

Last of the naval triumphs: revisiting some key Actian honours

Frederik Juliaan Vervaeet and Christopher J. Dart

In 29 B.C., after his victories over Marcus Antonius (*cos.* 44, 34) and Cleopatra at Actium and in Egypt, Caesar Octavi(an)us, or Imperator Caesar Divi f., as he then wanted to be known, returned to Rome as the uncontested master of the Roman world. He did so in a carefully managed pageant that culminated with his triple triumph on 13, 14 and 15 *Sextilis* (the month later renamed *Augustus* in his honour) and the opening of the Temple of Divus Iulius in the Forum Romanum shortly thereafter, on the 18th.¹ These ceremonies marked the culmination of his claim — a pompous declaration already made in the autumn of 36 in the aftermath of Naulochus — that he had put an end to war on “land and sea” throughout the world.² While the relevant entries in the *Fasti Triumphales* are lost, Cassius Dio produces a fairly accurate précis of Octavian’s triple triumph. The first day was the triumph over the Pannonians and the Dalmatians, the Iapydes and their neighbours, and some German and Gallic tribes; the second day commemorated the naval victory at Actium, the Ἀκτίῳ ναυκρατία; the third and final triumph, the most costly and magnificent of them all, was over Egypt. Dio clarifies that the Egyptian spoils proved so rich and bountiful that they covered the expense and lustre of all three triumphal processions.³

Regardless of the issues associated with the reconstruction of the precise wording of the entries for the European and Egyptian triumphs, the scope and nature of these celebrations is unproblematic. The sources varyingly refer to the former as a victory *ex Illyrico* or *Dalmatia*, whereas the latter was in all likelihood simply inscribed as *ex Aegypto*.⁴ The nature and status of the Actian triumph, however, remains contentious. Since Actium was a victory over both Roman and foreign enemies, it has often been assumed that Octavian had been compelled to resort to obfuscation or misrepresentation to render the victory palatable to

1 For the date of the dedication of this temple, see the *Fasti Antiaties Ministrorum Domus Augustae* as published in *Inscr. Ital.* 13.1, 328: *Aedis diui Iul(ii) ded(icata)*; cf. also Dio 51.22.2 f.

2 This claim, prominently featuring on the dedication inscription of the victory monument at Nicopolis (W. M. Murray and P. M. Petsas, *Octavian’s campsite memorial for the Actian war* [Philadelphia 1989] 76), resonates in Livy 1.19 and RG 3 and 13. See App., *BC* 5.130 (discussed below) for the same proclamation having been made by Octavian for the first time after the battle of Naulochus.

3 Dio 51.21.5–8. W. Havener (“A ritual against the rule? The representation of civil war victory in the Late Republican triumph,” in C. H. Lange and F. J. Vervaeet [edd.], *The Roman Republican triumph: beyond the spectacle* [Rome 2014] 174 n.65) incorrectly believes that Dio here states that all three triumphs were adorned with Egyptian spoils.

4 *Unum ex Illyrico*: Livy, *Per.* 133; Suet., *Aug.* 22: *Delmaticum (triumphum)*. The *Fasti triumphales Barberiniani* record the triumph as *de Dalma[t]is* (*Inscr. Ital.* 13.1, 344 f.). Observing that the Dalmatians had been the fiercest opponents, R. A. Gurval (*Actium and Augustus: the politics and emotions of civil war* [Ann Arbor, MI 1995] 27) suggests that this echoes the representation in the *Fasti Capitolini*. In our opinion, Dio’s representation indicates that the entry may well have listed a wide range of vanquished peoples and tribes, on the model of Pompey’s extensive *inscriptio triumphis* of 61 B.C. For obvious reasons, the literary sources as well as the *Fasti Barberiniani* distil matters down to their essence, singling out Illyricum or Dalmatia as the triumph’s foremost feature. The third triumph is recorded as *ex A[egy]pto* in the *Fasti Barberiniani* and Dio 51.21.7; cf. Livy, *Per.* 133: *tertium de Cleopatra*.

the Senate and Roman People.⁵ Such arguments include the suggestion that Actium may have been exclusively presented as a war against Cleopatra/Egypt, or that the decision to celebrate Actium ‘in between’ his other two triumphs, on the second day, was motivated by a desire to conceal a tainted victory won over his fellow citizens. One of the most influential proponents of this view is R. Gurval, who argues that “the manner in which the victory was represented avoided any suggestion of civil war”, that “the victor had really endeavored (...) to downplay the success at Actium”, and that all these triumphs therefore were “not extolled as separate or distinct military accomplishments”. Gurval further notes that the *Fasti Triumphales Barberiniani* list only one palm of victory bestowed on this occasion, and that the evidence of these *fasti*, “where recognition of the Actian triumph is absent, suggests that public opinion (or at least the engraver) was unsure of the formal distinctions between the second and third triumphs”.⁶

Although the extant epigraphic record is disparate, fragmented and seemingly conflicting, it does not corroborate Gurval’s hypothesis of Actium as an ‘underhanded’ triumph. First, it is likely the entries for the triple triumph in the *Fasti Capitolini Triumphales* are irretrievably lost. Second, the *Fasti Barberiniani* (*Inscr. Ital.* 13.1, 344 f., comp. 570) contain other notable inconsistencies. They do not, for instance, list the *dedicatio palmae* for the Egyptian triumph, instead only recording this act for the first triumph *de Dalma[t]is*. Since Octavian himself entered the City on the third day (Dio 51.21.8 f.) and the extant *Fasti Barberiniani* feature the words *palمام dedit* for every other triumph that they record (*Inscr. Ital.* 13.1, 342–45), it is safer to assume that three palms were dedicated for all three triumphs, especially since he had also dedicated a palm on the occasion of his ovation *ex Sicilia*.⁷ Third, the fact that the Actian triumph is indeed omitted in the *Fasti Barberiniani* cannot be used as evidence that Actium was publicly suppressed since the *Fasti Antiaties Ministrorum Domus Augustae* record only Actium of the three triumphs, containing the entry *f(astus) August(us) triumph(hauit)* for August 14.⁸ Neither is the fact that the *Res Gestae* only mentions Actium

5 See C. H. Lange, *Res publica constituta. Actium, Apollo and the accomplishment of the triumviral assignment* (Leiden 2009) 79 f. (for a sample of the extensive scholarship: 79 n.30). Lange repeatedly insists that Octavian made no effort to obfuscate the civil war aspect of his victories. Although the spear rite of the *fetiales* performed by Octavian on the Campus Martius in 32 indicates the war was initially represented as against a foreign enemy (J. Rich, “The *fetiales* and Roman international relations”, in: J. H. Richardson and F. Santangelo (edd.), *Priests and State in the Roman world* [Stuttgart 2009] 204–9), Antony’s support of Cleopatra also turned the conflict into a civil war.

6 Gurval (supra n.4) 28, 31 and 33; cf. also 131. The influential view that Octavian deliberately merged his Actian and Egyptian triumphs as a sort of thematic unity in order to obfuscate the civil war victory, with the focus entirely on the defeat of Cleopatra and the conquest of the Egypt as the Mediterranean’s last sizeable Hellenistic kingdom, has been embraced by, e.g., K. Balbuzza (“Die Siegesideologie von Octavian Augustus”, *Eos* 86 [1999] 277); G. Sumi (*Ceremony and power. Performing politics in Rome between Republic and Empire* [Ann Arbor, MI 2005] 216); and I. Östenberg (“Demonstrating the conquest of the world: the procession of peoples and rivers on the Shield of Aeneas and the triple triumph of Octavian in 29 B.C. (Aen. 8.722–728)”, *OpuscRom* 24 [1999] 155–62] and *Staging the world: spoils, captives and representations in the Roman triumphal procession* [Oxford 2009] 142 f.). Cf. also T. Hölscher, “Monuments of the battle of Actium: propaganda and response,” in J. Edmondson (ed.), *Augustus* (Edinburgh Readings on the Ancient World; 2009) 310–33 [= *Klio* 67 (1985) 81–102], for instance at 319: “the triple triumph of 29 BC (...) was Augustus’ only triumph”.

7 *Inscr. Ital.* 13.1, 342 f.

8 *Inscr. Ital.* 13.1, 328. The fact that the entry for August 1 features the note that *Aug(ustus)*

once by name (at 25.2) evidence that Augustus sought to minimize or hide the triumph: this concerns a particularly late phase in Augustan self-representation, and the much-vaunted conquest of Egypt, too, is named only once (at 27.1). Furthermore, examples that these victories could be openly labelled as civil wars can be found in Augustus' own words (*RG* 3.1 and 34.1).⁹

As recent scholarship has shown, civil-war triumphs became an established part of the triumphal tradition in the Late Republic, albeit requiring politically astute representation and execution.¹⁰ Augustus himself emphatically stated at *RG* 4.1 that he celebrated two ovations and three curule triumphs.¹¹ Suetonius (*Div. Aug.* 18) asserts that there was no intent to hide or downplay Actium: *quoque Actiacae uictoriae memoria celebratior et in posterum esset*. In Vergil's *Aeneid* it is Actium which is emphasized on the shield of Aeneas, rather than either the first or third triumphs: it is presented as central not only to the life of Augustus but to the history of Rome.¹² It should therefore not be doubted that the Actian triumph stood out as a distinct celebration in its own right, being commemorated as such.¹³ In this respect, it is worth remembering that each of the three triumphs had been decreed on separate occasions: Dalmatia in either 35 or 33, Actium in 31, and Egypt in 30.¹⁴ Furthermore,

Alexandriam recepit, and that the entry for September 2 notes that this was the day that [*Augustus*] *ad Actium uic(it)*] (date also attested in Dio 51.1.1), suggest that the decision only to mention the second triumph was deliberate. Cf. some further observations on the *Fasti Barberiniani* in n.18 below.

