

L'HISTORIOGRAPHIE ROMAINE

Table des matières

Préface	I
Avant-propos	1

Première partie

Formes et significations de l'historiographie à Rome

Historical <i>Praefationes</i> between Individual Programme and Literary Genre. The <i>prooemium</i> to Polybius' Histories David Engels (Université libre de Bruxelles)	11
Rencontre de l'histoire et de la religion dans le <i>Logistoricus</i> « <i>Calenus</i> » de Varron Yves Lehmann (Université de Strasbourg) Aude Lehmann (Université de Haute Alsace)	41
Les annalistes dans l'enquête de Censorinus sur les Jeux Séculaires Gérard Freyburger (Université de Strasbourg)	 51
Aspects de l'historiographie dans le chapitre I des <i>Collectanea rerum memorabilium</i> et du <i>Polyhistor</i> du <i>grammaticus</i> Solin Robert Bedon (Université de Limoges)	65
« † <i>aius matris deum</i> (Serv., <i>Ad Aen.</i> VII, 188) : petite enquête sur la Grande Mère » Alban Baudou (Université Laval-Québec)	85
Dion Cassius, le dernier des « Annalistes » romains Marie-Laure Freyburger-Galland (Université de Haute Alsace)	107

Le fonctionnement de certains <i>exempla</i> historiques dans la correspondance de Fronton Pascale Fleury (Université Laval-Québec)	123
Un exemple d'historiographie parodique : Sabinus le muletier Jeanne Dion (Université de Lorraine)	137
Musing on the Past: Historical Epic and Epic History at Rome John Marincola (The Florida State University – Tallahassee)	157
Speech in the Early Roman Historians John Rich (University of Nottingham)	175
Sallust and the Annalists from Manuzio to Peter Federico Santangelo (Newcastle University)	197
On future <i>Fragmenta</i> and <i>Testimonia</i> Notes on the Extra- Literary Evidence for Roman Republican Historiography Kaj Sandberg (Åbo Akademi University Finland)	215

Deuxième partie

Les questionnements de l'historiographie romaine antique

La figure de Romulus, fondateur de Rome, chez Jean d'Outremeuse, chroniqueur liégeois du XIV ^e siècle Jacques Poucet (Académie royale de Belgique/ Université de Louvain)	235
L'image des Samnites chez Tite-Live. La vision des Italiens ennemis de Rome chez un auteur provincial Dominique Briquel (Université de Paris-Sorbonne, Paris IV/École Pratique des Hautes Études, Section des Sciences Historiques et Philologiques)	257

Table des matières	391
L'image des Gètes aux I ^{er} et II ^e siècles ap. J.-C. : tradition géographique et historiographique vs vision ovidienne Mouna Essaidi (Université de Tunis)	281
Rois, roitelets et aspirants à la royauté Yasmina Benferhat (Université de Lorraine)	301
La loi agraire de Nerva entre la tradition littéraire et gromatique : d'un mythe à un paradigme de gestion Ella Hermon (Université Laval-Québec)	319
The Lives of Augustus Christopher Smith (British School at Rome/ University of St Andrews)	339

Troisième partie

Permanence et rémanence de l'historiographie romaine aux temps modernes

Justin, source ou ressource de Corneille François-Xavier Cuhe (Université de Strasbourg)	365
Index	383
Table des matières	389



RECHERCHES SUR LES RHÉTORIQUES RELIGIEUSES

VOLUME 33

*Collection dirigée par
Gérard Freyburger & Laurent Pernot*

L'historiographie romaine. Morphologie, thématiques et postérité d'un genre littéraire

Hommages à Martine Chassignet

Textes réunis et édités par

ALBAN BADOU

MOUNA ESSAIDI

YVES LEHMANN



© BREPOLS PUBLISHERS

THIS DOCUMENT MAY BE PRINTED FOR PRIVATE USE ONLY.
IT MAY NOT BE DISTRIBUTED WITHOUT PERMISSION OF THE PUBLISHERS

BREPOLS

© 2020, Brepols Publishers n.v., Turnhout, Belgium.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise without the prior permission of the publisher.

D/2020/0095/232
ISBN 978-2-503-59054-7
eISBN 978-2-503-59055-4
DOI 10.1484/M.RRR-EB.5.120839
ISSN 0770-0210
eISSN 2566-0004

Printed in the EU on acid-free paper.

Préface

La collection *RRR* n'avait pas encore eu jusqu'ici l'occasion d'accueillir parmi ses publications un ouvrage sur l'historiographie : elle se réjouit de pouvoir le faire avec le présent livre. Martine Chassignet, Professeur Émérite à l'Université de Strasbourg, à qui il est offert en hommage, a mené d'importantes recherches dans ce domaine et notre recueil réunit toute une série d'enquêtes de philologues et d'historiens qui précisent et approfondissent le concept d'historiographie.

Celui-ci est encore assez peu connu du grand public et le terme n'est pas d'un emploi courant. D'origine grecque, il désigne étymologiquement « le fait d'écrire l'histoire » et, alors que l'histoire est l'exposé des faits du passé, l'historiographie est pour nous de nos jours dans son essence, selon une définition des trois éditeurs du présent ouvrage dont on lira l'avant-propos avec profit, « l'art de dégager par l'écriture littéraire les messages humains que renferment les brumes du passé ».

On verra que cet art est par nature rhétorique. Divers procédés de la mise en forme de l'histoire sont analysés dans les différentes contributions du livre : ainsi la faculté de dégager des portraits marquants de personnages, souvent exemplaires, et de broser des images parlantes et se voulant instructives de certains peuples ; ainsi l'étude de la structure d'écrits historiques, annalistique ou biographique, ou encore l'examen des zones de confluence du genre historique avec l'épopée, l'éloquence ou la caricature. La religion de la Rome antique est maintes fois abordée dans ces études. Mais on constatera que c'est surtout la morale, souvent liée à la religion, qui est au cœur de l'historiographie romaine : celle-ci s'est notamment donné pour but de dégager, à travers l'observation des comportements humains, ce que les hommes de l'Antiquité déjà recherchaient avant tout, à savoir des leçons de l'histoire.

C'est donc à tous ceux qui s'intéressent à la fois à l'histoire et à la mise en forme de l'histoire que ce livre s'adresse. Les lecteurs d'aujourd'hui sont particulièrement ouverts à cette thématique : en témoignent les nombreuses publications actuelles portant sur l'appréciation du passé, sur ses multiples présentations et sur sa variable perception. Jean d'Ormesson s'est fait l'interprète talentueux de cet intérêt de nos contemporains en donnant dans son ultime *Et moi, je vis*

toujours la parole à l'histoire elle-même qui se raconte et jette un regard distancié sur ce qu'elle est depuis qu'elle existe dans l'humanité et sur les formes parfois variées, parfois permanentes qu'elle a revêtues tout au long des grandes étapes de son développement dans le temps.

Gérard Freyburger & Laurent Pernot

The Lives of Augustus

Christopher Smith

Martine Chassignet's Budé edition of the Roman fragmentary historians is a landmark edition.¹ Sober but careful, it traverses the phenomenally complex terrain of the nature of Roman historiography, and the difficulty of producing an edition which reflects the way fragmentary authors survive, with elegant precision. Her third volume arrives at Republican autobiography, a discrete group of works within the corpus as a whole, of which the life of Sulla was the most extensive and fraught with parallels for the future of the genre.²

One of the most lamented gaps in the flotsam of ancient literature is the autobiography of the life of Augustus.³ The volume was in thirteen books and went up to the Cantabrian War. It is variously entitled *hypomnemata*, *de vita sua*, *de memoria vitae suae*, or *commemoratio vitae suae* (I shall refer to it throughout as the *Autobiography*). As far as we can tell it was a first-person narrative, and it did not eschew omens, therefore setting it apart from Julius Caesar's commentaries. Whether it would have been a gripping read, we cannot tell – Augustus was interested in style,⁴ but there are no fragments of sufficient length to inform us as to its qualities as a literary text. Would it have let us glimpse the equivocations, compromises and self-justifications necessary to account for the trickiest part of Augustus' long life?

This essay, offered in friendship to a colleague who has shared the often self-denying experience of saying only what we actually know about works which survive in citations by others, derives in part

¹ M. Chassignet, *Caton. Les origines (fragments)*, Paris, Les Belles Lettres, 1986. *L'annalistique romaine*, vols 1-3, Paris, Les Belles Lettres, 1996-2004. I am grateful to Hannah Cornwell, Fred Drogula, Oliver Hekster, Carsten Hjort Lange, Costas Panayotakis, John Rich and Nicholas Wiater, who made many valuable suggestions and improvements, but are not responsible for any errors which remain.

