

TP 482 P(20)

CONCERNING THE ROSTRA OF JULIUS CAESAR

BY

FREDERICK W. SHIPLEY



Reprinted from

PAPERS ON CLASSICAL SUBJECTS

IN MEMORY OF

JOHN MAX WULFING

WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY STUDIES—NEW SERIES

LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE—No. 3

ST. LOUIS, 1930

Bibliothèque Maison de l'Orient



071850

CONCERNING THE ROSTRA OF JULIUS CAESAR*

FREDERICK W. SHIPLEY

While engaged in arranging in chronological order the buildings and other monuments erected in Rome during the period from 44 B. C. to 14 A. D. for the Chronological Table which will appear in Volume IX of the *Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome*, my attention was drawn to the number of honorary statues recorded as having been erected upon or restored to the Rostra during the year 44 B. C. and the first few weeks of 43. For some unaccountable reason the erection upon the Rostra of these statues, some of them equestrian, within a period of thirteen months has been almost entirely overlooked in the discussion of two vexed questions in regard to the Rostra: (1) Were the plans of Julius Cæsar to change the Rostra from its old location on the Comitium carried out before his death? (2) Can the so-called hemicycle be the Rostra of Julius Cæsar as has been maintained by Mau, and Richter, and more recently reaffirmed by Scheel?

The recorded data in regard to these statues have an important bearing upon the second of these questions, and some bearing upon the first.

Before taking up the statues it will be necessary to give in brief outline some of the data in regard to the Rostra of Julius Cæsar, and the divergent views which have been held in regard to this monument.

Cæsar's change in the position of the Rostra is recorded by Dio¹ who says that when Cæsar was dictator for the fifth

* This paper was presented at a special meeting of the St. Louis Classical Club, held in memory of John M. Wulfang, December 12, 1929.

¹ XLIII, 49. Ταῦτα μὲν τότε ἐπράχθη· τῷ δὲ ἔχομένῳ ἔτει, ἐν ᾧ ὁ Καῖσαρ ἐδικτατόρευσε τε ἅμα τὸ πέμπτον, καὶ ὑπάτευσε τὸ πέμπτον, συνάρχοντα τὸν Ἀντώνιον προσελόμενος, καὶ τὸ βῆμα ἐν μέσῳ που πρότερον τῆς ἀγορᾶς ὄν ἐς τὸν νῦν τόπον ἀνεχωρίσθη, καὶ αὐτῷ ἢ τοῦ Σύλλου τοῦ τε Πομπηίου εἰκῶν ἀπεδόθη. καὶ ἐπὶ τε τούτῳ εὐκλείαν ὁ Καῖσαρ ἔσχεν, καὶ ὅτι τῷ Ἀντωνίῳ καὶ τῆς δόξης τοῦ ἔργου καὶ τῆς ἐπ' αὐτῷ ἐπιγραφῆς παρέχωρησε.

time and consul for the fifth time, with Antony as his colleague (44 B. C.), the Rostra which formerly was in the center of the Forum was moved back to its present position; that the statues of Sulla and Pompey were restored to it; and that Cæsar was praised for this and also because he conceded to Antony the glory of the work and the inscription upon it. The change of position of the Rostra is attested by Diodorus,² a contemporary of Cæsar and Augustus, who speaks of the laws of the Twelve Tables as having been affixed to the Rostra "which at that time (τότε) was situated in front of the Senate house," showing that at the time at which Diodorus penned this passage the change had already taken place.³ Asconius,⁴ writing under Nero, in his commentary on Cicero's *Pro Milone*, states that the Rostra at the time of the delivery of that speech was not where it stood in his own day, but on the Comitium, close to the Senate House. Dio, however, is the only one of the three who ascribes the change to Cæsar and Antony. The other two are concerned with the location of the old Rostra, and not with the new, and simply note the change of position.

That Dio was referring to the completion and dedication of the Rostra would be the natural inference to be drawn from his account. His references to monuments are usually to dedications, since dedications were more commonly matters of record, although in exceptional cases⁵ he does mention the

² XII, 26.

³ The last datable reference in Diodorus is to the founding of a Roman colony at Tauromenium (XVI, 7), which seems to have happened in 36 B. C., though some place it in 21.

