

POMPEY'S *SUPPLICATIO DUPLICATA*:
A NOVEL FORM OF THANKSGIVING

FRANCES HICKSON-HAHN

DURING THE LAST CENTURY OF THE REPUBLIC, senatorial decrees of supplications giving thanks for important military victories underwent a gradual change that placed increasingly greater emphasis on the human, rather than divine recipients of this religio-political ritual. Scholars have observed this development both in the increasing number of days awarded and in the phraseology used to describe decrees.¹ It has not been observed that a supplication in Pompey's name in 62 provides additional evidence for the senatorial manipulation of this ritual as a means of bestowing glory on its favorites. Cicero, who proposed this supplication, described it as the first ever "duplicated": *primum duplicata est supplicatio* (*Prov. cons.* 27). In an 1892 article, in which W. Sternkopf demonstrates that Cicero refers to two supplications in 63 and 62 rather than one of double length, he does not, however, give adequate attention to the exact manner in which the second ceremony was novel.² He limits himself to a single sentence of description: "Zum ersten Male ist demselben Manne in demselben imperium oder auf Grund eines Krieges . . . zweimal eine supplicatio dekretirt worden!" (469). The present article reconsiders the statement *primum duplicata est supplicatio* in light of the historical evidence, which provides at least one precedent for multiple supplications on the basis of the same war or *imperium*. There is, however, no precedent for a supplication that so precisely duplicated an earlier. By giving thanks for the conclusion of "all wars on land and sea," the ritual of 62 included the Mithridatic war, whose conclusion had been recognized with a thanksgiving in the previous year, and thus duplicated the earlier supplication while also honoring other victories not previously distinguished in this fashion. At the same time, Cicero's proposal introduced a novel form of supplication that recognized the accomplishments of a general not for military victory in one war, as always before, but for five years of successful warfare.

The sole witness for these supplications in Pompey's name is Cicero's speech *De provinciis consularibus* (delivered in 56), in which the orator attempts to justify his current support of Caesar. In so doing, he calls attention to his vote the previous year in favor of a supplication of fifteen days in thanksgiving for Caesar's

This article has benefited from the helpful comments of Robert Morstein-Marx, Jonathan Edmondson, and the anonymous referees of *Phoenix*. All dates are B.C. unless otherwise indicated.

¹ Halkin 1953: 106–107; Freyburger 1978: 1422–23.

² Sternkopf 1892: 468–472. This article is an expansion of a chapter from an earlier publication, Sternkopf 1889: 11–13. Halkin accepts Sternkopf's interpretation and lists these two supplications as numbers 39 and 40 (1953: 38–39 and 38, n. 4 with bibliography). Similarly, Shackleton Bailey 1977: 279 and Freyburger 1977: 304, n. 105.

Gallic victories in contrast to one of five days, which had been judged sufficient to celebrate Marius' victory over the Cimbri (*Prov. cons.* 25–26). He notes that Pompey too had supported that honor for Caesar even though it surpassed his own earlier supplications of ten and twelve days. At the same time, Cicero mentions his personal role in proposing those honors for Pompey (*Prov. cons.* 27):

quo consule (sc. *Cicerone*) *referente primum decem dierum est supplicatio decreta Cn. Pompeio Mithridate interfecto et confecto Mithridatico bello et cuius sententia primum duplicata est supplicatio consularis—mibi enim estis adsensi, cum eiusdem Pompeii litteris recitatis, confectis omnibus maritimis terrestribusque bellis, supplicationem dierum duodecim decrevistis.*

When I as consul referred the question to the Senate, for the first time a supplication of ten days was decreed for Gnaeus Pompey because Mithridates had been killed and the Mithridatic war brought to a conclusion, and in accordance with my proposal as consular, for the first time a supplication was doubled—for you agreed with me when after a letter of the same Pompey had been read you decreed a supplication of twelve days because all wars on land and sea had been brought to a conclusion.

It will be useful to begin by reviewing the context for the two supplications in Pompey's name. Since Cicero specifies the death of Mithridates and the consequent end of the Mithridatic war as the immediate causes for the first thanksgiving,³ it belongs to the period in which the *lex Manilia* of 66 had granted Pompey command of the war against Mithridates and Tigranes with proconsular *imperium* over Bithynia, Pontus, and Cilicia.⁴ Cicero's explanation for the supplication of 62 is considerably broader; he identifies the cessation of all wars on land and sea, which would include that against the pirates as well as that against Mithridates.⁵ The *lex Gabinia* of 67 had granted Pompey command of the war against the pirates with *imperium* throughout the Mediterranean sea and fifty miles inland for a period of three years.⁶ Although Cicero mentions the receipt of reports from Pompey that prompted the second supplication, he makes no mention of such reports in connection with the former ceremony.⁷ Yet it was customary for the Senate to decree supplications after receiving a report from the commander describing his victory and requesting thanksgivings to the gods.⁸ It is possible that the Senate, at Cicero's prompting, acted independently upon receiving word of Mithridates' death. This could be one explanation for the unusual duplication of thanksgivings.

