The Report Committee for Benjamin Miles Crowther

Certifies that this is the approved version of the following report:

Topographies of Demonstration in the late Republican and Augustan Forum Romanum

APPROVED BY

SUPERVISING COMMITTEE:

Supervisor:

Rabun M. Taylor

Andrew M. Riggsby

Topographies of Demonstration in the late Republican and Augustan Forum Romanum

by

Benjamin Miles Crowther, B.A.; M.A.

Report

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of

The University of Texas at Austin

in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements

for the Degree of

Master of Arts

The University of Texas at Austin

May 2014

Abstract

Topographies of Demonstration in the late Republican and Augustan Forum Romanum

Benjamin Miles Crowther, M.A.

The University of Texas at Austin, 2014

Supervisor: Rabun M. Taylor

This report investigates the relationship between demonstrations and the built environment of the Forum Romanum. As one of the chief loci for the creation of public discourse in Rome, the Forum Romanum was a prime target for demonstrations. An in-depth evaluation of late Republican demonstrations within the Forum reveals how demonstrations sought to create alternative discourses. Late Republican demonstrators often incorporated the topography of the Forum into their demonstrations, either for strategic or symbolic reasons. Demonstrators were particularly concerned with the occupation of the Forum and restricting access to the speaker's platforms. In doing so, demonstrations attempted to legitimate their own goals and objectives by equating them with the will of the people. The Augustan transformation of the Forum Romanum disrupted this established Republican topography of demonstration. Changes in the built environment limited the effectiveness of a demonstration's ability to occupy the Forum. Entrances to the Forum were narrowed to impede the movement of demonstrators. Speaker's platforms were insulated from the assembled crowd. A number of redundant measures, including surveillance and legal remedies, ensured that a new topography of demonstration did not form. These changes to the Forum Romanum participated in Augustus's larger ideological program by prohibiting the creation of discourses opposed to the Augustan message.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Caesar's Funeral: An Introduction to Roman Demonstrations

In the weeks following Caesar's assassination, a number of violent demonstrations rocked the city of Rome. Even before his funeral, tensions were running high and a small scale disturbance broke out during the public reading of his will.[1] On the day of his funeral, Antony intended to pronounce the eulogy in the Forum, before a procession took his body to the Campus Martius for cremation.[2] As Piso escorted the body through the Forum, a countless multitude swarmed around it before it was placed on Caesar's new Rostra.[3] Some in the crowd were armed.[4] Antony mounted the Rostra and, instead of pronouncing the standard eulogy, instructed a herald to read aloud all the divine and mortal honors voted to Caesar and the oath that the Senate had sworn to ensure his safety.[5] The crowd began to react. Antony added a few words of his own. He recalled Caesar's speeches from the Rostra and triumphs that had taken place in this very Forum and contrasted them with his corpse, at that moment lying prostrate on the Rostra.[6] Motioning towards the Capitol, Antony called upon Jupiter to avenge Caesar's death.[7] The senators among the crowd stirred uneasily as the crowd became increasingly agitated.[8]

---

[1] App. *Bell. Civ.* 2.143.
[2] Sue. *Iul.* 84.1.
[3] App. *Bell. Civ.* 2.143.
[4] App. *Bell. Civ.* 2.143.
[5] Sue. *Iul.* 84.2. In Appian and Dio, Antony's extended speech touches upon many of the same themes (App. *Bell. Civ.* 2.144-5; Dio Cass. 44.36-49).
[6] Dio Cass. 44.49.3.
[7] App. *Bell. Civ.* 2.145.
[8] App *Bell. Civ.* 2.145; Dio Cass. 44.50.1.

With the crowd on the verge of violence, someone raised above the Rostra a wax image of Caesar, including the twenty-three fatal wounds he received at the hands of his former compatriots.[9] As current and ex-magistrates lifted Caesar's bier from the Rostra to proceed to the Campus Martius, a struggle broke out over the body.[10] All hell broke loose. Some wanted to cremate Caesar's body in the Temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus, others in the Theater of Pompey, the site of his assassination; both of these options were checked by mustering soldiers who were beginning to respond to the disturbance.[11] Suddenly, two miraculous figures, equipped with javelins and sword, leapt forward and set fire to the bier right there in the Forum, near the Regia.[12] The rest of the crowd responded eagerly. Grabbing the judge's chairs, the court benches, whatever flammable material they could find in the area, they tossed it onto the fire.[13] More soldiers flocked to the Forum, simultaneously attempting to contain the riot and battle the growing inferno.[14] Some demonstrators were captured and hurled from the Tarpeian Rock as a warning, but ultimately a standoff ensued, as the soldiers were unable to drive the crowd from the Forum and it remained around Caesar's pyre throughout the night.[15] Over the coming days, the outbreak of new demonstrations occasionally punctuated this uneasy peace.

Caesar's funeral may be an anomaly, but it provides us with a vivid account of a demonstration in the Forum Romanum. Several elements immediately jump out. First, Antony's

---

[9] App. *Bell. Civ.* 2.147.

[10] Sue. *Iul.* 84.3.

[11] Sue. *Iul.* 84.3 for dispute over at which location to cremate the body. Dio (44.50.2) records that soldiers prohibited the crowd from bringing the body to either location, while Appian (*Bell. Civ.* 2.148) writes that the priests pleaded with the crowd not to burn the body in the Temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus.

[12] For the two miraculous figures, Sue. *Iul.* 84.3. For the location near the Regia, App. *Bell. Civ.* 2.148.

[13] App. *Bell. Civ.* 2.148; Sue. *Iul.* 84.3.

[14] Dio Cass. 44.50.3.

[15] For executions at the Tarpeian Rock, Dio Cass. 44.50.3. For crowd remaining throughout the night, App. *Bell. Civ.* 2.148.

role in the demonstration. His speech from the Rostra certainly played a large part in sparking the already agitated crowd. In fact, Antony had much to gain from a well-timed violent demonstration. Certain elements, such as the tailor-made wax figure of Caesar, suggest planning, likely on Antony's behalf. Although afterward he backed away from demagoguery, in sparking this protest he demonstrated that the Senate needed him and his soldiers for protection. Unlike early modern and modern demonstrations, which can be broadly defined as a resource of the powerless to pursue or prevent changes in institutionalized power relations, the demonstration at Caesar's funeral and other Roman demonstrations of this period did not seek societal reform or the overthrow of the state.[16] Instead, the Roman demonstration was a political strategy primarily employed and activated by magistrates and other office-holders. This is not to say that social issues were completely absent from these demonstrations nor that demonstrators were duped in a sense by leading politicians. Many demonstrations centered on the issues of agrarian reform and distribution of grain, and it seems unlikely that so many demonstrators would be willing to risk life and limb for a cause they did not believe in, even if they did occasionally receive compensation. The key difference between these late Republican and early modern/modern demonstrations lies in the methods of mobilization and organization. Instead, Roman magistrates addressed pre-existing issues among the *populus Romanus* to garner support for their own position. Next, the response to the demonstration. Within Rome, Republican magistrates lacked the ability to enforce order if push came to shove. Outside of their lictors and members of their household, magistrates did not possess any formal body to

---

[16] V. Taylor and N. van Dyke, ""Get Up, Stand Up". Tactical Repertoires of Social Movements," in *The Blackwell Companion to Social Movements*, eds. D. Snow, S. A. Soule and H. Kriesi (Oxford: Blackwell, 2004), 268.

control and manage a large number of people. Although their presence was a violation of the pomerium's boundary, soldiers were more and more often used to check demonstrations, as was the case during Caesar's funeral. While ancient Rome never possessed a modern police force, soldiers provided a stop-gap and were able to enforce order if necessary. The use of soldiers and paramilitary units becomes important in the investigation of the mechanics of demonstrations.

Finally, and perhaps most importantly, the topography of the demonstration. In order to induce a response from the crowd, Antony invoked several places in the Forum and its environs, each pertaining to an association with Caesar. The rhetoric associated with demonstration drew on the different meanings invested in places within the Forum. Once the event was underway, the crowd incorporated the topography into its demonstration. A demonstration involved a struggle over Rome's topography. Demonstrators were prevented from reaching certain topographical features, such as the Capitol and the Theater of Pompey, but integrated others, like the Regia. Demonstrators did not just respond to meaning within Rome's topography; they actively recreated it as well. The destruction of judge's chairs and tribune's benches and the addition of an altar to Caesar after the riot rearranged the civic landscape of the Forum. Although the demonstration at Caesar's funeral may be an anomaly in size and scope, demonstrations were not uncommon in the late Republic and many correspond to a similar pattern. Although effective in this period, the demonstration abruptly disappeared after Augustus's ascendancy. It is possible to posit that Augustus's restoration of stability eliminated

the need for demonstrations. This answer is too simple.[17] In the course of this paper, I want to

investigate the relationship between topography and demonstrations in one of Rome's most

contentious places, the Forum Romanum. In order to investigate this relationship, I wish to

consider the demonstration in the Forum Romanum from start to finish. The spatial dynamics of

any demonstration were vital to its success or failure. Who participated in demonstrations? How

were they mobilized? Where did demonstrators congregate within the Forum? What did they

do once they were there? What attempts were made to check a demonstration, either in its

formative stages or once it was already underway? Using this information, I then want to

consider a hypothetical demonstration in the Augustan Forum Romanum. In doing so, I will

demonstrate that Augustan developments in the Forum rearranged the Republican topography

of demonstration, rendering it ineffective as a political tactic. This was part of an active strategy

to prohibit the creation of alternative public discourses outside of Augustus's own ideological

message.

---

[17] In 9 B.C., a nebulous disturbance led to parts of the Forum being burned (Dio Cass. 55.8.8). Purcell comments that the Forum Romanum continued as a locus for popular demonstrations throughout the imperial period, but none of these caused the same level of disruption as the late Republican demonstrations (N. Purcell, "Forum Romanum (the Imperial Period)," in *LTUR*, 336.

Chapter 2: The Demonstration in Theory

As is often the case for the ancient world, the evidence for demonstrations in the Forum Romanum is incomplete at best. Excerpts provide testimony for a particular action or for a particular section of the crowd, but rarely give us a complete picture of any one demonstration. To this end, it is necessary to turn to theoretical considerations and comparanda to better understand the relationship between topography, space, and demonstration. These considerations will allow us to make better sense of and pursue in more depth the following variables: a demonstration's participants, the demonstration in practice, and the relationship between demonstration and public space. All of these variables add up to an intimate connection between demonstrations and the built environment.

The Crowd and Collective Action

For Cicero, demonstrators who supported Clodius were slaves and gladiators at worst, craftsmen and shopkeepers at best. Either way the *multitudo Clodiana* was made up of individuals of low social standing who Cicero could easily dismiss. Modern scholarship needs to be careful not to replicate the ancient stereotype of the crowd. In his seminal study of the crowd in early modern France and England, George Rudé identifies two stereotypes historical studies often assign to the crowd in any pre-industrial period. In the vein of Cicero, all participants in popular disturbances are no more than "rabble", "a mob", "bandits", "beggars", etc.[18] On the other end of the spectrum, some studies valorize the crowd, who become "the

---

[18] G. Rudé, *The Crowd in History: A Study of Popular Disturbances in France and England, 1730-1848* (London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1981), 7-8.

people", "patriots", or "freedom fighters".[19] Either way, both are stereotypes and present the crowd as a disembodied abstraction, not a gathering of individual human beings.[20] Throughout the course of this study, I use the more neutral terms "the crowd" or "demonstrators" to discuss instances when a large group of individuals act together in a coordinated manner. "Demonstration" refers to the collective action itself, sometimes including low levels of physical violence, while a "riot" describes a demonstration that has turned excessively violent, usually resulting in a number of deaths and/or the destruction of large amounts of property. Although the nature of our evidence makes it difficult to single out the particular individuals who participated in demonstrations, I have tried my best to take Rudé's admonition to heart and have attempted to consider the collective group of individuals and not the abstraction.

What informs the particular actions undertaken by these collective bodies? In the 1970s, the early modern historian Charles Tilly introduced the concept of "repertoire of collective action", which he continued to build on throughout his career.[21] This theory postulates that a given population tends to choose from a relatively limited and well-established set of methods for organizing and carrying out demonstrations, instead of inventing new techniques each time.[22] Demonstrators become actors who stage demonstrations based on the available material, conceptual, and organizational resources, informed by culturally transmitted

---

[19] Rudé, *The Crowd in History: A Study of Popular Disturbances in France and England, 1730-1848*, 7.
[20] Ibid., 9.
[21] Summarized in C. Tilly, *The Contentious French* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1986), 3-4.
[22] C. Tilly, *Popular Contention in Great Britain 1758-1834* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1995), 26.

knowledge and/or prior experience.[23] While demonstrations are often organized within this framework, the inability to micromanage such a large number of individuals, coupled with a tense atmosphere, leads to moments of spontaneity during any given demonstration. Tilly has likened the demonstration to the improvisation of a jazz ensemble around a basic theme, throughout which the process employs a "paradoxical combination of ritual and flexibility".[24] This way the demonstration remains unpredictable and effective, while at the same time providing a repertoire of known cues that inform the participant how to act. If Tilly's theory holds up in the Roman world, we should expect to discover underlying patterns that shape and inform demonstrations in the Forum Romanum.

Demonstrations, Public Space, and the Built Environment

Effective demonstrations require public spaces, for both logistical and symbolic reasons. On the logistical side, demonstrations need to be visible in order to make an impact. The visibility of a demonstration is increased through its disruption of the routine.[25] Highly-frequented public space addresses both of these logistical requirements. Additionally, effective demonstrations need a space where a large number of individuals can gather. Taking all these factors into account, the public square provides an ideal location for demonstrations. On the symbolic side, physical symbols embedded in public space are invested with certain meaning

[23] L. Tilly and C. Tilly eds., *Class Conflict and Collective Action* (Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications, 1981), 19.

[24] Tilly, *Popular Contention in Great Britain 1758-1834*, 27.

[25] D. della Porta, M. Fabbri and G. Piazza, "Putting Protest in Place: Contested and Liberated Spaces in Three Campaigns," in *Spaces of Contention: Spatialities and Social Movements*, eds. W. Nicholls, B. Miller and J. Beaumont (Farnham: Ashgate, 2013), 32.

and collective memories for particular groups.[26] In the Forum Romanum, these symbols ranged in scale from temples to honorific statuary.[27] Through the physical occupation of these public spaces, demonstrations can take control of these messages and collective memories and use them to fashion their own public discourse.[28] The strength of this counter-claim becomes proportional to the number of individuals who mobilize in this one place.[29] The physical presence of an individual demonstrates his or her support for the claim; in a sense the demonstrators "vote with their feet". Control of public space becomes equivalent to control of the sites that produce public discourse. But the demonstration does more than simply incorporate a space's existing messages into its own claim; it also endows the space with new meanings and associations.[30] With this in mind, we can begin to investigate how demonstrations impacted the topography of the Forum and vice versa.

Of course, not all public space is equally conducive to demonstrations. The built environment can either limit or foster an effective demonstration. As spatial dynamics play a large role in any demonstration (i.e., mobilizing demonstrators, occupying space, prohibiting movement, etc.), the built environment can be modified to impact the effectiveness of demonstrations. Nineteenth-century Paris provides an excellent example with an abundance of evidence. During the early part of the nineteenth century, demonstrators in Paris erected

---

[26] J. Parkinson, *Democracy and Public Space: The Physical Sites of Democratic Performance* (Oxford: OUP, 2012), 74-5.

[27] D. Favro, "The Roman Forum and Roman Memory," *Places* 5, no. 1 (1988), 17-9.

[28] Parkinson, *Democracy and Public Space: The Physical Sites of Democratic Performance*, 146.

[29] Ibid., 149.

[30] P. Routledge, "Critical Geopolitics and Terrains of Resistance," *Political Geography* 15, no. 6-7 (1996), 517.

makeshift barricades across a number of key streets throughout the city.[31] Paris's inherited

network of winding, narrow medieval streets provided a prime target for demonstrators. The

barricades delineated and claimed sections of the city for the demonstrators, but they also

impeded the movement and coordination of the city's authorities.[32] In the latter half of the

century, Haussmann's transformation of Paris limited the effectiveness of the barricade

demonstration. Wide boulevards, driven through existing neighborhoods, facilitated the

movement of authorities throughout the city and Haussmann himself even acknowledged their

strategic value.[33] Haussmann's transformation of Paris certainly belonged to a larger ideological

program whose goals included, but also went beyond, the suppression of demonstrations.

Nonetheless, the changes to the built environment impacted the ability to organize and

implement a barricade demonstration.[34] Much like Haussmann's Paris, many of the Augustan

developments in the Forum Romanum belonged to a larger ideological program, but we still

need to take into account how these changes in the built environment impacted the ability to

stage effective demonstrations. Equipped with this theoretical framework, we can begin to

analyze the late Republican and Augustan Forum Romanum as a locus for demonstrations.

---

[31] M. Traugott, *The Insurgent Barricade* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2010), 9.

[32] Traugott, *The Insurgent Barricade* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2010), 180-90.

[33] P. de Moncan, *Le Paris d'Haussmann* (Paris: Les éditions du Mécène, 2009), 34.

[34] There was only one violent demonstration in the period after Haussmann's renovation of Paris and the French army quickly repressed the demonstrators. See J. Rougerie, *La Commune de 1871* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 2014), 115-7.