⁴ On *Pro Milone* 12.

⁵ In sporadic cases he was sometimes led, when dealing with important historical events, to mention, in anticipation, monuments which were connected with them. He thus mentions the Regia in advance, in connection with the campaign of Calvinus in Spain in 39 B. C.; the beginning of the temple of Apollo in 36 B. C., as well as its dedication in 28; the restoration of the Porticus Octavia in connection with Octavian's campaign against the Dalmatians; the beginning of the theatre of Marcellus, in connection with his death; and the promise of Tiberius on the day of his triumph, which was also the first day of his consulship, to rebuild the temple of Concord which was not dedicated until 17 years later. But in mentioning the great majority of monuments he is chiefly concerned with



decreeing or vowing of monuments as well as the dedication. His statement that Cæsar received praise because the statues of Sulla and Pompey were restored to the Rostra justifies us in assuming that the restoration actually took place while Cæsar was still alive. The same inference may be drawn from the statement that Cæsar yielded to his colleague Antony the glory of the work and the dedicatory inscription. If the restoration of the statues and the dedication by Antony took place after Cæsar's death, Dio (or his source), would hardly have spoken of the praise which Cæsar received for his magnanimity. Richter who in his earlier work on the Rostra⁶ first cast doubt upon the credibility of Dio's statement subsequently⁷ became its chief defender, in which he was supported by Mau.⁸ Their position has been recently re-affirmed by Scheel.⁹

The view originally advanced by Richter¹⁰ that the account of Dio referred only to the plans of Cæsar, and not to the completion of the monument still survives long after its author had abandoned it in favor of the view just stated. His first position was based upon the absence of references in Cicero to the fact that the Rostra had been moved, and that the name of the hated Antony had been placed upon the new structure.¹¹ Would Cicero have lost the chance to add one more to the catalogue of Antony's sins? Richter's former dedications, for which historical and epigraphic records were more readily available.

⁶ *Reconstr. u. Gesch. d. röm. Rednerbühne*. 1884.

⁷ *Beiträge zur röm. Topographie* II, Berlin, 1904, p. 22.

⁸ *Rhein. Mus.* Vol. XX, 1905, p. 265.

⁹ *Die Rostra am Westende des Forum Romanum*, *Eöm. Mit.* XLIII, 176-255.

¹⁰ See note 6.

¹¹ On first thought it seems surprising that Cicero should nowhere have mentioned the removal of the old platform on which he had won his oratorical spurs, and that its place had been taken by the new one which bore the name of the hated Antony. But it should be remembered that of the fourteen Philippics twelve were addressed to the Senate, and that only the fourth and sixth are addressed to the people. Both are short, and are summaries of what transpired at meetings of the Senate on December 20, 44, and January 4, 43. While he was probably speaking from the Rostra there was little chance in these two speeches to drag it into the discussion.

position continued to be held by Hülsen,¹² and De Ruggiero.¹³ In the recently published Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome by Platner and Ashby, the case is stated thus: (p. 451) "Cæsar had decided on the removal, but his definite plan seems not to have been carried out, or at least the dedication not to have taken place until after 42 B. C."

Much of the popular interest in the Rostra centres about two events, both belonging to the early part of 44 B. C.—the scene at the Lupercalia, on February 15, when Antony offered Cæsar the crown as he was seated on the Rostra,¹⁴ and the famous funeral oration which Antony delivered from the same platform over the body of Cæsar a few days after the tragedy of the Ides of March.¹⁵ These are the two scenes which visitors most desire to visualize in their topographical setting, thanks to the sentimental interest aroused by Shakespeare's Julius Cæsar. The two conflicting theories which I have outlined leave us in doubt as to whether the Rostra in

¹² *Röm. Mit.* XX, 1902, 22; *Das Forum Romanum*, 66; *The Forum and Palatine* 22.

¹³ *Il Foro Romano*, Roma, 1913, p. 360. De Ruggiero here sets forth a conjecture of Becker (*Top.* 337 sq.) that the Rostra was dedicated by Augustus along with the Curia in 29 B. C. But the reference in Diodorus (see p. 89) would seem to show that the change had already taken place before 36 B. C.