- 9 For some further pertinent criticism of Gurval, see also Lange (supra n.5) 148-56 and Havener (supra n.3) 173.
- 10 As cogently argued by C. H. Lange, "Triumph and civil war in the Late Republic," *PBSR* 81 (2013) 67-90 and Havener (supra n.3); for a discussion of Pompey's African and Spanish triumphs, cf. also F. J. Vervaeke, "'Si neque leges nec mores cogunt'. Beyond the spectacle of Pompeius Magnus' public triumphs", in Lange and Vervaeke (supra n.3) 132-38. Nonetheless, as Havener (ibid. 173) observes, "even Octavian shied away from explicitly calling his triumph a civil war triumph". We are, however, less inclined to accept Havener's view that Octavian wanted to set the Actian triumph aside as a pure civil war victory, thereto leaving a conspicuous void where one would have expected an effigy of Marc Antony, as opposed to his "external" wars celebrated in the other two triumphs and duly featuring defeated leaders, either in person or through visual representation (Cleopatra). As further evidence, Havener adduces that the *Fasti Amiternini* (discussed below) list only Antony as the opponent at Actium, making no mention whatsoever of Cleopatra. Since the Egyptian fleet was present at Actium, and Antony and his dwindling number of Roman supporters had hoped to continue the war from Egypt, Lange (supra n.5), 79-90 and 156-57 more plausibly suggests that both the Actian and Egyptian triumphs represented victory celebrations over enemies comprised of Romans and foreigners alike. Moreover, the fact that the *Fasti Amiternini* mention only Antony in itself does not prove that the Actian triumph was represented as a 'pure' civil war victory: it merely reflects the reality that Antony was the main opponent at Actium, with Cleopatra's Egypt taking on the rôle of his chief ally. In this respect, see Hölscher (supra n.6) 321 for a relief from the Museo Nazionale alle Terme showing Victory holding a ship's stern (*aplustre*) flanked by a trophy with a lunular shield (*pelta*), which signifies an eastern enemy and shows that Actium was also commemorated as a victory over the Egyptian navy. It should be noted that the *Fasti Amiternini* displays a remarkable openness in commemorating civil wars: see *Inscr. Ital.* 13.1, 170 f. and G. Alföldy, "Epigraphische Notizen aus Italien IV. Das Ende der Bürgerkriege in den Fasti Amiternini," *ZPE* 85 (1991) 167 (infra n.82).
- 11 Echoed in Livy, *Per.* 133 and Macrobius, *Sat.* 1.12.35.
- 12 Verg., *Aen.* 8.671-728.
- 13 As both Lange (supra n.5) 152 and Havener (supra n.3) 173 rightly emphasize.
- 14 The Dalmatian triumph had been voted in either 35 (Dio 49.38.1) or 33 (App., *Illyr.* 28) but had

the fact that the same war (often portrayed as the *bellum Actiacum*, though some sources differentiate between the *Actiacum* and the *Alexandrinum*¹⁵) produced two triumphs does not pose a problem: the First Punic War, for instance, resulted in no less than five primary and two secondary naval triumphs alone.¹⁶ The novel feature, really, is that the two triumphs voted on account of the victories at Actium and Egypt were decreed to, and celebrated by, the same imperator. Even this was not without precedent: some 70 years before, the Senate had voted C. Marius (*cos.* 107, 104-100, 86) two triumphs on account of his successive victories (over Teutones and Cimbri) in what was the same war, though he eventually decided on a single joint celebration with Q. Lutatius Catulus (*cos.* 102).¹⁷ The primary concern of the present study, however, is not with the strategies used by Octavian to legitimate the 'Actian war'. Rather, the focus is on the precise nature of the Actian triumph: the manner in which the victory was celebrated and officially represented, and the extent to which it revived and enhanced traditions associated with the naval triumph. Whenever useful, this inquiry will also touch on the prior naval victory at Naulochus and some of the ensuing honours awarded to Octavian and Agrippa.

Last of the naval triumphs?

Degrassi's widely-accepted reconstruction has Octavian celebrate his second triumph as *Imp. Caesar Diui f. C. n. IV, consul V, ex Actio XIX k. Sept.*¹⁸ In our 2011 study on the significance of the naval triumph in Roman history, we mounted a concise challenge to that view,

been deferred; the decrees awarding the Actian and Egyptian triumphs followed in 31 and 30 successively: Dio 51.19.1 and 5.

15 See Alföldy (supra n.10) 170 and Lange (supra n.5) 90 f.

16 The secondary naval triumphs being those awarded to imperators who had participated in the *ductus* of the fighting under the auspices of another imperator: see *Inscr. Ital.* 13.1, 76f.; C. J. Dart and F. J. Vervaeet, "The significance of the naval triumph in Roman history (260-29 BCE)," *ZPE* 176 (2011) 270-73 and especially Vervaeet, *The high command in the Roman Republic: the principle of the summum imperium auspiciūque from 509 to 19 BCE* (Stuttgart 2014) 95-99 and 127-29. Here it is also worth calling to mind that Aemilius Paullus' subordinate imperator Cn. Octavius celebrated a secondary triumph on account of a success in separate campaign won in the same war under Paullus' auspices: cf. infra n.92.

17 See Vervaeet *ibid.* (2014) 161 f.

18 *Inscr. Ital.* 13.1, 570. As indicated in the above, the *Fasti Barberiniani* only mention his preceding and subsequent triumphs *de Dalma[t]is* and *ex A[egy]pto*. Th. Mommsen (*Res Gestae Divi Augusti* [2nd edn., Berlin 1883] 10) suggests an oversight on the part of the engraver. With reference to the (above cited) *Fasti Antiat. Ministr. Dom. Aug.*, which only feature the second (Actian) triumph, the original editor of *CIL* I p. 479 (Tabula Triumphorum Barberiniani, A.U.C. 725) and its revised edition, *CIL* I², p. 78, argued that public opinion so closely associated the Actian and Egyptian victories that the engraver compressed the two ceremonies into one for the sake of brevity. M. Beard (*The Roman triumph* [Cambridge, MA 2007] 303 f.) however, suggests that "Actium had been a victory in a civil war, without even a euphemistic foreign label", and that it is "tempting to imagine that whoever composed or commissioned this particular triumphal list was attempting to 'clean up' triumphal history by finessing Actium out of the picture". As Lange (supra n.5) 193 correctly observes, "the sources, contemporary and later, are in agreement that the war at Actium was both a foreign and a civil war, as also stressed in the *RG*", while the new régime "never denied or downplayed the civil war aspect". We should like to add that the *bellum Alexandrinum* was just as much a 'mixed' conflict as the *bellum Actiacum*, and that it is not impossible that the engraver of the *Fasti Barberiniani* decided only to record the final triumph on account of the victory that technically ended the war, regardless of Actium being the decisive engagement.

producing a number of sources suggesting that Actium was in every respect celebrated as a naval victory.¹⁹ We instead proposed that the *Fasti Capitolini Triumphales* more probably recorded Augustus' second triumph as *ex Actio naualem*, or, perhaps more emphatically, *naualem ex Actio*, observing that there would have been significant advantages to commemorating Actium as a naval triumph. Making use of a survey of further literary, numismatic and epigraphic evidence, this study endeavors to substantiate that the Actian triumph was indeed (celebrated as) a naval triumph.

The literary sources suggest that the Actian war was overwhelmingly a naval conflict, a battle won at sea.²⁰ This is reflected in the most extensive account of the sundry honours voted following Octavian's victory, found in Dio (51.19.1-2):

During this time, and still earlier, the Romans at home had passed many resolutions in honour of Caesar's naval victory. Thus they granted him a triumph, as over Cleopatra, an arch carrying a *tropaeum* at Brundisium and another in the Roman Forum. Moreover, they decreed that the foundation of the shrine of Iulius should be decorated with the beaks of the captured ships and that a festival should be held every four years in his [i.e., Octav(ian)us'] honour; that there should also be a thanksgiving on his birthday and on the anniversary of the announcement of his victory; also that when he should enter the City the Vestal Virgins and the Senate and the people with their wives and children should go out to meet him.²¹

As is clearly suggested in Dio's précis, the Senate decreed a triumph on account of a naval victory and consciously put the emphasis on the defeat of the Egyptian fleet commanded by Cleopatra. This is ironic given that it had been Antonius' marines that fought on long after the flight of the Egyptian navy and their own commander-in-chief.²² Further on in his narrative, Dio is explicit that none of the triumphal decrees following the victories at Actium and Alexandria mentioned "by name Antonius and the other Romans who had been vanquished with him and thus imply that it was proper to celebrate their defeat".²³ Given that his statues were torn down, his name erased and the family prohibited from using the given name Marcus, it is unsurprising that Antonius went unmentioned by

19 Dart and Vervaeke (supra n.16) 279 f.

20 For excellent re-appraisals of the battle of Actium as a decisive and hard-won naval engagement between two determined adversaries, see W. M. Murray, "Reconsidering the Battle of Actium – again," in V. B. Gorman and E. W. Robinson (edd.), *Oikistes. Studies in constitutions, colonies, and military power in the ancient world, offered in honor of A. J. Graham* (Leiden 2002) 341-60, and C. H. Lange, "The battle of Actium: a reconsideration," *CQ* 61 (2011) 608-23. Amongst other things, both Murray and Lange have conclusively rehabilitated the ancient consensus that Antony was fighting for victory, destroying Kromayer's influential assertion that he rather aimed for a fighting withdrawal.

21 Dio consistently describes Actium as a ναυμαχία: cf. 51.18.2.

22 Dio 50.33.4-35; Plut., *Ant.* 68.1. According to the latter (*Ant.* 64.1 and 66.3), Antony and Cleopatra committed 60 sizeable Egyptian warships (from triremes to those having 10 banks of oars) to the actual engagement; it was the flight of this fleet that decidedly swung the balance. Alongside Cleopatra's navy, Antony sent into battle a fleet of at least 110 and at most 170 vessels, whilst Octavian and Agrippa committed some 250 warships: Lange 2011 (supra n.20) 612-15. The involvement of huge numbers of ships is also recorded in Flor. 2.11.7 and Eutrop., *Brev.* 7.7.

23 Dio 51.19.5. By virtue of the little discretion it had left, the Senate thus made it quite clear it did not wish a repeat of the unsavoury scenes at Caesar's fourth triumph following the battle of Thapsus ('*ex Africa*', over Juba), when he paraded lictors and other paraphernalia captured from Roman citizens, as well as images and pictures exhibiting the demise of men like L. Scipio, Petreius and Cato (with Pompey being the sole exception): Dio 43.19.2 f.; App., *BC* 2.101. For the outright indignation at the three triumphs staged by Caesar and two of his former *legati pro praetore* following the battle of Munda, see Dio 43.42.

the Senate.²⁴ Other conspicuous honours granted to Octavian were two arches adorned with trophies, to be erected at Brundisium and in the Forum, and a decree ordaining that the foundation of the temple of Divus Iulius be decorated with the *rostra* of the captured ships.²⁵ Frontinus (*Aq.* 2.129) confirms that the platform in front of the temple was known as the *Rostra Aedis Diui Iulii*.²⁶ The connection with the old Rostra and its prestigious origin was manifest. In 338 B.C., Senate and People had authorized the consul C. Maenius to attach the beaks of some of the captured Antiate vessels to a *suggestum* on the edge of the Comitium, as part of the honours granted to him following his victory over Antium, Lanuvium and Velitrae. These decrees further provided for the newly adorned platform to be converted into a *templum* (by the augurs) and renamed the Rostra.²⁷

That the *rostra* of captured ships featured most prominently during and after the Actian triumph is amply recorded. Despite the destruction of a portion of the enemy fleet by fire, Augustus himself claimed to have captured no less than 300 warships at Actium.²⁸ Whilst

24 Though Cicero Minor as consul in 30 presided over a concerted effort to erase Antony's memory in Rome (Plut., *Ant.* 86.5; *Cic.* 49.6; Dio 51.19.3), his name featured in the Capitoline *fasti* and was still visible in Rome in the decades after Augustus' death (Tac., *Ann.* 3.18).

25 The identification of the Arch of Augustus in the Forum Romanum, between the temples of Divus Iulius and Castor and Pollux, has remained contentious for more than a century. Dio 51.19.1 connects the naval battle at Actium with arches carrying *tropaea* at Brundisium and in the Forum Romanum. At 54.8.3 he claims that another arch was erected sometime after 19 to celebrate the return of the standards from Parthia, but fails to specify its location. The picture is complicated by *Schol. Veron. in Verg. Aen.* 7.606, which claims that, after the return of the standards, *huius facti notae repraesentantur in arcu, qui est iuxta aedem diui Iulii*. J. Rich ("Augustus's Parthian honors, the temple of Mars Ultor and the arch in the Forum Romanum," *PBSR* 66 [1998] 106-8) plausibly argues that the arch in the Forum is the Actian arch and that it was subsequently adorned with trophies associated with the diplomatic successes achieved with the Parthians. This resolves the apparent contradictions between the vague statements in Dio 54.8.3 and the Verona Scholia with the rather definite statement at Dio 51.19.1. For a similar argument, see Lange (*supra* n.5) 163-66. The decision to embellish the Actian arch also makes sense in that it further paraded the supremacy of Emperor Caesar Divi filius over Antony, one of the vanquished enemies at Actium: the latter had also fared dismally against the Parthians; standards lost by his legions were among those recovered by Augustus (through Tiberius) in 20 B.C.: cf. *RG* 29 and Suet., *Tib.* 9.1.