Chapter 3: The Republican Forum Romanum

Uses of the Republican Forum Romanum- The Intersection of Elite and Popular Politics

While the Republican Forum Romanum was, without a doubt, a multi-functional space, here, I wish to focus on the Forum as a locus for popular and elite interaction. The *populus Romanus* often gathered there, whether to watch spectacle, visit *tabernae*, or attend the funerals of leading aristocrats, among other activities.[35] It was very much a popular space, and, as Nicholas Purcell puts it, it "was not a managed civic space into which the *plebs* was allowed [only] on sufferance and on their best behavior".[36] At the same time, the Forum was also very much an aristocratic space. Both the Curia and the Temple of Castor often hosted meetings of the Senate. The public nature of the Forum and its associated crowds offered an opportunity for aristocratic display. The simple act of walking through the forum with the trappings of office or wealth was sufficient to mark one's status.[37] The nearby aristocratic residences, located along the Sacra Via, intimately linked elite public and private life.[38] These sorts of casual acts of display were complemented by more active forms of self-promotion. The public speech, whether of a prosecutor or a eulogist, allowed an individual to fashion his own public identity in front of a

---

[35] N. Purcell, "Forum Romanum (the Republican Period)," in *LTUR*, 331-334.The Republican Forum Romanum played host to a number of different activities. Outside of strictly political behavior, the Forum was a setting for formal spectacle, such as *munera* and triumphal processions. The aristocratic funeral can also be included in this category. The Forum was also a center for judicial proceedings, another setting that often involved elite and popular interactions. Finally, retail and economic activities constituted many day-to-day visits to the Forum.

[36] Ibid., 328.

[37] T. O'Sullivan, *Walking in Roman Culture* (Cambridge: CUP, 2011), 54-59.

[38] F. Coarelli, *Il Foro Romano (I): Periodo Arcaico* (Rome: Quasar, 1983), 11-26.

group of people.[39] Electoral canvassing also belonged to the range of elite activity in the Forum.[40] This intersection, with its accompanied face-to-face interactions, formed the basis for Roman political life and often shaped political success or failure.[41] These activities, dependent on the encounter between one and many, demonstrate how the Forum was the primary locus for the intersection of aristocratic and popular public life.

Topographical Overview of Politician-Crowd Interaction

The exact limits of the late Republican Forum are never made explicit by any ancient author, but a rough estimation suggests that the Regia and Atrium Vestae marked the limit to the east and southeast respectively, the lower terrace of the Capitoline the west, and the Basilica Aemilia and Basilica Sempronia the north and south respectively.[42] Throughout the Republic, the eastern edge of the Forum had always lacked definition. The area Vestae and Regia roughly defined its limit, but were located in an ambiguous position between the Palatine and the Forum Romanum.[43] This ambiguity may be intentional, as the central area of the Forum was expected to accommodate the entirety of the citizen body during the *contiones* and during the voting process itself, especially after 145 B.C., when the tribune C. Licinius Crassus took the novel step of transferring the gathering of the voting body from the Comitium to the confines of

---

[39] Both Cicero and Caesar provide prime examples. Cicero categorizes himself as according to *virtus*, not his *maiores*, while Caesar focuses on his heritage. See Cicero, *Pis*. 1.3, Suet. *Div. Iul.* 6. For popular reaction to this type of self-fashioning, see F. Millar, *The Crowd in Rome in the Late Republic* (Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press, 1998), 74.

[40] Poly. 31.29.8.

[41] K. Hölkeskamp, *Reconstructing the Roman Republic*, trans. H. Heitmann-Gordon (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2010), 71-75, 98-106.

[42] For a discussion of the Republican boundaries of the Forum, see Purcell, *Forum Romanum (the Republican Period)*, 325-326.

[43] Serv. *Aen.* 8.363. Severus locates the *Regia* at the base of the Palatine and at the limits of the Forum.

the Forum itself.[44] Defining the extent of the Forum became particularly imperative during the voting process and portions of the Forum were roped off to accommodate the different tribes of the *comitia tributa*.[45] Presumably, this measure aided the *custodes* who managed the actual process of voting by organizing the assembled citizens in order to verify their credentials.[46] Perhaps related, a series of small pits (*pozzetti*) have been found in various locations throughout the Forum, some of which appear to demarcate particular spaces in the Forum, most notably separating the Republican Rostra and Comitium from the central area of the Forum. Coarelli has argued that they ritually marked the extent of the Forum. Considering that the central area of the Forum measures close to only 1.5 *iugera,* Coarelli has emended Varro's description of the area of the Forum (originally *septem iugera forensia*) to *saepta iugera forensia*.[47] A series of roped posts, placed in the pits, would have enclosed the Forum, hence *saepta*. Due to their heterogeneity, Mouritsen has rejected the notion that they were used for any single purpose, but even so they still appear to partition the Forum in some way.[48] Newsome has put forward the hypothesis that they were used to manage the members of the *comitia tributa*, based on comparisons with the forum at Cosa.[49] Still, the irregular shape and imprecise alignment of

---

[44] Cicero Lael. 96, Var. Rust 1.2.9.

[45] Dion. Hal. 7.59.

[46] L. Taylor, *Roman Voting Assemblies* (Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press, 1966), 54.

[47] Varro Rust. 1.2.9; F. Coarelli, *Il Foro Romano (II): Periodo Repubblicano e Augusteo* (Rome: Quasar, 1985), 125-131. For the measurement of the central area of the Forum, see C. Giuliani and P. Verduchi, *L'Area Centrale del Foro Romano* (Florence: Leo S. Olschki, 1987), 33-7.

[48] H. Mouritsen, "Pits and Politics: Interpreting Colonial Fora in Republican Italy," *PBSR* 72 (2004), 37-67.

[49] F. Coarelli, *Il Foro Romano (II): Periodo Repubblicano e Augusteo* (Rome: Quasar, 1985), 125-131.; D. Newsome, "Movement and Fora in Rome (the Late Republic to the First Century CE)," in *Rome, Ostia, Pompeii: Movement and Space*, eds. R. Laurence and D. Newsome (Oxford: OUP, 2011), 299.

pozzetti suggest that they served another function.[50] Outside of these temporary partitions, only attested in the literary record, the limits of the Forum remained ill-defined and the central area accessible to larger gatherings.

Several locations in the Forum facilitated interactions between these gatherings and individual politicians. The raised platform, whether a dedicated speaker's platform or the podium of a temple, provided a suitable venue for addressing an assembled crowd. The orientation of the platform dictated the locations in the Forum where the crowd gathered to hear or, in the case of those out of earshot, see the speaker.[51] Given that the majority of those gathered would only be able to see and not hear the speaker, the raised platform became even more significant. In the case of the Rostra, a speaker either addressed a smaller crowd in the adjoining Comitium or turned to the southeast to face the central area of the Forum, like C. Licinius Crassus. The Rostra's oblique position in the Forum allowed the speaker to project across the entirety of the central area without obstruction.[52] The second primary platform, the rostrate Temple of Castor, allowed the speaker to address gatherings on the eastern side of the Forum, although the later construction of the Temple of Divine Caesar and Augustus's Parthian arch limited the number of individuals that could assemble directly in front of it.[53] Given the

---

[50] R. Taylor, "Roman Oscilla: An Assessment," *RES: Anthropology and Aesthetics*, no. 48 (Autumn, 2005), 91-2. Instead, Taylor suggest that the *pozzetti* were apertures for tree trunks and part of a sacred grove.

[51] Given the din of the crowd and distance from the speaker's platform, the majority of those assembled must have had a difficult time hearing the speaker. For the incorporation of physical gestures, appearance, etc. into rhetoric, see R. Morstein-Marx, *Mass Oratory and Political Power in the Late Roman Republic* (Cambridge: CUP, 2004), 270-1.

[52] For orientation of late Republican Rostra, see P. Carafa, *Il Comizio di Roma dalle Origini all'Età di Augusto* (Rome: "L'Erma" di Bretschneider, 1998), 148-151.

[53] Taylor, *Roman Voting Assemblies*, 41. Although the earliest phase of the Temple of Castor did not possess a tribunal, one was added to the second phase, pre-Metallan temple, post 200 B.C. Around this

constraints of both the Comitium and the central area of the Forum, it is impossible that the entire citizen body could gather all at once in either. In terms of the number of people who could be assembled at once, MacMullen, working with Coarelli's plan, estimates between five and six thousand in the Comitium, fifteen to twenty thousand in the central area of the Forum.[54] Carafa, adopting a smaller layout for the Comitium, suggests three thousand could have gathered there.[55] Mouritsen, seeking to curtail the role of the *contio*, advocates for a maximum of ten thousand for the central area of the Forum, based on the scenario of a voting assembly.[56] Thus, it seems likely that without the voting apparatuses in place, the optimal capacity of the central area during a *contio* likely lies closer to MacMullen's figures. Regardless, gatherings of this magnitude would be difficult to manage without a proportionally large number of individuals invested with the authority to regulate the proceedings. However, outside of the *custodes* present during voting and any lictors with their associated magistrates, few had any formal authority to enforce order. If the Forum was at capacity, it would be difficult to control the crowd should things become violent.

Public Discourse in the late Republican Forum Romanum

The juxtaposition of platform and square facilitated the gathering of the *populus Romanus* en masse and encouraged face-to-face interactions between magistrates, councils,

---

time, the temple began to be associated with the *comitia* and *contiones*. A special pavement marked the area around the tribunal, likely more robust to avoid wear during frequent gatherings. This pavement also designated the spot for assembly. See I. Nielsen and B. Poulsen eds., *The Temple of Castor and Pollux*, Vol. 1 (Rome: Edizioni de Luca, 1992), 113-4.

[54] R. MacMullen, "How Many Romans Voted?" *Athanaeum* 58 (1980), 455-456.

[55] P. Carafa, *Il Comizio di Roma dalle Origini all'Età di Augusto* (Rome: "L'Erma" di Bretschneider, 1998), 140.

[56] H. Mouritsen, *Plebs and Politics in the Late Roman Republic* (Cambridge: CUP, 2001), 20-23.

and assemblies. Although the *deductio* and other day-to-day encounters provided a context for more informal types of interaction, orations (whether in the context of funerals, trials, or other *contiones*) constituted the primary mode of formal interaction between a gathered crowd and an individual speaker acting in his capacity as magistrate, attorney, or eulogist. Throughout the late Republic these gatherings resulted in more and more outbreaks of political violence. While trials and public funerals often established their own public discourses, the spatial dynamics and proceedings of these gatherings are more ad hoc and vary from event to event. For these reasons, I wish to outline in this section the more established protocol of the voting process and the *contio* to better understand the mechanisms of these types of gatherings and the importance of physically controlling the Forum Romanum. Then I wish to look at gatherings in the Forum Romanum that turned into demonstrations, complete with a level of political violence. Here I will examine the type of gatherings at which demonstrations took place, the information available on the individuals who participated in demonstrations, the mechanisms and process of the demonstrations, and the aims of the demonstrations. Finally, I plan to examine Republican attempts to regulate and control demonstrations, including legal ramifications for violence, architectural solutions, and "authorized" violence. Through this survey, I hope to demonstrate that the spatial mechanics of demonstrations were integral both to staging and regulating them.

The Gathering in the Forum- Voting and *Contio*

To date, Lily Ross Taylor's *Roman Voting Assemblies* still remains the most thorough investigation of voting procedure within the Forum. While voting and the *contio* were

sometimes linked, technically each was considered a separate event. When the presiding magistrate dissolved the *contio* with the word *discedite* or the phrase *ite in suffragium*, the non-voters present, including slaves, foreigners, and women, were removed from the area and citizens distributed themselves according to voting unit.[57] The *comitia tributa* and the *concilium plebis* both gathered within the confines of the Forum and usually convened to vote on legislation or judgment regarding particular crimes against the state.[58] A number of lesser officials were on hand to manage the process. Each tribe possessed a *curator*, who was responsible for taking the census by tribes and presumably were present to ensure that only enrolled members of a tribe voted.[59] In addition to the *curatores*, the presiding magistrate appointed three *custodes* for each tribe, along with an additional *custos* for each candidate, if either voting body happened to be electing an official.[60] These *custodes* were prominent men, drawn from the nine hundred senators, equestrians, and *tribuni aerarii* on the official jury lists. Each was assigned to a tribe to which he did not belong to prevent tampering, voted with that tribe, and then tallied the votes. By this reckoning, during votes on legislation thirty-five *curatores* and one hundred and five *custodes* were on-hand to manage a crowd of at least ten thousand by minimum estimates, twenty thousand by maximum estimates. Clearly, these officials only performed limited crowd control functions and were present mainly to prevent tampering with the votes.

---

[57] Taylor, *Roman Voting Assemblies*, 3.
[58] Ibid., 21.
[59] Ibid., 69.
[60] Ibid., 79.

It is not particularly well known exactly how the tribes were arranged within the space of the Forum. In a description of a judicial trial within the Forum, Dionysius of Halicarnassus uses the word *perischoinizein*, "to surround with rope", to describe the division of tribes.[61] Additionally, each tribe possessed a designated spot (*choria*) within the Forum. This suggests that temporary divisions kept the tribes separated and organized. The Rostra and the podium of the Temple of Castor were integral to the voting process once the vote itself actually began.[62] Temporary wooden *pontes* were attached to the platform hosting the vote and the members of each tribe ascended the *pontes*, cast their vote in full view on the platform, and then descended from the other side.[63] Since the combination of *pontes* and speaker's platform were key to the voting process, they provided logical targets for those who wanted to disrupt or control the process, especially considering their ability to limit access to the voting urns. This ranged from custodial influence over voters to the outright destruction or occupation of the *pontes*.[64] More and more, speaker's platforms became the focal points of demonstrations within the Forum.

Long considered ancillary to the voting process, the *contio* has enjoyed a recent resurgence in considerations on the creation of public discourse at Rome. The *contio* was a form of popular assembly convened to accommodate a speech or speeches rather than a vote, so it could be held independently of the voting process if necessary.[65] At the most basic level, the *contio* was the venue for the creation and dissemination of a public discourse, shaped by the

---

[61] Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 7.59.1.

[62] Taylor, *Roman Voting Assemblies*, 41-5.

[63] Ibid., 39.

[64] For custodial tampering, see Cic. *Leg*. 3.38. For occupation of the *pontes*, see Actor ad Heren. 1.21, Cic. *Att.* 1.14.5.

[65] Morstein-Marx, *Mass Oratory and Political Power in the Late Roman Republic*, 9-11.

speaker and reinterpreted by the gathered crowd. This discourse was by no means limited to the legislative sphere, but also included topics such as military matters, threats to the state, oaths of office, and grain distribution schemes, all matters broadly considered political.[66] However, subjects discussed at the *contio* were non-binding, although the magistrate convening the *contio* attempted to make his position appear coterminous with popular opinions.[67] Only a magistrate ranked quaestor or higher had the power to convene a *contio* and was able to pick the individuals who accompanied him on the speaker's platform.[68] Additionally, a *contio* could be held on limited notice and this allowed the convening magistrate to assemble a favorable crowd before opponents had the chance to respond.[69] Once the *contio* began, clear rules governed one magistrate's ability to interfere with another's *contio* and a *contio* held by a tribune of the plebs could not be interrupted by any magistrate.[70] During his time on the platform, the speaker theoretically had a monopoly on the interaction with the crowd.

Exactly what the *contiones* achieved has been the subject of debate between Fergus Millar, Henrik Mouritsen, and Robert Morstein-Marx. In part continuing to highlight the democratic elements of Roman politics that he laid out in his 1984 article "The Political Character of the Classical Roman Republic, 200-151 B.C.", Millar's *The Crowd in Rome in the Late Republic* attributes the rising importance of the *contio* to a reassertion of the people's right to

---

[66] F. Pina Polo, "Procedures and Functions of Civil and Military *Contiones* in Rome," *Klio* 77 (1995), 209-11.
[67] Morstein-Marx, *Mass Oratory and Political Power in the Late Roman Republic*, 34-5.
[68] Ibid., 33; Taylor, *Roman Voting Assemblies*, 18.
[69] Morstein-Marx, *Mass Oratory and Political Power in the Late Roman Republic*, 39-40.
[70] Ibid., 38-9.

legislate.[71] In Millar's view, individual politicians shaped their political rhetoric to influence popular gatherings at the *contiones* in order to garner votes for projects they supported or their own election campaigns.[72] In this model, the power ultimately lay with the people. Mouritsen's response to Millar's position discounts the *contio* as little more than a political rally. For Mouritsen, the crowds that attended a *contio* constituted only a small fraction of eligible Roman voters; hence the *contio* was an empty gesture, democratically speaking.[73] Seeking to steer a middle path between these two extremes, Morstein-Marx's approach to the *contio* draws on theories of political discourse to determine how political power was constantly negotiated through mass oratory.

Robert Morstein-Marx's convincing position on the role of mass oratory emphasizes the importance of the Forum Romanum for Republican politics. In his model, the *contiones* were the primary point of contact for elite and popular public life. They acted as a mediator for popular and elite political opinions.[74] Within the venue of the Forum, on the Rostra or another speaker's platform, elite politicians gauged popular support for their political ideology and attempted to harness the support of the gathered crowd for their initiatives.[75] At the same time, political oratory was one of the few authoritative media when it came to political affairs and their interpretations.[76] Thus, orators actively shaped public discourse on the state of the *res publica*,

---

[71] F. Millar, "The Political Character of the Classical Roman Republic, 200-151 BC," *JRS* 74 (1984), 1-19.; Millar, *The Crowd in Rome in the Late Republic*, 1-7.

[72] Ibid.,, 73-93.

[73] Mouritsen, *Plebs and Politics in the Late Roman Republic*, 38-62.

[74] Morstein-Marx, *Mass Oratory and Political Power in the Late Roman Republic*, 5.

[75] Ibid., 19.

[76] Ibid., 273-278.

foreign affairs, etc.[77] More often than not, this discourse promoted no alternative political ideologies, but rather alternative rhetorical personae, presenting a threat only to the careers of individual politicians, rarely the *res publica*.[78] The end result of the *contio* reproduced the republican system and consolidated elite power, even if the individual political actors changed. Given mass oratory's power to shape both public discourse and political success, controlling the physical environs for the *contio* became a viable political approach. Through this process, the Forum became a contested space, both physically and ideologically. Physical control of the Forum, home to both the *comitia tributa* and the *contio*, was tantamount to control of both public discourse and the legislative process.

