

Augustus "Triumphator" : Manipulation of the Triumphal Theme in the Political Program of Augustus

Author(s): Frances V. Hickson

Source: *Latomus*, T. 50, Fasc. 1 (JANVIER-MARS 1991), pp. 124-138

Published by: Société d'Études Latines de Bruxelles

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/41535965>

Accessed: 16-02-2019 23:24 UTC

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



JSTOR

Société d'Études Latines de Bruxelles is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Latomus*

Augustus *Triumphator* : Manipulation of the Triumphal Theme in the Political Program of Augustus

This article argues a thesis and it will be well to set it forth at the outset ⁽¹⁾. As Princeps, Caesar Augustus manipulated political ceremonies and exploited the visual media in such a way as to monopolize, for himself and his intended successor, the image of *triumphator*. Paradoxically, one of the means toward this end was the avoidance of triumphal processions. After his magnificent triple triumph in 29, Augustus refused to celebrate additional triumphs. Moreover, in part through his own example and that of M. Agrippa, and in part through a shrewd reorganization of provincial administration, Augustus achieved a restriction of triumphs in general. Eventually only Augustus' potential successors received decrees of triumphs. At the same time, in apparent contradiction to these negative behaviors, Augustus made full use of other ceremonies, honors, commemorative coin types and monuments which proclaimed his personal and continuing association with the role of *triumphator*. This was not the result of a felicitous coincidence of events, but a deliberate and unified political program.

(1) I am grateful to Professors B. Jordan, C. F. Konrad, J. Linderski, and R. Renehan, who read drafts of this article and offered valuable suggestions. The following works will be referred to by author's last name : J. C. ANDERSON, *The Historical Topography of the Imperial Fora*, Brussels, 1984 ; A. BANTI and L. SIMONETTI, *Corpus Nummorum Romanorum*, vol. IV, Florence, 1974 ; T. D. BARNES, *The Victories of Augustus* in *JRS* 64 (1974), p. 21-26 ; J. B. CAMPBELL, *The Emperor and the Roman Army 31 BC-AD 235*, Oxford, 1984 ; F. COARELLI, *Il Foro Romano*, vol. II, Rome, 1985 ; R. COMBÈS, *Imperator*, Paris, 1966 ; H. A. GRUEBER, *Coins of the Roman Republic in the British Museum*, London, 1910 ; L. HALKIN, *La supplication d'action de grâces chez les Romains*, Paris, 1953 ; G. LAHUSEN, *Untersuchungen zur Ehrenstatue in Rom*, Rome, 1983 ; H. MATTINGLY, *Coins of the Roman Empire in the British Museum*, vol. I, London, 1923 ; Th. MOMMSEN, *Res Gestae Divi Augusti*, Berlin, 1883 ; M. REINHOLD, *From Republic to Principate*, Atlanta, 1988 ; H. W. RITTER, *Überlegungen zur Inschrift des Augustusbogens auf dem Forum Romanum* in *MDAIR* 85 (1978), p. 371-384 ; L. SCHUMACHER, *Die imperatorischen Akklamationen der Triumvirn und die auspicia des Augustus* in *Historia* 34 (1985), p. 191-222 ; C. H. V. SUTHERLAND, *Roman History and Coinage : 44 BC-AD 69*, Oxford, 1987 ; R. SYME, *Some Imperial Salutations* in *Phoenix* 33 (1979), p. 308-319 ; H. S. VERSNEL, *Triumphus*, Leiden, 1970 ; P. ZANKER, *Forum Augustum*, Tübingen, 1968. C. H. V. SUTHERLAND, *Roman Imperial Coinage*, vol. I², London, 1984, will be referred to as *RIC I²*.

I begin by reviewing Augustus' policy toward processions decreed in honor of his returns to Rome from military expeditions, both before and during the Principate. Then I examine the restriction of triumphs voted to other generals after the establishment of the Principate in 27. Turning from the triumph proper, I next treat Augustus' handling of various ceremonies which, although not actually part of triumphs, were very closely linked to them. Then the discussion will focus on the triumphal theme as revealed by monumental and numismatic evidence. The conclusion considers some of the possible motivations which guided Augustus' policies. There is considerable debate over the exact chronology of events and the physical appearance of monuments, not to mention interpretations. But it is not within the scope of this article to provide a detailed description and analysis of every individual item of evidence. It does seem worthwhile, however, to assemble the historical, ceremonial, and visual evidence, which has not elsewhere been brought together in a single publication. The juxtaposition of this evidence will bring into sharp relief the intentional purpose and unity of Augustus' triumphal policies.

1. *Augusti Reditus*. — Prior to the establishment of the Principate in 27, Octavian had made six honorific entries into the city of Rome. In 40 after his defeat of Lucius Antonius, he entered the city in a formal procession, which in some ways resembled a triumph, for he wore the dress and laurel crown characteristic of a *trivmphator* (Dio 48.16.1). Later in the same year, the Senate, grateful for the reconciliation between Antony and Octavian, granted both men the honor of riding into Rome on horseback in a lesser triumph or ovation ⁽²⁾. Octavian again enjoyed this honor in 36 after defeating Sextus Pompeius ⁽³⁾. Finally, on three consecutive days in August of 29, Octavian celebrated a triple triumph — for his victories in Dalmatia, at Actium and in Egypt ⁽⁴⁾.

Augustus never again made such an entry into Rome. In fact, as he himself tells us in the *Res Gestae*, Augustus refused triumphs which the Senate later decreed to him : *trī[s egī] curulis trivmphos ... [decernente plu]ris trivmphos*

(2) *Fast. Triumph. Capit. ad ann. 40* = *Inscr. It.* 13.1, p. 86f. ; *Tab. Triumph. Barb. ad ann. 40* = *Inscr. It.* 13.1, p. 342f. ; *Res Gest.* 4.1 ; SUET., *Aug.* 22 ; DIO 48.31.3. For the term *trivmphus minor*, see PLIN., *N.H.*, 15.19 and SERV., *ad Aen.* 4.543. For a brief discussion and bibliography on ovations, see VERSNEL, p. 166 and n. 2.

