

Anton V. Korolenkov

ON SOME TRIUMPHS IN THE EPOCH OF CIVIL WARS IN THE ROMAN REPUBLIC

In the last third of the second century BC, Rome entered a period of civil wars. Needless to say, it was a sign of deep changes in Roman mentality that influenced the practice of triumphs. But despite occasional violations of traditions, the Romans did not consider it appropriate to hold triumphs or ovations over *cives perniciosi* (Val. Max. 2. 8. 7).¹ Quite a few scholars consider some triumphs of the epoch of civil wars to be signs of victory over internal enemies. Is this view justified? The following analysis is an attempt to answer this question.

Sulla's Triumph

At the end of January 81 BC, Sulla celebrated “con magnificenza orientale” a two-day triumph.² It should be noted that triumphs lasting longer than one day were quite rare in Roman history.³ It is evident that Sulla believed he had every right to do so.⁴ Although “his

¹ See, e. g., Lange, 2016, 95–96 (with references).

² Lanzani 1936, 83. On the two days of Sulla's triumph, see *Fasti Triumphales* (*CIL* I² 49); Plin. *NH.* 33. 16. A review of opinions on the exact date: Ghilli 2001, 478 n. 801. Sometimes the researchers connect Appian's report on Sulla's invitation of many athletes and on the organization of spectacles in honor of his victories (*BC* 1. 99. 464; Fröhlich 1900, 1557) with Sulla's triumph, but more likely the *Ludi Victoriae Sullanae* are meant here (Gabba 1958, 271).

³ Sumi 2002, 416–417.

⁴ F. Hinard considers Sulla's triumph “le plus important et le glorieux que Rome Rome eût connu jusqu'alors” (Hinard 1985, 236), which is an overstatement of Plutarch's enthusiastic opinion (*Sulla* 34. 1) about the booty taken from Mithridates (πολυτελεία καὶ καινότητι τῶν βασιλικῶν λαφύρων). If the booty seemed to be unprecedented, it was so only for the contemporaries, because Aemilius Paulus' triumph over Macedonia had been even more splendid.

victory over Mithridates was anything but a conclusive victory”,⁵ the dictator indulged in celebrating a triumph.⁶ Moreover, if Sulla had not celebrated the triumph, which is very hard to imagine, many people could have thought that he was admitting a lack of decisive success in the East.⁷ But Sulla’s success in the West is more interesting for us than that in the East. According to many researchers, the dictator did not conceal that it was a celebration of the victory not only over Mithridates, but also over his fellow citizens during the civil war. Noting that “Romans did not triumph over Romans”, A. Keaveney believes that the Cinnans had not been considered citizens because “they had ceased to be Romans and could thus be put where he believed they belonged, among the allies of Mithridates. It was only in this way that they could be included in the triumph”.⁸ But it is not clear on what this judgment is based. G. Sumi holds a slightly different point of view. In his opinion, Marians were equated with foreign enemies, “thus, Marius, like Mithridates, became a *hostis* of the Roman state, even though he was a Roman citizen”.⁹ What evidence do proponents of this view use to corroborate their conjecture?

Some researchers point out that the treasures – 14000 (according to another reading 13000) pounds of gold and 6000 pounds of silver confiscated by Marius the Younger from the Roman temples – were displayed during Sulla’s victorious procession. The amount

⁵ Balsdon 1951, 3; “questo era più un’apparenza che una realtà” (Valiglio 1960, 163). Fröhlich 1900, 1557 puts it more strongly: “die wirklichen Verhältnisse im Osten waren zu einer solchen Feier gerade damals am wenigsten angethan”.

⁶ Besides, we can remember Murena’s triumph over Mithridates, which was celebrated almost without any reasons in the same year (see Cic. *De imp. Pomp.* 8; Fröhlich 1900, 1557; Lange 2016, 80–81).

⁷ Valiglio 1960, 163 said explicitly that the victory over the Marians (“il partito democratico”) was the real object of the triumph. Keaveney considers this opinion very far-fetched (Keaveney 1983, 188).

⁸ Keaveney 1983, 188.

⁹ Sumi 2002, 423. “Declaring Romans *hostes*, however, created a new dimension to triumph and civil war: it was permissible, as a means of justification, to triumph over them as enemies of Rome” (Lange 2016, 124; see also Morstein-Marx 2021, 452). But this conclusion is unconvincing, because it is not supported by any ancient evidence.

of gold and silver was announced *sub eo* (Sullae. – A. K.) *titulo in triumpho*.¹⁰ I. Östenberg believes that “the placard also explained that this was the money that the younger Marius had previously taken to Praeneste from the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus and other shrines”.¹¹ In other words, Sulla emphasized that the booty had been captured from Marius the Younger, i. e., his fellow citizen. The word “also” in Östenberg’s sentence is significant: the researcher supposes that *titulus* contained information not only about the amount of treasures, but also about their previous owner and their original location. However, Pliny the Elder’s text to which she refers is very vague (NH 33. 16):

quod ex Capitolinae aedis incendio ceterisque omnibus delubris C. Marius filius Praeneste detulerat, **XIII (XIII)** pondos, **quae sub eo titulo in triumpho transtulit** Sulla et argenti **VI**.