¹⁴ In regard to the incident of the Lupercalia all the authorities (Cic. *Phil.* II, 34, 85; Nicolaus of Damascus, *Vit. Aug.* 21; Velleius II, 56; Suetonius, *Julius* 79; Plutarch, *Caes.* 61; App. *B. C.* II, 16, 109; Dio XLIV, 11) are in substantial agreement. Cæsar was seated on the front of the Rostra, on a gilded chair, with a garland upon his head, when Antony, who was one of the Luperci, sprang upon the Rostra, approached the chair upon which Cæsar sat and placed upon his head the diadem "which Cæsar did put from him." Cæsar, after refusing the crown, ordered it to be taken to the temple of the Capitoline Jupiter, saying that it was more appropriate there. Nicolaus, contemporary with Cæsar and Augustus, mentions a variant in the story: that finally Antony embraced Cæsar and gave the crown to some of those standing near to place it on the head of the statue of Cæsar which was close by (τοῦ πλησίον ἀνδριάντος); this they did.

¹⁵ The accounts of the setting for Antony's funeral oration vary somewhat, especially as to where the body lay while Antony was speaking. Plutarch, *Ant.* 14, says simply "in the Forum." Dio in the preamble to the speech (XLIV, 35) also says "in the Forum"; but in the speech itself, which is probably a rhetorical elaboration, he makes Antony say (XLIV, 49): "wounded to death, you have been cast down upon the Rostra from which you often addressed the people." Suetonius (*Jul.* 84) says that a gilded shrine, made to resemble the temple of Venus, in which the body lay, was placed *pro rostris*, which is usually synonymous with *in rostris*. Appian (*B. C.* II, 143) states that the body was placed upon the Rostra: ἐπὶ τῶν ἐμβόλων.

February and March of 44 B. C. stood on the old site on the Comitium, or on the new site at the west end of the Forum. Even if we assume that the change of location had already taken place, there arises the further question: Can we identify the Rostra of Cæsar with any of the existing remains at the west end of the Forum?

It happens that Richter, Mau and Scheel, the three chief advocates of the theory that Dio was referring to the dedication, are united in identifying the hemicycle as the Rostra of Julius Cæsar. Most of those who hold the theory of a completion under the triumvirs, or by Augustus, now¹⁶ identify the rectangular structure as belonging to this completion, but do not regard the hemicycle itself as a prior and independent monument.

Let us now proceed to the discussion of the honorary statues erected upon the Rostra during the thirteen months from the beginning of 44 B. C. to the end of January of 43, and their bearing upon these two questions.

According to the passage in Dio,¹⁷ which refers to events at the beginning of 44 B. C., Cæsar, when the site of the Rostra was changed, placed upon the new speaker's platform the statues of Sulla and Pompey which had been thrown down from the old Rostra by the plebs in 48 B. C., after the news of Pharsalus. The statement is confirmed by Suetonius¹⁸ who places this act of magnanimity at the end of Cæsar's life. The new Rostra thus began its history with two statues upon it. The statue of Sulla, as we know from Cicero,¹⁹ was a gilded equestrian statue. In regard to that

¹⁶ Since the publication of "The So-called Flavian Rostra" by Van Deman, *A. J. A.*, Vol. XIII, 1909, 170-186, the belief that it belonged to the time of the Flavians, or even of Trajan, has been abandoned.

¹⁷ See note 1.

¹⁸ Suet. *Caes.* 75. He uses the words *tempore postremo*.

¹⁹ *Phil.* IX, 13: *Mihi autem recordanti Ser. Sulpici multos in nostra familiaritate sermones gratior illi videtur, si qui est sensus in morte, aenea statua futura, et ea pedestris, quam inaurata equestris, qualis L. Sullae primum statua est.* See also *App. B. C. I.*, 97.

of Pompey we are not informed whether it was an equestrian statue or not.