² Chassignet, *L'annalistique romaine*, vol. 3, p. 172-184. See for a recent reading of the life H. Flower, « Sulla's Memoirs as an Account of Individual Religious Experience », *Religion in the Roman Empire*, 1.3, 2015, p. 297-320.

³ C. Smith, A. Powell (eds.), *The Lost Memoirs of Augustus and the Development of Roman Autobiography*, Swansea, 2009; *FRHist.* 60 Augustus with full bibliography.

⁴ Suet., *Aug.* 86; Macr. *Sat.* 2.4.12 parodying Maecenas; Gell. 15.7 for his careful Latin.

from work on the English language edition of the fragmentary Roman historians,⁵ and in part from some recent work on Augustus himself. My specific point of reference is Luciano Canfora's 2015 book *Augusto, figlio di Dio*.⁶ Canfora has the luxury of a more discursive approach, which permits him to argue through the possibilities of the influence of the autobiography. In his hands, the *Autobiography* of Augustus takes a more expansive form. I will then examine the influence of the *Autobiography* on Appian's Illyrian books, before moving to some thoughts about how Augustus might have treated the battle of Actium.

Canfora's work is fundamentally a very detailed study of Appian, but it is founded on two principal ideas: first, that Appian extensively used the older Seneca's *Histories*; and second that Augustus' *Autobiography* played a major part in the work. Neither idea is new (or uncontroversial), but none has been pursued in such depth or with such tenacity.⁷ There are many other riches in the book – including a wonderful excursus on how Marx knew his Appian – but that is beyond the scope of this essay.

Canfora's approach to Appian is strongly conditioned by his belief that Appian clearly signalled that he had a single main source.⁸ This is derived from a reading of Appian's preface 12:

Καὶ τὰδε πολλοὶ μὲν Ἑλλήνων πολλοὶ δὲ Ῥωμαίων συνέγραψαν... ἀλλ' ἐντυγχάνοντά με, καὶ τὴν ἀρετὴν αὐτῶν ἐντελεῖ καθ' ἕκαστον ἔθνος ἰδεῖν ἐθέλοντα, ἀπέφερον ἢ γραφὴ πολλάκις ἀπὸ Καρχηδόνος ἐπὶ Ἰβηρας καὶ

⁵ T. J. Cornell *et al.* (eds.), *The Fragmentary Roman Historians*, Oxford, 2013 (hereafter *FRHist.*).

⁶ L. Canfora, *Augusto, figlio di Dio*, Rome, 2015.

⁷ On Appian and Seneca, see I. Hahn, « Appien et le cercle de Sénèque », *AAntHung.* 12, 1964, p. 169-206; G. Zecchini, « Seneca il Vecchio fonte di Appiano? », *Aevum*, 51, 145-8; R. Westall, « The Sources for the *Civil Wars* of Appian of Alexandria », in K. E. Welch (ed.), *Appian's Roman History: Empire and Civil War. Roman Culture in an Age of Civil War*, Swansea, 2015, p. 125-167. For Appian and Augustus, see A. Migheli, « Le memorie di Augusto in Appiano, *Illyr.* 14-28 », *AFLC*, 21.1, 1953, p. 197-217; and the balanced view of E. Gabba, « The historians and Augustus », in F. Millar, E. Segal (eds.), *Caesar Augustus: Seven Aspects*, Oxford, 1984, p. 61-88 at p. 68-70. The whole discussion has been put on a new footing by J. W. Rich, « Appian, Polybius and the Romans' war with Antiochus the Great: A study in Appian's sources and methods », in Welch (ed.), *Appian's Roman History*, p. 65-124.

⁸ See for a similar but more carefully argued approach Rich, « Appian, Polybius and the Romans' war with Antiochus the Great ». This argues for the importance of Dionysius of Halicarnassus to 265 BC, and Polybius from then to 146 BC, and hints at an argument for Posidonius' centrality thereafter.

ἐξ Ἰβήρων ἐπὶ Σικελίαν ἢ Μακεδονίαν ἢ ἐπὶ πρεσβείας ἢ συμμαχίας ἐς ἄλλα ἔθνη γενομένας...

The Loeb translation runs as follows:

These things have been described by many writers, both Greek and Roman... Being interested in it, and desiring to compare the Roman prowess carefully with that of every other nation, my history has often led me from Carthage to Spain, from Spain to Sicily or to Macedonia, or to join some embassy to foreign countries, or some alliance formed with them;

If we start with the phrase ἐντυγχάνοντά με, Canfora insists that this refers to the process of reading.⁹ Although *LSJ* also offers something along the lines of ‘encountering this material’, I think it is probably correct that this indeed refers to reading. I find less convincing Canfora’s idea that the subject of this sentence, *he graphe*, means someone else’s writing.¹⁰ Canfora’s argument is that the writing is the authoritative source for Appian’s work. My translation would be something like:

As I read, and wanted to see a full picture of the virtue of each *ethnos*, one by one, my writing took me often from Carthage to Spain, etc.

In other words, it is Appian’s own process of writing, not someone else’s script, which guides him. Canfora’s reading is difficult, especially because the first preface reveals quite serious uncertainties about how the work will actually develop, and does not well describe the actual outcome. Bucher, whose article on Appian remains perhaps the best attempt to understand Appian’s compositional techniques, shows the discrepancies and weaknesses of the first preface and from this point of view, it makes more sense to see Appian as presenting himself as working out the way his history would develop as he went along.¹¹

The *graphe* of the first books therefore is no other than Appian’s own writing. However, let us for the moment assume that there was a single source; how does this relate to the rest of Canfora’s argument on Augustus? I think the intention is to suggest that Appian’s method was to have a single source which dominated. This used to be a fairly

⁹ Canfora, *Augusto*, p. 85-97.

¹⁰ This view is also held by Rich, « Polybius and the Romans’ war with Antiochus the Great », p. 70: « he speaks of “the account” (ἡ γραφή), and his description sounds very like Polybius’ history... ».

¹¹ G. Bucher, « The Origins, Program, and Composition of Appian’s Roman History », *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, 130, 1974, p. 411-458.

common view of ancient historical compositions, sometimes known as Nissen's Law. Canfora's basic position, if I correctly understand it, is that the dominant source in Appian *Civil Wars* Books 1 and 2 is Seneca the Elder, and from Book 3 is Augustus' *Autobiography*.

The major issue with the argument that Seneca drives the earlier part of the *Civil Wars* is the debate over the starting point of the histories. Barbara Levick in *FRHist* took the view that Seneca began from 49 or 43 BC. Canfora argues that *ab initio bellorum civilium* pushes back the starting point further, arguing that *initium* means *arche*, a first point of origin.¹² This does not take us as far as Canfora would like, I suggest. One problem is the famous Lactantius passage, which may or may not be from the *Histories*.¹³ As has long been recognised, these kinds of divisions of time are not uncommon, and have as much a philosophical as a historical weight.¹⁴ So it is by no means certain that this was part of the *Histories*, but even if it was, the passage suggests a rather more complex approach. A key turning point for Appian, as for Sallust in his *Histories* which are sometimes thought to be heavily influenced by Posidonius, was the defeat of Carthage and the removal of the *metus Punicus*,¹⁵ but the passage goes on to argue that Rome then conquered all the kings and peoples and then turned on itself. This does not fit the Gracchan period, when there were still the external wars against Mithridates, the conquest of the east, and of Gaul, and of Egypt to come.

The other difficulty is the remarkable phrase, again in the life of Seneca, on the nature of the *Histories*, that they began from the civil wars *unde primum veritas retro abiit*.¹⁶ Now this is too general to be indisputably associated with any one point in time, but the phrase is striking. One obvious consequence of placing this in the time of Gracchi is that it is not flattering to Cicero, and we may well wonder if this was deliberate. There is no doubt that Cicero was still immen-

¹² *FRHist* 74 L.(?) Annaeus Seneca (Maior), esp. vol. 1, p. 506-508; Canfora, *Augusto*, p. 138-147.

¹³ *FRHist* 74 F2 ap. Lact. *Inst.* 7.15.14.

¹⁴ Livy 39.6-7 argues for a change around 187 BC; Pol. 31.25.3 attributes a change to around 168 BC; Piso *FRHist*. F40 ap. Pliny *NH* 17.244 to 154-3 BC. All start their histories from a different date. See also Cic. *rep.* 2, and T. J. Cornell, « Cicero on the origins of Rome », in J. G. F. Powell, J. A. North (eds.), *Cicero's Republic*, London, 2001, p. 41-56.