(3) *Fast. Triumph. Capit. ad ann. 36* = *Inscr. It.* 13.1, p. 86f. ; cf. *Tab. Triumph. Barb. ad ann. 36* = *Inscr. It.* 13.1, p. 342f. (*trivmphavi sic*) ; *Res Gest.* 4.1 ; DIO 49.15.

(4) For a brief description of the triumphal procession, see VERSNEL, p. 56f. and bibliography in n. 1. Octavian's triple triumph celebrated his victories over the Pannonians in 34, M. Antonius in 31, and Cleopatra in 30 : *Tab. Triumph. Barb. ad ann. 29* = *Inscr. It.* 13.1, p. 344f. ; SUET., *Aug.* 22 ; DIO 51.21.5-7 *et al.*

mihi senatu quibus omnibus su]persedi (4.1) (5). There is no evidence for the exact number of times on which Augustus declined these senatorial awards, but there are three likely occasions (6). Dio and Florus report that in 25 Augustus declined a triumph which the Senate had decreed for his victories in Spain (7). It is likely that he again refused to celebrate a triumph in 19 when he returned from the Eastern provinces, where he had, among other exploits, negotiated the recovery of legionary standards held by the Parthians (8). Finally, Dio writes that in 8 Augustus declined a triumph for Tiberius' victories in Germany (9).

Not only did Augustus repeatedly refuse triumphs, but he deliberately avoided any sort of formal reception at all by entering the city unannounced at night. Dio records two such entries. After refusing a triumph for the recovery of the standards captured by the Parthians, Augustus made a nocturnal entry in 19 (Dio 54.10.4) (10). In 13 after two years spent supervising military campaigns in the Western provinces, he again entered the city at night (54.25.4). Commenting on the latter entry, Dio notes that this was Augustus' regular practice: *Καὶ τὴν ἀπάντησιν τοῦ δήμου καὶ τότε ἐξέστη· νυκτὸς γὰρ ἐς τὴν πόλιν ἐσεκομίσθη, ὅπερ πού καὶ ἀεὶ ὡς εἰπεῖν, εἶτε ἐς τὰ προάστεια εἶτε καὶ ἄλλοσέ ποι ἐκδημοίῃ, καὶ ἀφορμώμενος καὶ ἐπανιῶν ὁμοίως ἐποίει, ἵνα μηδενὶ αὐτῶν ὀχληρὸς εἴη. Τῇ δ' ὀστεραία ἔν τε τῷ παλατίῳ τὸν δῆμον ἡσπάσατο, καὶ ἐς τὸ Καπιτώλιον ἀνελθὼν τὴν τε δάφνην ἀπὸ τῶν ῥάβδων περιεῖλε καὶ ἐς τὰ τοῦ*

(5) All quotations from the *Res Gestae* are taken from Jean GAGÉ, *Res Gestae Divi Augusti*, Paris, 1950². I have not attempted to reproduce his elaborate system of *sigla* indicating sources of the reconstruction.

(6) On Dio's mistaken idea that the Senate voted Augustus triumphal honors for the victories of M. Crassus in 29, see REINHOLD, p. 162-163 (with literature) *ad* Dio 51.25.2.

(7) Recent opinion contradicts Dio's attribution of Augustus' acclamation in 25 to the successful exploits of his legate Vinicius in Germany. *Imp.* VIII is assigned rather to Augustus' own Spanish campaign. See SYME, p. 310, and BARNES, p. 21. *Καὶ ἐψηφίσθη μὲν πού καὶ τὰ ἐπινίκια αὐτῷ ... δ' οὐκ ἠθέλησεν αὐτὰ πέμψαι* (DIO 53.26.5); *digna res lauro, digna curru senatui uisa est; sed iam tantus erat Caesar, ut triumpho augeri contemneret* (FLOR. 2.33.53).

(8) *Caesari ex prouinciis redeunti currus cum corona aurea decretus est, quo ascendere noluit* (CASSIOD., *Chron.* 385). Dio gives two different accounts of Augustus' return in 19; he mentions both an ovation (54.8.3) and a nocturnal entry (54.10.4). The historian is obviously wrong about the ovation. The *Res Gestae* (4) specifies only two ovations and only two are listed in the *fasti triumphales*, those of 40 and 36. A variety of coins issued after 19 depicts triumphal chariots, thus suggesting a decree of the Senate awarding Augustus a triumph (see below p. 136). Note also *carmen* 3.4 of Propertius which describes the anticipated triumph of 19.

(9) *Αὐτὸς γὰρ ἐκεῖνα μὲν οὐκ ἠθέλησε πέμψαι* (DIO 55.6.6). Dio 56.17 should probably be understood to ascribe a vote of triumphal honors in AD 10 to Tiberius alone and not to Augustus as well. See MOMMSEN, p. 19.

(10) See n. 8.

Διὸς γόνατα κατέθετο (54.25.4) ⁽¹¹⁾. Suetonius makes a similar statement without reference to a specific occasion: *Non temere urbe oppidoune ullo egressus aut quoquam ingressus est nisi uespera aut noctu, ne quem officii causa inquietaret* (53.2). This practice was probably the only way in which Augustus could avoid a reception. Otherwise his returns would have been massive public affairs, perhaps too reminiscent of the triumphal processions, which he clearly sought to avoid.

2. Restriction of Triumphs. — Most of my comments concerning Augustus' restriction of other men's triumphs will be familiar territory to some readers. It will be helpful, however, briefly to summarize the political situation. The consolidation of Augustus' power in January of 27 marks the beginning of a severe restriction of the number of triumphs awarded and of the men admitted to this honor. Triumphs which M. Licinius Crassus and M. Valerius Messalla celebrated later in that same year and a third which Sex. Appuleius celebrated in the following year commemorated victories won prior to 27 and thus do not reflect the restrictive policies of the Principate ⁽¹²⁾. Only four other triumphs took place during the forty and one half years of Augustus' rule. That small number stands in sharp contrast to the twenty triumphs occurring in the years between Caesar's death and 27 ⁽¹³⁾.