26 It is unlikely that the rams used to adorn the temple of Divus Iulius (dedicated on August 18, 29 B.C.) had been displayed in the triumphal pageant a few days before: the beaks for the podium would have been small ones, not as impressive as those from the more sizeable warships. *Rostra* were also attached to the walls of the Actium victory monument at Nicopolis and depicted on its relief: K. Zachos, "The tropaeum of the sea-battle of Actium at Nikopolis: interim report," *JRA* 16 (2003) especially 72-74 and 83 f. *Rostra* furthermore appear on coins of 17/16 B.C. attached to an arch built in Augustus' name to commemorate the construction of roads: *BMC* 1, Aug., nos. 433 f.

27 Livy 8.14.12; Plin., *NH* 34.20. Pliny also records that Maenius was the first person ever to be honoured with a column carrying his statue, the so-called *columna Maenia*. On the form and central location of this column, see M. Jordan-Ruwe, *Das Säulenmonument. Zur Geschichte der erhöhten Aufstellung antiker Porträtstatuen* Bonn 1995) 55 f. and E. Kondratieff, "The column and coinage of C. Duilius: innovations in iconography in large and small media in the Middle Republic", *SCI* 23 (2004) 10.

28 As quoted from his memoirs in Plut., *Ant.* 68.1, along with the claim that there were only 5,000 dead. As Dio 50.34.1 records, Octavian had only reluctantly authorized setting Antony's ships on fire when the battle was dragging on and he saw no other means to win it, eager as he was to secure as much booty as possible. The number of 300 ships captured sits well with *RG* 3.4, where Augustus boasts of having captured 600 ships in addition to those smaller than triremes.

some of these ships were sent to Forum Iulii in Gaul to serve at the naval station there, the beaks of others were later used to adorn a hillside victory monument at Nicopolis. Across the straits on the tip of Cape Actium, the future Augustus rebuilt and enlarged the ancient temple of Apollo Actiacus that sat on a low hill.²⁹ At its foot, he dedicated a display of 10 warships, one each of the 10 different sizes that fought in the enemy fleet.³⁰ There should be no doubt, however, that the majority of captured *rostra* were transported to Italy since Propertius (2.1.31-34) informs us that they were paraded along the Sacred Way during the Actian triumph:

Aut canerem Aegyptum et Nilum, cum attractus in Urbem / septem captivis debilis ibat aquis, / aut regum auratis circumdata colla catenis, / Actiaque in Sacra currere rostra Via.

In this respect, it is well worth noting that there are fragments showing boat carts on wheels amongst the pieces of the upper horizontal register of the altar Octavian erected at Nicopolis.³¹ As this register shows a triumphal parade,³² Octavian probably displayed some smaller warships in the Actian triumphal pageant.

Orosius (6.19.12) has 12,000 killed and 6,000 wounded, of whom 1,000 died while being cared for, numbers probably deriving from Livy, as plausibly suggested by Lange (*supra* n.20) 622. Lange cleverly observes that the “external character of the war meant that Octavian’s victory would qualify for a triumph but, since it was also civil, he had an interest in playing down the carnage. It may be no coincidence that, since the early second century, 5,000 had by law been the minimum number killed to qualify a commander for a triumph. Augustus’ claim may have been carefully calibrated: he had killed just enough to earn his Actian triumph”. For a similar appraisal of how Octavian may well have “understated the number of human casualties”, see Murray (*supra* n.20), 354. Cf. *supra* n.22 for a brief discussion of the size of the fleets committed to battle at Actium.

29 See Tac., *Ann.* 4.63; Tac., *Hist.* 2.43; Murray and Petsas (*supra* n.2); and Zachos 2003 (*supra* n.26) 72-74.

30 Dio 51.1.2 f. and Strabo 7.7.6 (stating that a fire later destroyed the boats and sheds); cf. Tac., *Ann.* 2.53.

31 In their report, one of the anonymous referees generously provided us with the following information: “I can report that among the pieces found were fragments of two boat carts on wheels, one of which seems to have a god reclining on its deck. The paper, written by Anastasia Giannopoulou, was titled [in Greek]: “Marble sculpture with the depiction of a boat from the altar of the Monument of Augustus at Nicopolis”. She presented the evidence for more than one boat cart in the talk, and showed me the fragments. The carts are very fragmentary, but I saw fragments of solid wheels associated with their hulls, *aphlasta*, sweeping *stoloi*, and steering oars, so they are intended to be warships”. While we greatly look forward to the final publication of the fragments, one can find a drawing of the restored altar that gives an idea of what the boat carts looked like in K. Zachos, D. Kalpakis, H. Kappa and T. Kyrkou (edd.), *ΝΙΚΟΠΟΛΗ: ΑΠΟΚΑΛΥΠΤΟΝΤΑΣ ΤΗΝ ΠΟΛΗ ΤΗΣ ΝΙΚΗΣ ΤΟΥ ΑΥΓΟΥΣΤΟΥ* (Athens 2008) 64 f.

32 K. Zachos (“Τα γλυπτά του βωμου στο Μνημειο Οκταβιανού Αυγούστου στη Νικόπολη. Μία πρώτη προσέγγιση,” in *Nicopolis B. Proc. 2nd int. Nicopolis Symposium [2002]* [Preveza 2007] vol. 1, 411-34, with ill. at vol. 2, 307-21) is uncertain whether the triumphal parade scene is an amalgam of Octavian’s three consecutive triumphs or was intended to represent the Actian triumph only. We believe it depicts the Actian triumphal procession, and that the inclusion of Octavian in his triumphal chariot is the product of (necessary) artistic license: whilst Dio 51.21.9 unequivocally attests that Octavian only entered the City during his third triumph (see F. J. Vervaet, “On the order of appearance in Imperator Caesar’s third triumph (15 August 29 BCE),” *Latomus* 70 [2011] 96-102), the *triumphator*’s absence would have been incongruent with the overall scheme of the altar to commemorate (the victor of) Actium. At all events, it is unlikely that the second and third triumphs featured visual representations of Antony’s defeated men: Octavian had incorporated (and later sent back to Italy) the mass of Antony’s soldiers in the immediate aftermath of Actium, and was keen to avoid Caesar’s offenses: cf. n.23 above.

In all likelihood, the display of captured enemy *rostra* was a hallmark of the so-called *triumphus naualis* and its customary manner of commemoration.³³ The creation of the Rostra by C. Maenius in 338 offers the first example of beaks of enemy ships being publicly dedicated and displayed in permanent fashion. It was, however, not before the consul C. Duilius' unprecedented naval triumph, following his historic victory over the Carthaginian fleet near Mylae in 260, that the display of *rostra* became one of the defining features of this novel sort of triumphal celebration.³⁴ After parading "naval booty" (*NAVALED PRAEDAD*) in his triumphal pageant, Duilius probably converted much of the captured bronze beaks into *aes signatum* for distribution to the people. Significantly, some were also used for the erection of Rome's first *columna rostrata*, by vote of Senate and People, on the NW corner of the Forum Romanum, near Vulcan's altar at the foot of the Capitoline, overlooking the Rostra, Comitium and Curia to the northeast, and the Via Sacra to the south. The column carried a bronze statue of Duilius, possibly in full military dress, its shaft adorned with bronze rams probably deriving from the smallest triremes. In all likelihood, Duilius followed this by establishing a second rostral column near the entrance to the Circus Maximus.³⁵

Although the evidence is scant, it is plausible that Duilius' column set a precedent that was emulated by subsequent celebrants of the naval triumph. Thanks to a note in Livy, we know that lightning in 172 destroyed a rostral column erected on the Capitol by M. Aemilius Paullus (*cos.* 255), who in 254 had celebrated a naval triumph *de Cossurensibus*

33 Östenberg 2009 (supra n.6) especially 49 f. and J. W. Rich, "The triumph in the Roman Republic: frequency, fluctuation, policy," in Lange and Vervaeet (supra n.3) 218 plausibly suggest that the display of captured rams in the triumphal procession was a distinctive feature of the *triumphus naualis*. To commemorate his naval victory over king Perseus, Cn. Octavius (*cos.* 165) built the Porticus Octavia *ad Circum Flaminius*, described by Pliny (*NH* 34.13) as a double portico with bronze Corinthian capitals and rebuilt by Octavian as a monument to the final conquest of Dalmatia in 33, apparently his first gift to the Roman people that was not a completion of one of Caesar's undertakings: L. Richardson, *A new topographical dictionary of ancient Rome* (Baltimore, MD 1992) 317. In all likelihood, the bronze derived from the rams of Perseus's captured ships and probably first paraded across the Via Sacra in Octavius' naval triumph. For the symbol of the *rostra* (along with naval trophies and other maritime features) taking on a central rôle in Augustan imagery all across the empire, featuring on an astonishing variety of (building) materials, see Hölscher (supra n.6) and P. Zanker, *Augustus und die Macht der Bilder* (Munich 1987) 88-90.

34 For Duilius' triumph being the first of naval triumphs, see *Inscr. Ital.* 13.1, 76-81; Plin., *NH* 34.20; Tac., *Ann.* 2.49 (quoted below), and Dart and Vervaeet (supra n.16) 270. For the sake of this inquiry, it is important to point out that C. Maenius's column was unadorned and erected in the wake of his triumph over Antium, Lanuvium and Velitrae: see *LTUR* I (1993) 301 f. (with fig. 176 on p. 467), s.v. 'Columna Maenia' (= D. Palombi, "Columnae rostratae Augusti," *LTUR* 1 [1993] 308) and *Inscr. Ital.* 13.1, 68 f.: *de Antiatis, Lavineis, Veliterneis*. Livy (8.14) suggests that Antium's fleet fell into Roman hands after the capture of the town. Some of the Antiate warships were laid up in the Roman dockyards (*naualia*) whilst some were burnt after their *rostra* had been removed to adorn the *suggestum*, henceforth known as the Rostra (Livy 8.14.12).