¹⁵ Cf. Sall. *Hist.* 111 McGushin. See also Sall. *Iug.* 41; *Cat.* 10.1 and P. McGushin, *C. Sallustius Crispus Bellum Catilinae: A Commentary*, Leiden, 1977, p. 87-88, with further bibliography on Posidonius at p. 292-295.

¹⁶ *FRHist* 74 T1 ap. Sen., *vita patr.* Fr 15 Haase.

sely important, and used in schools,¹⁷ but it is not so clear that he was a universal hero, either for Seneca the Elder, or indeed for Seneca the Younger.¹⁸

However, there is an equally good argument that it was the imperial system which killed truth, and such a criticism may have been precisely the sort of thing which persuaded Seneca the Elder not to publish his work in his lifetime. It is exactly what Tacitus says at the beginning of his *Histories*; after Actium, *veritas pluribus modis infracta*.¹⁹ It is entirely possible that Seneca sketched in the broad history of Rome, just as Sallust did in his works, before deepening the level of detail with the collapse into civil war in the 40s.²⁰ The truth is we cannot tell. Not enough of the work survives.

Canfora's introduction of Florus into the argument does not help either. Florus, who certainly followed Livy, may have used Seneca, but he may have used other sources too, and although there is a clear similarity between Florus' periodization in his epitome and the Lactantius passage, they can again be seen as generalised opening statements. Florus begins Book 2 with the Gracchi, which might suggest that from that point he was using Seneca, and Appian similarly began again with Seneca in hand around 133 BC, but it equally might not.²¹

What is at stake in this is the attempt to recover a slightly more logical approach on Appian's behalf to the complexity of the period, and specifically to the proscriptions. Schwartz, Kornemann and Gabba have little positive to say about Appian.²² That tide has now definitively turned, though Canfora chooses not to cite the more recent scholarship

¹⁷ S. McGill, « Seneca the Elder on Plagiarizing Cicero's *Verrines* », *Rhetorica: A Journal of the History of Rhetoric*, 23.4, 2005, p. 337-346.

¹⁸ R. A. Kaster, « Becoming "Cicero" », in P. E. Knox, C. Foss (eds.), *Style and tradition: studies in honor of Wendell Clausen*, Stuttgart, 1998, p. 248-263; A. Gowing, « Tully's boat: Responses to Cicero in the imperial period », in C. Steel (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Cicero*, Cambridge, 2013, p. 233-250.

¹⁹ Tac. *Hist.* 1.1, 'historical truth was impaired in many ways.'

²⁰ Cf. Sall. *Cat.* 6-13; *hist.* F10-12 McGushin.

²¹ For general scepticism on Seneca's history starting early, and the link with Florus, see M. Griffin, « The Elder Seneca and Spain », *JRS*, 62, 1972, p. 1-19.

²² E. Schwartz, « Appianus (2) », *RE*, 2. 1.216-37; E. Kornemann, « Die historische Schriftstellerei des C. Asinius Pollio. Zugleich ein Beitrag zur Quellenforschung über Appian und Plutarch », *Jahrbucher für classische Philologie* (Suppl. 22), 557-692; E. Gabba, *Appiano e la storia delle guerre civili*, Florence, 1956. For an overview see K. Brodersen, « Appian und seine Werk », *ANRW*, 2.34.1, 1993, p. 339-363; I. Hahn, G. Németh, « Appian und Rom », *ANRW*, 2.34.1, 1993, p. 364-402 for summaries of the scholarship.

which has dealt with this at length.²³ If anything, modern scholarship such as Gowing's comparison of Appian and Dio suggests an even more complex interweaving of sources than Canfora does. Canfora is right then that Appian is a much better historian than he used to be considered, but is he perhaps even better than Canfora thought?

The next question then is what can we learn about the *Autobiography* of Augustus? At this point we should look at another recent edition, Bringmann and Wiegandt's *Augustus: Schriften, Reden und Aussprüche*.²⁴ This edition includes over 300 fragments of Augustus' works. It is the most complete account we have and the range of writing which is represented is impressive. Poetry, letters, notes, edicts, mandates, speeches in all sorts of contexts, a work against Brutus, and geographical and historical works are all represented. This is a picture of the *princeps* as writer, as author.

The inevitable question is that with so many of Augustus' pronouncements, some quite personal, in circulation, how can we be sure that the *Autobiography* is the only source which Appian used? Appian does cite Augustus' life specifically, but he cites other works too, especially letters. Herein lies one of the great challenges for the editor. When Appian cites a letter to Sextus Pompeius, should we include it as a testimony for a separate item or as a fragment of the autobiography from which it is perhaps most likely to have come? There is no evidence that Appian had a cache of the emperor's letters, but at the same time he might have picked up a reference from an intermediary source – Asinius Pollio?²⁵ Seneca reading Asinius Pollio? Yet they may not have had an actual letter either; it could be simply a description of a historical action.

As often, we lack a defensible methodology here. It is unsafe to assume that any expression of Augustus' thoughts or opinions come from Augustus, even if one restricts this to positive expressions. This would deprive Appian of any capacity to construct a narrative.

²³ B. Goldmann, *Einheitlichkeit und Eigenständigkeit der Historia Romana des Appian*, Hildesheim, 1988; A. Gowing, *The Triumviral Narratives of Appian and Cassius Dio*, Ann Arbor, 1992; K. Welch (ed.), *Appian's Roman History...* There are important articles in individual works in *ANRW*, 2.34.1, 1993.

²⁴ K. Bringmann, D. Wiegandt, *Augustus, Schriften, Reden und Aussprüche*, Darmstadt, 2008 (hereafter B-W). This replaces E. Malcovati, *Imperatoris Caesaris Augusti operum fragmenta*, third edition, Turin, 1948.

²⁵ The role of Pollio as a potential source goes back to the mid-nineteenth century, was championed by Kornemann, «Die historische Schriftstellerei des C. Asinius Pollio», and more recently by Gabba, *Appiano*, 1956, on which see the sharp review of E. Badian, *Classical Review*, NS 8.2, 1958, p. 159-162.

Similarly, documentary evidence might come from the *Autobiography* but it might be repeated across a range of sources. At that point, the existence of the document might be accepted, but it is too simplistic to assume that Appian was following Augustus, and indeed the very idea that Appian had a work on the desk at the time of writing may be problematic. I have a dozen books by me as I write, but the ancient world was a culture of memory. Our understanding of the processes of ancient composition remains weak.²⁶

So what is the evidence that Appian had direct access to Augustus' *Autobiography*? There are nine references in Bringmann and Wiegandt's collection from Appian. They miss, in my opinion, *FRHist* 60 Augustus F7c; several sources report the dream of Octavian before Philippi, including App. *BC* 4.110, who cites it from the *Autobiography*. In their classification, two come from Augustus' early life; the first is Octavian's acceptance of the will of Julius Caesar, with his heightened references to the *Iliad*.²⁷ The second is Octavian's speech to the people, introduced by the tribune, Cannutius, in 44 BC.²⁸ Four are classed as letters; a letter from Octavian to Antony's mother before the peace at Brindisi; two letters accusing Sextus Pompey of encouraging piracy; and a letter sent to all the legions in 36 BC relating to slaves who had enlisted as soldiers.²⁹ Shortly after this Octavian entered the city and made various speeches, which he wrote down in a *biblion*.³⁰ The most significant and only direct reference to the *Autobiography* in the *Civil Wars* is Appian's citation of the speeches by L. Antonius and Octavian before Perugia.³¹ Finally, Appian refers directly to the *Autobiography* in his work on the Illyrian Wars.³² We will come to this later.

Looked at another way, there are a small number of very clear references in Appian to the *Autobiography*; *BC* 4.110 on Octavian's dream; the speeches at Perugia and the reference in the *Illyrica*. Everything else we choose to attribute to the *Autobiography* we do so without evidence.

The account of the speeches at Perugia is clearly the most straightforward from one point of view, but from another it has challenged

²⁶ See J. P. Small, *Wax Tablets of the Mind: Cognitive Studies of Memory and Literacy in Classical Antiquity*, London, 1997.

²⁷ App. *BC* 3.13 = B-W F283.

²⁸ App. *BC* 3. 41 = B-W F159.

²⁹ App. *BC* 5.63, 77, 80, 131 = B-W F70-3.

³⁰ App. *BC* 5.130 = B-W F 161.

