Marquette University

e-Publications@Marquette

2020

The Ship of Aeneas

Jennifer Finn
Marquette University, jennifer.finn@marquette.edu

The Ship of Aeneas
Jennifer Finn

Abstract: *The ship of Aeneas, the subject of a single literary attestation in Procopius, has received little serious attention from scholars. In a 1997 article, Pier Luigi Tucci made a plausible case for locating the shipshed for the vessel on the banks of the Tiber in the so-called* navalia*; he went further to propose that Augustus was the architect behind the ship's placement there. Here I will expand upon Tucci's argument by suggesting that Augustus dedicated the ship in 2 BC, simultaneous with the performance of his famous* naumachia *and the dedication of the Augustan Forum. As the culmination of a "naval narrative" surrounding his defeat of Antony and Cleopatra at the battle of Actium in 31 BC, the ship of Aeneas can be viewed as consistent with the first emperor's ideological program; it carried allusions not just to the Trojan foundation of the city of Rome, but also to a subversive attempt to apply a revisionist narrative to Greek—and particularly Athenian—history. Augustus' preoccupation with positioning his reign in the longue durée of global conflicts between East and West was so pervasive that it was still recognizable to Procopius in the sixth century CE.*

Keywords: *Aeneas; Augustus; Aeneid; naval narrative; Persian Wars; Procopius*

Procopius' Relic

In the mid-sixth century CE, the Byzantine historian Procopius of Caesarea embarked upon a tour of Rome, while accompanying the general Belisarius in his prosecution of Justinian's Gothic wars in Italy. His perusal of Rome's antiquities led him to a curious encounter: the ship of Aeneas, which the historian locates "near the bank of the Tiber:"

> Καίτοι ἀνθρώπων μάλιστα πάντων ὧν ἡμεῖς ἴσμεν φιλοπόλιδες Ῥωμαῖοι τυγχάνουσιν ὄντες, περιστέλλειν τε τὰ πάτρια πάντα καὶ διασώζεσθαι ἐν σπουδῇ ἔχουσιν, ὅπως δὴ μηδὲν ἀφανίζηται Ῥώμῃ τοῦ παλαιοῦ κόσμου. οἵ γε καὶ πολύν τινα βεβαρβαρωμένοι αἰῶνα τάς τε πόλεως διεσώσαντο οἰκοδομίας καὶ τῶν ἐγκαλλωπισμάτων τὰ πλεῖστα, ὅσα οἷόν τε ἦν χρόνῳ τε τοσούτῳ τὸ μῆκος καὶ τῷ ἀπαμελεῖσθαι δι᾽ ἀρετὴν τῶν πεποιημένων ἀντέχειν. ἔτι μέντοι καὶ ὅσα μνημεῖα τοῦ γένους ἐλέλειπτο ἔτι, ἐν τοῖς καὶ ἡ ναῦς Αἰνείου, τοῦ τῆς πόλεως οἰκιστοῦ, καὶ εἰς τόδε κεῖται, θέαμα παντελῶς ἄπιστον. νεώσοικον γὰρ

ποιησάμενοι ἐν μέσῃ τῇ πόλει, παρὰ τὴν τοῦ Τιβέριδος ὄχθην, ἐνταῦθά τε αὐτὴν καταθέμενοι, ἐξ ἐκείνου τηροῦσιν. (*Justinian's War* 8.22.5-8)[1]

And more than all other men of which we know, the Romans love their city, and in all zealousness, they protect and preserve all their ancestral things, lest anything of their ancient honor be obliterated. Although they were held under barbarian influence for quite a long time, nevertheless they salvaged the buildings of the city and most of its ornaments, whichever things could withstand such a great length of time and utter neglect due to the excellence of their craftsmanship. Furthermore, such memorials of this race still remain situated there, among which is the ship of Aeneas, the founder of the city, an entirely incredible thing to behold. For they built a dock in the middle of the city, near the bank of the Tiber, and depositing it there, they have guarded it ever since.

A lengthy description of the ship follows (ἥπερ ὁποία ποτέ ἐστιν αὐτὸς θεασάμενος ἐρῶν ἔρχομαι, "What kind of ship this was I will explain now, as I have seen it myself"), indicating that the vessel was still preserved in a "museum" setting in Procopius' day. He describes the pristine nature of the ship:

τούτων δὲ δὴ τῶν ξύλων οὐδὲν οὔτε σέσηπεν οὔτε τι ὑποφαίνει ὡς σαπρὸν εἴη, ἀλλ ἀκραιφνὴς πανταχόθι οὖσα ἡ ναῦς, ὥσπερ ὑπόγυον τῷ τεχνίτῃ τῷ αὐτῆς, ὅστις ποτ ἦν, νεναυπηγημένη, ἔρρωται καὶ ἐς ἐμὲ θαυμαστὸν ὅσον. (*Justinian's War* 8.22.16)

The timbers are not at all rotted, nor does it show any signs of being putrid, but the ship is altogether unharmed, just as if newly built by the ship's craftsman himself, whoever he was, and its strength has remained incredible even in my day.

Cameron characterizes Procopius' digression as a commentary on "the traditional patriotism of Rome," in which he uses the survival of pagan artefacts and mythologies to demonstrate the endurance of Roman traditionalism even through barbarian threats.[2] Besides the testimony of Procopius, we have no other attestations of the ship of Aeneas in Rome.[3] While Tucci has previously argued that the ship of Aeneas was placed by Augustus in the *navalia*,[4] he did not suggest an occasion for the dedication of the ship. In this article, I will argue that, while the shipsheds on the bank of the Tiber had been in use for a long period before the reign of Augustus, we should date the placement of the vessel of Aeneas there in 2 BC. The appearance of the ship on the banks of the Tiber should be viewed in conjunction with the performance of the *naumachia* and the dedication of the Forum Augustum, when Augustus cemented his legacy in the *longue durée* of Greco-Roman history through a series of symbolic actions that completed a narrative first inaugurated at the battle of Actium in 31 BC. The ship

---

[1] Chapter numbers for Procopius are derived from Kaldellis (2014); translations are my own.

[2] Cameron (1985) 203 and 203 n. 112.

[3] Kaldellis (2014) 511 n. 816, notes that there are no other sources that mention this monument.

[4] Tucci (1997) 35-42.

of Aeneas in Rome served as a monumental tool in the synchronization of the Aeneas-Augustus complex—both signaled as founders of Rome through naval symbolism—that was so pervasive during this period. But more than that, it brought Augustus' ideological pronouncements into direct contact with Athenian cultural memory, particularly with the legacy of the 5th century BC Persian Wars. Augustus' adoption of a Trojan ancestor and his programmatic usurpation of Athenian mnemohistory in the performative setting of the events of 2 BC served as the climax of Augustan image-making. When read in this way, Procopius' description of Aeneas' ship can provide us with a truly valuable commentary on late antique reception of Augustan ideological rhetoric.

Actium and the Triple Triumph: Authoring an Imperial Scene

In 31 BC, Octavian cemented his power over the Roman world in his defeat of the combined forces of Antony and Cleopatra in a naval engagement at Actium, off the coast of northwestern Greece. The battle, which "constitutes a potent and enduring turning point in the course of Roman history and indeed of Western civilization,"[5] represented the end of the Republic, the symbolic defeat of the "East" by the "West,"[6] and the beginning of a new era of one-man rule in Rome.[7] Octavian himself was quick to view the battle in such a light. Before his return from the East in 29 BC, he founded Nikopolis, "city of Victory," in direct imitation of Alexander the Great (and Pompey);[8] at this point he could now present himself as the liberator of the East.[9] At Nikopolis, we have important evidence for a dedication by Octavian, where, as Cassius Dio 51.1.3 relates, he established a war memorial here:

> πόλιν τέ τινα ἐν τῷ τοῦ στρατοπέδου τόπῳ, τοὺς μὲν συναγείρας τοὺς δ' ἀναστήσας τῶν πλησιοχώρων, συνῴκισε, Νικόπολιν ὄνομα αὐτῇ δούς. τό τε χωρίον ἐν ᾧ ἐσκήνησε, λίθοις τε τετραπέδοις ἐκρηπίδωσε καὶ τοῖς ἁλοῦσιν ἐμβόλοις ἐκόσμησεν, ἕδος τι ἐν αὐτῷ τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος ὑπαίθριον ἱδρυσάμενος.
>
> *On the site of his camp he founded a city, by assembling some and dispossessing others of the neighboring peoples, and he gave it the name "Nikopolis." In the place where he had*

---

[5] Gurval (1995) 1.

[6] Augustus's propaganda had formulated the run-up to Actium as a battle between East and West, painting Antony as an un-Roman, "barbarian" figure. See Kienast (1969) 437-446. On Octavian's propaganda against Antony, see also Gurval (1995) 189-208.

[7] For an excellent and up-to-date bibliography (with primary source citations) on the battle, see Fratantuono & Smith (2018) 693-694.

[8] Pompey's foundation of a Nikopolis near the area in Asia Minor where he delivered the decisive blow to Mithridates appears to be in direct imitation of Alexander's foundation of a like-named city after the battle of Issus in 333 BC. See Kühnen (2008) 67 and n. 142 for bibliography and Gurval (1995) 69-70. For a discussion of the sources on the foundation of Nikopolis (and their inconsistencies), see Murray & Petsas (1989) 9-12.