35 Serv. *ad Georg.* 3.29, Plin., *NH* 34.20; Quint. 1.7.12; *CIL* VI 40952 = *Inscr. Ital.* 13.3.13, 20 f. For discussion of the honours granted to Duilius as well as his coinage, in great detail and with much historical context and insightful commentary, see Kondratieff (supra n.27) especially 2 f., 7-10 and 16-32. Although W. Haftmann (*Das italienische Säulenmonument* [Leipzig 1939] 24) believes that the Senate also commissioned this second column, L. Pietilä-Castren (*Magnificentia publica: the victory monuments of the Roman generals in the era of the Punic Wars* [Helsinki 1987] 30) more plausibly suggests that Duilius erected the monument *sua pecunia*; cf. also Kondratieff *ibid.* n.23.

et Poeneis one day after that of his colleague, Ser. Fulvius Paetinus Nobilior. E. Kondratieff plausibly suggests that Aemilius Paulus had picked this location to overshadow Duilius' column situated at the foot of the Capitoline.³⁶ The next attested construction of a *columna rostrata* dates from the troubled times of the civil wars that followed Caesar's assassination. According to Appian, the Senate voted Caesar Octavian "unbounded honours" as he returned to Rome following Agrippa's decisive naval victory over Sextus Pompey on 3 September, 36 B.C., near Naulochus, giving him the privilege to accept all or any such as he chose.³⁷ After making speeches to Senate and People and proclaiming peace and goodwill, as well as the end of the civil wars, he reportedly accepted: an ovation, annual solemnities on the days of his victories, and a golden image to be erected in the Forum, with the garb he wore when he entered the City, to stand upon a column covered with the beaks of captured ships, with the inscription 'PEACE, LONG DISTURBED BY CIVIL WAR, HE RE-ESTABLISHED ON LAND AND SEA'.³⁸ On the one hand, by celebrating an ovation 'ex Sicilia' on 13 November, 36, he craftily avoided celebrating a curule triumph over a Roman adversary in a conflict he had consistently cast as a war against slaves and pirates, so avoiding offensive transgressions of triumphal customary law of the type committed by Pompey and especially Caesar.³⁹ On the other hand, however, he consciously, and in most conspicuous fashion, associated his ovation and related triumphal honours with the great naval triumphs of a venerable and glorious past.

-
- 36 Livy 42.20.1; *Inscr. Ital.* 13.1, 76 f.; Kondratieff *ibid.* 12. For a brief discussion of Paullus' rostral column, see D. Palombi in *LTUR* I, 307 f., where it is plausibly suggested that the *columna rostrata* C. Duilii was "il prototipo monumentale"; Jordan-Ruwe (*supra* n.27) 60, who argues that this this column "ist durch ihren Standort als Weihgeschenk gekennzeichnet und wurde als solches von Aemilius Paullus selbst errichtet"; and M. Sehlmeier, *Stadtrömische Ehrenstatuen der republikanischen Zeit* (Stuttgart 1999) 119-21. It is quite likely that Fulvius Nobilior likewise erected a rostral column on the Capitol, especially as the triumphal chronology indicates that he had held the *summum imperium auspiciumque* on the day of the decisive naval victory (cf. *supra* n.16).
- 37 For the date of Naulochus, see *Inscr. Ital.* 13.3, 506 = V. Ehrenberg and A. H. M. Jones, *Documents illustrating the reigns of Augustus and Tiberius* (2nd edn., Oxford 1976) 51.
- 38 App. *BC* 5.130. Dio (49.15.3) clarifies that Octavian made these speeches "according to ancient custom outside the *pomerium*". Appian mistakenly has Octavian deliver his speeches the day after his arrival. Since Appian claims throngs of people escorted him upon arrival first to the temples and next to his house, it is obvious that he confused events following Octavian's ovation and those preceding his *ouans* crossing of the *pomerium* into the City.
- 39 *Inscr. Ital.* 13.1, 86f. (cf. 569) and 342 f. That Octavian/Augustus officially cast the war against Sextus as one against slaves and pirates (Hor., *Epod.* 4.19 and 9.7-10; RG 25.1 and 27.3; Vell. 2.73.3; Plin., *NH* 16.8; Lucan 6.419-22; Flor. 2.18.1-2; App., *BC* 5.77 and 80; Dio 48.17.3) suggests that he had already settled on a mere ovation 'ex Sicilia' in the run-up to the final showdown with Sextus, intended as a conspicuous display of adherence to triumphal customary law. For the offense caused in 46 and 45 by the triumphs following Thapsus and Munda, cf. n.23 above. For Pompey subverting the custom that victories over such lowly opponents as brigands/pirates (*praedones*) and slaves could at the most earn one the ovation, as documented in Gell. 5.6.20f., see Vervaet 2014 (*supra* n.10) 139-45. Lange 2013 (*supra* n.10) 81 suggests that Gellius is mistaken since M. Antonius (*cos.* 99) probably celebrated a triumph over the Cilician pirates in 100; cf. Murray and Petsas (*supra* n.2) 118 f., who (groundlessly) quote Cicero's *Orat.* 3.10 as evidence this was in fact a naval triumph. Rich (*supra* n.33) 233 f. (with n.185), however, cleverly suggests that Antonius' θρίαμβος was an ovation rather than a curule triumph. In our view, Cicero's *Verr.* 2.5.67 indeed unequivocally confirms that no one had celebrated a curule triumph over mere pirates before 67. This passage also shows that the memory of naval triumphs was alive and well in 70 B.C.

A valuable and revealing commentary in Servius (Auctus) *ad Georg.* 3.29 records that the naval victory at Actium likewise spawned rostral columns:

AC NAVALI SVRGENTES AERE COLVMNAS – columnas dicit, quae in honore Augusti et Agrippae rostratae constitutae sunt. Augustus uictor totius Aegypti, quam Caesar pro parte superauerat, multa de nauali certamine sustulit rostra, quibus conflatis quattuor effecit columnas, quae postea a Domitiano in Capitolio sunt locatae, quas hodieque conspicimus: unde ait ‘nauali surgentes aere columnas’. nam rostratas Duilius posuit, uictis Poenis nauali certamine, e quibus unam in rostris, alteram ante circum uidemus a parte ianuarum.⁴⁰

‘And [I shall build] towering columns with naval bronze.’⁴¹ He speaks about the beaked columns which were set up in honour of Augustus and Agrippa. When Augustus was victorious over all of Egypt, which Caesar had conquered in part, he brought back many *rostra* from the naval battle, and joining these together he made four columns, which were afterwards placed by Domitian on the Capitoline, and which we see today; hence he says: ‘towering columns with naval bronze’. For Duilius set in place beaked columns when he had defeated the Phoenicians in a naval battle, of which we see one on the Rostra, and the other before the circus from the side of the gates.

That the Capitoline Hill still boasted a significant number of rostral columns in A.D. 404 is further confirmed by Claudianus in his lofty panegyric on Honorius’ sixth consulship.⁴²

Those few scholars who took note have produced varying appraisals.⁴³ W. Haftmann suggests that Augustus commissioned four rostral columns following his victory over

40 The reading *Duilius* is attested in Thilo-Hagen only in one manuscript, Karlsruhe 186, which is very early (9th c.). Most of the other manuscripts give *Iulius*, although one (Vat. 3317) gives *duas uilius*. The section underlined (*columnas ... sunt*) is the convention used by Thilo-Hagen to indicate text taken from Servius Auctus (also called Servius Danielis). Servius’ commentary on Vergil was written around A.D. 400 and was designed for young men studying in his school. He did have recourse, however, to the far more extensive commentary by Aelius Donatus, written c.350, which is now lost apart from the introduction to the *Eclogues*. Around 1600, the French humanist Pierre Daniel published additional text found in some manuscripts of Servius which contained far more detailed notes on Vergil; this is the italicized text in T-H (hence Servius Danielis/Auctus). The general consensus has been that this text most probably derives from the commentary of Donatus: see the discussion by G. Brugnoli in *Enciclopedia Vergiliana* vol. 4 (‘Servio’), particularly 806-7 and 809-10.

41 Vergil, *Georg.* 3, describes an imaginary temple he will construct in honour of Rome and Augustus.

42 Ll. 44-52. especially 48 f.: *aeraque uestitis numerosa puppe columnis consita* (“bronze columns planted and clothed by many a ship”). We read *aera* to refer by synecdoche to the whole column, which is a standard device in Claudian’s hexameter poetry. D. Palombi (Columnae rostratae Augusti,” *ArchClass* 45 [1993] 325) plausibly suggests that these rostral columns would have included the ‘Augustan’ four re-located by Domitian, and that they were visible from the Palatine.

43 Strangely enough, G. J. Gorski and J. E. Packer (*The Roman Forum. A reconstruction and architectural guide* [Cambridge 2015]) do not discuss any of the rostral columns. Whilst they ignore the ‘Augustan’-era columns altogether, there is no mention of the *columna Duilii* even though it regularly features in many of the volume’s visual reconstructions, invariably located immediately behind the left section of the Rostra (seen from its front) and missing the statue that certainly topped it (see Kondratieff [supra n.27] 7-10, and below). Those scholars who do touch on the issue of the ‘Augustan’ columns generally presume them to have been made entirely of bronze: e.g., Zanker (supra n.33) 87; Richardson (supra n.33) 97; Palombi (supra n.34) 308; id. (supra n.42) 322, 324, 326 and 329; and M. Sehlmeier, “Die Siegesmonumente Octavians nach Actium. Zur Lokalisierung des bronzenen Viersaulendenkmals (Serv.georg. 3,29),” in J. Spielvogel (ed.), *Res publica reperta. Zur Verfassung und Gesellschaft der römischen Republik und des frühen Prinzipats* (Stuttgart 2002) 218. In our view, Vergil’s words more likely mean “columns with bronze” than “columns from bronze”.

Egypt, but that it was Domitian who subsequently re-erected them in honour of both Augustus and Agrippa on the Capitoline.⁴⁴ Again only with the slightest mention of Agrippa, D. Palombi believes that Naulochus earned Octavian a single column, complete with statue, whereas Actium generated a commemorative “monumento (...) costituito da tre colonne bronze rostrate” without any statues, and that Servius mistakenly numbers Octavian’s first rostral column amongst those erected after Actium.⁴⁵ T. Hölscher ignores Agrippa altogether but suggests that, after a rostral column had already been established in the Forum on account of Naulochus, four additional such columns were erected in his honour following Actium.⁴⁶ Starting from the erroneous view that Actium could not have been celebrated openly without offending the Senate, M. Sehlmeier argues that the four bronze columns (made of melted *rostra* captured at Actium) were unadorned and stood in front of the Curia Iulia, largely resting his case on a presumed numismatic representation of this building.⁴⁷ C. H. Lange rightly counters that Octavian could hardly have celebrated a triumph on account of Actium if that victory was too problematic for public celebration, and that he did not refrain from displaying *rostra* elsewhere in the Forum.⁴⁸ Furthermore, the defining feature of a *columna* was that it stood apart, as distinct from pillars supporting elements of buildings or monuments, and Servius (Auctus) expressly records it concerned

44 Haftmann (supra n.35) 27.

45 Palombi (supra n.34), argued more fully in id. (supra n.42) 326, where he also suggests that only the three Actian columns were entirely cast of bronze. As for the mention of Agrippa in Servius Auctus, Palombi merely observes (324, n.11) that “Servio giustamente ricorda il ruolo fondamentale svolto da Agrippa nelle operazioni militari” and that “l’associazione nella dedica non è improbabile pur avendo egli agito sotto gli auspici di Ottaviano”. For an earlier example of a similar view, see, e.g., H. Mattingly, *BMC I* (London 1923/1965), cxxiv. Palombi is followed by Y. Schmuhl, *Römische Siegesmonumente republikanischer Zeit* (Hamburg 2008) 145 and Lange (supra n.5) 162. At all events, Palombi (supra n.42) 324 rightly rejects F. Castagnoli’s suggestion (s.v. “Roma. Archaeologia,” in *Enciclopedia Virgiliana* vol. IV [1988] 551) that this verse in Vergil does not allude to a real monument but rather concerns a poetic improvisation inspired by the Naulochus column.

46 Hölscher (supra n.6) 314. Cf. also Zanker (supra n.33) 87 and Rich (supra n.25) 108, who both remain silent about Agrippa. Though Richardson (supra n.33) 97 takes the same view, oddly enough he first (96 f.) distinguishes between the “Columna Rostrata (Augusti)” (*sic*) and the “Columnae Rostratae Augusti et Agrippae,” and elsewhere (450 f.) between the “Columna Rostrata of Octavian” (which he dates to 36) and the “Columna Rostrata of Octavian and Agrippa” (dated to 30), without any further consideration of Agrippa.

