



Omissi, A. and Ross, A. J. (Eds.) (2020) *Imperial Panegyric from Diocletian to Honorius*. Series: *Translated texts for historians*. Liverpool University Press: Liverpool. ISBN 9781789621105

This is the Author Accepted Manuscript.

There may be differences between this version and the published version. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite from it.

<http://eprints.gla.ac.uk/200810/>

Deposited on: 17 October 2019

Enlighten – Research publications by members of the University of Glasgow
<http://eprints.gla.ac.uk>

IMPERIAL PANEGYRIC FROM DIOCLETIAN TO HONORIUS

Edited by
Adrastos Omissi & Alan J. Ross

CONTENTS

Acknowledgments

List of Contributors

Imperial Panegyric from Diocletian to Honorius

Adrastos Omissi & Alan J. Ross

PANEGYRIC: THEORY AND PRACTICE

What is a ‘panegyric’?

Laurent Pernot

(Not) Making Faces: *Prosopopeia* in Late Antique Panegyric

Roger Rees

Libanius’ Imperial Speech to Constantius II and Constans (*Or.* 59): Context, Tradition, and Innovation

Grammatiki Karla

THE IMPERIAL IMAGE

Playing with Conventions in Julian’s *Encomium to Eusebia*: Does Gender Make a Difference?

Belinda Washington

Julian and Claudius Mamertinus: Panegyric and Polemic in East and West

Shaun Tougher

THE ORATOR AND ORATORIAL IDENTITY

How to Praise a Christian Emperor: The Panegyric Experiments of Eusebius of Caesarea

James Corke-Webster

Neoplatonic Philosophy in Tetrarchic and Constantinian Panegyric

Diederik Burgersdijk

Roman and Gallic in the Latin Panegyrics of Symmachus and Ausonius

Robert Chenault

OUTSIDERS WITHIN THE SPEECH

Civil War and the Late Roman Panegyric Corpus

Adrastos Omissi

Inviting the Enemy in: Assimilating Barbarians in Theodosian Panegyric

Robert Stone

The Audience in Imperial Panegyric

Alan J. Ross

Appendix: Editions, Translations and Commentaries of Imperial Panegyrics

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This volume grew out of a panel on late antique panegyric at the 9th Celtic Conference in Classics held at University College Dublin in 2016, which was generously supported by the European Union via Marie Curie Individual Fellowship Grant 625174 ‘CONSTANTIUS’.

We would like to thank Mary Whitby for her constant encouragement and consummate advice throughout the project, as well as Gillian Clark and Mark Humphries, the other General Editors for Translated Texts Contexts, for their incisive editorial guidance. We also express our gratitude to Alison Welsby and Clare Litt, former and current commissioning editors at LUP respectively, for all their help in the production of this volume.

CONTRIBUTORS

Diederik Burgersdijk is a lecturer in literary studies and ancient history at Utrecht University. He is also research fellow at the Institute of Historical, Literary and Cultural Studies at Radboud University, and is long-standing visiting scholar at Allard Pierson, University of Amsterdam, all in The Netherlands. He recently published *Imagining Emperors in Late Antiquity* (ed. with Alan J. Ross, Leiden, 2018) on representations of late antique emperorship, a topic which also forms his main focus of research.

Robert Chenault is Associate Professor of History and Classics at Willamette University, USA. His research interests are in the history and culture of the city of Rome and its senators in late antiquity. He has published several articles and reviews and is preparing a book tentatively titled *Rome Without Emperors: The Revival of a Senatorial City in the Fourth Century A.D.*

James Corke-Webster is Lecturer in Roman History at King's College, London, UK. His work focuses on early Christian and late antique history and literature. His first monograph, *Eusebius and Empire: Constructing Church and Rome in the Ecclesiastical History*, was jointly awarded the 2018 Conington Prize. As well as Eusebius, he has also published on early Christian experience under Rome — in particular the Pliny-Trajan correspondence on the Christians — martyr literature, apologetic writings, and early hagiography.

Grammatiki Karla is Assistant Professor of Classical Studies at the National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, Greece. She is the author of *Überlieferung, Sprache und Edition einer frühbyzantinischen Fassung des Äsopromans* (Wiesbaden, 2001) and editor of *Fiction on the Fringe. Novelistic Writing in the Post-Classical Age* (Leiden, 2009). Her research interests include ancient Greek popular literature, specifically the *Life of Aesop* and the *Alexander Romance*, and the rhetorical texts of the late antique orators such as Julian, Themistius, and Libanius.

Adrastos Omissi is Lecturer in Latin Literature at the University of Glasgow, UK. His work to date has focused on inter-imperial relations and the culture of the late Roman court. His first monograph, *Emperors and Usurpers in the Later Roman Empire: Civil War, Panegyric, and the Construction of Legitimacy* (Oxford, 2018) traces the history of the late Empire's civil wars and explores the aggressive political culture of competing imperial houses. He has also published on *damnatio memoriae*, panegyric culture, and the reception of Roman political symbolism in the modern world.

Laurent Pernot is Professor and Chair of the Department of Greek at the University of Strasbourg, France, Senior member of the Institut Universitaire de France, Member of the Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, Member of the Academy of Naples, Italy (Accademia di Archeologia, Lettere e Belle Arti), and former President of the International Society for the History of Rhetoric. His publications on rhetoric include: *La Rhétorique de l'éloge dans le monde gréco-romain* (Paris, 1993); *Rhetoric in Antiquity. Translated by W. E.*

Higgins (Washington DC, 2005); *Epideictic Rhetoric: Questioning the Stakes of Ancient Praise* (Austin, TX, 2015). His *L'Art du sous-entendu. Histoire — Théorie — Mode d'emploi* (Paris, 2018) has recently appeared. Pernot is Director of the series *Recherches sur les rhétoriques religieuses* (Brepols) and Executive Editor of *International Studies in the History of Rhetoric* (Brill).

Roger Rees is Reader in Latin at St Andrews University, UK. His publications include *Layers of Loyalty in Latin Panegyric* (Oxford, 2002), *Romane Memento: Vergil in the Fourth Century* (ed., London, 2004), *Diocletian and the Tetrarchy* (Edinburgh, 2004), *Ted Hughes and the Classics* (ed., Oxford, 2009), *Latin Panegyric* (ed., Oxford 2012), *Pliny the Younger in Late Antiquity* (ed. with B.J. Gibson, *Arethusa* 2013) and *Roman Rule in Greek and Latin Writing* (ed. with J.M. Madsen, Leiden, 2014). His commentary on *Panegyrici Latini* II(12) will be published by CUP in 2020.

Alan J. Ross is Assistant Professor in the Department of Classics, Columbia University, USA. He is the author of *Ammianus' Julian: Narrative and Genre in the Res Gestae* (Oxford, 2016) and co-editor of *Imagining Emperors in the Later Roman Empire* (ed. with D.W.P. Burgersdijk, Leiden, 2018). His research interests include panegyric oratory, historiography, and narrative literature in late antiquity.

Robert Stone is a PhD student at the University of Nottingham, UK. His doctoral thesis focusses upon representations of barbarians in the latter half of the fourth century and their reflections upon imperial authority.

Shaun Tougher is Reader in Ancient History at Cardiff University, UK. He specialises in late Roman and Byzantine political and social history. He has published extensively on Julian and the Constantinian dynasty. His publications include *Julian the Apostate* (Edinburgh, 2007), *The Eunuch in Byzantine History and Society* (London, 2008), *Emperor and Author: The Writings of Julian the Apostate* (ed. with Nicholas Baker-Brian, Swansea, 2012), and *The Emperor in the Byzantine World* (ed., London, 2019). At present he is finalising a volume on *The Sons of Constantine*.

Belinda Washington is an independent scholar. Her doctoral research was on the roles of imperial women in late antiquity (306-455AD) at the University of Edinburgh, UK.

IMPERIAL PANEGYRIC FROM DIOCLETIAN TO HONORIUS

Adrastos Omissi & Alan J. Ross

Whereas praising disgraceful things purely for the sake of pleasing is a sign of flattery, winning over those in power for people's advantage is a sign of political intelligence.¹

Sopater, *Letter to Himerius* 54

The editors of this volume once attended a conference together at the Georg-August-Universität in Göttingen, Germany. On the first morning of the conference, one of the senior academics of our host institution offered to take us on a short tour of this beautiful, sleepy little German town. We thus found ourselves outside the imposing neoclassical Assembly Hall of the university, a ceremonial space used for concerts, graduations, and the like. Within its impressive edifice, we knew, was a large and beautifully decorated nineteenth century auditorium, capable of seating more than five hundred people. The door, however, was locked. Our only option therefore was one by one to peer in at this room through the keyhole, which afforded us only a very sharply circumscribed view of this monumental space. As one of our colleagues (whom we won't embarrass by naming) wryly observed, one could hardly think of a more fitting metaphor for the study of classical history.

Those who study the ancient world are used to a simple but frustrating problem: there is not nearly as much evidence as we would like. The literary and physical testament that the ancients have left to us is a fiercely attenuated one, and within a given genre, or a given time period, the evidence with which we must work is frustratingly scant: Cicero's corpus is the sole witness to the Republican epistolary tradition; Petronius and Apuleius are isolated (and in the former case, fragmentary) testaments to the Roman novel; and, Ammianus, perhaps the last great author of Latin history in the classical tradition, is separated from his last known predecessor, Tacitus, by almost three centuries.² One could go on.

Imperial panegyric is different, however. Between the accession of the emperor Diocletian in 284 and the death of the Emperor Honorius in 423, there survive panegyric texts addressed to emperors written by as many as 21³ separate individuals who between them authored a body of more than 60 extant panegyrics. These authors praised an impressive

¹ Ἐπεὶ κολακείας μὲν τὰ φαῦλα ἐπαινεῖν αὐτῆς ἕνεκα μόνης τῆς ἀρεσκείας, πολιτικῆς δὲ φρονήσεως τοῖς ἐν δυνάμει καθομιλεῖν πρὸς ὠφέλειαν ἀνθρώπων. (Preserved in Stobaeus 4.5.54).

² For Cicero's *Letters*, see Shackleton-Bailey 1965-70, 1977 and 1980, and Hutchinson 1998. The Roman Novel: Hanson 1989, Harrison 1999, Schmeling 1998 and 2011. Ammianus: Seyfarth 1978 and Kelly 2008.

³ In a somewhat chronological order, these are the (potentially) eleven authors of the *Panegyrici Latini*, the enigmatic Optatian, the bishop Eusebius of Caesarea, Libanius, Themistius, the Emperor Julian, Symmachus, Ausonius, Claudian, and the perplexingly forthright Synesius of Cyrene. For a full list of these authors and their works, see the Appendix.

roster of emperors, with panegyrics to Maximian (285-305; 306-8; 310),⁴ Constantius I (293-306), Constantine I (306-37), Constantius II (324-61), Constans (333-50), Julian (355-63), Jovian (363-64), Valentinian I (364-75), Valens (364-78), Gratian (367-83), Theodosius I (379-95), Arcadius (383-408), and Honorius (393-423). In addition to these, Diocletian (284-305), Crispus (Caesar from 317-26), Constantine II (317-40), and Valentinian II (375-92) find mention in panegyrics not directed at them. We thus find in the panegyrics a continuous — if uneven — record of the four great dynasties of the later Roman Empire.

It is not, however, merely their honorands that single the speeches out. In them, we hear from western and eastern consuls, provincial teachers from Gaul or from Antioch, confidants of the emperor and men meeting him for the first time, Roman senators of ancient families and Constantinopolitan senators on the rise; we hear from Christians and from pagans, from old men and from young men, from people delighting in triumph or hiding the shame of defeat; we hear senior emperors and junior emperors praised; we hear men praising soldiers, men praising children, men praising women (and even, if only the text survived, we would hear women praising men).⁵ In short — and within the narrow confines of the Empire's highest elite — these panegyrics represent the literary testament of a perhaps unrivalled cross-section of late Roman society.

Given the size of this corpus, it is little wonder that it is rarely considered and talked about in its entirety. Yet the potential profit from such an exercise is considerable, for in panegyric we view a developed and mature public culture, we view one of the most important literatures of the late Roman period, and we have a chance to better understand both emperors and orators. This volume aims to be an early shot in what we hope will eventually become a veritable salvo directed at the panegyric culture of the late Roman world. Its primary virtue is that, unlike much previous work on this topic, it takes a consciously comparative approach to a panegyric. Each of our contributors draws upon evidence taken from multiple authors or from different kinds of panegyric in order to explore both the communal and the particular in this most idiosyncratic of media. A comparative approach lies at the heart of our project, and through it we seek to explore questions that always take a broader view of panegyric culture in the late Roman period.

What is imperial panegyric?

Though 'the panegyric' leeches into many different genres in the late Roman period — into history, hagiography, biography, and other forms of rhetoric, to name but a few — we are concerned here only with examples of what we might call true panegyric, that is the record of

⁴ Dates include Caesarships (if held), during which some emperors were the recipients of praise directly or indirectly (e.g. Constantius I in *Pan. Lat.* VIII[4] and Julian in *Them. Or.* 2).

⁵ The lost female author is the poetess Faltonia Betitia Proba who composed a poem entitled *The War of Constantius against Magnentius* (*Constantini [sic] bellum contra Magentium*) which may have been of a panegyric nature (cf. Matthews 1992).

speeches given in public in honour of the imperial person.⁶ A central question, therefore, is to define what is and what is not a panegyric. It may be noted that the numbers we quoted above — both of authors and of texts — were decidedly vague, caged round with the somewhat defensive ‘as many as’ and ‘more than’. This is because the boundaries of the genre, ostensibly so clearly defined, grow hazier and hazier the closer one examines them.⁷

As our first contributor, Laurent Pernot, points out in his chapter ‘What is a “Panegyric”?’, the Greek term πανηγυρικός and its Latin equivalent *panegyricus* were employed with comparative infrequency in the late Roman period. Latin orators preferred the term *laudes* (‘praises’), whereas Greeks employed either a generic word for praise ἐγκώμιον, or else more specialised terms to denote particular addressees or occasions, such as στεφανωτικός for crown-gold speech (e.g. Themistius *Or.* 3) or προσφωνητικός (e.g. Libanius *Or.* 12).⁸ Technically, a Greek speech of praise to an emperor, without a more specific occasion or purpose, was simply a βασιλικὸς λόγος, a ‘royal oration’, perhaps implying that to address the emperor would necessarily entail praise.⁹ Latin had certainly borrowed and Latinized πανηγυρικός as *panegyricus*, but Roger Rees has identified in the few occurrences of *panegyricus* by late Latin authors a recognition (sometimes derisive) of the term’s Greek origins that may explain their unwillingness apply the it to their own speeches.¹⁰ The good Roman term for the genre, as we have seen, was *laudes*.¹¹

This confusing picture is complicated further by the fact that, in addition to a baffling array of ancient terms (of which the above touches on the most common), modern scholarship has arbitrarily employed one of these several ancient terms — panegyric — in a sense far broader than that which ancient authors intended. We use panegyric today to describe, in a general way, *all* public orations of praise, whether those be praise of a city (as, for examples, the *Antiochikos* of Libanius), of an institution (as are Eumenius’ panegyric on the schools, *Pan. Lat.* IX[5], or Eusebius of Caesarea’s panegyric on the building of the churches, at *HE* 10.4.3-72), or of an individual. And though many if not most of the individuals whom we see praised in the surviving speeches are emperors, nonetheless, ‘private’ orations (in particular by Themistius and Libanius), together with the extant and fragmentary speeches of Himerius, hint at a lost world of non-imperial praise-giving.¹² The

⁶ On the panegyric in other genres, see for example its use in history: Ammianus’ praise of Julian, which Ammianus himself declares verges upon the panegyric (Amm. 16.1.3) or Aurelius Victor on the Emperor Constantius II (*Caes.* 42.17-25). The panegyric also found its place in the genre of hagiography: Rapp 1998; Hinterberger 2014.

