

John Ellis Jones

Cities of Victory — Patterns and Parallels*

In these remarks, gathered together under the rather grandiose title of "Cities of Victory - Patterns and Parallels", I offer nothing new, original or very controversial today, rather some reflections on the manner in which a Roman emperor might celebrate, commemorate and consolidate a great victory, a decisive victory in a long military and political struggle. It was as a champion of Roman values and traditions that Octavian presented himself in the "cold war" and the "propaganda campaigns" that led up eventually to the battle of Actium in 31 B.C. It was a confrontation between Octavian - or Emperor Caesar divi filius, to give him his formal style at the time — leading the combined naval and land forces of Italy and the western provinces, and Cleopatra, Queen of Egypt and her renegade Roman consort Marc Antony, who had carved up Roman provinces to create kingdoms for the offspring of a foreign queen¹. It might be natural to think that the champion of Roman traditions would choose entirely Roman methods to celebrate his victory; and it is appropriate to look first at those Roman methods (though indeed they were often enough an amalgam of borrowed practices).

To celebrate his victory before his own people the emperor might claim, and be awarded a triumph - a long-established Roman way of presenting the victorious general and army to the people, and parading the spoils and prisoners taken, and happily combining self-glorification with thanksgiving to the gods of Rome. Octavian was certainly to celebrate various triumphs, for his victories over Cleopatra as over other enemies of Rome². Indeed from his time on full triumphs were to be reserved for Roman emperors alone or members of the imperial family.

To commemorate a Roman victory, commonly a trophy or other visible symbol of victory was set up. It was often appropriate that this symbol should be raised on or near the field of battle, but often a great monument might be erected

* The text of this paper is printed very much as it was presented at the Nicopolis Symposium with minimal changes and with only the addition of footnotes.

1. Suetonius *Augustus* 17.1–2; Plutarch *Antony* 60.1; Dio Cassius 50. 4.3–5, 6.1; Camb. Anc. Hist. (CAH) X (1934) 90–111; J.M. Carter, *The Battle of Actium* (1970) 174–87, 190–1, 193–9.

2. Suetonius *Aug.* 22.1 *curulis triumphos tris egit, Delmaticum, Actiacum, Alexandrinum, continuo triduo omnes* (13–15 August, 29 B.C.); Dio Cassius 51.19 1, 5; 51. 21. 5–9 for further details.

elsewhere also, in Rome or at some other political centre. Two early Roman naval victories had been commemorated at Rome by decorating the speakers' platform in the Roman forum with the beaks of captured ships (hence its name *rostra*) and by raising a column adorned in the same style³. In much the same spirit Octavian was to raise a triumphal monument formed of ten of Antony's ships, one from each of the classes in his fleet, on the site of Antony's camp at Actium, and another massive stone-revetted monument also decorated with the prows of many ships on the site of his own headquarters on a hill near Nicopolis, while at Rome the reconstructed *rostra Augusti* and the podium of the Temple of Julius were also embellished with beaks from Antony's ships⁴. Many Roman symbols of victory took the form of architectural structures with sculptural embellishments: Octavian was to be honoured with two triumphal arches, at Rome and at Brundisium, while later examples are the arches raised by Claudius for his British victory, and the arches of Titus, Severus, Galerian, and Constantine, or again the columns of Trajan, Antoninus Pius and Marcus Aurelius⁵. There were earlier examples of sculptural representations such as the monument of Aemilius Paulus at Delphi⁶. Particular incidents might be commemorated, as when Bocchus had statues raised in Rome to glorify Sulla's capture of King Jugurtha of Numidia⁷. An incident (an anecdote one might say) of the Actium campaign was similarly commemorated when Octavian had statues raised in bronze at Nicopolis of a muleteer and his beast; these two had passed by the tent of Octavian on the morning of the battle of Actium, and on enquiry he had found that their names, Eutychus and Nicon, had sounded like omens of his victory and good fortune⁸.