47 Sehlmeier (supra n.43) 223–26. The coin in question is *RIC I*² no. 266 = *BMC I*, Aug. nos 631 f. Sehlmeier (217, n.6) flatly rejects the possibility that the Naulochus column was joined by three more columns after Actium on the basis of the weak and rather odd argument that “dann müßte man verschiedene Arten von Monumenten annehmen”. Cf. already F. Castagnoli, “Note numismatiche,” *ArchClass* 5 (1953) 105, who asserts that “non sappiamo infatti se esse erano rostrate e se sostenevano statue”; and Jordan-Ruwe (supra n.27) 64 f., who raises the groundless doubt that “außerdem geht aus der genannten Stelle nicht eindeutig hervor, daß es sich bei den vier Säulen um statuentragende *columnae rostratae* handelte. Servius scheint hier unter dem Eindruck der ihm sicher geläufigen Säulengruppen der Spätantike zu schreiben”. Jordan-Ruwe, moreover, implausibly suggests (66) that the Naulochus column was erected after 29. As regards the numismatic evidence invoked by Sehlmeier, Gurval (supra n.4), 62 mounts a compelling argument against the identification of the building displayed with the Curia Iulia. One should add that the four pillars displayed on the coin in question are clearly integrated into the building’s front section.

48 Lange (supra n.5) 163; cf. also Hölscher (supra n.6) 314.

rostral columns — i.e., columns adorned with the bronze beaks of captured ships, rather than columns made of recycled bronze *rostra*.⁴⁹

Since Domitian later moved all four *columnae* of the Augustan era to the Capitolium, it in all likelihood concerned four traditional, freestanding, rostral columns. Servius' commentary also suggests that they were all grouped together at the time of their relocation.⁵⁰ Though generally ignored in the scholarship, the commentary unequivocally attests that these four rostral columns were set up in honour of both Augustus and Agrippa. That the commentaries of Servius (Auctus) were written some 400 years after Naulochus and Actium enhances the historicity of this tradition: only the recognizable presence of Agrippa's imagery or inscribed name can explain their attestation after so many centuries. Although it is easy to understand why Servius and his contemporaries attributed all four re-grouped columns to Actium, the régime's battle of battles that overshadowed all previous victories,⁵¹ it is far more likely that Agrippa, too, had been honoured with a rostral column following Naulochus, and that both Octavian and Agrippa were again voted a second *columna* on account of Actium, on the model of what had been decided in 36 B.C.⁵² That Appian only records the one column decreed to Octavian after Naulochus, and that he and all other surviving historiographical sources remain silent on two more rostral columns decreed after Actium, need not be problematic. Appian's overlooking of Agrippa is understandable in a narrative focused on the rivalling protagonists of the so-called *bellum Sicilum*, whilst Dio (and, for that matter, several other sources) displays a marked tendency to record only the novel and the extraordinary.⁵³ In this respect, it is worth calling to mind that the *columna rostrata* was an innovation of the First Punic War, not the Late Republic. If we accept that Naulochus produced two rostral columns, the secondary one awarded to Agrippa perhaps having been decreed at the behest of Octavian himself shortly after his return to Rome from Sicily, and that both men received similar distinctions following Actium, there would have been nothing really new or remarkable in that.⁵⁴ Neither should

49 Although O. L. Richmond, "The Augustan Palatium," *JRS* 4 (1914) 214-19, followed by Sehl-meyer (supra n.43) 218-21, puts forth a substantiated and compelling defence of Servius' knowledgeability and reliability as an eye-witness, he is quick (218 with n.10) to dismiss the fact that "im Servius auctus wird ergänzt, daß nicht nur Augustus, sondern auch Agrippa geehrt worden sei", suggesting that the pairing of Octavian and Agrippa is topical, and to note that only Servius auctus defines the *columnae* as *rostratae*.

50 Cf. also Jordan-Ruwe (supra n.27) 64: "Servius versteht die Säulen jedoch anscheinend als ein einheitliches Gesamtdenkmal". It is thus highly improbable that the *columnae* were part of the arches surmounted by trophies to be erected at Brundisium and on the Forum decreed on account of Actium (Dio 51.19.1, discussed above; cf 49.15.1 for a similar distinction having been made in regard to the honours voted after Naulochus but no doubt declined by Octavian upon his return to Rome).

51 See Palombi (supra n.42) 326 and Gurval (supra n.4) 41.

52 The inscriptions on the Naulochus columns probably did not contain specifics facilitating easy distinction from Actium, and certainly would not have mentioned the name of Sextus Pompeius: cf. App., *BC* 2.130 (quoted above) and the *RG*, where Sextus' name is prominently missing. The dedication inscription on the victory monument of Octavian at Nicopolis also omits any reference to civil war or mention of his adversaries by name: Murray and Petsas (supra n.2) 76.n

53 In his summary of the honours ensuing Naulochus, Dio merely mentions the vote of statues: 49.15.1 (εἰκόνας).

54 The combination of Appian, *BC* 5.130, and Dio 49.15.1 f. strongly suggests that Octavian's rostral column ranked amongst honours decreed immediately after news of his victory made it

it surprise that Agrippa too received a rostral column on account of both Naulochus and Actium. Whilst the critical importance of Actium and Agrippa's vital rôle in winning that day have been generally acknowledged, one should not forget that both adversaries fielded c.300 warships in the battle of Naulochus, making it "one of the biggest naval engagements in which the Romans ever took part", easily rivalling the magnitude and intensity of Actium.⁵⁵ In both instances, the grants of rostral columns to Agrippa, complemented with further signal honours such as the *corona naualis* (Naulochus) and a blue flag (Actium), should be seen as substitutes for (secondary) naval triumphs.⁵⁶ The fact that Agrippa was in all likelihood the only Roman ever to receive his naval crown both in the field and subsequently also by vote of Senate and People may well help to explain why his first rostral column went unnoticed in the extant Late Republican and Early Imperial sources, where the focus invariably is on the crown. This may be explained in that Octavian himself had already been awarded with a rostral column shortly before Agrippa — a conspicuous distinction noted only by Appian — and the sources overlooked, or ignored, the uniqueness of such an honour being granted to a commander without imperatorial status.⁵⁷

In this respect, it is worth making some further observations. First, coins minted in honour of the late Agrippa in 12 B.C. show his equestrian statue complete with *rostra* fixed to its base, another striking award undocumented in the extant literary sources.⁵⁸ Second, there

to Rome.

- 55 K. Welch, *Magnus Pius. Sextus Pompeius and the transformation of the Roman Republic* (Swansea 2012) 276. That there were 300 vessels on each side: App., *BC* 5.118 and 120. J. Kromayer ("Die Entwicklung der römischen Flotte vom Seeräuberkrige des Pompeius bis zur Schlacht von Actium," *Philologus*, 56 [1897] 452-58) calculated that the combined number of ships involved may have even been between 900 and 950; cf. M. Pitassi, *The navies of Rome* (Woodbridge, UK 2009) 188-90. At all events, Welch rightly stresses (295) that "the real problem is that scholarship has not appreciated the true significance of Naulochus and Caesar's reaction to it". Since Augustus himself claimed to have captured 600 warships, of which 300 at Actium (cf. supra n.28), it follows that he had captured about the same number at Mylae and Naulochus in 36: Lange (supra n.20) 613.
- 56 The substitute of the *ornamenta triumphalia*, typically decreed by the Senate *ex auctoritate principis* (e.g., Tac., *Ann.* 2.52), would first be introduced on behalf of Tiberius Claudius Nero in A.D. 12: Suet., *Tib.* 9.2; Dio 54.31.4.
- 57 Agrippa's secondary column was probably voted when Senate and People, at the behest of Octavian, confirmed and enhanced his award of the *corona naualis*: Dio 49.14.3 f. The successive votes of *SPQR* on Agrippa's *corona rostrata* and his *columna rostrata*, both unprecedented honours, created confusion in the historiographical tradition as to precisely what aspect of these distinctions was entirely novel. We will return elsewhere to the issue of Agrippa's *corona navalis*.
- 58 *BMC* I, Aug. nos. 122 f. = *RIC* I², Aug. no. 412, minted by Cossus Cornelius Lentulus. M. Spannagel (*Exemplaria principis. Untersuchungen zu Entstehung und Ausstattung des Augustusforums* [Heidelberg 1999] 149) suggests that the coins rather depict the *monetalis'* famous ancestor A. Cornelius Cossus (*cos.* 428) carrying the *spolia opima*. The timing of the issue and the presence of *rostra*, however, favour the traditional view that the coin portrays M. Agrippa. That Agrippa is carrying captured armour is unproblematic since an *aureus* minted in commemoration of Naulochus features a temple of Diana adorned with a *triskelis* and displaying a *tropaeum* carrying *spolia* and standing on a ship's prow complete with anchor and rudder: *BMC* I, Aug. no. 643 = *RIC* I², Aug. no. 273; cf. Schmuhl (supra n.45) 146. Trophies were also attached to arches erected to celebrate Actium (Dio 51.19.1 f.) and no doubt likewise carried *spolia*. That there is no coinage (posthumously) featuring Agrippa's rostral columns need not be problematic: in contrast to the rostral columns, which had been awarded to Octavian in the first place, Agrippa's naval crown and equestrian statue complete with rostral base represented

is the fact that in 37, about a year before Naulochus, Agrippa had as consul foregone the triumph voted to him earlier at the behest of Octavian on account of his Germanic victories in Gaul because he thought it “disgraceful for him to make a display when Caesar had fared so poorly”.⁵⁹ In consideration of Agrippa’s notable show of humility and deference, shunning the ephemeral and yet politically most important honour of a curule triumph, Octavian handsomely rewarded his formidable enforcer and loyal lieutenant with singular distinctions of a lasting nature.⁶⁰ Furthermore, a secondary rostral column for Agrippa would also have made for a showy and carefully timed (if, of course, gratuitous) display of collegiality, especially since Lepidus had been deposed in Sicily and M. Antonius was now overwhelmingly preoccupied with ‘his’ eastern half of the Mediterranean.

The contemporary numismatic evidence also abounds with references to naval victory. Of particular note are a number of coin types which directly link emblems of naval victory (*rostra*, ship’s prows and naval spoils) with the triumph (quadriga, victory presenting a laurel wreath). One such example is a *denarius* which was issued between 29 and 27: the obverse shows Octavian in a quadriga being crowned by Victory, the reverse, Victory atop a ship’s prow, right arm extended holding a laurel wreath, with a palm in her left hand.⁶¹ Another example is a *denarius* of Octavian (CAESAR DIVI F) depicting Neptune/Caesar with vertical sceptre and aplustre with his foot upon a globe.⁶² This coin echoes the inscription upon the monument at Nicopolis where Octavian had consecrated his camp to Mars and Neptune. A precedent for connecting the depiction of the triumphal *quadriga* with *rostra* to the commemoration of a naval triumph can be found in a coin from a century earlier. A coin type minted in Rome in 124 by Q. Fabius Labeo depicts Jupiter riding in a quadriga with a ship’s ram beneath.⁶³ Labeo was either the son or grandson of Q. Fabius Labeo (*pr.* 189, *cos.* 183) whose campaigns against Antiochus and the rescue of Roman prisoners from Crete in 189 earned him a naval triumph in 188: [Q.] *Fabius Q. f. Q. n. Labe[o pr(aetor) ex] Asia de rege Antioch[o naualem egit n]on. Febr. [an. DLXV]*.⁶⁴

A *denarius* minted in Italy (Rome?) confirms that the naval victory at Actium too resulted in the erection of *columnae rostratae*: the obverse shows Octavian’s laureate head, whilst the reverse features IMP – CAESAR, a rostral column ornamented with 2 anchors and 6 beaks of galleys, surmounted by a statue of Octavian, holding a spear in his right hand and a parazonium in his left.⁶⁵ Although G. Lugli, P. Zanker, Palombi, Gurval, M. Spannagel,

honours exclusively voted to him in the aftermath of Naulochus/Actium. The coinage suitably commemorates the ‘primary’ honours granted to Octavian and Agrippa, respectively.

