Instruments*. (London 1998) 1-10.

- Wiseman, T. P. *Clio's Cosmetics: Three Studies in Graeco-Roman Literature*. (Bristol 2003).
- Wiseman, T. P. 'Legendary Genealogies.' *Greece and Rome*. 52, 2 (2005) 153-164.
- Wiseman, T. P. *Remembering the Roman People*. (Oxford 2009).
- Woolf, Greg. *Becoming Roman: The Origins of Provincial Civilization in Gaul*. (Cambridge 1998).
- Woolf, Greg. 'Monumental Writing and the Expansion of Roman Society in the Early Empire.' *The Journal of Roman Studies*. 86 (1996) 22-39.
- Wooten, C. W. *Cicero's Philippics and their Demosthenic Model: the Rhetoric of Crisis*. (Chapel Hill 1983).
- Yakobson, Alexander. 'Elections and Electioneering in Rome.' *Historia*. 128 (1999).
- Yakobson, Alexander. 'Popular Power in the Roman Republic.' In: Nathan Rosenstein and Robert Morstein-Marx (eds.). *A Companion to the Roman Republic*. (Oxford 2006) 383-400.
- Zanker, Paul. 'The City as Symbol: Rome and the Creation of an Urban Image.' In: Elizabeth Fentress (ed.). 'Romanization and the City: Creation, Transformation and the City.' *Journal of Archaeology Supplementary Series* 38 (2000) 25-41.
- Zanker, Paul. 'The Irritating Statues and Contradictory Portraits of Julius Caesar.' In: Miriam Griffin (ed.). *A Companion to Julius Caesar*. (Malden 2009) 288-314.
- Zanker, Paul. *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus*. (Michigan 2010).
- Zevi, Fausto. 'Cicero and Ostia.' In: A. Gallina Zevi and J. H. Humphrey (eds.). Ostia, Cicero, Gamala, Feasts, and the Economy. *Journal of Roman Archaeology*. 57 (2004) 15-31.
- Ziolkowski, Adam. *The Temples of Mid-Republican Rome and their Historical and Topographical Context*. (Rome 1992).