[9] Isager (1993) 78.

had encamped, he built a foundation with square stones, adorned it with the beaks of captured ships, and dedicated on it, an open-air shrine to Apollo.[10]

The sockets for these displayed ship's rams are archaeologically attested.[11] The victory monument, which honored the gods Mars and Neptune, contains upper and lower friezes depicting the triumphal procession of the victor, and was likely to have been commissioned from Rome not long after Octavian's return from the East.[12] Additionally, Octavian made an exceptional dedication of a full complement of ten ships from the battle of Actium inside shipsheds attached to the sanctuary at Nikopolis (Strabo 7.7.6).[13] The site became a tourist attraction in and of itself, as visitors came in honor of the Actian games, which, although previously established here, were henceforth celebrated in honor of Augustus himself.[14] These games became a part of the athletic *periodos*,[15] and the emperor Nero himself later participated in the games,[16] which, of course, had added a ship race to the traditional Panhellenic festival program. Although erected in a Greek city, the Actian monument and its inscription were unfailingly evocative of (what would become) the Augustan ideological program,[17] and should be seen as the inauguration of the "naval narrative" surrounding the new regime at Rome.

To celebrate his momentous achievement, Octavian staged a rare triple triumph in Rome, on August 13th, 14th, and 15th of 29 BC.[18] The first day was meant to celebrate Octavian's victories in Illyria,[19] for which he had been awarded a triumph in 34 BC that was deferred until this celebration.[20] The second day, celebrated for his victory at Actium, was notable in and of itself for being the first individual battle "to become the formal occasion and *nomen* of a

---

[10] Also Suetonius *Aug.* 18.2, which reads: *Quoque Actiacae victoria memoria celebratior et in posterum esset, urbem Nicopolim apud Actium condidit ludosque illic quinquennales constituit et ampliato vetere Apollinis templo locum*

would be all the more celebrated in the future, he founded near Actium a city called Nikopolis, and there he established quinquennial games and built up the old temple of Apollo, adorning the place where his camps were located with spoils from his naval victories, and consecrated it to Neptune and Mars).

[11] Murray & Petsas (1989) 27-35. See also Büscher (1996).

[12] See Pollini (2012) 191-203 and Zachos (2001).

[13] Murray & Petsas (1989) 116.

[14] For various arguments relating to the dating of these games (sometime between 28 and 27 BC), see Tidman (1950) 123-125. For a more recent assessment of the evidence, see Gurval (1995) 74-81.

[15] König (2005) 168-169; see also Lämmer (1986/87).

[16] Halfmann (1986) 174.

[17] See the excellent assessment of Lange (2009) 95-123.

[18] Prior to this, only dictators had celebrated more than one triumph: M. Furius Camillus, with four; M. Valerius Corvus, with four; and Caesar, with five. See Hickson (1991) 137 n. 64. Both Hickson (1991) 124-138 and Itgenshorst (2017) 59-81 argue that with this extravagant ceremony in 29 BC, Augustus had essentially monopolized the triumph, as the emperor himself never celebrated another triumph and, after the establishment of the Principate in 27 BC, he reserved such rites for the members of his own family and/or potential successors to the throne.

[19] App. *Ill.* 14.42-15.43. Appian says that he knows of the victory over Illyria from Augustus' own account. See Smith (2009) 9-10.

[20] Dio 49.38.1.

triumph."[21] But about the logistics and presentation of the Actian triumph on the second day we know very little, with it being upstaged in primary sources by accounts of the first and third days.[22] The memory of Actium that was created through the performance of this exceptional triumph may have required an injection of traditionalism to make it palatable for the Roman people, especially given that it was being celebrated over a civil foe.[23] The final day of the triumph was meant to commemorate Octavian's conquest over Egypt and the subjugation of Africa. An effigy of Cleopatra was led through the triumphal route,[24] together with exotic animals (e.g., a hippopotamus and a rhinoceros) and a representation of the Nile river, meant to highlight the foreign nature and remoteness of Octavian's greatest victory.[25] In reminiscence of this naval theme, following the completion of his triumph at Rome, Octavian made a series of dedications, including the naval beaks from Actium.[26] These were placed in the recently completed temple of Divus Julius,[27] and stood beside the famous painting of Apelles, the Venus Anadyomene, as a reference to the divine ancestry of the Julian house.[28]

To commemorate this signal victory, in book 8 of *The Aeneid*, Vergil—who began work on the epic in 29 BC under commission by Octavian/Augustus[29]—has Aeneas receive a shield, the centerpiece of which is a depiction of the battle of Actium (8.671-713); his triple triumph closes the ecphrasis (*Aen.* 8.714-728). In contrast to our historiographical sources, who give detail about the first and third days of the triumph, Vergil provides no hint on the shield of the Illyrian or Alexandrine victories;[30] here, Actium takes center stage. Indeed, in 27 BC, the Senate and the People of Rome had simultaneously bestowed upon Octavian the name of Augustus and a golden shield meant to commemorate his *pietas*, *iustitia*, *clementia*, and *virtus*. Aeneas'

---

[21] Gurval (1995) 21. While Gurval (1995) 28, does not believe the placement of the triumph in honor of Actium to be of great significance, Havener (2016) 83-139 argues that we should emphasize the second day, viewing it in terms of a "Triumph als Siegesritual," specifically meant to emphasize Octavian's part in ending the civil wars that had plagued the Republic for so long.

[22] Gurval (1995) 28.

[23] It has often been noted that, in its account of the triumph, the Barberini marble omits the second day, only mentioning the triumph over the Dalmatians and that over Egypt. Mommsen (1883) 10, posited that this omission was due to a transcription error (in *RG* 4.1, Augustus himself mentions three separate triumphs), while Gurval (1995) 32-33 argues that we can attribute the absence of Actium to a conflation in the Roman psyche between the victory at Actium and that over Egypt. Beard (2007) 303-304, however, posits a more political explanation: being a victory in a civil war, the battle at Actium may have been omitted by the composer or the commissioner of the marble to "'clean up' triumphal history by finessing Actium out of the picture."

[24] Plutarch *Ant.* 85-86; Dio 51.14.1-6; Livy *Per.* 133; Vell. 2.87.1; Flor. 2.21.10; Strabo *Geo.* 17.1.10.

[25] Gurval (1995) 28-30. Servius *Comm. in Verg. Aen.* 8.714 mentions the three days out of order, placing Actium first, the victory over the Dalmatians second, and the Alexandrine war on the third day.

[26] On the history of the naval triumph and ships and rams displayed at Rome, see Östenberg (2009) 46-57.

[27] Gurval (1995) 33-34.

[28] A useful summary of all the monuments to the Actian victory in Rome and their relation to Octavian's propaganda can be found in Zanker (1988) 82-85. It is important to keep in mind that in *Aeneid* 3.502, there is a direct kinship expressed between the Epirotes and the Romans, which is certainly a reference to the foundation of Nikopolis; see Horsfall (1989) 19.

[29] For a measured view on the role of poets in "serving the regime," see Griffin (2005) esp. 314-319. On Augustus' role in dictating the content of the *Aeneid*, see White (1993) 115-116.

[30] Fratantuono & Smith (2018) 731.

shield is the narrative reflection of these qualities, resulting in Aeneas' "Augustanization."[31] But Vergil does not create the Augustan Aeneas out of whole cloth. This passage in the *Aeneid*, argues McKay, is representative of Vergil's acquaintance with the east frieze of the Parthenon at Athens. It will have recalled the famous Athenian victory over the Persians in the 5th century BC, and drawn an implicit analogue between the "Great Event"[32] and Octavian's victory over Cleopatra's barbaric, eastern army.[33] Likewise, Quint brilliantly explicates the ways in which official literary propaganda—namely, the *Aeneid*—perpetuated the dichotomy between East and West, presenting the battle of Actium as a triumph of Western unity, masculinity, control, order, and permanence against Eastern multiplicity, femininity, chaos, and loss of identity. As such, the *Aeneid* can be viewed as "apologetic propaganda for the winning side of Augustus [which] brings into play a whole ideology that transforms the recent history of civil strife into a war of foreign conquest."[34] In addition to the literary attestations of Octavian's victory, the abundance of artistic works from all over the empire that represent the events at Actium attest to "one of the most elaborate barrages of propaganda ever employed in the ancient world."[35]

Therefore, it should be unsurprising that, with the *Aeneid* functioning as an Augustan propaganda piece, ships are an integral part of the story. Aeneas' first act as a colonist is to build ships (3.5-6; 9.80),[36] and his first arrival in Rome is marked by the traversing of his ships up the Tiber river (8.86-101). Landing in Rome on the same day as the start of Octavian's triple triumph (August 13th),[37] the ships of Aeneas have carried the only remnants of Troy to Rome. But unlike the men in the wooden horse at Troy, those who arrive in this wooden vessel come, like Augustus, to build (not sack) a city.[38] The ships become the metaphor *par excellence* for the future of Rome: so Hardie describes Vergil's depiction of Aeneas in 10.218, who "rules sitting in his royal tunic and administers the ship of state" (
Indeed, at several points, Vergil points to a clear association between the ships of Aeneas and those of Augustus at Actium.[40] Indeed, Augustus clarified this nautical connection between himself and Aeneas at an elaborately-staged event in the year 2 BC.

---

[31] Boyle (1999) 153 and Binder (1971) esp. 213-269. On pg. 271 he finds the culminating point of the *Aeneid* to be in Aeneas' victory over Turnus, which connects the hero to Augustus triumphant.

[32] The terminology of Drews (1973).

[33] McKay (1998) 201-202.

[34] Quint (1989) 3.

[35] Williams (1981) 26. We also see representations of Actium in other Italian municipalities, such as in wall paintings at Pompeii, a funerary monument from Ostia, and a relief from Praeneste; for which, see Kellum (2010) 187-205.

[36] Horsfall (1989) 15.

[37] Galinsky (1990) 287.

[38] Hardie (1987) 170.

[39] Hardie (1987) 168-169.

[40] Nadeau (2010) 223-226. E.g., the ships of Aeneas in *Aen.* 3.10-12 and the ships of Augustus in 8.675-681, again echoed in the description of Aeneas' new fleet in 10.261-275.