59 Dio 48.49.3 f.; cf. also App., *BC* 5.92. Agrippa would go on to turn down two further decreed triumphs in 19 and 14 B.C.: Dio 54.11.6 and 54.24.7f.

60 Agrippa continued to be prominently involved in the monumental immortalisation of Naulochus and Actium: in 25 he built the Basilica of Neptune in commemoration of both naval victories (Dio 53.27.1).

61 *RIC* I², Aug. no. 263; *BMC* I, Aug. nos. 616 f.

62 *RIC* I², Aug. no. 256; *BMC* I, Aug. no. 615; on this type’s association with Actium, see Sehlmeier (supra n.36) 258–59, and J. Pollini, *From Republic to Empire: rhetoric, religion, and power in the visual culture of ancient Rome* (Norman, OK 2012) 73 f.

63 *RRC* 273/1 and 273/2.

64 *Inscr. Ital.* 13.1, 80 f. On Labeo’s campaign, see Livy 38.39 and Polyb. 21.43. Cf. also Dart and Vervaet (supra n.16) 274 f.

65 *RIC* I², Aug., no. 271 = *BMC* I, Aug., no. 633. By contrast, there is no dispute about the approximate date of coinage featuring AVGVSTVS on the obverse and a *corona rostrata* with long ties in the centre on the reverse: *RIC* I², Aug. no. 473.

K. Freyberger and M. Koortbojian believe the coin was occasioned by Naulochus,⁶⁶ others (e.g., H. Mattingly, Haftmann, Castagnoli, Sutherland, Hölscher, Kondratieff and Pollini) more plausibly opt for the aftermath of Actium.⁶⁷ In this respect, it is important to note that only Actium resulted in the vote of a curule triumph and that, historically, the *columna rostrata* was the monumental expression *par excellence* of the naval variant of the curule triumph. The coin moreover features Caesar wearing a wreath of laurel, and the tradition is unequivocal that M. Licinius Crassus (*pr.* 71, *cos.* 70 and 55) in January 70 was the only exception to the rule that the celebrant of an ovation was entitled to myrtle only.⁶⁸ That Octavian is nude apart from a cloak floating behind his back, looking very godlike, whilst Appian records (in *BC* 5.130) that the statue to be placed on the Naulochus column was to be fitted with the garments he wore when entering the City (i.e., in ovation, wearing the *toga praetexta*: *Dion. Hal.* 5.47.3) further suggests the coinage was minted following Actium, when he could much better afford to manifest himself in such godlike fashion.⁶⁹

66 G. Lugli, *Roma antica. Il centro monumentale* (Rome 1946) 165; Zanker (supra n.33) 50; Palombi (supra n.42) 321 f. n.4; Gurval (supra n.4) 41 and 47-65, especially 57f.; Spannagel (supra n.58) 335 n.516; K. S. Freyberger, *Das Forum Romanum* (Mainz 2009) 62; M. Koortbojian *The divinization of Caesar and Augustus* (Cambridge 2013) 140-42.

67 Haftmann (supra n.35) 28; Castagnoli (supra n.47) 105; Mattingly in *BMC I* (1923/1965), Aug., no. 633, and C. H. V. Sutherland in *RIC I²* (1984) Aug., no. 271, both date the IMP CAESAR series to c.29-27 B.C. Sutherland ("Octavian's gold and silver coinage from c. 32 to 27 B.C.," *NumAntCl* 5 [1976] 129-57) argued, upon the basis of changes in Octavian's titulature and die links, that the coins CAESAR DIVI F date to the period 32-29, while those IMP CAESAR date to 29-27; Hölscher (supra n.6) 314 (suggesting that the *denarius* was minted after Actium and shows one of the four additional rostral columns voted in honour of this victory); Kondratieff (supra n.27) 34 ("29-27 BCE"); and Pollini (supra n.62) 73-75. Richardson (supra n.33) 96, however, believes the coins were "issued between 35 and 28 B.C." and feature the Naulochus column. Cf. Palombi 1993 (supra n.34) 308 and Schmuhl (supra n.45) 144, who both assign the coinage to 29-27 but suggest it features the rostral column in honour of Naulochus as recorded at Appian, *BC* 5.130. O. Hekster and J. W. Rich ("Octavian and the thunderbolt: the Temple of Apollo Palatinus and Roman traditions of temple building," *CQ* 56 [2006] 150, n.8) remain undecided: "the column may be depicted at *RIC* 12, Aug. no. 271, but this may show one of the further naval columns erected after Actium (Serv. *ad Georg.* 3.29)". Lange (supra n.5) 162 takes a similar view.

68 See Plin., *NH* 15.125 and Aul. Gell. 5.6.23; cf. Cic., *Pis.* 58. Though Zanker (supra n.33) 50 notes that Dio 49.15.1 records that the first round of honours voted after Naulochus also comprised the right of wearing the laurel crown on all occasions, it is quite likely that this privilege, first awarded to Caesar the dictator in the aftermath of Munda (Dio 43.43.1; Suet., *Div. Iul.* 45.2), was amongst those Octavian refused. Dio at 48.16.1 also records that he had already been granted the right to wear the laurel crown "on every occasion on which it was the custom of those celebrating triumphs to use it" after Perusia, but this can hardly mean anything other than the right to wear it whenever some other imperator celebrated a curule triumph. In 25, Augustus also received the right to wear "the crown and the triumphal dress" on the first day of every year (Dio 53.26.5): this probably was the golden *corona triumphalis*, too large and massive to be worn and therefore held over the head of the *triumphator* during his triumph by a public slave (*Juv.* 10.38-42).

69 *Contra* Jordan-Ruwe (supra n.27) 65, who suggests that "naheliegender ist der Schluß, daß das Münzbild das Denkmal anders zeigte als es geplant war oder als es später ausgeführt wurde, da die Darstellung der Columna Rostrata Octaviani deren Ausführung nicht voraussetzt. Das Münzbild spiegelt das Bild wider, das Octavian zum Zeitpunkt der Prägung von sich vermitteln wollte". Even if it is true that monuments were often portrayed on coins in a free and schematic way (see G. Fuchs, *Architekturdarstellungen auf römische Münzen der Republik und der frühen Kaiserzeit* [Berlin 1969] 92-128; cf. also the insightful discussion in Rich 1998 [supra n.25] 109-14), the battle of Actium had dramatically changed the geopolitical landscape in favour of Impera-

This is, however, not to say that this series cannot be interpreted as also a retrospective commemoration of Naulochus, perhaps in honour of the *classici* who had fought there. Since that victory had earned Caesar his first rostral column, this would have been a fitting and politically convenient corollary.

The testimony in Servius that Domitian later shifted all four columns to the Capitol has two further implications of interest to the present inquiry. First, this suggests that, following the precedent set by Paullus (and, possibly, Fulvius Nobilior) in 254, there may have stood an entire row of *columnae rostratae* of the Mid-Republic on the Capitol.⁷⁰ The second and more important inference is that the Actium columns, too, were most probably erected in the Forum, where they would have joined those built after Naulochus, so forming a coherent and imposing ‘quattuorcolumnate’, commemorating the régime’s decisive naval victories over its two most formidable and tenacious enemies. Servius’ commentary sits very well with the fact that Domitian was particularly active on both the Capitoline, where amongst other things he finished the restoration of the Capitolium and added a new temple in honour of Jupiter Custos, as well as in the Forum Romanum, where he completed the temple of Divus Vespasianus and Titus and built the *Equus Domitiani*.⁷¹ Flavian interest in rostral columns is also attested in coins issued by Vespasian and Titus, imitating the rostral column issues under Augustus, and by Domitian, showing Minerva atop a rostral column.⁷² It is tempting to speculate that the ‘Augustan’ columns were erected in the vicinity of the *columna Duilii*, which still stood in the Forum in the time of Pliny the Elder,⁷³ and the old Rostra, near the Via Sacra – perhaps in the space between. The fact that the Senate had wanted to honour Galba posthumously with a rostral column to be erected in the Forum on the very spot where he was killed⁷⁴ may lend some further credibility to this hypothesis, suggesting that the ‘Augustan’ rostral columns had (re-)confirmed the Forum as the venue of choice for such monuments.⁷⁵

tor Caesar. However, Jordan-Ruwe rightly rejects the suggestion of Zanker (supra n.33) 50 that “Octavian scheint damals also wohl nach des großen Pompeius und des Sextus Vorbild nicht die römische *toga*, sondern wie Alexander und die Könige eine griechische Chlamys getragen zu haben”: Dio (49.15.3) indicates that Octavian craftily decided on a showy display of respect for the *mos maiorum* following his return from Naulochus (cf. also n.38 above). Following A. Burnett in *Gnomon* 55 (1985) 564, Jordan-Ruwe also explodes the older argument that the statue on the coin perhaps displays some divinity.

70 As already suggested by Jordan-Ruwe *ibid.* 60.

71 Suet., *Dom.* 5 on his works in the Forum Romanum and on the Capitoline. The gigantic *Equus Domitiani* was erected in A.D. 91 to celebrate Domitian’s victories in Germany (*Stat., Silv.* 1.1). At *Dom.* 13, Suetonius alludes to gold and silver statues of Domitian being set up on the Capitol, testimony confirmed by Hieron., *Chron. a.* 91 p. Chr. (ed. Helm 1984) p. 191.

72 *BMC II, Vesp.*, nos. 253-54; *Tit.*, nos. 27-29; *Dom.*, no. 258.

73 *Plin., NH* 34.21 f.

74 Suet. *Galba* 23. Unsurprisingly, Vespasian annulled this decree, under the pretext that “Galba had sent assassins from Spain to Judaea, to take his life”. The Senate may have wanted to associate Galba’s overthrowing of the hated Nero with Augustus and his decisive victory at Actium roughly a century before.