³ On the supplication, see App. *Mith.* 113.

⁴ Plut. *Pomp.* 30; see Broughton *MRR* 2.153 *sub* C. Manilius for additional sources.

⁵ The date of the second supplication is derived from Cic. *Fam.* 5.7.1. On this date, see Sternkopf 1889: 11–12 and 1892: 470; also Shackleton Bailey 1977: 279.

⁶ Plut. *Pomp.* 25–26; sources in Broughton *MRR* 2.144 *sub* A. Gabinius. See also Miltner 1952: 2093–98.

⁷ Cicero likely mentions Pompey's report also in *Fam.* 5.7. On this letter and its assistance in dating the supplication of 62, see Sternkopf 1892: 470–471 and 1889: 11–13.

⁸ See Halkin 1953: 77–93 on the normal practices involved in the request for, and granting of, supplications.

The news of Mithridates' death in itself is an unusual motivation for a supplication. Typically supplications took place not long after a commander's military victory, but in the case of the supplication of 63, there was no immediately preceding military victory *per se*.⁹ In 66 Pompey had defeated Mithridates' army at Dasteira, although the king himself had escaped and Pompey never again faced him on the battlefield.¹⁰ In fact, Pompey was in the area of Jericho when he received news of Mithridates' death in 63. The king had died by his own request at the hands of a Celtic bodyguard when, betrayed by his son Pharnaces, he realized that there was no longer any hope of successfully fighting Rome.¹¹ Plutarch's account of the announcement of this news to Pompey mentions the decoration of the messengers' spears with laurel, as would be a commander's report announcing a victory (*litterae laureatae*).¹² Just so, this news was received in Rome and among Pompey's soldiers as signalling the end of the war, since as long as Mithridates had been alive there remained a threat of the resumption of hostilities.¹³ Perhaps for this reason Pompey did not send *litterae laureatae* in 66, as suggested by the fact that there is no record of supplications in his name for the victory at Dasteira.¹⁴

Although many scholars have interpreted the Ciceronian passage as referring to a single supplication, the diction and syntax clearly point to the existence of two decrees.¹⁵ The passage divides neatly into two sections, each beginning with a relative pronoun (*quo, cuius*) referring to Cicero. By means of ablative absolutes identifying the reason for the supplications, the orator sharply contrasts the two events. While the first of these explanations specifies the death of Mithridates and the conclusion of the Mithridatic war, the second explanation, occurring in the middle of a parenthetical remark, names the conclusion of all wars on land and sea. Although each of these ablative absolutes refers to the end of warfare, Cicero underscores the contrast between the two events by employing first the singular and then the plural (*confecto bello, confectis bellis*). Furthermore, the phrase *maritimis . . . bellis*, which must include the war against the pirates, obviously distinguishes the two occasions. Here, as elsewhere in the passage, Cicero's use of repetition calls attention to the parallelism of the two halves and the compound nature of Pompey's honor. Thus Cicero names Pompey twice: first with his *praenomen* and second with the adjective *eiusdem*, an addition that would be superfluous were only one supplication described. Particularly striking

⁹On requirements for granting a *supplicatio*, which were similar to those for triumphs, see Val. Max. 2.8.1; Pliny *NH* 15.125; Paulus Festus 213L s.v. *ovalis corona*; Halkin 1953: 90–93.

¹⁰Plut. *Pomp.* 32; Dio 36.48–49; App. *Mith.* 100–101.

¹¹App. *Mith.* 110–112; an alternative version: Dio 37.12–13.

¹²Plut. *Pomp.* 41.3. On *litterae laureatae*, see, for example, Livy 5.28.13; Halkin 1953: 78, 80.

¹³Cic. *Prov. cons.* 27; Plut. *Pomp.* 42.

¹⁴Plutarch (*Pomp.* 38.1–2) comments on Pompey's earlier criticism of Lucullus for acting like a victor while Mithridates was still alive and notes Pompey's comparable behavior following Dasteira in the distribution of gifts and the organization of provinces.

¹⁵Sternkopf 1892: 469–470.

is the repetition in each section of the word *primum* placed near the beginning of its clause and accompanied by the noun *supplicatio*.