(the gold) that Gaius Marius had conveyed to Praeneste from the conflagration of the temple of the Capitol and from all the other shrines amounted to 14 000 lbs., which, with a placard above it to that effect, was carried along in his triumphal procession by Sulla, as well as 6000 lbs. weight of silver.¹²

It is not quite clear whether the said *titulus* contained information only about the amount of the treasures displayed during the triumph or also about their origin, since the latter is not mentioned in the source explicitly.

G. S. Sumi, quoting Pliny’s text *in extenso* and understanding it in the same way as Östenberg, writes: “The display of the Marian fortune was just as important as a demonstration of pietas on Sulla’s part – an indication that he would honour the very temples of the gods which Marius had so wantonly desecrated”.¹³ Theoretically, we cannot

¹⁰ Plin. NH 33.16. Plutarch mentions these explanatory texts (δέλτοι, γράμματα) in the description of Lucullus’ and Pompey’s triumphs (*Luc.* 37. 6; *Pomp.* 45. 2; see also Östenberg 2009, 68–69).

¹¹ Östenberg 2009, 69.

¹² Transl. by Rackham 1952, 15 (with slight corrections).

¹³ Sumi 2002, 418. Schur 1942, 185–186 ranks it “zu einem symbolischen Akte von tiefer Bedeutung”.

exclude such a possibility, but it seems to be based on too broad an interpretation of Pliny's words. Such an overt demonstration that the gold and silver carried during the triumph had once been confiscated by Marius the Younger¹⁴ would become too obvious a hint at the victory over his fellow citizens.¹⁵ It is noteworthy that, according to Valerius Maximus' report (2. 8. 7), no pictures of "Roman citizens' cities" (i. e., Italian cities) had been carried during Sulla's triumphal procession (*L. Sulla... cum... triumphum duceret, ut Graeciae et Asiae multas urbes, ita civium Romanorum nullum oppidum vexit*).¹⁶ The difference is clear.

As for A. Eckert's interpretation, it looks quite speculative, as she believes, "das [capitolinisches] Gold weckte nicht nur Erinnerungen an die Belagerung von Praeneste im Bürgerkrieg, es rief auch das auf Sullas Anweisung an den männlichen Einwohnern der Stadt verübte Massaker ins Gedächtnis".¹⁷ Given the lack of any information on the reaction of Rome to the massacre at Praeneste, this associative array is absolutely unclear, even if Romans knew that they had been shown treasures captured at Praeneste. In this regard, the researchers pay attention to Plutarch's well-known passage: "For the most distinguished and influential of the citizens, crowned with garlands, followed in the procession, calling Sulla their saviour and father, since indeed it was through him that they were returning to their native city and bringing with them their wives and children" (*Sulla* 34. 2).¹⁸ This text is often considered further evidence of Sulla's demonstration of

¹⁴ Among other things, V. Havener emphasizes that the booty that had been captured in the East was demonstrated on the first day (Plin. *NH* 33. 16: *pridie*), while the booty of the civil war was carried on the second day (Havener 2016, 163; Lange 2016, 103 tends to accept this opinion). However, the mere division by day did not matter much unless it was indicated where the loot shown on the second day had been taken from – it could be understood that it was also Mithridates' treasures.

¹⁵ As stated by Hinard 1985, 236, during Sulla's triumphal procession, they carried the pictures demonstrating the scene of Valerius Flaccus' murder by Fimbria. Equally, Rosenblitt 2019, 129 asserts, "the defeat of Marius was advertised on a placard". This could have been an obvious hint at the civil war, but there is no information about these pictures in our sources.

¹⁶ Valgiglio 1960, 163; Lange 2016, 102.

¹⁷ Eckert 2016, 80.

¹⁸ Transl. by Perrin 1916, 433.

his victory not only over a foreign enemy, but also over his fellow citizens.¹⁹ Nevertheless, even Plutarch does not say openly that people in Sulla's retinue who had run from the Marians or had been exiled by the latter attracted some attention and formed a special group.²⁰ That is not surprising, because Sulla himself, as well as his followers, were outlawed in the same way. They had undesirable juridical status and could wear wreaths in honor of their return. Moreover, this fragment reflects a retrospective view of the events (maybe from Sulla's *Memoirs*), describing the former exiles as "the most distinguished and influential of the citizens" (οἱ ... ἐνδοξότατοι καὶ δυνατώτατοι τῶν πολιτῶν), whereas in Sulla's retinue there were no δυνατώτατοι at that time, because none of them were consular.²¹

Finally, having every opportunity to celebrate a triumph not only over Mithridates, but also, for example, over the Samnites, the dictator nevertheless refrained from the latter²² – presumably, in order to avoid any hints of victory in the civil war. All this suggests that it was a classic victory celebration over an external enemy, namely the Pontic king. Surely, there might have been various rumors among both common people and even the senators, but decorum was maintained.