75 Richmond (supra n.49) 219 f., J. Gagé (“Actiaca,” *Mélanges d’archéologie et d’histoire* 53 [1936-37] 44 n.1), and P. V. Hill (“Buildings and monuments on Augustan coins, c. 40 BC–AD 14,” *NumAntCl* 9 [1980] 212) all suggest the *domus Palatina* or the *area Apollinis* as the location for the four ‘Augustan’ columns (note that Richmond invokes the same coin used by Sehlmeier to argue for the Curia Julia: cf. supra n.47). Zanker (supra n.33) 86 f. believes that the rostral column for Naulochus stood near the old Rostra (a suggestion already made by Castagnoli

There would have been a strong rationale for Caesar Octavian to situate his rostral columns near these venerable monuments on one of the Forum's most hallowed grounds. First, this would have allowed him to connect his victory with what was the first, and by all accounts the most iconic and prestigious, of past naval triumphs. Second, as every Roman *triumphator* would strive to emulate and outdo his predecessors,⁷⁶ the establishment of two — and shortly thereafter no less than four — rostral columns near the prototype would have been an excellent means to convey that his (and, of course, Agrippa's) naval victories outclassed even that of the illustrious C. Duilius, the father of Rome's naval power. All of this lends more weight to the already-compelling case for an Augustan restoration of the inscription of Duilius.⁷⁷ At all events, the fact that Tacitus unequivocally records that Augustus restored the *templum Iano* built by Duilius on the Forum Holitorium further

(supra n.47) 106 and F. Coarelli (*Il Foro romano. Periodo repubblicano e augusteo* [Rome 1985] 259), along with “das Reitermonument Octavians von 43 v. Chr.”, whereas the four additional columns voted following his victory over Antony and Cleopatra were erected “nicht weit Davon, vor der Basilica Iulia”. On the basis of Servius' subsequent mention of Duilius' prototypical rostral column, Lugli (supra n.66) 165 and Palombi 1993 (supra n.34) and id. (supra n.42) 321–29 suggest that all four 'Augustan' rostral columns relocated by Domitian originally stood on the Forum Romanum. Since construction of the *Equus Domitiani* required the destruction of a slab of concrete from the Augustan era equipped with three features to support heavy vertical elements (see C. F. Giuliani and P. Verduchi, *L'area centrale del Foro Romano* [Florence 1987] especially 138) Palombi (supra n.34; supra n.42, 326–29) further speculates that this could be the base of a three-column victory monument commemorating Actium, rejecting the possibility that it concerns the foundations for Domitian's equestrian statue — cf. already Lugli (ibid.) who believes that four bronze columns erected after the conquest of Egypt stood “nel luogo in cui Domiziano eresse il tempio di Vespasiano la sua statua equestre”. Palombi's view, that the Naulochus and Actium columns originally stood at different locations on the Forum (i.e., near the Rostra and on the spot of the future *Equus Domitiani*, respectively) and were subsequently relocated and 'united' by Domitian, has found acceptance in Schmuhl (supra n.45) 149 f. In our view, the possibility of some pre-Domitianic equestrian statue on this ideal spot should not be discarded so rashly. Richardson (supra n.33) 97 also thinks that the Naulochus column recorded by Appian stood on the Forum Romanum, but he revives the hypothesis that the four rostral columns decreed after Egypt were erected “in the precinct of Apollo Palatinus, because the passage in Virgil where such columns are mentioned clearly takes that temple as its model”. That Vergil would have associated Apollo and the rostral columns voted after Actium is unsurprising since Apollo had been chosen as a patron deity of Octavian and was singled out for special treatment following Actium. Significantly, the fictitious temple which Vergil 'pledges' to build at 3.13–39 is dedicated to Emperor Caesar Divi filius himself, and he clearly intends for it to be adorned with features symbolizing his signal victories on very different geographical fronts across the empire. Lange (supra n.5) 162 f. suggests that the Naulochus column “was refitted after Actium, with the original single column now (...) joined by three more”, so creating a “four-column-monument (...) built to commemorate Actium and perhaps also the capture of Egypt”. The latter suggestion is doubtful since the conquest of Egypt and the capture of Alexandria did not involve a major naval battle: cf. infra n.82. At all events, the 'triumphal' area *in Circo* (i.e., in the vicinity of the Circus Flaminius) can be safely excluded as Augustus only began its fundamental transformation from the 20s onwards: Hölscher (supra n.6) 316.

⁷⁶ Octavian's/Augustus's eagerness to outdo his all his triumphal predecessors is attested at *RG* 4.1.
⁷⁷ For a compelling argument that Augustus was responsible for the latest restoration of Duilius' column and its inscription, see Kondratieff (supra n.27) 13. Given that the Naulochus *columnae* were erected in the Forum Romanum (see above) and the Forum of Augustus was not completed until after 20 (Richardson [supra n.33] 160–62), it is unlikely that Servius is mistaken and that the Actian rostral columns were in Augustus' new forum instead.

corroborates his keen interest in this particularly eminent and outstanding representative of the Republican *summi uiri*.⁷⁸

The inscriptions thought to have been on the Arch of Augustus on the SE end of the Forum Romanum, the so-called *Fasti Consulares et Triumphales*, would constitute the most authoritative source for how Octavian/Augustus chose to celebrate and commemorate his triple triumph of August 29.⁷⁹ As indicated in the above, the key section covering the period from 32 to 29 (altogether some 16 lines) is lost.⁸⁰ Fortunately, however, some fragments from *fasti* commissioned by communities outside Rome preserve explicit references to Actium and probably reflect the manner in which the Actian triumph was represented in the *Fasti Capitolini*. Whilst the *Fasti Cuprenses* and *Venusini* merely preserve the term *Bellum Actiense*,⁸¹ the oft-ignored or overlooked *Fasti Amiternini* feature what is probably the most complete and explicit definition of the Actian war. Following the names of the ordinary and suffect consuls for 32, the *Fasti Amiternini* have: *Bellum Actie(n)s(e) class[icum] cum M. Antonio*.⁸² Though not intended as a formal *inscriptio triumphi* on the model of the Augustan *Fasti Triumphales*, this record nonetheless provides some of the most powerful evidence that the Actian victory parade officially took the form of a naval triumph: the Actian war was officially remembered as having been decided in a naval engagement between regular fleets/armies of marines (*classes/classici*). Commissioned at the municipal level after 28, these *Fasti* also freely admit a fact that Emperor Caesar had been somewhat reluctant to parade publicly: that the Actian war had been fought *cum M. Antonio*.⁸³

78 Interestingly, Tacitus (*Ann.* 2.49) takes the trouble to add the explanation *qui primus rem Romanam prospere mari gessit triumphumque naualem de Poenis meruit*, suggesting that Augustus wanted to associate his own naval victories, earning him the last of the official naval triumphs, with that of Duilius.

79 For the widely accepted suggestion that the *Fasti*, including additional fragments found in the area of the arch in the 1870s, belonged to the Arch of Augustus, see A. Degrassi, "L'edificio dei Fasti Capitolini," *RendPontAcc* 21 (1945-46) 57; cf. also Freyberger (*supra* n.66) 64-67.

80 *Inscr. Ital.* 13.1, 86 f.

81 *Fasti Cuprenses*: *Inscr. Ital.* 13.1, 245, in the entry for 32 B.C.: [*Bellum Actie*]nse. *Fasti Venusini*: *Inscr. Ital.* 13.1, 255, in the entry for 32 B.C.: *Bellum Acti(ense)*; in the entry for 30 B.C.: *Bellum Alexandrae*. This evidence probably accounts for Degrassi's widely accepted reconstruction of the lost Actian entry in the Capitoline *Fasti* (*Inscr. Ital.* 13.1, 570: cf. above).

82 *Contra* Th. Mommsen, *CIL IX* 4191, W. Henzen, *CIL I²* p. 61, and Degrassi in *Inscr. Ital.* 13.1, 170 f.; cf. 172, where Degrassi clarifies that "*Bellum Actiese pro Actiaco* redit etiam in fastis Cuprensibus (n.7) et in titulo C.I.L. XI, 623; hic autem tantum, quod sciam, classiarum appellatur"; Alföldy (*supra* n.10) 168-71 conclusively argues that the final entry in this list of civil wars should not be reconstructed as *Bell[um classia]r(ium) confect(um)* but rather as *Bell[a civilia p(opuli)] R(omani) confect(a)*. Although Mommsen, Henzen, Degrassi and even Alföldy (*ibid.* 167) all favour the reading *Bellum Actie(n)s(e) class[iar(ium)]* for the preceding entry, a reading inspired by Mommsen's incorrect reconstruction of the Actian war entry, we are inclined to read it as *Bellum Actie(n)s(e) class[icum]*. First, the names of all preceding civil wars recorded in the *Fasti* (see n.10 above and Alföldy *ibid.* 167 f.) are spelled out in full: *Mutine(n)se*; *in campis Philippicis*; and *Perusinum*. Second, as opposed to the presumed *class[iar]*, the term *class[icum]* fits perfectly the space available to the right of the extant text. Third, the term *classicus* is used more widely than *classarius* in the Late Republican and Early Imperial literary and epigraphic record (cf. n.93 below). The mention of a *bellum classicum* doubtless refers to Actium, as Dio (51.9-14), Plutarch (*Ant.* 76.1) and Orosius (6.19.16) all record that the conquest of Alexandria did not involve a full-fledged naval battle.

83 Although both Degrassi (*Inscr. Ital.* 13.1, 169) and Alföldy (*supra* n.10) 167 date these *Fasti* to 28, a later date seems more likely. In the same unvarnished fashion, the 'Medinaceli' frieze (from

In our 2011 study of the significance of the naval triumph, we suggested that the official entry in the Augustan *Fasti Triumphales* may have been *ex Actio naualem (triumphum egit)* or, more emphatically, *naualem ex Actio*. Whilst this remains a possibility, the above analysis prompts an alternative, more likely, conjecture. Whereas there is every indication that the term *ex Actio* featured in the *inscriptio triumphi*,⁸⁴ the emphatic mention of a *bellum classicum* in the *Fasti Amiternini* suggests that Octavian at some point in the years 31–29 decided to inscribe, and commemorate accordingly, his triumph as one “of the fleet”, a *classicus triumphus*. The presence of this term in the official *inscriptio triumphi* is, perhaps, reflected in Livy, *Per.* 133 (*M. Antonius ad Actium classe uictus Alexandriam profugit*), in Propertius’ reference to *bella classica* (in regard to the so-called *bellum Sicilum*), and in Velleius’ terming (2.81.3) of Agrippa’s *corona naualis* as a *corona classica*.⁸⁵ In this respect, it should be noted that *classis* is twice used in the *Res Gestae* (at 23 and 26.4) to denote fleet(s), whereas the terms *naues* and *naualis proelio*, used at RG 3.4 and 23, respectively, signify individual ships captured and a staged *naumachia*. Besides, had the Actian *inscriptio triumphi* used the more traditional term *naualem*, the *Fasti Amiternini* would have more likely featured *bellum Actie(n)s(e) nauale cum M. Antonio*.⁸⁶

There would have been several advantages to inscribing his triumph in this particular terminology instead of the customary *naualis triumphus*. Rather than merely associating his victory with the venerable Republican tradition of the naval triumph, first instituted by C. Duilius,⁸⁷ such would also enable him to set his achievement apart as a truly unique

Abellinum in Campania; fragments are in the Szépművészeti Múzeum, Budapest, the Duchess of Cardona collection, Córdoba, and the Casa de Pilatos, Seville), dating to the Julio-Claudian period, depicts the battle quite clearly as having been fought between the ships of Octavian and Antony, with soldiers dressed in characteristically Roman arms fighting on the decks of the opposing ships. To the left, Apollo watches on while a centaur (a possible association with Antony’s patron deity Dionysius) stands upon the prow of another. Apparently there was no attempt to show the battle as between Romans and Egyptians. On the fragments, first re-united and exhibited in 2013, see E. La Rocca, C. Parisi Presicce, A. Lo Monaco, C. Giroire and D. Roger, *Augusto* (Milan 2013) 320–22.