The word *consularis* deserves detailed comment. As a noun in apposition to *cuius*, *consularis* distinguishes the timing of the two decrees by calling attention to Cicero's changed status, from consul to consular.¹⁶ It also serves to differentiate Cicero's role in the two supplications. On the first occasion, he placed the question before the Senate as presiding magistrate (*quo consule referente*). On the second occasion, as indicated by the noun *sententia*, it was as a non-magistrate that he offered his opinion to the Senate.¹⁷ The phrase *sententia consularis* further defines Cicero's role by indicating the practice of calling upon former consuls to offer their opinions prior to other senators of lesser rank.¹⁸ Thus in a letter to Atticus, Cicero uses this same phrase to indicate the highly respected opinions of ex-consuls: '*dignitate*' (*fortasse sententia consularis*).¹⁹ As the *sententia* of a consular, Cicero's proposal would have carried special weight among his fellow senators.²⁰ Although some scholars, as distinguished as Merguet, have identified *consularis* as an adjective modifying *supplicatio*,²¹ there is no precedent for this collocation. Furthermore, linking *consularis* to *supplicatio* does not produce a meaningful concept. The term cannot indicate a "thanksgiving in the name of a consul" here since there is no record of supplications in Pompey's name during his consulship (70) nor any military campaign that year that might have given reason for a thanksgiving. Pompey had already celebrated a triumph at the end of 71 for his successes in Spain and any related supplications would have taken place prior to the triumph. Similarly, the phrase "thanksgiving in the name of an ex-consul" would contribute nothing meaningful to Cicero's statement, since the novelty of this supplication was not dependent on the status of the recipient, as will be shown.

Once the existence of two supplications is accepted, the meaning of the participle *duplicata* becomes clear. Here as elsewhere in Cicero, the verb *duplico* refers to a doubling, in this passage the doubling of the number of occasions on which Pompey's Mithridatic victory was celebrated.²² Thus in the *Pro Sestio*

¹⁶ Sternkopf 1892: 472 and 1899: 11–12.

¹⁷ Mommsen 1888: 944–945.

¹⁸ On this practice and the phrase *loco consulari*, see Gell. 4.10.4; Varro fr. Gell. 14.7.9; Cic. *Phil.* 1.15, 7.15; also Daremberg and Saglio 1877: 1482; Mommsen 1888: 966–967.

¹⁹ *Att.* 9.3: *itaque nimirum hoc illud est quod Caesar scribit in ea epistula cuius exemplum ad te misi, [et] se velle uti . . . 'dignitate' fortasse sententia consularis*. Cf. Cic. *Phil.* 13.19: *parata de circumscribendo adolescente sententia consularis*.

²⁰ Thus, on some occasions, the magistrate presiding at a meeting of the Senate entrusted a proposal to a consular rather than making it himself. On this practice, see Bonnefond-Coudry 1989: 487, 492–493.

²¹ Merguet 1877: 675. In the Budé edition, Cousin (1962) translates "des prières en l'honneur d'un consulaire." Similarly Gardner (1958) in the Loeb edition: "a thanksgiving awarded to those of consular rank." Cf. Butler and Cary 1924: 64.

²² "Verdoppeln": see Merguet 1877; see also Merguet 1887 and 1905–6: s.v. *duplico*.

(74), Cicero complains that Sex. Atilius Gavianus had been bribed to oppose the orator's recall and that by prolonging deliberation of the question had doubled the size of his bribe (*illi interea deliberatori merces longa interposita nocte duplicata est*). In the only other use of this verb in the speeches, excluding the passage under discussion, Cicero responds to criticism of his flight from Rome, denying that he feared a trial before the Roman people; none had been proposed, but "had it been, [he] would have come out with [his] glory doubled" (*Dom. 95: iudicium populi pertimuisse? at id nec propositum ullum fuit, et, si fuisset, duplicata gloria discessissem*).

Those who see reference to only one supplication, however, assume that the verb refers to the doubling of the greatest number of days allotted for any previous supplication, that is, ten days rather than five,²³ and follow Manutius' emendation of the manuscript reading *duodecim* to *decem* to make the two references to duration identical.²⁴ The assumption that Cicero is referring to the lengthiest duration among earlier supplications is hardly obvious from the Latin, which simply refers to *supplicatio*. Furthermore, since Cicero's diction, in particular *sententia consularis*, proves there were two supplications, *duplicata* cannot refer to duration. That would make nonsense of Cicero's two-fold use of the word *primum*. It makes no sense to say that in 63 supplications of ten days were decreed for the first time and then to say that in 62 supplications were for the first time doubled in length, that is, twice five, thus ten days, since there cannot be two occasions on which ten-day supplications were decreed for the first time. Sternkopf's suggestion that *duplicata* refers to the doubled occurrence of a thanksgiving for the conclusion of the Mithridatic war is preferable. While Cicero has been discussing the unprecedented length of Caesar's supplication and compares that to the length of Pompey's, unique at the time of that decree, he goes on to point out yet another way in which Pompey's supplication was innovative.