To these we must add a²⁰ statue of Cæsar himself, erected on the Rostra some time after the battle of Munda. On the old Rostra or on the new? At any rate, it seems to have stood on the Rostra during the famous incident of the Lupercalia (February 15, 44 B. C.), as we learn from Nicolaus of Damascus,²¹ a contemporary. The diadem was placed upon it after Cæsar had put it from him. Cicero, writing to Cassius early in October of 44 B. C., states that Antony had placed the inscription "Parenti optime merito" on the statue which he (Antony) had placed upon the Rostra.²² This statement should apply to the new Rostra which Antony had dedicated as consul. The statue may never have stood on the old Rostra, or, if it did, it was transferred by Antony.

Sulla's statue was equestrian. We do not know whether those of Cæsar and Pompey were equestrian or not, but may perhaps infer that they were from Velleius II, 61, who, speaking of the honor of an equestrian statue erected on the Rostra to Octavian, says: *qui honor non alii per trecentos annos quam L. Sullae, et Cn. Pompeio, et C. Cæsari contigerat.* Velleius, who lived during the reigns of Augustus and Tiberius, must have seen all three statues.

We have information in regard to another statue which had long stood upon the old Rostra, and was transferred to the new tribunal. In the ninth Philippic²³ delivered about the

²⁰ Dio XLIV, 4, mentions *two*. But he was probably misled into thinking that the *corona civica* and the *corona obsidionalis* could not belong to one and the same statue.

²¹ *Vita Aug.* 21. See note 14. The word *πλησίον* is a little vague, but Nicolaus was probably using it with Cæsar in mind as he sat in his gilded chair upon the Rostra. He has already referred in chap. 20 (in connection with the earlier episode of the tribunes and the diadem) to the gilded statue of Cæsar "which had been erected upon the Rostra by vote of the people." Cf. Suet. *Caes.* 29.

²² *Fam.* XII, 3: *Primum in statua quam posuit in rostris inscripsit "Parenti optime merito."*

²³ *Phil.* IX, 4: *Cn. Octavii clari viri et magni, qui primus in eam familiam, quae postea viris fortissimis floruit, attulit consulatum, statuam videmus in rostris.*

end of January of 43 B. C., Cicero in proposing the erection of the honorary statue to Servius Sulpicius, of which we shall speak presently, refers, among other precedents²⁴ for the erection of this statue, to a statue erected to Cn. Octavius (consul in 165 B. C.) who was treacherously slain at Laodicea while on an embassy to Antiochus. This statue, he says, "we see upon the rostra." Pliny speaks of the same statue as standing upon the Rostra in his own day.²⁵ This statue was therefore transferred when the Rostra was changed from the old site to the new. Is Cicero referring to the Rostra on the Comitium, or to the Rostra of Cæsar and Antony? We shall discuss this question later.²⁶

We now come to three other statues, two of them equestrian, and the other a standing statue, which were all voted by the Senate within the space of five or six weeks between the latter part of December of the year 44 and the end of January, 43 B. C. For these we have the contemporary evidence of Cicero's *Philippics* and *Letters*.

The voting of these three statues within a few weeks of each other has an interesting bearing, not only upon the problems of Cæsar's Rostra, but also upon the political manoeuvrings for these few weeks. After his open break with Antony in September of 44, it was part of Cicero's policy to endeavor to align against Antony, and with the so-called Republican party, Cæsarians who had no natural interest in aiding the cause of Cæsar's assassins, such as Plancus, Lepidus, and Octavian, particularly the two latter. The voting

²⁴ In the same passage (*Phil.* IX, 4) Cicero also mentions the four statues of the envoys who were put to death by Tolumnius, king of Veii, which he says stood usque ad meam memoriam in rostris. They may have been removed in the time of Sulla. At any rate they were no longer on the Rostra when Cicero delivered this speech. They may have been replaced later, perhaps on the Rostra as enlarged by Augustus, since Pliny (*N. H.* XXXIV, 23) mentions them in the present tense. In the same passage Pliny speaks of a statue of Camillus *in rostris*, but as he uses no verb it is uncertain whether he is speaking of his own time. Asconius (*pro. Scauro* 30) uses the past tense.

²⁵ *N. H.* XXXIV, 24: Non praeteribo et Cn. Octavium ob unum SC. verbum. . . . In qua legatione interfecto senatus statuam poni iussit quam *oculatissimo* loco, eaque est in rostris.