The victory for which Crassus received his triumph probably played a very important part in Augustus' decision to pursue a more restrictive policy toward triumphs ⁽¹⁴⁾. In 29 during his Macedonian campaign, Crassus had personally

(11) The historians' comments emphasize the unusual nature of Augustus' behavior. Cf. references to nocturnal entries by other men. Cicero subjected two political enemies to abuse for returning to Rome unmet and under cover of darkness (*Pis.* 53-55; *Att.* 2.1.5). On the other hand, Plutarch suggests that Pompey returned to Rome at night after the passage of the *Lex Gabinia* in order to avoid an enthusiastic welcome (*Pomp.* 26.1).

(12) In 27 two generals celebrated triumphs: M. Licinius Crassus (*cos.* 30) for victories while proconsul of Macedonia in 29 (*Fast. Triumph. Capit. ad ann.* 27 = *Inscr. It.* 13.1, p. 86f.; *Tab. Triumph. Barb. ad ann.* 27 = *Inscr. It.* 13.1, p. 344f.; *DIO* 51.23-25 *et al.*) and M. Valerius Messalla (*cos.* 31) for victories over the Aquitanians while proconsul of Gaul (*Fast. Triumph. Capit. ad ann.* 27 = *Inscr. It.* 13.1, p. 86f.; *Tab. Triumph. Barb. ad ann.* 27 = *Inscr. It.* 13.1, p. 344f.; *APPIAN, BC* 4.38). In January of 26 Sex. Appuleius (*cos.* 29) triumphed for victories achieved as proconsul of Spain in 28 (*Fast. Triumph. Capit. ad ann.* 26 = *Inscr. It.* 13.1, p. 86f.; *Tab. Triumph. Barb. ad ann.* 26 = *Inscr. It.* 13.1, p. 344f.). Appuleius was the son of Octavia, the step-sister of Augustus. For a discussion of the dating of his imperial acclamation, see SCHUMACHER, p. 213, and COMBÈS, p. 169-170.

(13) See *Inscr. It.* 13.1, p. 567-569, on the evidence for these twenty triumphs.

(14) Cf. *LIVY* 4.20.5-11. See the comments and bibliography of Reinhold, p. 162f. on the *spolia opima* (*DIO* 51.24.4) and on Crassus' imperial acclamation (*DIO* 51.25.2).

killed the enemy king. Apparently Octavian denied Crassus the right to dedicate the *spolia opima* on the grounds that he was not fighting under his own auspices. The fact that, nevertheless, he permitted Crassus to celebrate a triumph, points to the extreme delicacy of the situation. Certainly he did not relish offering a rival military leader such an extraordinary opportunity to court popular favor at a time when he was consolidating his own power. This was a transitional period in which Octavian was still considering the most effective means of securing his power. No doubt, the experience with Crassus emphasized the need to deal with potential rivals, who still threatened the power of the new regime, and supported the movement toward more restrictive policies regarding triumphs.

Augustus' reorganization of provincial administration in 27 was probably the most significant factor in the actual reduction of triumphs⁽¹⁵⁾. Under this plan, the Princeps himself appointed *legati pro praetore* to govern most of those provinces where military campaigns were common. These *legati* fought *auspiciis principis*. Since they did not possess independent *auspicia*, none of these generals received triumphs for their victories. In the remaining provinces, the Senate continued to appoint proconsuls possessing *auspicia sua*, and thus, the right to triumph⁽¹⁶⁾. With the exception of Africa and Macedonia, however, these provinces had no need of a significant military presence and few opportunities for victories worthy of triumphs. Nevertheless, the proconsular governors who did achieve major military victories continued to celebrate triumphs until 19. Thus, two of the generals who received triumphs for victories won after 27 were proconsuls of Africa: in 21 L. Sempronius Atratinus and in 19 Cornelius Balbus⁽¹⁷⁾. No subsequent governor did so, however, despite victories⁽¹⁸⁾.

After Balbus, the only generals who were awarded triumphs were Augustus' potential successors. If any specific legal means were employed to enforce such restriction, there remains no direct evidence. The only recorded evidence suggests that the adept use of examples was the only means employed beyond the new organization for provincial administration. In Dio's opinion, Agrippa's humble moderation set a precedent for other generals. In 19, at Augustus' urging, the Senate voted the Princeps' stepson and intended successor,

(15) On the administration of the two types of provinces, see F. MILLAR, *The Emperor, the Senate and the Provinces* in *JRS* 56 (1966), p. 156-166.

(16) See SCHUMACHER, p. 215-216, on Cossus Cornelius Lentulus whom Augustus appointed to govern Africa *auspiciis Imp. Caesaris Aug.* (*AE* 1940, 68). He received triumphal *ornamenta* for his victories over the Gaetulians.

(17) Atratinus: *Fast. Triumph. Capit. ad ann.* 21 = *Inscr. It.* 13.1, p. 86f.; *Tab. Triumph. Barb. ad ann.* 21 = *Inscr. It.* 13.1, p. 344f. Balbus: *Fast. Triumph. Capit. ad ann.* 19 = *Inscr. It.* 13.1, p. 86f.; cf. 571; STRABO 3.5.3 *et al.*

(18) E.g. L. Passienus Rufus, who did receive the title *imperator*. See below p. 131.