84 Compare the extant local *fasti* (quoted above) as well as Livy, *Per.* 133 (*alterum ex Actiaca uictoria*); Suet., *Aug.* 22 (*triumphum Actiacum* (cf. 18.2: *Actiaca uictoriae memoria*); and Suet., *Tib.* 6.4: *Actiaco triumpho*).

85 Livy’s description of the aftermath of the battle is possibly echoed in *Flor.* 2.11.7, which also features the term *classis*. The term *inscriptio triumphi* is on record at *Flor.* 2.7.8 and is probably the technical term for official triumphal rôle of honour. There should, however, be no doubt that there was no mention of Antony in the Actian triumphal entry: in *BC* 2.101, Appian records that even Julius Caesar “took care not to inscribe any Roman names in his triumph (as it would have been unseemly in his eyes and base and inauspicious in those of the Roman people to triumph over fellow citizens)”.

86 Especially as the inscription on the victory monument at Nicopolis features the term *navalibus spoliis* (echoed at Suet., *Aug.* 18.2); Murray and Petsas (supra n.2) 76. The term *bellum classicum* (or some variant) seems to be extremely rare in the extant epigraphic and literary sources. The literary sources more regularly use the term *nauale bellum* or *proelium* or some variant (cf., e.g., Cic., *Leg. Man.* 28; Livy 32.21.27; Livy, *Per.* 32; Amm. Marc. 22.16.24; Oros. 3.1.7, 4.20.22 and 6.15.34; Eutrop. *Brev.* 7.7), whilst Cicero (*Verr.* 2.5.67) uses the term *triumphus naualis*. For Flavian coinage with the inscription VICTORIA NAVALIS SC, see *RIC* 2, Vesp. nos. 481, 503, 551, 562 and 601. Whilst L. Laffranchi (“Un centenario numismatico nell’ antichità,” *RivItNum* 24 [1911] 427–36) suggests that a number of coin types of Vespasian may have been imitating or referring to Actium as part of its 100th anniversary, the coinage asserting *uictoria naualis* probably refers to contemporary events.

87 The closure of the temple of Janus on 11 January 29 — eagerly welcomed by Octavian (Dio

feat of arms, incomparable to any precedent.⁸⁸ In support of this argument, it is worth calling to mind that the term *classe* features prominently in both Duilius' *Elogium* and the first naval triumph entry in the Augustan *Fasti* — and only in the first.⁸⁹ Celebrating his Actian triumph as a *classicus triumphus* was thus to achieve full circle: from Duilius' groundbreaking defeat of the *classis Poenica* to his defining victory over the *classis Antoni et Cleopatrae*, from the first major victory over a rival naval power to the definitive.⁹⁰ Last but not least, it would have turned the entire occasion into a decidedly popular event, putting into stark relief the valorous efforts of the *classici*, the humble yet indispensable marines who won the day and would have been well represented in the triumphal parade.⁹¹ Though often ignored, these fiercely proud soldiers had, after all, been responsible for Octavian's most decisive victories, both at Naulochus and Actium, Philippi having been largely the work of M. Antonius. Some 7 years after Naulochus, which due to political considerations had yielded only an ovation, they too finally got to enjoy their curule triumph: Imperator Caesar's *classicus triumphus* not just as a triumph 'of the fleet' but also 'of the marines', in contrast to the traditional triumphs 'of the ships' (*naualis triumphus*) of the mid-Republican period.⁹² It is therefore quite plausible that the Actian entry in the Augustan *Fasti* ran as

51.20.4; cf. *RG* 13) and, so we are told, only the third such event in all of Roman history — further strengthened this association with Duilius' victory since we know that the victor of Mylae built a temple to Janus *ex manubiis* in the Forum Holitorium as a permanent memorial to his victory, probably in fulfilment of a vow and perhaps dedicating it himself as censor in 258: Tac., *Ann.* 2.49 (cf. above) and Kondratieff (supra n.27) 6. Both the wording in Dio 51.20.4 and the fact that Augustus emphatically claimed that the closure happened because he had brought about "peace on land and sea" (Livy 1.19.3; *RG* 13) indicate that the Senate ordered the immediate closure of the temple as part of the honours voted on 1 January 29, *contra* Gural (supra n.4) 33.

88 M. Roller ("On the intersignification of monuments in Augustan Rome," *AJPh* 134 [2013] 120-26) argues cogently that Duilius ranked eminently amongst Octavian's favourite *exempla*, and observes that the impressiveness of the latter's claim to have surpassed the former much depended upon Duilius being remembered as a glorious victor. This lends further support to the case for an Actian naval triumph outclassing all previous such triumphs, even that of the great Duilius.

89 See Kondratieff (supra n.27) 14 f. and *Inscr. Ital.* 13.1, 76 f.

90 Cf. Murray (supra n.20) 339: Actium "marked the decisive reaffirmation of Rome's control over the Eastern Mediterranean and stands as the last great naval conflict of antiquity".

91 In 260, Duilius already had gone to great lengths to court popular favour, in the short as well as the long term: see the insightful discussion in Kondratieff (supra n.7) 21-33.

92 That they would only enter the City on August 15, the day of the Egyptian triumph, probably marching as a distinct body in the column following Octavian's *quadriga* (see Dio 51.21.8 f.; Vervaet [supra n.32] 100-2) is of no consequence to this argument. In the period considered here, *imperatores* celebrating an ovation would enter the City on horseback and were followed by their soldiers. In previous times they entered on foot and were followed by the Senate in a body, rather than by their soldiers: Livy 3.10.4 (*ovans sine militibus*) and 26.21.6-10; Aul. Gell. 5.6.27 (*sequentibus eos non militibus, sed universo senatu*) and Dion. Hal. 5.47.3. The *imperator*, however, remained at liberty to parade in front of him all sorts of booty, prominent foreign personalities, and visual representations of his achievements. In this regard, it is also worth remembering that Octavian had honoured all *classici* involved in the battle of Naulochus with the prestigious *corona oleaginea*: Dio 49.14.2. Since we can presume he did the same after Actium, the scale, pomp and circumstance of the *classicus triumphus* of August 14, 29 B.C., could not have been more different from the last recorded naval triumph of December 1, 167, when the propraetor Cn. Octavius (*pr.* 168) celebrated his secondary triumph one day following the resplendent Macedonian triumph of L. Aemilius Paullus (*cos.* 168) (*Inscr. Ital.* 13.1, 80 f.) in

follows: *Imp. Caesar Divi f. C. n. IV, consul V, classicum ex Actio XIX k. Sept.*⁹³

Conclusions

Imperator Caesar Divi filius' second curule triumph for all intents and purposes took the form of a full-fledged naval triumph, celebrated (and later uniquely inscribed in the Augustan *Fasti Triumphales*) as a *classicum triumphus*.⁹⁴ The rationale for this would have been compelling.⁹⁵ Not only could he eclipse Pompeius Magnus' contested triumph over pirates in September 61, celebrated (and commemorated) much in the vein of a naval triumph without naming it as such:⁹⁶ it also gave him an excellent chance to surpass the entire triumphal records of both Pompey and Caesar, who had both triumphed over all three of the known continents in, respectively, three and five curule triumphs.⁹⁷ As regards the monumental honours awarded after Actium, the evidence also suggests that this critical victory generated two, rather than four, rostral columns, and that these were voted on behalf of both Octavian and Agrippa. These decrees were probably modelled on votes passed in the aftermath of Naulochus, when first Octavian, and thereafter also Agrippa, were honoured with *columnae rostratae*. In all likelihood first located in the Forum Romanum, probably

rather lacklustre manner, without prisoners or spoils: Livy 45.42.2f. (cf. Plut., *Aem.* 30.2). Livy also records that the *socii nauales* and their officers marched in Octavius' triumph and duly received their financial reward at the hand of the *triumphator*. The Actian naval triumph thus seamlessly revived, and concluded, the grand tradition magnificently begun by Duilius in 260.

93 As such, *classicum* could both be read as an adjective, in the accusative singular, denoting triumph "of the fleet", and a noun, in the archaizing syncopated genitive plural, denoting triumph "of the marines". In this respect, it is worth indicating that Late Republican and Early Imperial literary and epigraphic sources more frequently use the shorter *classici*>*classicus* for marines, instead of the slightly longer *classiarii*>*classarius*: see a range of examples in the *OLD* (2nd edn., vol. 1, 2012) 365 (s.v. 'classarius' and 'classicus'); Lewis and Short, *A Latin dictionary* (1962 edn.) 350 (s.v. 'classarius', 'classicus' and 'classici'); cf. also *TLL* vol. 3, cc. 1278-80 ('classarius' and 'classicus'). Given that the term *classicus* in the first instance denotes 'belonging to the highest class of citizens' and in the second (especially so in the plural) 'marine(s)' in the sense of naval servicemen (*OLD*), inscribing his naval triumph as a *classicum triumphum* indicates the eagerness of Imperator Caesar Divi filius both to emphasize the first-class nature of his victory and put the glorious rôle of his marines into stark relief.

94 *Contra Gurval* (supra n.4) 131: "Actium merited a triumph, but the triple triumph ceremonies were not a glorification of the naval battle".

95 In stark contrast to the ovation *ex Sicilia* (supra n.39), the Actian naval triumph cannot have been premeditated, as the decision to stake it all on a naval engagement at Actium was made in Greece (see Lange [supra n.20] 615 f.). However, once victory had been achieved, the choice of a naval triumph was obvious. Octavian's interest in naval triumphs may already have been kindled by Caesar's Egyptian triumph of 46, which featured some captives taken in the naval engagement on the Nile (App., *BC* 2.101) and perhaps also paraded some *rostra* or other distinctive ship parts. After his quadruple triumph, Caesar staged a hugely popular *naumachia*: Suet., *Div. Iul.* 39; Dio 43.23.4; App., *BC* 2.102.

96 For more extensive discussions of how Pompey artfully integrated his victory over piracy in his resplendent third triumph of September 61, see Dart and Vervaet (supra n.16) 276-78 and especially Vervaet (supra n.10) 139-45.

97 Octavian's desire to distinguish his triumphal record from that of both Pompey and his adoptive father also shows in his decision to celebrate his three curule triumphs on successive days. In doing so, he interestingly combined the approach taken by Pompey in his third triumph of September 61, which he spread over two consecutive days (Plut., *Pomp.* 45.1), and Caesar's decision to stage his first four triumphs in 46 on four separate days (Dio 43.19.1).

near the old Rostra and the iconic *columna Duilii*, these four columns constituted a single 'Augustan' group, later incorrectly perceived as having been erected solely on account of Actium. Domitian had them relocated to the Capitol, where they joined a number of similar monuments from the Middle Republic, completing an imposing rostral colonnade still prominently visible at the start of the 5th c. A.D. That only Appian and Servius Auctus provide direct literary testimony can be explained in two ways: first, there is the loss of Livy and other key sources for the period under consideration; second, the award of rostral columns following Naulochus and Actium, however remarkable, did not constitute an absolute novelty, as this distinction had been voted to the commanders of some of the naval victors of the Middle Republic.

fvervaet@unimelb.edu.au
cdart@unimelb.edu.au

The University of Melbourne

This paper builds upon our 2011 study on the naval triumph. All dates are B.C. unless otherwise noted. We would like to express our gratitude to Eric Kondratieff and Andrew Turner, as well as the anonymous referees for their incisive and helpful feedback. We alone remain responsible for any remaining flaws or errors. All translations are from the *LCL*, revised where necessary.