The Demonstrations

With these preconditions in place, political violence within the Forum became more and more typical as a strategy for political success. A number of different studies have examined in depth the phenomenon of political violence in the late Republic.[79] Here, I wish to consider political violence vis-à-vis the topography of the Forum to better understand the spatial dynamics of these mass demonstrations. In doing so, I wish to examine the following issues: 1) The composition and mechanisms of a demonstration. What sorts of individuals participated in these demonstrations? How was a demonstration mobilized? Were they orchestrated or

---

[77] Morstein-Marx, *Mass Oratory and Political Power in the Late Roman Republic*, 202-203.

[78] Ibid., 276-277.

[79] Andrew Lintott's *Violence in the Roman Republic* is the classic text. Paul Vanderbroeck focuses on the organization and mobilization of popular demonstrations, while Wilfred Nippel treats the repression of political violence. See A. Lintott, *Violence in Republican Rome* (Oxford: OUP, 1999); W. Nippel, *Public Order in Ancient Rome* (Cambridge: CUP, 1995); P. J. J. Vanderbroeck, *Popular Leadership and Collective Behavior in the Late Roman Republic (ca. 80-50 B.C.)* (Amsterdam: Gieben, 1987).

spontaneous? At what types of events did they frequently take place? 2) The process of a

demonstration. Where exactly in the Forum did demonstrators tend to gather? How did

demonstrators interact with different elements of the Forum? How did they alter the Forum? 3)

The purpose of a demonstration. What did demonstrations seek to achieve, both in the short

and long term? Cui bono? Can these objectives be mapped onto the Forum itself? This holistic

approach to demonstrations can help us better understand the Forum as the epicenter for

political violence.

Makeup and Mechanisms of Demonstration

The demographics of demonstrations at Rome are notoriously difficult to disentangle.

Elite rhetoric sought to downplay the status of those who participated in demonstrations,

especially if they supported a rival politician. Thus, for Cicero, all of Clodius's supports were

nothing more than slaves and gladiators.[80] Cicero even goes so far in his private letters as to

associate the contional crowd in general with the "filth and shit of the city".[81] This sort of

rhetoric also tends to blur the distinction between different low-status social groups and, at

worst, it attributes servile or foreign status to large numbers or, at best, describes them en

masse as the *populus Romanus* or the like. In seeking to establish a level of civic knowledge of

the contional crowd, Morstein-Marx points to another possible conflation: equating the

contional crowd with the violent crowd.[82] He argues that the crowd that assembled for a *contio*

was not necessarily the same group that committed violence. Yet in seven of ten instances of

---

[80] Vanderbroeck, Popular Leadership and Collective Behavior in the Late Roman Republic (ca. 80-50 B.C.), 90-1; P. A. Brunt, "The Roman Mob," *P&P* 35 (1966), 23-5.
[81] Cic. *Att.* 1.16.11.
[82] Morstein-Marx, *Mass Oratory and Political Power in the Late Roman Republic*, 128-9.

violence at a late Republican *contio* in the Forum, the crowd that has already assembled becomes violent.[83] This is not to say that the crowd gathered at a *contio* was always prone to violence, but rather that the contional assembly was capable of turning into a demonstration.[84] Given that the magistrate who called the *contio* was the first to know of the meeting, presumably he had the most time to mobilize his supporters and construct a favorable crowd.[85] At the same time, once opponents learned about the impending *contio*, they could begin to mobilize their own supporters, resulting in some of the clashes in the Forum attested in our sources. Exploring this process of mobilization can help us disentangle the composition of a demonstration in the Forum, whether the venue was a *contio*, trial, or legislative assembly.

One method of mobilization involved tapping into the networks of the *vici*, the neighborhood organizations in Rome. These neighborhood units are first attested in the political sphere in support of Marius Gratidianus's proposition to improve standards for coinage in 85 B.C., although Harriet Flower argues convincingly that Tiberius Gracchus tapped into these networks during his campaign for reelection as tribune of the plebs.[86] The *Commentariolum*

---

[83] For these demonstrations, see Vanderbroeck, *Popular Leadership and Collective Behavior in the Late Roman Republic (ca. 80-50 B.C.)* appendix B-8, B-11, B-21, B-25, B-27, B-37, B-67.

[84] Terms like *polloi, demos, plethos, universus populus Romanus, populus*, etc. suggest an undifferentiated mass of people, although in a few of these instances smaller (*homines, operae, improbi*) are singled out. On the concept of a contional crowd and its make-up, see Morstein-Marx, *Mass Oratory and Political Power in the Late Roman Republic*, 128-136; Mouritsen, *Plebs and Politics in the Late Roman Republic*, 39-46; Vanderbroeck, *Popular Leadership and Collective Behavior in the Late Roman Republic (ca. 80-50 B.C.)*, 86-93. Vanderbroeck stresses the role of shopkeepers and artisans in demonstrations, perhaps unduly so, while Morstein-Marx and Mouritsen call for a more variable composition of the audience.

[85] Morstein-Marx, *Mass Oratory and Political Power in the Late Roman Republic*, 131.

[86] After his death, the *vici* organized cults for Gratidianus. See J. B. Lott, *The Neighborhoods of Augustan Rome* (Cambridge: CUP, 2004), 48-9. Tiberius Gracchus's varied mobilization strategies depended on day-to-day practicalities. While seeking election to a second tribunate, he was forced to turn to the *vici* to mobilize supporters. See H. Flower, "Beyond the *Contio:* Political Communication in the Tribunate of

Petitionis suggests such a strategy, advising the politician to court the *principes* of low-status social groups, a category into which the *vicomagistri* certainly fall.[87] The networks of the *vici* were particularly useful in organizing demonstrations since they came ready-made and did not have to be built from scratch. Thus, they could be mobilized on relatively short notice. The fact that they were located within the city limits also made them increasingly attractive to those organizing demonstrations, especially the prompt counter-demonstrations that resulted in violence between two sides. However, as the *Commentariolum Petitionis* suggests, these networks needed to be cultivated and courted before they joined in a demonstration. Clodius was known to have tapped into this network and organized the celebration of the *Compitalia*, although it was still outlawed at the time.[88] Shortly thereafter, he was able to mobilize the *vici* to participate in an occupation of the Temple of Castor during a vote on the reinstatement of the *collegia*.[89] The *vicus* had now become a smaller organizational unit for mobilizing larger parts of the urban plebs.

The *collegia* provided another avenue for mobilization. Like the *vici*, they offered a ready-made network that could be mobilized quickly. Legislation enacted against the *collegia* suggests that they were considered a threat to the status quo and were active participants in demonstrations.[90] The well-known, but infrequently attested, act of closing the *tabernae*

Tiberius Gracchus," in *Community and Communication: Oratory and Politics in Republican Rome*, eds. C. Steel and H. van der Blom (Oxford: OUP, 2013), 94-98.

[87] *Comm. Pet.* 30.

[88] Asc. 7C; Cic *Pis.* 8, 23.

[89] See Vanderbroeck, *Popular Leadership and Collective Behavior in the Late Roman Republic (ca. 80-50 B.C.)* appendix B-41.

[90] In 64 B.C. a senatorial decree outlawed subversive *collegia*. After the repeal of the ban in 58 B.C., Caesar as dictator passed another *lex de collegiis* in 46 B.C. after Caelius and Dolabella used them to

appears to be related to the mobilization of *tabernarii* and *opifices*, both types of people who

were likely members of a *collegium*.[91] Once the *tabernae* surrounding the Forum were closed,

tabernarii and *opifices* were free to participate in a demonstration. Similar to the mobilization of

the *vici*, the greatest advantage of mobilizing the *collegia* may have been their proximity,

especially if their *tabernae* were located in or around the Forum. They could provide a sudden

and disruptive force to an otherwise uneventful gathering in the Forum.[92] Still, members of the

collegia did not participate in demonstrations without good cause; particular interests led them

to ally themselves with certain politicians.[93] Once again, Clodius was notorious for his use of

these tactics, but he was neither the first nor the last to mobilize the *collegia*.[94] These rough-

and-ready organizational units provided a solid foundation for a larger demonstration.

If an organizer had enough advanced notice, more likely for a legislative assembly, less

likely for a *contio*, then he could search outside of Rome for able bodies to stock his

demonstration. Tiberius Gracchus provides the most famous example, but even the champion of

---

organize demonstrations. See Vanderbroeck, *Popular Leadership and Collective Behavior in the Late Roman Republic (ca. 80-50 B.C.)*, 154; Z. Yavetz, *Julius Caesar and His Public Image* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1983), 85-96.

[91] For the strategy behind issuing a *iustitium* and closing shops, see Vanderbroeck, *Popular Leadership and Collective Behavior in the Late Roman Republic (ca. 80-50 B.C.)*, 126-7. Too much emphasis may be placed on the role of the *iustitium* in mobilizing demonstrations, see Morstein-Marx, *Mass Oratory and Political Power in the Late Roman Republic*, 129.

[92] Cic. *Flacc.* 18.

[93] Brunt suspects that those who joined Clodius's violent demonstrations must have had real grievances in order to risk injury and death for his cause. These grievances could be as basic as lack of foodstuffs. During a particularly severe famine in 41 B.C., demonstrators drove all the magistrates from the Forum, without any explicit elite leadership (App. *Bell. Civ.* 5.18). See Brunt, *The Roman Mob*, 24-25.

[94] For Clodius's relationship with the *collegia,* see J. Tatum, *The Patrician Tribune: Publius Clodius Pulcher* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1999), 142-8. Of course, not all the *collegia* necessarily allied themselves with one politician. Cicero mentions *collegia* as one of the groups that support his return from exile (Cic. *Dom.* 74). For mobilization and organization of *collegia* in demonstrations, see Vanderbroeck, *Popular Leadership and Collective Behavior in the Late Roman Republic (ca. 80-50 B.C.)*, 112-3.

agrarian reform was unable to mobilize the rural populace every time he required its support.[95]

In all of these instances, Gracchus was attempting to mobilize the rural citizens either to vote in

the popular assemblies for his proposals or to vote for his reelection to the tribunate. For other

types of gatherings that did not require citizen status, there was no need to be quite as

discerning. Of course, from the perspective of an elite politician like Cicero, there were both

respectable and disreputable elements that could be brought in from the countryside and even

further afield. On the one hand there were the resident foreigners, unable to vote, but still able

to participate in the *contiones*, perhaps for a day's wage. Cicero specifically attributes

disruptions in the *contiones* to these sorts of men, even if this bit of rhetorical flourish is meant

to discredit opponents' supporters.[96] Opposite these "disruptive" types, Cicero brags that

twenty thousand *equites* (perhaps a bit of rhetorical flourish here as well) from all over Italy

gathered in the Forum to support his return from exile.[97] Shortly thereafter, at a *contio* in the

Forum, a group of Clodius's claquers harassed Hortensius and Curio for their participation in the

equites' demonstration.[98] This particular back-and-forth demonstration and counter-

demonstration is emblematic of the diverse methods of shaping public discourse through

gatherings in the Forum.

---

[95] Seeking reelection to the tribunate, Tiberius Gracchus was unable to mobilize his rural supporters due to their participation in the harvest during the summer. See Flower, *Beyond the Contio: Political Communication in the Tribunate of Tiberius Gracchus*, 96.

[96] Cic. *Flacc.* 17.

[97] See Vanderbroeck, *Popular Leadership and Collective Behavior in the Late Roman Republic (ca. 80-50 B.C.)* appendix B-43.

[98] Dio Cass. 38.16.5.

26

The last groups I wish to examine are the *operae*, *manus*, and *cheira*: the hired bands. In most cases, these appear to be small groups of armed retainers loyal to a particular politician.[99] These bands served two essential functions: first, they were often involved with the recruitment and organization of the first three categories of demonstrators, and second, they formed the backbone of a demonstration, doing the dirty work that others may have been hesitant to. Given the relationship attested between the *operae* and the mobilization of larger gatherings, many members of the *operae* likely fell into Vanderbroeck's category of intermediate leaders, the lower-status individuals who possessed wide networks across the city.[100] Once the demonstration was underway, these bands incited the assembled crowd towards violent and harassing actions and saw to the most necessary tasks themselves.[101] Since these bands were well-armed, opposing demonstrators stood little chance of preventing one of them from seizing its objective, such as the *pontes* or the speaker's platform.[102] While the majority of the crowd participated as more passive bystanders or a physical barrier in its own right, the *operae* provided the muscle for the demonstration and made sure that their side controlled the key parts of the Forum.

Now that we have looked at who attended these demonstrations and each of their roles, we need to examine when these demonstrations turned violent. Were certain types of gatherings more prone to violence? Between the years 78 and 50 B.C., Vanderbroeck records

---

[99] For the composition of these bands, see Lintott, *Violence in Republican Rome*, 83-5.

[100] Vanderbroeck, *Popular Leadership and Collective Behavior in the Late Roman Republic (ca. 80-50 B.C.)*, 52-66 Vanderbroeck suspects that *operae* is often a derogatory term for *collegia* (Ibid., 115).

[101] Ibid., 150-2.

[102] Prior to a vote on Cicero's recall, Pompey's *cheira* forced Clodius's supporters from the Forum. See Ibid., appendix B-57.

thirty-seven instances of violent interactions between opposing groups within the Forum.[103] Of these, trials (12), *contiones* (10), and legislative assemblies (8) are most often attested as violent. Within Vanderbroeck's range, two funerals also become violent, although Caesar's falls outside of his examination. The remaining five violent events happened outside of a formal gathering, but they primarily consist of clashes between rival groups along the Sacra Via. Although the sample size is somewhat small and we cannot know the exact frequency of each type of event, the distribution of violent occurrences is roughly equal between the first three types of formal gatherings. However, the type of violence at each varied. In six of the attested instances at trials, smaller bands of individuals, *operae* and the like, disrupted, harassed, or threatened speakers or members of the jury.[104] Even when larger demonstrations took place at trials, usually they consisted of similar actions and in only one case did physical violence break out.[105] Thus, it appears that trials, although open to the public, did not draw a crowd of a particularly significant size and it was possible to disrupt them with only a small group of retainers. In the context of the *contiones* and the legislative assemblies, action from only a small section of the gathering is attested in just two of the eighteen instances.[106] On the whole, it appears that a larger part of the crowd participated at some level in the violence of the *contio* and legislative assembly. From a perspective of crowd control and maintenance of public order,

---

[103] Vanderbroeck, Popular Leadership and Collective Behavior in the Late Roman Republic (ca. 80-50 B.C.), appendix B-2, B-3, B-8, B-9, B-11, B-13, B-15, B-16, B-18, B-21, B-25, B-27, B-30, B-31, B-34, B-37, B-44, B-49, B-51, B-52, B-57, B-62, B-64, B-65, B-67, B-72, B-73, B-75, B-78, B-79, B-80, B-83, B-84, B-86, B-87, B-88, B-89.
[104] Ibid., appendix B-15, B-16, B-18, B-49, B-65, B-83.
[105] Ibid., appendix B-89.
[106] Ibid., appendix B-44, B-57.

these larger gatherings would be more difficult to contain and the consequences would be more disruptive if violence did occur.

When these demonstrations occurred, to what degree were they planned or spontaneous? Much of the mobilization process suggests that many demonstrations were planned well in advance. To begin with, claquers, with their elaborate chants and jeers, had to be recruited and instructed how to respond to particular cues from the speaker.[107] Armed bands had to be equipped beforehand and given targets. During the vote on the *lex Pupia Valeria de incestu*, Clodius's *operae* targeted and occupied the voting bridges, distributing only tablets with an "A" for *antiquo*.[108] All of this, including the tablets, must have been prepared well beforehand. In the case of larger demonstrations, it would take time to assemble enough bodies to pack the Forum. The threat of ejection led to further escalation and preemptive occupation of the Forum, sometimes long before the actual proceedings took place. The tribune Aquilius Gallus took drastic measures to ensure that he would be present in the Forum to oppose legislation. Seeking to frustrate Pompey and Crassus's attempt to obtain Spain and Syria as their *provinciae* and fearing that he would be barred from entering the Forum in the morning, he occupied the Curia overnight.[109] But his attempt was in vain, as his rival Trebonius locked him in the building before the proceedings started. Cicero, in his Fourth Catilinarian, describes the measures in place to protect the meeting of the Senate during the conspiracy: "Full is the Forum, full the temples around the Forum, full all the approaches to this temple [the Temple of

---

[107] Dio Cassius describes Clodius's claquers as *tinon propareskeuasmenon* "some who were prepared for it" (Dio Cass. 38.16.5).
[108] Cic. *Att.* 1.14.5.
[109] Dio Cass. 39.35.4.

Jupiter Stator] and place".[110] Several sources indicate some of the *equites* who joined this crowd were armed.[111] Such measures were not spontaneous, but instead were highly calculated moves designed to prevent rival politicians and their supporters from ever setting foot in the Forum.

A minority of demonstrations appear to have been truly spontaneous. Usually these involved shortages of food within the city. Appian records one such instance in 41 B.C. during which the crowd explicitly rejected the involvement of any magistrate: "the people closed their shops and drove the magistrates from their places, thinking that they had no need of magistrates or crafts in a city suffering from want and robbery".[112] It must be stressed that this type of demonstration belongs in the minority. At the same time, particular aspects of a demonstration unfolded unexpectedly or were at least meant to appear spontaneous. In certain cases, the trick seems to have been not to allow an opponent enough time to mobilize his own supporters. Clodius appears to have used a proclamation of *iustitium*, a right of the tribunes, to suddenly close the *tabernae* around the Forum, thus allowing his supporters among the shopkeepers to quickly rally to the Forum without opposition.[113] After Clodius's death and during Milo's trial, the tribune Munatius called for the *tabernae* to be closed on the following day and for supporters to gather at the trial to ensure that Milo's conviction went forward.[114] In this instance, Munatius may have tipped his hand too early and Pompey was forced to station

---

[110] Cicero, *Cat.* 4.7.14.
[111] Sall. *Cat.* 49.4.
[112] App. *Bell. Civ.* 5.18.
[113] Cic. *Dom.* 54. All three instances of a *iustitium* in Livy prompt instant responses (Livy 3.27.2; 4.31.9; 9.7.8).
[114] Asc. 40C.

soldiers around the Forum to keep public order and frustrate the attempted demonstration.[115]

Even if one group of supporters did manage to occupy the Forum first, their hold on it could still

be challenged. Forced from the Forum after proposing legislation against electoral bribery, the

consul Calpurnius Piso rallied his own band of followers and drove off the opposing party in

order to pass the proposition.[116] This suggests that politicians, if caught unaware, could tap their

networks at a moment's notice and produce a counter-demonstration capable of challenging

the original one. While sometimes the crowd acted spontaneously, more often than not

individual politicians or groups with similar interests mobilized followers to achieve domination

of the Forum.