³¹ App. *BC* 5. 42-5 = B-W F199 = *FRHist* 60 F8. Cf. Dio 48.14.3-6.

³² App. *Ill.* 14 = f 201.

modern scholars. It does not provide the one-sided Augustan point of view one might have expected, but this assumes that we know what the tone of the *Autobiography* was.³³ We should rather I think recalibrate our expectations. The Perusine massacre was a dark moment in the young Augustus' career and perhaps required a more subtle treatment. Some reflection of the complexities is perhaps to be expected. What Appian does with this is another matter. Knowing there was a speech between the two, perhaps from Augustus, how did he construct L. Antonius' speech? At least part of the speech should prepare for Octavian's actions a few chapters later where he does indeed pardon Antonius' troops, as Antonius had requested.³⁴ But it may have been Appian who created the connection between Antonius' acknowledgement that Octavian had won the argument by making it about land distribution, which Octavian then repeats.³⁵ And finally, Antonius' unanswered comment about the failure of Octavian to bring back regular magistracies might come from an alternative source, not necessarily as part of this speech, but as part of a general attitude – and of course it is part of what Augustus himself would eventually claim to do, so it was not beyond Appian to have thought this up himself.

This is all necessarily speculative. Canfora is right to argue that this whole sequence must have appeared in the *Autobiography*, and that it is no argument against the incorporation of this as a fragment in our collections that it includes opinions probably not uttered by Antonius in his speech in that work.³⁶ However, a detailed consideration shows how complex and layered the process must have been whereby the account we see in Appian was constructed. In a sense it is hard even to say what the original was – every account was mediated through layers of invention and ideology.

Bringmann and Wiegandt's classification of the fragments is inevitably questionable. The letters are not cited by our sources as documents but as actions, and in the case of the accusations against

³³ R. Ridley, « Augustus: The emperor writes his own account », in G. Marasco (ed.), *Political Autobiographies and Memoirs in Antiquity: A Brill Companion*, Leiden, 2011, 267-314 declares that the inclusion of Antonius' long speech of eulogy is 'improbable', 274. For a full recent account with further references see U. Livadiotti, « Lucio Antonio, Appiano e la propaganda augustea », *SemRom* N. S. 2.1, 2013, p. 65-92.

³⁴ App. *BC* 5.44; cf. 47.

³⁵ App. *BC* 5.43; cf. 47.

³⁶ Canfora, *Augusto*, p. 233-237.

Sextus Pompeius are part of an argument about Pompeius' behaviour. This was not without importance; it was difficult to justify a triumph over a compatriot, and so the Romans made significant efforts to reclassify internal enemies as external foes. This is part of the reason for the requalification of Pompeius and his troops.³⁷ The letters no doubt existed – whether they were transmitted in any form other than in the context of historical narratives seems less certain. The same to an extent goes for the speeches. The *Biblion* of Octavian's selected orations may have circulated, but it is equally possible that the speeches were also included in the autobiography, perhaps amended for a historical genre.

The question therefore of whether and to what extent the autobiography really underpins Appian is very complicated and largely unanswerable. Equally, even if Appian moves from one main source to another between books 2 and 3, some aspects of a more equivocal approach to Augustus continue in the later part of the *Civil Wars*.

When it comes to Augustus' youth, the situation is complicated by another potential source, Nicolaus of Damascus. We now have a substantial rethinking of this source by Toher, who grapples with the problem of the relationship between Nicolaus's *Life of Augustus* and the *Autobiography* on the one hand, and Nicolaus and other sources on the other.³⁸ Toher rightly notes that the debate over Nicolaus' life has been shaped by Jacoby's assumption that it was written shortly after and under the heavy influence of Augustus' work.³⁹ Arguments for this are hard to find, and Toher is right to note that the suggestion that the debates over responsibility and guilt in the triumviral period were irrelevant later on ignores the fact that the original work was much broader in scope. Toher's strategy is to point out the unhelpfulness of the question. There is no explicit evidence that Augustus' work underpins Nicolaus' *Life*, and there are passages which seem to come

© BREPOLS PUBLISHERS
THIS DOCUMENT MAY BE PRINTED FOR PRIVATE USE ONLY.
BIAAD - THE BELGIAN ASSOCIATION OF THE PUBLISHERS

³⁷ C. H. Lange, *Triumphs in the Age of Civil War: The Late Republic and the Adaptability of Triumphal Tradition*, London-New York, 2016, p. 115-121; the accusation is still there at RG 25. See also K. E. Welch, *Magnus Pius: Sextus Pompeius and the Transformation of the Roman Republic*, Swansea, 2012, p. 294-298, who argues that the initial campaign to portray Pompeius as a pirate was unsuccessful and was revisited only later.

³⁸ M. Toher, «Divining a lost text: Augustus' autobiography and the ΒΙΟΣ ΚΑΙΣΑΡΟΣ of Nicolaus of Damascus», in Smith, Powell (eds.), *Lost Memoirs of Augustus...*, p. 125-144; *id.*, *Nicolaus of Damascus, The Life of Augustus and The Autobiography*, Cambridge, 2017.

³⁹ F. Jacoby, *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker, Zweiter Teil C, Kommentar zu Nr. 56-105*, Leiden, 1926, p. 263-265.

from other sources⁴⁰ (though there Toher is himself making assumptions), but ultimately the extent of the influence and the nature of Augustus' *Autobiography* cannot be recovered from Nicolaus. 'To assert that Nicolaus might have used the autobiography of Augustus in composing the *Bios* is at once plausible and insignificant. Serious consideration of the proposition only leads to aporia and the ghost of a lost work ought not to define how an extant text is understood. Better guides to comprehending the nature of the *Bios* are the facts of N.'s own life and the evidence in the text itself.'⁴¹

This is especially relevant then to the complexity of the source tradition over the young Augustus' reaction to news of Caesar's will and his own inheritance. Nicolaus suggests that the decision was taken between Apollonia and Brindisi and largely conducted via letters. It is not at all clear that he ever presented the scene in Rome when Octavian quotes Achilles in the *Iliad*, which is the emotional high point of Appian's account. Dio glosses over all the familial discussion, yet Appian omits a key feature which we find in Dio, the halo around the sun seen at Octavian's entrance into the city. This is consistent with Appian's general avoidance of omens.⁴²

It is quite possible that Augustus, in a highly expansive account, is the source of all this – the family debates, the omen, and the quotation from Homer. His work was after all thirteen books long, and we know that he used the omen of the comet seen at Caesar's funeral games.⁴³ However, again, we cannot make a sound methodological case for assuming that everything we find about the young Octavian was from the *Autobiography*.

Canfora's book is a full account of the sorts of areas where Augustus may have influenced the tradition. Equally, and partly because of his insistence on the importance of Seneca the Elder's *Histories* and assumption that these were more sceptical, he makes a good case for an oppositional line from time to time, especially around the awkwardness of the proscriptions.⁴⁴ What is perhaps surprising is

⁴⁰ Octavian's fear (117); ill health (19-20); sexual abstinence (36); criticism of Julius Caesar (67); claim to have the power and offices of Caesar (53, 113).

⁴¹ Toher, *Nicolaus of Damascus...*, p. 26.

⁴² Nic. Dam. *Bios* 51-5; App. *BC* 3.13 citing Hom. *Il.* 18.98; Dio 45.4; Gowing, *Triumviral Narrative...*, p. 59-64. The omen is found at Suet., *Aug* 95; Sen. *Nat.* 1.2.1; Pliny *NH* 2.98; Oros. 6.20.5; *Obseq.* 68. For Appian's avoidance of omens in his narrative see A. Gowing, *Triumviral Narrative...*, p. 16, n. 25.

⁴³ *FRHist* 60 Augustus F1-2.

⁴⁴ Canfora, *Augusto*, e.g. p. 257-284, 371-393.

that he spends practically no time on the indisputable fact that Appian relied on Augustus for his whole account of the Illyrian Wars from 36 BC.⁴⁵ Moreover, it is likely that these wars were significant for Augustus structurally in the composition of his work.

