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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.
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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 ἄνθρώπων μάλιστα πάντων ὃν ἡμεῖς ἵσμεν φιλοπόλεις Ῥωμαῖοι τυγχάνουσιν ὄντες, περιστέλλειν τε τὰ πάτρια πάντα καὶ διασώζεσθαι ἐν ὀποίῃ ἔχουσιν, ὡς δὴ μηδὲν ἄφανισθαι Ῥώμῃ τοῦ παλαιοῦ κόσμου. οἱ γας καὶ πολὺν τίνα βεβαρβαρωμένου αἰώνα τάς τε πόλεως διεσώσαντο ὑποδομίας καὶ τῶν ἐγκαλλωπισμάτων τὰ πλεῖστα, ὡς τῶν ἐλελείποντο ἐν τοῖς καὶ τῇ ναῦς Αἰνείου, τοῦ τῆς πόλεως οἰκιστοῦ, καὶ εἰς τόδε κεῖται, θέαμα παντελῶς ἀπίστον. νεώσοικον γὰρ
And more than all other men of which we know, the Romans love their city, and in all zealously, 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 (ἦπερ ὁποία ποτέ ἔστιν αὐτὸς θεασάμενος ἔρων 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:

tούτων δὲ δὴ τῶν ξύλων οὐδὲν οὔτε σέσηπεν οὔτε τι υποφαίνει ὡς σαπρὸν εἶ, ἀλλὰ ἄκραιφήν οὐδαμάθη οὐδὲ ἡ ναῦς, ὡς ὁποῖον τῷ τεχνίτῃ τῷ αὐτῆς, ὡς ὅστις ποτὲ 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. Besides the testimony of Procopius, we have no other attestations of the ship of Aeneas in Rome. While Tucci has previously argued that the ship of Aeneas was placed by Augustus in the navalia, 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.
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," represented the end of the Republic, the symbolic defeat of the “East” by the “West,” and the beginning of a new era of one-man rule in Rome. 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), at this point he could now present himself as the liberator of the East. 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 στρατόπεδου τόπῳ, τοὺς μὲν συναγείρας τοὺς δ᾿ ἀναστήσας τῶν πλησιοχώρων, συνῴκισε, Νικόπολιν ὄνομα αὐτῇ δούς, τῶν μὲν συναγείρας, τὸ δὲ χωρίον ἐν ὑπαίθρῳ ἱδρυσάμενος, ἐδοὺ τῖ ἐν αὐτῷ τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος ὑπαίθριον 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

---


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.\(^\text{10}\)

The sockets for these displayed ship’s rams are archaeologically attested.\(^\text{11}\) 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.\(^\text{12}\) 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).\(^\text{13}\) 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.\(^\text{14}\) These games became a part of the athletic \textit{periodos},\(^\text{15}\) and the emperor Nero himself later participated in the games,\(^\text{16}\) 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,\(^\text{17}\) 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 15\(^\text{th}\) of 29 BC.\(^\text{18}\) The first day was meant to celebrate Octavian’s victories in Illyria,\(^\text{19}\) for which he had been awarded a triumph in 34 BC that was deferred until this celebration.\(^\text{20}\) 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 \textit{nomen} of a

---

\(^\text{10}\) Also Suetonius \textit{Aug.} 18.2, which reads: \textit{Quoque Actiacae victoria memoria celebratior et in posterum esset, urbem Nicopolim apud Actium condidit ludosque illic quinquennales constituit et ampliato vetere Apollinis templo locum.}


\(^\text{14}\) 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.

\(^\text{15}\) König (2005) 168-169; see also Lämmer (1986/87).


\(^\text{17}\) See the excellent assessment of Lange (2009) 95-123.

\(^\text{18}\) 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.


\(^\text{20}\) Dio 49.38.1.
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triumph.” 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. 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. 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, 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. 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. These were placed in the recently completed temple of Divus Julius, and stood beside the famous painting of Apelles, the Venus Anadyomene, as a reference to the divine ancestry of the Julian house.

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—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; 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’
shield is the narrative reflection of these qualities, resulting in Aeneas’ “Augustanization.” 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” and Octavian’s victory over Cleopatra’s barbaric, eastern army. 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.” 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.”