⁷ A key observation of both Whitby 1998 and Hägg and Rousseau 2000.

⁸ Authors of the *Panegyrici Latini* frequently and self-reflexively designate their speeches as *laudes* during their opening proem. Most explicit is Nazarius, whose opening line reads ‘I am about to utter the most majestic praises of Constantine’ (*dicturus Constantini augustissimas laudes*, *Pan. Lat.* IV[10]1.1). Cf. X(2)1.1, XI(3)1.1, VI(7)1.5; V(8)1.2; IV(10) 3.1, 3.2; III(11)2.5; II(12)2.2. Symmachus *Or.* 4.1

⁹ Men. Rh. II.368.3, Soc. 5.14.6.

¹⁰ Rees 2010, 14-21; an example: Symm. *Ep.* 2.31 (postscript).

¹¹ The only other term used with any frequency is *gratiarum actio*, the speech of thanks. Murray 2018: 220.

¹² For Himerius, see Barnes 1987 and Penella 2007.

field of formal praise-giving possesses a diversity that the modern ‘panegyric’ can easily elide.

Within this broader set of ‘the panegyric’, imperial panegyric seems, at least at first, an easy subset to define by occasion and function, if not by original title. Imperial panegyrics are texts that represent the written record of a formal speech made in public before the emperor and his court, a speech in which the emperor is praised using the techniques set out by, among others, Aristotle, in his foundational treatise on the art of *Rhetoric*.¹³ Many texts slot themselves unproblematically into this category. When, in Trier, the panegyrist of 311 declares to Constantine: ‘Now, therefore, since the whole retinue of your friends, and all the apparatus of empire, stands at your side in this city which still enjoys, more than the rest, your continuous presence,’¹⁴ we can read in this the record of a genuine moment of direct address, when orator and emperor regarded one another across a crowded audience chamber in a performative moment, with orator speaking to emperor directly. The texts of these speeches are such that we feel confident in saying that they were not reworked for later publication, but represent a more-or-less faithful record of what was said on a given occasion.

Yet if the genre is to be defined by its relation to a previous speech act — in other words, if we are to understand much of panegyric’s significance as its relationship to a moment of performative oratory — how then do we classify the significant minority of speeches that were either not delivered, or not delivered to the emperor? Julian’s panegyrics to his cousin Constantius, for instance, cannot possibly have been delivered by the Caesar in his cousin’s presence, for after their parting in northern Italy in the autumn of 355, they were never again in one another’s company. One would hardly know this from the text of the two speeches, however, which addressed their imperial honorand directly in the second person throughout. This was hardly a unique conceit of Julian’s. The orator of the speech delivered in the presence of the Caesar Constantius in 297 also addressed both Maximian and Diocletian directly, as if they were present, and Libanius’ *Or.* 19 and 20, ostensibly given to Theodosius in the immediate wake of the riot of the statues, give little hint that they were in fact rhetorical exercises composed after the whole affair had been settled.¹⁵

Within its own boundaries, the genre was also capable of great stylistic variation, and two panegyrics might present very different faces to the world. In the first place, panegyrics were produced in both Latin and Greek, and authors from these two linguistic traditions very naturally drew on differing bodies of imagery and mythology. The pagan Roman senator Symmachus, as Robert Chenault eloquently demonstrates in his chapter in this volume, drew the themes and subtexts of his imperial addresses from Roman history itself and referred always to the greatness of the Roman Republic, whilst the Antiochene author, Libanius,

¹³ Arist., *Rh.* 1.9.36; cf. *Rhet. Hen.* 1.2.2 and Quint., *Inst.* 3.4.

¹⁴ *Nunc itaque cum in hac urbe, quae adhuc adsiduitate praesentiae tuae prae ceteris fruitur...totus tibi amicorum tuorum comitatus et omnis imperii apparatus adsistat.* *Pan. Lat.* V(8)2.1. Translations of the *Panegyrici Latini* are taken from Nixon and Saylor Rodgers 1994.

¹⁵ *Pan. Lat.* VIII(4)21.1; for Libanius, see French 1998, 473-4. Libanius’ conceit fooled Zosimus, writing only a century later, *New History* 4.41.3.

could show himself little interested with and little informed about Roman tradition.¹⁶ Irrespective of these linguistic bounds, individual authors might approach a speech in utterly different ways. Themistius tended to shape his speeches around a clear philosophic theme, the illustration of which was entrusted to a combination of excurses into the deep well of Greek myth and history and of illustrations taken from the life of the emperor himself, whilst the writers of the *Panegyrici Latini* preferred snappy narrative pieces that deployed a rich and emotive vocabulary to conjure living scenes for their audiences.¹⁷ Most panegyrics that survive to us were written in prose, yet we also have the corpus of Claudianic epic, where panegyric to the living was fused with the stylistic grandeur of Vergil and the mythological colour of Ovid.¹⁸ These texts are as different from one another as the *Church History* of Eusebius is from the *Res gestae* of Ammianus. Helping to bring these questions of genre more fully to light is part of our mission in this work.

Panegyric's very flexibility permitted experimentation, and in the pages that follow we explore this. James Corke-Webster, in his chapter on Eusebius of Caesarea, examines how Christians began to colonise a genre whose pagan overtones were not only explicitly articulated through the evocation of myth (and in some cases philosophy, as Diederik Burgersdijk argues in his chapter), but also were implicitly associated with panegyric both by its use as a prop of the onetime pagan Roman imperial order and by panegyric's origins in and associations with the public festival of the pagan empire. How were Christian authors to colonise this foreign soil, and to Christianise public performative space? Questions of inventiveness, colonisation, and of genre also surface for another of our contributors, Belinda Washington, whose chapter explores the challenges posed to male orators writing in a male-dominated world who turned the eye of panegyric onto female members of the imperial household. Did the need to repurpose the imperial oration to a female honorand fundamentally change the norms of the genre, or merely reinforce them?

All these questions and complexities raise their heads in the pages that follow as our contributors explore the broad and varied church that is imperial panegyric. Like many churches, when viewed from the outside it presents an image of apparent unity and homogeneity, but the new initiate will quickly discover that it is in fact the striking differences that make panegyric so fascinating.

Panegyric in Modern Research

The last quarter century has witnessed a remarkable rehabilitation of imperial praise literature. Suffering from Aristotle's designation as the third branch of rhetoric after forensic and deliberative, epideictic has often been dismissed as staid, formulaic, and — when

¹⁶ During his congratulatory address to the Emperor Julian for his consulship of 362, for instance, he gives a highly attenuated account of the history of the consulship (*Or.* 12.8) that is more tipping the cap to Roman history when it cannot be ignored than it is genuine engagement with it.

¹⁷ As, for instance, was his *Or.* 6 to Valens, which was constructed entirely around the idea of *φιλανθρωπία*, or brotherly affection.

¹⁸ Ware 2012, 171-197.

directed towards emperors — servile flattery indicative of the worst aspects of imperial monarchy.¹⁹ Two major works were instrumental in overturning these prejudices, and have enabled the rich flowering of studies on panegyric in recent decades, and from which we take our lead. Firstly, Pernot's *La rhétorique de l'éloge dans le monde gréco-romain* (1993) combined literary and social-historical analysis to offer an exhaustive survey of the form, function, and social status of praise literature in the second and third centuries AD. By demonstrating how praise could be a means for communicating and reinforcing shared social values, Pernot freed encomium from that traditional criticism of empty flattery, and identified praise as a vibrant facet of Greek cultural life under Roman rule.

Imperial panegyric formed just one part of an extensive range of subjects and situations of praise during the second sophistic, and Pernot could draw upon a range of extant speeches that celebrated cities, festivals, and anniversaries during the second and third centuries.²⁰ Extant epideictic speeches from the period that is the subject of this volume, however, are overwhelmingly directed towards an imperial honorand. The second major publication mentioned above appeared a year after Pernot's, when Nixon and Saylor Rodgers gave the Anglophone world its first complete translation and historical commentary of the eleven imperial panegyrics that, together with Pliny's, make up the collection now known as the *XII Panegyrici Latini*.²¹ If Pernot had demonstrated the importance of sensitive literary readings of epideictic in the second and early third centuries, then Nixon and Saylor Rodgers offered an important rehabilitation of late third and fourth century imperial panegyric for the historian of imperial politics and of the interaction between provincial elites and the imperial court.²²

Although very different in their approaches and subject matter, Pernot and Nixon & Saylor Rodgers both employed a more positive and constructive attitude to praise literature as both a rhetorical genre and a historical source. They also marked the beginning of a period of intense study of imperial panegyric in Anglophone scholarship that was often structured around individual authors or the corpus of the *Panegyrici Latini*. Themistius received competing treatments from Vanderspoel (1995), who argued for the orator's relative independence from his imperial addressees, and Heather and Moncur (2000), who conversely saw him as a tenacious mouthpiece of successive regimes. Both, nonetheless, used the panegyrics to investigate Themistius as a historical actor more so than a literary author. Treating a different corpus of speeches, Rees' 2002 monograph provided the first literary study of the five Tetrarchic *Panegyrici Latini*, examining rhetorical constructions of

¹⁹ Alan Cameron's view is typical of its time: 'So conventional (not to say trite), and so divorced from anything so mundane as mere facts are most of the themes of most of the panegyrists that it is hard to believe that they could have had much influence on the conduct or beliefs of either emperor or subjects.' Cameron 1970, 37.

²⁰ Dio Chrysotom and Aelius Aristides most prominently.

²¹ Nixon and Saylor Rodgers 1994.

²² The volume otherwise exhibits an undecided attitude to the role of literary criticism as either a complement to or integral part of historical analysis. The Introduction includes a section on 'Language and Literary Character' but frequently in the commentary that follows the editors express frustration with what they label as the orators' 'vagueness' and 'imprecision', which, nonetheless, must be a conscious part of the orators' style.

provincial loyalty. Two collections of essays from the same period began to expand the focus on Late Antique panegyric outwards in different directions. Setting late antique panegyric in a longer continuum of imperial praise, Mary Whitby's *The Propaganda of Power* (1998) gathered a series of essays that mostly studied individual Latin and Western speeches from the first to the seventh centuries AD.²³ The chapters in Hägg and Rousseau's *Greek Biography and Panegyric in Late Antiquity* (2000) left formal, imperial encomium behind in order to investigate the generic fluidity of the panegyric (as opposed to formal panegyric) in Greek literature of the third to fifth centuries, and especially the generic interplay between praise and biography (albeit with a greater focus on the panegyric in formal biography, than biographic elements in formal panegyric). Between them, these two collections demonstrated the pervasiveness of encomiastic style throughout Late Antiquity, yet they also illustrate a tendency in scholarship to treat Latin and Greek, Western and Eastern texts independently (as do the monographs of same period).

The appearance of so many ground-breaking works within such a short space of time has been testament to the vitality of study on late antique praise, but it also meant that several of these publications were not in a position to draw upon the conclusions of the others. One aim of this volume, then, is to narrow our focus onto imperial panegyric of the 'long' fourth century particularly, and yet to do so in an explicitly comparative frame that will allow us to put Greek and Latin, Eastern and Western panegyric into dialogue. To do so ought not to be considered a frivolous or unnecessary enterprise, but rather as something that addresses the fundamental nature of late Roman imperial culture. It is axiomatic to point out, as one of our contributors did memorably in 2002, that 'In Late Antiquity, emperors were everywhere,' and just as emperors moved about the Empire, so did the cultural world that surrounded their court.²⁴ In 357, the eastern senator, Themistius, appeared in the western capital of Rome to deliver a Greek oration before a onetime eastern emperor, Constantius II. Less than five years later, in 362, a western praetorian prefect appeared in the Eastern capital of Constantinople to deliver a Latin oration to a onetime western emperor, Julian. Imperial culture criss-crossed imperial territory. The fourth century was a period of unprecedented mobility of individuals, not just the emperor, and saw a significant development of the institution of emperorship and the methods of government, from the reorganisation of administrative divisions under Diocletian, to the emergence of a new senate in Constantinople and the development a trans-imperial senatorial class, all while local populations and governing classes sought to negotiate their relationships with the ever-moving imperial centre(s).²⁵ The theme of comparison, then, is intrinsic to our volume and occurs within individual chapters.

What is panegyric source material for?

²³ This preponderance of Latin, Western texts (*Panegyrici Latini*, Claudian, Sidonius Apollinaris, Venantius Fortunatus), were joined by a few Greek texts (by Julian and George of Pisidia). Each ancient author received a separate chapter.

²⁴ Rees 2002, 1.

²⁵ These phenomena are ably explored in many of the chapters of Wienand 2015, particularly Weisweiler 2015 and Kulikowski 2015. For senators between East and West, see now Moser 2018.

Part of the motivation for the boom in studies of panegyric that has taken place in the last decades stems from the fact that panegyric was, for a long time, largely neglected as a valuable source for the study of the later Empire. It was perhaps with an eye on the apparent candour and historicity of the oratory — largely Ciceronian — that survives to us from the Republic that scholars so frequently turned away in (often explicit) disgust at the toadying and obeisance to be found in the panegyrics.²⁶ Certainly, when the speeches are approached in the hope that they will yield the raw material of empiricist historical narrative, the panegyrics often prove disappointing. Approached more obliquely, however, their texts can be rewarding.

The majority of scholars who have employed panegyric as a source in recent years have used it as either a companion to more traditional narrative texts or as a window onto political culture.²⁷ The latter, certainly, is one of the most obvious employments to be granted to a body of sources so overtly political and so richly saturated in the hyperbolic language of late Roman court ceremony. Panegyric has also more recently been studied as a medial and communicative genre that help establish imperial authority, sustain ideology, and reflecting societal attitudes to Roman monarchy.²⁸

A further promising avenue of enquiry has been the growing awareness that imperial panegyric played an important role as primary source material when ancient authors set about writing historical narrative. Much to ancient historians' chagrin, panegyric had an edge upon historiography and several other genres that discussed imperial affairs, in terms of both temporal primacy and proximity to their subject.²⁹ Panegyric often offered extensive narration of recent political and military events, informed by the participants of those same events — just the sort of material that interested ancient historians, who scrupulously waited for the demise of an emperor before penning their account of his reign. Several of the chapters in Burgersdijk and Ross' recent *Imagining Emperors in the Later Roman Empire* chart the ways that panegyric acts as an agenda-setting genre for historiography, often establishing a literary depiction for a single emperor that would be the subject of subsequent debate, revision, reproduction or attack by historians, but acted as an unavoidable foundation nonetheless.