Appian is very clear that with the defeat of Lepidus, the civil wars were over and he imputes the same thought to Octavian, who had already accepted an honorific column covered in ship's beaks, surmounted with a gold image dressed as Octavian had been when he entered the city, and with the inscription 'peace, long disturbed, he re-established on land and sea'.⁴⁶ It is precisely at this point that Octavian is said to have offered to hand the government back to individual magistrates, thus finally answering L. Antonius' complaint after Perusia.⁴⁷ All that remains in the *Civil Wars* is to narrate the fall of Sextus Pompeius. However, the *Illyrian Wars*, which preceded the *Civil Wars* in Appian's account, are flagged at the end, and constitute our best chance of seeing Augustus' life in detail.⁴⁸

First, the fact that Appian specifically says that even in the *Autobiography* he could not find anything about the early history of Pannonia suggests that Augustus did offer a brief ethnographic digression, but perhaps more on origins than on subsequent activity, since Appian goes on to say that his work focused on his own achievements.⁴⁹ The successes were enumerated through the lists of tribes, some now very obscure. The list is comparable with but not identical to the list at Pliny *NH* 3.142-4, and also needs to be read alongside Strabo's account which itself reflected the position after subsequent campaigning.⁵⁰

Liburnian piracy is mentioned, so Augustus stakes his claim for continuing to safeguard the seas. The Salassi resisted. Augustus himself admitted he was not prepared to undertake a lengthy war because he was expecting a renewal of hostilities with Antony. So first he allowed their independence, but then punished their transgressions through Messala Corvinus. We know from Strabo 4.6.7. and Dio. 53.25. that the

⁴⁵ M. Šašel Kos, *Appian and Illyricum*, Ljubljana, 2005 for a very full and illuminating commentary.

⁴⁶ App. *BC* 5.132; cf 5.128, and 5.130 for the column and its inscription.

⁴⁷ App. *BC* 5.132; cf App. *BC* 5.43.

⁴⁸ App. *BC* 5.145; App. *Ill.* 14-28.

⁴⁹ App. *Ill.* 15.

⁵⁰ Strabo 7.5; S. Potheary, « The European provinces: Strabo as evidence », in D. Dueck, H. Lindsay, S. Potheary (eds.) *Strabo's Cultural Geography: The Making of a Kolossourgia*, Cambridge, 2005, p. 161-179 at p. 173-175.

job was finished off by A. Terentius Varro Murena in 25 BC, but this came after the probable cut-off of the *Autobiography* and possibly after its composition.

The Iapydes were also tough opponents. One of the interesting elements of the narrative here is the attribution to Augustus of foresight – a critical virtue of the good general. Against the Metulians, we find a complex description of a siege, and the remarkable detail that the Metulians were using war engines seized from Decimus Brutus. There is a mention of Augustus' personal inspection of the battle front, and how he encouraged his soldiers by leading personally – his leap into battle is Alexander-like.⁵¹ The result was slightly comical; all the soldiers rushed after him and their weight collapsed the bridge. Augustus was injured but showed himself to his men to preserve their confidence.

Campaigning moved on to Dalmatia. Augustus displays cunning in his siege warfare and then ferocity against a cohort of his own army who had abandoned their position. An injury intervened and Augustus returned to Rome for political business, started off the next year, and then returned to complete the job. He recovered standards taken by the Dalmatians from Gabinius. There is a lacuna in the text before we learn that Augustus was granted a triumph.

It is impossible to tell how many books Augustus used to narrate the Illyrian command, though on the basis of a suggested dating for a fragment from Book 13 we calculated about two books per year from 44 to 25 BC.⁵² There is no doubt that he used it as an important demonstration of his legitimacy as a general, which is important given that he had cut a poor figure at Philippi.⁵³ It is interesting that Appian repeatedly says that Augustus hoped that the tribes would come across willingly, that is, he was not fighting for the sake of it. Sasel Kos sums up very well when he writes: 'Appian's narrative preserves for posterity a decidedly exalted image of Octavian as a military leader. He emerges as an experienced and capable general, taking personal part in combat, despising danger and even incurring severe injuries. ... He knew how to mete out punishment at the right moment in order to maintain the necessary discipline in the army, ... and above all his clemency was emphasized, a virtue that was to become important in the imperial propaganda, especially after Actium.'⁵⁴

⁵¹ Arrian, *Anab.* 6.9.

⁵² *FRHist* 60 Augustus, vol. 1 p. 457.

⁵³ Pliny *NH* 7.147-8.

⁵⁴ Šašel Kos, *Appian and Illyricum ...*, p. 397.

It is also likely that this sort of detail, almost certainly repeated for the Gallic and Spanish wars, helped situate the *Autobiography* within its genre. For the most part, what we can see of autobiography was that it emphasised military value, and I have argued that autobiographies often culminated in triumphs.⁵⁵

However that raises a question as to whether there is any trace of the post-Illyrian War narrative? Canfora uses Photius' account of Appian's work, along with the two prefaces *BC* 1.6 and *BC*. 5.1, both of which imply that the battle of Actium formed part both of the *Civil Wars* and of the four books on Egyptian affairs, to argue that there is a missing part of Appian *BC* 5, which dealt with Actium.⁵⁶ This seems less persuasive than the suggestion that Appian changed his mind and did not change his preface. The books on Egypt will presumably have begun before Actium and then continued through to the fall of Alexandria, and in this they followed Appian's practice, for instance in the Illyrian and Iberian books.⁵⁷

How Augustus presented the battle of Actium in the *Autobiography* is not recoverable, though by analogy with the Illyrian books, we might imagine a heavy focus on military detail. The battle also had immense ideological significance; later authors made of Actium a turning point in world history. However, this sense that Actium changed everything may not have been the Augustan line (or the initial one); the *Autobiography* did not stop here.⁵⁸

Actium was at the time in so many ways a compromised victory. It was a civil war battle.⁵⁹ Neither Octavian nor Antony had an absolutely clear position in law.⁶⁰ In the triple triumph the final and most

⁵⁵ C. Smith, Sulla's *Memoirs*, in Smith, Powell (eds.), *Lost Memoirs of Augustus*, p. 65-85.

⁵⁶ Canfora, *Augustus*, p. 108-124.

⁵⁷ See F. J. Gómez Espelósín, « Appian's 'Iberiké'. Aims and Attitudes of a Greek historian », *ANRW*, 2.34.1, p. 403-427. Appian does however carry his Spanish account into Augustus' time however; see App. *Iber.* 102.

⁵⁸ Suet., *Aug.* 85.1. For the problems of Actium, and the argument that the Actium myth developed over time, see R. Gurval, *Actium and Augustus: The politics and emotions of civil war*, Ann Arbor, 1995.

⁵⁹ C. H. Lange, « *Res publica constituta* »: *Actium, Apollo and the accomplishment of the triumviral assignment*, Leiden, 2009, p. 82-90.

⁶⁰ This is now a hotly contested topic. Vervaeke has argued that Octavian's triumviral powers did not in fact lapse until 27 BC; see F. J. Vervaeke, « The secret history: The official position of Emperor Caesar Divi filius from 31 to 27 BCE », *AncSoc.* 40, 2010, p. 79-152; Lange, « *Res Publica constituta* »..., p. 53-60; J. W. Rich, « Making the Emergency Permanent: auctoritas, potestas and the Evolution of the Principate of Augustus », in Y. Rivière, *Des réformes augustéennes*. Rome, 2012,

splendid day of celebrations was for the conquest of Egypt, which was far less fraught.⁶¹ The myth-making around Actium in a sense reflects the attempt to justify the unjustifiable, and the battle generated both poetic and visual descriptions and allusions to an unprecedented degree.⁶² We will conclude with two of the latter.

The first is the victory monument at Nicopolis.⁶³ The monument is on two terraces facing south. Above a retaining wall, 71m in length, is a second wall c. 63 m wide adorned originally with 36 bronze rostra. At the top was a monumental inscription. The wall was part of the support for a broad Π-shaped Stoa, with a peristyle of 38 m by 38 m. Towards the front was an altar in local limestone measuring 6 by 22 meters with two levels of frieze decorating the lower one of spolia, and the upper, about a metre in height, representing a procession. The monument was part of an even wider project of city foundation.

The generally accepted date for the monument is the early 20s BC, and possibly in time for Octavian's visit in 29 BC. Lange however

p. 37-121, and further below. Augustus' other autobiography, the *Res Gestae*, clearly saw the oath as a critical moment of legitimization, but this comes from a later time, and is perhaps bound up with the problem of the terminal date of the triumphal powers, on which see C. R. B. Pelling, «The Triumphal Period», in *CAH X* (2nd edition), p. 1-69 at p. 67-68; K. M. Girardet, «Der Rechtsstatus Oktavians im Jahre 32 v. Chr.» *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie*, 133, 1990, p. 322-350; *id.* «Per continuos annos decem (res gestae divi Augusti 7, 1): zur Frage nach dem Endtermin des Triumvirats», *Chiron*, 25, 1995, p. 147-161; E. Gabba, *Appiani Bellorum civilium liber quintus*, Florence, 1970, p. lxxviii-lxxix; R. T. Ridley, *The emperor's retrospect: Augustus' «Res gestae» in epigraphy, historiography and commentary*, Leuven, 2003, p. 172-177.