²⁶ P. 99.

of exceptional honors, including statues on the Rostra, was part of his diplomatic policy in this connection.

The first²⁷ of these honorary statues in order of time was probably the equestrian statue on the Rostra voted by the Senate to Octavian, possibly in the last weeks of 44 B. C., and certainly not later than the first four days of January of 43.²⁸ This, in addition to other unusual honors, was voted as a reward for the raising of an army against Antony. The motion was not made by Cicero himself, as in the case of the statues of Lepidus and Servius Sulpicius Rufus, but by Lucius Marcius Philippus, though Brutus, no doubt rightly, seems to have placed the ultimate responsibility on Cicero.²⁹ The statue is represented on coins³⁰ of the period, one of which (Babelon No. 66) has in the exergue below the statue the beak of a ship which seems to represent the Rostra. Velleius³¹ states that for three centuries this honor had not fallen to the lot of anyone except Sulla, Pompey, and Julius Cæsar, adding that the statue was still standing upon the Rostra in his day (about 29 A. D.), though he is there no doubt referring to the Rostra as rebuilt by Augustus.

A similar gilded equestrian statue of Lepidus, along with the honor of a triumph, was proposed by Cicero on the first of January, 43 B. C., to reward him for bringing about an

²⁷ The statement of Velleius II, 61 (see note 31) would seem to place it before the similar statue voted to Lepidus. Cic. *ad Brut.* I, 15, 7 (see note 29) also places it before the other special honors to Octavian.

²⁸ App. *B. C.* III, 51, mentions it among other honors voted at this time.

²⁹ Cicero *ad Brut.* I, 15, 7, writing in July 43 B. C., disclaims responsibility for all the honors voted to the young Octavian: *statuam Philippus decrevit, celeritatem petitionis Servius, post maiorem etiam Servius. Nihil tum nimium videbatur.*

³⁰ Babelon *Monn. de la Rep. Rom.* II, p. 36, No. 63, with C. CAESAR IMP on the obverse, and an equestrian statue, with S. C. in the exergue on the reverse. Babelon would place this between Mutina, April 16, and the formation of the triumvirate, November 27, 43 B. C. No. 65 has a similar equestrian statue on the reverse and C. CAESAR III VIR R. P. C. on the obverse. No. 66 has C. CAESAR III VIR R. P. C. on the obverse; on the reverse, a prow of a ship, between the letters S. C. below the statue in the exergue, seems to indicate the Rostra.

³¹ II, 61: *Eum senatus honoratum equestri statua, quae hodieque in rostris posita aetatem eius scriptura indicat, qui honor non alii per trecentos annos quam L. Sullae et Cn. Pompeio et C. Caesari contigerat, propraetore . . . bellum . . . gerere iussit.*

understanding with Sextus Pompey, and with the further purpose of winning his support against Antony.³² The motion was made in the fifth *Philippic* (15, 40-41): . . . eique statuam equestrem inauratam in rostris, aut quo alio loco in foro vellet, ex huius ordinis sententia placere velle. The statue was duly voted³³ and placed upon the Rostra,³⁴ from which later in the same year it was promptly thrown down³⁵ after the *rapprochement* between Lepidus and Antony, when Lepidus was declared a public enemy.

Later in January, B. C. 43, Servius Sulpicius Rufus (author of the well known letter of consolation to Cicero on the death of his daughter Tullia) who had been sent on an embassy from the Senate to Antony, died in the vicinity of Antony's camp. On the motion of Cicero,³⁶ made partly with the purpose of increasing the ill feeling between the Senate and Antony, as well as that of honoring his friend, the Senate voted that a bronze statue of Sulpicius should be erected on the Rostra with a free space about it of five feet in every direction from which his children and his children's children might view the games and gladiatorial contests. Cicero's motion stated that the statue was to be placed *in rostris*. Pomponius, the jurist, writing in the time of Hadrian, states that it was placed *pro rostris*, and that it was still standing in his day *pro rostris Augusti*.³⁷

³² Cic. *ad Brut.* I, 15, 9, after the statue had been thrown down, explains his motive: nos illum honore studuimus a furore revocare.