Many of the contributions to this volume develop these themes. Shaun Tougher, for example, focuses on Julianic panegyrics to investigate the careful reshaping of the memory of Constantius II, Julian's predecessor, to fit the contemporary political needs of the new reign

²⁶ Cf. Cameron, quoted in note 19 above.

²⁷ Of the former group, one might cite, in particular, Timothy Barnes, who has made detailed use of (particularly) the Constantinian panegyrics in order to build a richer narrative of that emperor's life and reign. Of the later, Roger Rees (a contributor to this volume) ought particularly to be mentioned. Rees' work on the tetrarchic panegyrics has done much to enrich our understanding of the world of the Tetrarchy and the political culture that the Tetrarchs attempted to create throughout the Empire.

²⁸ Omissi 2018 and the special edition of the *Journal of Late Antiquity* edited by Meaghan McEvoy and Jan Willem Drijvers entitled 'Envisioning the Late Roman Emperor'.

²⁹ Burgersdijk and Ross 2018, 12-15. For historians' attempts to distance their genre from panegyric see Paschoud 2005.

(all the more important a task when we consider the importance of Julianic panegyric to the subsequent construction of Ammianus' historical narrative of the 350s and 360s).³⁰ Robert Chenault and Robert Stone both look at the importance of advertising the depictions of groups — traditional Romans and barbarians respectively — to further the aims of either panegyrist or emperor. Adrastus Omissi, in his chapter, explores the creation of in-group and out-group in the panegyric recollection of civil war and communal violence, and how those narratives in turn shaped the events that gave birth to them.

Direct contributions to late Roman political narrative are an important aspect of panegyric studies, but the texts themselves have other stories to tell. We are now, as a discipline, all increasingly familiar with and alert to what Guy Sabbah called *communication ascendante* and *communication descendante*, a two-way discourse effected by panegyric in which messages travelled both 'down from' the emperor and his court, in the form of the panegyrist's repetition and reproduction of central propaganda messages, but also 'up to' the imperial audience, in the forms of subtle reinterpretations of core themes, or even outright requests for patronage and favour. Such upward communication could involve carefully calibrated attempts to repackaging the emperor in clothing suitable to the communities that sought to praise him. Nor should we approach these two poles with a view to finding either one or the other.³¹

It should further be noted that the two poles were not the only forms of communication available, for though the orator often took his role in order to act as a communicant between a political community and the emperor who was that community's summit, the orator too was a player in this drama, and his own motives might form a third vertex of communication. Thus it is a recurrent feature of *gratiarum actiones*, the panegyrics delivered by incoming consuls in thanksgiving for the office, that one of their core themes is the advertisement to the audience of the orator's own close relationship to the emperor. Examples of these survive in Latin, in both Mamertinus' *Pan. Lat.* III(11) for his consulship in the year 362 and Ausonius' *gratiarum actio* for his consulship in the year 379. In these contexts, the true target of panegyric praise often becomes obscured: in the course of praising Gratian, Ausonius was able to heap fairly fulsome praise upon himself as well, bathing himself in the reflected light of the emperor with whom (as he was at considerable pains to remind his audience) he enjoyed an enviably close relationship.³²

A fourth participant in the drama of the panegyric, and one often forgotten, was the audience itself. Based on what we know both of late Roman ceremonial and of the Roman court, we think it reasonable to believe that panegyrics would have been delivered before crowds numbering in the hundred or even thousands.³³ In our final chapter, Alan Ross

³⁰ For which see Ross 2016.

³¹ For example, Ware 2018 explores the orator's choices of emphasis and elaboration in in *Pan. Lat.* VI(7) to identify the mingling of *communication ascendante* and *descendante* between Constantine and the population of Trier.

³² For which, see now Gibson 2018.

³³ Rees (2002, 10) imagines a much smaller audience for the *Pan. Lat.* than we might suppose. Libanius, however, suggests that the bigger the audience the more effective the praise (and the glory for the orator): *Or.* 1.129. Certainly panegyrics delivered before bodies of (roughly) known size, like

explores the role of these audiences in the delivery of a given speech, and the way in which the extant speeches show that authors were anticipating and even prescribing the reactions of the crowd and treating those who listened as participants in the performance of the panegyric.

Our speeches are just as valuable as sources for intellectual and literary history. Burgersdijk and Corke-Webster both explore to what extent contemporary metaphysical systems of thought and belief (Neoplatonism and Christianity, respectively) influenced the models of ideal kingship that served as the basis of praise for individual rulers. Ancient philosophers had often denigrated rhetoric as worldly and even antithetical to truth, and rhetoricians could hit back as vociferously against their critics,³⁴ a relationship which makes it all the more surprising to discover a muted but reasonably consistent Platonic system of virtues and cosmology at play in some Constantinian panegyrics. Taken together with Themistius' more explicit recourse to philosophy later in the fourth century, the Platonic elements of the *Panegyrici Latini* are witness to a late antique reconciliation between these two branches of literature. Yet, the challenge of uniting epideictic rhetoric and metaphysics was confronted far more head-on by the Christian Eusebius of Caesarea, for whom the subservience of a Christian emperor to God forced a radical rethinking of the form and expression of imperial panegyric, especially when construed by the mediating figure of a bishop, as Corke-Webster demonstrates.

This volume is deeply congenial to the aims of the Translated Texts for Historians series. In the first place, many of the speeches that constitute the corpus of the late Antique panegyrics have been translated into English — on occasion the only such translation — in TTH. (An Appendix of the major editions, translations, and commentaries of extant panegyrics appears at the end of the volume). But the aim of this volume is more than simply to add to the body of commentary that is to be found within these and other translations.³⁵ As we have been at repeated pains to stress, we hope here to point research on panegyric in a new direction, and to begin tying together some of the strands of an intellectual discipline that has, until now, been conducted in a relatively compartmentalised way.

Theory and practice

Earlier we remarked that imperial panegyrics had once been dismissed as formulaic flattery. Formulaic in this context was of course used pejoratively, and it had seemed an obvious point

the senates of Rome (*Pan. Lat.* IV and II) and Constantinople (*Pan. Lat.* III) would have had audiences numbering in the hundreds, and such clues as panegyrics themselves provide (e.g. *Pan. Lat.* V[8].2.1) suggest large numbers, as do the size of the audience chambers that might hold them (Omissi 2018, 60 n. 94, estimates the capacity of the imperial basilica in Trier as being *at a minimum* around 2,500 people).

³⁴ Best exemplified during the Second Sophistic by Sextus Empiricus *Against the Rhetoricians* and Aelius Aristides *To Plato, in Defence of Oratory*. Vickers 1988, 170-178; Murray 2018, 219-20 and 228-231. Such voluble polemic disguised that philosopher and rhetoricians in fact had much in common.

³⁵ For a list of speeches and their translations, see the Appendix.

to make because of the existence — almost unique among other genres of antique literature — of what appears to be a manual for imperial panegyric.³⁶ A treatise, dated to the last quarter of third century and ascribed to Menander of Laodicea, provides a step-by-step guide for how to compose an encomium of an emperor.³⁷ It is fair to say that the measuring up of extant panegyrics to the precepts of Menander has become an obsession of modern scholarship, and resulting conclusions are often used to imply the rigidity of the genre or the insincerity of individual panegyrists.³⁸ Often such studies rest upon assumptions about the aims of Menander's treatise, the sort of advice it imparts, and its availability to Latin authors in Gaul.

Before turning to the validity and import of these sorts of comparison, the existence of Menander's treatise itself deserves consideration. Ever since Aristotle, various commentators had discussed the place of epideictic within wider rhetorical theory.³⁹ Menander, however, is exclusively concerned with epideictic, and the *basilikos logos* ('the Imperial Oration') is just one among many types of celebratory speeches for which instructions are given ('Speech of arrival', 'Birthday speech' and the 'Funeral speech' to name just three of the sixteen topics covered in Treatise II⁴⁰). Nonetheless, this is the first occasion in which we find a theoretical discussion of a speech of praise specifically addressed to an emperor. Furthermore, it seems the *basilikos logos* was given prominent place at the head of the treatise, and is certainly receives the longest set of instructions of any other type of epideictic.⁴¹ Unlike earlier theorists such as Aristotle or Quintilian who sought to analyse epideictic's form and purpose in comparison to other branches of rhetoric, Menander deals only with epideictic and is explicitly didactic, often instructing his reader directly about what to include and why, and offering examples for imitation: 'after the *prooemia*, you will come to the topic of his native country',⁴² or 'after "birth", you must say something about "nature", e.g. "straight from the labour of his mother's womb he shone forth radiant in beauty, dazzling the visible universe,

³⁶ It is worth remarking that the same charge has scarcely been applied to ancient historians who appear to follow the advice of Lucian's *How to Write History*.

³⁷ Men. Rh. II.368-377. For dating and attribution see Russell and Wilson 1981, xxxiv-xl. In this volume we follow Russell and Wilson's arguments that Treatises I and II were probably written by different individuals, or if by the same individual, then at different times. Nonetheless, for simplicity's sake, in what follows we use 'Menander Rhetor' to refer to the author of the second of the two extant treatises on epideictic, which contains instructions for an Imperial Oration (*basilikos logos*).

³⁸ Rees 2012, 41-42 for examples of comparisons of Menander Rhetor to the *Panegyrici Latini*. Readings of insincerity have been more common among Greek speeches: MacCormack 1981, 187 for Libanius' *Oration* 59, and Athanassiadi 1992, 61-2 for Julian *Oration* 1.

³⁹ Aristotle, *Rhetoric*. And for Latin, notably Cicero's *de Inventione*, and pseudo-Ciceronian *Rhetorica ad Herrenium*, and Quintilian's *Institutio Oratoria*.

⁴⁰ The work is incomplete, and we might imagine that Menander also covered the 'festival speech (*πανηγυρικός λόγος*)' or the 'speech of thanks (*χαριστήριος λόγος*)'. Russell and Wilson 1981, xxxviii. On Greek titulature, see above and Pernot in Chapter 1.

⁴¹ The order of the *topoi* in Treatise II is not secure, but two of the three manuscript families place the *basilikos logos* at their head. The only other *topos* to receive almost as much detail is the Address (*προσφωνητικός*). Russell and Wilson 1981, xliv-xlvi.

⁴² μετὰ τὰ προοίμια ἐπὶ τὴν πατρίδα ἤξεις. (369.18)

rivalling the fairest star in the sky”⁴³. In this respect, Menander is far more similar to the *Progymnasmata* of Ps.-Hermogenes (21-27 Rabe) which briefly sets out some theoretical definitions of encomium before offering two short model examples (in praise of Wisdom and Thucydides).⁴⁴ But Ps-Hermogenes, like Nicolaus, Aphthonius and other authors of *Progymnasmata*, does not feel the need to offer specific guidance for how to address encomium to an emperor. Curiously, even Libanius, who composed several imperial panegyrics to Constans, Constantius, and Julian, confined his model encomia in his *Progymnasmata* to mythological characters or non-human subjects, with the sole exception of the long-dead orator Demosthenes.⁴⁵

As we noted above, recent collections of essays have demonstrated malleability and even pervasiveness of panegyric style in the close generic overlap between panegyric and a range of other genres: biography, historiography and even hagiography. But the existence of the first two chapters of Menander’s second treatise provides important testimony that by the late third century, panegyric addressed to an emperor had emerged not just as a distinct form of encomium, which required specific guidance, but as the most important form of encomium that an orator might be expected to compose, and, we might well imagine, in the most high-stakes situation, before the emperor himself (not just as a school room exercise, as the *Progymnasmata*).

To return to our earlier question: how (and should) we use Menander as a yardstick to judge extant speeches? The answer depends partly on one’s interpretation of Menander’s position as prescriptive or descriptive of epideictic practice. Was he the sole, seminal creator of a set of rules that we should expect successive panegyrists to follow; or did he summarize and condense the practice of third-century orators into a handy set of guidelines? Most scholars recently have tended towards the latter interpretation, and thus we might then ascribe any similarities between Treatise II and later speeches to their shared tradition, rather than direct use of Menander: Menander serves as a useful witness to lost (Greek?) imperial panegyrics of the third century. Nonetheless, it is important to note how important a conduit Menander became for channelling and codifying epideictic practice. For example, a fifth-century papyrus from Egypt suggests he remained the go-to text when composing epideictic.⁴⁶ And the tenor of other later testimonia led Russell and Wilson to conclude ‘that the “authority” on epideictic in Byzantine times was known to be Menander.’⁴⁷

Despite the absence of testimonia to Greek speeches before the 340s, we find fourth-century panegyrists referring to the ‘correct’ form of imperial panegyric in their speeches. In

⁴³ μετὰ τὴν γένεσιν ἐρεῖς τι καὶ περὶ φύσεως, οἷον ὅτι ἐξέλαμψεν ἐξ ὠδίνων εὐειδῆς τῷ κάλλει καταλάμπων τὸ φαινόμενον ἀστέρι καλλίστῳ τῶν κατ’ οὐρανὸν ἐφάμιλλος (371.15-17).

⁴⁴ Kennedy 2003.

⁴⁵ Praise of Demosthenes was a standard schoolroom topic (Theon 111; Aphthonius 21; Gibson 2008, 237-9).

⁴⁶ P.Berol. 21849, a letter in which one Victor asks for the urgent return of some books he had lent to a Theognostus, including ‘Menander’s “art” (Μενάνδρου τέχνην)’. Maehler speculates on the context: Victor’s aim was ‘to write a laudatory speech on some illustrious person, perhaps a prominent visitor to Hermupolis whose visit had been announced at short notice’. Maehler 1974, 311.

⁴⁷ Russell and Wilson 1981, xxxvi.

the late 340s, and in one of our earliest extant Greek panegyrics, Libanius speaks of the ‘custom’ (ἥθος) of panegyrists to downplay their own abilities at the outset of their speeches. In the following decade, Julian in his first panegyric declares he follows the ‘rule of panegyric’ by mentioning Constantius’ native land.⁴⁸ Both speeches conform by-and-large to the structure set out in Menander. Such references presuppose that the audience, as well as the orator, were *au fait* with the expected structure and style of imperial panegyric, perhaps even as codified in textbook form, such as by Menander.

Several of our chapters explore the relationship between theory (especially as illustrated by Menander) and practice. Perhaps unsurprisingly, it is a Greek speech that seems to exhibit greatest affinity with Menander’s text itself. Grammatiki Karla shows that in the same speech in which he mentions panegyrists’ customs, Libanius uses several of the same examples and phrases as Menander recommends. The sort of intertextuality identified by Karla is of a different order to that often used to argue for the *Panegyrici Latini*’s adherence to Menander — rather than just structural similarity, Karla argues for precise lexical allusions that allow her to conclude Libanius had Menander’s text at his side when he composed.⁴⁹ This is not to say that Libanius slavishly followed Menander as a model, however. Karla also traces when and where Libanius consciously breaks with Menander’s prescriptions, to reveal a creative engagement with the ‘norms’ of imperial panegyric.

Menander is far from comprehensive in his advice, however, and is largely concerned with structure and what sort of material should be included, not how it should be used or developed. Belinda Washington explores how two authors, one Greek the other Latin, address praise to women. In the Greek case, Julian is at pains to discuss once more the ‘norms’ of panegyric, while composing praise for a subject not imagined by Menander. Not unlike Libanius, then, he largely follows the contours of Menander’s *basilikos logos* at a macro-level, adapting them where necessary for a female subject.