⁶¹ W. Havener, *Imperator Augustus: die diskursive Konstituierung der militärischen persona des ersten römischen Princeps. Studies in ancient monarchies, 4*, Stuttgart, 2016 (non vidi) argues that the second day of triumph was over Antony, which is surely wrong – see J. W. Rich's review at <http://bmcr.brynmawr.edu/2016/2016-11-49.html>, with my thanks to John Rich for drawing this to my attention.

⁶² Gurval, *Actium and Augustus...*; J. F. Miller, *Apollo, Augustus, and the poets*, Cambridge, 2009; C. J. Nappa, *Reading after Actium: Vergil's «Georgics», Octavian, and Rome*, Ann Arbor, 2005. The inscription on the Solarium Augusti, *CIL*, VI, 702, reminded everyone of Actium again over twenty years later (H. Cornwell, pers. comm.).

⁶³ W. M. Murray, M. Petzas Photios, *Octavian's campsite memorial for the Actian War*, *TAPhS*, 69.4, 1989; K. L. Zachos, «The "tropaeum" of the sea-battle of Actium at Nikopolis: interim report», *JRA*, 16.1, 2003, p. 64-92 (a revised interpretation is said to be forthcoming); J. Pollini, *From Republic to Empire: Rhetoric, Religion, and Power in the Visual Culture of Ancient Rome*, Norman (Okla.), 2012, p. 191-196; Lange, *Triumphs...*, p. 125-153.

suggests that the text of the inscription may have been earlier. The text reads:

Vacat Imp · Caesa]r · Div[i · Iuli ·]f · vict[oriam · consecutus · bell]o · quod
per [· r]e [·] p[u]blic[a] · ges[si]t · in · hac · region[e · consul [· quintum ·
i]mperat[or · se]ptimum · pace [·] parta · terra [· marique · Nep]tuno · [et
Ma]rt[i · c]astra [· ex ·] quibus · ad · hostem · in]seq[ue]ndum · egr]essu[s ·
est · navalibus · spoli]is [· exorna]ta · c[on]se]cravit vacat.⁶⁴

Lange sees this as reflecting the laurelled letter which accompanied a request for a triumph.⁶⁵ Indeed what is interesting about the inscription is that it mentions no enemy at all, neither Cleopatra nor Antony – even *ad hostem* is restored.⁶⁶ The second is easier to explain. Lange has shown that the traditional view that one could not triumph in a civil war is incorrect, but in so doing has also shown that the Romans felt obliged to make significant efforts to conceal the enemy.⁶⁷ Hence, as we have seen, Sextus Pompeius was tarred with the charge of leading pirates.⁶⁸

Having concluded his war against the Dalmatians, Octavian and Antony spent 32 and 31 BC heading towards war. The break came in October 32, after the senate had split, and after Octavian had been able to read out Antony's will (or what he claimed to be the will) in what was left of the senate and then again in the assembly.⁶⁹ According to Dio, war was declared on Cleopatra, without mention of Antony, and the same is said in Plutarch's *Life of Antony*.⁷⁰ This 'war against Cleopatra' has often been assumed to have been the *provincia* which was assigned to Octavian, and it would appear that he engineered two triumphs from it, which was unusual.⁷¹ The consequence of the line

⁶⁴ H. Cornwell tentatively proposes Vacat Imp Caesa]r · div[i Iuli ·] f · victor · bel[lo · Actiac?]o · quod · pro [re pu]blic[a] · ges[si]t in her important new book, *Pax and the Politics of Peace: Republic to Principate*, Oxford, 2017.

⁶⁵ Lange, *Triumphs...*, p. 139-141.

⁶⁶ H. Cornwell (pers. comm.) notes the avoidance of the names of enemies is also found in the *Res Gestae*.

⁶⁷ Lange, *Triumphs...*; for the traditional view see Val. Max, 2.8.7; C. H. Lange, « Triumph and Civil War in the Late Republic », *PBSR*, 81, 2013, p. 67-90 at 69-72 with references.

⁶⁸ App. BC 5.77, 80 and see above; Welch, *Magnus Pius...* p. 262-265.

⁶⁹ Dio 50.4; for chronology see M. Reinhold, *From Republic to Principate: An Historical Commentary on Cassius Dio's Roman History Books 49-52 (36-29 BC)*, Georgia, 1988, p. 85.

⁷⁰ Dio 50.4; Plut. *Ant.* 60; Strabo 7.7.6 has both as conquered enemies.

⁷¹ Girardet, « Der Rechtsstatus Oktavians... » on *imperium* and *provincia*, see F. Drogula, *Commanders and Command in the Roman Republic and Early Empire*,

taken by Vervaet and others however is that as Antony was stripped of his powers, all the provinces reverted to Octavian.

Nicopolis may help us understand how Augustus played this hand of cards; the inscription may very well have been a lapidary summary of the line taken in the *Autobiography*. The critical phrase is *pace parata terra marique*, also used in the *Res Gestae*.⁷² Actium was not just about Cleopatra – it was about a much broader recovery of the east from Antony, a claim which might have been even clearer if Octavian was presented as restoring control over *provinciae* formerly in the hands of Antony. As Virgil noted, Antony fought at Actium *variis armis* – the might of the east, Egyptians, Bactrians, Indians, Arabians and Sabaeans.⁷³ This complex patchwork of opponents was regularly set in contrast to the Italian forces of Octavian, and indeed Kromayer established that fully a third of Antony's forces were not Roman, part of the consequences of Octavian's success in preventing Antony from recruiting in Italy.⁷⁴ In other words, this was a fact about Actium, and not Virgilian invention.

Actium led to the conquest of Alexandria, and the deaths of Antony and Cleopatra – but that left the settlement of the east. This took time of course, but critically, Octavian started straightaway with some of his re-ordering, including in northern Greece with Nicopolis, in Crete and Cyprus, in the near East with the meeting with Herod, in the Anatolian plateau with readjustments of the local rulers, and through the establishment of the border with Parthia.⁷⁵ The contemporary coinage has the legends ASIA RECEPTA and AEGVPTO CAPTA,⁷⁶

Chapel Hill, 2015. The consequence of the line taken by Vervaet and others is that as Antony was stripped of his powers, all the provinces reverted to Octavian.

⁷² *RG* 3.1; 13; cf. Livy 1.19.3, Suet., *Aug.* 22; App. *BC* 5.130, cited above. See Rich, « Making the emergency permanent... » p. 47 for this argument.

⁷³ Virg. *Aen* 8.685-8; Gurval, *Actium and Augustus...* 209-48. C. R. Whittaker, *Rome and its Frontiers: The Dynamics of Empire*, London, 2004, p. 144-145.

⁷⁴ J. Kromayer, « Kleine Forschungen zur Geschichte des Zweiten Triumvirats », *Hermes* 33.1, 1898, p. 1-70.

⁷⁵ F. Millar, *The Roman Near East: 31 B.C.-A.D. 337*, Cambridge (Mass.), 1993, p. 27-43; B. M. Levick, « Greece (including Crete and Cyprus) and Asia Minor, » in *CAH X* (second edition), p. 641-675 at p. 641-663.

⁷⁶ *RIC* (second edition), 275a, 276. On the synoecism of Nicopolis, see Str. 7.7.6; Dio 51.3.1; Pausanias 7.18.8-9, and N. Purcell, « The Nicopolitan Synoecism and Roman Urban Policy », in E. K. Chrysos (ed.) *Nicopolis I: Proceedings of the first International Symposium on Nicopolis (23-29 September 1984)*, Preveza, 1987, p. 71-90. See now the important collection of essays, L. Cavalier, M.-C. Ferrière, F. Delrieux (eds.) *Auguste et l'Asie Mineure*, Bordeaux, 2017.

and the first perhaps reflects the Actian situation. Guralv has argued perhaps over strongly that the propagandistic presentation of Actium came later, but it is interesting to look again at Nicopolis, and its Actian Games, as a moment of old-fashioned Hellenistic power politics. Dio's account in Book 51 shows just how complex this settlement was.