¹⁹ Lanzani 1936, 83; Schur 1942, 186; Carcopino 1947, 114–115; Ghilli 2001, 479 n. 803; with caution Gabba 1958, 278. As Rosenblitt 2019, 128–129 writes, "the parade of Roman exiles in his triumph over Mithridates deliberately blurs the foreign / civil line". F. Vervaeke 2023, 229 calls it "conspicuously novel" (as well as was the display of the gold and the silver from Praeneste).

²⁰ This unproven fact is the basis of the opinion that the participation of exiles in a triumphal procession was an innovation (Carcopino 1947, 114–115; Valgiglio 1960, 163; Havener 2016, 164). Equally controversial is the judgment of V. Havener, who considers this episode in the context of the custom of presenting fellow citizens in triumph (Havener 2016, 164) – they went separately, while the exiles returned by Sulla in fact made up his retinue (παρείποντο... τὸν Σύλλαν).

²¹ The only *consularis* among *Sullani* was L. Marcius Philippus, but he was a deserter not exiled. Moreover, we do not know if he took part in Sulla's triumph; anyway, his presence would not justify the plural form (ἐνδοξότατοι καὶ δυνατώτατοι) in Plutarch's text.

²² W. Letzner 2000, 263 claims that the triumph gave the impression of a celebration of victory not only over Mithridates, but also over the Marians and Italics, and especially the Samnites, although he notes the lack of images of Italian cities during the triumphal procession. It is not clear what exactly contained special allusions to the Samnites.

Caesar's Triumphs

In 46 BC, after the defeat of the Pompeians at Thapsus, Caesar celebrated four successive triumphs: one over the Gauls, one over the Egyptians, one over Pontus, and one over Numidia. There were valuable trophies displayed in the procession, and Vercingetorix, the Gallic chief, Arsinoe, the Egyptian princess, and Juba, the four-year-old Numidian prince (the future king and writer Juba II) were paraded through the streets (Plut. *Caes.* 55. 3; App. *BC* 2. 101. 418; Cass. Dio 43. 19. 2–4). People cheered when they saw the depictions (ποικίλαις γραφαῖς) of Achilles' and Pothinus' deaths and laughed at the scene of Pharnaces' flight (App. *BC* 2. 101. 420).

But according to the sources, not everything caused exultation. For example, many people showed sympathy for Arsinoe (Cass. Dio 43. 19. 3). More importantly, however, the public was outraged by the paintings depicting the death of Metellus Scipio,²³ Marcus Petreius, and Cato the Younger (ὁ δὲ δῆμος ἐπὶ μὲν τοῖς οἰκείοις κακοῖς, καίπερ δεδιώς, ἔστενε, καὶ μάλιστα, κτλ.), while the statue of Pompey was not shown, given the latter's popularity with the Romans (App. *BC* 2. 101. 419–420).

This information from Appian is completely accepted by researchers. R. A. Billows believes that they were “caricatures”, while in C. Meier's opinion, Caesar's enemies were directly or indirectly portrayed as his slaves.²⁴ However, the very idea of these pictures being present in the triumph is implausible. According to Appian (*BC* 2. 101. 419), Caesar refrained from celebrating his triumph over his fellow citizens because he did not consider it appropriate (ὥς

²³ Appian mistakenly refers to Metellus Scipio as Quintus instead of Lucius (Münzer 1899, 1224). The procession of elephants (apparently captured from Juba) with torches, which accompanied Caesar (according to Suetonius, *Jul.* 37. 2, to the Capitol; according to Dio Cassius, 43. 22. 1, when he was on his way home on the third day), is sometimes also interpreted as an allusion to the defeat of Metellus Scipio, since the figures of elephants on the coins were something like a coat of arms of the Metelli (Östenberg 2009, 180, n. 315), and Metellus Scipio himself minted such coins in Africa (Voisin 1983, 33 and n. 22 with bibliography). But it is unknown if these parallels occurred to Caesar himself and other Romans.

²⁴ Meier 1993, 582; Billows 2009, 246.