The Nautical Emperor

Two years after Octavian's triple triumph in 29 BC, a negotiation between Octavian and the Senate yielded what Galinsky calls the "first settlement," in which Octavian restored the *res publica* to the senate and the Roman people. At this time he was bestowed with the name Augustus and *princeps*, while acting as consul at Rome: "The entire agreement was a compromise that duly considered the widely shared desire for a return to legitimate government, Octavian's equally strong desire to remain in charge, and the feat that the republic would revert to chaos if the senatorial oligarchy tried to govern without him."[41] While the façade of the *res constituta* began to fade, both Augustus and his foremost naval officer Agrippa continued to participate in the construction of a grand narrative surrounding their naval superiority. In 25 BC, Agrippa built the *porticus Argonautarum* as a monument to his naval victories (Dio 53.27.1). Dio notes that it was referred to as the στοὰ τοῦ Ποσειδῶνος and contained paintings representing the adventures of the Argonauts, as well as (potentially, if Martial book 7 epigram 19 reflects reality) a piece of the famous ship.[42] It was located in *regio* IX of the city (as recorded in the *Curiosum*) and has been placed by scholars on the west side of the Saepta Julia.[43] Ackroyd notes that in Ovid's tour of Rome in Book 3, he describes an arcade of Augustus's son-in-law (Agrippa), "crowned with naval honors" (*Navalique gener cinctus honore caput,* 3.392), likely to be a reference to the *porticus Argonautarum.* She ventures the plausible suggestion that, with their similar focus on Neptune, the *porticus* may have been modeled on Octavian's victory monument at Nikopolis.[44] Certainly, Agrippa's role in the victory at Actium did not go unnoticed by Augustus; they maintained a close partnership until Agrippa's death in 12 BC.

It was not until after the publication of the *Aeneid* and the death of Agrippa, however, where Augustus had free reign to express the full extent of his power. Drawing from Agrippa's model of recalling the famous sea-faring Argo and taking a cue from Vergil's Athenian-inspired description of his triple triumph on the shield of Aeneas, Augustus brought the naval narrative to a head at his fabulously staged *naumachia* in 2 BC. In this year, the emperor built an artificial lake, the *stagnum Augusti*, in Trastevere. It had been symbolically placed in gardens that had once belonged first to Cassius, one of the notorious assassins of Caesar, and then, fittingly, to Antony.[45] The construction of the *stagnum* itself was a feat to be remembered, as Augustus mentions it in his *Res Gestae* (23), where he locates it *trans Tiberim in quo loco nunc nemus est*

his *Aqueducts* (ch. 11), Frontinus associates the construction of the artificial lake with the

---

[41] Galinsky (1996) 364.

[42] Gianfrotta (1991) 89-90.

[43] See the excellent notes and bibliography of Dumser on digitalaugustanrome.org, connected with monument #17, the Stoa of Poseidon.

[44] Ackroyd (1996) 596-597.

[45] Located in Regio XIV, the Trans-Tiberim, or modern Trastevere.

[46] Notably, the *stagnum Augusti* and Augustus' staged *naumachia* are highlighted with their own chapter in the *Res Gestae*, whereas other important monuments, like the temple of Mars Ultor (see below) are combined with other construction achievements.

building of the *Aqua Alsietina*, which may have been alternatively referred to as the *Aqua Augusta*.[47] The naval spectacle he staged here, meant to be a reproduction of the Athenian victory over the Persians at Salamis,[48] was a clear allusion to the battle of Actium:[49]

> ὁπλομαχία τε ἐν τοῖς σέπτοις καὶ ναυμαχία ἐν τῷ χωρίῳ ἐν ᾧ καὶ νῦν ἔτι σημεῖά τινα αὐτῆς δείκνυται Περσῶν καὶ Ἀθηναίων ἐποιήθη: ταῦτα γὰρ τὰ ὀνόματα τοῖς ναυμαχοῦσιν ἐτέθη, καὶ ἐνίκων καὶ τότε οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι. (Cassius Dio 55.10.7-8)
>
> *There was a combat in the Saepta, and a staged naval battle between the Persians and the Athenians, on a spot where still now one can see relics related to it. These were the names given to the contestants, and the Athenians won, just as they had then.*

The *naumachia* was a perfect occasion to recall the Greek wars against the eastern "barbarians," as the naval battle and its associated games (the *ludi circenses* and the *lusus Troiae*) were meant to celebrate the *profectio* of G. Caesar, grandson of Augustus, on his planned campaign against the Parthians. The happy occasion promised a successful conclusion to the wars between the West and the East.[50]

While it is often recognized that Augustus was keen on exploiting the memory of the Roman Republic for his own political gain, it was not until Spawforth's 2012 study that the complicated nuances of Augustan recollections of the Greco-Persian Wars became well understood.[51] As Spawforth notes, Augustus and his regime were "acutely aware of the historical parallelism between contemporary threats from the east and the struggle between Classical Greece and 'barbarian' Persia."[52] These allusions, if Hardie is correct, are echoed in the literary sources on the Augustan principate, particularly in Vergil, who "draws both on Hellenistic ways of figuring victories over barbarians and on fifth-century models that had already been used in the Hellenistic period" to create his narrative of the battle of Actium as it is depicted on the Shield of Aeneas in Book 8.[53] He even goes so far as to suggest that, in his broad planning of the themes on the Aeneas' shield, Vergil may have been influenced by the Pheidian statue of Athena Parthenos at the Parthenon, a monument which itself contained undeniable allusions to the Persian Wars.[54] The currency of the Persian Wars theme at Rome was so pervasive that it saw a long life in Roman rhetorical education as a declamation theme.

---

[47] Coleman (1993) 52. See, however, Taylor (1997) 477, who argues that the Aqua Alsietina was not supplying the *stagnum* in Frontinus' age.

[48] Ancient sources for the *naumachia* are helpfully collected in Taylor (1997) 467-468. On the location and size of the *stagnum*, see Coleman (1993) 51-54. Coarelli (1992) 43-46 has confirmed its existence through archaeological investigation.

[49] See Kellum (2010) 196-197, with Hölscher (1984).

[50] Sumi (2005) 251.

[51] Spawforth (2012) 103-141. See more below.

[52] Spawforth (2012) 103.

[53] Hardie (2007) 137.

[54] Hardie (1986) 99.

There is every reason to believe that the lengthy vitality of the trope was linked to the explicit adoption of the memory of the Persian Wars in Augustan ideology.[55]

The Persian Wars had long fascinated the Romans: this is beyond doubt. But it is too simplistic to assume that they adopted Persian War imagery without a critical analysis of the events. In Dio's description of Augustus' *naumachia* in 55.10.7, he records that the spectacle was meant to recall the battle of the "Persians" against the "Athenians," not the "Persians" against the "Greeks." Therefore, we see the Athenians are singled out in Augustus' performative reenactment of the battle of Salamis;[56] this implies the desire to impose a particular interpretation on that history, with a focus on the Athenian contribution to the "Great Event." In his famous article of 1984,[57] Hölscher began the conversation about Augustus' visual veneration of the Athenian victory at Salamis by arguing that neo-Attic reliefs with representations of Victory erected by Augustus in allusion to the victory at Actium were modeled after reliefs with images of Nike and Athena meant to celebrate the victory at Salamis. But these allusions were not thoughtless reenactments of Greek history in a Roman context: it is possible to view the staging of the *naumachia* as a blatant claim that Rome was the greater power in the Mediterranean, being finally able to accomplish the historical mission of Athens, who ultimately failed to subdue the Persian empire.[58] I concur, then, with Sumi, who argues that this *naumachia* is representative of Augustus' stranglehold on the past (and present) historical narrative:

> My suggestion is that this spectacle looked both to the past and the future at once, for in it time was compressed; in other words, the past and the future converged on the present. But if this mock battle was intended to anticipate the successful conclusion of Gaius' campaign—to demonstrate, in effect, how his success would be an echo of the successes of Greeks over barbarians, or west over east, from history—then it stands to reason that the defeat of the "Athenians" at the hands of the "Persians" would have not only reversed the outcome of history but also offered a foreboding omen that would have clouded Gaius' departure. For this reason, it seems to me that Augustus would have wanted to ensure the "Athenians'" victory, because this would have created the appropriate context for Gaius' departure and, at the same time, demonstrated the emperor's ability to recreate history on a lavish scale for the entertainment of the residents of the capital.[59]

It is this type of revisionism of Greek history and mythography—and particularly within an Athenian context—that will concern us here.

---

[55] Spawforth (2012) 128.

[56] Schmalz (2007-2008) 39.

[57] Hölscher (1984) 187-203.

[58] Hardie (2007) 129-130.

[59] Sumi (2005) 243.