So whilst it was unavoidable that Augustus' autobiography placed a great deal of attention on Cleopatra, it is at the same time plausible that Augustus also emphasised the magnitude of the forces opposing him. Marek rather evocatively wrote of Actium: 'the East marched against the West in Greece... From Asia Minor, the kings of Tarkondimontos of Cilicia, Archelaos of Cappadocia, Deiotarus Philadelphos of Paphlagonia, and Mithridates (the son of Antiochos) of Commagene were present in Antony's army; Polemon of Pontos and Lesser Armenia and Amyntas of Galatia had sent troop contingents.'⁷⁷ Given Augustus' punctiliousness in enumerating all the Illyrian and Dalmatian peoples he had conquered, it is reasonable to think that he would not have refrained in his account of Actium. The Nicopolis inscription then is more accurate perhaps than the poetic focus on Cleopatra, at least some of which comes later – Octavian brought peace to land and sea in this region, but against multiple enemies. The abundance of spoils in the lower register of the Nicopolis frieze alludes to the scale of the task.

So for that matter may the Actian Arch. This controversial monument cannot detain us for long, but if the now lost inscription *ILS*, 81, recorded in the sixteenth century, does record accurately the arch's dedication, it echoes the sense of a broader danger averted:

*Senatus populusque Romanus / imp(eratori) Caesari divi Iuli f(ilio)
co(n)su(li) quint(um) co(n)su(li) design(ato) sext(um) imp(eratori)
sept(imum) re publica conservata.*

The Senate and People of Rome to Emperor Caesar, son of the divine Julius, consul for the fifth time, designated for the sixth time, emperor for the seventh time, for the republic having been saved.

If Rich is right that the same arch was used to celebrate the return of the standards lost to the Parthians, we might see a continuity with Actium as a war against a wider foe. This is not incompatible with the acknowledgement that the war was also against Romans and brought

⁷⁷ C. Marek, *In the Land of a Thousand Gods: A History of Asia Minor in the Ancient World*, Princeton, 2016, p. 308.

civil wars to a close, but it would also permit an emphasis on the defeat of a broader eastern coalition.⁷⁸

This more complex picture was perhaps present in the difficult Actian day of the triple triumph.⁷⁹ The little we know of the second day of the triumph is that Alexander of Emesa, one of Antony's client-kings, was paraded in the triumph before being killed (Dio 51.2); and that Adiatorix, son of Domnecleius, tetrarch of the Galatians, together with his wife and two sons, were paraded, again before Adiatorix's execution (Strabo 12.3.35). This was the safe path in 29 BC, but it was also to some extent true – the *Bellum Actiacum* was against a different constellation of enemies to the *Bellum Alexandrinum*.⁸⁰ In due course, the figure of Cleopatra would outshine all the rest, just as Apollo of Actium would become increasingly visible, but even here, the lavish temple of Apollo can be read as referring to a much wider conquest than that over Cleopatra alone. As well as perhaps a subtle hint via the portico of the Danaids, who were the daughters of Aegyptus, the temple's references are to the broader Greek world – Perseus and Medusa, Hercules and Apollo striving for the Delphic tripod – and the ivory reliefs on the double doors show the expulsion of the Gauls from Delphi in 278 BC, whence they made their way into Asia Minor to become the Galatians, whose cavalry pulled out from Antony's side just before the battle of Actium.⁸¹

In another visual reference to the life of Augustus, the Medinaceli relief, we see a visual representation of Augustus' life from Actium to his death.⁸² There are scenes from the battle for Actium, and the sequence seems to end with a procession after Augustus' death. Much about this frieze is unknown, even its date is disputed. Lange argues

⁷⁸ J. W. Rich, « Augustus's Parthian honours, the temple of Mars Ultor and the arch in the Forum Romanum », *Papers of the British School at Rome*, 66, 1998, p. 71-128; P. Baas, « Fasti Capitolini, Parther- und Actiumbogen: Monumente augusteischer Siegespropaganda », *BABESCH*, 90, 2015, p. 109-124.

⁷⁹ Dio 51.21; Gurval, *Actium and Augustus*, p. 25-36; I. Östenberg, *Staging the world: Spoils, captives, and representations in the Roman triumphal procession*, Oxford, 2009, p. 287-288 with full reference to the sources.

⁸⁰ Lange, « *Res Publica constituta* »..., p. 73-79 for the careful differentiation between the two *bella* in some sources, no doubt reflecting the need to see them as two different campaigns leading to two different triumphs.

⁸¹ Miller, *Apollo, Augustus and the Poets*, p. 185-252.

⁸² Lange, *Triumphs*..., p. 171-194; M. Trunk, P. Witte, *Die « Casa de Pilatos » in Sevilla : Studien zu Sammlung, Aufstellung und Rezeption antiker Skulpturen im Spanien des 16. Jhs.*, Mainz, 2002; T. Schäfer, « Ciclo di rileievi Medinaceli », in E. La Rocca (ed.) *Augusto*, Milan, 2013, p. 321-323.

for a Claudian origin, and one of his arguments is that the representation of Actium as a battle between Romans, since they are all wearing the same armour, would not have worked for the Augustan period. This would fit the admittedly hypothetical argument presented here that in the *Autobiography*, Augustus may have emphasised a broader achievement of peace against a wide coalition of forces, following the line that other sources say that Antony was not made a *hostis*⁸³ and that the war was declared against Cleopatra, even if the erasure of Antony's name and other marks of disgrace would have kept the memory live in other contexts. Actium may have been presented as a more general defeat of a threat from the east, followed by the specific conquest of Egypt, perhaps even before Virgil presents it as such. However, Suetonius' inclusion of Actium in a list of the civil wars in which Augustus fought, or indeed Augustus' own admission that in his sixth and seventh consulships he brought an end to civil war represent a different standpoint.⁸⁴ And local views could be brutal, as in the *Fasti Amiternini* and its unflinching description of the *bellum Actiese classiarium cum M. Antonio*.⁸⁵ There were after all many versions of the life of Augustus.

Bibliography

Allély, A., *La déclaration d'hostis sous la République romaine*, Bordeaux, 2012.

Baas, P., « Fasti Capitolini, Parther- und Actiumbogen: Monumente augusteischer Siegespropaganda », *BABESCH*, 90, 2015, p. 109-124.

Bringmann, K., Wiegandt, D., *Augustus, Schriften, Reden und Aussprüche*, Darmstadt, 2008.

Brodersen, K., « Appian und seine Werk », *ANRW*, 2.34.1, 1993, p. 339-363.

Bucher, G., « The Origins, Program, and Composition of Appian's Roman History », *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, 130, 1974, p. 411-458.

Canfora, L., *Augusto, figlio di Dio*, Rome, Editori Laterza, 2015.

⁸³ See A. Allély, *La déclaration d'hostis sous la République romaine*, Bordeaux, 2012, p. 110-112.

⁸⁴ Suet., *Aug.* 9.1; *RG* 34.1. It is noteworthy that Dio gives every impression of scepticism over the exclusion of Antony.

⁸⁵ *Fasti Amiterni* = A. Degrassi, *Inscriptiones Italiae, XIII: Fasti et elogia, I: Fasti consulares et triumphales*, Rome, 1947, p. 170-171, on which see Lange, *Triumphs...*, p. 133-139. Other *Fasti* mention the wars but not the enemy.



- Cavalier, L., Ferriès (M.-C.), Delrieux (F.) (eds.), *Auguste et l'Asie Mineure*, Bordeaux, 2017.
- Chassignet, M., Caton. *Les origines (fragments)*, Paris, Les Belles Lettres, CUF, 1986.
- , *L'annalistique romaine*, tome I, *Les Annales des Pontifes. L'annalistique ancienne*, texte établi et traduit par M. Chassignet, Paris, Les Belles Lettres, CUF, 1996.
- , *L'annalistique romaine*, tome II, *L'annalistique moyenne*, texte établi et traduit par M. Chassignet, Paris, Les Belles Lettres, CUF, 1999.
- , *L'annalistique romaine*, tome III, *L'annalistique récente, l'autobiographie politique (fragments)*, texte établi et traduit par M. Chassignet, Paris, Les Belles Lettres, CUF, 2004.
- Cornell, T. J., « Cicero on the origins of Rome », in J. G. F. Powell, J. A. North (eds.), *Cicero's Republic*, London, 2001, p. 41-56.
- Cornell, T. J. et al. (eds.), *The Fragmentary Roman Historians*, Oxford, 2013.
- Cornwell, H., *Pax and the Politics of Peace: Republic to Principate*, Oxford, 2017.
- Degrassi, A., *Inscriptiones Italiae, XIII : Fasti et elogia, I : Fasti consulares et triumphales*, Rome, 1947.
- Drogula, F., *Commanders and Command in the Roman Republic and Early Empire*, Chapel Hill, 2015.
- Gabba, E., *Appiano e la storia delle guerre civili*, Florence, 1956.
- , *Appiani Bellorum civilium liber quintus*, Florence, 1970.
- , « The historians and Augustus », in F. Millar, E. Segal (eds.) *Caesar Augustus: Seven Aspects*, Oxford, 1984, p. 61-88.
- Girardet, K. M., « Der Rechtsstatus Oktavians im Jahre 32 v. Chr. » *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie*, 133, 1990, p. 322-350.
- , « Per continuos annos decem (res gestae divi Augusti 7, 1) : zur Frage nach dem Endtermin des Triumvirats », *Chiron*, 25, 1995, p. 147-161.
- Goldmann, B., *Einheitlichkeit und Eigenständigkeit der Historia Romana des Appian*, Hildesheim, 1988.
- Gómez Espelosín, F. J., « Appian's 'Iberiké'. Aims and Attitudes of a Greek historian », *ANRW*, 2.34.1, p. 403-427.