Agrippa, a triumph for his victories over the Cantabri. He declined the honor. Apparently Agrippa thought it more beneficial to court Augustus' trust than public favor. Again in 14 he refused to celebrate a triumph for victories over tribes of the Cimberian Bosphorus (Dio 54.11.6 ; 54.24.7) ⁽¹⁹⁾. *Οὐ μέντοι καὶ τὰ ἐπινίκια καίτοι ψηφισθέντα αὐτῷ ἐπέμφθη· οὔτε γὰρ ἔγραψεν ἀρχὴν ἐς τὸ συνέδριον ὑπὲρ τῶν πραχθέντων οὐδέν, ἀφ' οὗ δὴ καὶ οἱ μετὰ ταῦτα νόμῳ τινὶ τῷ ἐκείνου τρόπῳ χρῶμενοι, οὐδ' αὐτοὶ τι τῷ κοινῷ ἔτ' ἐπέστελλον, οὔτε τὴν πέμψιν τῶν νικητηρίων ἐδέξατο· καὶ διὰ τοῦτο οὐδ' ἄλλῳ τινὶ ἔτι τῶν ὁμοίων αὐτῷ, ὥς γε καὶ ἐγὼ κρίνω, ποιῆσαι τοῦτο ἐδόθη, ἀλλὰ μόναις ταῖς ἐπινικίοις τιμαῖς ἐγαυροῦντο* (54.24.7-8). No doubt, Augustus' own repeated refusal of triumphs also influenced the requests of generals and awards of the Senate. He provided yet another example by refusing to allow Tiberius a triumph for victories over the Pannonians in 12 BC (Dio 54.31.4). Presumably Augustus attributed this denial to the fact that Tiberius did not yet possess *imperium* ⁽²⁰⁾.

The pattern of triumphs and ovations awarded to members of the imperial family reveals a close relationship between triumphal honors and prospective succession ⁽²¹⁾. When the Senate voted triumphs (which he refused) for Agrippa in 19 and 14, he was the intended successor to the Principate. Not long after Agrippa died in 12, the next candidates for succession, Tiberius and Drusus, earned ovations ⁽²²⁾. Drusus died in 9. In 8, the surviving prospect, Tiberius, earned his triumph, celebrated in 7, for successes in Germany. He subsequently celebrated an ovation in AD 10 and a triumph in AD 12, the last victory processions under Augustus' rule ⁽²³⁾. These awards presented extraordinary opportunities for public recognition and favor. Thus they served to prepare the people for an orderly and effective transition of power. The Roman people could see that their future peace and prosperity would be

(19) Agrippa had previously refused a triumph in 37 for his successes in Gaul (Dio 48.49.4).

(20) *Res Gest.* 30 : *Pannoniorum gentes ... deuictas per Ti. [Ne]ronem, qui tum erat priuignus et legatus meus*. Mommsen incorrectly conjectures that this statement refers to Tiberius' status on the occasion of his first triumph (p. 129). By way of compensation to Tiberius, the Princeps awarded, apparently for the first time, the triumphal *ornamenta* — the traditional wreath, tunic, and scepter of the *triumphator*. On the *ornamenta* and recipients, see Suet., *Tib.* 9.2 ; Dio 54.24.7 ; C. Barini, *Triumphalia*, Torino, 1952, p. 24 ; 27-47. On Tiberius' receipt of proconsular *imperium* in 10, see Syme, p. 310.

(21) On the imperial use of the triumph to support dynastic plans, see Campbell, p. 136-142.

(22) Dio 54.33.5, 34.3 ; 55.2.4 ; Suet., *Tib.* 9.2. For a detailed discussion of the ovations of Tiberius and Drusus, see Syme, p. 310f.

(23) 7 BC : Dio 55.6.5, 8.2 ; Suet., *Tib.* 9.2. AD 12 : Dio 56.17.1 ; Suet., *Tib.* 17.1 ; 20.1.

in the hands of a man of proven military prowess. This was important because they believed that it was by means of victories, such as those of Augustus, that peace was to be acquired and preserved ⁽²⁴⁾.

3. Related Ceremonies of Victory. — Although Augustus repeatedly refused to enter Rome in a triumphal procession, he did participate in other ceremonies. After reviewing the types of ceremonies traditionally associated with military victories, we will examine Augustus' use of them to perpetuate his image as *triumphator*.

During the Republic, the process of securing a triumph began when a commander's soldiers saluted him with the title *imperator* after his first major victory ⁽²⁵⁾. If the Senate later confirmed this imperatorial acclamation, the commander kept the title through the day of his triumph, if he received one. Meanwhile, the *fasces* of his lictors were wrapped with laurel as a symbol of the victory. Next the commander sent *litteras laureatas* to the Senate announcing his victory and usually making two requests — the honor of a triumph and the honor of a *supplicatio*, a public thanksgiving to the gods in his name ⁽²⁶⁾. If approved, the thanksgiving normally took place before the commander returned to Rome. When he did arrive in the city, there were other religious rituals to observe. In fulfillment of vows pronounced before his departure, the commander made a thank offering to Jupiter Optimus Maximus. He also placed the victory laurel from his *fasces* in the lap of the god's statue, a ceremony termed the *depositio laurus* ⁽²⁷⁾. If the commander did triumph, these two rituals immediately followed the conclusion of the procession on the Capitoline Hill and thus, in practice, became part of the triumphal celebration.

The importance which Augustus attached to these ceremonies is evident from his own words in the *Res Gestae* (4). Here, specific references to triumphs

(24) As an example of this attitude, cf. *Res Gest.* 13.

(25) For the history and significance of the *appellatio imperatoris* during the republic, see VERSNEL, p. 340-351, and COMBÈS, p. 72-120.

(26) On supplications and their relationship to triumphs, see VERSNEL, p. 170-174, and HALKIN, p. 99-105 ; 109-111. Cf. Cicero's correspondence with Cato, esp. *ad Fam.* 15.4.11. With reference to the phraseology of the request for triumph and *supplicatio*, Halkin states, "... les généraux employaient la même formule quand ils sollicitaient soit la supplication, soit le triomphe, en demandant que le sénat rendît aux dieux l'honneur qu'ils avaient mérité" (p. 109). A clear contrast, however, sometimes distinguishes the two requests: *actum esset utrum ... cuius nomine absentis ... supplicatio decreta foret et dis immortalibus habitus honos, ei praesenti negare triumphum* (LIVY 26.21.3) ; *Non magis de triumpho eius quam de honore diis immortalibus habendo* (LIVY 33.22.5).