Washington shows how the entire structure of imperial panegyric might be adapted to an ‘atypical’ subject. Roger Rees focuses on one specific feature recommended by Menander — ‘in-character’ speech, or *prosopopeia*, in which an orator invokes the voice of another, imagined speaker — to demonstrate how it is applied inconsistently, albeit in distinct patterns across Latin and Greek speeches within our period. Perhaps curiously, it is Latin panegyric that offers more examples of *prosopopeia* than Greek, but even then, Rees detects later authors in the *Panegyrici Latini* collection taking inspiration from their predecessors, rather than necessarily from a textbook, and much less a Greek textbook such as Menander. As Rees concludes, ‘rhetorical aesthetics in the *Panegyrici Latini* collection may have had its own, internal and relatively hermetic ecosystem’.⁵⁰

One final chapter also speaks to some of these issues. Ross notes that Menander offers almost no advice on how an orator should engage an attendant audience beyond just the honorand, and argues that a distinct practice developed across Latin panegyric that was likely due to imitation of actual speeches, rather than textbook advice. From these four chapters,

⁴⁸ Ὁ μὲν οὖν τῶν ἐπαίνων νόμος (*Or.* 1.5b).

⁴⁹ Cf. Veerecke 1975 for critiques of this sort of structural comparison between Menander and the *Panegyrici Latini*.

⁵⁰ P. 46 below.

then, we can conclude that the *idea* that there could be a codified set of rules specifically for imperial panegyric was an important aspect especially for Greek panegyric, which often advertised the existence of such rules in varying degrees of explicitness. In Latin panegyric we can observe the codification of practice occurring via imitation of earlier examples. In both cases, however, it is important to note that Menander Rhetor's advice is not a straightjacket for 'real' speeches, rather a creative impulse for imitation and adaptation.

Structure

The chapters that follow are arranged thematically under four broad headings which provide a framework for the comparisons that underpin our study. These headings are based upon the major recurring structural and thematic elements that together help define fourth-century imperial panegyric, and aim to move discussions of imperial panegyric beyond purely technical discussions or commentary on the reigns of individual emperors.

Panegyric: Theory and Practice. The first section explores the theoretical foundations of the panegyric genre, especially the extent to which rhetorical traditions and theoretical models shaped panegyric practice during the fourth century. Beginning with an exploration of the terminology applied by contemporaries to panegyric that reveals a conceptual difference between Latins and Greeks (Pernot), two further chapters then explore how authors deployed a long-standing rhetorical strategy of *prosopopeia* to create new traditions (Rees) and how orators sought to apply panegyric theory to actual practice (Karla).

The Imperial Image. Turning to perhaps *the* central concern of the imperial panegyrist's art — how to praise the emperor and to construct a message that served immediate political purposes — the two chapters in this section make a focussed study of the Emperor Julian, who, uniquely among his contemporaries, was both subject and author of several panegyrics in both Latin and Greek. First Washington explores how Julian as Caesar moulds the relatively unusual panegyric image of an empress by setting the image of Eusebius in *Oration 2* against a wider tradition of public memorials of imperial women. Then Tougher considers how Julianic texts from before and after his usurpation, in both Latin and Greek, together create an intricate nexus, and especially how Julian's early praise of Constantius II conditions later praise of Julian.

The Orator and Oratorial Identity. Though structurally panegyric was orientated towards its honorand, individual orators brought their own strategies and preoccupation to their speeches, and identifying these authorial preoccupations is a vital part of understanding panegyric. The contributors to this section examine how the newly tolerated Christian Church began to colonise 'secular' panegyric (Corke-Webster), how despite long-standing animosity between philosophers and rhetoricians, panegyricists of the early fourth century could draw upon contemporary philosophical ideals to praise the emperor, albeit in an intentionally ambiguous way (Burgersdijk); and how different regional agendas manifested themselves in panegyric, especially between Rome — the traditional home of empire — and the new reality that power lay wherever the emperor was (Chenault).

Outsiders within the Speech. This final section examines how recurring figures that lie outside the binary relationship between the praise-giver and the praised were incorporated into the praise of the emperor. Such figures frequently play a role within the speech's discourse and were given important rhetorical form, whether they were usurpers (Omissi), barbarians (Stone), or the (imagined or constructed) wider audience of the panegyrics themselves (Ross).

With these chapters, we aim to showcase the diverse richness as well as the commonality of panegyric across the long fourth century, though of course we cannot be exhaustive. Neither every possible approach nor every possible panegyric author (let alone every extant speech) is touched upon.⁵¹ But we hope we demonstrate that only by examining imperial panegyric culture across traditional divisions of Latin and Greek, East and West may we fully understand this fundamentally important aspect of political and literary culture during the last century of a unified Mediterranean world in antiquity.

Bibliography

- Athanassiadi, P. (1992) *Julian: an Intellectual Biography*. London.
- Burgersdijk, D.W.P and A.J. Ross (2018) 'Introduction', in D.W.P. Burgersdijk and A.J. Ross (eds.), *Imagining Emperors in the Later Roman Empire*. Leiden.1-17.
- Cameron, A.D.E. (1970) *Claudian: Poetry and Propaganda at the Court of Honorius*. Oxford.
- Drake, H. (1975) *In Praise of Constantine: a Historical Study and New Translation of Eusebius' Tricennial Orations*. Berkeley.
- Evelyn-White, H.G. (1922) *Ausonius*. Cambridge, MA.
- French D. (1998) 'Rhetoric and the Rebellion of ad 387 in Antioch', *Historia* 47: 468–84.
- Hanson, J. A. (1989) *Metamorphoses*. 2 vols. Cambridge, MA.
- Heather, P. and J. Matthews (1991) *The Goths in the Fourth Century*. TTH 11. Liverpool.
- Heather, P. and D. Moncur (2000) *Politics, Philosophy and Empire in the Fourth Century: Select Orations of Themistius*. TTH 36. Liverpool.
- Gibson, B. (2018) 'Gratitude to Gratian: Ausonius' Thanksgiving for his Consulship' in D.W.P. Burgersdijk and A.J. Ross (eds.), *Imagining Emperors in the Later Roman Empire*. Leiden. 270-288.
- Gibson, C. (2008) *Libanius' Progymasmata*. Atlanta.

⁵¹ It is worth stating explicitly here that we have omitted from this volume any consideration of the poem-panegyrics of Optatian, a series of thirty-one speeches written for (among others) the Emperor Constantine in the 320s (the history and provenance of these speeches is complex: see Wienand 2017, esp. 132-5). As acrostic poems — that is poems in which hidden messages can be spelled out by reading individual letters from multiple lines — these poems were neither performed nor were they performable, as their genius is only appreciable on the page, putting them in a somewhat different category from the speech-oriented works that form the subject of this volume.

- Hägg, T. and P. Rousseau (2000) *Greek Biography and Panegyric in Late Antiquity*. Berkeley.
- Harrison, S. J. (1999) *Oxford readings in the Roman novel*. Oxford.
- Hinterberger, M. (2014) 'Byzantine Hagiography and its Literary Genres', in S. Efthymiadis (ed.), *The Ashgate Research Companion to Byzantine Hagiography vol. 2*. Farnham. 25-60.
- Hutchinson, G. O. (1998) *Cicero's correspondence: A literary survey*. Oxford.
- Kelly, G. (2008) *Ammianus Marcellinus, the Allusive Historian*. Cambridge.
- Kennedy, G. (2003) *Progymasmata*. Atlanta.
- Kulikowski, M. (2015) 'Regional Dynasties and Imperial Court', J. Wienand (ed.), *Contested Monarchy: Integrating the Roman Empire in the Fourth Century AD*. Oxford. 135-48.
- Lieu, S. and D. Montserrat (1996) *From Constantine to Julian: Pagan and Byzantine Views*. London.
- MacCormack, S. (1981) *Art and Ceremony in Late Antiquity*. Berkeley.
- Maehler, H. (1974) 'Menander Rhetor and Alexander Claudius in a Papyrus Letter', *GRBS* 15: 305-311.
- Malosse, P.-L. (2003) *Libanios, Discours T.4*. Paris.
- Matthews, J. (1992) 'The Poetess Proba,' in M. Christol, S. Demogin, Y. Duval, C. Lepelley, L. Pietri. (eds.), *Institutions, société et vie politique dans l'empire romain au IVe siècle ap. J.-C.: actes de la table ronde autour de l'œuvre d'André Chastagnol (Paris, 20-21 Janvier 1989)*. Rome. 277-304.
- Moser, M. (2018) *Emperor and Senators in the Reign of Constantius II*. Cambridge.
- Nixon, C.E.V. and B. Saylor Rodgers (1994) *In Praise of Later Roman Emperors: the Panegyrici Latini*. Berkeley.
- Norman, A.F. (1969) *Libanius: Selected Works. Volume I*. Cambridge, MA.
- Norman, A.F. (1977) *Libanius: Selected Works. Volume II*. Cambridge, MA.
- Omissi, A. (2018) *Emperors and Usurpers in the Later Roman Empire: Civil War, Panegyric, and the Construction of Legitimacy*. Oxford.
- Paschoud, F. (2005) 'Biographie und Panegyrik: wie spricht man vom lebenden Kaiser?' in K. Voessing (ed.), *Biographie und Prosopographie. Internationales Kolloquium zum 65. Geburtstag von Anthony R. Birley*. Stuttgart. 103–18.
- Rapp, C. (1998) 'Comparison, Paradigm, and the Case of Moses', in Mary Whitby (ed.), *The Propaganda of Power: The Role of Panegyric in Late Antiquity*. Leiden. 277-298.
- Rees, R. (2002) *Layers of Loyalty in Latin Panegyric*. Oxford.
- Rees, R. (2012) *Latin Panegyric*. Oxford.
- Russell, D.A. and N. Wilson (1981) *Menander Rhetor, edited with a Translation and Commentary*. Oxford.
- Saylor Rodgers, B. (2009 [2015]) *Orations of Symmachus*. Online translation: <http://www.uvm.edu/~bsaylor/>
- Schmeling, G. (1998) 'Apollonius of Tyre: Last of the troublesome Latin novels', in Hildegard Temporini and Wolfgang Haase (eds.), *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt II.34.4*. Berlin. 3270–3291.
- Schmeling, G. (2011) *A commentary on the Satyrical of Petronius*. Oxford.
- Seyfarth, W. (1978) *Ammiani Marcellini Rerum Gestarum libri qui supersunt*. Leipzig.

- Shackleton Bailey, D. R. (1965–1970) *Cicero's letters to Atticus*. 7 vols. Cambridge.
- Shackleton Bailey, D. R. (1977) *Cicero: Epistulae ad familiares*. 2 vols. Cambridge.
- Shackleton Bailey, D. R. (1980) *Cicero: Epistulae ad Quintum fratrem et M. Brutum*. Cambridge.
- Swain, S. Forthcoming. *Themistius, Speeches to Valens and his Family (Orr 6-13)* [provisional title]. TTH. Liverpool.
- Veerecke, E. (1975) 'Le corpus des panégyriques latins de l'époque tardive: problèmes d'imitation', *L'Antiquité Classique* 44:141-160 [translated as 'The Corpus of Latin Panegyrics from Late Antiquity: Problems of Imitation' in R. Rees (2012) *Latin Panegyric*. Oxford. 251-64].
- Vickers, B. 1988. *In Defence of Rhetoric*. Oxford.
- Ware, C. (2012) *Claudian and the Roman Epic Tradition*. Cambridge.
- Ware, C. (2018) 'Constantine, the Tetrarchy and the Emperor Augustus', in D.W.P. Burgersdijk and A.J. Ross (eds.), *Imagining Emperors in the Later Roman Empire*. Leiden. 113-36.
- Weisweiler, J (2015). 'Domesticating the Senatorial Elite: Universal Monarchy and Transregional Aristocracy in the Fourth Century AD', in J. Wienand (ed.), *Contested Monarchy: Integrating the Roman Empire in the Fourth Century AD*. Oxford. 17-41.
- Whitby, Mary (1998) *The Propaganda of Power: The Role of Panegyric in Late Antiquity*. Leiden.
- Wienand, J. (2015) *Contested Monarchy: Integrating the Roman Empire in the Fourth Century AD*. Oxford.
- Wienand J. (2017) 'Publilius Optatianus Porfyrius: The man and his book', in M. Squire and J. Wienand (ed.), *Morphogrammata / The Lettered Art of Optatian. Figuring Cultural Transformations in the Age of Constantine*. Paderborn. 121-63.
- Wright, W.C. (1913) *Julian, Volume 1*. Cambridge, MA.

WHAT IS A ‘PANEGYRIC’?

Laurent Pernot

The Greco-Latin word ‘panegyric’ is a difficult word, more difficult than it appears initially, because its meaning is anything but clear. Let us take for instance the 4th-century BC *Panegyric* of Isocrates and the *Panegyric* of Pacatus which is the twelfth and chronologically latest piece of the collection of Latin Panegyrics (*Pan. Lat.* II[12]). These two orations bear the same title (πανηγυρικός in Greek, *panegyricus* in Latin) and are approximately the same length. But the goal and content in each oration is different. Isocrates was addressing all the Greeks in order to convince them to devise a strategy against Persia under the guidance of Athens, while Pacatus expounded an encomium for the Emperor Theodosius in front of the Roman Senate. Between 380 BC and AD 389 — a gap of almost eight centuries — both the historical and geographical contexts had changed and the rhetorical nature of the panegyric oration had also changed. This is why it is necessary to trace as well as understand the evolution of the word.

The main study on the topic remains the article ‘Panegyrikos’ published by Ziegler in the *Realencyclopädie* in 1949, which presents many references, arranged in chronological order.¹ Although it is rich with information, this work fails to include a number of usages; these omissions, which mainly affect Greek sources, had the effect of leading Ziegler to a questionable conclusion, when he states that the Greek word ‘πανηγυρικός (with or without λόγος) in Antiquity had never meant encomium.’² Moreover Ziegler imposes a separation between the Greek πανηγυρικός and the Latin *panegyricus*, and at the end of his article he makes a list of only Latin panegyric orations, which gives the impression that there are no Greek examples to compare and contrast them with. The task of this chapter is to correct this perspective, by including omitted references and, as far as possible, to classify the material thematically, in order to highlight the main elements in rhetorical and literary conceptions of the term across antiquity. This chapter, then, traces the parallel developments in Latin and Greek traditions that underpin the phenomenon of late-antique praise literature. It is necessary to historicize our understanding of the words πανηγυρικός and *panegyricus* and problematize the off-hand way in which we, modern scholars, often talk about ‘panegyric’ as if it was a clearly defined genre. The problem under examination is panegyric, not praise oratory in general. Special attention will be given to ancient ways of designating speeches, especially titles.³

¹ Ziegler 1949. See also Fornara-Dingel-Berger 2000; Hostein 2012, 46-58; Rees 2012; Laudani 2014, 14-16. Mause 2003 expands the topic to include encomium in general.

² Ziegler 1949, 570: ‘π. (mit oder ohne λόγος) im Altertum niemals die Bedeutung ‚Lobrede‘ angenommen hat.’