That the orator does not simply mean that for the first time supplications were held twice in honor of one man is clear from numerous Republican examples.²⁵ The earliest record of a general receiving multiple supplications dates to the

²³ Drumann 1838–41: 4.474; 5.710–711; Butler and Cary 1924: 64. The Loeb and Budé translations both assume a single supplication: "doubled in length" (Gardner 1958); "de doubler la durée des prières" (Cousin 1962). Earlier supplications had varied from one to five days depending on the importance of the victor or victory. We have only four references to thanksgivings lasting five days prior to Pompey's (P. Cornelius Scipio Africanus in 203, T. Quinctius Flamininus in 197, L. Aemilius Paullus in 168, C. Marius in 101). That of P. Cornelius Scipio Aemilianus in 146 was of unspecified length, but may have lasted as long as five days (Halkin 1953: *supplicatio* no. 35).

²⁴ The Oxford, Budé, and Loeb editions (Peterson 1911; Cousin 1962; Gardner 1958) all follow Manutius; see also Butler and Cary 1924: 64 and Shackleton Bailey 1977: 279. The latter sees two supplications.

²⁵ Cicero's comments about previous supplications show his familiarity with those of Africanus (in 203), Paullus (in 168), and Aemilianus (in 146 and 133), *inter alia* (*Cat.* 4.21). In addition to the examples below, Livy may record two supplications for M. Livius Salinator and C. Claudius Nero in 207 (Livy 27.51.8; 28.9.7; Halkin 1953: *supplicatio* no. 8) and L. Cornelius Scipio Asiaticus in 189 (Livy 37.52.2, 59.1; Halkin 1953: *supplicatio* no. 21), but this could be a careless repetition on the historian's part.

Hannibalic war, which resulted in at least two, and possibly three, supplications in the name of Scipio Africanus.²⁶ Twice for victories over the Cisalpine Gauls, the Senate decreed thanksgivings in the name of L. Furius Purpurio.²⁷ T. Quinctius Flamininus also received this honor for his victory over Philip at Cynoscephalae and again for his defeat of Nabis of Sparta.²⁸ Twice L. Aemilius Paullus won victories over the Ligurians that motivated the Senate to order supplications.²⁹ Yet a third time, the Senate decreed a thanksgiving, this one for his victory over Perseus of Macedonia.³⁰ In honor of his victories over the Celtiberians and the Ligurians, Q. Fulvius Flaccus received two supplications.³¹ Finally, Scipio Aemilianus also received the honor of two thanksgivings in his name: for victories over Carthage and Numantia.³²

The number of examples of multiple supplications makes it clear that some other distinction is in effect here. Sternkopf rightly focuses on the notion of a single war or *imperium* as the source of the supplication as indicated by Cicero's description in the *De provinciis consularibus* of a supplication in the name of Julius Caesar: *C. Caesari supplicationes decrevistis, numero ut nemini uno ex bello, honore ut omnino nemini* (*Prov. cons.* 25). The phrase *uno ex bello* shows that the distinguishing characteristic is that a single war gave rise to supplications of unusual length and honor.³³ It is the same criterion of a single war that Cicero applies two sections later when he characterizes the thanksgivings in Pompey's

²⁶ Supplications of four and five days in 203: Livy 30.17.1–4; 21.10; Halkin 1953: *supplicationes* nos. 9 and 10. A supplication of three days in 202: Livy 30.40.4; Halkin 1953: *supplicatio* no. 11. In 201 Scipio celebrated a triumph for his victories over Hannibal, the Carthaginians, and Syphax (*Inscr. It.* XIII.1, 551; Broughton *MRR* 1.321).

²⁷ In 200 a supplication of three days: Livy 31.22.1, 48.12; Halkin 1953: *supplicatio* no. 12. In 196 a supplication of three days, shared with M. Claudius Marcellus: Livy 33.37.9; Halkin 1953: *supplicatio* no. 15. For his first victory, Furius received a triumph in 200; he was denied a triumph for the second victory (Livy 31.49.2; Broughton *MRR* 1.323).

²⁸ In 197 a supplication of five days: Livy 33.24.3; Halkin 1953: *supplicatio* no. 14. In 195 a supplication of three days: Livy 34.42.1; Halkin: *supplicatio* no. 17. Flamininus celebrated a triumph over Philip and Macedonia in 194 (*Inscr. It.* XIII.1, 553; Broughton *MRR* 1.344).