- Gowing, A., *The Triumviral Narratives of Appian and Cassius Dio*, Ann Arbor, 1992.
- , « Tully's boat: Responses to Cicero in the imperial period », in C. Steel (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Cicero*, Cambridge, 2013, p. 233-250.
- Griffin, M., « The Elder Seneca and Spain », *JRS*, 62, 1972, p. 1-19.
- Hahn, I., « Appien et le cercle de Sénèque », *AAntHung.*, 12, 1964, p. 169-206.
- Hahn, I., Németh, G., « Appian und Rom », *ANRW*, 2.34.1, 1993, p. 364-402.
- Havener, W., *Imperator Augustus: die diskursive Konstituierung der militärischen persona des ersten römischen Princeps. Studies in ancient monarchies*, 4, Stuttgart, 2016.
- Jacoby, F., *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker, Zweiter Teil C, Kommentar zu Nr. 56-105*, Leiden, 1926.
- Kaster, R. A., « Becoming "Cicero" », in P. E. Knox, C. Foss (eds.) *Style and Tradition: Studies in Honor of Wendell Clausen*, Stuttgart, 1998, p. 248-263.
- Kornemann, E., « Die historische Schriftstellerei des C. Asinius Pollio. Zugleich ein Beitrag zur Quellenforschung über Appian und Plutarch », *Jahrbucher für classische Philologie* (Suppl. 22), p. 557-692.
- Kromayer, J., « Kleine Forschungen zur Geschichte des Zweiten Triumvirats », *Hermes* 33.1, 1898, p. 1-70.
- Lange, C. H., « *Res publica constituta* »: *Actium, Apollo and the Accomplishment of the Triumviral Assignment*, Leiden, 2009.
- , « Triumph and Civil War in the Late Republic », *PBSR*, 81, 2013, p. 67-90.
- , *Triumphs in the Age of Civil War: The Late Republic and the Adaptability of Triumphal Tradition*, London-New York, 2016.
- Levick, B. M., « Greece (including Crete and Cyprus) and Asia Minor, » in *CAH X* (second edition), p. 641-675.
- Livadiotti, U., « Lucio Antonio, Appiano e la propaganda augustea », *SenCom N S* 2.1, 2013, p. 65-92.
- Malcovati, E., *Imperatoris Caesaris Augusti operum fragmenta*, third edition, Turin, 1948.
- Marek, C., *In the Land of a Thousand Gods: A History of Asia Minor in the Ancient World*, Princeton, 2016.
- McGill, S., « Seneca the Elder on Plagiarizing Cicero's *Verrines* », *Rhetorica: A Journal of the History of Rhetoric*, 23.4, 2005, p. 337-346.

- Migheli, A., « Le memorie di Augusto in Appiano, *Illyr.* 14-28 », *AFLC*, 21.1, 1953, p. 197-217.
- Millar, F., *The Roman Near East: 31 B. C.-A. D. 337*, Cambridge (Mass.), 1993.
- Miller, J. F., *Apollo, Augustus, and the Poets*, Cambridge, 2009.
- Murray, W. M., Petzas Photios, M., *Octavian's campsite memorial for the Actian War*, *TAPhS* 69.4, 1989.
- Östenberg, I., *Staging the World: Spoils, Captives, and Representations in the Roman Triumphal Procession*, Oxford, 2009.
- Pelling, C. R. B., « The Triumviral Period » in *CAH X* (2nd edition), p. 1-69.
- Pollini, J., *From Republic to Empire: Rhetoric, Religion, and Power in the Visual Culture of Ancient Rome*, Norman (Okla.), 2012.
- Pothecary, S., « The European provinces: Strabo as evidence », in D. Dueck, H. Lindsay, S. Pothecary (eds.) *Strabo's Cultural Geography: The Making of a Kolossourgia*, Cambridge, 2005, p. 161-179.
- Purcell, N., « The Nicopolitan Synoecism and Roman Urban Policy », in E. K. Chrysos (ed.) *Nicopolis I: Proceedings of the first International Symposium on Nicopolis (23-29 September 1984)*, Preveza, 1987, p. 71-90.
- Reinhold, M., *From Republic to Principate: An Historical Commentary on Cassius Dio's Roman History Books 49-52 (36-29 BC)*, Georgia, 1988.
- Rich, J. W., « Augustus's Parthian honours, the temple of Mars Ultor and the arch in the Forum Romanum », *Papers of the British School at Rome*, 66, 1998, p. 71-128.
- , « Making the Emergency Permanent: auctoritas, potestas and the Evolution of the Principate of Augustus », in Y. Rivière, *Des réformes augustéennes*. Rome, 2012, p. 37-121.
- , « Appian, Polybius and the Romans' war with Antiochus the Great: A study in Appian's sources and methods », in k. e. Welch (ed.) *Appian's Roman History: Roman culture in an age of civil war*, Swansea, 2015, p. 65-124.
- Ridley, R. T., *The Emperor's Retrospect: Augustus' « Res gestae » in Epigraphy, Historiography and Commentary*, Leuven, 2003.
- , « Augustus: The emperor writes his own account », in G. Marasco (ed.) *Political Autobiographies and Memoirs in Antiquity: A Brill Companion*, Leiden, 2011, 267-314.
- Šašel Kos, M., *Appian and Illyricum*, Ljubljana, 2005.
- Schäfer, T., « Ciclo di rilievi di Medinaceli », in E. La Rocca (ed.) *Augusto*, Milan, 2013, p. 321-323.

- Schwartz, E., « Appianus (2) », *RE*, 2. 1.216-37.
- Small, J. P., *Wax Tablets of the Mind: Cognitive Studies of Memory and Literacy in Classical Antiquity*, London, 1997.
- Smith, C., Sulla's *Memoirs*, in Smith, Powell (eds.) *Lost memoirs of Augustus*, p. 65-85.
- Smith, C., Powell, A. (eds.), *The Lost Memoirs of Augustus and the Development of Roman Autobiography*, Swansea, 2009.
- Toher, M., « Divining a lost text: Augustus' autobiography and the ΒΙΟΣ ΚΑΙΣΑΡΟΣ of Nicolaus of Damascus », in Smith, Powell (eds.) *Lost memoirs of Augustus...*, p. 125-144.
- , *Nicolaus of Damascus, The Life of Augustus and The Autobiography*, Cambridge, 2017.
- Trunk, M., Witte, P., *Die « Casa de Pilatos » in Sevilla : Studien zu Sammlung, Aufstellung und Rezeption antiker Skulpturen in Spanien des 16. Jhs.*, Mainz, 2002.
- Vervaet, F. J., « The secret history: The official position of Imperator Caesar Divi filius from 31 to 27 BCE », *AncSoc.* 40, 2010, p. 79-152.
- Welch, K. E., *Magnus Pius: Sextus Pompeius and the Transformation of the Roman Republic*, Swansea, 2012.
- Welch, K. E. (ed.) *Appian's Roman History: Empire and Civil War. Roman culture in an age of civil war*, Swansea, 2015.
- Westall, R., « The Sources for the *Civil Wars* of Appian of Alexandria », in K. Welch (ed.) *Appian's Roman History: Empire and Civil War. Roman culture in an age of civil war*, Swansea, 2015, p. 125-167.
- Whittaker, C. R., *Rome and its Frontiers: The Dynamics of Empire*, London, 2004.
- Zachos, K. L., « The "tropaeum" of the sea-battle of Actium at Nikopolis: interim report », *JRA*, 16.1, 2003, p. 64-92.
- Zecchini, G., « Seneca il Vecchio fonte di Appiano? », *Aevum*, 51, 145-148.