More important than these celebrations and symbols are the political steps taken to consolidate the victory and impose the victor's pattern on the area of recent conflict – and Octavian's choice in this respect is what concerns us most nearly. Where it was necessary to secure conquered territory or resettle dependants and veterans, a Roman general could arrange individual allotments of territory, by

3. Gaius Maenius' capture of the fleet of Antium in 338 B.C. and Gaius Duilius' defeat of the Carthaginian fleet at Mylae in 260 B.C. Livy 8.14.12; ILS 65; *E. Nash*, *Pict. Dict. Rome*² (1968) I. 282; II. 272–5; *D.R. Dudley*, *Urbs Roma* (1967) 92–94.

4. Strabo 7.7.6; Suetonius *Aug.* 18.2; Dio Cassius 51.1.2–3; Anth. Pal. VI. 236; *J.M. Carter*, *The Battle of Actium* (1970) 235; *J.M. Carter* ed. Suetonius *Divus Augustus* (1982) 111–2 with revised text of the inscription on the Michaelitzi monument at Nicopolis. For the memorials at Rome: Frontinus *Aqua*. 129; Dio Cassius 51. 19.2; 56. 34; *Dudley*, *Urbs Roma* (1967) 102–4; *Nash*, *Pict. Dict. Rome*² I 512–4, II 276–83.

5. Dio Cassius 51.19.1; *Dudley*, *Urbs Roma* (1967) 84–5, 115–6, 134–7, 138, 185, 190–4; *Nash*, *Pict. Dict. Rome*² I 92–101, 102–3, 104–112, 126–30, 133–5, 270–5, 276–9, 283–6.

6. Polybius 30.10.1–2; Livy 45.27.7; Plutarch *Aemilius* 28.2; *Rostovtzeff*, *Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World: (SEHHW)* (1941) II. 740, pl. 82.

7. Plutarch *Sulla* 6. 1–2; *Marius* 32.2.

8. Suetonius *Aug.* 96.2; Plutarch *Antony* 65.3.

viritim resettlement⁹. But there would exist no corporate community which by its continuity and its name would honour the conqueror's achievement. The general could however also establish a *forum* and that would have such an effect, and no great formality was required to create such a centre. One name that springs to mind is *Forum Iulii* in southern Gaul, founded by Julius Caesar¹⁰. But a *forum* was not a community of high and privileged status, and so was the less fitting as a memorial of a final victory. The classic Roman method was to establish a *colonia* of Roman or Latin status in the area of recent conflict, and so achieve practical political and commemorative purposes, for the colony would incorporate the name of the founder in its formal titles, and he thereafter would be the *patronus* of that community¹¹. Octavian certainly used these methods to good effect in many parts of the empire: he had veteran soldiers to demobilize and to reward after the Civil War, he had large numbers of civilians also to resettle, those whom he had displaced in order to accommodate his soldiers, and in many provinces he needed to create centres of security and commerce, of urbanized life and centres of Romanization.

But how far was this method appropriate in Greece? Not entirely appropriate, on a large scale. There had been also from earlier times an element of tact and discretion in Roman policies towards Greece, a policy of apparent liberalism. The proconsul Flamininus had declared the Greek states free at the close of the Second Macedonian War, a popular declaration which in effect indicated that Rome would not tolerate another power, such as Macedon, controlling the Greek states but that there was no intention at the time of annexing territory or establishing garrison colonies there¹². The political settlement then involved a division of power between small states which could not seriously harm Roman interests. The declaration of Flamininus was never formally rejected by Rome, although there were of course changes which altered the relations between different Greek states and Rome very considerably. This liberalism of gesture had been displayed more recently by Julius Caesar, if we can accept Plutarch's remark that he had celebrated his great victory at Pharsalus over Pompey by making a similar pronouncement of freedom for Thessaly¹³. Caesar's restoration of Corinth had

9. Livy 8.11.13–14; 8.12.12 (340 B.C.); Polybius 2.21.7–9 (232 B.C.); Livy 31.4.1–2; 31.49.4–5 (200 B.C.); Heitland, *The Roman Republic* (1909) II 268, 397; L. Homo, *Primitive Italy* (ed. 1968) 220; E.T. Salmon, *Roman Colonization under the Republic* (1969) 13–14.