²⁹ In 182 a supplication of one day: Livy 40.16.4; Halkin 1953: *supplicatio* no. 24. In 181 a supplication of three days: Livy 40.28.9; Halkin 1953: *supplicatio* no. 25. The victories of Aemilius derived from campaigns against two different Ligurian tribes: the first over the Apauni and the second over the Igauni (Livy 40.1.3, 25.1). Livy ascribes Aemilius' triumph in 181 to his victory over the Igauni (Livy 40.34.7; *Inscr. It.* XIII.1, 554; Broughton *MRR* 1.384).

³⁰ In 168 a supplication of five days: Livy 45.2.1–8; Halkin 1953: *supplicatio* no. 32. Aemilius celebrated a triumph in 168 over Perseus (*Inscr. It.* XIII.1, 554; Broughton *MRR* 1.427).

³¹ In 180 a supplication of unspecified duration: Livy 40.36.12; Halkin 1953: *supplicatio* no. 26. In 179 a supplication of three days: Livy 40.53.3; Halkin 1953: *supplicatio* no. 27. He celebrated two triumphs (*Inscr. It.* XIII.1, 554; Broughton *MRR* 1.389, 392).

³² In 146: Cic. *Cat.* 4.21; Halkin 1953: *supplicatio* no. 35. In 133: Cic. *Cat.* 4.21; Halkin 1953: *supplicatio* no. 36. Aemilianus celebrated two triumphs: in 146 over Carthage and Hasdrubal and in 132 over the Numantines (*Inscr. It.* XIII.1, 557, 558; Broughton *MRR* 1.467, 498).

³³ Cicero refers to the fifteen-day supplication which gave thanks for Caesar's victories over Helvetians, Suebians, and Belgians during his Gallic campaigns of 58 and 57 (Caes. *BG* 2.35; Halkin

name. Thus, the supplication of 63 was at that time unprecedented in the number of days voted to honor victory in a single war and the supplication of 62, as a second supplication for success in the same war. By applying the single war criterion, we can quickly eliminate some of the earlier cases of multiple thanksgivings as possible precedents. Thus, for example, the victories of Furius Purpurio over the Gauls belong to different wars, as shown by the two separate requests for triumphs (of which Furius received only one). There still remain, however, two precedents for multiple thanksgivings for a commander in the same war. Two, possibly three, supplications in the name of Scipio Africanus acknowledged victories in the Hannibalic war and two in the name of Aemilius Paullus celebrated victories in Liguria. Even if we were to exclude the two supplications of Aemilius Paullus because of his transition from consul to proconsul, there would still remain those of Scipio, all of which belong to the period during which he held *imperium* as proconsul in Africa. Clearly Sternkopf's explanation (1892: 469: "Zum ersten Male ist demselben Manne in demselben imperium oder auf Grund eines Krieges . . . zweimal eine supplicatio dekretirt worden!") does not adequately define the novelty of the supplication in Pompey's name. Cicero is unlikely to have forgotten that Scipio received multiple supplications as a result of his role in the Hannibalic war. There must be another narrower criterion on which the orator could claim primacy. Perhaps some further insight can be gained by examining the two possible thanksgivings in Scipio's name in 203.

The first of these supplications recognized Scipio's victory over the Carthaginians and their ally, Syphax king of the Numidians. Later in the same year, because of Scipio's activities in Africa, the Carthaginians recalled Hannibal from Italy.³⁴ In response, the Senate decreed another supplication.³⁵ Livy does not mention the commander in whose name the Senate decreed that second supplication of 203, but Halkin assigns the honor to Scipio and cites Cicero, who names Africanus among men whose memorable victories were celebrated with supplications. Cicero specifically mentions Hannibal's departure from Italy: *sit Scipio clarus ille cuius consilio atque virtute Hannibal in Africam redire atque Italia decedere coactus est* (Cat. 4.21).

Weissenborn and Müller may suggest another candidate for the honor by citing Pliny, who mentions the award of the *corona graminea* to Q. Fabius Maximus after Hannibal had been driven from Italy.³⁶ Since Fabius, however, was not personally engaged in battle with Hannibal during 203, the honor would have recognized his

1953: *supplicatio* no. 43). The first day of Caesar's quadruple triumph in 46 honored these combined Gallic victories (*Inscr. It.* XIII.1, 566–567; Broughton *MRR* 2.293).

³⁴ Livy 30.9.7–9.

³⁵ Livy 30.21.10: *conclamatum deinde ex omni parte curiae est uti referret P. Aelius praetor; decretumque ut quinque dies circa omnia pulvinaria supplicaretur victimaque maiores immolarentur centum viginti*; Halkin 1953: *supplicatio* no. 10.