³³ Cic. *Phil.* XIII, 4, 9: Haec causa fuit cur decerneretis statuam in rostris cum inscriptione praeclara, cur absentis triumphum.

³⁴ Cic. *ad Brut.* I, 15, 9: At in Lepido reprehendimur; cui cum statuam in rostris statuissimus, idem illam evertimus. The letter was written about July 1, 43 B. C.

³⁵ See note 34; also Cic. *ad Fam.* XII, 10, 1; Vell. II, 64 and 66; Dio XLVI, 51.

³⁶ *Phil.* IX, 6, 16. Senatui placere Ser. Sulpicio statuam pedestrem aeneam in rostris ex huius ordinis sententia statui circumque eam statuam locum ludis gladiatoribusque liberos posterosque eius quoquo versus pedes quinque habere, eamque causam in basi inscribi quod is ob rem publicam mortem obierit. . . .

³⁷ Pomp. *Dig.* I, 1, 2, 43: Hic cum in legatione perisset statuam ei populus Romanus pro rostris posuit, et hodieque extat pro rostris Augusti. This is the only specific mention of the Rostra of Augustus. Topographers in discussing the Rostra have consequently given a good deal of attention to this passage. Most

We have seen that Cæsar conceded to Antony the glory of dedicating the Rostra. Cicero's willingness to erect in rapid succession upon the Rostra three statues of men who were, or who he hoped would become, Antony's enemies is the more readily explained on the assumption that they were to be erected upon the monument which Antony dedicated. It could have possessed no sacredness in his eyes, such as might have attached to the old Rostra in front of the Comitium on which he had won his oratorical reputation, and which had been sacrificed to permit of the clearing of the Comitium area in connection with the building of the new Senate house, which Cæsar had planned and probably begun³⁸ before his death. This attitude on Cicero's part may also explain why he never chose to give Antony the satisfaction of identifying him with the new Rostra.

What evidence, if any, can be gleaned from the references to these various statues bearing upon the question as to whether the change in the position of the Rostra, which Dio mentions, took place at the beginning of 44 B. C., before Cæsar's death, or later under the triumvirs or Augustus. Our information, based, for the most part, upon contemporary or nearly contemporary sources, covers a period of thirteen months, from the beginning of 44 to the end of January 43 B. C., or eighteen if we include the reference to the throwing down of the statue of Lepidus after he joined Antony. It is not absolutely conclusive, but lends weight to what has already been said (p. 88 f.) in discussing Dio's statement. It may be summarized as follows:

1. The statue of Sulla, which as we know from Suetonius,³⁹ had been thrown down from the old Rostra by the plebs after of them have failed to note in this connection the passage in Cicero containing his actual motion made at the end of January in 44 B. C., long before Augustus could have had anything to do with the Rostra.

The words *pro rostris*, here and elsewhere, are to be interpreted as "on the front of the Rostra."

³⁸ Van Deman, *A. J. A.* XVI, 1912, pp. 250-251, finds evidence of Cæsarian construction in the foundations of the Curia.

³⁹ See note 18.

the battle of Pharsalia, is spoken of by Cicero in the ninth Philippic in the present tense.⁴⁰ The presumption is that it had already been restored upon Cæsar's new Rostra. Furthermore, according to Dio or his source, Cæsar was praised for restoring the statues of Sulla and Pompey and placing them on the new Rostra. This praise would be hard to understand if the statues were not placed upon the Rostra until after Cæsar's death.

2. The statue of Cæsar, which stood on the Rostra at the time of the famous incident of the Lupercalia⁴¹ (February 15, 44 B. C.), was erected upon the Rostra some time after Munda (March 17, 45 B. C.). Cicero, writing in October of 44 B. C. says it was put there by Antony; Nicolaus says "by vote of the people."⁴² It will be remembered that it was Antony to whom Cæsar conceded the honor of the inscription upon the new Rostra. Antony could hardly have had the authority before his consulship (which began January 1, 44 B. C.) to erect a statue even of Cæsar upon the Rostra, a place reserved for those honored by decrees of the Senate, or by vote of the people. The presumption is in favor of the inference that it was placed by Antony upon the new Rostra which bore his name.