From this overview, we can draw two important conclusions: 1) no fixed group of the

plebs contionalis participated in all demonstrations, and 2) magistrates were usually responsible

for organizing demonstrations to achieve their own ends. The ancient sources emphasize again

and again the role of high-status leadership in popular demonstrations.[117] This is not to say that

an ignorant crowd blindly followed their social betters. Instead, Yavetz aptly describes the

situation: "democracy did not exist in Rome, but popular pressure did."[118] This political climate

fostered a give-and-take between individual politician and larger social groups. Top leaders had

to respond to particular interests among their followers while at the same time cultivating a

group of supporters who would visibly support them at crucial moments in the Forum. The

---

[115] Asc. 41C.

[116] Asc. 74-76C; Dio Cass. 36.38.

[117] Vanderbroeck proposes a tiered system, with elite politicians at the top, such as the Gracchi, Pompey, Caesar, Cicero, and Clodius. Assistant leaders consisted of low-level magistrates and tribunes, while intermediate leaders were the heads of *collegia, vici,* and other units of mobilization (Vanderbroeck, Popular Leadership and Collective Behavior in the Late Roman Republic (ca. 80-50 B.C.), 23-66).

[118] Z. Yavetz, *Plebs and Princeps* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1969), 39.

different strategies that magistrates used to organize followers point to the wide range of groups that participated in demonstrations.[119] This was a dynamic system in which the process of mobilization could change based on shifting political allegiances or basic, day-to-day practicalities.[120] It is hard to imagine any particular demonstration being completely homogenous. Instead, different groups and individuals participated according to their own reasons. However, demonstrations within the Forum were never intended to threaten the structure of the *res publica*. Alternative forms of government were never proposed; instead, successful (or unsuccessful) demonstrations reconfigured the networks of elite power.[121] They promoted one politician or a group of politicians at the expense of others.

Topography of a Demonstration

The Forum was not a blank, open area, but had a varied topography that in certain places possessed strategic and/or symbolic value. This section aims to examine two questions: 1) within the Forum, where did demonstrators focus their efforts and 2) what alterations were made to the Forum during a demonstration? For the most part, demonstrations tended to

---

[119] Mouritsen dismisses the idea of a unified, politically active section of the citizenry (Mouritsen, *Plebs and Politics in the Late Roman Republic*, 39-46). In terms of paying supporters to show up to the Forum, Tatum suggests not so much that it was a bribe, but that it was compensation for the loss of a day's wages (Tatum, *The Patrician Tribune: Publius Clodius Pulcher*, 143).

[120] In an attempt to postpone the consular elections of 55 B.C. so Pompey and Crassus would not be elected, Cato convened a *contio*. Opposite Cato, Clodius spoke to the crowd on Pompey's behalf. Throughout the course of this exchange, the crowd switched sides several times, threatening opposing speakers in turn (Dio Cass. 39.27.3-29.3; Val. Max. 6.2.6). The rhetorical component of the *contio* was not an empty gesture, but actually impacted the crowd.

[121] Even the most disruptive demonstrations often led to the political rise of the individuals who fostered them, such as Antony's political success after Caesar's funeral. Such a strong display of public support made the Senate hesitate to oppose these leaders. But their ultimate goal appears to have remained within a republican framework. See Morstein-Marx, *Mass Oratory and Political Power in the Late Roman Republic*, 280.

congregate around access points to the Forum and around the speakers' platforms, i.e. the

Rostra or the podium of the Temple of Castor. Given that mass oratory and voting both took

place in the same locations, one of the speaker's platforms in the Forum, these places in

particular became hotly contested. The easiest way to prevent a speaker from ever making his

way to the platform was to ensure that he never made it into the Forum. As a speaker might

bring a large number of his own followers as in the counter-demonstrations described above,

the entrances to the Forum became natural choke-points that could be fortified to prohibit

entry. At the same time, control over the speaker's platform ensured control over the public

discourse created during meetings. But from a more practical standpoint, the speaker's platform

also offered an elevated vantage point which could be used to direct a demonstration and also

fortified against seizure.[122] Thus, when demonstrators made modifications to the Forum, they

were aimed at prohibiting access, whether through constructing ad hoc barriers around key

access points, or through the destruction of platform steps. Let us turn to specific examples to

see how this played out in practice.

One access point in particular appears more often in our sources than others. The Sacra

Via was especially significant due to its connection with the nearby aristocratic houses, a

frequent mobilization point for supporters.[123] Magistrates proceeded along this route with an

escort when performing a *deductio*, a frequent procession that demonstrated the magistrate's

---

[122] It is interesting to note that basilicas were never targets of a demonstration, despite possessing commanding views across the Forum. This further suggests that the strategic and symbolic value of controlling the speaker's platform outweighed any strategic advantage a basilica might offer.

[123] Aristocratic households served as mobilization points for demonstrators, who would then proceed en masse to the Forum. These households could be stocked with weaponry, as Milo's house on the Clivus Capitolinus allegedly was (Cic. *Mil.* 64).

importance by means of the number of individuals who accompanied him.[124] Control of this route, described as narrow and hence a natural bottleneck, went a long way in limiting access to the Forum.[125] Sallust records an instance of a *deductio* turned violent that occurred in 75 B.C. The two consuls were leading their favored candidate for the praetorship down the Sacra Via when the crowd, angered by the high price of corn, assailed them and forced them back into the nearby *domus* of Octavius.[126] Another clash took place in 52 B.C. between the supporters of Milo and the supporters of P. Plautius Hypsaeus, both candidates for the consulate that year.[127] During this skirmish, Cicero had to take cover in the Regia, suggesting that the engagement took place on the eastern edge of the Forum.[128] Each side was evidently trying to prohibit its opponent from entering the Forum, likely for a *contio* called by Milo or Cicero, given that the two were traveling together.[129] The physical mass of the crowd was itself a barrier to entering the Forum. In an attempt to speak against Caesar's agrarian bill, Cato tried in vain to force his way through the middle of the crowd and was promptly ejected. His second attempt, this time from another entrance, was equally unsuccessful.[130] Second to the Sacra Via, the Clivus Capitolinus also witnessed its fair share of disturbances; the supporters of popular tribunes

---

[124] O'Sullivan, *Walking in Roman Culture*, 54-64. Lintott points out that in the context of the Sacra Via, there is a fine line between *deductio* performed with clients and a demonstration supported by *operae* (Lintott, *Violence in Republican Rome*, 74-85).

[125] App. *Bell. Civ.* 5.68.1.

[126] Sall., *H.* 2.45M.

[127] Asc. 48C.

[128] Cic. *Mil.* 37.

[129] See Dio Cass 40.48 on cancellation of the election due to violence.

[130] App. *Bell. Civ.* 2.11.

occupied it twice and the *equites* fortified it during the Catilinarian conspiracy.[131] Control of

these routes was the opening move in an occupation of the Forum.

Demonstrations repeatedly centered on a select few locations within the Forum. The

Rostra and the Temple of Castor, both equipped with speaker's platforms, played a central role

during demonstrations. A dedicated speaker's platform from its inception, the Rostra were

originally designed for addressing an assembly in the Comitium and was only later converted to

address larger crowds gathered in the Forum. Twice in *in Verrem* Cicero refers to the Temple of

Castor as a *locus celeberrimus* and mentions the gathering of the *populus Romanus* before it.[132]

Before Augustus, this temple was the second most frequent location for the meeting of the

contiones, therefore another key locus for the interaction between Senate and people.[133]

Verbally harassing or supporting a speaker on the platform offered one of the most basic ways

to participate in a demonstration.[134] The area immediately around the platform must have been

prime real estate for demonstrators, who, if they arrived early enough, could pack the space and

act as intermediaries between the assembled crowd and the speaker.[135] The practice of face-to-

face politics left individual magistrates and senators exposed to the crowd as they made their

way through the Forum to the Curia, Rostra, etc.[136] A preemptive crowd could prevent a speaker

---

[131] Cic. *Rab. Perd*. 31; Asc. 45C; Cic. *Att.* 2.17; *Sest.* 28; *Phil.* 2.16, 19.

[132] Cicero, *In Verr.* 2.1.129, 2.5.186.

[133] Morstein-Marx, *Mass Oratory and Political Power in the Late Roman Republic*, 50.

[134] For instance, Vanderbroeck, *Popular Leadership and Collective Behavior in the Late Roman Republic (ca. 80-50 B.C.)* appendix B-3, B-21, B-25, B-31, B-44. Dio (36.30.3-4) records one particularly amusing incident during which the demonstrators were so loud that a raven flying overhead was shocked by the noise and plummeted into the crowd. On a more realistic note, at the same *contio*, the noise of the crowd forced the tribune L. Roscius to resort to hand gestures to signal his disapproval of the proposed bill.

[135] Morstein-Marx, *Mass Oratory and Political Power in the Late Roman Republic*, 165-6.

[136] Millar, *The Crowd in Rome in the Late Republic*, 39.

from even ascending to the platform.[137] Once the speech began, if the demonstrators were particularly hostile, the speaker had the option of publicly conceding to the views of his opponents or risk being physically removed from the platform.[138] If the crowd surrounding the platform was comprised of supporters from opposing sides, a struggle for the platform was a distinct possibility.[139] When Caesar as consul proposed new agrarian laws, Bibulus and his followers struggled with Caesar's followers over control of the podium, which ended with Bibulus's disgraceful withdrawal and numerous injuries to his side.[140] Demonstrations ensured that no one magistrate held a monopoly on the speaker's platform without a fight.

The physical mass of the crowd itself was not the only method of barring access. When the tribune Dolabella proposed measures in 47 B.C. regarding debt and property rents, the assembled crowd erected barriers and some towers around the entrances to the Forum before the vote took place.[141] Such impromptu barricades must have left the Forum stripped of most portable objects. It is easy to imagine that statues, benches, and market stalls, piled high, would have made formidable barriers.[142] In this instance, Dolabella's gathering did battle with Antony's

---

[137] Even a small band, strategically positioned near a speaker's platform, could prohibit someone from ascending it, such as when the tribune Sestius attempted to mount the Temple of Castor to declare unfavorable omens, but was prohibited by *manus* supporting Clodius (Cic. *Sest.* 79-80).

[138] After accusing Caesar of participating in the Catilinarian conspiracy, Lucius Vettius was almost torn to pieces by the crowd in front of the Rostra (Sue. *Iul.* 17).

[139] Cic. *Q. fr.* 2.3.2. Diodorus Siculus (34/35.6.2) offers a particularly vivid account of a clash between the supporters of Tiberius Gracchus and Marcus Octavius in 133 B.C. Amidst the turmoil, the battle lines of the opposing parties formed patterns like waves and billowing clouds.

[140] Dio Cass. 38.6.1-3.

[141] Dio Cass. 42.32.3.

[142] During the Flavian supporters' occupation of the Capitoline in 69 A.D., statues were piled high to blockade the routes up the hill (Tact. Hist 3.71; Dio Cass. 42.18). Demonstrators often targeted statues for destruction, especially those with negative connotations. After Caesar's victory at Pharsalus, demonstrators smashed the statues of Sulla and Pompey located on the Rostra (Sue. *Iul.* 75.4). During

troops and had to yield the Forum, although not before inflicting some casualties on the soldiers.[143] During most instances when a crowd occupied the Forum overnight, it is likely that they spent some of the time preparing barriers to keep opponents out come morning.[144] In addition to the construction of barriers, other elements of the Forum were targeted for destruction. In particular, key access points to the Forum's elevated platforms became choice targets. Without the *pontes*, citizens were unable to cast their votes, so destruction of these wooden walkways became one strategy for disrupting the voting process.[145] Speaker's platforms were another target. Cicero, in an ironic passage of *De domo sua*, makes it explicit just how effective occupying the podium of the Temple of Castor could be:

When you were having weapons carried into the Temple of Castor, you had of course no end in mind other than that of preventing anything being done by force! When you tore down and removed the steps of Castor, you then aimed to bar rash men from access and ascent to the temple, in order that you might be able to conduct business peacefully![146]

A significant part of the fortification involved the removal of the steps to prevent others from accessing the podium. Not only did Clodius's supporters control one of the best venues for addressing an assembled crowd, but they also controlled the Forum's "high ground", a strategic vantage point against potential counter-demonstrations. In a dispute over whether Pompey

---

Caesar's funeral, demonstrators added the tribune's benches to the pyre, suggesting that they were willing to employ during their demonstrations whatever the material was at-hand (App. *Bell. Civ.* 2.148).

[143] Plut. *Ant.* 9.2.

[144] Appian describes how Antony's supporters were able to rope off the Forum overnight much to the senate's surprise (App. *Bell. Civ.* 3.30). From a logistical standpoint, it makes sense to keep demonstrators busy during an overnight occupation, lest they lose steam and disperse.

[145] The quaestor Quintus Caepio's attempt to disrupt the vote on Saturninus's grain law employed this exact method (Auctor ad Heren. 1.21).

[146] Cic. *Dom*. 21.54.

should be recalled to deal with the Catilinarian conspiracy, Metellus and Caesar occupied the temple with an armed band and used it as their base of operations to control the entire Forum during voting.[147] All of these alterations, construction and destruction, were aimed at controlling access to key points in the Forum. Shaping and controlling movement through and into the Forum was critical to any successful demonstration.

Purposes of Demonstrations

Why stage demonstrations? Did they aim at reform, similar to those of the modern era? Ultimately, the majority of demonstrations aimed to provide some sort of political advantage to their organizers, whether through coercing voters, intimidating members of the jury, or disrupting a rival's speech. Only demonstrations over a shortage of grain lacked obvious political motives and even these may have been manipulated by scheming politicians.[148] Outside of these larger objectives, what were the immediate and short-term goals during a demonstration? Despite the variation in particular long-term aims, many demonstrations adhered to similar patterns. First and foremost, demonstrations focused on regulating movement in the Forum. Demonstrators looked to expel rival leaders and their supporters or prevent them from accessing the Forum, if they had not yet entered the area. But how did the occupation of the Forum become a viable political strategy? The occupation of physical space, especially public space laden with meaningful political symbols, makes a strong public claim.[149] As Favro has

---

[147] Plut. *Cato Min.* 27-29.

[148] For a political context for grain riots, including Clodius using rival Cicero as a scapegoat, see Vanderbroeck, *Popular Leadership and Collective Behavior in the Late Roman Republic (ca. 80-50 B.C.)* appendix B-60.

[149] Parkinson, *Democracy and Public Space: The Physical Sites of Democratic Performance*, 77-8, 146-7

convincingly argued, as a focal point for communal activity, the Forum was a container of Rome's collective consciousness.[150] Through the occupation of the Forum, the leaders of a demonstration appropriated these symbols and the collective consciousness they embodied. Orators were accustomed to incorporate physical environs of the Forum into their speeches and manipulate them to suit their own ends.[151] It is likely that leaders of a demonstration did the same. By controlling the chief communal space where public discourse was fashioned, they could claim to represent the will of the *populus Romanus*, who demonstrated their support through noise and numbers.[152] Through this claim, magistrates could justify their political decisions and shape this discourse further to their advantage. By the same standard, the *populus Romanus* had rejected opponents' positions, unless a larger (or better equipped) counter-demonstration removed the original one from the Forum. Because of its ability to shape public discourse, political success in the late Republic began to rely increasingly upon monopolizing the interaction between orator and crowd and, by extension, physically controlling through violence the location for interaction, the Forum.

Crowd Control in the late Republic

Numerous attempts were made to regulate these gatherings up through the end of the Republic, although none of them were wholly successful. Legal measures were explored as a potential solution. Some of these measures targeted the associations and gatherings that

---

[150] Favro, *The Roman Forum and Roman Memory*, 17

[151] Morstein-Marx, *Mass Oratory and Political Power in the Late Roman Republic*, 92-107.

[152] Ibid., 131-6. Cicero (*Sest.* 106) argues that popularity can be measured at *contiones, comitia,* and gladiatorial and theatrical games, so long as bribery and coercion were absent (something he would never attribute to any gathering organized by Clodius).

facilitated large-scale demonstrations, while others outlawed certain types of demonstrations and persecuted those who enabled them. In addition to these legal measures, state-sanctioned violence was increasingly put to use to disperse particularly disruptive demonstrations.[153] Finally, fixed and semi-fixed architectural controls over movement and activity offered another alternative. This option included regulating access to public space and creating a more controlled environment for historically disruptive gatherings. While each of these measures addressed specific aspects of demonstrations, they only tangentially dealt with the Forum itself, the most frequent location for demonstrations.