(27) On these ceremonies, see J. MARQUARDT, *Staatsverw.*, vol. II, p. 562 n. 3 ; 569, and MOMMSEN, p. 20-21.

at the beginning and end of the passage show that he viewed all of these ceremonies as closely connected with one another and the triumph: [*Bis*] *ouans triumphauit et tri[s] egi* curulis triumphos, et appella[tus sum u]iciens et semel imperator, [*decernente plu*]ris triumphos mihi senatu qu[ibus omnibus su]persedi. L[aurum de f]asc[i]bus deposui in Cap[itolio, uotis quae] quoque bello nuncupaueram [sol]utis. Ob res a [me aut per legatos] meos auspiciis meis terra ma[r]ique pr[o]spere gestas qu[inquagens et q]uinquens decreuit senatus supp[lica]ndum esse dis immortalibus. Dies a[utem pe]r quos ex senatus consulto [s]upplicatum est, fuere DC[CCLXXX]. In triumphis meis ducti sunt ante currum meum reges aut r[egum] lib[eri nouem]. Augustus mentions the imperial acclamation, *depositio laurus, uotorum solutio*, and *supplicatio*. His acceptance of and participation in these particular honors and ceremonies shows that it was only the triumphal procession and not the image of *triumphator* which Augustus sought to avoid.

Augustan policy toward imperial acclamations bore some similarity to his policy toward triumphs. The number of generals who received this honor for victories achieved after 27 declined markedly. In addition to Atratinus and Balbus, another proconsul of Africa, L. Passienus Rufus, also received the title *imperator* in c. AD 3 although he did not celebrate a triumph as they did⁽²⁸⁾. Otherwise, the Princeps and his prospective successors monopolized the title⁽²⁹⁾. Apart from this imperial monopoly, however, Augustus handled acclamations quite differently from triumphs. While he refused the latter, he actually accumulated the former. In his *Res Gestae*, Augustus boasts a total of twenty-one occasions on which he received the title *imperator*. The exact date and reason for each of these acclamations is not known for certain, but a few general observations are possible⁽³⁰⁾. We can probably attribute the first nine of Augustus' twenty-one acclamations to his own military activities⁽³¹⁾. The remaining twelve derived from victories won by other generals. Included in this number are seven acclamations of Tiberius in which Augustus shared. On these occasions, both men augmented the numeral which followed the title *imperator* after their names. For example, the progression

(28) CIL 8.16456; VELL. 2.116.2. See SCHUMACHER, p. 215-218.

(29) On the imperial monopoly of acclamations, see COMBÈS, p. 154-186, and appendix. For Augustus' use of *imperator* as a *praenomen*, see DIO 52.42; R. SYME, *Imperator Caesar: A Study in Nomenclature in Roman Papers*, vol. I, 1979, p. 361-377, esp. 370-373; COMBÈS, p. 132-154.

(30) On the chronology of Augustus' acclamations, see SCHUMACHER, p. 191-222; SYME, p. 309-319; BARNES, p. 21-26; COMBÈS, p. 171; MOMMSEN, p. 10-18.

(31) On the attribution of *Imp.* VII to the capture of Alexandria in 30, see SCHUMACHER, p. 210-211. In contradiction of DIO 53.26.4, *Imp.* VIII should be assigned to Augustus' own Spanish campaign and not to exploits of Vicinius in Germany. See SYME, p. 310, and BARNES, p. 21.

Imp. IV-VII of Tiberius parallels *Imp.* XVIII-XXI of Augustus⁽³²⁾. In these various ways Augustus controlled an important element of triumphal symbolism. His actions had a two-fold objective — to promote his plans for the succession, but always with an eye toward magnifying his own fame⁽³³⁾. We see both of these factors at play in the seven acclamations which Augustus shared with Tiberius.

The term *imperator* has a second relevance for our inquiry. Besides using it with a numeral to indicate an imperial acclamation, Augustus took *Imperator* as a *praenomen*. It was an unusual, perhaps novel move. Although Dio and Suetonius report that the Senate had granted this right to Julius Caesar in 45, no other historiographical or epigraphical sources provide supporting evidence⁽³⁴⁾. Dio is certainly incorrect in his statement that Augustus received the same right in 29 since epigraphical evidence supports an earlier date, perhaps as early as 38 or 40⁽³⁵⁾. The full significance which the new name held for Augustus and his contemporaries can only be a subject for conjecture. In other contexts *imperator* designated a general or leader, a magistrate possessing *imperium*, and the recipient of an imperial acclamation. No one of these alone offers a sufficient and correct interpretation of the *praenomen*. All of the earlier usages contribute to the new name. Whatever broader connotations it may have evoked, the image of *triumphator* was unquestionably present — a general who by virtue of his *imperium* and prowess has earned an imperial acclamation. By assuming the name *Imperator*, Augustus made this image a permanent personal possession⁽³⁶⁾.

Although prayers of supplication were directed toward the gods, they also honored the human being in whose name they were offered⁽³⁷⁾. Under the Principate, that man was usually Augustus. According to the *Res Gestae*, the Senate voted fifty-five supplications in honor of victories achieved through Augustus' own actions or those of his legates (4.1)⁽³⁸⁾. There is no evidence

(32) See SCHUMACHER, p. 222 ; BARNES, p. 23-26 ; MOMMSEN, p. 16-18.

(33) On Augustus' use of the imperial acclamation as a tool of his dynastic plans, see CAMPBELL, p. 125.

(34) DIO 43.44.2 ; SUET., *Iul.* 76. See SYME, *Imperator*, p. 365-366, and COMBÈS, p. 123, n. 4, on the much discussed reliability of Dio and Suetonius.

(35) DIO 52.41.3. Combès accepts the evidence from the *fasti triumphales Barberiniani* for the year 40 (p. 134-135). On the later date see SYME, *Imperator*, p. 368.

(36) See SYME, *Imperator*, p. 372.

(37) Halkin notes that the formula of the *senatus* decreeing a *supplicatio* and the prayers themselves probably mentioned the general by name and his exploits (p. 107, n. 4).