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), 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), 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. 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. 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.
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.
37 Galinsky (1990) 287.
The Ship of Aeneas

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

---

43 See the excellent notes and bibliography of Dumser on digitalaugustanrome.org, connected with monument #17, the Stoa of Poseidon.
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*. The naval spectacle he staged here, meant to be a reproduction of the Athenian victory over the Persians at Salamis, was a clear allusion to the battle of Actium:

> ὁπλομαχία τε ἐν τοῖς σέπτοις καὶ ναυμαχία ἐν τῷ χωρίῳ ἐν ὶ καὶ νῦν ἔτι σημεῖα τίνα άυτῆς δεῖκνυται Περσῶν καὶ Άθηναίων ἐποιήθη: ταῦτα γάρ τὰ ὄνοματα τοῖς ναυμαχοῦσιν ἐτέθη, καὶ ἔνικων 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.

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. 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.” 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. 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. 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.


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.


\(^{58}\) Hardie (2007) 129-130.

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. The ship was said to be the one that Theseus had used on his Cretan expedition. Plutarch (Thes. 23.1) describes the unusual measures taken by the Athenians to preserve it:

τὸ δὲ πλοῖον ἐν ὧν μετὰ τῶν ἤθεων ἔπλευσε καὶ πάλιν ἐσώθη, τὴν τριακόντορον, τὰ μὲν παλαιὰ τῶν ξύλων ὑφαιροῦντες, ἄλλα δὲ ἐμβάλλοντες ἰσχυρὰ καὶ συμπηγνύντες οὕτως ὡστε καὶ τοῖς: φιλοσόφοις εἰς τὸν αὐξόμενον λόγον ἀμφιδοξούμενο παράδειγμα τὸ πλοῖον εἶναι, τῶν μὲν ώς τὸ αὐτό, τῶν δὲ ώς οὔ 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: 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. 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. 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.
63 It is the anticipated return of this ship from Delos that Plato Crit. 44a2-3 blames for the delayed execution of Socrates.
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this new treatment, argues Turner, as a personification of Athenian naval supremacy, with a special nod to the battle of Salamis. 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, 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. 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. 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. 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. Although it may be doubtful whether Caesar ever personally visited the city, 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.”

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

---


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.


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.”


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. 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. 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. Ilium Novum, “New Troy,” had been born; the fall of Troy had become the birth of Rome.

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; likewise, a myth concurrent to that of Romulus and Remus designated Aeneas—a foreign, Trojan figurehead—to represent the foundation of Rome. 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, 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, 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,
and he appears to have been recognized for his piety. 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.

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. 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.” 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 (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, also inaugurated in the same year. The Augustan Forum, the crowning

---

83 Apollodorus 5.21. On the other hand, Galinsky (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.


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.”

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 12\(^{\text{th}}\), 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 12\(^{\text{th}}\), 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 barbororum 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.


\(^{91}\) 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.


\(^{95}\) 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 Platea 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 13\(^{\text{th}}\) to May 17\(^{\text{th}}\) 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.
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were modeled on those of the Propylaea at the Acropolis at Athens; 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. 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." 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.

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. 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 Flamininus, it seems to have been in continued use throughout this period. Tucci argues that the via Anicia fragment of the Severan Marble Plan depicts the shipshed for the vessel of Aeneas; 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.


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.


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 argue 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 Flamininus, 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 Capitol Museum. See Höscher (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 Østenberg (2009) 50 no. 203.

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

construction, and would thus corroborate the testimony of Procopius.\(^\text{107}\) 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.\(^\text{108}\) These connections caused Tucci to date the placement of the ship of Aeneas in the reign of the first emperor.\(^\text{109}\)

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.\(^\text{110}\) 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.\(^\text{111}\) 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.\(^\text{112}\) 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 sensible 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 900\(^{th}\) 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.


\(^{114}\) 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.


\(^{117}\) 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
It had become clear after Actium that “Rom war sein Schicksal geworden, und jetzt war er, der Sohn des Caesar, das Schicksal Roms.” 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.”

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. 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. Moore’s schematic charting of Book 8 shows that the description of the ship of Aeneas is literally sandwiched by Herodotean digressions, which, I argue, places the ship in a firmly Persian Wars context. Similarly, in the same book.
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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
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