Certain legal measures aimed to disrupt the mechanisms that mobilized demonstrations. From the 60s B.C. onwards, the *collegia* continued to appear more and more frequently at demonstrations. Asconius relates that at a trial in 66 B.C. a group of known gang leaders (*noti operarum duces*) threatened the prosecutors of a certain Cornelius.[154] Later, he also mentions that Cornelius's adherents were organized in *collegia*.[155] In an explicit response to this disturbance (and presumably earlier ones as well), the Senate decided in 64 B.C. to ban any *collegia* that had acted *adversus rem publicam*.[156] This ban also included the performance of the

---

[153] It was often difficult for the Romans in the late Republic to determine what acts of violence were in fact state-sanctioned and who was authorized to use force. Legal measures prohibited the use of force *adversus rem publicam*, adding little clarification. Still, there was an increasing trend towards the state's monopoly of violence, especially once Augustus solidified his position. See A. Riggsby, *Crime and Community in Ciceronian Rome* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1999), 112-9.

[154] Asc. 60C.

[155] Asc. 75C.

[156] Nippel, *Public Order in Ancient Rome*, 71-3. For types of *collegia* considered *adversus rem publicam*, see F. Salerno, "Collegia Adversus Rem Publicam?" in *Sodalitas. Scritti in Onore di A. Guarino* (Naples: Jovene, 1984), 615-631.

Compitalia, therefore also weakening the ability to mobilize demonstrators through the *vici*.[157]

The *contio* itself was even a target of legislation. Sulla's measures against the tribunes seem to have diminished the power of the *contio* and the interactions between people and politician that it fostered.[158] However, neither of these measures was particularly effective and both were repealed before too long.[159] In the case of the reinstatement of *collegia*, a demonstration forced the repeal, suggesting that the ban was seldom enforced to begin with.

Other measures took direct legal action against demonstrations. The *lex Lutatia de vi* of 78 B.C. and a later *lex Plautia*, passed before 63 B.C., made it illegal to carry arms with malicious intent, to gather *contra rem publicam*, or to seize public locations and temples.[160] These laws outlawed some of the most effective methods for demonstrators to control the Forum. Still, they did little to lessen the effectiveness of a demonstration. In part, the phrase *contra rem publicam* led to some ambiguity regarding damage to the state. Cicero's defense of Sestius emphasized that Sestius did mobilize followers for violent demonstration, but he was acting in defense of the state, rather than against it.[161] State and individual interests were difficult to disentangle, especially when the rhetoric of each side portrayed its actions as popular will.[162]

---

[157] Asc. 7, 75; Cic. Pis 8.

[158] Cicero, *Clu.* 40.110. Cicero claims that by 74 B.C. the people had grown unaccustomed to the *contiones*. See Millar, *The Crowd in Rome in the Late Republic*, 54 for interpretation.

[159] In the case of the restrictions on *contiones*, the specific moment of repeal is unknown. In 58 B.C., after his illegal celebration of the *Compitalia*, Clodius passed a law through the assembly that reinstated the banned *collegia* (Cic. *Pis.* 9).

[160] Evidence for the provisions of these earlier laws comes from the wording of the later *leges Iuliae de vi*. Contemporary sources (Asc. 55; Cic. *Cael.* 70) suggest that the earlier *lex Lutatia* and *lex Plautia* had similar phrases and likely similar clauses. See Lintott, *Violence in Republican Rome*, 114-5; Riggsby, *Crime and Community in Ciceronian Rome*, 82-3.

[161] Riggsby, Crime and Community in Ciceronian Rome, 89-97.

[162] Morstein-Marx, *Mass Oratory and Political Power in the Late Roman Republic*, 158-9.

And how could it not be, considering such a large group of demonstrators had gathered together to occupy the entire Forum? Even if the organizer of a demonstration was tried, the same set of tactics that brought him into court could procure his acquittal. Legal repercussions focused on the organizer instead of the demonstrators, partially due to the recognition that a lone individual was likely responsible for the demonstration, but also because no authority existed to disperse or arrest such a large gathering.[163] The ban on illegal weapons also only went so far, considering that in many violent demonstrations the mass of demonstrators equipped themselves with ad hoc instruments (stones, wood and such) rather than "true" weapons.[164] Thus the most effective method of curbing a demonstration remained repression through counter-demonstration. These legal attempts to regulate demonstrations represented a shift towards more formal methods of control, but without a body in place to enforce order, "justice" was still contingent upon self-policing.

In reaction to some of the more violent demonstrations, soldiers became increasingly responsible for restoring public order and dispersing demonstrators. After the destruction caused by the crowd at Clodius's funeral, Pompey was granted extraordinary powers in order to restore order.[165] Milo and several members from the Clodian side were successfully convicted under the laws against *vis* but this was only possible through a formal levy of troops.[166] The situation required that Pompey station soldiers within the Forum, especially during the final

---

[163] Nippel, *Public Order in Ancient Rome*, 54-6.
[164] Riggsby, *Crime and Community in Ciceronian Rome*, 115-6.
[165] Asc. 34, 2-6.
[166] M. C. Alexander, *Trials in the Late Roman Republic* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990), 151-165.; Nippel, *Public Order in Ancient Rome*, 80-1.

days of Milo's trials, when the judges specifically requested protection.[167] Despite all these preventative measures, the Clodian demonstrators and the troops still came to blows during these trials. Pompey ordered his soldiers to strike the demonstrators only with the flat of their swords, but they would not yield and continued to antagonize the soldiers, leading to further violence and fatalities.[168] The demonstration was still sufficiently successful, as the presence of crowd disconcerted Cicero enough that he delivered an uncharacteristically poor speech.[169] After Dolabella's supporters barricaded the Forum in 47 B.C., Antony as master of the horse dispatched soldiers to oust them from the space, with eight hundred casualties reported on the side of the demonstrators.[170] During a sustained demonstration over a shortage of grain, after toppling the statues of Caesar and Antony in the Forum, a crowd encircled Octavian, who was only saved because Antony cut his way through the crowd with a band of soldiers.[171] In each of these cases, despite lacking the weaponry of the soldiers, the demonstrators did not disperse or back down, but instead assaulted the troops, often with volleys of stones, suggesting that the demonstrators had fortified and prepared their position. These clashes between demonstrators and soldiers represent a shift in the repression of demonstrations. Prior to Pompey's intervention, counter-demonstrations battled demonstrations for control of the Forum. After 52 B.C., soldiers, acting under the orders of an individual invested with exceptional powers, established control over the space, often to the advantage of their commander.

---

[167] Asc. 41, 1-3; 50, 25; 40, 7-11.
[168] Dio Cass. 40.53.
[169] Dio Cass. 40.54.
[170] Livy, *Per.* 113.
[171] App. *Bell. Civ.* 5. 68-287-9; Dio Cass. 48.31.6.

Outside of legal means and the authorized use of force, some physical barriers were also in place for controlling and regulating moved in the Forum Romanum. Cicero twice makes mention of *cancelli* in the Forum. One reference is in the context of games, the other time he claims that the orator should be knowledgeable about everything within the limits of the "*forensibus cancellis*".[172] Presumably, the *cancelli* were temporary gates set up at the entrances to the Forum, especially when large gatherings took place within the Forum.[173] This was the authorized form of the barricade, erected to manage the flow of people throughout the Forum during high-traffic events. The aforementioned small pits (*pozzetti*) may have also played a role in managing a larger crowd, but once again, if they did support roped boundaries, they appear only to have been used during voting procedures to provide organization, but offered little inhibition to movement. The actions of Antony and Octavian, roping off the Forum overnight to prepare it for voting, suggest that this method of crowd control was still in use through the period of the Second Triumvirate.[174] However, the Augustan repaving of the Forum covered these pits and they ceased to have any further function.[175] Up to this point, architectural controls on movement in and through the Forum were limited to these sorts of temporary measures.

In the construction of the Forum Iulium, Caesar created a new, more controlled environment for the interaction between speaker and crowd. The Forum Iulium, originally conceived of as an addition to the Forum Romanum, furnished several solutions for dealing with

---

[172] Cic., *Sest*. 58.124; *De. Or*. 1.52.
[173] Newsome, *Movement and Fora in Rome (the Late Republic to the First Century CE)*, 301.
[174] App. *Bell. Civ*. 3.30.
[175] Newsome, Movement and Fora in Rome (the Late Republic to the First Century CE), 300.

crowds.[176] The bounded precinct design limited the points of access and facilitated the control of movement.[177] Appian explicitly describes Caesar's Forum as a place for transacting public business, to the exclusion of retail.[178] This effectively limited any sort of casual traffic in the forum. In contrast to the Forum Romanum, the Forum Iulium provided a highly-controlled environment for interactions between the dictator and those who gathered there.[179] With its high platform and lateral staircases, even the design of the podium offered security for the speaker and separation from the masses.[180] Further separation was achieved through the placement of a fountain to the Appiades nymphs in front of the temple podium.[181] At the same time, the central courtyard was still able to accommodate a decent-sized crowd and the complex was involved in Caesar's elaborate triumph in 46 B.C.[182] With its speaker's platform and central square, Caesar's Forum was designed to replace the Forum Romanum as the locus for interaction between politician and people. Its design, however, redefined the relationship between the two. The speaker was insulated and separated from the crowd, less likely to be removed from the platform by demonstrators below. The audience could be screened upon

---

[176] Ulrich notes that there is no indication that Caesar's project, in its initial conception, was independent from the Forum Romanum. See R. Ulrich, "Julius Caesar and the Creation of the Forum Romanum," *AJA* 97, no. 1 (Jan., 1993), 54.

[177] Delfino stresses the precinct-like nature of the Forum of Caesar through comparisons to the Porticus Octavia, the Porticus Metelli, and the portico complex of Pompey's Theater. Access in the first phase of the Forum of Caesar is especially limited, but a second phase (datable to 45-29 B.C.) opens the complex up to the Argiletum. See A. Delfino, "Il Foro di Cesare nella Fase Cesariana e Augustea," in *Giulio Cesare: l'uomo, le imprese, il mito*, ed. G. Gentili (Milan: Silvano, 2008), 52-54.

[178] App. *Bell. Civ.* 2.102.

[179] Drawing on accounts from Suetonius (*Iul.* 78) and Plutarch (*Caes.* 60), Ulrich sees the Forum of Caesar as a ceremonial precinct, where Caesar could interact with a large number of people in a controlled environment. See Ulrich, *Julius Caesar and the Creation of the Forum Romanum*, 77.

[180] Ibid., 75.

[181] Ibid., 77.

[182] Cass. Dio 43.22.

entry and any sort of counter-demonstration would be hard-pressed to storm the complex from all sides. This new environment hampered violent demonstrations through the nature of its design.

These late Republican trends were reacting to the prevalence and success of violent demonstrations. Each sought to curtail the power of the demonstration in the name of public order. But public order was still wrapped up in the game of politics, complete with its own winners and losers. Each was an attempt to limit an opponent's use of demonstrations, but many politicians who decried such practices had little problem using them to their own advantage.[183] However, a certain trend appears in the use of demonstrations. The demonstration and its power to upset the status quo was a tactic for those who had to act outside the traditional political process or those with a tenuous grasp on political power, the two not being mutually exclusive. Although he was involved in demonstrations in his early career, once Caesar secured the supreme office in the Republic, maintaining public order was in his best interest, as disturbances within the state now reflected exclusively on his ability and position. Unsure of where he stood after his commander's assassination, Antony considered it best to incite the crowd at Caesar's funeral, resulting in much destruction throughout the city and the spontaneous erection of a column and an altar at the site of Caesar's cremation in the Forum.[184] But at the same time, the demonstration made a show of popular support for the memory of Caesar and reaffirmed the political position of Antony and other ex-Caesarian lieutenants within the state. The demonstration was by no means finished as a political strategy.

---

[183] See Cicero's treatment of Sestius and Milo in Riggsby, *Crime and Community in Ciceronian Rome*, 89-97, 105-112.
[184] Sue. *Iul.* 85; App. *Bell. Civ.* 2.148.

Chapter 4: Rearranging the Topography of Demonstration: the Augustan Forum Romanum

The Forum Romanum- 14 A.D.

In 14 A.D., Tiberius, successor to Augustus, mounted the rostra attached to the Temple of Divine Caesar and pronounced the funeral eulogy for the now-deceased head of state. The funeral was a somber affair and after the eulogies, a procession of senators carried the body from the Forum Romanum to its final resting place on the Campus Martius.[185] Situated within the confines of the Forum, Augustus's funeral appears to embody the Augustan phenomenon that Richard Brilliant has described as the "progressive sacralization of the public space for ritualized performance".[186] But throughout the Republican period, the Forum had hosted the funerals of many leading aristocrats; what exactly made this one any different? To begin, Tiberius spoke not from the Rostra, but from the podium of the Temple of Divine Caesar, a creation of the Second Triumvirate. The original Rostra were no longer located adjacent to the Comitium, but instead a Caesarian construction augmented by Augustan renovations anchored the western end of the Forum. The steps of the Comitium, the initial arena for tribal voting, had been paved over and perhaps only a fence defined the limits of the area. These traditional loci for the interaction between people and politician had all been rearranged, modified, or replaced. The Augustan Forum Romanum looked significantly different from its late Republican predecessor. How did this spatial rearrangement impact the type of activities that took place

---

[185] Suet. *Aug.* 100. Unlike Caesar's body, Augustus's actually made it to the Campus Martius.

[186] R. Brilliant, "Review of Augustus. Kunst und Leben in Rom um Die Zeitenwende by Erika Simon; Kaiser Augustus und Die Verlorene Republik by Mathias Hofter Et Al.; the Power of Images in the Age of Augustus (Jerome Lectures Sixteenth Series) by Paul Zanker," *The Art Bulletin* 72, no. 2 (Jun., 1990), 329.

within the Augustan Forum Romanum? More specifically, how did this spatial rearrangement impact the effectiveness of the demonstration, a common occurrence in the late Republican Forum?

In this next section, I wish to examine the topographical changes made to the Forum Romanum through the lens of the popular demonstration. In the late Republic, physical control of the Forum was tantamount to political control of Rome. Augustus knew this lesson well. At the beginning of his political career, he had joined Antony and his followers in roping off and occupying the Forum in order to procure for Antony the governorship of Cisalpine Gaul.[187] But Augustus's meteoric rise quickly established him as one of the leading men of the state. Further demonstrations could only upset the status quo and threaten Augustus's position. To this end, the Augustan reordering of space in the Forum Romanum aimed to address the issue of demonstrations. In order to confirm this proposition, I want to produce a hypothetical demonstration within the Augustan Forum Romanum at several successive stages. As we saw in our Republican examples, demonstrations focused on certain places within the Forum and the regulation of movement coupled with the spatial dynamics of a demonstration played a large part in its success or failure. What happened to these places in the Augustan Forum Romanum and how would the architecture of the Forum affect the circulation of a large number of individuals gathered for a demonstration? If Augustus did aim to limit the effectiveness of demonstrations within the Forum, we should expect to find other mechanisms in place to promote public order in the Forum, similar to those established in the late Republic. For this reason, I will also consider how legal and social controls reinforced patterns of movement in the

---

[187] App. *Bell. Civ.* 3.30.

Forum. Working within this late Republican paradigm in which control of the Forum equaled control of Rome, Augustus's piecemeal architectural alterations to the area further reduced the effectiveness of demonstrations while strengthening his physical and symbolic control over the space.

First, let us consider the changes made to the Forum on the macro scale as it looked in 14 A.D. The relocation of the Caesarian Rostra to the western edge of the Forum, along with the creation of the speaker's platform on the Temple of Divine Caesar, shaped a new east-west axis for the Forum. This arrangement put focus on the central area of the Forum, where assemblies now gathered to listen to speakers, and deemphasized the two former gathering spots in front of the original Rostra of the Comitium and in front of the Temple of Castor.[188] A well-defined perimeter delineated the edges of this central space. Under Caesar, the refurbishment of the Basilica Aemilia and the construction of the Basilica Julia furnished the northern and southern sides of the Forum with unified colonnades.[189] Developments during the Augustan era further transformed the Forum into a more insulated space.[190] The completion of the Forum of Caesar and the later addition of the Forum of Augustus began to disassociate the Argiletum, one of the main entrances to the Forum, from the neighboring Suburra.[191] The Suburra was home to many plebeians and one particular disturbance in the Forum is not attributed to the plebs at large, but specifically to the *populus Suburanus*.[192] Each of these fora moved the popular forces of the Suburra further away from the Forum Romanum. Although it is difficult to determine the precise

---

[188] Taylor, *Roman Voting Assemblies*, 41.
[189] D. Favro, *The Urban Image of Augustan Rome* (Cambridge: CUP, 1996), 68-9.
[190] For isolation by design in Augustan building projects, see Ibid., 170-4.
[191] E. Tortorici, "Argiletum," in *LTUR*, 125-126.
[192] Gran. Lic. 22.

impact, the completion of the Forum of Caesar also reoriented the *Clivus Argentarius*, another route to the Forum Romanum.[193] The modifications did not suppress the street, thereby prohibiting access, but rather altered the approach and actively directed human movement.[194] Favro notes that other entrances similarly shaped the pedestrian's approach to the Forum.[195] These architectural constraints controlled and directed movement, guiding the pedestrian along a prescribed route. A close examination of particular routes will allow us to evaluate how exactly they impacted movement into the Forum.

The Eastern Side

By 14 A.D., a number of building projects had transformed completely the entrance to the Forum along the Sacra Via. As previously mentioned, prior to this transformation, the SE edge of the Forum was architecturally ill-defined, with the Regia and Atrium Vestae occupying a liminal zone between the Forum and the Palatine. Further east on the Sacra Via, the Fornix Fabianus was occasionally considered the eastern boundary for the Forum; however, the entrance to the Forum north of the Regia still lacked architectural definition.[196] This lack of definition made the Sacra Via a natural entryway into the Forum for large masses of people, including the traditional procession of the *deductio in Forum*, the triumphal parade, and finally, crowds of demonstrators. In contrast, the Augustan projects in this zone redefined the limit of

---

[193] For recent excavations in this area of the Forum, see R. Meneghini and R. Santangeli Valenzani, *I Fori Imperiali: Gli Scavi del Comune di Roma (1991-2007)* (Rome: Viviani, 2007), 32.