³⁶ Commenting on Livy 30.21.10, Weissenborn and Müller (1899) write: "Livius hat übergangen, was von Plinius 22.10 berichtet wird." Pliny *NH* 22.10: *data est (corona graminea) et a senatu populoque*

much earlier contributions to the war. Gellius' account of the award of the *corona graminea*, in fact, recalls Fabius' role in freeing the city of Rome from the enemy's threat.³⁷ Gellius probably had in mind Fabius' service as dictator in 217 following the disaster at Lake Trasimene. In his summary of the famous general's deeds, Livy, however, makes no mention of any honor recognizing his role in the war.³⁸ This *laudatio* follows Livy's report of the death of Fabius as a quite old man in the same year as Hannibal's departure and appears only five chapters after notice of the supplication of 203. Given the proximity of these two passages, it would be reasonable to expect Livy to name Fabius, if he were the recipient of this honor. A third candidate for the recipient of this supplication would be Cn. Servilius Caepio, the consul assigned the province of Bruttium in 203. Livy, however, is uncertain of the value of the consul's efforts against Hannibal, as Valerius Antias was the only earlier historian to mention a victory. Thus Livy was unaware of any supplication in Servilius' name. In fact, Livy makes a sarcastic comment about Servilius' exaggerated opinion of his value in driving Hannibal from Italy.³⁹

Given these facts and the larger context of Scipio's African campaign that dominates Book 30 of Livy's history, it seems likely that the historian had Scipio in mind when reporting the second supplication of 203. This thanksgiving differed from most in that the commander and his troops had not defeated in battle the enemy (Hannibal) over whom the Romans celebrated their victory; instead, it was Syphax and the Carthaginians whom Scipio had defeated. It is not possible to distinguish two different military victories celebrated by the two supplications. Thus this pair of thanksgivings presents the closest parallel to the double recognition of Pompey's Mithridatic victory since the Senate twice recognized Scipio's single victory over the Carthaginians and Numidians by first celebrating the actual battle and then its indirect result in forcing Hannibal from Italy. Since a supplication of Scipio also seems to have been *duplicata*, we might be justified in viewing Cicero's statement about Pompey's honor as either a rhetorical exaggeration or pardonable imprecision. Alternatively, Cicero was being extremely precise in his statement, since both of Pompey's supplications gave thanks for the conclusion of the Mithridatic war. In its comprehensive

Romano, . . . Fabio illi, qui rem omnem Romanam restituit non pugnando . . . honoratus est Hannibale Italia pulso.

³⁷ Gell. *NA* 5.6.10: *hanc coronam gramineam senatus populusque Romanus Q. Fabio Maximo dedit bello Poenorum secundo, quod urbem Romam obsidione hostium liberasset.*

³⁸ Livy 30.26.7. Livy, however, does not mention Fabius' triumph in 209 for the recapture of Tarentum, found in Plut. *Fab.* 23.2 and the *elogia* of the Forum Augusti (*CIL* I² 13). Münzer (1909: 1827) comments: "das Schweigen des Livius im Vergleich mit seiner Verherrlichung der Triumphe von Syrakus, Sena und Zama macht ihn etwas verdächtig."

³⁹ Livy 30.19.11–12: *idem consul (Cn. Servilius) cum Hannibale in agro Crotoniensi acie confixit. obscura eius pugnae fama est; Valerius Antias quinque milia hostium caesa ait; quae tanta res est, ut aut impudenter ficta sit aut neglegenter praetermissa; 30.24.1: Cn. Servilius consul, haud dubius quin pacatae Italiae penes se gloria esset, velut pulsum ab se Hannibalem.* The Senate seems not to have shared this high opinion and kept him from crossing to Africa to continue the war against Hannibal.

character, the second supplication was able fully to enfold and duplicate the earlier ceremony. Here there was no question of differing aspects or results.

Perhaps even more significant than the resulting duplication, however, was the fact that this supplication was the first to celebrate victory in multiple wars (Cic. *Prov. cons.* 27: *confectis omnibus maritimis terrestribusque bellis*).⁴⁰ Although there are a few cases among earlier supplications in which the sources name more than one enemy over whom the victory was won, these should be considered single wars against allied peoples, rather than separate wars. Thus in 184, the Senate voted supplications in the names of C. Calpurnius Piso and L. Quinctius Crispinus, governors of Farther and Hither Spain respectively, for their combined victory over the *Hispani*, as Livy first names the enemy.⁴¹ While Livy subsequently notes that each man celebrated a triumph over the Lusitanians and Celtiberians (39.42.3), this is clearly a single war, as the historian's own words show: *in Hispania praetores C. Calpurnius et L. Quinctius, cum . . . copias eductas in Baeturia iunxissent . . . progressi sunt, communi animo consilioque parati rem gerere* (39.30.1).⁴² Similarly, in 175 the Senate decreed a thanksgiving in the names of Q. Mucius Scaevola and M. Aemilius Lepidus for quelling an uprising among Cisalpine Gauls and Ligurians that Livy treats as a single event: *tumultus Gallicus et Ligustinus* (41.19.3).⁴³ Thus prior to Pompey's *supplicatio duplicata*, it is probable that the Senate decreed thanksgivings to acknowledge victories in single wars only. Cicero does not specify the wars intended in the phrase *omnibus maritimis terrestribusque bellis* (*Prov. cons.* 27), but *maritimis bellis* must refer to the war against the pirates and *terrestribus bellis* must include the war against Mithridates.⁴⁴ It is probable that Cicero had other wars in mind as well. The designation of those wars may be deduced