ἐμφύλια οὐκ εὐκότα τε αὐτῷ).²⁵ Why then would he emphasize that it was a victory over his Roman enemies by carrying their images?²⁶ It is noteworthy that Cicero, who never missed a chance to blame the dictator for his willfulness, does not mention such images in his procession, while at the same time he is indignant at the triumph over Massalia, allied to Rome.²⁷ Remember that Cicero wrote a eulogy for Cato the Younger,²⁸ and in this context his silence looks particularly strange. Other ancient authors (including Plutarch, who criticized the Spanish triumph of Caesar) seem to know nothing about it, either.²⁹ Finally, the representation of the aforementioned suicides would be counterproductive, because suicide exalted those who committed it: in this respect, the story of Perseus, who disgraced himself in the eyes of ancient tradition by preferring to be carried in Aemilius Paulus' triumphal procession to voluntarily ending his life, is characteristic.³⁰

Nevertheless, J.-L. Voisin, who made some of the abovementioned observations, believes that Appian's account is true. He claims that Caesar had to portray the suicide of his enemies, otherwise he would be blamed for their death, as was the case with his cousin L. Julius Caesar. The beautiful, truly Roman death of the Pompeian leaders was an atonement for their alliance with the enemies of Rome. During his triumph, Caesar thus welcomed this atonement and made it clear that even death does not make it possible to escape his mercy, even

²⁵ C. Lange 2016, 110 assumes that the quadruple triumph was a *sui generis* recompense granted to Caesar for not celebrating a triumph after his victory at Pharsalus. It is not clear why A. Eckert 2016, 79 believes that Caesar's victory over his fellow citizens was implied by his triumph over Egypt.

²⁶ J. Carcopino even believes that Caesar did not advertise his victory over the Pompeians, which is the reason for the absence of the names of Pompey and Cato during the triumph (Carcopino 1968, 467–468). However, if a picture of Cato's suicide as Appian described it, with torn entrails (*BC* 2. 101. 420), was indeed displayed, then the recognizability of the scene would have made mentioning the name unnecessary for informed people. On Pompey, see below.

²⁷ Cic. *Off.* 2. 28; cf. *Phil.* 8. 18; Voisin 1983, 15.

²⁸ For sources, see Büchner 1939, 1272.

²⁹ Voisin 1983, 14. He reasonably points out that Roman authors from Cicero to Florus did not see anything in Caesar's African triumph that would offend the feelings of Roman citizens, even the Pompeians. However, we do not have to end this list with Florus.

³⁰ Plut. *Aem.* 34. 3–4; Voisin 1983, 22 (he also refers to Livy 45. 39, but the latter mentions nothing of the kind).

if granted retroactively. At the same time, Caesar demonstrated his superiority over those who had the courage to take their own lives; his *virtus* turned out to be stronger.³¹

This interpretation can hardly be accepted. The representation of the suicides gave every reason to blame Caesar for the deaths of his enemies. Whether he granted them forgiveness or not, they died fighting against him, and *clementia Caesaris* annoyed the nobility.³² When Cato refused to accept Caesar's pardon, it was the latter who looked bad in the eyes of the majority of the nobles, while Cato became a symbol of the fight for liberty. It is doubtful, too, that the latter's death (in Appian's text he is depicted as "torn open by himself like a wild beast") would have appeared noble and even as a sign that Caesar welcomed Cato's "expiation" of "sins" and that at least one of the spectators of the triumph perceived it this way. At any rate, if we strictly follow the source, we do not see there anything like that. Besides, it is unclear why the public should have regarded the display of this kind of paintings as a "retroactive" manifestation of Caesar's mercy.

It seems that the French researcher underestimated the importance of his own observations, which have led me to a different conclusion. In my opinion, Appian's information is wrong. The partiality of the historian from Alexandria or his source is evident. The passage about Caesar's refusal of the display of Pompey's statue, which is explained with the latter's popularity, is completely out of place,³³ since Pompey, who died back in 48, could not participate in the African campaign.³⁴ But the mention of him gives rise to an anti-Caesarian attack, since it is obviously hinted that Caesar provided the opportunity for such an unseemly act. Appian himself points out that there were no names on the placards.³⁵ Therefore, we cannot be sure that it is not a garbled version: someone interpreted the image in his

³¹ Voisin 1983, 26–27.

³² See, e. g., Dowling 2006, 30.

³³ A triumph in honor of the victory at Pharsalus would be suitable for this (Voisin 1983, 25), but as mentioned above, Caesar abstained from celebrating it (see Cass. Dio 42. 18. 1).

³⁴ W. Havener discussing the absence of Pompey's statue does not consider this evident circumstance (see Havener 2016, 169–170).

³⁵ App. *BC* 2. 101. 419; Lange 2016, 110.

own way, and then the incorrect interpretation (in fact, a rumor) was added with fictitious details, which Appian willingly included in his work. In other words, it dealt with pictures showing some people. It should be noted that the pictures in question did not have any labels; besides, it was not easy to discern their message during the triumph when they were on the move.³⁶ It is true that Appian reports quite specifically about the messages of the paintings: Metellus Scipio, who is thrown into the sea after he pierced himself with a sword, and Cato with his insides turned out. However, it is difficult to imagine that the winner went to such an unrestrained and unreasonable mockery of Cato, which would have been counterproductive for Caesar himself, given great Cato's popularity.