(38) Only 65 occasions from the Republic are known for certain (HALKIN, p. 77). For supplications during the Principate, see G. FREYBURGER, *La supplication d'action de grâces sous le Haut-Empire* in *ANRW*, vol. II.16.2 (1978), p. 1423f. ; and HALKIN, p. 117-120.

available to indicate the date and impetus for most of these decrees. It is reasonable, however, to assume that the Senate ordered supplications in Augustus' name for every victory which won him an imperial acclamation. Nevertheless, as was the case with acclamations, most of the fifty-five supplications were earned by generals other than Augustus⁽³⁹⁾. This would have been in line with the practice which Dio attributes to Iulius Caesar : τῷ Καίσαρι, ... ἱερομηνίαν τε ἐξαίρετον ὁσάκις ἂν νίκη τέ τις συμβῇ καὶ θυσίαι ἐπ' αὐτῇ γίνωνται, κἄν μῆτε συστρατεύσῃται μὴθ' ὅλως ἐπικοινωνήσῃ τῶν καταπραχθέντων, ἔδοσαν (Dio 43.44.6). Among the supplications in Augustus' name, many probably derived from victories which did not result in imperial acclamations.

Similar examples of religious rituals which were closely associated with triumphs were the *depositio laurus* and *uoti solutio*. Although the fragmentary reference in the *Res Gestae* does not tell us how often Augustus performed these ceremonies, it is probable that the Princeps did so on every return, even when he had not personally directed battlefield engagements⁽⁴⁰⁾. Dio records two specific occasions when Augustus presented the laurel from his *fascēs* to Jupiter. In 13 Augustus returned from supervising campaigns in the Western provinces. He entered the city quietly at night, but on the following day he performed the traditional rites on the Capitoline (Dio 54.25.4). In 8 when giving thanks for successful military campaigns, he placed the laurel, contrary to custom, in the temple of Jupiter Feretrius, where Romulus had offered the *spolia opima* of his first triumph (Dio 55.5.1).

4. Images of Triumph. — As we have seen, although Augustus repeatedly declined the honor of a triumphal procession, he continued to participate in other ceremonies which were related to that event. Augustus did not, however, restrict his exploitation of the triumphal theme to ceremonies. It took concrete form in a forum, arches, and coins.

The most concentrated use of the triumphal theme appeared in the Forum Augustum, whose temple to Mars Ultor was dedicated in 2 BC⁽⁴¹⁾. Here, Augustus housed the legionary standards recovered from the Parthians, and here future *triumphatores* would dedicate the crown and scepter symbolic of their successes. Future meetings of the Senate to discuss triumphal honors would also take place in this temple. In addition to these functional aspects,

(39) For legates receiving this honor, see HALKIN, p. 90f.

(40) See Mommsen's comments on the ceremony and his consideration of supplements to *Res Gestae* 1.23 (p. 18-21). Torelli refers to this ceremony as a "pseudotriumph" (M. TORELLI, *Typology and Structure of Roman Historical Reliefs*, Ann Arbor, 1982, p. 54).

(41) On the new forum and its functions, see DIO 55.10.3, ANDERSON, p. 65-100, and ZANKER.

the triumphal theme appeared in the sculptural program as well. Marble statues of the great men of Rome's past stood in colonnades running the length of the Forum and in the niches of walls curving out in hemicycles on either side of the temple. According to Suetonius, all of the statues in the porticos were presented *triumphali effigie* (Aug. 31.5) ⁽⁴²⁾. Dio tells us that additional statues, in bronze, were to be erected for subsequent *triumphatores*, as well as for the recipients of the triumphal *ornamenta* in honor of victories won *auspiciis principis* (55.10.3). The forum also contained a wall painting, which portrayed *Belli faciem ... et Triumphum* (Pliny *N.H.* 35.27). Of course, the Forum Augustum would not have been complete without a specific reference to Augustus' own triumphal deeds. The Princeps himself mentions the *quadriga* which stood in his forum: *in foro Aug. sub quadrig[is] quae mihi ex s.c. pos[it]ae [sunt]* (*Res Gest.* 35) ⁽⁴³⁾. Although there is no direct evidence, it is possible that a statue of Augustus stood in this *quadriga* ⁽⁴⁴⁾.

The triumphal theme also characterized arches erected in Augustus' honor. According to Dio at least three arches were built in Rome to commemorate acts of the Princeps — the victory at Actium in 31, the repair of the Via Flaminia in 27, and the return of legionary standards negotiated in 20 with the Parthians (51.19, 53.22.2, 54.8.3). Numismatic evidence indicates that each of these arches displayed a sculpture of the victorious Augustus ⁽⁴⁵⁾. In 29 the Senate erected an arch in honor of the success at Actium (Dio 51.19) ⁽⁴⁶⁾. The sculpture of Augustus riding in a triumphal chariot drawn by four horses, which stood above the arch, commemorated the triumph which he celebrated in August of that year ⁽⁴⁷⁾.

Two years later when Augustus had completed repairs to the Via Flaminia, arches in his honor were erected on the Tiber bridge and at Ariminum (Dio 53.22.2). Both the repair and the accompanying arch were part of a republican tradition by which many *triumphatores* built or restored public buildings and works in fulfillment of vows and as a means of memorializing their victories ⁽⁴⁸⁾. Therefore, it is not surprising that the arches built to commem-

(42) See ANDERSON, p. 81-83, and *contra* ZANKER, p. 14f., on triumphal dress. Perhaps Suetonius' statement should be understood to distinguish statues in the porticos from those in the hemicycles.

(43) See ZANKER, p. 12 on the location of this *quadriga*.

(44) ZANKER, p. 12.

(45) On the sculptural program of triumphal arches, see LAHUSEN, p. 61-65.

(46) Coarelli has recently revived the theory that the triple arch appearing on a coin struck by L. Vinicius in 16 BC (*RIC* I², n. 359) depicts this monument (p.259-268).

(47) Concerning the *quadriga* on triumphal arches, see LAHUSEN, p. 63; KÄHLER in *RE*, vol. 7A 1 (1939), col. 475, s.v. *Triumphbogen*.