The Problem with Aeneas

In his visual program in the *porticus Argonautarum*, Agrippa had already recalled Greek naval mythography as a useful analogue for the propagation of the Augustan naval narrative. But while articulating Vergil's manifest destiny, Augustus chose a very particular Greek mythography, and placed himself not only in the continuum of great Athenian naval victories but also in the continuum of great Athenian founders. The Athenians too had, as the story goes, kept a ship dedicated to their founder, Theseus, perhaps at Brauron.[60] The ship was said to be the one that Theseus had used on his Cretan expedition.[61] Plutarch (*Thes.* 23.1) describes the unusual measures taken by the Athenians to preserve it:

> τὸ δὲ πλοῖον ἐν ᾧ μετὰ τῶν ἠϊθέων ἔπλευσε καὶ πάλιν ἐσώθη, τὴν τριακόντορον, ἄχρι τῶν Δημητρίου τοῦ Φαληρέως χρόνων διεφύλαττον οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι, τὰ μὲν παλαιὰ τῶν ξύλων ὑφαιροῦντες, ἄλλα δὲ ἐμβάλλοντες ἰσχυρὰ καὶ συμπηγνύντες οὕτως ὥστε καὶ τοῖς: φιλοσόφοις εἰς τὸν αὐξόμενον λόγον ἀμφιδοξούμενον παράδειγμα τὸ πλοῖον εἶναι, τῶν μὲν ὡς τὸ αὐτό, τῶν δὲ ὡς οὐ τὸ αὐτὸ διαμένοι λεγόντων.
>
> *The ship on which [Theseus] sailed with the youths and returned in safety, a triaconter, the Athenians preserved down to the time of Demetrius of Phalerum, periodically removing the old beams and replacing them with strong and well-constructed ones: for the philosophers this ship became a paradigm for the doubtful question of growth, some saying that it was the same ship and others proclaiming that it was not.*

It should be no surprise that Augustus would desire to evoke Theseus and the Cretan expedition. The story featured an Athenian prince who journeyed to a hostile island, overtook a much-feared tyrant, and returned triumphant to his home city:[62] it was a veritable mirror of Octavian's defeat of Antony at Actium, as the *princeps* hoped to portray it.

The sacred ship of Theseus was said to have made a yearly journey to the island of Delos (Plato *Phaed.* 58a10-c1) to fulfill an Athenian vow to Apollo, who had ensured Theseus' safe return to Athens from Crete.[63] Plutarch (*Thes.* 21) also mentions that Theseus was responsible for establishing games and a mimetic dance recalling the Labyrinth at Delos on his return journey.[64] But there is more. In the period after the Persian Wars, the paternity of Theseus was newly ascribed to Poseidon, perhaps to highlight the hero's skills at sea-faring; we should read

---

[60] Walker (1995a) 43. This placement is often attributed to Pisistratid influence, though Walker gives arguments to reject that idea. Tucci (1997) 42 also mentions the ship of Theseus in connection to the ship of Aeneas.

[61] Walker (1995a) 43.

[62] Shapiro (1991) 37.

[63] It is the anticipated return of this ship from Delos that Plato *Crit.* 44a2-3 blames for the delayed execution of Socrates.

[64] Marshall (2000) 354.

this new treatment, argues Turner, as a personification of Athenian naval supremacy, with a special nod to the battle of Salamis.[65] Together with the production of the *naumachia*, Octavian's focus on Apollo in the foundation of a victory monument and games at Nikopolis, as well as the dedication of the temple of Apollo on the Palatine in 28 BC,[66] gives every indication of an attempt to mimic certain aspects of the uniquely Athenian legend associated with Theseus and his ship. To more explicitly equate himself with Theseus, Augustus tapped into the particularly Roman imagery of the Trojan Aeneas, whose ship he sought to preserve *ad infinitum* on the banks of the Tiber.

The special status of Troy (Ilion) was very early recognized by the Romans.[67] As the legendary home of Aeneas, Troy was the first Asiatic city to establish a relationship with Rome, and in 205 BC, the city was recognized as an independent state under Roman protection.[68] In 48 BC, Julius Caesar himself ordered his Roman engineers to level the acropolis and begin the construction of new earthworks, complete with the restoration of the Hellenistic temple to Athena that had been erected there by Lysimachus, a successor to Alexander the Great.[69] In a crucial passage in his *Geography* (13.1.27), Strabo connects this building project not only to Caesar's veneration for Alexander, but also to the origins of the Julian line at Troy.[70] Although it may be doubtful whether Caesar ever personally visited the city,[71] his legacy is intertwined with the site: Caesar was said to have desired to make Troy the new capital of the Roman empire (Suet. *Caes.* 79; Nicolaus of Damascus, *Aug.* 20.68). Caesar had first adopted Troy for an ideological purpose: "to remake the history of Troy and thereby appropriate it—to make of it, mainly, a kind of prehistory of the *gens Iulia*."[72]

We are on surer footing with the dawn of the imperial period. We have hard evidence that the first emperor himself visited the site,[73] which precipitated a cascade of new construction

---

[65] Turner (2014) 83, and Shapiro (1991) who also sees Theseus as a representational vector for newly-acquired Athenian naval supremacy following the Persian Wars and Cimon's return of Theseus' bones to Athens.

[66] This temple was one of only four new temples erected by Augustus (for another, the temple of Mars Ultor, see below). Evidence for Octavian's propagation of his connection to Apollo before 36 BC (the naval battle of Naulochus against Sextus Pompey) is, as is noted by Gurval (1995) 91-113, rather weak. For many scholars, the timing of the naval battles and the focus on Apollo indicates that the god was primary in the ideology of Augustan naval supremacy. Hekster & Rich (2006) 162-165, provide a cogent summary and analysis of previous work on whether we should read intentional and meaningful associations between the temple iconography and the Augustan propagation of the Actian victory, ultimately deciding that such connections would have been difficult to deny.

[67] Around 700 BC, Greek settlers had raised a new town at the site of the Trojan War; it is this area that was discovered and cultivated by the Romans. See Casson (1994) 256.

[68] Vermeule (1995) 469.

[69] Vermeule (1995) 471.

[70] For a thoughtful analysis of Strabo's literary relationship to both Troy and Rome (where the former is a paradigm for the "fallen" city and the latter a "rising" one, which Augustan propaganda craftily steeped in the legendary qualities of its destroyed ancestor), see Pfuntner (2017).

[71] Celotto (2018) 335-336 argues that Caesar's trip to Troy is unhistorical, as no historical source (besides Lucan) records it. Likewise, Bourgeaud (2010) 344: "Caesar's fictional trip to Troy is made to prefigure Augustus' refoundation of Rome."

[72] Bourgeaud (2010) 346.

[73] Halfmann (1986) 158.

projects, undertaken around Troy IX, in the Lower City. In the reign of Augustus, a new stoa was built here, overlooking the western sanctuary, where a massive remodeling project was performed.[74] Nearly 80% of the imperial images dedicated at Troy were statues of the Julio-Claudian family, and the accompanying benefactions indicate that Augustus was viewed as the foremost driver of the city's rejuvenation.[75] Troy's special connection to the Julio-Claudian house was made manifest by the addition of the term συγγενής ("kinsman") on imperial statue bases; no other city in Asia Minor could make a similar claim. In the same period, coinage depicting Aeneas carrying his father Anchises on his back from burning Troy was minted in the area.[76] Ilium Novum, "New Troy," had been born;[77] the fall of Troy had become the birth of Rome.[78]

Plutarch (*Thes.* 1.2) had recognized the role of Theseus as Athenian founder, for which reason he saw it fit to compare him to Romulus in his *Parallel Lives.* In Theseus, the Athenians had chosen an "outsider" born in Troezen as their representative founder;[79] likewise, a myth concurrent to that of Romulus and Remus designated Aeneas—a foreign, Trojan figurehead—to represent the foundation of Rome.[80] Both Theseus and Aeneas saw a significant increase in capital because of political developments in Athens and Rome: the currency of the myth of Theseus can be connected to the successful expulsion of the tyrants and the elimination of one-man rule,[81] while, conversely, Aeneas was utilized as a byway through which Augustus could negotiate the instantiation of one-man rule. But in Athens, Trojan history carried multiple meanings, a tension that reached its height after their victory in the Persian Wars,[82] when artistic representations of the Trojans often show likenesses to the barbarian Persians. In particular, there was ambiguity related to the hero Aeneas; some Athenians bore his name,

---

[74] Sweeney (2018) 98-100. The archaeology of the stoa and its connection to the western sanctuary is discussed in Rose (2014) 224.

[75] Rose (2014) 223.

[76] Rose (2014) 226-227. Caesar, too, had exploited coins to propagate this image: a silver denarius with the "flight of Aeneas" and the inscription CAESAR on the right side of the reverse was one of the most widely circulated of all of Caesar's coins. See Vermeule (1995) 471.

[77] Vermeule (1995) 470-471.

[78] Sweeney (2018) 103. As Pabst (2014) 60 notes, it was especially under Augustus that "Vor allem aber wird Troja als Ursprung der Römer hervorgehoben, was deren Sieg letztendlich als seine späte Rache erscheinen läßt, die sie wegen der Zerstörung ihrer Urheimat an den in Epen über den Trojanischen Krieg 'Achaier' gennanten Griechen übten (*Aen.* 6.840)."

[79] See Plut. *Thes.* 3-6, who describes his birth at Troezen and subsequent journey to Athens, with Apollodorus *Bibl.* 3.16 and Diod. 4.59.1. However, see Walker (1995b) 1-13, who argues that Theseus and his legend is of local, Attic origin.

[80] On previous connections between Aeneas, the Trojans, and the foundation of Rome, see Galinsky (1969).

[81] This is the argument of Walker (1995b) 13-33. On the other hand, Neils (2009) 111-112 argues that the François Vase, on which Theseus is depicted celebrating his victory over the Minotaur and fighting with the Centaurs at the wedding of Peirithoos, gives prominence to Theseus as a function of Alcmeonid attempts to adopt the hero, as the Pisistratids did with Heracles. The parallelism between the deeds of Heracles and those of Theseus as they develop in Athenian myth may speak to the concurrent and competitive generation of these mythologies, although the Theseus cult at Athens certainly predates the Pisistratid tyranny. See den Boer (1969) 9.