3. There is not much to be inferred from the honorary statues erected to Octavian and Lepidus. These honors were temporary political expedients reluctantly resorted to by Cicero and the anti-Antonians, and are explained by Cicero's letter to Brutus (I, 15, 7-9) of July 1, 43 B. C., and by his famous remark in regard to Octavian: *laudandus et tollendus*.⁴³ There is this to be said, however, that Cicero would have had less compunction about erecting these two statues upon a monument dedicated by Antony than upon the older Rostra upon which Cicero had himself won his oratorical spurs. The situation was somewhat different in the case of the statue of Servius Sulpicius Rufus. Servius was of the

⁴⁰ See note 19.

⁴¹ See notes 14, 21.

⁴² See notes 22 and 21.

⁴³ Velleius II, 62.

party opposed to Antony, and was in addition one of Cicero's most intimate friends. In providing for a space about the statue from which the children and children's children of his friend might view the games, it is at least probable that Cicero had in view a permanent location and would not have been guilty of a mere gesture in selecting a monument whose site was soon to be moved.

4. In regard to the statue of Cn. Octavius, had we no information except the statement of Cicero, we might infer that he was speaking of the old Rostra on the Comitium. But the reference to it in Pliny⁴⁴ makes it clear that this statue was moved to the Rostra at the west end of the Forum, and Cicero's statement may therefore apply to either site.

On the whole, the evidence to be deduced from the records in regard to the statues would seem to favor the literal interpretation of the words of Dio. I am therefore inclined to agree with Richter, Mau, and Scheel in dating the actual change of position of the Rostra in the beginning of 44 B. C.

But I must part company with them, chiefly on the evidence of the statues, in the second stage of their conclusions. All three agree in identifying the so-called hemicycle as the Rostra of Julius Cæsar. The most recent formulation of this view is that of Scheel,⁴⁵ published in 1928, after a careful

⁴⁴ See note 25.

⁴⁵ *Röm. Mit.* XLIII, 1928, pp. 176-255. In this study Scheel has treated exhaustively, from the standpoint of construction, all the remains in the immediate vicinity of the Rostra at the west end of the Forum which could possibly have had any connection with it: the so-called hemicycle, the rectangular platform in front of it, the umbilicus, the Schola Xantha, and the eight arches on the edge of the Clivus Capitolinus. These he has studied from the standpoint of the use of tufa and travertine, of marble, of brick, and of concrete, in an effort to establish chronological relationships, or sequences, in the light of what is known in regard to the use of these materials.

We are concerned here only with his conclusions in regard to the rectangular platform and the so-called hemicycle. The addition of the rectangular platform he assigns to Augustus (p. 255, sec. 5). The hemicycle he identifies as the hastily built and never completed Rostra of the great Cæsar (p. 254, sec. 5). He arrives at this conclusion from his general study of construction and particularly from the following considerations; the essential chronological unity of the concrete core (p. 215), the possibility, at this period, of a curved structure as an independent building (p. 228, sec. 7), and the fact that the Porta Santa slabs of the



study of materials and construction. But he paid scant attention to the literary references. It is true that he devotes a chapter to them,⁴⁶ but he seems to have been laboring under the misapprehension that there is little mention of the Rostra in contemporary literature.⁴⁷ The statues are not mentioned at all.⁴⁸ And yet they are as important as materials and construction in identifying the monument on which they stood. If, as Mau, Richter, and Scheel believed,—and in this I think they are right—the Rostra of Julius Cæsar was completed early in 44 B. C. and before the death of Cæsar, we must find a place for the seven statues which I have mentioned, all attested by contemporary or nearly contemporary authorities. Could they have stood on the hemicycle?

Now the so-called hemicycle is a curved structure whose chord was 23.65 metres long, approached from the west by a flight of five curved steps, extending practically its whole length. Its core was of solid concrete. Its top, facing the Forum on the east, was barely two metres wide, in spite of its great length. Could this narrow platform,—even if we do not allow for a balustrade, which was almost essential—ever

east front *can* belong to Cæsar's time, and *can* represent the decoration of the front of an independent structure (p. 202 ff.). These conclusions in regard to the hemicycle are identical with those previously formulated by Richter and Mau.