Besides, this “appealing” detail is quite understandable. The source may have contained information about paintings depicting Metellus Scipio, who pierced himself with a sword and was thrown into the sea, and Cato, who turned out his insides; but possibly this was the author's comment about their fate, and not the images themselves, while Appian or his informant who used the specified source understood biographical information as a presentation of the message of the paintings.

A very curious case is the Spanish triumph of Caesar in 45, which, according to Plutarch (*Caes.* 56. 7–9), “vexed the Romans as nothing else had done” (θρίαμβος ὡς οὐδὲν ἄλλο Ῥωμαίους ἠνίασεν), because it should not have celebrated the misfortunes of the fatherland, “for it commemorated no victory over foreign commanders or barbarian kings, but the utter annihilation of the sons³⁷ and the family of the mightiest of the Romans, who had fallen upon misfortune”.³⁸ Cassius Dio expresses a similar sentiment. According to his account, Caesar's Spanish triumph was celebrated not in honor of the conquest of the foreign peoples, but because many citizens were destroyed (καίτοι μηδενὸς ἀλλοτρίου κρατήσας ἀλλὰ καὶ τοσοῦτο πληθὸς πολιτῶν ἀπολέσας). Besides, Caesar's legates

³⁶ I am grateful to Dr. Wjatcheslaw Chrystaljow, who drew my attention to this circumstance.

³⁷ In fact, only one son, Gnaeus, was killed, since Sextus fled (Pelling 2011, 420). Pelling notes that in Rome they might not have known about this at that time, but in the same way we can speak of exaggerations in any propaganda, especially since Plutarch himself definitely knew the truth.

³⁸ Trans. by Perrin 1967, 573.

Q. Pedius and Q. Fabius Maximus, who did not possess *imperium* at all and therefore were not entitled to such an honor, were awarded with triumphs, which caused ridicule (Cass. Dio 43. 42. 1–2). In E. Meyer’s opinion, Caesar paid homage to the republican traditions by granting the triumph to the governors of both Spanish provinces, Q. Fabius Maximus and Q. Pedius, even though they had not fought under their own auspices but under Caesar’s.³⁹ I think if Caesar was interested in this, it was very insignificant and in a purely formal sense. At the time of the celebration, Fabius was already a consul-suffect, which legitimized his position at least to some extent, but in the case of Pedius, we see a direct falsification by Caesar or his supporters because he was titled proconsul in the *fasti*.⁴⁰

But let us return to the triumph of Caesar. From the account of Dio Cassius, researchers unanimously concluded that although this triumph had been celebrated formally *ex Hispania* (in the *Fasti Triumphales* there is a lacuna), in reality it was an undeniable violation of the taboo against triumphs in honor of victory in a civil war.⁴¹ It is generally believed that during this triumph, the episode described by Suetonius took place: when Caesar passed by the place where the plebeian tribunes were sitting, one of them, Pontius Aquila, remained seated, which angered the winner (Suet. *Iul.* 78. 2).⁴²

The fact that this triumph was perceived as a celebration of victory over fellow citizens is reported only by very late sources, Plutarch and Dio Cassius, while Cicero, who was greatly biased, does not mention this, just as he does not mention this in the case of the celebrations

³⁹ Meyer 1922, 458.

⁴⁰ Lange 2016, 110.

⁴¹ Lange 2016, 85, 110, 203. See also Meyer 1922, 458; Gelzer 1969, 308; Meier 1993, 606; Billows 2009, 246. Carcopino 1968, 468 believes that Caesar equated those who resisted him after Thapsus with enemies such as the Lusitanians.

⁴² Meyer 1922, 458; Gelzer 1968, 308; Meier 1993, 606–607; Morstein-Marx 2021, 515. However the authenticity of this episode has been doubted (see Havener 2016, 172). It is quite possible that Caesar’s clash with Pontius took place under different circumstances. “Strictly speaking, nothing absolutely excludes a date in 46 for Pontius’s tribunate rather than 45, but since App. BC 2. 113/474 suggests that Pontius Aquila had taken the Pompeian side in the Civil War his election is harder to imagine before Thapsus than after it” (Morstein-Marx 2021, 515 n. 118). But we do not know whether Pontius Aquila took part in the civil war on the Pompeian side.

of 46 BC. If the triumph was indeed presented as *ex Hispania*, then there were certain grounds for this, since a significant part, if not most, of the Pompeian troops consisted of provincials who did not have Roman citizenship, i. e., the triumph was celebrated over the Spaniards.⁴³ There is no information about any depictions of deaths of the Pompeians.⁴⁴ Pontius Aquila's passive protest can be compared with the voice of one crying in the wilderness: it is not reported that the public applauded or reacted to the tribune's "impudence", although it is unlikely that Suetonius would have remained silent about such a fact if it had taken place. Besides, he did not condemn the triumph. Moreover, Plutarch could have significantly exaggerated the degree of people's displeasure.