³ On the meaning and importance of titles, see e. g. Hadot 1989, 8-11; Pernot 1993, 1.470-474; Fredouille, Goulet-Cazé, Hoffmann, Petitmengin 1997; Jansen 2014.

The *Panegyric* of Isocrates

The first person, to our knowledge, who designated an oration as a panegyric, was Isocrates. His speech, which has been referred to above, is entitled Πανηγυρικός in the manuscripts and the authenticity of the title is established by several passages from other works by Isocrates, in which he refers to this very speech as a πανηγυρικός.⁴ Subsequent authors attest that this designation became the standard title throughout antiquity.⁵

How are we to interpret such a title? It cannot be explained by tradition, since this is the first appearance of the word in Greek literature. Isocrates' use of the title is not only the first one in the field rhetoric, it is simply the first time this word was ever employed — at least to our knowledge. What we have is an original, perhaps a striking title.

By using this word, Isocrates obviously meant an oration relative to a πανήγυρις, a holy festival. Indeed, that the speech is related to festivals is made explicit as early as in the exordium (section 1). Later on (sections 43-46), the orator brings up the subject of festivals again. Scholars acknowledge that this oration is to be linked to the Olympic festival of 380 BC, although it was not actually delivered during the celebration, but rather published or recited to a small group, in front of an Athenian audience, on the margins of the festival.⁶ The title Πανηγυρικός is thus part of a series of orations by Isocrates whose titles end in –ικός and refer to the circumstances and content of the oration. The Τραπεζιτικός is about bank matters, the Πλαταιικός is about the city-state of Plataea, the Ἀρεοπαγιτικός is about the powers of Areopagus and, last but not least, the Παναθηναϊκός refers to the festival of Panathenaea.

The *Panegyric* can be compared to other orations by authors prior to it, of which only fragments remain: the *Olympic* and *Pythian* orations of Gorgias, delivered in Olympia and in Delphi respectively, and the *Olympic* oration of Lysias. Isocrates was probably aware of these precedents and perhaps alludes to them in the exordium of the *Panegyric*, when he mentions 'the so-called sophists' who had preceded him in this oratorical field (section 3). Isocrates was even accused by some of imitating or plundering Gorgias⁷ and Lysias.⁸

What has not been sufficiently observed is the following: in comparison to the other titles ending in –ικός that have been just mentioned, πανηγυρικός is vague, as it does not specify which πανήγυρις one is dealing with. It is like saying 'the assembly oration' or 'the tribunal oration', without specifying to which assembly or tribunal one is referring to. In sum, Isocrates uses 'panegyric' as a generic title. This generic denomination shows that the author did not want to include his work in any specific context, preferring to stand back, as far as specifications are concerned, and retaining a certain level of generality. This generality can be seen in the content and in the ideas, and at the same time in the rhetorical form. So, when Isocrates composed the *Panegyric*, he was not simply writing a speech: he was creating a genre. In another work, he talks about 'Hellenic, political and panegyric speeches' (*Ant.* 46), a phrase which shows that to him 'panegyric' represented an oratorical category.

⁴ *Ant.* 59; *Panath.* 172; *Phil.* 9, 84; *Epist.* 3.6.

⁵ Arist. *Rhet.* 3.1408b16; Cic. *Or.* 37; Quint. *Inst.* 10.4.4; Diog. Laert. *Vit.* 5.35; etc.

⁶ Papillon 2007, 63.

⁷ Philostr. *V.S.* 1.17 (504).

⁸ Ael. Theon. *Prog.* 1 (63).

An essential feature in order to define this category is the combination of advice and encomium. Isocrates himself defines the *Panegyric* as an oration of advice, using the verb συμβουλεύειν ('to advise') not only within the oration itself, but later on, when he refers to this speech in another work.⁹ The *Olympic* orations of Gorgias and Lysias were also, judging by the portions of them that were left, speeches of advice on Greek matters.

However, as far as the *Panegyric* is concerned, even though the section that touches upon advice is the most developed, the first part consists of an encomium of Athens (sections 21 to 99). Isocrates regarded this encomium as a preparation of the opinion to be given in the rest of the speech, since the merits of Athens supported Athens' claims to hegemony. As an encomium, the oration belongs to ἐπίδειξις ('exhibition, performance'), and, as advice, its objective is to get results and be persuasive, even though it is not intended to elicit a vote within an institutional framework such as a tribunal or an assembly.¹⁰ This method of combining praise and advice was criticized, and some even reproached Isocrates for having over-elaborated encomia at the expense of useful advice.¹¹

To all this must be added the fact that Isocrates' attitude changed during his life. After exalting the festivals (πανηγύρεις) in the *Panegyric*, he would speak very harshly and disapprove of them in his later works. He would write that speaking to Greeks assembled at the πανηγύρεις is vain idle talk: 'In the populace gathered for festivals, there are more sleepers than they are listeners.'¹² If one wants to talk usefully, he would write, it is better off to speak to a man who has power, for example a sovereign like Dionysius of Syracuse or Philip.¹³

Therefore there was, between encomium and advice, a tension-bearing alliance. The first use of the word 'panegyric' as the title of an oration by Isocrates is complex from a rhetorical standpoint, weighed down with intentions and even laden with ambiguity. Aristotle, who noticed this ambiguity, classified the *Olympic* of Gorgias and the *Panegyric* of Isocrates as epideictic orations, but he also acknowledged that the *Panegyric* addresses the issue of advice.¹⁴

The next stage for our study, which again relates to Isocrates, was the transcription of the Greek word πανηγυρικός into Latin in the form *panegyricus*. The first appearance of this transcription, to our knowledge, can be found in Cicero. The Ciceronian passage is of interest as it is more than a bibliographical reference. Cicero had read Isocrates, whom he liked a lot.

⁹ *Paneg.* 3; *Phil.* 9. See also *Ant.* 57-58.

¹⁰ *Paneg.* 17.

¹¹ *Ant.* 62: φανήσονται τινες ... οἱ χαριέντως μὲν εἰρήσθαι ταῦτα φήσουσιν, — τὸ γὰρ εὖ φθονήσουσιν εἰπεῖν, — πολὺ μόντοι χρησιμωτέρους εἶναι τῶν λόγων καὶ κρείττους τοὺς ἐπιπλήττοντας τοῖς νῦν ἀμαρτανομένοις ἢ τοὺς τὰ πεπραγμένα πρότερον ἐπαινοῦντας, καὶ τοὺς περὶ ὧν δεῖ πράττειν συμβουλεύοντας ἢ τοὺς τὰ παλαιὰ τῶν ἔργων διεξιόντας ('They will say that these things have been said "in a pleasing manner" — they are not generous enough to say "well" — but that speeches which denounce our current mistakes are much more useful and more powerful than those which eulogize our past deeds, and likewise, those which advise what we must do are better than those which narrate our history.' Transl. Y. L. Too in Mirhady-Too 2000, 217).

¹² *Panath.* 263.

¹³ *Epist.* 1.6; *Phil.* 12-13.

¹⁴ *Rhetoric* 3.1414b30-35; 3.1418a31.

When he cited the *Panegyric*, he put emphasis on the issue highlighted by Aristotle: this speech both belongs to ‘epideictic oratory’ (‘what the Greeks call epideictic’, *quod Graece ἐπιδεικτικὸν nominatur*) and is ‘a piece of advice’ (*suasio*).¹⁵ Quintilian made the same remark, in a more general way, by asserting that Greek panegyrics are epideictic and they are written in the form of advice.¹⁶

This is the first meaning of the word ‘panegyric’: an oration delivered for a festival, following Isocrates’ definition, and taking its content from these circumstances, since the orator speaks about the festival, religion, and politics. Regarding its rhetorical content, such an oration offers pieces of advice based on encomia.

The Panegyric Genre

A second meaning of the word developed, in the phrase ‘panegyric genre’ (and other similar expressions), to refer to all orations that engaged in praise and blame. The first known attestation is in Philodemus’ *Rhetoric* (ca 70-40 BC), where he speaks of the ‘panegyric part’ (πανηγυρικὸν μέρος) of rhetoric, in contrast to the ‘political’ (πολιτικὸν) and ‘judicial’ (δικανικὸν) part.¹⁷ This three-way split is based on a system that had existed since Aristotle, who had divided rhetoric into three genres, called deliberative, judicial, and epideictic respectively.¹⁸ ‘Panegyric’ therefore became synonymous with ‘epideictic’ to refer to the rhetorical category of encomium and blame. This passage of Philodemus relates to the quarrels of his time that took place in the Epicurean school; and other sections of the *Rhetoric* from the same author use the word ‘panegyric’ in the same sense.¹⁹ It is therefore clear that the word ‘panegyric’, utilized as a synonym for ‘epideictic’, was already in use as far back as first century BC.

There were various problems linked to the definition and name of the third Aristotelian rhetorical genre. This is why it had been deemed necessary to replace the word ‘epideictic’ either by ‘laudative’ (ἐγκωμιαστικός, *laudativus*) or, as we have noted, by ‘panegyric’. This new use of the word ‘panegyric’ entailed a double shift (semantically) in comparison to the Isocratic meaning. On the one hand, encomium, which was part of the Isocratic panegyric, took up, from now on, the whole notion of ‘panegyric’. On the other hand, this very notion was no longer linked to the πανηγύρεις per se, that is to the Panhellenic religious festivals,

¹⁵ Cic. *Or.* 37. The *Panegyric* is also linked to advice by Ps.-Plut. *Vit. X. Or. (Isoc.)* 836f. Sophistic panegyric orations aim to ‘exhort’ (παρακαλεῖν) according to Plut. *Tim.* 37.4.

¹⁶ Quint. *Inst.* 3.4.14: *An quisquam negauerit panegyricos ἐπιδεικτικούς esse? Atqui formam suadendi habent et plerumque de utilitatibus Graeciae locuntur* (‘Can anyone deny that “panegyrics” are epideictic? Yet they have the form of advice, and often discuss the interests of Greece’ trans. Russell 2001, 35).

¹⁷ Philod. *Rhet.* Vol. 1, p. 92-93 Sudhaus.

¹⁸ Arist. *Rhet.* 1.3.

¹⁹ Vol. 1, p. 285; 2, p.235, 251, etc. See a detailed analysis of extracts of Philodemus in Ziegler 1949, 560-561.

but applied to all contexts where an orator might need to deliver an encomium or a speech of blame. At this point, then, we witness a broadening of the notion of ‘panegyric’.

After Philodemus, usage of the word ‘panegyric’ to refer to the third genre by many writers can be found throughout the Imperial and Byzantine period.²⁰ It is enough to point out a text from the *Preliminary Exercises* of Nikolaos of Myra which shows that this usage of the word was part of school instruction (since we are dealing with *progymnasmata*) in the fifth century AD.²¹

As an extension to the usage, theorists of rhetoric also mention a ‘panegyric style’, meaning a style showing distinctive (or perceived to be distinctive) features of the panegyric or epideictic genre. Dionysius of Halicarnassus and Philostratus allude to a ‘panegyric harmony’, that is to a style entailing grace, variety, and gentleness.²²

The prior meaning of the word had not been forgotten, to the point where both meanings coexisted. For instance, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, in the same treatise, speaks of Lysias’ ‘panegyric oration’ (πανηγυρικὸς λόγος) as an oration that gives political advice (which corresponds to the first meaning), and presents the panegyric genre as an alternative designation for the epideictic genre (τὸ καλούμενον ἐπιδεικτικὸν ἢ πανηγυρικόν) (which corresponds to the second meaning).²³

At this stage of our investigation, there are two definitions within rhetoric of the word ‘panegyric’. These two meanings are not opposites: but neither do they coincide.

An Extension of meaning in Hermogenes

The change in meaning of the word ‘panegyric’ was not yet complete. One further example has to be considered: it is an exceptional one, but it cannot be left out, since it appears in the works of Hermogenes, the great author of rhetoric treatises in the second or third century AD.

At the end of the treatise *On Forms of Speech* (2.10-12), Hermogenes distinguishes what he calls political and panegyric discourse. ‘Political discourse’ (πολιτικὸς λόγος) means deliberative and judicial rhetoric which is modelled after Demosthenes. Through deduction, we would expect ‘panegyric discourse’ (πανηγυρικὸς λόγος) to refer to encomia, as in the three-way split mentioned above. Far from it, however, since the panegyric discourse as defined by Hermogenes is much more original. It is twofold.

On the one hand, the ‘political panegyric’ discourse (πολιτικὸς πανηγυρικὸς) is a very limited sub-genre, which corresponds to certain types — indeed a minority — of debating orations.²⁴ On the other hand, ‘pure and simple panegyric discourse’, ‘panegyric discourse in itself’ (αὐτὸ τοῦτο πανηγυρικὸς) embraces many types of literature, even outside

²⁰ See the references collected in Pernot 1993, 1.38, 117, 129; 2.507.

²¹ Nicol. *Prog.*, p. 3 Felten.

²² Dion. Hal. *Dem.* 45.2; see also *De comp. verb.* 22.35, 23.23 on different aspects of the panegyric style. Philostr. *V.S.* 1.5 (486); see also 2.16 (597), 2.26 (613).

²³ Dion. Hal. *Lys.* 29.1 and 16.3 respectively.

²⁴ Hermog. *Id.* 2.10.22 (386-387), 2.10.27-28 (388-389): for instance, a debate between the Athenians and the Spartans about the first place in a procession (προπομπεία) after the Persian wars.

oratory.²⁵ It covers all literary forms that do not involve any rhetorical argument or intention to persuade and debate, such as history, philosophy and all forms of poetry. It is characterized especially by grandeur, gentleness, decorations, narrative aspects, and presenting characters. Its models are Plato and Homer.²⁶ Conversely, the panegyric orations by Lysias and Isocrates, despite their titles, are ‘moderately’ (μετρίως) panegyric according to Hermogenes’ system.²⁷

Hermogenes’ aim was to create a very wide category, which in effect corresponds to what we would call literature, contrary to agonistic rhetoric. Before Hermogenes, some theorists were already moving in that direction, such as Cicero in the *Orator* (62-68) or Fronto at the beginning of *De eloquentia*. What is of interest to us in the case of Hermogenes, is that to refer to literature as a whole, he chose to use the word πανηγυρικός.

The word ‘epideictic’ has sometimes also been used in a very broad sense, to refer to any form of writing not intended to win an argument in a specific institutional context.²⁸ If the meaning of the word ‘epideictic’ drifted, then the word ‘panegyric’, insofar as it was synonymous with ‘epideictic’ (cf. the second meaning outlined above), also drifted as it was defined by Hermogenes. But this attempt was isolated and received little or no reaction in ancient rhetorical theory as far as we know. Ziegler, in the *RE* article, gives it too much importance.

Some Connotations outside Rhetoric

It should be remembered that the word ‘panegyric’ is not only a technical term in rhetoric — it has a broader meaning. Out of the approximate eight hundred attestations of πανηγυρικός that I have reviewed in the *Thesaurus linguae Graecae*, more than half are unrelated to rhetoric. Usages outside rhetoric enable us to specify connotations of the term.