⁴⁶ P. 238, sec. X: "Die Rednerbühne in der Literatur."

⁴⁷ P. 239: "Auch die zeitgenössische Literatur versagt." He goes on to mention especially the silence of Cicero. His sole reference to Cicero in this chapter is to *Phil.* II, 90 which he mentions only to point out that Cicero had there lost an opportunity to mention the Rostra. He mentions the passage from Pomponius in the Digest (see note 37) in regard to Sulpicius, but seems to be unaware that in *Phil.* IX we have the exact text of Cicero's motion to erect the statue.

⁴⁸ Since the first publication of Hülsen's *Formae Urbis Romae Antiquae*, its Nomenclator Topographicus has become a source book for topographical references. For some strange reason, probably accidental, there are no references in that work to Cicero, Nicolaus of Damascus, and Velleius Paterculus under the headings Rostra Caesaris, and Rostra Augusti. This portion of his bibliography is quite incomplete and some of the material is irrelevant and belongs to the old Rostra on the Comitium. This may account for the failure to mention the statues on the part of Scheel and others who have written on the Rostra. It should be said that in 1890 Gilbert in his *Gesch. u. Top.*, Abtheil. III p. 153, had listed five of these seven statues, namely, those of Cn. Octavius, Julius Cæsar, Lepidus, Sulla and Pompey. He does not, however, make use of them as evidence in settling the topographical problem.

have served, or have been intended to serve the purposes of the Rostra, or could it meet the requirements of the historical references which we have for the Rostra during the years 44 and 43 B. C.? We must find a place on it for seven known statues, and it is conceivable that others besides the statue of Cn. Octavius were transferred to the new Rostra from the old.

We have seen that the statue of Sulla at least was equestrian, possibly also the statues of Pompey and Julius Cæsar. We know that the statues of Octavian and Lepidus were also equestrian. There is no place for three equestrian statues—and possibly five—on the narrow platform which Richter, Mau, and Scheel identify as the Rostra of Julius Cæsar, even assuming that they were not life size. The statue of Sulpicius, as we know, was a standing figure, also in all probability the statue of Cn. Octavius. These two statues might indeed have stood upon the narrow top; but where can we find the free space ten feet in diameter for the statue of Sulpicius? It is not to be supposed that Cicero, in honoring his friend, was guilty of a mere gesture in stipulating five feet of free space about his statue in every direction, on a platform which was barely two metres wide. The hypothesis that the Rostra of Julius Cæsar which Antony dedicated was limited to the existing hemicycle will not fit the known facts, all attested by contemporary writers. The statues alone, aside from the purpose for which the monument was intended, require a much wider platform. If the hemicycle is to be identified at all as the work of Julius Cæsar, it can only have formed a part of Cæsar's Rostra.

The conclusions of Van Deman,⁴⁹ published in 1909, after a minute study of the brickwork and concrete, come much nearer to meeting the requirements furnished by the evidence of the statues. This investigator recognized in the concrete core of the southern portion of the hemicycle, as it exists to-

⁴⁹ *A. J. A.*, XIII, 170-186.

day, *two* building periods, and believed that the upper stratum of reddish concrete above the topmost layer of marble and travertine chips was the work of Augustus, and that the lower strata of greyish concrete belonged to the Rostra of Cæsar; that traces of Cæsarian construction extended at least six metres southward of the southern line of the rectangular platform, and also eastward of the line of the hemicycle to within a metre and a half of the rear wall of the rectangular platform; that the architects of Augustus cut away a part of the southern end of the structure, extending the new Rostra a little to the north and farther to the east, and raising its height; and that the plan of Cæsar's Rostra, though not admitting of determination in detail, probably resembled, in general, the Rostra of Augustus which took its place.

This theory provides for a platform large enough for the purposes for which the Rostra was used, and sufficient room for the statues which we have been discussing. This is in substance the theory accepted in the Topographical Dictionary of Platner-Ashby,⁵⁰ though the editors still assume, wrongly, I believe, that the completion and dedication of Cæsar's Rostra did not take place until after 42 B. C.

⁵⁰ P. 452.