10. Festus de verb. signif. ed. W.M. Lindsay (1913) 74; *forum ... negotiationis locus ut forum Flaminium, forum Iulium ab eorum nominibus qui ea forā constituenda curarunt*. P–W. RE VII 62–74. Forum Iuli became a colonia and a naval base: *colonia Octavianorum Pacensis Classica Forum Iuli*.

11. Livy 8.14.7–8 (Velitrae, Antium); Polybius 2.19.10–13 (Sena 283 B.C.); OCD² ager publicus, colonia: P–W RE IV 511 ff. Salmon op. cit. 14–19.

12. Livy 33.31.7–11; 33.32.5–10; E. Badian, *Foreign Clientelae* (1958) 69–75.

13. Plutarch *Caesar* 48.1; Appian *Bell. Civ.* 2.88.

again an air of an 'act of reparation' about it, though the form that the revived Corinth was to take was a colony of resettled freedmen¹⁴. These acts to some extent set precedents for Octavian's own policies after another Civil War. For example, Augustus assented to being named chief magistrate of the Thessalian Confederacy¹⁵.

In that summary of his own official career which Augustus wrote, the *Res Gestae Divi Augusti*, we are told that he founded a great many colonies of veteran soldiers in several parts of the Roman Empire (far more extensively than had been done before); the provinces listed are Africa, Sicily, Macedonia, both Spains, Achaëa, Asia, Syria, Gallia Narbonensis, and Pisidia. Augustus indeed does not include all his colonizing activities, for he mentions specifically here *colonias militum* - colonies of veteran soldiers¹⁶. So for example he does not include Crete in the list: his colony there - *Colonia Iulia Nobilis Cnossos* - was a colony of resettled civilians. The *Res Gestae* makes no specific mention of the foundation of Nicopolis. It is in any case a rather eclectic account by Augustus of his activities as a Roman magistrate and statesman, a rendering of accounts to the Roman people, to the Roman state; and it is a narrative that is significant for its silences as well as its statements.

Certainly then, Octavian did establish some colonies in Greece, in those parts which became in 27 B.C. the senatorial province of Achaëa, as in those parts which were included in the province of Macedonia. His foundations included not only colonies which he found already established or part-established and refounded under his own name, such as Caësar's at Buthrotum, or Antony's at Philippi, which from being *Colonia Antonia Victrix* became *Colonia Iulia Augusta Philippensium*, or again *Colonia Hortensia Cassandrea* which became *Colonia Iulia Augusta Cassandrea*; but Augustan colonies included several new foundations, such as Patras, Dion, Dyrrachium and Pella, and as mentioned, Cnossos in Crete¹⁷.

As is well known there are two references to Nicopolis also as a Roman colony, though they run counter to other ancient sources and to archaeological evidence in so far as that reveals what was the status of Nicopolis itself. The two authors were perfectly aware of the colonizing activities of Octavian, in Greece as elsewhere, and perhaps interpreted his foundations in Greece as consistent in this

14. Strabo 8.6.23; Plutarch *Caesar* 57.5; P-W RE IV 530; Salmon op. cit. 135. Antony had also presented a popular image in Greece: Plutarch *Antony* 23.2.

15. IG ix.2.4.415b; *Acta Classica* I (1958) 123-30, Larsen, 'The Policy of Augustus in Greece'; G.W. Bowersock, *Augustus and the Greek World* (1965) 83-100, 104, 160-1.

16. *Res Gestae divi Augusti* 28; see also, 3, 16.