The most striking feature is ambivalence. The word πανηγυρικός can carry good or bad associations. In the positive side, it reminds us of religion, festivals, joy, peace and security — but also of luxury, pomp and ceremony. Plutarch exemplifies this shift from the positive connotation to its negative connotation, when the word evokes ostentation, display, misguided guise. For instance, Plutarch often uses the adjective ‘panegyric’ to convey a hint of reproach or reservation and may be applied to popular entertainment, way of life (pacific and not prepared to war), or even to a vain woman.²⁹

²⁵ *Ibid.* 2.10.21 (386).

²⁶ *Ibid.* 2.10.21-52 (386-395), 2.12 (403-413).

²⁷ *Ibid.* 2.12.16 (407-408).

²⁸ Pernot 1993, 1.39-41.

²⁹ Plut. *Per.* 11.4 (‘some sort of a pageant in the town for the masses, or a feast, or a procession’, ἀεὶ μὲν τινα θεῶν πανηγυρικὴν ἢ ἐστίασιν ἢ πομπήν); *Marc.* 14.15 (‘he spent the greater part of his life in freedom from war and amid the festal rites of peace’, τοῦ βίου τὸ πλεῖστον ἀπόλεμον καὶ πανηγυρικὸν βίωσας); *Luc.* 6.4 (‘a woman so forward and ostentatious’, γυναικὶ σοβαρᾶ καὶ πανηγυρικῆ), respectively.

The So-called ‘Panegyrics’ in the Imperial Period

Turning back to rhetoric, the time has come to focus on speeches called ‘panegyrics’.³⁰ Until now we have only encountered the speech of Isocrates. Speeches with this title split into two groups: those that are related to festivals, and those that are related to the encomium of a monarch. The two groups overlap, since a speech may be delivered at a festival and praise a monarch at the same time.

The festivals could be either *πανηγύρεις* in the narrow sense, that is big Panhellenic gatherings in honour of national gods of Greece, or more generally any kind of festival involving a huge crowd. The examples include two orations delivered by Aelius Aristides in the second century during the festival of the Hadriana Olympia and at the inauguration of the Pergamon aqueduct (there remains only a fragment of the second) and an oration delivered by Eusebius to inaugurate a church in Tyre around AD 315.³¹ The last speech marks a very important stage: the Christianisation of the panegyric.³² For an oration related to a church, Eusebius borrowed, seamlessly and in full continuity, the term which was used for orations related to temples in a pagan context. One can observe a similar appropriation of the term in the phrase *πανηγυρικὰ γράμματα*, which relates to ‘festal’ letters, in the Christian sense, that is letters sent by the archbishop of Alexandria to fix the date for Easter feast, since the date varies from one year to another.³³

Parallel to these preserved orations, the handbooks by Ps.-Dionysius of Halicarnassus and Menander Rhetor set down the rules of the panegyric oration in the third century AD.³⁴ It is noteworthy that these two theorists, who were specialists in the epideictic genre, refrain from using ‘panegyric’ in its broad sense, as a synonym of ‘epideictic’, and reserve the word for the strict sense of an oration delivered during a festival.³⁵ They adopt the Isocratic meaning, never the Philodemian or the Hermogenian one. They were evidently aware of possible confusion and wanted to avoid it.

There were also specific titles referring to a particular kind of *πανήγυρις*: the *Olympic* oration of Dio Chrysostom (*Or.* 12), the *Panathenaic* and *Isthmic* orations of Aelius Aristides (*Or.* 1 and 46), the *Sminthiac* oration in Menander Rhetor (2.437-446), and some other orations that we only know of through a reference in works by Philostratus or in the *Suda*,

³⁰ The question of the origin of the titles is difficult. To try to determine whether they are due to the author or to a subsequent editor, each title should be examined individually, which goes beyond the limits of this paper. Probably, in many cases, it is impossible to reach certainty.

³¹ Aristid. *Or.* 27: *Panegyric in Cyzicus about the Temple* (in a passage of the *Sacred Tales* in relation to this oration [*Or.* 51.16], Aristides calls the festival in question a *πανήγυρις*); *Or.* 53: *Panegyric on the Water in Pergamum*; Eus. *Hist. Eccl.* 10.4: *Panegyric on the Building of Churches*.

³² For which, see Corke-Webster in this volume.

³³ See Roques in Garzya-Roques 2000, 109.

³⁴ Ps.-D. Hal. *Rhet.* 1; Men. Rh. I.365-367. For which, see the Introduction.

³⁵ This is true of chapters 1-7 of Ps.-Dionysus of Halicarnassus’ *Rhetorica*, which bear on epideictic speeches, not of the other chapters, which deal with other subjects and are by different authors.

and which had the titles, it seems, Ὀλυμπικός, Παναθηναϊκός, Πανελλήνιος, or Ἐλευσινιακός.³⁶

It is clear that the sophists of the Second Sophistic were immensely active in this field. Such an activity was a resurgence of the First Sophistic and the new sophists were following in the footsteps of Gorgias, Lysias, and Isocrates. But if we look at the content of these orations more carefully, we notice that the rhetorical definition of the panegyric has changed between Classical Greece and the Imperial period. In the Imperial period, advice on the affairs of Greece was not excluded, but it was no longer the definition of the speech. The outline looked like a succession of juxtaposed encomia: the orators praised the city-state hosting the festival, the monument around which the festivities took place, the festival itself, the god in whose honour the ceremony was performed, and the person who had the appropriate authority, for instance the emperor, or in Eusebius' case, the bishop. Thus, the Greek panegyric oration of the Imperial period was both a ceremonial oration and an oration of praise.³⁷ This principal, almost unique, role conferred to the rhetoric of praise corresponds to changes that the rhetoric of praise underwent generally, for several reasons, in the Greek world of that time.

Among juxtaposed encomia, praise of emperors and of powerful figures had a particular weight. Which leads us to the second group of orations, those called 'panegyric' in relation to the praise of a monarch. The first example is a lost speech, entitled *Panegyric on the Emperor Hadrian*, cited by the *Suda* in the list of the works of Sarapion of Alexandria, an orator and theorist of rhetoric.³⁸ The second example, which is preserved, is the *Panegyric in honour of the Emperor Anastasius*, an oration given by Procopius of Gaza around 500 AD when a statue or portrait of Anastasius was brought to the city; this text praises the emperor, by reviewing his actions step-by-step.

A methodological problem has to be mentioned here. It is not uncommon for orations to be referred to retrospectively as πανηγυρικοί in a later source. When the oration itself is lost and what we only have is an external indication, it is impossible to verify the accuracy of the reference.³⁹ When the oration is preserved and can be verified, one realizes that often the actual title is different. Such is the case of the speech addressed by Gregory Thaumaturgus to his teacher Origen in 238 AD: Saint Jerome and the *Suda* refer to it as a 'panegyric', using the Greek word πανηγυρικός,⁴⁰ while in the manuscripts this speech is entitled Προσφωνητικός ('address, allocution'), a title which is perfectly justified. Similarly, a commentator on Hermogenes and the *Suda* both mention πανηγυρικοί by Gregory of Nazianzus,⁴¹ while none of Gregory's orations bears this title. Photius speaks about

³⁶ Philostr. *V.S.* 2.24 (607); *Suda* Π 1951, Φ 422-423.

³⁷ Except for Dio Chrysostom, who in the *Olympic* oration transforms the expected rhetorical speech into a philosophical lesson.

³⁸ *Suda* Σ 115.

³⁹ For instance, the *Suda* cites πανηγυρικοί by Genethlius (Γ 132), Metrophanes (Μ 1010), Palladius (Π 35), Philostratus (Π 422).

⁴⁰ Jerome *Vir. ill.* 65; *Suda* Γ 452.

⁴¹ *Rhet. Gr.* 6.45 Walz; *Suda* Γ 450.

πανηγυρικοί by Choricus,⁴² the *Suda* speaks about πανηγυρικοί by Synesius,⁴³ while none of the known orations by Choricus or Synesius has such a title.

It is clear that πανηγυρικός was used in the sense of ‘epideictic oration’, in accordance with the broader sense defined above, and applied to speeches that were not entitled in this way. This is why we should try to leave out doubtful and unverifiable cases and keep, as best possible, to reliable attestations.

On this basis, we can come to a meaningful conclusion regarding the use of the Greek word πανηγυρικός to refer to the encomium of a monarch or of a great figure. This usage is rare. Besides the few attested cases, what is equally remarkable is absence. There are no orations entitled ‘panegyric’ in the manuscript tradition of the corpus of the great Greek orators of Late Antiquity: Libanius, Julian, Himerius, Themistius, Synesius, Choricus, Basil, Gregory of Nazianzus, and John Chrysostom. These writers composed encomia for emperors, martyrs, bishops, parents, etc., but they did not give them the title ‘panegyric’. The titles they used were ‘in honour of’ (with the preposition εις + accusative), ‘praise’ (ἐγκώμιον), and more precise terms such as βασιλικός, ἐπιθαλάμιος, ἐπιτάφιος, μονωδία, πρεσβευτικός, προσφωνητικός, ὑπατικός, χαριστήριος, or πενταετηρικός, δεκετηρικός, and τριετηρικός.

The example of oration 15 of Gregory of Nazianzus is very clear. He writes a praise of the Maccabees. This oration is delivered, or is supposed to be delivered, during a feast in honour of these martyrs. The feast is called πανήγυρις in the oration itself (section 1: ἡ παροῦσα πανήγυρις). And yet the oration is not entitled ‘panegyric’. The title it bears is Εἰς τοὺς Μακκαβαίους, ‘In honour of the Maccabees’, which corresponds with its content.

This situation did not come about by chance. It shows reserve and cautiousness from the Greek orators of Late Antiquity with regard to the word πανηγυρικός. Probably, this word was seen as broad and generic. It did not give enough precision as far as the context of a specific oration was concerned. It could create confusion with the meaning ‘oration delivered in a πανήγυρις and with the aim of celebrating a ceremony’. Consequently the word πανηγυρικός was used to show in which category an oration was classified (as one could also use ἐπιδεικτικός in the same sense), but it was used rarely to give a title to a specific oration.

It is the Latin side, not the Greek side — paradoxically — which proves to be richer and offers a series of occurrences in which the Latin word *panegyricus* refers to praise of a monarch or a powerful figure. A *Panegyric of Messalla* (*Panegyricus Messallae*), by an unknown author, appears in the Tibullian corpus (3.7). Messalla’s assumption of the consulship of the year 31 BC seems to explain why the poem of congratulations was composed, either on this date, or later.⁴⁴ The content consists of the encomium of Messalla. This instance may be the first usage of *panegyricus* referring to encomium addressed to a great figure. Another distinctive feature is that this encomium is written in verse: poetry makes its first appearance in our collection. The question that needs to be asked is whether or not the title *Panegyricus Messallae* is authentic. This was given, it appears, by the precious manuscript called ‘Cujas’ Fragment’ (*Fragmentum Cuiacianum*), but this manuscript was lost

⁴² *Bibl.* 160.102b38.

⁴³ Σ 1511.

⁴⁴ Fulkerson 2017, 38.

and its readings are known through Scaliger's report.⁴⁵ The preserved manuscripts bear the title *Laudes Messalae*.

The next example is an encomium for Augustus cited in the scholia to Horace as 'Panegyric of Augustus' (*Panegyricus Augusti*) and credited (in certain parts of the scholia) to the poet L. Varius Rufus.⁴⁶ The word *panegyricus* is used in regard to this poem by the scholiast Porphyrio. However, the turn of phrase used by Porphyrio gives the impression that the title *panegyricus* comes from the scholiast rather than being the original title of the book. Horace himself, in the section in question, uses *laudes*,⁴⁷ which is also the word used elsewhere for similar compositions, like the preserved anonymous *Laus Pisonis* or the lost *Laudes Neronis* by Lucan. A passage of Fronto reads 'Extracts from a panegyric for Vologaesius' (*excerpta ex panegurico Vologaesii*), but the context is not clear.⁴⁸

The *Historia Augusta* gives two anecdotes with parallel meaning. In both cases, it is said that the emperors (Pescennius Niger and Severus Alexander) did not like 'panegyrics' (*panegyricum, panegyricos*) in their honour and preferred orations and poems in honour of great figures of the past.⁴⁹ It is not indicated whether the compositions in question (if they existed) actually bore the title *panegyricus*. The interest of these extracts is to attest to the use of the word *panegyricus*, with the specialized meaning of encomium (in prose or in verse) addressed to the emperor, at the date when these sections of the *Historia Augusta* were written. The negative connotation should also be noted here, according to which the 'panegyric' is a false and misleading oration that should be rejected.⁵⁰ In this sense, there is an opposition, in the second anecdote, between *panegyrici* (that are bad) and *laudes* (that are good).

Preserved Latin works entitled 'panegyric' also include Optatian's 'Panegyric for Constantine' (*Panegyricus Constantino Augusto dictus*), which is a collection of poems, then the *Latin Panegyrics* (*Panegyrici Latini*) in prose and Claudian's panegyrics in verse. As for Claudian, there are doubts about the titles in the manuscript tradition, the word *panegyricus* being written sometimes by a second hand in the manuscripts; but, in certain cases, it seems to be the original reading. The list goes on with the 'Panegyrics' (*Panegyrici*) of Sidonius Apollinaris in the fifth century, which are poems in honour of great figures of his time, among them Emperor Avitus, and Ennodius' 'Panegyric for Theodoric' (*Panegyricus dictus clementissimo regi Theoderico*), which is written in prose.

Thus, for Late Latin Antiquity, the references are numerous, in verse and in prose. Nevertheless, we notice here, as we did earlier, a tendency to apply the term 'panegyric' to speeches that originally did not bear this title. The Moderns frequently talk about

⁴⁵ See Dixon 2006, 60 note 94.

⁴⁶ Schol. Horat. *Ep.* 1.16.27.

⁴⁷ Horat. *Ep.* 1.16.29 : *Augusti laudes adgnoscerere possis*.

⁴⁸ Fronto. *Princ. hist.* 8, ed. Van den Hout² p. 207.

⁴⁹ *SHA: Pesc. Nig.* 11.5; *Alex. Sev.* 35.1.

⁵⁰ For other doubts concerning the veracity of 'panegyric' in the sense of encomium of a sovereign, see Socr. *Hist. eccl.* 1.1.7; Lact. *Div. Inst.* 1.15.13. Latin authors occasionally use the word *panegyricus* pejoratively with an anti-Greek connotations: see Rees 2010.

‘panegyrics’ of Symmachus whereas these orations are entitled *Laudatio*. Panegyric has become an all-pervasive term.

Conclusion

The number of the speeches that were called ‘panegyric’ by their author is lower than one might think. A methodical study needs to be conducted, in order to make a distinction between titles attested in the manuscript tradition, the designations of the contemporaries, and the designations of the Moderns.

The word ‘panegyric’ is not a mere synonym of ‘encomium’ or βασιλικὸς λόγος, nor a label or an all-purpose word. ‘Panegyric’, in Antiquity, was a word full of meaning, which kept something of its etymology and its history. On the one hand it referred to the πανήγυρις, that is to the community gathering for an event, generally a joyful one, which had a religious dimension. On the other, it referred to advice (blended with encomium), and even to philosophy (like in works by Isocrates and Hermogenes). That is why panegyrics in honour of emperors had a ‘mirror for princes’ element and contained opinions submitted to a monarch by the community’s spokesperson. Taken in such a manner, the panegyric was a consensus builder. It served to maintain social order and might seem conventional and encouraging unanimity.