[82] Erskine (2001) 68-92.

and he appears to have been recognized for his piety.[83] The difficulties inherent in recognizing the merit of the pious Trojan is no clearer than in the approach of Pyrrhus of Epirus, who at the request of the Greeks in southern Italy, led a campaign against the Romans in the third century BC, using the Roman association with the Trojan hero as a sign of their barbarism.[84]

Regardless of prior ambiguities, it is well known that the Roman association with Aeneas saw a significant ratcheting up in the Augustan Age, where its utility was mainly in establishing a connection between Rome and the Greek world.[85] What made Aeneas so attractive to a newly-minted emperor? As Louden argues, he made a perfect candidate for Roman mythographical construction because he was the "one just man" who survived apocalyptic conditions, in the vein of the Ancient Mesopotamian Utnapishtim, or Biblical Noah. Homer's *Iliad*, he argues, figures "Aineias not only as a warrior but as the one just man, descended from a line Zeus favored more than Hektor's. In so doing the *Iliad* left the door open for Vergil to develop and exploit more fully Aineias' relation to this traditional figure."[86] Vergil's recognition of the utility of the "just man" paradigm made Aeneas the perfect foil for the first emperor. But I would also suggest that, when read together with his focus on overwriting the Athenian tradition of the Persian Wars, we can view Augustus' adoption of Aeneas' guise in a subversive way, especially as it relates to Athenian cultural memory. He had beat them at their own game not once, but twice: Augustus had decisively defeated the Persian enemy (as symbolized in the *naumachia*). Additionally, in ostentatiously planting his ship on the banks of the Tiber, Augustus had very much Romanized the barbarian Trojan Aeneas[87] (about whom the Athenians had some ambiguous feelings), while usurping the most important ideological aspects of the very Athenian founder, Theseus.

The Ship of Aeneas and the Persian Wars

The performance of a spectacular *naumachia* was not the only noteworthy event of 2 BC. The Trojans—and Aeneas in particular—are also front and center in the visual topography of the new Augustan Forum,[88] also inaugurated in the same year. The Augustan Forum, the crowning

---

[83] Apollodorus 5.21. On the other hand, Galinksy (1969) 1-11, argues that the emphasis on Aeneas' piety is a late Roman addition, played up by the "deliberate encouragement of the imperial house...In that part of the Greek literary tradition, which can safely be said to be exclusive of Roman influences or reflections," he argues on 10-11, "Aeneas' *pietas* is a trait that is virtually nonexistent."

[84] Galinsky (1969) 171 and Gruen (1992) 44, although see Erskine (2001) 157-161, who finds that those Greeks in southern Italy and Sicily would have seen the call to arms as a collaboration between Greeks and Trojans in a shared epic past.

[85] Erskine (2001) 15-43.

[86] Louden (2006) 235-239; quote on pg. 239.

[87] Papaioannou (2003) 701, suggests that Vergil's Romanized Evander played an integral role in "help[ing]" Trojan Aeneas make his peace with the Greek world, and instruct[ing] him on how to become the model Roman, and a leader, too."

[88] See also the excellent and concise examination of Gowing (2005) particularly 132-145 and Zanker (1988) 210-215 on the *summi viri* in the Forum of Augustus.

achievement of Augustus' construction projects,[89] was situated in a busy section of Rome, to the northeast of the Julian Forum and extending into the Subura.[90] The new Forum of Augustus broadcast a sophisticated vision of the foundation origins of the city of Rome, with Aeneas and Romulus facing one another in two *exedrae*,[91] between which stood a statue of Augustus himself in front of the temple of Mars Ultor, as the crowning achievement of the emperor's accomplishments.[92] Dedicated on the same day as the performance of the *naumachia*, the temple of Mars Ultor, although initially vowed after the battle of Philippi,[93] was not actually dedicated until more than 40 years later, on May 12th, 2 BC.[94] It housed the standards recovered from the Parthians in 20 BC,[95] and became the location for all future *triumphatores* to dedicate the crown and scepter representative of their successes.[96] Beckmann argues that the famous column in Trajan's Forum, also dedicated on May 12th, was meant to recall the failed mission of G. Caesar; the emperor himself would now achieve final vengeance in a new war on Parthia in 113 CE.[97] This deliberate allusion indicates that the temple of Mars Ultor was associated in the Roman imagination with a stalwart East-West conflict that was so highlighted in Augustus' visual program.[98] Indeed, the first emperor himself used the temple as a frontispiece for an oath forced upon barbarians that they would maintain their promised peace with Rome (*ut quorundam barbarorum principes in aede Martis Ultoris iurare coegerit mansuros se in fide ac pace quam peterent*, Suet. *Aug.* 21.2). The outer columns on the temple had Corinthian capitals and

---

[89] As it is presented in *RG* 35.

[90] Anderson (1984) 65-66.

[91] Anderson (1984) 81, notes: "Thus the sculptural program must have enhanced the religious aspect of the Forum of Augustus, honoring one group as the descendants and chosen people of Mars, and another as the equally distinguished and heroic descendants of Venus."

[92] Zanker (1988) 201-208, who notes that this is the first time that a fixed iconography for Aeneas and his family appears at Rome; see also Barchiesi (2005) 283-288, who expounds upon the idea that the visual topography of the Forum should be read considering the ideology of the principate as given in Augustan literature. For a fresh perspective on an audience's "reading" of the Augustan Forum, see now Pandey (2018) 158-170. She views the construction of the Forum not strictly as a reflection of the ideology in the *Aeneid* (and in Aeneas' trip to the Underworld in Book 6 in particular), but as a corrective of that narrative, which "asserted a starker power differential between audience and author, who was also the Forum's central honorand" (162).

[93] Suet. *Aug.* 29.2; Ovid *Fasti* 5.569-578.

[94] Ovid *Fasti* 5.545-98; Suet. *Aug.* 29.1, *RG* 35. Richardson (1992) 160.

[95] On the recovery of the standards from Parthia in Augustan art, see Zanker (1988) 186-192.

[96] Hickson (1991) 133; Rich (1998). Resonances of the "Great Event" were not limited to Actium, and became a hallmark of this great Augustan achievement, too: in ca. 20 BC, the same year in which the Parthian standards were recovered, Augustus dedicated two identical monuments meant to recall the thank-offerings of the Greeks at Delphi following the battle of Plataea in 479 BC; see Spawforth (2012) 104, with bibliography. Notably, Pausanias (1.18.7) records seeing one of these monuments in the Olympieum at Athens.

[97] Beckmann (2016) 126-134. Telling is the fact the *ludi Persici* took place from May 13th to May 17th in the second and third centuries CE (pg. 142); these games would naturally follow the dedication of a monument meant to recall Roman wars against the Persians.

[98] Ganzert (1988) esp. 55-59, even sees certain decorative elements in the Augustan Forum as a translation of Roman rhetoric about the East, and an attempt to represent continuity between great Eastern and Western empires.

were modeled on those of the Propylaea at the Acropolis at Athens;[99] similarly, the caryatids in the Augustan Forum were clearly connected to ancestral cult in the same way as those at the Erechtheum on the Acropolis.[100] A temple to Ares erected in the Athenian agora was likely meant as a sort of extension to the temple to Mars Ultor, whose "Athenian borrowings now had produced an annoying case of reciprocity."[101] The artistic program and placement of these building projects, then, point towards a real focus on dynastic considerations and the incorporation of the Julian line (as Ovid, *Fasti* 5.563-64 so concisely puts it) into the longue durée of epic conflicts between East and West.[102]

The culmination of this program was the dedication of the ship of Aeneas, legendary founder of Rome, in a shipshed on the banks of the Tiber. The ship mentioned by Procopius was presumed to be a figment of the author's literary imagination, until Tucci suggested that it was located on a platform known as the *navalia*.[103] The *navalia* was a complex of shipsheds (attested by Livy 8.14.12; 40.51.6) already established in the 3rd/2nd centuries BC; both Livy (3.26.8) and Pliny (*NH* 36.40) mention it as a point of geographical reference in the first centuries BC and CE, respectively. Likely to have been situated near the Circus Flaminius,[104] it seems to have been in continued use throughout this period.[105] Tucci argues that the via Anicia fragment of the Severan Marble Plan depicts the shipshed for the vessel of Aeneas;[106] if correct, the dating would indicate, at the very least, a *terminus ante quem* of the 2nd century CE for the

---

[99] Galinsky (1996) 200. Zanker (1988) 256 notes that the new temples in Augustan Rome were all intentionally a *mixtum compositum*, with podia, porches, and pediments belonging to the Italic tradition complemented by Hellenistic column capitals and façades adapted from Greek organizational principles.

[100] Galinsky (1996) 203.

[101] Galinsky (1996) 361.

[102] Additionally, Donderer (2009) 76-77, has suggested that the Mausoleum of Augustus may have been a part of a building program of which the *stagnum* was included.

[103] Tucci (1997) 39-40. Tucci's identification of the porticus Aemilia as the *navalia* has been doubted by Hurst (2010) 33-34; Tucci convincingly restated his case in Tucci (2012) 575-591.

[104] This area was of special significance to Augustus and saw significant construction during his reign. The temples in the area—to Jupiter Stator, Juno Regina, Neptune, Mars, and Apollo—all had their traditional *dies natalis* changed to correspond to that of Augustus. See La Rocca (1987) 358, who argues more generally for a special Augustan interest in this region of the city. Additionally, immediately following the staging of the *naumachia*, water was let into the Circus Flaminius, near the location of the shipsheds, for a *venatio* of 36 crocodiles (Dio 55.10.8). Augustan-era monuments in this area also highlighted the first emperor's naval victories, as indicated by *spolia* (likely from Actium) decorating a frieze on display at the Capitoline Museum. See Hölscher (1988) 346-369. See, on the other hand, Quilici (1998) 741-756, who presents the (less convincing) arguments for locating the ship near the Campus Martius, based on the idea that a ship of a Macedonian king defeated by the Romans may have been kept here and later associated with the mythistorical Trojan origins of the Augustan line. This view is based on a remark by Livy 45.42.12, who relates that Macedonian ships were dragged onto the Campus Martius after the triumph of Aemilius Paullus over Perseus. On this, see Östenberg (2009) 50 n. 203.