The Failed Triumph of Decimus Brutus

A year after Caesar's death, a truly unprecedented event occurred: the Senate, in violation of all unwritten rules, granted a triumph to Decimus Junius Brutus for his victory over Mark Antony,⁴⁵ i. e., for success in the civil war.⁴⁶ In addition, Octavian was also awarded an ovation for the Mutina War,⁴⁷ but he demanded a triumph for himself, which seemed quite logical: Brutus only withstood the siege, but did not achieve victory in a proper battle, while Octavian took the most active part in the battle of Mutina.⁴⁸ Despite this, the Senate responded

⁴³ See Gelzer 1968, 293. The parallel with the triumphs of Metellus Pius and Pompey after the victory over the Sertorians, vaguely doubted only by Florus (3. 22. 10), suggests itself (Lange 2016, 110; see also Havener 2016, 151 n. 10).

⁴⁴ Our sources contain little information on Caesar's Spanish triumph (Östenberg 2014, 187; Havener 2016, 171). "Had Caesar taken note of the negative response towards the previous triumphs and now refrained from putting images of other Romans on parade? Or did he rather choose to push the message of civil war victory even further?" (Östenberg 2014, 187–188).

⁴⁵ Liv. *Per.* 119; Vell. Pat. 2. 62. 4; Cass. Dio 44. 40. 1; Östenberg 2014, 183; Lange 2016, 89, 128.

⁴⁶ We also know about the proposal to include the name of Decimus Brutus in the *fasti*, which, however, the Senate rejected (Cic. *Ad Brut.* 1. 15. 9; see also *Fam.* 11. 10. 1).

⁴⁷ Cic. *Ad Brut.* 1. 15. 9; 17. 2 – Marcus Brutus wrongly writes in his letter to Cicero about the triumph (Bellen 1997, 60 n. 76).

⁴⁸ See Liv. *Per.* 119; Havener 2016, 154.

with a very unkind refusal (App. *BC* 3. 80. 325; 82. 337; 89. 368),⁴⁹ but the granting of an ovation was also an obvious departure from tradition. In this context, the plans to erect a monument to the fallen in the fight for *res publica* should be mentioned; this project, however, was unlikely to be implemented.⁵⁰ But it should be noted that this idea itself was exceptional: public veneration of the fallen was not a custom among the Romans, unlike among the Greeks, and in this case it was about those who died in the civil war.⁵¹

Lange reasonably assumes that both this project and the granting of a triumph to Decimus Brutus demonstrated that the Senate was in dire straits.⁵² On the one hand, it is important that the *patres* voted for such measures. On the other hand, it is unclear whether they would have decided to implement them in practice after a victory over Antony,⁵³ and if the vote for Brutus' triumph did not seem to have caused debates or even confusion,⁵⁴ then its implementation could well have generated them; it is very likely that Brutus would have been convinced to abandon the victory celebrations. It is noteworthy that the triumvirs did not take this path and preferred to follow other precedents: back in 45, Caesar allowed Lepidus to celebrate a triumph, not for victories on the battlefield, but for preventing a powerful uprising in Spain.⁵⁵ For these peacemaking efforts (i. e., agreement with Sextus Pompeius) on the last day of 43 BC, Lepidus celebrated the triumph that the Senate had decreed, even before the formation

⁴⁹ Lange 2016, 88 admits that Octavian ultimately refused the ovation, which he never celebrated. It seems that the refusal was due to the negotiations he had started with Antony; an ovation in such circumstances would have looked extremely inappropriate.

⁵⁰ Cic. *Phil.* 14. 31–35; Lange 2016, 127.

⁵¹ Clark 2014, 27. As is well known, Decimus Brutus' triumph did not take place.

⁵² Lange 2016, 127. See also Östenberg 2014, 183.

⁵³ As for the monument, Clark 2014, 27 doubts that Cicero and his audience could have expected that it would actually be erected.

⁵⁴ Lange 2016, 87, 88, 90, 113.