To counter slightly this conventional definition of panegyric, one should add that the panegyrics sometimes conceal implicit criticism. Underlying the display of the most enthusiastic approval, they contain or can contain reservation and distorted messages, particularly in the field of politics. It is important to read ancient laudatory speeches bearing in mind the possibility that the orators could mean more than they say.⁵¹ Much work has already been done in this field, and this endeavour is worth pursuing, even though extreme precaution has to be taken, because it can result in a new or a renewed vision. It can help bring to light coded messages, clearly defined positions, and disguised criticisms, under the seemingly approving tone of the ‘panegyrics’.

Bibliography

- Dixon H. (2006) ‘The Discovery and Disappearance of the *Fragmentum Cuiacianum* of Tibullus’, *Revue d’histoire des textes* 1: 37-72.
- Fornaro S., J. Dingel, A. Berger (2000) ‘Panegyrik’, *Der Neue Pauly* 9: 240-45.
- Fredouille J.-C., M.-O. Goulet-Cazé, P. Hoffmann, P. Petitmengin (eds.) (1997) *Titres et articulations du texte dans les œuvres antiques*. Turnhout.
- Fulkerson L. (2017) *A Literary Commentary on the Elegies of the Appendix Tibulliana*. Oxford.
- Garzya A. and D. Roques (2000) *Synésios de Cyrène II: Correspondance. Lettres I-LXIII*. Paris.

⁵¹ Pernot 2015, 102-111.

- Hadot P. (1989) 'Préface', in R. Goulet (ed.), *Dictionnaire des philosophes antiques I*. Paris. 7-16.
- Hostein A. (2012) *La cité et l'empereur: Les Éduens dans l'Empire romain d'après les Panégyriques latins*. Paris.
- Jansen, L. (ed.) (2014) *The Roman Paratext: Frame, Text, Readers*. Cambridge.
- Laudani C. (2014) *Nazario: Panegirico in onore di Costantino*. Bari.
- Mause M. (2003) 'Panegyrik', *Historisches Wörterbuch der Rhetorik* 6: 495-502.
- Mirhady D. and Y. L. Too (2010) *Isocrates I*. Austin.
- Papillon T. L. (2007) 'Isocrates', in I. Worthington (ed.), *A Companion to Greek Rhetoric*. Chichester. 58-74.
- Pernot L. (1993) *La rhétorique de l'éloge dans le monde gréco-romain*. Paris.
- Pernot L. (2015) *Epideictic Rhetoric: Questioning the Stakes of Ancient Praise*. Austin.
- Rees R. (2010) 'Words of Praise in Roman Politics', *Millenium* 7: 9-28.
- Russell D. A. (2001) *Quintilian: The Orator's Education, Books 3-5*. Cambridge, MA.
- Rees R. (2012) 'The Modern History of Latin Panegyric', in R. Rees (ed.), *Latin Panegyric*. Oxford, 3-48.
- Ziegler K. (1949) 'Panegyrikos', *Realencyclopädie* 18: 559-581.

(NOT) MAKING FACES: *PROSOPOPEIA* IN LATE ANTIQUE PANEGYRIC

Roger Rees¹⁰³

Among the various texts and treatises from classical antiquity to grant us insights into epideictic rhetorical education, the *Basilikos Logos* of Menander Rhetor holds a unique position. Dated to the late third century, this short but complete Greek text is the only extant, systematic account of what to say in a speech of praise to the emperor.¹⁰⁴ Menander began by recommending the orator confess his own rhetorical inadequacy to articulate the emperor's full worth; he then proposed a sequence of topics for inclusion in the speech, namely the emperor's home country, birth, upbringing, accomplishments and actions. Actions were to be divided under the headings of courage, justice, temperance and wisdom, across times of war and peace. The orator should then compare the emperor with his predecessor before concluding by noting the universal prosperity the emperor brings. Despite questions about important matters such as its provenance, original distribution and longevity, the *Basilikos Logos* is highly valued. Each of the Greek orators Julian, Libanius and Themistius, for example, spoke of a contemporary rhetorical standard against which they set their own speeches, and although they do not name Menander, his *Basilikos Logos* constitutes a plausible and convenient model for that standard.¹⁰⁵ And so, in many influential studies over the past century and more, the contours of surviving late antique panegyrics, in Greek and Latin, prose and verse, have been mapped against Menander's recommendations: there is a certain methodological *force majeure* at work here, since most surviving late antique panegyric dates to the 'long fourth' century and we have almost nothing from the third, but some of these comparative studies have sought to identify direct influence on later texts by Menander, others more circumspectly to better differentiate between formulaic and innovative composition in panegyric.¹⁰⁶ The *Basilikos Logos* is a conventional reference point.

The starting-point for this chapter's analysis of 'in-character speech' in late antique panegyric is Menander's discussion of the figure. The term generally used for 'in-character speech' in modern discussions is *prosopopeia*. From the Greek πρόσωπον, ('face' or 'appearance'), it is understood to denote a speech-act given to a character as part of a dramatization of a narrative; in particular, the term is understood to denote an imaginary

¹⁰³ With my thanks to colleagues at the Dublin conference, my St Andrews colleagues Stephen Halliwell and Emma Buckley, and to the editors.

¹⁰⁴ For the date, see Russell and Wilson 1981, xi, xxxix-xl; Heath 2004, 94. For further discussion of Menander, see Murray 2018, 217-21 and Introduction. All translations are my own unless otherwise stated.

¹⁰⁵ Them. *Or.* 1.2a; Jul. *Or.* 1.4c-5c; Lib. *Or.* 59.5. See also Introduction p. 11-14.

¹⁰⁶ For example, see Kehding 1899, 16-28; Mesk 1912; MacCormack 1975, 144-5; Saylor Rodgers 1989; Russell and Wilson 1981, 271-2; Nixon and Saylor Rodgers 1994, 10-14; Dewar 1996, xxv-xxvi; Cameron and Hall 1999, 31-2; Hägg and Rousseau 2000, 11, 23; Heather and Moncur 2001, 6-7, 9-10, 74, 118, 218; Buckland 2010, 94, 294-5; Criore 2013, 113. Cf. the criticisms of the methodology levelled by Vereecke 1975.

speech.¹⁰⁷ In the first section of this chapter, I address Menander’s recommendation both in its own right and in relation to the evidence of two rhetoricians, one Latin, one Greek, namely Quintilian (c.35-c.100CE) and Libanius (314-393) respectively. In the second section, I turn to the Greek and Latin panegyrics of the ‘long’ fourth century; in particular here, I want to bear in mind two statements made in a milestone article written by Donald Russell in 1998, ‘The Panegyrists and Their Teachers’. The first is his characterisation of *prosopopoeia* as ‘very much a poetical device’; the second is ‘There are many examples of [*prosopopoeia*] in our texts’, which Russell illustrates with reference to two passages in Drepanius Pacatus (*Pan. Lat.* II[12].11, 40), one in Themistius (*Or.* 19. 226) and one in Claudius Mamertinus (*Pan. Lat.* III[11].13) (see below).¹⁰⁸ My attempt to canvas all surviving panegyric from the period seeks to allow consideration of the extent of any correspondence between treatises and practice and between Greek and Latin material; it should also illuminate appreciation of rhetorical-poetic aesthetics and how the Greek compares with the Latin in that respect.

Prosopopoeia in Educational texts

In the course of his discussion of the topic of the emperor’s actions and virtues, Menander said (II.374.6-18):

ἐνταῦθα καιρὸν ἔξεις καὶ ἀνεῖναι κατὰ μέσον τὸν λόγον (καὶ γὰρ τοῦτο παρειλήφαμεν
παρὰ τῶν νεωτέρων καινοτομηθέν) καὶ φωνὴν καθάπερ ἐν δράματι ἢ χώρα ἢ ποταμῷ
περιτιθέναι· ποταμῷ μὲν, ὡς ὁ ποιητής,

ὦ Ἀχιλεῦ, περὶ μὲν κρατέεις, περὶ δ’ αἴσυλα ῥέζεις

χώρα δὲ ὁμοίως, ὅταν εἴπωμεν ἐκείνην καταμέμφεσθαι τὴν θρασύτητα τὴν τῶν
τολμησάντων ἀντιστήναι, καὶ ὅτι ἐστενοχωρεῖτο τοῖς τῶν πεσόντων σώμασιν· οἷον
κάμοι δοκεῖν, εἰ ποιητικὸς ἦν ὁ Ἴστρος, ὥσπερ ὁ ποταμὸς ἐκεῖνος ὁ ποιητικὸς
Σκάμανδρος, εἶπεν ἄν,

ἐξ ἐμέθεν γ’ ἐλάσας πεδίον κάτα μέρμερα ῥέζε.
πλήθει γὰρ δὴ μοι νεκύων ἐρατεινὰ ῥέεθρα,
οὐδέ τί πη δύναμαι προχέειν ῥόον

¹⁰⁷ *Prosopopoeia* may seem a specific component of *ethopoeia* (‘[literary] character formation’) but in practice the words *prosopopoeia* and *ethopoeia* seem to be synonymous in some ancient discussions: for example, Demetrius *Peri Ermeneias* 461-3 and Theon (*Prog.* 10) use *prosopopoeia*, but Libanius (see below), Athonius (*Prog.* 11), and Nicolaos (*Prog.* 11) use *ethopoeia*, effectively to denote the same — or very similar — practice (Lausberg 1998, §820, 822, 826-9, 1131-2; Buckland 2010, 22). For a critique of the ‘compendium tradition’ of rhetorical naming and categorizing, see Paxson 1994, 8-12.

¹⁰⁸ Russell 1998, 31.

You will also have an opportunity here to relax in the middle of the speech — this is an innovation we have learned from recent exponents — and give a voice to a country or a river, as if in a play. The poet makes a river speak as follows:

‘O Achilles, you are supreme in power and supreme in your evil-doing’.

Similarly with a country: we can say that it blames the audacity of those who have dared to resist, and was crowded with the bodies of the fallen.

If the Ister had been poetical, like the poetical Scamander, it might have said, it seems to me,

‘Drive them from me and work your grim deeds on the plain. My lovely streams are full of corpses, nor is there any way I can pour my waters forth’.¹⁰⁹

The rather jumpy effect of the switch from second person (‘you’) to the first person (‘we’) and the unheralded launch into the exemplary ‘If the Ister ...’ are typical of the treatise. The poetic precedent Menander quoted is from the *Iliad* (21. 214ff.), when the personified river Scamander accosted Achilles mid-*aristeia*. Recognition that ‘the poet’ is Homer was safely assumed. That river-personifications became canonical in epic poetry is confirmed in, for example, Vergil’s *Aeneid* when the river Tiber addressed Aeneas in a dream-sequence (8. 36ff.).¹¹⁰ The speech of Scamander to Achilles was well-known and often cited.¹¹¹ In this respect, Menander’s example can be said to be conventional, but we should note some curious details of his discussion. First (and of least consequence), Menander did not name the figure *prosopopoeia* or *ethopoeia* (or, in fact, anything), although the terms existed.¹¹² Secondly, he recommended the figure as one of ‘relaxation’. He did not elaborate or specify, but such formality might perhaps be in style or moral / ideological elevation in a speech largely concerned with an emperor’s virtues and actions.¹¹³ By contrast, Laurent Pernot identifies as the specific attraction of *prosopopoeia* for epideictic rhetoric generally (and for consolatory texts in particular), the increased authority it brought to supplement that of the author alone;¹¹⁴ citing panegyric poets from different eras, Pernot notes how both Pindar and Statius, for example, used *prosopopoeia* precisely for that reason.¹¹⁵ Thirdly, Menander said that ‘recent writers’ had innovated in this way. No names are given: Pernot observes that

¹⁰⁹ Trans. Russell and Wilson 1981, adapted.

¹¹⁰ See also e.g. Val. Fl. *Arg.* 4.25-37; Sil. Ital. *Pun.* 8.211-24; Stat. *Theb.* 9.376-98, 421-45; for Claudian, see below.

¹¹¹ Russell and Wilson 1981, 279 and Russell 1998, 31 note that Themistius *Or.* 10. 133b and Symmachus *Or.* 2.26, both dated to 370 and both panegyrics, refer to this Homeric passage. This is, of course, correct, but in neither case is *prosopopoeia* deployed.

¹¹² See n.4.

¹¹³ Russell 1998, 31: ‘it is interesting that the *prosopopoeia* ... is here regarded as offering relief from the high formality of the speech’.

¹¹⁴ 1991, 401.

¹¹⁵ 1991, 401-2.

we do not know who such writers were (the poor survival record of literature from the third century render it difficult to evaluate Menander's claim), and Russell and Wilson note Menander 'indicates by this that no example of a digression of this kind was found in the classical models'.¹¹⁶ Finally, the analogy 'as if in a play' is peculiar¹¹⁷: attribution of 'in-character' speech to a country or river seems not to have been characteristic of drama, and besides in the next sentence Menander introduced Homer, who was neither a recent nor a dramatic author.¹¹⁸ If each of these peculiarities could be attributed to differences in taste or even to rushed or clumsy writing, it is also notable that Menander's discussion of 'in-character speech' was apparently ignorant of the established position it seems to have had in Latin and Greek rhetorical education.

The fullest Latin source for the place and role of *prosopopoeia* in rhetorical education is Quintilian, the professor of rhetoric from the late first century CE, who discussed the figure several times.¹¹⁹ He is a particularly important witness to the expansion of *prosopopoeia* into oratory. In an extended passage, he noted how *prosopopoeia* could vary and animate a speech and that it could serve a variety of different functions, including giving characters to words of advice, reprimand, complaint, praise or pity (*Instit. Orat.* 9.2.30). In terms of its formal instruction, Quintilian observed that *prosopopoeia* was part of school exercises: grammarians (*grammatici*) were tending to teach it, he said, but he felt it should be the preserve of rhetoricians (*rhetores*) (*Instit. Orat.* 2.1.2). He saw *prosopopoeia* as a useful practice in declamation, where there were two types of speech, *suasoriae* and *controversiae*; the former were speeches of advice to historical or mythical characters, urging them to a particular course of conduct, and the latter were speeches for fictitious legal cases.¹²⁰ Quintilian explicitly identified both as *prosopopoeiae* (*Instit. Orat.* 3.8.51-54):

enimvero praecipue declamatoribus considerandum est quid cuique personae conveniat, qui paucissimas controversias ita dicunt ut advocati: plerumque filii patres divites senes asperi lenes avari, denique superstitiosi timidi derisores fiunt, ut vix comoediarum actoribus plures habitus in pronuntiando concipiendi sint quam his in dicendo. quae omnia possunt videri prosopopoeiae, quam ego suasoriis subieci quia nullo alio ab his quam persona distat: quamquam haec aliquando etiam in controversias ducitur quae ex historiis compositae certis agentium nominibus continentur. neque ignoro plerumque exercitationis gratia poni et poeticas et historicas, ut Priami verba apud Achillem aut sullae dictaturam deponentis in contione. sed haec in partem cedent trium generum in quae causas divisimus. nam et rogare, indicare, rationem reddere et alia de quibus supra dictum est varie atque ut res tulit in materia iudiciali deliberativa demonstrativa solemus, frequentissime vero in his utimur ficta personarum quas ipsi substituimus oratione.