⁴⁰ When Livy explicitly names the cause of a supplication, he normally specifies the province in which the victory took place, e.g., 37.58.5: *supplicationes . . . quod L. Aemilius in Hispania prospere rem publicam gessisset*.

⁴¹ Livy 39.38.5–6: *qui (legati), quantum bellum iam profligatum in Hispania esset, senatu edocto postularunt simul ut pro rebus iam prospere gestis diis immortalibus haberetur honos et ut praetoribus exercitum deportare liceret. supplicatio in biduum decreta est* (Halkin 1953: *supplicatio* no. 23).

⁴² Cf. also Livy 39.38.5: *quantum bellum*. On the triumph, Livy 39.42.2–3: *prior C. Calpurnius de Lusitanis et Celtiberis triumphavit*. See also *Inscr. It.* XIII.1, 555; Broughton *MRR* 1.373.

⁴³ Livy 41.19.2: *ob eas res in Gallia Liguribusque gestas duorum consulum ductu auspicioque senatus in triduum supplicationes decrevit*; Halkin 1953: *supplicatio* no. 30; *Inscr. It.* XIII.1, 555; Broughton *MRR* 1.402. Occasionally, as here, Livy uses the plural *supplicationes* to refer to a single ritual: e.g., 3.63.5: *senatus in unum diem supplicationes consulum nomine decrevit*. Halkin (1953: *supplicatio* no. 38) assigns a single thanksgiving in 101 in the name of C. Marius to victories over the Teutones in 102 and the Cimbri in 101, but the sources suggest two supplications. Since the Senate decreed a triumph in 102 for Marius' victory over the Teutones, which he declined, it is likely that they also decreed a *supplicatio* in the same year acknowledging that victory although it is not recorded. Commenting on men whose deeds had been celebrated with supplications, Cicero writes of Marius: *qui bis Italiam obsidione et metu servitutis liberavit* (*Cat.* 4.21). On the triumph celebrated in 101, see *Inscr. It.* XIII.1, 562.

⁴⁴ Aulus Gellius (*NA* 5.6.21) claims that "there is no cause for a triumph when the race of the enemy is lowly and inappropriate, as with slaves and pirates" (*non triumphandi causa est . . . cum hostium nomen humile et non idoneum est, ut servorum piratorumque*), but M. Antonius received a triumph in 101 or 100 for his victory over the pirates, as did Pompey in 61 (*Inscr. It.* XIII.1, 560–561; Broughton *MRR* 1.576).

from various descriptions of Pompey's triumph in 61, which name an unusually large number of enemies over whom Pompey celebrated victory, including Asia, Pontus, Armenia, Paphlagonia, Cappadocia, Cilicia, Syria, Scythia, Judaea, and Albania.⁴⁵

In summary, by reviewing multiple supplications decreed in previous centuries, we have seen that the actual novelty of Pompey's supplication derived not from its source in a single war or a single grant of *imperium*, but from its comprehensive character. Pompey's letter announcing his termination of all wars on land and sea offered Cicero an opportunity to flatter the great *imperator* by proposing a new kind of supplication, which recognized the combined accomplishments of a general not for a single military victory, as always before, but for five years of victorious battles, even duplicating the previous thanksgiving for the Mithridatic war.

The novelty of this form of supplication is consistent with a trend to be observed especially in the last century of the Republic toward ever greater focus on men rather than gods in the ritual of public thanksgiving. Perhaps the clearest statement of that development appears in the *De provinciis consularibus*, immediately prior to Cicero's comments on the supplications in Pompey's name, where he reflects on the Senate's decree of a fifteen-day thanksgiving for Caesar's Gallic victories.⁴⁶ Cicero clearly distinguishes between the number of days sufficient to give thanks to the gods or to satisfy the needs of the state and the additional days, which could only be seen as an honor to the general himself: *rei publicae satis erat tot dierum quot C. Mario; dis immortalibus non erat exigua eadem gratulatio quae ex maximis bellis. ergo ille cumulus dierum hominis est dignitati tributus* (*Prov. cons.* 26). Prior to the ten-day supplication in Pompey's name in 63, the lengthiest had been five days; even the conclusion to the Second Punic War had been celebrated with public thanksgiving of only three days. The close of the Republic saw an ever increasing number of days of thanksgiving, peaking at celebrations of fifty days and finally almost an entire year.⁴⁷ The same trend toward focus on the human being may also appear in the Ciceronian choice of wording to describe the decree of a supplication. While Livy regularly omits the name of a general in formulaic statements reporting the decree of a thanksgiving, in Cicero's discussions of supplications, admittedly usually his own, the orator most often names the recipient. Furthermore, in most instances he employs a dative construction, absent from Livy, which makes the general himself the recipient of ritual thanksgiving.⁴⁸ Six months after the decree of the extraordinary