⁵⁵ Cass. Dio 43. 1. 2–3. Cassius Dio notes mockingly that Lepidus sent to Rome only the money he had seized from the plunder of the allied communities; perhaps this is an echo of the ridicule caused by the fact that the triumph was granted to him without victories over enemies or even without fighting them (Weigel 1992, 144 n. 36).

of the second triumvirate.⁵⁶ When Caesar entered Rome with the *ovatio* after celebrating *Feriae Latinae*, it was not a recognition of any military successes. Probably, these very examples were followed by the triumvirs, who preferred ovation (but not a triumph!) in order to avert a new civil war in the wake of the agreement in Brundisium.⁵⁷

Conclusion

Therefore, we can see an interesting evolution of triumphs associated with victories during the civil wars. Apparently, Sulla tried to avoid any hint that he was celebrating the victory not only over external enemies, but also over his fellow citizens, especially since the Mithridatic War was a conflict separate from the fight against the Marians. Similarly, we do not have indisputable evidence of Caesar's triumphs celebrating victories in the civil war, although the very celebration of the African and Spanish triumphs was a clear hint at such victories, because Numidians and Spaniards were only allies of the Pompeians. But in 43 BC, the Senate did not hesitate to award a triumph to Decimus Brutus and an ovation to Octavian for their victory over Antony. The belief that Sulla and Caesar celebrated victories over their fellow citizens only emerged in the imperial era, when triumphs became the subject of active reflection. The triumvirs' refusal to follow the Senate's "extremist" line can be explained not only by its going beyond all conceivable norms, but also by the lack of necessity – the Senate in 43 BC was in dire straits, while the triumvirs felt like masters of the situation.

Anton V. Korolenkov

State Academic University for the Humanities, Moscow

sallust86@gmail.com

⁵⁶ Lange 2016, 83–86, 246 n. 94 (with sources). Lange admits the triumph could be partly in celebration of Lepidus' victories, but Cicero (*Phil.* 13. 7–9), when justifying honors for Lepidus, emphasizes a peaceful settlement (§ 8: *adduxit ad pacem remque publicam sine armis maximo civilis belli periculo liberavit*).

⁵⁷ Lange 2016, 65–66, 114–115. Lange places more emphasis on following the precedent of Caesar's *ovatio*, stressing that the triumvirs also celebrated an *ovatio*, not a triumph. However, the idea itself of celebrating the prevention of civil war brings them closer to the triumphs of Lepidus.

Bibliography

- J. P. V. D. Balsdon, “Sulla Felix”, *JRS* 41: 1 (1951) 1–10.
- H. Bellen, *Politik – Recht – Gesellschaft. Studien zur Alten Geschichte* (Stuttgart 1997).
- R. A. Billows, *Caesar: The Colossus of Rome* (London – New York 2009).
- K. Büchner, “M. Tullius Cicero (Fragmente)”, *RE* 2. R. 13 (1939) 1236–1274.
- J. Carcopino, *Sylla ou la monarchie manquée* (Paris 1947).
- J. Carcopino, *Jules César* (Paris 1968).
- J. H. Clark, *Triumph in Defeat. Military Loss and the Roman Republic* (Oxford 2014).
- M. Dowling, *Clemency and Cruelty in the Roman World* (Ann Arbor 2006).
- A. Eckert, *Lucius Cornelius Sulla in der antiken Erinnerung. Jener Mörder, der sich Felix nannte* (Berlin–Boston 2016).
- F. Fröhlich, “Cornelius 392”, *RE* 7 (1900) 1522–1566.
- E. Gabba (ed.), *Appiani bellorum civilium liber primus* (Florence 1958).
- M. Gelzer, *Caesar. Politician and Statesman* (Cambridge, Mass. 1968).
- L. Ghilli, “Commento [alla biografia di Silla]”, in: L. Ghilli, F. M. Muccioli (eds.), *Plutarco. Vite parallele. Lisandro. Silla* (Milan 2001) 300–514.
- W. Havener, “Triumphus ex bello civili? Die Präsentation des Bürgerkriegssieges im spätrepublikanischen Triumphritual”, in: H. Börm, M. Mattheis, J. Wienand (eds.), *Civil War in Ancient Greece and Rome. Contexts of Disintegration and Reintegration* (Stuttgart 2016) 149–184.
- F. Hinard, *Sylla* (Paris 1985).
- A. Keaveney, “Studies in the dominatio Sullae”, *Klio* 55 (1983) 185–208.
- C. H. Lange, *Triumphs in the Age of Civil War: The Late Republic and the Adaptability of Triumphal Tradition* (London – New York 2016).
- C. Lanzani, *Lucio Silla dittatore, storia di Roma negli anni 82–78 A.C.* (Milan 1936).
- W. Letzner, *Lucius Cornelius Sulla: Versuch einer Biographie* (Münster 2000).
- C. Meier, *Caesar* (Munich 1993).
- E. Meyer, *Caesars Monarchie und das Principat des Pompejus. Innere Geschichte Roms von 66 bis 44 v. Chr.* (Stuttgart–Berlin 1922).
- R. Morstein-Marx, *Julius Caesar and the Roman People* (Cambridge 2021).
- F. Münzer, “Caecilius 99”, *RE* 3 (1899) 1224–1229.
- I. Östenberg, *Staging the World: Spoils, Captives, and Representations in the Roman Triumphal Procession* (Oxford 2009).
- I. Östenberg, “Triumph and Spectacle. Victory Celebrations in the Late Republican Civil Wars”, in: C. H. Lange, F. J. Vervaeke (eds.), *The Roman Republican Triumph Beyond the Spectacle* (Rome 2014) 181–193.
- C. Pelling (tr., comm.), *Plutarch. Caesar* (Oxford – New York 2011).
- B. Perrin (ed., tr.), *Plutarch's Lives. IV: Alcibiades and Coriolanus, Lysander and Sulla* (Cambridge, Mass. – London 1916).