[105] See the excellent summary of Haselberger and Petruccioli on digitalaugustanrome.org, monument #44.

[106] Tucci (1997) 35-42. This fragment was discovered in Trastevere and depicts commercial and monumental buildings on the right bank of the Tiber. See Castagnoli (1985) 205-11; and Rodríguez-Almeida (1988) 120-3. For an excellent evaluation of the Severan marble map and its relation to earlier urban maps of Rome, see Trimble (2008) 67-98.

construction, and would thus corroborate the testimony of Procopius.[107] However, Tucci goes further, to suggest that the settlement of the ship was in line with the naval ideology of Augustus; that consistency may be corroborated by the fact that the term used by Procopius to describe the shipshed for the vessel of Aeneas (νεώσοικος) is the same as that used by Strabo in his description of the housing for Octavian's exceptional dedication of ten ships at Nikopolis following the battle of Actium.[108] These connections caused Tucci to date the placement of the ship of Aeneas in the reign of the first emperor.[109]

Beyond pinpointing the reign of Augustus, Tucci did not conjecture a date as to the construction and placement of the ship of Aeneas on the bank of the Tiber. I suggest that the fitting occasion would have surrounded the *naumachia* of 2 BC.[110] The celebrations in 2 BC were the most fitting stage for such a dedication, as the political setting in prior years would have been unsuitable for such a grand proclamation.[111] Octavian had not been proclaimed emperor (and Augustus) until 27 BC, following the triple triumph at Rome, where the allusions to the battle of Actium were still (necessarily) nebulous. But the construction of a naval narrative was accelerated by Agrippa's building of the *porticus Argonautarum* in 25 BC; then, the Parthian wars and return of the standards in 20 BC allowed for an even stronger association with a dichotomous East-West paradigm. Combined with the staging of the *naumachia*, which meant to ape the battle of Salamis and took place in conjunction with the dedication of the Augustan Forum, Augustus had reached the culmination of his efforts to define himself in terms more specifically associated with Athenian martial history and with the semi-mythological Roman foundation that had been concretely set forth by Vergil with the publication of the *Aeneid* in 19 BC.[112] The intertext of this ideology was particularly associated with Athenian social memory—

[107] Richardson (1992) 266, is circumspect about our dearth of sources, suggesting that Procopius is either confused about the identity of the ship in question (since he mentions it as being located "in the middle of the city") or a "victim of hoax," though he ultimately concludes that "it [the ship of Aeneas] might well have been displayed in the *navalia*."

[108] Tucci (1997) 40.

[109] Tucci (1997) 42. He suggests that the ship could have already existed in the fourth century BC, in the same period in which the "tomb of Aeneas" was created in Lavinium; hence, we may have to refer to Augustus' movement of the ship to the banks of the Tiber as its "final settlement."

[110] In consideration of the *naumachia*, it is important to note that the *navalia* would have been visible from the *stagnum Augusti*.

[111] Some may express doubt, since such a significant symbol as the ship of Aeneas in not mentioned in the *Res Gestae*, Augustus' own record of his achievements. However, also conspicuously absent in the naval narrative of Augustus is the foundation of Nikopolis; see Spawforth (2012) 34. Lange (2016) 143-144, notes that this omission was not meant to assuage the republican sensibilities of the Roman people, as the monument at Nikopolis was well known in Rome itself. And as Lange (2009) 123 rightly notes, the inscription on the victory monument at Nikopolis is consistent with the official ideology in the *Res Gestae*. While programmatic ideological statements certainly have their place in the *Res Gestae*, not all ideological monuments warrant the attention of that document. Unmentioned monuments to Aeneas, also a significant part of Augustan ideology, should not, therefore, give us pause.

[112] It should also be noted that in 19 BC, Agrippa built the Aqua Virgo, which supplied Regio XIV in Trastevere, where the *naumachia* was later held. See Lloyd (1979). With the construction of this bridge and the publication of the *Aeneid*, it is also conceivable and sensical that Augustus placed the ship of Aeneas in the *navalia* in 19 BC Gianfrotta (1991) 88, has argued that we cannot glean anything archaic in Procopius' description of the ship but believes it to reflect reality. Therefore, he prefers the placement of the ship to be dated to the reign of Antoninus Pius, during whose tenure fell the 900th anniversary of the founding of Rome and whose ideological

their great naval victory at Salamis, and their fundamental history connected to another famous sea-faring founder, Theseus.

As mentioned already in respect to the *naumachia*'s resonances with the battle of Salamis, there is some evidence that Augustus' adoption of Athenian paradigms in 2 BC was the consequence of the first emperor's attempt at a truly revisionist program. This year may have seen the construction of another suggestive monument that attests to this sophisticated dialogue: the temple of Roma and Augustus on the Acropolis at Athens. Dedicated by the *demos* during the hoplite generalship of Pammenes and the archonship of Areos, the temple was a *tholos* structure located to the east and on the same axis as the Parthenon.[113] Whittaker notes that most scholars have attempted to date the building to sometime before 17 BC; her suggestion, however, is that we consider the date of 2 BC, in conjunction with G. Caesar's visit to Athens on his way to the East.[114] The positioning of the temple in front of the Parthenon, itself viewed as a votive offering for the Athenian victory at Salamis (Dem. 22.13), "may have been a response to Roman propaganda which associated their campaigns against the Parthians with the wars between the Athenians and Persians."[115] Indeed, we may view the dedication of this monument as an Athenian reception of Augustan ideology, and an attempt to reclaim the Persian Wars narrative that had been so explicitly performed in Rome in the same year. The temple in and of itself may be one of the best examples of the intricate interrelationship between Athenian mnemonics and their Augustan translation: a copy of the *Res Gestae* was inscribed in Greek on its outer face, which Elsner argues belies a "certain propagandistic intent."[116] Together with the dedication of the monument in the Olympieum at Athens (see fn. 96), we can read this temple as part of a complex meant to allude to the parallelism between Augustus' accomplishments and the Greco-Persian Wars.[117] Spawforth views this behavior as having extended also to Sparta and Plataea;[118] but at Athens, the program is more nuanced, and carries more than a hint of subversion of Athenian cultural memory.[119]

---

program centered around connections between himself and Pius Aeneas. As will be argued below, I believe the evidence for 2 BC to present a stronger case in the programmatic development of the Augustan Persian Wars narrative.

[113] Whittaker (2002) 25-26.

[114] Whittaker (2002) 33-36. Morales (2017) 144-147 has recently restated the case for a date in 21 or 19 BC.

[115] Whittaker (2002) 36.

[116] Elsner (1996) 49.

[117] Morales (2017) 148. O'Sullivan (2016) 353-354 goes further and suggests that this topography of remembrance created by the structural placement of this monument, the tripod at the Olympieon, and the panoply of Persian weaponry visible on the eastern façade of the Parthenon, would have served to situate Augustus within a complex of the great wars of history between the East and West.

[118] Spawforth (2012) 103-141. He also sees a reciprocal reinvigoration of this memory undertaken by the Greek city-states themselves in the same period.

[119] The need for Athenian reclamation of the memory of the Persian Wars may imply that the reception was of an Augustan subversion of that ideology. That subversion (as has been argued in relation to the *naumachia*) may have been spurred on by sour relationships between the Athenians and Augustus. He had singled out Athens for punishment for their support of Antony in the battle of Actium. For bibliography, see Lange (2009) 111 n. 78. Additionally, Augustus is said by Pausanias (4.31.1) to have been aided at Actium by the Spartans, and his recognition of the long-standing tension between the two *poleis* may be involved in these choices. Galinsky (1996) 360-361, too, notes that even Augustan "citations" of Athenian art and architecture had biting undertones: they

Procopius and the Manifest Destiny of Rome

It had become clear after Actium that "Rom war sein Schicksal geworden, und jetzt war er, der Sohn des Caesar, das Schicksal Roms."[120] The Manifest Destiny of Rome, and Augustus' insistence on his place in the historical continuum, will have been received appropriately, if we return to Procopius' statements. His description makes it clear that Aeneas' ship stood as a symbol for the long history of Rome; as Rutledge notes: "The boat arguably symbolized the Romans' weathering of adversity, and their native *fortitudo et constantia*, something further reflected in how long-lived the boat was as an artefact. It is an instance where the literal endurance of an object served to mirror the endurance and antiquity of the Roman people."[121] The pristine nature of the ship, so highlighted in Procopius, is our first clue that Augustus' monument to Aeneas was meant to recall Athenian history. Theseus' ship, by Plutarch's day, had become a matter of great philosophical debate because of its enduring nature: if the beams were continuously replaced to preserve the perfection of the ship, was it still the same vessel? And it should not surprise us that Procopius should mention a monument so tied up with the memory of the Greco-Persian Wars, as in the sixth century CE, he found himself writing a long history of the wars between the Romans and the Sassanid Persians. The ship's survival—constructed as it was out of an impermanent material but enduring just as well as the rest of Augustus' marbled Rome—would yet concretize the universal impact and endurance of the first emperor's vision.

Jessica Moore has recently argued that Procopius betrays interest in Roman *lieux de memoire,* particularly in those sites that blend his fascination with the Greco-Roman historical and mythic pasts.[122] She argues that, in his production of *The Wars of Justinian*, Procopius relies on Herodotus for "mapping the world," while also taking the *Histories* as a model for his own account of the contemporary Persian Wars.[123] Moore's schematic charting of Book 8 shows that the description of the ship of Aeneas is literally sandwiched by Herodotean digressions,[124] which, I argue, places the ship in a firmly Persian Wars context. Similarly, in the same book

---

were meant to exude the superiority of Roman culture but eschewed reference to the structure of democratic Athens, whose *demos* may have expressed outward discontent towards the emperor during this period. So Morales (2017) 153-154: "the radical democracy, briefly resurrected by the anti-Roman party in 88 BCE, would be buried not only under the ruins of the Sullan sack, but also under the new buildings of Augustan age." Toher (2014) 127-134, suggests that the Athenian *demos* enlisted the help of Herod to repair Athenian relationships with the princeps.