17. P-W RE IV 530-1, 549-50; Bowersock op. cit. 62-72.

respect. Interestingly enough both references occur in Latin works by authors who were themselves members of the Roman ruling orders, Northern Italians, perhaps, of Romanized rather than of Roman background. Tacitus in his *Annals*, composed well over a century after the foundation of Nicopolis, makes a passing reference to a visit by the Roman governor C. Poppaeus Sabinus in 31 or 32 A.D., at a time of political disturbance; the phrase, with reference to the governor's arrival, is *Nicopolim Romanam coloniam ingressus*¹⁸. There is no discussion of the status of Nicopolis, other than what was implied by the single phrase *Romanam coloniam*; and perhaps not much more is implied in the context than 'the Roman foundation of Nikopolis', a centre where support for the official regime might be counted on¹⁹. But Tacitus makes reference also to an earlier visit and by a personage of more significance, that by Germanicus in 18 A.D. Mention is made of that prince's visits to the sites of the camps of both Octavian and Antony, for he was related to both. In this context, perhaps more might have been heard about the supposed colony, but Tacitus uses the phrase *urbem Achaiae Nicopolim* there²⁰.

The second reference to a *colonia* at or near Nicopolis occurs in Pliny's *Natural History*. Pliny lists towns and places along the coast of Epirus and Acarnania, making use of different terms, as if he were alive to distinctions of status: so we hear of *colonia Buthrotum ... Ambracius sinus ... oppidum Ambracia ... civitas Anactorica ... Acarnaniae oppida, quae antea Curetis vocabatur, Heraclia, Echinus* — and then, *in ore ipso colonia Augusti Actium cum templo Apollinis nobili ac civitate libera Nicopolitana*²¹. This use of distinctive terms and the inclusion of details might lend a certain plausibility to the passage as if Pliny were aware of two communities co-existing side by side. No other author adds anything to confirm such a view, and perhaps Pliny is only really trying to reconcile an assumption that an Augustan foundation in Greece must have been another of his colonies with an awareness that Nicopolis had a privileged status as a Greek city. Archaeological evidence does not support the ideas that there might have been any colony at Actium or Nicopolis before or within the lifetime of Pliny. Again, other Latin authors make specific reference to Nicopolis as a city. Suetonius' life of Augustus uses the phrase *urbem Nicopolim apud Actium condidit*²². The Greek authors who refer to the foundation of Nicopolis likewise all refer to its status as a *polis* and never as *colonia* or *apoikia*²³.

18. Ann. V. 10.3–4.

19. Cf. Strabo 7.7.5: *Τὸ τοῦ Σεβαστοῦ Καίσαρος κτίσμα, τὴν Νικόπολιν*.

20. Ann. II. 53.1.

21. NH 4.4–5.

22. Suetonius *Augustus* 18.2.

23. The evidence is reviewed in *Balkan Studies* 11 (1970) 91–96, T.C. Sarikakis, 'Nikopolis d' Epire: etait-elle une colonie romaine ou une ville grecque?'

But before leaving these references by Roman authors to Nicopolis as a Roman colony, one might note that in the years between the battle of Actium and the time when they wrote, there had been other imperial victories, other imperial triumphs, and other foundations to celebrate and seal conquests. The most notable achievement in the interval had been the conquest of Britain, which involved an imperial visit to the front, with Claudius leading the army in person to Colchester, or Camulodunum, the capital of king Cunobellinus; there followed a magnificent triumph, and two triumphal arches, and later the foundation of a colony of veterans at Colchester *colonia Victricensis Camulodunum*²⁴. It was raised on the very site of a legionary fortress and indeed replaced it, as excavations in recent years have indicated²⁵. Such foundations were fully in the Roman tradition, and were the normal practice in the western provinces, where the Roman were dealing with *barbari*. Here veteran colonies were a natural development, for they first consolidated conquests and then aided the process of urbanization and Romanization.

The situation was far different in Greece, where urban life had its own deep historic roots and where Romanization was not a policy that was generally desirable.

I turn then to the approach which Greek rather than Roman traditions suggested. The Greek authors who refer to Nicopolis not only refer to the foundation as a *polis* but imply that the city was the result of *synoikismos*. Several specify the towns and areas affected by this policy of centralizing the regions's political life at Nicopolis and gathering much of the local population there²⁶.