(48) On the effect of Augustan triumphal policy on the Senatorial class, see W.

orate the road repair should also commemorate the victory at Actium. One coin type from the years 18/17 bearing the legend *quod uiae mun(itae) sunt* presents a viaduct and arch surmounted by a *quadriga* of horses and flanked by ships' *rostra*, which clearly refer to the naval victory at Actium⁽⁴⁹⁾. A second type with an identical legend from the same period shows an arch supporting a chariot drawn by two elephants, normally a reference to an eastern victory, again likely Actium⁽⁵⁰⁾.

In 20 the Senate decreed another arch, this time in honor of the success in Parthia (Dio 54.8.3). Like the triumphal arch commemorating his victory at Actium, this arch also supported a statue of Augustus in a horse-drawn *quadriga*⁽⁵¹⁾. In addition, the arch displayed the triumphal *fasti*, a list of all generals who had celebrated triumphs or ovations from Romulus, the legendary first *triumphator*, to Balbus, the last non-imperial recipient of this honor⁽⁵²⁾. The combination of Augustus in his triumphal chariot poised above the names of all Rome's triumphing generals must have made a dramatic visual statement⁽⁵³⁾.

Triumphal imagery also appears on a variety of coin types, which include a horsedrawn *quadriga*, an elephant *biga*, and a triumphal chariot inside a temple. Two coin types issued by an uncertain Italian mint active *circa* 32-27 probably refer to Octavian's victories at Actium and/or Egypt in 31 and 30⁽⁵⁴⁾. One displays on its obverse the goddess Victory holding a wreath and palm branch while standing on the prow of a ship, a reference to the naval battle. On the reverse, Octavian holding a laurel branch rides in a horse-drawn

ECK, *Senatorial Self-Representation : Developments in the Augustan Period* in *Caesar Augustus*, ed. F. MILLAR and E. SEGAL, Oxford, 1984, p. 138-143.

(49) *RIC* I², n. 144-145 ; illust. MATTINGLY, vol. I, pl. 10, 7-8. For the attribution to Actium, see GRUEBER, vol. II, p. 40, n. 2.

(50) *RIC* I², n. 140 (pl. 3). According to Grueber the elephant *biga* refers to Augustus' successes in Africa (vol. II, p. 39, n. 3). See Banti-Simonetti for a brief discussion of the type (p. 165, n. 164). There is also a variant without the viaduct. There the arch is flanked by two porticos (*RIC* I², n. 141, 143 ; illust. GRUEBER, vol. II, 40 n. 4462 var.). Another coin type commemorating repair of the Via Flaminia displays an arch surmounted by an equestrian statue (*RIC* I², n. 142 ; illust. MATTINGLY, vol. I, pl. 10, 9).

(51) See Coarelli's discussion of the evidence for location and appearance of the Parthian arch (p. 269-296). Coarelli rejects the theory that a simple arch in honor of the victory at Actium was torn down and replaced by a triple arch in honor of the victories at both Actium and Parthia (p. 268). On this latter view, see RITTER, p. 371-378. A triple arch with *quadriga* and the legend CIVIB ET SIGN MILIT A PART RECUP or RECUPER appears on several coin issues (*RIC* I², n. 131-137 [pl. 3, n. 131]).

(52) For a recent discussion of the location and dating of the *triumphal fasti*, see COARELLI, p. 269-308.

(53) ZANKER, p. 21. Ritter notes the possibility of a god in the chariot (p. 378).

(54) See *RIC* I², p. 30f., on the Italian provenience of these coins.

quadriga ⁽⁵⁵⁾. The other type features a driverless *quadriga* of horses surmounted by another in miniature. Possibly the empty chariot refers to the fact that the triumphal procession did not take place until two years after the event ⁽⁵⁶⁾.

Although no formal triumph took place on the occasion of Augustus' return from the East in 19, a number of coins struck at about that time display triumphal images ⁽⁵⁷⁾. Coins issued by a Spanish imperial mint *circa* 19 feature triumphal chariots. One type displays again the driverless horse-drawn *quadriga* surmounted by the same in miniature. In addition, the *quadriga* sometimes contains a legionary standard ⁽⁵⁸⁾. Another type displays a circular temple within which we see a horseless chariot. Above the chariot appears another miniature horse-drawn *quadriga* and inside, a legionary standard ⁽⁵⁹⁾. Most likely, the legionary standard appearing on each of these types refers to the recovery of standards from the Parthians in 20. Since Augustus did not celebrate a triumph for that success, it is possible that these coins depict the chariot mentioned in Cassiodorus' *Chronica* : *currus cum corona aurea decretus est, quo ascendere noluit* (385) ⁽⁶⁰⁾. The refusal may also account for the depiction of the chariots as driverless. Finally, a series of coins issued in Rome in 18 displays Augustus holding a laurel branch and scepter and riding in an elephant *biga*, clearly a reference to Eastern victories ⁽⁶¹⁾.

As we have seen, the triumph was a common theme of Augustan monuments and coinage. An arch in the Forum Romanum and imperial coin types soon memorialized the triumphal victory at Actium, as did subsequent arches on the Via Flaminia. Eleven years later the successful recovery of standards from the Parthians also inspired a triumphal arch and coinage, despite the fact that Augustus did not actually celebrate a triumph on that occasion. The Parthian arch with its *fasti* and *quadriga* furnishes a striking paradigm of

(55) *RIC* I², n. 263 (pl. 5) and 264. Concerning the attribution of the Victory/*quadriga* to Actium, see GRUEBER, vol. II, p. 8, n. 2 in reference to type X, n. 4342. Mattingly thinks that the appearance of Octavian in the *quadriga* refers to the conquest of Egypt (vol. I, p. cxxiii).

(56) *RIC* I², n. 258 and 259 (pl. 5). For his attribution of this type to the victory at Actium, see MATTINGLY, vol. I, p. cxxii. He distinguishes this from the previous type as no triumph was immediately held. Grueber incorrectly associates the driverless *quadriga* with the ovation for the battle at Naulochus in 36 (vol. II, p. 8, n. 2, concerning type I n. 4322).