[120] Dahlheim (2010) 161.

[121] Rutledge (2012) 132. See also Ghilardi (2009) 109-135 on Procopius' interest in presenting himself to his audience as someone who has personally and carefully observed the monuments in Rome.

[122] Moore (2014).

[123] Kaldellis (2004) 17-61 notes in particular the dangers of previous scholarship, which has presumed that learned men of the Byzantine era were educated on the basis of authors such as Homer, Herodotus, and Thucydides, but failed to be affected by their ideas or values ("They smoked but never inhaled," is his pithy construction of the problem on pg. 40). Rather, he shows, Procopius very carefully culled allusions from Classical authors to create pointed commentary on the characters and events in his rather impressive literary output.

[124] Moore (2014) 315.

there are multiple references to Jason and Medea and the voyage of the Argonauts.[125] This organizational scheme, then, is not random, but is rather a vestige of an extremely sophisticated literary reception of the intended Augustan meaning behind the ship of Aeneas in its global meta-historical context.[126] We have no reason to believe that Procopius invented the ship of Aeneas: he provides accounts of other important Roman monuments (such as the *templum pacis* in *Goth.* 4.21.11-12) that are corroborated by other, earlier authors, such as Pliny (*NH* 36.102) and Pausanias;[127] as in this case and that of the House of Sallust (*Goth.* 3.2.24),[128] he does not hesitate to mention if the monument is no longer preserved in its prior state of glory.[129] Thus it is with Procopius that we began, and it is with him that we can end our quest for the ship of Aeneas, an artifact of Augustan revisionism of the highest order, on the banks of the Tiber at Rome.[130]

JENNIFER FINN
MARQUETTE UNIVERSITY

Bibliography

Barbara G. ACKROYD, 'The Porticus Argonautarum and the Saepta', *Athenaeum* 34 (1996), p. 591-597.

James C. ANDERSON, *The Historical Topography of the Imperial Fora* (Collection Latomus vol. 182), Brussels 1984.

Alessandro BARCHIESI, 'Learned Eyes. Poets, Viewers, Image Makers', in: K. Galinsky (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Augustus,* Cambridge 2005, p. 281-305.

Mary BEARD, *The Roman Triumph*, Cambridge 2007.

Martin BECKMANN, 'Trajan's Column and Mars Ultor', *JRS* 106 (2016), p. 124-146.

Gerhard BINDER, *Aeneas und Augustus. Interpretationen zum 8. Buch der* Aeneis, Meisenham am Glan 1971.

Philippe BOURGEAUD, 'Trojan Excursions: A Recurrent Ritual, from Xerxes to Julian', *History of Religions* 49.4 (2010), p. 339-353.

---

[125] The only other place they appear is once in Book 2. See Moore (2014) 329-331.

[126] Thus, "far from being slavishly attached to a particular, traditional construction of Roman memory and identity, [Procopius] is skilled at drawing old (and new) memories together to construct a schema of Roman memory that is at once appropriate to the world of the sixth century and faithfully based in the stable, deep roots of a centuries-long tradition." See Moore (2014) 283.

[127] See Anderson (1984) 106.

[128] An artifact whose existence we also should not doubt; see Rutledge (2012) 188 n.83.

[129] Even if the ship is wholly a Procopian literary invention (which I hope to have disproved above) it still represents an understanding of a conception of Greco-Roman metahistory that is in line with Augustan goals as stated above.

[130] I would like to express my sincere gratitude for the work of the anonymous referees at *The Ancient History Bulletin* for their constructive suggestions, which greatly benefited the argument. All other errors and infelicities are mine alone.

Anthony J. BOYLE, 'Aeneid 8: Images of Rome', in: C. Perkell (ed.), *Reading Vergil's* Aeneid: *An Interpretive Guide*, Norman 1999, p. 148-161.

Petra BÜSCHER, 'Das Siegesmonument von Nikopolis', in: P. Berktold et al. (eds.) *Akarnanien: eine Landschaft im antiken Griechenland.* Würzburg 1996, p. 149-154.

Averil CAMERON, *Procopius and the Sixth Century*. Berkeley 1985.

Lionel CASSON, *Travel in the Ancient World*, Baltimore 1994.

Ferdinando CASTAGNOLI, 'Un nuovo documento per la topografia di Roma antica', *StudRom* 33 (1985), p. 205-11.

Giollio CELOTTO, 'Alexander in Seneca's Works and in Lucan's *Bellum Civile*', in: K. Moore (ed.), *Brill's Companion to the Reception of Alexander the Great,* Leiden 2018, p. 325-354.

Filippo COARELLI, '*Aedes fortis Fortunae*, Naumachia Augusti, Castra Ravennatium, la Via Campana Portuensis e alcuni edifici adiancenti nella pianta marmorea severiana', *Ostraka* 1 (1992), p. 39-54.

Kathleen M. COLEMAN, 'Launching into History: Aquatic Displays in the Early Empire', *JRS* 83 (1993), p. 48-74.

Werner DAHLHEIM, *Augustus. Aufrührer, Herrscher, Heiland. Eine Biographie*, Munich 2010.

W. DEN BOER, 'Theseus. The Growth of a Myth in History', *G&R* 16.1 (1969), p. 1-13.

Michael DONDERER, 'Zur Datierung des Augustus-Mausoleums', *JöAI* 78 (2009), p. 69-77.

Robert DREWS, *The Greek Accounts of Eastern History* (Publications of the Center for Hellenic Studies), Cambridge, Mass. 1973.

Jaś ELSNER, 'Inventing Imperium. Texts and Propaganda of Monuments in Augustan Rome', in: J. Elsner (ed.), *Art and Text in Roman Culture*, Cambridge 1996, p. 32-54.

Andrew ERSKINE, *Troy between Greece and Rome. Local Tradition and Imperial Power*, Oxford 2001.

Lee M. FRATANTUONO & R. Alden SMITH, *Virgil,* Aeneid *8. Text, Translation, and Commentary* (Mnemosyne Supplements 416), Leiden 2018.

G. Karl GALINSKY, *Aeneas, Sicily, and Rome*, Princeton 1969.

G. Karl GALINKSY, 'Hercules in the Aeneid', in: S.J. Harrison (ed.) *Oxford Readings in Vergil's Aeneid*, Oxford 1990, p. 277-294.

G. Karl GALINSKY, *Augustan Culture. An Interpretive Introduction*, Princeton 1996.

Joachim GANZERT, 'Der Mars-Ultor-Tempel auf dem Augustusforum in Rom. Ein Bericht über die laufenden Bauforschungsarbeiten und Beitrag zur Sakralbau Entwicklung', *AW* 19.3 (1988), p. 36-59.

Massimiliano GHILARDI, 'Com'essa sia fatta io, che l'ho vista, vengo a riferire. La città di Roma nel De Bello Gothico di Procopio di Cesarea', in: E. Plebani (ed.), *Società e cultura in età tardoantica e altomedievale. Studi in onore di Ludovico Gatto*, Rome 2009, p. 109-135.

Piero A. GIANFROTTA, 'Navi mitologiche a Roma', in *Atti IV Rassegna di archeol. Subacquea*, Messina 1991, p. 85-91.

Alain M. GOWING, *Empire and Memory. The Representation of the Republic in Roman Imperial Culture*, Cambridge 2005.

Jasper GRIFFIN, 'Augustan Poetry and Augustanism', in: K. Galinsky (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Augustus*, Cambridge 2005, p. 306-320.

Erich GRUEN, *Culture and National Identity in Republican Rome*, Ithaca 1992.

Robert A. GURVAL, *Actium and Augustus. The Politics and Emotions of Civil War*. Ann Arbor 1995.

Helmut HALFMANN, *Itinera Principum: Geschichte und Typologie der Kaiserreisen der Römischen Reich,* Stuttgart 1986.

Philip R. HARDIE, *Vergil's* Aeneid. *Cosmos and Imperium*, Oxford 1986.

Philip R. HARDIE, 'Ships and Ship-Names in The *Aeneid*', in: M. Whitby, P. Hardie, & M. Whitby (eds.), Homo Viator: *Classical Essays for John Bramble*, Bristol 1987, p. 163-171.

Philip R. HARDIE, 'Images of the Persian Wars in Rome', in: E. Bridges, E. Hall & P. J. Rhodes (eds.), *Cultural Responses to the Persian Wars. Antiquity to the Third Millennium*, Oxford 2007, p. 127-144.

Wolfgang HAVENER, *Imperator Augustus. Die discursive Konstituierung der militärischen* persona *des ersten römischen* princeps, Stuttgart 2016.

Olivier HECKSTER & John RICH, 'Octavian and the Thunderbolt. The Temple of Apollo Palatinus and Roman Traditions of Temple Building', *CQ* 56.1 (2006), p. 149-168.

Frances V. HICKSON, 'Augustus "Triumphator": Manipulation of the Triumphal Theme in the Political Program of Augustus', *Latomus* 50.1 (1991), p. 124-138.

Tonio HÖLSCHER, 'Actium und Salamis', *JdI* 99 (1984), p. 187-214.

Tonio HÖLSCHER, 'Historische Reliefs', in: M. Hofter et al. (eds.) *Kaiser Augustus und die verlorene Republik*, Main 1988, p. 351-400.

Nicholas HORSFALL, 'Aeneas the Colonist', *Vergilius* 35 (1989), p. 8-27.