[194] Newsome, *Movement and Fora in Rome (the Late Republic to the First Century CE)*, 306. Newsome notes that Caesar's project, unlike the later Forum Transitorium, was hesitant to completely suppress a path to the Forum Romanum.

[195] Favro, *The Urban Image of Augustan Rome*, 199.

[196] Seneca, Dial. 2.1.3: "*a rostris usque ad arcem Fabianum*".

the Forum. By 14 B.C. at the latest, the Temple of Divine Caesar, flanked by an arch to the south

and a colonnaded entryway to the north, delineated the edge of the Forum along the Sacra Via

and articulated two primary entrances.[197] Both entryways into the Forum Romanum

distinguished the central plaza from the surrounding cityscape.[198] The unified facade of the

three monuments separated the more orderly Forum from the disorder of the city. To a person

passing through either entrance, this emphasis on formal order would be striking when

compared to the surrounding city.[199] The Forum was no longer a continuation of the city, it was

now something separate. Without the soft edge formerly articulated by the Regia and the Fornix

Fabianus, the pedestrian would be very much aware of this transition, especially given the

revelation of the Tablinum and Capitoline Hill on the other side.[200] For all intents and purposes,

the monumentalized Sacra Via was a gateway into the Forum.

While the final product created a unified architectural program, originally it was not

conceived as such and was developed piecemeal. Work on the Temple of Divine Caesar began in

42 B.C. under the triumvirs.[201] The location of Caesar's funeral pyre likely determined the

placement of the temple, but at the same time its central location at the eastern edge of the

Forum created a natural focal point, a culmination of the continuous colonnade created by the

---

[197] The identification of arches to the north and the south of the Temple of Divine Caesar are still a point of contention. For a succinct, yet thorough, overview of the arguments, see E. Nedergaard, "Arcus Augusti (a. 19 a.C.)," in *LTUR*, 81-85; E. Nedergaard, "Arcus Augusti (a. 29 a.C.)," in *LTUR*, 80-81.

[198] W. MacDonald, *The Architecture of the Roman Empire Volume II: An Urban Appraisal* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1986), 76-77. MacDonald also notes that the arch articulates passageway and guides movement, primarily into enclosed public space.

[199] Favro, *The Urban Image of Augustan Rome*, 221.

[200] In his categorization of passage architecture, MacDonald notes that arches are primarily located at nodal points that organize space and regulate traffic (MacDonald, *The Architecture of the Roman Empire Volume II: An Urban Appraisal*, 75).

[201] Cass. Dio 47.18.4.

two basilicas.[202] The responding Augustan Rostra on the west side of the Forum essentially

created a central courtyard, changing the dynamics of movement within the Forum.[203] Within

the central area of the Forum, crowds could gather to listen to a speaker on the rostrate

platform of the Temple of Divine Caesar.[204] The temple's design was quite similar to that of the

Temple of Venus Genetrix, one of the primary places for Caesar's interactions with the

people.[205] Lacking a frontal staircase, the podium was accessed via a pair of lateral stairs, one

located along the north side of the temple, the other the south.[206] This design offered security to

the speaker; the height of the platform (3.50 m.) physically separated the speaker and the

crowd and the narrow lateral stairs prohibited potential demonstrators from quickly gaining

access to the temple.[207] Furthermore, the lateral stairs, tucked away behind a screen of pillars,

allowed the speaker to ascend the platform without having to pass through the crowd in the

middle of the Forum, especially if the speaker was arriving from the Sacra Via, perhaps

descending from the Palatine Hill. This screen of pillars linked the temple platform to the

---

[202] Caesar's body was carried by the assembled crowd from the Rostra to the eastern part of the Forum where his pyre was constructed (App. *Bell. Civ.* 2.148). Other sources claim his body was burned at the foot of the Rostra (Livy, *Epit.* 116; Sue. *Iul.* 84). The spontaneous erection of an altar by the people on the east end of the Forum appears to support Appian's account. This early cult to Caesar would have informed the location of the temple built by the members of the Second Triumvirate. For location of the Temple of Divine Caesar, see R. Ulrich, *The Roman Orator and the Sacred Stage: The Roman Templum Rostratum* (Brussels: Latomus, 1994), 167-172. With this appearance of a continuous colonnade, the Forum now looked more like Vitruvius's prescribed vision for a forum (Vitr. 3.3.2).

[203] For distinction between through-space and destination space in Roman architecture, see E. Macaulay-Lewis, "The City in Motion: Walking for Transport and Leisure in the City of Rome," in *Rome. Ostia, Pompeii: Movement and Space*, eds. R. Laurence and D. Newsome (Oxford: OUP, 2011), 262-289.

[204] For architecture of Temple of Divine Caesar see P. Gros, "Iulius, Divus, Aedes," in *LTUR*, 116-119.. For Temple of Divine Caesar as speaker's platform, see Ulrich, *The Roman Orator and the Sacred Stage: The Roman Templum Rostratum*, 185-8.

[205] Ibid., 180.

[206] Gros, *Iulius, Divus, Aedes*, 118-119.

[207] Ulrich, *The Roman Orator and the Sacred Stage: The Roman Templum Rostratum*, 179.

adjacent Regia, which could have been used as a staging area for the speaker and his party.[208] All of this changed the dynamics between orator and crowd. In addition to increasing the theatricality of the speech through the speaker's sudden appearance on the platform, the design of the structure also limited the threat of the crowd. Unlike the Caesarian/Augustan iteration of the Rostra, where a speaker would have to expose himself to the crowd as he passed through the center of the Forum, the lateral stairs of the Temple of Divine Caesar, oriented towards the rear of the building, enabled a speaker to ascend the platform without having to enter the central area of the Forum. The position of the stairs eliminated the possibility of a mass of people gathered before the temple blocking the route and forbidding access to the platform, as was common during Republican demonstrations. The interaction between speaker and crowd still existed in the Forum Romanum, but now architectural constraints managed the crowd.

The celebration of Augustus's two triumphs, the Actian and Parthian victories, further shaped the SE edge of the Forum. The temple was only completed and dedicated in 29 B.C. as part of the Actian celebration. The arch to the south of the temple was built post-19 B.C. to mark the Parthian victory. Although the identification of the arch is still somewhat contested, the combination of archaeological, literary, and numismatic evidence suggests that the remains unearthed belong to the arch celebrating Augustus's Parthian victory. First, the surviving foundations indicate a triple-bay arch, eliminating the possibility that the foundations belong to

---

[208] R. T. Scott, "Excavations in the *Area Sacra* of Vesta, 1987-1989," in *Eius Virtutis Studiosi: Classical and Postclassical Studies in Memory of Frank Edward Brown (1908-1988)*, eds. R. T. Scott and A. R. Scott (Hanover, NH: University Press of New England, 1993), 164, n. 4.. Sometimes identified as the Porticus Julia. See G. Lugli, *Monumenti Minori del Foro Romano* (Rome: Bardi, 1947), 85-8.

the single-bay Augustan arch depicted on a series of coinage.[209] Following R. Gamberini

Mongenet's discovery of a pair of foundations just east of the foundations for the triple-bay

arch, some have proposed that these foundations originally supported an arch that

commemorated Augustus's triple triumph, then it was demolished or converted into a

monument to celebrate the Parthian victory; however, at least one of these two foundations is a

later addition, making such a transformation unlikely.[210] Coarelli's identification of the arch as

the Actian arch requires the re-dating of a series of coins in order to identify the single-bay arch

on Augustan coinage as the Naulochus arch and the triple-bay arch on the denarii of L. Vinicius

as the Actian arch.[211] This re-dating means that circa 16 B.C. provincial mints in Spain and

Pergamum were striking issues with the Parthian arch on the reverse, while in Rome L. Vinicius

was still producing Actian-arch denarii.[212] Given the significance of the Parthian victory for

Augustus, this too seems unlikely. Additionally, Nedergaard's careful investigation of the

architectural fragments, foundations, and numismatic evidence further suggests that the triple-

---

[209] On the grounds that Appian (*Bell. Civ.* 5.130) does not list the Naulochus arch among the honors that Augustus accepted from the senate, Rich concludes that the Naulochus arch was never erected (J. W. Rich, "Augustus's Parthian Honours, the Temple of Mars Ultor and the Arch in the Forum Romanum," *PBSR* 66 (1998), 106.) Rich also suggests that the coinage featuring a single-bay arch could either depict the Naulochus arch or the Actian arch, but the triple-bay arch must represent the Parthian arch (Ibid., 98-100).

[210] Nedergaard, *Arcus Augusti (a. 29 a.C.)*, 81; E. Carnabuci, "L'Angolo Sud-Orientale del Foro Romano nel Manoscritto Inedito di Giacomo Boni," *Atti Della Accademia Nazionale Dei Lincei* Memoire 9.1.4 (1991), 315-7. Rich's suggestion that the Actian arch was not demolished, but rather was redecorated seems unlikely given the literary testimony for the Parthian arch and the fact that not a single series of coins attests to a triple-bay Actian arch (Rich, *Augustus's Parthian Honours, the Temple of Mars Ultor and the Arch in the Forum Romanum*, 106-15). Like the Naulochus arch, Gurval questions whether the Actian arch was ever erected. See R. Gurval, *Actium and Augustus: The Politics and Emotions of Civil War* (Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 1995), 36-47.

[211] Coarelli, *Il Foro Romano (II): Periodo Repubblicano e Augusteo*, 258-68.

[212] F. Kleiner, "The Study of Roman Triumphal and Honorary Arches 50 Years after Kähler," *JRA* 2 (1989), 199.

bay arch should be identified as the Parthian arch.[213] This entranceway, celebrating one of Augustus's premier victories, articulated the triumphal route from the Sacra Via, through the Forum, and up to the Capitoline.[214] At the same time, the arch created a hard edge for the SE corner of the Forum.

The combination of the Temple of Divine Caesar and the Parthian arch completely reshaped the spatial dynamics of the Forum's eastern edge. This rearrangement pushed other buildings into the periphery, most notably the Temple of Castor, a traditional location for the *contio*, voting, and meeting place of the Senate. Designed with similar features (the speaker's platform, the lateral stairs), the Temple of Divine Caesar upstaged the Temple of Castor and replaced it as one of the primary focal points of the Forum.[215] Now, the physical presence of the Temple of Divine Caesar made it impossible for large crowds to gather in front of Castor. As a speaker's platform, it was essentially obsolete. Additionally, as attested by a meeting of the *concilium plebis* in 9 B.C., voting procedures were transferred from Castor to the platform of the Temple of Divine Caesar.[216] More importantly, the placement of Augustus's Parthian arch effectively limited access to one of Castor's lateral staircases. Throughout the late Republic, politicians and their followers had literally fought for control over the temple's stairs and platform. In all of these cases, politicians used the occupation of the temple's podium both as a

---

[213] Nedergaard makes a point-by-point refutation of the identification of the Parthian arch north of the Temple of Divine Caesar and the Actian arch south. See E. Nedergaard, "Facts and Fiction about the Fasti Capitolini," *ARID* 27 (2001), 113-9.. Dio (51.19.1) only notes that the senate voted an arch to Augustus for his victory at Actium, never mentioning that it was erected. A late antique scholiast (Schol. Veron. In Verg. Aen. 7.606) explicitly describes the arch as sited near the Temple of Divine Caesar ("*iuxta aedem divi Iulii*").

[214] R. T. Scott, "The Triple Arch of Augustus and the Roman Triumph," *JRA* 13 (2000), 189-90.

[215] Ulrich, *The Roman Orator and the Sacred Stage: The Roman Templum Rostratum*, 184-185.

[216] Taylor, *Roman Voting Assemblies*, 44; Front. 2.129.

means of displaying their popular support and as a fortress to control the entirety of the Forum. The sum of the Augustan developments along the SE edge of the Forum sought to limit the temple's effectiveness in order to ensure that a dissenting politician and his followers did not have the opportunity to upset the status quo through occupying the platform during a demonstration. Viewed in this light, Tiberius's renovation of the temple in 6 A.D., which shortened the length of the speaker's platform, restricting its value as a tribunal, makes sense.[217] Its relegation to a corner of the Forum stripped this highly charged temple of its dynamic qualities and transformed it into a more static monument. There even seems to have been a fear that the Temple of Divine Caesar might become a second Temple of Castor, a rallying point during demonstrations. Dio mentions that originally the Temple of Divine Caesar possessed the right of asylum, but when many people started gathering there, it was fenced off so efficiently that the right might as well have been revoked.[218] The potential for the platform to be occupied was too risky.

The final major addition to the NE edge was the Porticus of Gaius and Lucius, located just to the north of the Temple of Divine Caesar and constructed after a fire gutted the Basilica Aemilia.[219] This NE entrance to the Forum consisted of a paved street immediately north of the temple and the projecting SE corner of the portico, raise above the street by four steps and

---

[217] I. Nielsen, "Castor, Aedes, Templum," in *LTUR*, 245.

[218] Dio Cass. 47.19.1-2.

[219] For date and construction of the portico, see Coarelli, *Il Foro Romano (II): Periodo Repubblicano e Augusteo*, 171-6. A minority view, summed up by Ackroyd, identifies the Basilica Julia as the Porticus of Gaius and Lucius, supposing that the building was rededicated in honor of Augustus's grandsons (B. Ackroyd, "The Porticus Gai et Lucii. The Porticus Philippi. The Porticus Liviae," *Athanaeum* 88 (2000), 563-71.) The discovery of three inscriptions commemorating Gaius and Lucius (CIL 6.36908, 6.36880, and 6.36893) near the Basilica Aemilia and the entrance to the Forum north of the Temple of Divine Caesar mitigate this suggestion.

homogenous to the rest of the colonnade fronting the Basilica Aemilia.[220] The encroachment of the portico onto the street suppressed part of this previously-wider northern passage. In form, this part of the portico resembled a propylon, an appropriate structure for articulating an entrance to the central plaza. With the Parthian arch to the south and the Porticus of Gaius and Lucius to the north, entrance to the Forum from the Sacra Via was effectively limited to six passageways: the three bays of the arch, the northern street, and the two intercolumniations of the portico. A mass of demonstrators could no longer rush the Forum from the Sacra Via as these passageways prohibited a large number of people from moving into the plaza at once. The steps of the portico deterred movement through the colonnade and channeled traffic towards the adjacent street, creating an additional bottleneck for mass movement coming from the Sacra Via. But if push came to physical shove, men already stationed within the portico possessed the high ground. Additionally, each entryway provided a natural checkpoint from which a *custos* could keep surveillance over both the crowd in the Forum and those entering the area.[221] Much like the Forum of Caesar, this arrangement, with its control over movement, produced a much more managed environment for interaction between a speaker and the people.

---

[220] Coarelli suggests that this projecting SE corner of the portico should be considered a separate monument and identifies it as Augustus's Parthian arch. However, Nedergaard's study of the architectural elements proves that those belonging to the projecting corner are homogenous to those decorating the rest of the portico. See E. Nedergaard, "La Collocazione Originaria dei *Fasti Capitolini* e gli Archi Di Augusto nel Foro Romano," *BCAR* 96 (1994-95), 54-6. Additionally, there is insufficient space for a triple-bay arch in this passageway (Kleiner, *The Study of Roman Triumphal and Honorary Arches 50 Years after Kähler*, 199. There is sufficient space for the span of a single arch, but more excavation is required to determine if such an arch existed (Rich, *Augustus's Parthian Honours, the Temple of Mars Ultor and the Arch in the Forum Romanum*, 105).

[221] For analysis of the Parthian arch's impact on vision and movement through the Forum, see S. J. Huskey, "Ovid's (Mis)Guided Tour of Rome: Some Purposeful Omissions in "Tr." 3.1," *The Classical Journal* 102, no. 1 (Oct. - Nov., 2006), 18-25.

The Western Side

Similar to the Temple of Castor, the Rostra, Comitium, and Curia were focal points for demonstrations on the western side of the Forum. By 14 A.D., this sector too had been reorganized, retaining certain toponymns, but little resembling its late Republican predecessor. In addition to the destruction caused by Clodius's funeral, continual work by the dictators Sulla and Caesar had already transformed the area, making it somewhat difficult to determine exactly what the area looked like at the time of Caesar's death. By the end of the Sullan period, the area of the Comitium was still bounded by the Rostra and the Graecostasis, but a recent pavement covered its distinctive steps.[222] The demonstrators at Clodius's funeral had destroyed both the Sullan-era Curia Hostilia and the neighboring Basilica Porcia.[223] Caesar had begun to rebuild the former, now known as the Curia Julia, while the latter was never rebuilt.[224] Before his assassination in 44 B.C., Caesar had transposed the Rostra from their traditional site to a location on the NW end of the Forum, fronting the Temple of Concord.[225] Augustus continued to manipulate this area after Caesar's death. Between 42 and 12 B.C., the new Rostra were completed with some further modifications.[226] On the other hand, the Curia remained in its

---

[222] Coarelli dates this phase of pavement to the Caesarian period, but Giuliani and Verduchi prove through stratigraphic relationships to the Caesarian/Augustan Rostra that the pavement belongs to the Sullan period. See Coarelli, *Il Foro Romano (II): Periodo Repubblicano e Augusteo*, 211-223; Giuliani and Verduchi, *L'Area Centrale del Foro Romano*, 52-66. While this pavement appears to have covered the steps of the Comitium, the area retained its traditional form complete with Rostra and Graecostasis. For late Republican Comitium, see Carafa, *Il Comizio di Roma dalle Origini all'Età di Augusto*, 148-159.

[223] Asc. 33.

[224] For location of Basilica Porcia and its disappearance, see Coarelli, *Il Foro Romano (II): Periodo Repubblicano e Augusteo*, 59-63.

[225] Dio Cass. 43.49.1.