⁴⁵ From the fragmentary *fasti triumphales* (*Inscr. It.* XIII.1, 566). Pliny *NH* 7.98 adds Iberia, Crete, and the Bastrenians. Plut. *Pomp.* 45.2 adds Media, Colchis, Iberians, Mesopotamia, Phoenicia, Palestine, and Arabia.

⁴⁶ *Prov. cons.* 25–26; Caes. *BG* 2.35.4; Halkin 1953: *supplicatio* no. 43.

⁴⁷ On this pattern, see Halkin 1953: 106–107; Freyburger 1978: 1422–23.

⁴⁸ For example, Cic. *Prov. cons.* 27: *supplicatio decreta Cn. Pompeio*; there are at least fifteen similar instances. Freyburger (1978: 1422) and Halkin (1953: 107–108) believe that the earliest construction for decrees of supplications was an ablative of *nomen* with a genitive. Freyburger does not mention

ten-day supplication for Pompey, Cicero devised yet another innovative manner in which to use the traditional ritual of thanksgiving to the gods as a means of giving honor to a human being. Since the decree of a supplication always specified the reason for giving thanks, this was also a means of publicly glorifying the deeds of prominent generals. By broadening the scope of thanksgiving in Pompey's case, Cicero also magnified the glory and honor attached to its human recipient.

DEPARTMENT OF CLASSICS
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,
SANTA BARBARA, CALIFORNIA 93106
U.S.A.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bonnefond-Coudry, M. 1989. *Le sénat de la République romaine*. Rome.
Broughton, T. R. S. 1951–52. *The Magistrates of the Roman Republic*. 2 vols. New York.
Butler, H. E. and M. Cary. 1924. *M. Tulli Ciceronis de Provinciis Consularibus Oratio ad Senatum*. Oxford.
Cousin, J. 1962. *Cicéron Discours* 15. Paris.
Daremberg, C. and E. Saglio. 1877. *Dictionnaire des antiquités grecques et romaines* 1. Paris.
Drumann, W. 1838–41. *Geschichte Roms* 4–5. Koenigsberg.
Freyburger, G. 1977. "La supplication d'action de grâces dans la religion romaine archaïque," *Latomus* 36.2: 283–315.
— 1978. "La supplication d'action de grâces sous le Haut-Empire," *ANRW* II.16.2: 1418–39.
Gardner, R. 1958. *Cicero* 13. London.
Halkin, L. 1953. *La supplication d'action de grâces chez les Romains*. Paris.
Merguet, H. 1880. *Lexikon zu den Reden des Cicero* 2. Jena.
— 1887. *Lexikon zu den philosophischen Schriften Ciceros* 1. Jena.
— 1905–6. *Handlexikon zu Cicero*. Leipzig.
Miltner. 1952. "Pompeius Magnus," *RE* 21: 2062–2211.
Mommsen, T. 1888. *Römisches Staatsrecht*³ 3. Leipzig.
Münzer, F. 1909. "Fabius," *RE* 6.2: 1814–30.
Peterson, G. 1911. *Ciceronis Orationes* 5. Oxford.
Shackleton Bailey, D. R. 1977. *Epistulae ad Familiares* 1. Cambridge.
Sternkopf, W. 1889. *Ciceros Korrespondenz aus den Jahren 68–60 v. Chr.* Elberfeld.
— 1892. "Wurden Pompeius ex bello Mithridatico eine oder zwei Supplikationen dekretiert?," *RhM* N.F. 47: 468–472.
Weissenborn, W. and H. Müller. 1899. *Titi Livi Ab Urbe Condita Libri*⁴ 7. Zurich.

that Cicero too uses this construction on four occasions: e.g., *Phil.* 14.29: *eorum trium nomine*; *Cat.* 3.15: *meo nomine*; *Cat.* 4.5; *Fam.* 11.18.3. Cf. *Hist. Aug.* 16.3.1. He gives the impression of a very clearcut development from the ablative to dative constructions, which is not borne out by the sources.