- B. Perrin (ed., tr.), *Plutarch's Lives. VII: Demosthenes and Cicero, Alexander and Caesar* (Cambridge, Mass. – London 1967).
- H. Rackham (ed., tr.), *Pliny, Natural History. IX: Libri XXX–XXXV* (Cambridge, Mass. – London 1952).
- J. A. Rosenblitt, *Rome after Sulla* (London – New York 2019).
- W. Schur, *Das Zeitalter des Marius und Sulla* (Leipzig 1942).
- G. S. Sumi, “Spectacles and Sulla’s Public Image”, *Historia* 51: 4 (2002) 414–432.
- E. Valgiglio (ed., comm.), *Plutarco. Vita di Silla* (Turin 1960).
- F. J. Vervaet. *Reform, Revolution, Reaction. A Short History of Rome from the Origins of the Social War to the Dictatorship of Sulla* (Seville–Zaragoza) 2023.
- J.-L. Voisin, “Le triomphe africain de 46 et l’idéologie césarienne”, *Antiquités africaines* 19 (1983) 7–33.
- R. D. Weigel, *Lepidus: The Tarnished Triumvir* (London – New York 1992).

The article is devoted to some triumphs that are usually perceived as victory celebrations over fellow citizens in *bella civilia*. The author analyzes the triumphs of Sulla, Caesar, and D. Brutus (the latter triumph was voted but not held). In his opinion, there were no signs of celebrations of victory over fellow citizens during Sulla’s triumph; only the victory over Mithridates VI of Pontus was celebrated. Such hints might have been dropped during Caesar’s African triumph, but modern researchers seem to overestimate their importance. Only late authors perceived the African and Spanish triumphs as victory celebrations also over fellow citizens. At the same time, the absence of any negative reaction to the granting to Decimus Brutus of a triumph over Antonius is noteworthy. It shows deep changes in the perception of triumphs at the end of the Roman Republic.

Статья посвящена некоторым триумфам, которые обычно воспринимаются как триумфы над согражданами в *bella civilia*. Автор анализирует триумфы Суллы, Цезаря (африканский и испанский) и Д. Брута (декретированный, но не состоявшийся). По его мнению, нет признаков празднования победы над согражданами во время триумфа Суллы, который справлялся над Митридатом VI Понтийским. Какие-то намеки подобного рода могли быть во время африканского триумфа Цезаря, но они сильно преувеличены современными исследователями. Африканский, а также испанский триумф воспринимались как празднование победы над согражданами только поздними авторами. В то же время примечательно отсутствие негативной реакции на дарование триумфа над Антонием Дециму Бруту. Это показывает глубокие перемены в восприятии триумфов в конце Римской республики.

CONSPECTUS

А. И. ЗАЙЦЕВ	
Древнейшее место культа Эдипа	197
[Alexander Zaicev, The Oldest Location of Oedipus' Cult]	
ZOIA BARZAKH	
Sophocles <i>OT</i> 809: The Response of the Defense	203
WALTER LAPINI	
Note ad alcuni scoli ad Aristofane	
(<i>Ach.</i> 794; <i>Eq.</i> 478b, 781b, 1034b; <i>Nub.</i> 144c, 421d, 450b. α, 1017;	
<i>Lys.</i> arg. I; <i>Ran.</i> 775a; <i>Plut.</i> 550c)	219
ANTON V. KOROLENKOV	
On Some Triumphs in the Epoch of Civil Wars	
in the Roman Republic	234
PHILIP BOSERUP-LEMIRE	
A Critical Note on Servius' <i>Commentary</i> on Verg. <i>Aen.</i> 6. 1–2	249
DENIS KEYER	
<i>Certum est dare lintea retro</i> : Juvenal 3. 205; 5. 141, 143–144;	
6. 195, 197–198 Reconsidered	252

ARCHAEOLOGICA ET EPIGRAPHICA

NATALIA PAVLICHENKO, VIKTOR VAKHONEEV	
New Funerary Lead Urns with Inscriptions from the Necropolis	
of Tauric Chersonesos	281
NATALIA PAVLICHENKO	
Marble Plaques in Tombstones from the Southern Suburb	
of Tauric Chersonesos	315
Keywords	342

Статьи сопровождаются резюме на русском и английском языке
Summary in Russian and English