(57) On the Parthian success and coin types commemorating it, see SUTHERLAND, p. 13-17.

(58) Without standard : *RIC* I², n. 96-101 (pl. 2, n. 99), 109. With standard : n. 107-108b ; 110-113b.

(59) *RIC* I², n. 114-120a (pl. 2,, n. 119).

(60) See the discussion of possible ceremonies in SUTHERLAND, p. 15-17, and BANTI-SIMONETTI, vol. IV, p. 176 ; 181.

(61) *RIC* I², n. 280-284 (pl. 5, n. 283), 301, 311.

the way in which the image of Augustus *triumphator* began to pervade and dominate commemorations which were not strictly triumphal. This tendency reached full expression in the elaborate sculptural program and functions of the Forum Augustum, whose focal point, the temple of Mars Ultor, fulfilled a vow to avenge the murder of Iulius Caesar. The role of *triumphator*, much in the same way as the name and title *imperator*, had come to be a continuing possession of the Princeps⁽⁶²⁾. The actual event of a triumph and the status of *triumphator* bore increasingly less relationship to one another.

5. Conclusions. — Imperial acclamations, the assumption of the *praenomen Imperator*, the offering of laurel, supplications of thanksgiving, a forum, arches, the triumphal *fasti*, coins. Paradoxically, at the same time that Augustus thus monopolized and exploited the image of a triumphing general, he refused to triumph. What function did this refusal serve? Obviously, he was not declining personal honors. Nor was he avoiding association with the triumph⁽⁶³⁾.

By actually celebrating only the triple triumph, Augustus focused the triumphal propaganda of the Principate on that extraordinary event. The number three is significant. Augustus placed himself firmly within the republican tradition by refusing to accept further triumphs. According to the *fasti triumphales*, only three men had exceeded that number; all were dictators⁽⁶⁴⁾. Clearly that was not an image which Augustus would wish to foster. By limiting himself to three triumphs, however, Augustus identified himself with a leader whose image he did find pleasing. The first three triumphs listed in the *fasti triumphales* belong to Romulus, the *primus conditor urbis*⁽⁶⁵⁾. Of Augustus' own victories, monumental and numismatic evidence indicates that Actium was the principal subject for triumphal imagery. This was the victory by which, as imperial propaganda stressed, Augustus had preserved the republic. By not celebrating repeated triumphs for lesser victories or victories in which he had played a smaller role, Augustus protected his image as *triumphator par excellence*.

(62) See J. GAGÉ, *La théologie de la victoire impériale* in *Revue Historique*, 171 (1953), p. 9.

(63) Pais sees Augustus avoiding the display of his power: "In tutto ciò v'era il calcolo assennato di un sobrio uomo di Stato, il quale con l'affettare l'eguaglianza repubblicana, con lo schivare le troppo frequenti occasioni di mettere in vista il suo potere, cercava di rafforzare il nuovo ordine di cose" (E. PAIS, *Fasti Triumphales Populi Romani*, Rome, 1920, p. 324). He does not take into account Augustus' exploitation of triumphal imagery.

(64) M. Furius Camillus, 4 triumphs: *Fast. Triumph. Capit. ad ann. 367 = Inscr. It.* 13.1, p. 68f., see also p. 539; M. Valerius Corvus, 4 triumphs: *Fast. Triumph. Capit. ad ann. 346, 343, 335, 301 = Inscr. It.* 13.1, p. 68f., 72f. On Julius Caesar's 5 triumphs, see *Inscr. It.* 13.1, p. 567.

(65) *Fast. Triumph. Capit. ad ann. 753 = Inscr. It.* 13.1, p. 64f.; cf. p. 534.

Triumphal imagery continued to commemorate victories for which the Princes refused triumphs. The commemoration of his Parthian success is the most obvious example of this practice: the arch with its list of *triumphatores*, the triumphal chariot on coins, the imperatorial acclamation, as well as victory ceremonies. Only the procession was missing. It was perhaps a small concession to maintain the semblance of republican tradition. Augustus demonstrated yet again his astute political talents by balancing avoidance of triumphal elements with manipulations of them in order to maximize the benefits of both policies.

Augustus found that the restriction of other generals' triumphs was also in his interest. It reduced the opportunities for potential political rivals to attract excessive public attention to their own military prowess. Thus he quickly eliminated the opportunity for any rival general to celebrate a triumph. This represented a major change from the years prior to the principate when triumphs were relatively frequent. The fewer triumphs celebrated, the more memorable those which did take place. Augustus thus magnified and protected his image as *triumphator*.

When Augustus had seen his own fame and power secured, the personal celebration of further triumphs offered no advantages. There were, however, others who could benefit from such an honor. Now that restriction had increased its significance, the triumph was a more effective tool to promote plans for the succession. We have seen that once triumphs were limited to members of the imperial house, even they were sparingly awarded. The recipients were all intended successors to the Principate. In this way Augustus prepared the Roman people quietly and willingly to support his dynastic plans.

In sum, it is clear from this new presentation of the evidence, Augustus deliberately pursued a coherent political program in his handling of triumphs, both his own and those of other men. Although Augustus did not take the title *triumphator* as a *praenomen*, as he had the title *imperator*, nevertheless, his policy was to appropriate for himself the image of *triumphator*. Augustus denied himself the ephemeral show of triumphal processions, but he perpetuated his image as *triumphator* by means of more lasting memorials. Countless Roman citizens handled coins bearing representations of his triumphs and saw his triumphal statues in the Roman and Augustan *fora*. Augustus had preserved the republican image of *triumphator* untarnished by excessive or trivial usage. He then adroitly applied the persuasive power of that image to ensure the continuance of his power through his successor. Concerning M. Fabius Vibulanus' refusal of a triumph in 480, Livy commented: *Omni acto triumpho depositus triumphus clarior fuit; adeo spreta in tempore gloria interdum cumulatione redit* (2.47.11). It could have been written of Augustus.

University of California, Santa Barbara.

Frances V. HICKSON.