Synoikismos was of course a very old tradition in Greece. Specific instances of its use by a victorious general consciously to consolidate and commemorate a victory are the cases of Mantinea, Megalopolis and Messene founded after the battle of Leuctra (371 B.C.); a new balance of power was planned for the Peloponnese and these three cities were to be symbols and sureties for its continuity²⁷. This type of creation was characteristic of the policies of the kings and dynasts who came to dominate politics in Greece and throughout the Greek world from the mid - fourth century B.C. onwards. Sometimes such creations had the element of *synoikistic* resettlement of local populations; often they had the element of the introduction of

24. Dio Cassius 60.21 – 23; Tacitus *Agr.* 14; Ann XII. 32; XIV. 31, 32; CIL XIV. 3955 *consistor civium Romanorum coloniae Victricensis quae est in Britannia Camuloduni*.

25. Britannia 8 (1977) 65 – 105, P. Crummy, 'Colchester: the Roman fortress and colonia'.

26. Strabo 7.7.6; 10.2.2.; Pausanias 5.23.3; 7.18.8 – 9; 10.38.4; Dio Cassius 51.1.2 – 3; Anth. Palat. IX. 553.

27. Pausanias 4.26.3 – 28.1; 8.8.6 – 10; 8.27.1 – 10; 8.33.1; 9.13 – 14; O.C.D. ² Epaminondas, Mantinea, Megalopolis, Messene.

loyal supporters of the conquering regime. Typical also of many of these foundations is that the cities were named after the royal founder or a member of the royal family. Philip of Macedon followed this pattern, and Alexander above all others²⁸. Cities named *Alexandria* pepper the map of his newly-won empire. The successors followed his lead, and so there are numerous cities with names like Antigoneia, Antioch, Seleucia, Berenice, Thessalonike, Nicomedeia, and so on. Where such foundations occurred in lands where city-life was a new growth, the kernel of the settlement was frequently a body of Macedonian or Greek troops, who became representatives and champions of the conquering regime and of a new pattern of urban life — in many respects such were very similar to Roman *coloniae* in the west. Where however the cities were in Greece or long Hellenized parts, the element of *synoikismos* was more emphatic. A particular instance of this is Demetrius' foundation of Demetrias, in which he synoikisized a great part of Magnesia²⁹. The parallel between Demetrias and Nicopolis is clear enough; a large area was milked of its population to fill a new city, and old social and economic patterns changed to satisfy the royal founder's pride and political will.

This was a pattern which recommended itself also to some Roman generals and emperors later, when Rome succeeded to the power of Alexander's successors. Pompey the Great in particular adopted these methods in Asia Minor after his victories over the pirates and over Mithrates VI of Pontus; he revived cities ravaged by war and depopulation, gathering together the local population, or created entirely new cities. He also followed the local dynastic patterns in giving his own name to a few of these cities — and so we have a *Magnopolis* and a *Pompeopolis*³⁰. Later examples of Roman use of this Hellenistic practice are not lacking — we have also instances of *Traianopolis* and *Hadrianopolis*³¹.

But it was not exactly that style which Octavian adopted for his commemorative foundation in Epirus; he did not give it his own name. He left it to others to name cities after him, and so to honour their own creations and to underline their loyalty to the new master of the Roman world. Herod is a case in

28. Plutarch *Moralia* 328e; J.R. Ellis, Philip II and Macedonian Imperialism (1970) 69–70, 86, 136, 167–8, 230–2; G. Cawkwell, Philip of Macedon (1978) 40, 43, 46; Tarn, Alexander the Great (1948) I. 132–6, II 232–59; J.R. Hamilton, Alexander the Great (1973) 160.

29. Strabo 9.5.15 (436); Plutarch *Demetrius* 53.3 (cf. 25.2); A.H.M. Jones, The Greek City from Alexander to Justinian (1940) 1–26 for the foundations and policies of the Successors generally. Appian *Syr.* 57. for the activities of Seleucus I Nikator.

30. Strabo 12.3.1, 30–1, 37, 40; Appian *Mithr.* 115; A.H.M. Jones, Cities of the Eastern Roman Empire (1971) Cities 156–9, 166–8, 170, 202, 206.