Henry HURST, 'Exceptions rather than the rule: the shipsheds of Carthage (mainly) and Athens', in: D.J. Blackman and M.C. Lentini (eds.) *Recoveri per navi militari nei porti del Mediterraneo antico e medievale*, Bari 2010, p. 27-36.

Jacob ISAGER, 'Alexander the Great in Roman Literature from Pompey to Vespasian', in: J. Carlsen et al. (eds.) *Alexander the Great: Reality and Myth*, Rome 1993, p. 75-84.

Tanja ITGENSHORST, 'Die Transformation des Triumphes in augusteischer Zeit', in F. Goldbeck & J. Wienand (eds.), *Der römische Triumph in Prinzipat und Spätantike*, Berlin 2017, p. 59-81.

Anthony KALDELLIS, *Prokopios. The Wars of Justinian*. Indianapolis 2014.

Barbara KELLUM, 'Representations and Re-presentations of the Battle of Actium', in: B. Breed, C. Damon & A. Rossi (eds.), *Citizens of Discord: Rome and Its Civil Wars*. Oxford 2010, p. 187-206.

Dietmar KIENAST, 'Augustus und Alexander', *Gymnasium* 76 (1969), p. 430-456.

Jason KÖNIG. *Athletics and Literature in the Roman Empire*. Cambridge 2005.

Angela KÜHNEN, *Die* imitatio Alexandri *in der römischen Politik.* Münster 2008.

E. LA ROCCA, 'L'adesione senatoriale al consensus: i modi della propaganda augustea e tiberiana nei monumenti in circo Flaminio', in: *L'Urbs. Espace urbain et histoire (Ier siècle av. J.-C. - IIIe siècle ap. J.-C.),* Rome 1987, p. 347-372

Manfred LÄMMER, 'Die Aktischen Spiele von Nikopolis', *Stadion* 12/13 (1986/87), p. 27-38.

Carsten Hjort LANGE, Res Publica Constituta. *Actium, Apollo, and the Accomplishment of the Triumviral Assignment.* Leiden 2009.

Carsten Hjort LANGE, *Triumphs in the Age of Civil War. The Late Republic and the Adaptability of the Triumphal Tradition*, London 2016.

Robert B. LLOYD, 'The Aqua Virgo, Euripus and the Pons Agrippae', *AJA* 83.2 (1979), p. 193-204.

Bruce LOUDEN, *The* Iliad. *Structure, Myth, and Meaning*, Baltimore 2006.

C. W. MARSHALL, 'Rotting Timbers. *Medea* 1386-7 and the Mission to Delos', *EMC* 45 (2000), p. 351-357.

Alexander G. MCKAY, '*Non enarrabile textum*? The Shield of Aeneas and the Triple Triumph of 29 BC. *Aeneid* 8.630-728', in: H. P. Stahl (ed.) *Vergil's* Aeneid*: Augustan Epic and Political Context*, London 1998, p. 199-221.

Theodor MOMMSEN, ed. *Res Gestae Divi Augusti*, 2nd ed. Berlin 1883.

Jessica MOORE, *Procopius of Caesarea and Historical Memory in the Sixth Century*, unpublished diss, University of Wisconsin-Madison 2014.

Fabio Augusto MORALES, 'The Monument of Roma and Augustus on the Athenian Acropolis: Imperial Identities and Local Traditions', in: W. Vanacker & A. Zuiderhoek (eds.) *Imperial Identities in the Roman World*, London 2017, p. 141-161.

William M. MURRAY & Photios M. PETSAS, *Octavian's Campsite Memorial for the Actian War.* Philadelphia 1989.

Yvan NADEAU, 'Naulochus and Actium, The Fleets of Paris and Aeneas, and the Tree-Felling of C. Julius Caesar Erysichthon', in: C. Deroux (ed.), *Studies in Latin Literature and History* XV, Brussels 2010, p. 219-239.

Jenifer NEILS, 'Beloved of the Gods: Imag(in)ing Heroes in Greek Art', in: S. Albersmeier (ed.), *Heroes: Mortals and Myths in Ancient Greece*, Baltimore 2009, p. 108-119.

Lara O'SULLIVAN, 'Augustus and Alexander the Great at Athens', *Phoenix* 70.3 (2016), p. 339-360.

Ida ÖSTENBERG, *Staging the World: Spoils, Captives, and Representations in the Roman Triumphal Procession,* Oxford 2009.

Angela PABST, *Kaiser Augustus: Neugestalter Roms*, Stuttgart 2014.

Nandini PANDEY, *The Poetics of Power in Augustan Rome. Latin Poetic Responses to Early Imperial Iconography*, Cambridge 2018.

Sophia PAPAIOANNOU, 'Founder, Civilizer and Leader. Vergil's Evander and his Role in the Origins of Rome', Mnemosyne 56.6 (2003), p. 680-702.

Laura PFUNTNER, Death and Birth in the Urban Landscape: Strabo on Troy and Rome', *ClAnt* 36.1 (2017), p. 33-51.

John POLLINI, *From Republic to Empire. Rhetoric, Religion and Power in the Visual Culture of Ancient Rome*. Norman 2012.

Lorenzo QUILICI, 'La nave di Enea vista da Procopio negli arsenali di Roma', in: R. Farioli Campanati (ed.), *Ricerche di Archeologia e Topografia,* Ravenna 1998, p. 741-756.

David QUINT, '*Aeacidae Pyrrhi*: Patterns of Myth and History in *Aeneid* 1-6', in: B. Breed, C. Damon, & A. Rossi (eds.), *Citizens of Discord: Rome and Its Civil Wars*, Oxford 2010, p. 133-144.

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

L. RICHARDSON, Jr., *A New Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome*, Baltimore 1992.

E. RODRÍGUEZ-ALMEIDA, 'Un frammento di una nuova pianta marmorea di Roma', *JRA* 1 (1988), p. 120-123.

C. Brian ROSE, *The Archaeology of Greek and Roman Troy*, Cambridge 2014.

Steven H. RUTLEDGE, *Ancient Rome as a Museum. Power, Identity, and the Culture of Collecting*, Oxford 2012.

Geoffrey C. R. SCHMALZ, 'Inscribing a Ritualized Past. The Attic Restoration Decree *IG* II^2 1035 and Cultural Memory in Augustan Athens', *Eulimene* 8-9 (2007-2008), p. 9-46.

H. A. SHAPIRO, 'Theseus. Aspects of the Hero in Archaic Greece', *Studies in the History of Art* 32 (1991), p. 122-139.

Christopher SMITH, 'The Memoirs of Augustus: testimonia and fragments', in: C. Smith & A. Powell, *The Lost Memoirs of Augustus and the Development of Roman Autobiography*, Swansea 2009, p. 1-13.

A. J. S. SPAWFORTH, *Greece and the Augustan Cultural Revolution*, Cambridge 2012.

Geoffrey SUMI, *Ceremony and Power. Performing Politics in Rome between Republic and Empire*, Ann Arbor 2005.

Naoíse Mac SWEENEY, *Troy: Myth, City, Icon*, London 2018.

Rabun TAYLOR, 'Torrent or Trickle? The Aqua Alsietina, the Naumachia Augusti, and the Transtiberim', *AJA* 101 (1997), p. 465-492.

Brenda M. TIDMAN, 'On the Foundation of the Actian Games', *CQ* 44.3-4 (1950), p. 123-125.

Mark TOHER, 'Herod, Athens, and Augustus', *ZPE* 190 (2014), p. 127-134.

Jennifer TRIMBLE, 'Process and Transformation on the Severan Marble Plan of Rome', in: R. W. Unger & R. J. A. Talbert, *Cartography in Antiquity and the Middle Ages. Fresh Perspectives, New Methods*, Leiden 2008, p. 67-98.

Pier Luigi TUCCI, 'Dov'erano il tempio di Nettuno e la nave di Enea?' *Bullettino della Commissione Archeologica Comunale di* Roma 98 (1997), p. 15-42.

Pier Luigi TUCCI, 'La controversa storia della 'Porticus Aemilia'', *ArchClass* 63 (2012), p. 575-591.

Susanne TURNER, 'Who's the Daddy? Contesting and Constructing Theseus' Paternity in Fifth-Century Athens', in: N. M. Sweeney (ed.), *Foundation Myths in Ancient Societies*, Philadelphia 2014, p. 71-102.

Cornelius C. VERMEULE III, 'Neon Ilion and Ilium Novum: Kings, Soldiers, Citizens, and Tourists at Classical Troy', in: J. B. Carter & S. P. Morris (eds.), *The Ages of Homer: A Tribute to Emily Townsend Vermeule.*, Austin 1995, p. 467-482.

Henry J. WALKER, *Theseus and Athens*, Oxford 1995a.

Henry J. WALKER, 'The Early Development of the Theseus Myth', *RhM* 138.1 (1995b) p. 1-33.

Peter WHITE, *Promised Verse: Poets in the Society of Augustan Rome*, Cambridge, Mass. 1993.

Helène WHITTAKER, 'Some Reflections on the Temple to the Goddess Roma and Augustus on the Acropolis at Athens', in: E. Nis Ostenfeld (ed.), *Greek Romans and Roman Greeks. Studies in Cultural Interaction*, Aarhus 2002, p. 25-39.

Hector WILLIAMS, 'A Ship of Actium on a Roman Lamp', *The International Journal of Nautical Archaeology and Underwater Exploration* 10.1 (1981), p. 23-27.

Konstantinos L. ZACHOS, 'Excavations at the Actian Tropaeum at Nikopolis: A Preliminary Report', in J. Isager, (ed.) *Foundation and destruction, Nikopolis and Northwestern Greece: The Archaeological Evidence for the City Destructions, the Foundation of Nikopolis and the Synoecism*, Athens 2001, p. 29-42.

Paul ZANKER (trans. A. Shapiro), *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus*, Ann Arbor 1988.