[226] P. Verduchi, "Rostra Augusti," in *LTUR*, 215.

traditional location in the Forum.[227] This spatial divorce of popular and elite politics is significant. In former times, face-to-face interaction between Senate and people in the Forum Romanum formed one of the cornerstones of republican politics.[228] It was no coincidence that the Curia and Rostra had been constructed in close proximity; the intimate connection between the two was symbolically charged as the meeting point between Senate and people.[229] Cicero even makes the relationship between the two explicit.[230] By fulfilling Caesar's plans, Augustus split this symbolic relationship and while the Curia and Rostra were not that far apart, they were no longer connected. The completion of the Temple of Divine Caesar at the other end of the Forum confirmed the east-west axis of the central area, which forced the Curia, and by extension the senate, to the literal and figurative periphery.

The relocation of the Rostra from their traditional location also had practical implications for movement within the Forum. Prior to its repositioning, senators departing from the Curia to mount the Rostra did not have to expose themselves to the crowd gathered before it. Although the distance between the two was not particularly far, demonstrators were well aware of past examples of prohibiting unfavorable speakers access to the platform and were

---

[227] Caesar appears to be following a Sullan model of making modifications to the area of the Comitium in order to make a political statement. On Sullan impact on the comitial area and its political implications, see E. Kondratieff, "Reading Rome's Evolving Civic Landscape in Context: Tribunes of the Plebs and the Praetor's Tribunal," *Phoenix* 63, no. 3/4 (Fall-Winter 2009), 322-5. Augustan's decision to continue building the Curia Iulia is particularly relevant. See E. Tortorici, "Curia Iulia," in *LTUR*, 332-334.

[228] For the topography of face-to-face interactions in Rome, see Hölkeskamp, *Reconstructing the Roman Republic*, 72.

[229] Morstein-Marx, *Mass Oratory and Political Power in the Late Roman Republic*, 54-55.

[230] Cic *Flacc.* 57.

more than likely to seize upon this strategy again.[231] At the same time, the new position of the

Rostra limited the element of surprise associated with particular demonstrations and counter-

demonstrations. Located at the confluence of the Argiletum, the Clivus Argentarius, and the

Clivus Capitolinus, the former Rostra were susceptible to sudden seizure by demonstrators

erupting into the Forum. The Basilica Porcia shielded these approaches, making it difficult to

detect the oncoming demonstrators until it was too late.[232] In its Augustan iteration, the Rostra

were set apart from each of these entrances and all approaches to it were visible from the

platform, giving the speaker, a pro-speaker crowd, or any guards present time to react should a

group of demonstrators attempt to cause trouble.[233] While at first glance the isolated Rostra

appeared exposed on all sides, in the right situation this was more of an asset than a liability.

The area around the Republican Rostra and Comitium also possessed symbolic

significance for demonstrations. In the course of addressing the *contio*, late Republican speakers

often incorporated the various monuments positioned around the Comitium into their rhetoric.

Morstein-Marx documents a number of instances in which a speaker stirred a reaction from the

crowd by invoking his surroundings.[234] The majority of these monuments related to the early

days of the Republic, but still provided exempla for late Republican speeches. In 67 B.C., the

---

[231] Millar vividly imagine that the noise of the crowd outside the Curia must have been heard from within and would be perturbing to the senate (Millar, *The Crowd in Rome in the Late Republic*, 39). Although hypothetical, it captures the heightened senses and tension that accompanies an unpredictable demonstration.

[232] For topographical relationship between Basilica Porcia and Rostra, see Carafa, *Il Comizio di Roma dalle Origini all'Età di Augusto*, 152, fig. 95.

[233] Given advanced notice, fleeing the Forum was always an option. In Appian's description of a demonstration that traps Octavian in the Forum, before the demonstration turned violent, Octavian remained to plead with the crowd, suggesting that he could have escaped if he wished (App. *Bell. Civ.* 5.68).

[234] Morstein-Marx, *Mass Oratory and Political Power in the Late Roman Republic*, 92-107.

consul Piso, fighting Gabinius's proposal to give Pompey extraordinary *imperium*, declared from

the Rostra that if Pompey wanted to become another Romulus, he would not escape Romulus's

fate.[235] Standing next to Romulus's supposed tomb, it is easy to imagine that Piso made a

gesture to the monument.[236] In this case, the crowd demonstrated its overwhelming support for

the proposal by attempting to tear Piso apart on the spot, an episode eerily similar to Romulus's

death at the hands of senators. Even outside the context of speeches, the assembled crowd

incorporated the Forum's monumental landscape into their demonstration, as when they

destroyed the statues of Sulla and Pompey on the Rostra after Caesar's victory at Pharsalus.[237]

One night, a small band of demonstrators, seeking to make a popular statement, scaled the

Temple of Concord and added some graffiti to the dedicatory inscription: "An act of madness

made the Temple of Concord".[238] Demonstrators recognized the meaning incorporated into the

Forum's landscape and did not hesitate to manipulate it to suit their own ends.

Undertaken by the praetor L. Surdinus sometime in the final decades B.C., the large-

scale Augustan paving of the Forum at the very least rearranged this monumental landscape, if

it did not sterilize and replace it altogether.[239] For these small-scale monuments, the new

pavement forced a choice: update the monument in its traditional location, but at the new level,

relocate it elsewhere, or remove it. Unfortunately, it is difficult to tell exactly what remained

---

[235] Plut. *Pomp.* 25.4.

[236] Morstein-Marx, Mass Oratory and Political Power in the Late Roman Republic, 95.

[237] Dio Cass. 42.18.2; Sue. *Iul.* 75.4.

[238] Plut. *C. Gracch.* 17.6.

[239] For the date of the Augustan paving, see Giuliani and Verduchi, *L'Area Centrale del Foro Romano*, 61-6. Kondratieff's examination of the praetor's tribunal provides a framework for analyzing the functional and symbolic impact of the relocation of minor monuments in the Forum. See Kondratieff, *Reading Rome's Evolving Civic Landscape in Context: Tribunes of the Plebs and the Praetor's Tribunal*, 348-55.

after the paving, what was relocated, and what disappeared forever. There is, however, one

Republican monument in the area whose fate we know and this can help us get a general sense

of Augustus's treatment of Republican monuments in the Forum. C. Duilius, consul in 260 B.C.

who defeated the Carthaginians in a naval battle off Sicily during the First Punic War, originally

set up a rostrate column near the Volcanal to commemorate his victory.[240] The inscription from

the monument's base survives, not in the original, but as an Augustan transcription or

adaptation.[241] Servius notes that by his time, the column was located on the Rostra.[242] Although

this leaves a number of years unaccounted for, it makes sense that the column was relocated

when the Forum was repaved, coinciding with the date of its updated inscription. After

Augustus's victory at Naulochus, he received a similarly rostrate column in the Forum,

presumably in proximity to and modeled after the Duilius monument.[243] Augustus's column

reframed Duilius's monument in new terms and charged it with a new meaning. Augustus co-

opted the older message to make claims about his victory at Naulochus; instead of a victory over

fellow Romans, it could now be likened to a Republican naval battle off the coast of Sicily that

had also preserved the state.[244] In repaving the Forum and updating existing monuments,

Augustus rewrote the monumental memory of the Forum in reference to himself. In this

reconstructed landscape, a speaker would have difficulty incorporating a visible monument into

---

[240] M. Roller, "The Exemplary Past in Roman Historiography and Culture," in *The Cambridge Companion to the Roman Historians*, ed. A. Feldherr (Cambridge: CUP, 2009), 221-3. Duilius's *elogium* (CIL 6.40952) from the Forum of Augustus places the original column near the Volcanal.

[241] For the original inscription and its Augustan recreation, see E. Kondratieff, "The Column and Coinage of C. Duilius: Innovations in Large and Small Media in the Middle Republic," *Scripta Classica Israelica* 23 (2004), 10-26.

[242] Servius, *ad Georg.* 3.29.

[243] App. *Bell. Civ.* 5.130.

[244] Roller, *The Exemplary Past in Roman Historiography and Culture*, 223.

his rhetoric that did not have a positive association with Augustus. Tiberius's renovations to the Temple of Concord, undertaken as part of his triumph in 7 B.C., further demonstrate this point.[245] Finished in 10 or 12 A.D., the temple was dedicated in the names of Tiberius and his deceased brother Drusus.[246] The dedication stressed the concord of Augustus's family, fully erasing the Opimian anti-popular connotations that speakers and demonstrators so often made reference to in their rallying cries.[247] After the Augustan renovations, this type of rhetorical emphasis was no longer possible, or at the very least, had to navigate the positive references to Augustus and his family.

Looking at the architecture of the Augustan Forum Romanum, we can continue to evaluate our premise that the spatial mechanics of demonstrations were integral both to staging and regulating them. The Augustan transformation of the Forum involved a complete rearrangement of the late Republican topography of demonstration. Architectural constraints limited access to the Temple of Castor and should demonstrators manage to occupy the podium, the reduced size of the speaker's platform limited its effectiveness as a fortress. The Republican Rostra were no more, replaced by the more insulated Caesarian/Augustan Rostra. Instead of gathering around a speaker's platform, crowds now assembled in the central area of the Forum, suggestively marked off from the rest by a continuous curb.[248] The heavily monumentalized Sacra Via, so often the scene of violence, was controlled by multiple checkpoints regulating movement into the Forum. Even a development as seemingly harmless

---

[245] For date, Dio Cass. 55.8.2.

[246] Dedication in 10 A.D.: Dio Cass. 56.21.1. Dedication in 12 A.D.: Sue. *Tib.* 20.

[247] For the incorporation of the Temple of Concord into contional rhetoric, see Morstein-Marx, *Mass Oratory and Political Power in the Late Roman Republic*, 102-3.

[248] Giuliani and Verduchi, *L'Area Centrale del Foro Romano*, 33-8.

as repaving the Forum could affect the range of rhetoric employed at a demonstration. This new topography of the Forum had either relocated or removed the established rallying points for demonstrations.

Creating Public Order

These disruptions to the traditional topography of demonstration made mobilizing and staging demonstrations of the late Republican variety difficult enough, but a number of redundant measures beyond the realm of controlling architecture were in place to ensure that a new topography did not form. While architectural constraints channeled and controlled the movement of the crowd, with enough time and energy these could be overcome. Surveillance, the authorized use of force and legal remedies worked in conjunction with architectural control to further regulate traffic in the Forum and limit the possibility of a successful demonstration. Without this range of enforcement, it would have been difficult to elicit compliance from the users of the space, especially those bent on challenging Augustus's political position through popular demonstration. These tactics made certain the managed environment that Augustus had created remained managed.

In the later years of the Republic, magistrates often resorted to armed guards to maintain order within the Forum. Lintott attributes the continuation of political violence during the Late Republic to the lack of a suitable public organization to which the monopoly of force was entrusted.[249] Augustus's creation of the *vigiles* and the urban cohorts fulfilled such a

---

[249] Lintott, *Violence in Republican Rome*, 89-106.

function.[250] Originally, Augustus's initiative may have been a reaction to the creation of fire brigades by the ambitious aedile Egnatius Rufus.[251] The thought of a large organization answering to another politician clearly would not have sat well with Augustus, especially considering the role that similar organizations had played in earlier demonstrations.[252] In emergency situations, Augustus could dispatch the *vigiles* in response to hostile demonstrations.[253] Tacitus even comments that Augustus created the position of the urban prefect in order to keep in check the disorderly and reckless part of the population.[254] Augustus's establishment of these paramilitary units and offices codified the ad hoc measures that were increasingly employed against demonstrations in the late Republic.

This is not to say that these forces were consistently stationed in the Forum itself, but rather that if a large enough disturbance arose control over the Forum could be quickly reestablished. Only during times of crisis was it necessary to station military forces in public, such as after the disaster at Teutoburg Forest in 9 A.D.[255] Even when soldiers did appear in public, they were not necessarily fully equipped, but perhaps were only outfitted with a sword as a badge of their authority.[256] Such a symbol served as a reminder not only that they were authorized to use force, but also that more soldiers, fully armed, would most certainly appear should things get out of hand. Evidence from the reigns of the Julio-Claudians and later attests

---

[250] O. Robinson, *Ancient Rome: City Planning and Administration* (London: Routledge, 1992), 181-188.

[251] Dio Cass. 53.24.4-6. For interpretation, see Nippel, *Public Order in Ancient Rome*, 96.

[252] After a fire devastated Nicomedia, Trajan denied Pliny's request to form a fire brigade on the basis that such an association (*collegium*) is prone to subversive activity (Plin. *Ep.* 10.34.1).

[253] Sue. *Aug.* 25.2.

[254] Tact. *Ann*. 6.11.

[255] Sue. *Aug.* 23.1.

[256] Plin. *Pane.* 23.3 attests to this use of soldiers in public.

to the presence of a cohort of Praetorian guardsmen stationed on the Palatine and it is likely

that at least some soldiers were posted to the hill during Augustus's reign, given his residence

there.[257] The Palatine provided an excellent vantage point over the Forum and a swift response

could be mustered at the first sign of trouble. A shadowy branch of the Praetorian Guard, the

speculatores, were responsible for maintaining surveillance on threats to the state and it is easy

to imagine a small group of them posted to the Forum to keep an eye out for trouble, perhaps

employing the second story of the basilicas as observation posts.[258] Still, it is more likely that the

individuals who monitored daily activity in the Forum were more similar to the *custos* that

Ovid's book encounters at the Temple of Apollo Palatinus.[259] Like Ovid's *custos*, they too likely

had the power to remove individuals whom they regarded as "unsuitable" for the Forum. These

civilian guards continually maintained surveillance over the area and could summon the

necessary authorities should a disturbance prove unmanageable.[260] This combination of

displayed soft power with concealed hard power suggested to the visitor that public order was

maintained without the need for an undue amount of force.

Certain legal measures specifically addressed gatherings in the Forum. Augustus's

prohibition against remaining in the Forum without a toga restricted gathering in the area.[261]

Edmondson has explored how Roman dress demonstrated membership within a defined, citizen

---

[257] Tact. *Ann.* 12.69; Tact. *His.* 1.29; Sue. *Otho* 6.
[258] S. Bingham, *The Praetorian Guard: A History of Rome's Elite Special Forces* (Waco: Baylor University Press, 2013), 87-94.
[259] Ov., *Tr.* 3.1.
[260] An inscription (CIL 6.41285a) indicates that *procuratores* existed for the Forum of Trajan. It seems likely that as a public space the Forum Romanum had a staff as well.
[261] Sue. *Aug.* 40.5.

community, much to the exclusion of others.[262] The context for Augustus's decision is particularly interesting. After arriving at a *contio*, Augustus was dismayed at the number of dark tunics (i.e., individuals not self-identifying as citizens) that he saw among the crowd and he commanded the aediles to never again allow anyone to remain within the Forum unless they donned the toga. Based on Suetonius's word choice (*consistere*), it seems that those not wearing it could still pass through the Forum, but could not linger there.[263] Effectively, this barred non-citizens from the Forum and prohibited anyone from remaining there for long unless they donned the bulky, cumbersome dress. But it was in the context of the *contio*, often prone to demonstrations, that Augustus worried about the potential presence of non-citizens. While the ban simultaneously ensured that citizens self-identify through their uniform, it also made admittance to events like the *contio*, formerly open to all, but really intended for citizens, less ambiguous.

How would authorities enforce such a ban? And what impact might it have on traffic in the Forum? Certainly, a *custos* or the like could remove offenders. Those who violated the ban would stick out amongst the togate crowd. Given that offenders visually distinguished themselves from the rest of the gathering, self-regulation on the part of the citizen body may have also helped enforce the ban.[264] Even if limited personnel enforced such a measure, social norms would also pressure those without the toga to leave the area. Clear boundaries for the

---

[262] J. Edmondson, "Public Dress and Social Control in Late Republican and Early Imperial Rome," in *Roman Dress and the Fabrics of Roman Culture*, eds. J. Edmondson and A. Keith (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2009), 22.

[263] Newsome, *Movement and Fora in Rome (the Late Republic to the First Century CE)*, 293.

[264] For self-regulation and social control in maintaining public order, see Nippel, *Public Order in Ancient Rome*, 30.

Forum were necessary for the enforcement of this law; both potential violators and enforcers had to know the limits to which the law pertained. Once these boundaries were established, surveillance became particularly easy. This burden would deter all but those who had official business in the Forum. The ban kept loiterers out of the Forum and limited the number of people assembled there at any given time, unless they were present for a specific purpose. Presumably, this shifted retail and other more casual activities further away from the Forum.[265] Ultimately, the ban appears to be aimed at excluding troublemakers from the *contio* and other settings prone to demonstrations. The ban addressed the familiar rhetorical trope (and fear) that organizers would mobilize slaves, gladiators, foreigners, etc. to pack the Forum during these key events. By forcing citizens to self-identify through their dress, non-citizens present could be easily identified, ensuring that hirelings and the like did not disrupt the proceedings.[266] Additionally, the uniform dress would make it difficult for one group of citizens to easily identify an opposing group should the event come to blows.

Like the authorized use of force, Augustan legal reforms also codified and streamlined existing Republican laws regarding public space and demonstrations. The *lex Iulia maiestatis* explicitly prohibited riotous activity, including arming men with weapons or rocks, gathering *contra rem publicam*, and occupying temples and other public places.[267] The *lex Iulia de vi publica* disallowed the possession of weapons in public spaces and at public events and also

---

[265] Purcell, *Forum Romanum (the Republican Period)*, 334.

[266] Although this does not preclude outfitting non-citizens in togas in order to gain access to the Forum. Appian claims that slaves who dressed as citizens had long been available for hire (*Bell. Civ.* 2.120). For the social constraints imposed by the *Leges Iuliae* on access to public areas, see P. Zanker, *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus*, trans. A. Shapiro (Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press, 1988), 147-153.