31. Rostovtzeff, Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire² (1957) 134–5, 251–2; A.H.M. Jones, Cities (1971) 4–7, 11–12, 18–21, 23–4, 89, 168, 361.

point; having honoured his previous protector, Antony, by naming a new fortress *Antonia* after him, he proceeded to honour his new protector by naming two of his reorganized Graeco – Roman cities *Caesarea* and *Sebaste*³².

The style and name which Augustus did choose for his synoikistic city was of course *Nicopolis* – and there were indeed precedents for that style also. I shall comment briefly on these and make mention of some later creations of the same name.

The first *Nicopolis* I need mention, and perhaps the most significant as far as a model goes, was that *Nicopolis* which was founded by Alexander the Great himself in northern Syria near the border of Cilicia³³. That city commemorated his great victory at the Battle of Issos, which gave him mastery of much of the Persian Empire. As Alexander himself emulated Achilles and envied him for his good fortune in having a Homer to immortalize his deeds, so other conquerors or would – be conquerors made a cult – figure of Alexander in his turn, and modelled the style of their regimes upon his³⁴.

Appian credits Seleucus I Nikator with the foundation of another *Nicopolis*, in Armenia³⁵. But *Nicopolis* in Armenia is described by other sources as a later creation, that of a Roman general not a Greek dynast. The Roman was Pompey the Great, and he was one of those who, as far as a Roman of his day could go, admired and emulated the cult – figure of Alexander. After his defeat of Mithrates VI of Pontus near Dasteira in 66 B.C. he founded a city on or near the site of the battle with the title of *Nicopolis*³⁶. There he created a mixed community of wounded and time – expired soldiers from his army and also people of the region – perhaps the only case of a part – veteran community among his Asian foundations, and oddly enough the very kind of mixed community which Pliny's reference to our *Nicopolis* in Epirus might suggest had been the case here.

The next two foundations with the name which I should mention are those of Octavian himself, first his *Nicopolis* here to commemorate the victory at Actium over Antony and Cleopatra and secondly his *Nicopolis* in Egypt, near Alexandria, which marked the occasion of his final victory over those enemies. At both places

32. Strabo, 16.2.46; Josephus B.J. I 75, 118, 156, 386–416; AJ XV 292–3, 331–9, 409; A.H.M. Jones, *The Herods of Judaea* (1938) 35–63; M. Grant, *Herod the Great* (1971) 73–5, 77–110.

33. Steph. Byz. s. Issos; Strabo 14.5.19 (676); Ptolem. 5.7.7; P – W RE XVII 535–6.

34. Cicero *Arch. poeta*. 24; Plutarch *Alexander* 5.5; 15.4–5; *Pompey* 2.1–2; 34.4–5; 45.1–5; 46.1; *Caesar* 11.3; Suetonius *Div. Iul.* 7; Pliny NH. 7.95; Appian *Mithr.* 116–7; Dio Cassius 37.52.2; D. Michel, *Alexander als Vorbild für Pompeius, Caesar und M. Antonius* (1965); Weinstock, *Divus Julius* (1971) 37, 66–7, 188, 381; J. Leach, *Pompey the Great* (1978) 31–2.

35. Appian *Syr.* 57; Jones, *Cities* (1971) 244–5, 452, links this reference to the *Nicopolis* in Cilicia, and ascribes its foundation to Seleucus rather than Alexander.

36. Strabo 12.3.28; Appian *Mithr.* 105, 115; Cassius Dio 36.50.3; 49.39.3; Orosius 6.4.7; P – W RE XVII 536–8; Jones, *Cities* (1971) 157, 170–1.

the forces available to Antony and Cleopatra faced up to the forces of Octavian; at neither place was there a smashing victory after a real stand – up fight, but none the less there was a decisive victory at both places, a victory conceded by forces that in part at least refused battle, rather than one gained by the endurance and toil of the victor³⁷. When Octavian eventually returned to Rome to celebrate three triumphs on three successive days, the second and third triumphs were for these two victories, one at Actium and the other at Alexandria, and each of these was commemorated locally by a new *Nicopolis*. It was while he was at Alexandria that Octavian had the tomb of Alexander opened so that he could gaze on the remains of another world – beater, his model in some respects; when the offer was made to open the tombs of the Ptolemies also, his curt reply was that he had wanted to see a king, not a series of corpses³⁸. Unlike the *Nicopolis* of Epirus founded in one sense in a vacuum, which was filled by emptying other places, the *Nicopolis* of Egypt was in effect a township on the fringe of Alexandria; but it was to grow, with support, so as to be a place of some size³⁹. As at Actian *Nicopolis* there was great symbolic emphasis laid on the site of Octavian's own headquarters, for the site of his camp became the permanent fortress of the Roman legionary garrison of Alexandria, until the time of Caracalla. Here also as in Greece Octavian decreed that there should be games celebrated every five years to commemorate the victories which had ended the split in the Roman empire and reunited it under single rule.

Other emperors were to follow the lead of Augustus. The Emperor Trajan was one of those emperors who sought to make their regime acceptable by imitating, in some respects, the Augustan pattern; and he imitated him in this instance in particular, that he founded two cities of the name of *Nicopolis*, one in Thrace *Nicopolis peri Neston*⁴⁰, and another which was, later certainly, to be accounted part of Moesia, *Nicopolis ad Haemum* or *ad Istrum*⁴¹. The latter was founded to celebrate his victory over the Dacian king in the first Dacian war. Ammianus Marcellinus refers to *Nicopolim quam indicium Victoriae contra Dacos Traianus Imperator condidit*⁴². It is perhaps significant that this *Nicopolis ad Haemum* was definitely a consciously Greek city, with Greek as its administrative language, with

37. Suetonius *Aug.* 17.2, 3; CAH X (1934) 100–111; J.M. Carter, *The Battle of Actium* (1970) 200–227, 230–2.

38. Suetonius *Aug.* 18.1; Dio Cassius 51.16.5.

39. Strabo 17.1.10; 17.1.16; Josephus BJ 4.11.5; Dio Cassius 51.18.1; P–W RE XVII 538–9; *Nicopolis* became also known as *Iuliopolis*.

40. Ptolem. 3.11.7; P–W RE XVII 518; Jones, *Cities* (1971) 18, 20, 24.

41. Ptolem. 3.11.6; P–W RE XVII 518–532; Rostovtzeff, *Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire*² (1957) 141, 249–50, 645; Jones, *Cities* (1971) 19.

42. Amm. Marc. 31.5.16.

Greek titles and Greek political forms — its *demos*, *boule*, *archons* and a host of minor officials with familiar Greek titles. The settlers came, it seems, largely from Asia Minor, from Bithynia, and the city operated as a Hellenizing influence in new territory.

One can add two more examples of 'cities of victory' so named, founded a great deal later. There is a *Nicopolis* in Palestine — the former Ammaeus which had been a garrison point in Hellenistic times, a legionary camp for a while when Vespasian was involved in the Jewish War; it was renamed *Nicopolis* not to celebrate the capture of Jerusalem, as one author indicates, but much later on, sometime in the early 3rd century A.D.⁴³ And again there was a Nicopolis on the Danube, said to have been founded by the Emperor Heraclius for a victory gained in 629 A.D.⁴⁴

To conclude and to revert to Actian Nicopolis which concerns us most, it is proper to re-emphasize its Greek character.

Octavian had indeed founded colonies of formal Roman type here in Greece and one in Crete, some composed of veteran soldiers, others of displaced civilians. But at Nicopolis, near where he had faced the massed forces of the East in his guise as champion of Roman *virtus* and Roman *mores* he set out to create a city of Greek character, which was given an influential role to play in Panhellenic affairs through its weight in the Amphictyonic Councils⁴⁵. In creating this important, favoured and privileged city, he was presenting himself as appreciative of Greek political and civic traditions, a patron of Greek religion and ideas in the Greek world as much as he was of Roman ideals elsewhere. The free and federate city of Nicopolis was a symbol of reconciled ideals.

43. Eusebius *Chronicon*. 224; P-W RE XVII 533–5; Jones, *Cities* (1971) 279, 463–4.

44. P-W RE XVII 518–9.

45. Pausanias 10.8.3–5.