[267] *Dig.* 48.4.1.1.

forbade the stockpiling of weapons within a home.[268] Once again, this law targeted activities associated with demonstrations and their mobilization. Both of these legal remedies appear to have incorporated earlier Republican precedents, but now established paramilitary units, acting at the behest of Augustus, were authorized to maintain public order by force if necessary.[269] Other laws did not explicitly address riotous behavior but nonetheless impacted the ability to stage effective demonstrations. The *lex Iulia municipalis* stated that public space was under the jurisdiction of the aediles (hence Augustus's order to the aediles to ensure that visitors to the Forum wore the toga) and that they were responsible for ensuring that public areas were kept free of unauthorized structures that enclosed or barred access to any part of the public zone.[270] This ordinance likely refers to market stalls, whose placement once again fell under the jurisdiction of the aediles.[271] By limiting the number of stalls set up in public space, the law also limited the amount of readily accessible material for demonstrators to construct improvised barricades at the entrances to the Forum. Along the same lines, the ordinance regulated the amount of commercial activity in the Forum, reducing the number of casual visitors. These regulations limited the impact of a demonstration in the Forum, should one arise.

Symbolic Claims to the Forum

Outside of these more tangible controls over the Forum, Augustus laid claim to the Forum through symbolic actions. As part of the settlement of 23 B.C., Augustus acquired

---

[268] *Dig.* 48.6-7.

[269] On late Republican/early imperial trend of state-held monopoly on force, see Riggsby, *Crime and Community in Ciceronian Rome*, 113-4. Compare these institutions to the ad hoc forces Cicero as consul needed to raise after the senate authorized him to care for the safety of the state.

[270] *Lex Iulia municipalis* 17.

[271] For comparanda from Pompeii, see CIL 4.1096a-97b, 2485.

tribunician power for life.[272] The office of the tribune of the plebs was intimately linked with the Forum. Beginning in 494 B.C., tribunes had gained the right to use the speaker's platform without interruption; a serious penalty existed for those who attempted to stop them.[273] The tribunes fulfilled most of their duties in the Forum and plebeians could seek them out on their benches located outside of the Comitium.[274] By the late Republic, tribunes were often responsible for mobilizing demonstrations, whether as the primary leaders or as assistants to them.[275] In acquiring tribunician power, Augustus did not intend to take up residence on the benches in the Forum, but rather sought to stifle tribunes' opportunities to work against him through demonstrations. In earlier times, inhabitants of Rome seeking redress went to the tribunes and in turn tribunes organized them into a coherent force for demonstrations.[276] By establishing himself as a tribune-like figure, Augustus became the patron *par excellence* for the Roman plebeians. Discontented plebeians looked directly to the princeps rather than the tribunes, curbing the influence of those trying to gain clients through dissatisfaction among the urban population.[277] At the same time, an attack against Augustus was equivalent to an attack on the plebs, again making it difficult to mobilize a large enough number of supporters to stage an effective demonstration.[278] Thus, with tribunician powers, in addition to possessing legal

---

[272] *Res gest.* 4.4.
[273] Taylor, *Roman Voting Assemblies*, 15.
[274] Ibid., 23.
[275] Vanderbroeck, *Popular Leadership and Collective Behavior in the Late Roman Republic (Ca. 80-50 B.C.)*, 26-7, 30-1, 34-52.
[276] Brunt, *The Roman Mob*, 25-7.
[277] Yavetz, *Plebs and Princeps*, 97.
[278] Ibid., 92.

rights to the Forum, Augustus denied others the necessary ingredients for mobilizing demonstrations. More and more, Augustus monopolized the area of the Forum.

Even after its Augustan transformation, the Forum remained the location in Rome for the creation of public discourse. Prior to the construction of the Forum Augustum, Augustus continued to show preference to the Forum Romanum over the Forum of Caesar.[279] Once he established sustained control over the Forum, putting an end to the demonstrations and violence that had plagued it, Augustus opted to perform familiar Republican rituals within its confines. The initial *deductiones* of Gaius and Lucius Caesar upon their coming of age in 5 and 2 B.C. respectively demonstrate how Augustus altered Republican ritual for his own ends.[280] The Republican *deductio* was a measure of a man's social and political status, defined by the importance and number of his attendants.[281] The two young *viri* were escorted into the Forum by no less than the princeps himself, serving as consul, and his lictors. This act of public display co-opted the Republican rituals and recast them to further distinguish members of Augustus's family in the public eye.[282] Favro considers such actions to be part and parcel of a developing imperial ceremony, but at the time they provided legitimacy to Augustus's position as princeps and *paterfamilias* of the leading family in the *res publica*.[283] It is important to stress, however, that similar *deductiones* during the late Republic were often contested by rivals along the Sacra Via. Indeed, it could be difficult to distinguish between a proper *deductio* and a fomenting demonstration or counter-demonstration. Disruptive demonstrations limited the effectiveness

---

[279] Ulrich, *The Roman Orator and the Sacred Stage: The Roman Templum Rostratum*, 158, 192-4.
[280] Sue. *Aug.* 26.2.
[281] O'Sullivan, *Walking in Roman Culture*, 55-6.
[282] Ibid., 57.
[283] On imperial ceremony in the Forum, see Favro, *The Roman Forum and Roman Memory*, 20-3.

of most Republican social and political activities that took place in the Forum, instead seeking to insert their own messages into the public discourse through non-traditional methods. While demonstrations often stifled the attempts of late Republican magistrates to promote their agendas through traditional channels, Augustus made efficient use of these Republican rituals to control public discourse and reproduce his own authority without any dispute.

Chapter 5: Conclusion

The Republican demonstration operated outside the formal rituals (the *contio*, the *deductio*, the triumph, etc.) that produced public discourse and political power in Rome. Through its disruption of these rituals, the demonstration created its own alternative discourse that savvy political figures put to use to secure their own political authority. Over time, the demonstration itself became ritualized behavior. Certain places within the Forum (the Rostra, the Temple of Castor, and the Sacra Via) were endowed with new meanings and associations through repeated demonstrations. Certain actions became hallmarks of a demonstration: shouting down an opposing speaker, organized chants, seizing the speaker's platform, occupying the Forum, barring opponents' entry. These types of collective actions formed the basic repertoire for the majority of demonstrations, but a more exclusive category of actions continued to make each demonstration unpredictable and unique: the use of the *iustitium* and the sudden storming of the Forum, the creation of makeshift barricades, even the minutiae such as the wax image of Caesar displayed at his funeral. All of these strategies continually shaped and revised the Forum Romanum's topography of demonstration.

Augustus's wholesale rearrangement of the Forum disrupted the established topography of demonstration. The changes made to the Sacra Via, the Temple of Castor, and the Rostra greatly limited the effectiveness of a given demonstration. As alluded to earlier, like Haussmann's Paris, Augustus's redevelopment of the built environment did not exclusively aim at repressing demonstrations. Instead, the Augustan Forum Romanum belonged to a larger ideological program. If we think of the Forum as a locus for public discourse, the discourse

created there was no longer a dialogue between several parties, but now a singular message. The *gens Iulia* with its dynastic intentions left its imprint on its projects within the Forum.[284] Allusions to Actium, not as a civil conflict, but as an end to civil conflict, adorned the Forum.[285] The resurrection of *pietas* informed Tiberius's renovations of the Temple of Castor and the Temple of Concord.[286] All in all, these developments crafted an entirely new experience of the Forum, albeit one informed by certain Republican traditions.[287] Contained within this new experience was an ideological message about the relationship of the *princeps* to the Roman world. It was not a dialogue; it could only be accepted or rejected. However, with its power to create alternative discourses, the demonstration possessed the ability to contest this message. Therefore, it became imperative for Augustus to restrict the impact of demonstrations in order to secure his vision of the *princeps*. In addition to creating his message, the transformation of the Forum's environment achieved this end.

---

[284] Favro, *The Urban Image of Augustan Rome*, 128-33; Zanker, *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus*, 79-82.

[285] Ibid., 82-5. The addition of rostra to the Temple of Divine Caesar (Dio Cass. 51.19.2) after Augustus's victory further the comparison between Actium and the Republican victory at Antium. Cf. the Column of Duilius and Augustus's rostrate column for the Naulochus victory.

[286] Zanker, The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus, 102-10.

[287] Favro, *The Urban Image of Augustan Rome*, 195-200.

Bibliography

Ackroyd, B. "The Porticus Gai et Lucii. The Porticus Philippi. The Porticus Liviae." *Athanaeum* 88, (2000): 563-571.

Alexander, M. C. *Trials in the Late Roman Republic*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990.

Bingham, S. *The Praetorian Guard: A History of Rome's Elite Special Forces*. Waco: Baylor University Press, 2013.

Brilliant, R. "Review of Augustus. Kunst und Leben in Rom um Die Zeitenwende by Erika Simon; Kaiser Augustus und Die Verlorene Republik by Mathias Hofter Et Al.; the Power of Images in the Age of Augustus (Jerome Lectures Sixteenth Series) by Paul Zanker." *The Art Bulletin* 72, no. 2 (Jun., 1990): 327-330.

Brunt, P. A. "The Roman Mob." *P&P* 35, (1966): 3-27.

Carafa, P. *Il Comizio di Roma dalle Origini all'Età di Augusto*. Rome: "L'Erma" di Bretschneider, 1998.

Carnabuci, E. "L'Angolo Sud-Orientale del Foro Romano nel Manoscritto Inedito Di Giacomo Boni." *Atti della Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei* Memoire 9.1.4, (1991): 249-363.

Coarelli, F. *Il Foro Romano (I): Periodo Arcaico*. Rome: Quasar, 1983.

———. *Il Foro Romano (II): Periodo Repubblicano e Augusteo*. Rome: Quasar, 1985.

de Moncan, P. *Le Paris d'Haussmann*. Paris: Les éditions du Mécène, 2009.

Delfino, A. "Il Foro di Cesare nella Fase Cesariana e Augustea." In *Giulio Cesare: l'uomo, le impresse, il mito*, edited by Gentili, G., 52-54. Milan: Silvano, 2008.

della Porta, D., M. Fabbri, and G. Piazza. "Putting Protest in Place: Contested and Liberated Spaces in Three Campaigns." In *Spaces of Contention: Spatialities and Social Movements*, edited by Nicholls, W., B. Miller and J. Beaumont, 27-45. Farnham: Ashgate, 2013.

Edmondson, J. "Public Dress and Social Control in Late Republican and Early Imperial Rome." In *Roman Dress and the Fabrics of Roman Culture*, edited by Edmondson, J. and A. Keith, 21-46. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2009.

Favro, D. "The Roman Forum and Roman Memory." *Places* 5, no. 1 (1988): 17-24.

———. *The Urban Image of Augustan Rome*. Cambridge: CUP, 1996.

Flower, H. "Beyond the *Contio:* Political Communication in the Tribunate of Tiberius Gracchus." In *Community and Communication: Oratory and Politics in Republican Rome*, edited by Steel, C. and H. van der Blom, 85-100. Oxford: OUP, 2013.

Giuliani, C. and P. Verduchi. *L'Area Centrale del Foro Romano*. Florence: Leo S. Olschki, 1987.

Gros, P. "Iulius, Divus, Aedes." In *LTUR*, 116-119.

Gurval, R. *Actium and Augustus: The Politics and Emotions of Civil War*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 1995.

Hölkeskamp, K. *Reconstructing the Roman Republic*. Translated by Heitmann-Gordon, H. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2010.

Huskey, S. J. "Ovid's (Mis)Guided Tour of Rome: Some Purposeful Omissions in "Tr." 3.1." *The Classical Journal* 102, no. 1 (Oct. - Nov., 2006): 17-39.

Kleiner, F. "The Study of Roman Triumphal and Honorary Arches 50 Years after Kähler." *JRA* 2, (1989): 195-206.

Kondratieff, E. "The Column and Coinage of C. Duilius: Innovations in Large and Small Media in the Middle Republic." *Scripta Classica Israelica* 23, (2004): 1-40.

———. "Reading Rome's Evolving Civic Landscape in Context: Tribunes of the Plebs and the Praetor's Tribunal." *Phoenix* 63, no. 3/4 (Fall-Winter 2009): 322-360.

Lintott, A. *Violence in Republican Rome*. Oxford: OUP, 1999.

Lott, J. B. *The Neighborhoods of Augustan Rome*. Cambridge: CUP, 2004.

Lugli, G. *Monumenti Minori del Foro Romano*. Rome: Bardi, 1947.

Macaulay-Lewis, E. "The City in Motion: Walking for Transport and Leisure in the City of Rome." In *Rome. Ostia, Pompeii: Movement and Space*, edited by Laurence, R. and D. Newsome, 262-289. Oxford: OUP, 2011.

MacDonald, W. *The Architecture of the Roman Empire Volume II: An Urban Appraisal*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1986.

Meneghini, R. and R. Santangeli Valenzani. *I Fori Imperiali: Gli Scavi del Comune Di Roma (1991-2007)*. Rome: Viviani, 2007.

Millar, F. *The Crowd in Rome in the Late Republic*. Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press, 1998.

———. "The Political Character of the Classical Roman Republic, 200-151 BC." *JRS* 74, (1984): 1-19.

Morstein-Marx, R. *Mass Oratory and Political Power in the Late Roman Republic*. Cambridge: CUP, 2004.

Mouritsen, H. "Pits and Politics: Interpreting Colonial Fora in Republican Italy." *PBSR* 72, (2004): 37-67.

———. *Plebs and Politics in the Late Roman Republic*. Cambridge: CUP, 2001.

Nedergaard, E. "Arcus Augusti (a. 19 a.C.)." In *LTUR*, 81-85.

———. "Arcus Augusti (a. 29 a.C.)." In *LTUR*, 80-81.

———. "La Collocazione Originaria dei *Fasti Capitolini* e gli Archi di Augusto nel Foro Romano." *BCAR* 96, (1994-95): 33-70.

———. "Facts and Fiction about the Fasti Capitolini." *ARID* 27, (2001): 107-127.

Newsome, D. "Movement and Fora in Rome (the Late Republic to the First Century CE)." In *Rome, Ostia, Pompeii: Movement and Space*, edited by Laurence, R. and D. Newsome, 290-311. Oxford: OUP, 2011.

Nielsen, I. "Castor, Aedes, Templum." In *LTUR*, 242-245.

Nielsen, I. and B. Poulsen eds. *The Temple of Castor and Pollux*. Vol. 1. Rome: Edizioni de Luca, 1992.

Nippel, W. *Public Order in Ancient Rome*. Cambridge: CUP, 1995.

O'Sullivan, T. *Walking in Roman Culture*. Cambridge: CUP, 2011.

Parkinson, J. *Democracy and Public Space: The Physical Sites of Democratic Performance*. Oxford: OUP, 2012.

Pina Polo, F. "Procedures and Functions of Civil and Military *Contiones* in Rome." *Klio* 77, (1995): 203-216.

Purcell, N. "Forum Romanum (the Imperial Period)." In *LTUR*, 336-342.

———. "Forum Romanum (the Republican Period)." In *LTUR*, 325-336.

Rich, J. W. "Augustus's Parthian Honours, the Temple of Mars Ultor and the Arch in the Forum Romanum." *PBSR* 66, (1998): 71-128.

Riggsby, A. *Crime and Community in Ciceronian Rome*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1999.

Robinson, O. *Ancient Rome: City Planning and Administration*. London: Routledge, 1992.

Roller, M. "The Exemplary Past in Roman Historiography and Culture." In *The Cambridge Companion to the Roman Historians*, edited by Feldherr, A., 214-230. Cambridge: CUP, 2009.

Rougerie, J. *La Commune de 1871*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 2014.

Routledge, P. "Critical Geopolitics and Terrains of Resistance." *Political Geography* 15, no. 6-7 (1996): 509-521.

Rudé, G. *The Crowd in History: A Study of Popular Disturbances in France and England, 1730-1848*. London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1981.

Salerno, F. "Collegia Adversus Rem Publicam?" In *Sodalitas. Scritti in Onore di A. Guarino*, 615-631. Naples: Jovene, 1984.

Scott, R. T. "Excavations in the *Area Sacra* of Vesta, 1987-1989." In *Eius Virtutis Studiosi: Classical and Postclassical Studies in Memory of Frank Edward Brown (1908-1988)*, edited by Scott, R. T. and A. R. Scott, 161-181. Hanover, NH: University Press of New England, 1993.

———. "The Triple Arch of Augustus and the Roman Triumph." *JRA* 13, (2000): 183-191.

Tatum, J. *The Patrician Tribune: Publius Clodius Pulcher*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1999.

Taylor, L. *Roman Voting Assemblies*. Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press, 1966.

Taylor, R. "Roman Oscilla: An Assessment." *RES: Anthropology and Aesthetics* no. 48 (Autumn, 2005): 83-105.

Taylor, V. and N. van Dyke. ""Get Up, Stand Up". Tactical Repertoires of Social Movements." In *The Blackwell Companion to Social Movements*, edited by Snow, D., S. A. Soule and H. Kriesi, 262-293. Oxford: Blackwell, 2004.

Tilly, C. *The Contentious French*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1986.

———. *Popular Contention in Great Britain 1758-1834*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1995.

Tilly, L. and C. Tilly eds. *Class Conflict and Collective Action*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications, 1981.

Tortorici, E. "Argiletum." In *LTUR*, 125-126.

———. "Curia Iulia." In *LTUR*, 332-334.

Traugott, M. *The Insurgent Barricade*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2010.

Ulrich, R. "Julius Caesar and the Creation of the Forum Romanum." *AJA* 97, no. 1 (Jan., 1993): 49-80.

———. *The Roman Orator and the Sacred Stage: The Roman Templum Rostratum*. Brussels: Latomus, 1994.

Vanderbroeck, P. J. J. *Popular Leadership and Collective Behavior in the Late Roman Republic (ca. 80-50 B.C.)*. Amsterdam: Gieben, 1987.

Verduchi, P. "Rostra Augusti." In *LTUR*, 214-217.

Yavetz, Z. *Julius Caesar and His Public Image*. London: Thames and Hudson, 1983.

———. *Plebs and Princeps*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1969.

Zanker, P. *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus*. Translated by Shapiro, A. Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press, 1988.