¹¹⁶ Pernot 1991, 402 n.364; Russell and Wilson 1981, 278.

¹¹⁷ Cf. 'like in dramas' at 381.

¹¹⁸ Noted by Russell and Wilson 1981, 278.

¹¹⁹ Paxson 1994, 16.

¹²⁰ On surviving declamations, see Russell 1983 and Bernstein 2013.

For declaimers in particular, who deliver very few *controversiae* as if they were advocates, must consider what is fitting for each character. Generally, they become sons, fathers, rich men, old men, severe, lenient, greedy, finally superstitious, timid and mocking men, so that comedy actors can hardly conceive of more roles in their performance than these men in speaking. All these may be seen as part of *prosopopoeia* which I have put under *suasoriae* because it differs from that only in that it involves assuming a character, although this is sometimes even drawn in *controversiae* which are composed from histories and are restricted to the genuine names of persons. And I know that poetic and historical situations are generally set for the sake of practice, such as the words of Priam to Achilles or Sulla's to the people as he resigned his dictatorship. But these will fall into one of the three types into which I have divided causes, for we are accustomed both to ask, to state and to give reasons, and other matters about which we spoke before, variously as the situation demands, in judicial, deliberative and demonstrative subjects — in fact, in these, we very frequently use the fictional orations of characters we ourselves have brought in.

The closing sentence in particular is revealing: it would be difficult to conclude from surviving Latin oratory of the classical period that *prosopopoeia* was 'very frequent'. One famous example is the hostile address by the home-country (*patria*) to Catiline in Cicero's *Catilinarians* (1.18; and at 27 to Cicero himself); Cicero also had Appius Claudius Caecus and Clodius deliver speeches to Clodia in the *Pro Caelio* (33-4; 36).¹²¹ Cicero himself had occasionally and briefly noted the (unnamed) figure in his theoretical and technical works: it was, for example, said to be a useful means of amplification (*Part. Orat.* 55), but was also only suitable for grander rhetorical styles, otherwise to be avoided (*Orator* 85).¹²² There may be some confusion in Quintilian, since his examples suggest he generally conceived of *prosopopoeia* as a preserve of judicial oratory, but nonetheless his observation that the figure was 'very frequent' serves to remind us that the oratory which survives is perhaps not representative of what was written. That said, the alleged frequency of *prosopopoeia* in all three branches of oratory would have been an index of its broad versatility. Quintilian revisited this versatility when he said: 'Finally, not only are there as many variations in *prosopopoeia* as there are in the case, but there are even more than this, because in them we imitate the emotions of children, women, peoples, even voiceless things, to all of whom is owed its own grace'.¹²³ To this versatility, the potential in *prosopopoeia* for emotional intensity may be added: 'the bare facts alone are moving, but when we pretend the people

¹²¹ Austin 1933, 1960³, 90-91. It cannot be coincidental that Quintilian mentions these two men in his discussion of differentiation in character (*Instit. Orat.* 11.1.39; see too 12.10.61 where the references to Cicero are explicit).

¹²² Paxson 1994, 15-18. See also *Top.* 45; *De Orat.* 1.245; 3.205; *Brut.* 322.

¹²³ *denique non modo quot in causa totidem in prosopopoeia sunt varietates, sed hoc etiam plures, quod in his puerorum, feminarum, populorum, mutarum etiam rerum adsimulamus adfectus, quibus omnibus debetur suus decor. Instit. Orat.* 11.1.41.

themselves are speaking, emotion is drawn from their character too'.¹²⁴ In sum, Quintilian's testimony for the place of *prosopopoeia* in Roman rhetorical education explicitly related it to the usefulness of fictional speech (*ficta oratio*) in oratorical practice; according to him, as it was a useful means of developing the sort of flexibility an accomplished orator would need, it was formally taught, sometimes even by a grammarian rather than a rhetorician; it was a useful means to heighten a speech's emotional pitch and had application in all three branches of oratory (forensic, deliberative, and demonstrative).

The equivalent Greek term for the sort of schoolroom exercises Quintilian discusses was *progymnasmata* and various rhetoricians refer to the practice, including Theon, Aphthonius, Nicolaos, and Libanius. Each of Libanius' *progymnasmata* isolated a particular mode: they include narrative, refutation, thesis, encomium and 'in-character speech', which Libanius called *ethopoeia*.¹²⁵ There survive nearly thirty examples of an 'in-character speech' (most of which are considered authentic).¹²⁶ In each case, Libanius set up a scenario in which a speech was required; he then gave such a speech. In exercise 1, for example, it was asked 'What would Medea say when she is about to murder her children?'¹²⁷; in exercise 2, 'What words would Andromache say over the dead Hektor?'¹²⁸; in exercise 5, 'What words would Ajax say when he is about to kill himself?'¹²⁹. The rich traditions of characters such as these were, of course, in verse, but the speeches were in prose, and besides, not all the exercises dramatized a moment from myth; exercise 18, for example, asked 'What would a prostitute say on gaining self-control?'¹³⁰; exercise 19, 'what words would a coward say upon seeing that a picture of war has been painted in his house?'¹³¹ This is clearly quite a different proposition to the elevated origins of *prosopopoeia* in epic poetry, and its adoption into rhetorical exercises is an index of its versatility in various contexts. Such exercises in imaginative personification would develop an orator's inventiveness, to different effect.

From the patchy evidence of the educational texts of Quintilian, Menander Rhetor, and Libanius, it seems, therefore, that thoughts about if, how, and why *prosopopoeia* was to be deployed in epideictic oratory varied. Certain differences between Quintilian and Menander are particularly notable, with the former insisting that *prosopopoeia* was common in contemporary oratory, including epideictic, and the latter observing that *prosopopoeia* in panegyric was a 'recent' innovation. In itself, variance such as this need hardly cause surprise, as the three texts span some four centuries, and both Latin and Greek cultures. If we accept both writers as reliable witnesses to their own contemporary practices, we can begin to identify differences in time and / or between Latin and Greek conventions. In the texts of the 'long fourth century' we have the opportunity to hold the practice of surviving Greek and

¹²⁴ *nudae tantum res movent: at cum ipsos loqui fingimus, ex personis quoque trahitur adfectus. Instit. Orat. 6.1.25.*

¹²⁵ *Progymnasmata* 11; Gibson 2014.

¹²⁶ Gibson 2008.

¹²⁷ Τίνας ἂν εἴποι λόγους Μήδεια μέλλουσα ἀποσφάττειν τοὺς ἑαυτῆς παῖδας;

¹²⁸ Τίνας ἂν εἴποι λόγους Ἀνδρομάχη ἐπὶ Ἑκτορι;

¹²⁹ Τίνας ἂν εἴποι λόγους Αἴας μέλλων ἑαυτὸν ἀποσφάττειν;

¹³⁰ Τίνας ἂν εἴποι λόγους πόρνη σωφρονήσασα;

¹³¹ Τίνας ἂν εἴποι λόγους δειλὸς θεασάμενος πόλεμον ἐν τῇ ἰδίᾳ οἰκίᾳ γεγραμμένον;

Latin panegyrics against the different recommendations of educational texts, and to consider how they fare against them, and against each other.

***Prosopopoeia* in Greek prose panegyric of the ‘long fourth century’**

As was mentioned above, it is not known who Menander’s ‘recent’ writers were, and we have to turn to the fourth century for surviving Greek texts. There are many such, but the panegyric works of Eusebius, Libanius, Himerius, Themistius and Julian yield very little in the way of *prosopopoeia*. The three panegyrics (*Or.* 1-3) by Julian feature none; nor does Himerius’ speech in praise of Constantinople and Julian (*Or.* 41). In a speech of 1 January 363, delivered at Antioch, Libanius broke his narrative of Julian’s rise to imperial power in 361 to record how the gods addressed him at the moment of his imminent battle with Constantius II: ‘If you shrink from striking, take strength: this will be our concern’.¹³² In 368, Themistius attributed a sentence to the Persian king Artaxerxes, as a parallel to the virtuous government of Valens: ‘I shall be none the poorer, but to entrust office to a bad man would be quite unjust’.¹³³ Similarly, in a speech of 384, Themistius ‘quoted’ the oracle of Lycurgus on the preference of good over evil (*Or.* 19.225ff.). Although neither text was a panegyric proper, *prosopopoeia* also featured in what might be termed a panegyric mode in two further fourth century Greek texts. In both, the author had the emperor himself speak. The first is in the *Life of Constantine* by Eusebius which Averil Cameron and Stuart Hall characterise as a ‘literary hybrid’.¹³⁴ Eusebius frequently quoted documentary material at length, but at one point he introduced the text of a letter addressed by Constantine to the citizens of the Eastern empire with the suggestion that the quotation summons the emperor: ‘This document too, which bears his autograph but is translated from the Latin, is highly relevant to quote in our present study, so that we may feel we are listening to the voice of the emperor himself’.¹³⁵ Eusebius then quoted the letter (2.47). The second text is Libanius’ funeral oration for Julian — again, not a panegyric, but in a straightforwardly panegyric vein. Libanius imagined what Julian himself would say if brought back to life to attend his own funerary proceedings (*Or.* 18.296-7):

καί μοι δοκεῖ κἄν δεῦρο εἰσελθόν, εἴπερ ἐνήν, τοιούτοις ἂν πρὸς ἡμᾶς χρήσασθαι λόγοις, ὅτι τὴν ἐμὴν ὑμεῖς ὀδυρόμενοι πληγὴν καὶ τὸν ἐν τῇ νεότητι θάνατον, εἰ μὲν τὸ συνεῖναι θεοῖς χεῖρον ἡγεῖσθε τοῦ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, οὐκ εὖ φρονεῖτε. εἰ δ’ οὐκ οἶσθέ μοι ταύτης μεταδεδοῖσθαι τῆς χώρας, πᾶν τοῦμὸν ἀγνοεῖτε καὶ πρᾶγμα πεπόνθατε ἀτοπώτατον τοῦτον ἤκιστα εἰδότες ὃν σφόδρα εἰδέναι πέπεισθε. ἔτι τοίνυν μηδὲ τὸ ἐν

¹³² εἰ δὲ ὀκνεῖς, φησί, τὸν φόνον, θάρρει. καὶ τοῦτο ἡμῖν μελήσει. *Or.* 12.68 (trans. Norman)

¹³³ ‘Οὐκ ἔσομαι, ἔφη, πενέστερος, κακῶ δὲ ἀρχὴν ἐπιτρέψας ἀδικώτερος. *Or.* 8.117/176, trans. Heather and Matthews.

¹³⁴ 1999, 27.

¹³⁵ καὶ ταύτην δὲ τὴν γραφὴν, αὐτόγραφον οὖσαν αὐτοῦ μεταληφθεῖσαν δ’ ἐκ τῆς Ῥωμαίων φωνῆς, ἀπολαβεῖν ἀναγκαῖον τῷ παρόντι λόγῳ, ὡς ἂν δοκοῖμεν αὐτοῦ βασιλέως ἐπακούειν. Euseb. *VC.* 2.47.2. Trans. Cameron and Hall 1999.

πολέμῳ καὶ διὰ σιδήρου δεινὸν ὑμῖν δοκεῖτω. οὕτως ἀπῆλθε Λεωνίδας, οὕτως Ἐπαμινώνδας, οὕτω Σαρπηδών, οὕτω Μέμνων, οἱ τῶν θεῶν. εἰ δ' ὁ χρόνος τῆ βραχύτητι λυπεῖ, φερέτω παραμυθίαν ὑμῖν Ἀλέξανδρος ὁ Διός.

And I think that if it were possible and he came here, he would use words such as these to us: ‘You bewail the blow that struck me, and my youthful death, but if you consider it worse to be among gods than among men, you do not think right. And if you think a share of that space has not been made for me, you don’t know me at all and you suffer this most extraordinary situation — that you know least of all the one whom you trusted you knew most. And what’s more, don’t think it terrible that this happened in war and by the sword; so departed Leonidas, so Epaminondas, so Sarpedon and Memnon, the sons of gods. And if the brevity of my time causes you grief, let Alexander son of Zeus bring you consolation’.

It is notable that Libanius, whose use of ‘in-character speech’ as part of school exercises we have seen, provided two instances of *prosopopoeia* in his panegyric works. However, in overall number, this is a small return in relation to Menander’s recommendation of the figure. However, some of these examples, such as Libanius’ use of the gods’ voice to justify Julian’s intention to engage Constantius in battle, or his and Eusebius’ use of an emperor’s authoritative voice constituted enterprising variations of the figure. Further, in the light of Menander’s identification of the poetic origins of *prosopopoeia*, it is notable that although Libanius, Julian, and Themistius frequently studded their speeches with echoes of the Homeric texts in particular, they did not quote or adapt his *prosopopoeiae*; that is not to deny that these examples have any poetic resonance, but that is not their most conspicuous feature.¹³⁶ In sum, in quantity, form and function, the figure of *prosopopoeia* in fourth century Greek prose panegyrics suggests a marked discontinuity from third century practice as reported by Menander.

***Prosopopoeia* in Latin prose panegyric of the ‘long fourth century’**

The surviving panegyric texts are the eleven late antique speeches from the *XII Panegyrici Latini*, the *gratiarum actio* of Ausonius, and the three fragmentary speeches by Symmachus (*Or.* 1-3).¹³⁷ The earliest to introduce *prosopopoeia* is *Pan. Lat.* VIII(4) of 297, addressed to Constantius I.¹³⁸ The context is a brief narrative of the campaign the previous year to bring Britain back into the Empire by ending the separatist regime of Allectus. The in-character speech featured as the Roman fleet was launched across the Channel (*Pan. Lat.* VIII[4]14.5):

¹³⁶ E.g. Lib. *Or.* 12.1, 86, 97 (*Il.* 16.148, 5.839), *Or.* 18.27 (*Od.* 5.333), 53 (*Il.* 2.453); Jul. *Or.* 2.50A (*Il.* 19.56-7), 51B-C (*Il.* 2.101-80); Them. *Or.* 5.66c (*Il.* 7.301-2), 69a (*Il.* 2.400), 70d (*Od.* 4.149-50); 15.189a (*Od.* 19.109-114), 191b (*Il.* 9.527), 191c (*Il.* 1.53, 22-3).

¹³⁷ See below for some remarks on the poet Claudian.

¹³⁸ By date this is the fourth speech in the collection, after Pliny’s *Panegyricus*, and X(2) and XI(3) of 289 and 291 respectively.

omnium, ut dicitur, accepto nuntio nauigationis tuae una uox et hortatio fuit: ‘quid dubitamus? quid moramur? ipse iam soluit, iam prouehitur, iam fortasse peruenit. experiamur omnia, per quoscumque fluctus eamus. quid est quod timere possimus? Caesarem sequimur.’

As it is said, when the order for your launch was received, all had one voice and encouragement: ‘Why do we hesitate? Why delay? He has himself set sail; now he is being conveyed, now perhaps he arrives [in Britain]. Let’s try everything; let’s go through whatever waves. What is there we could fear? — we are following Caesar!’.

In various guises, universal acclamation is a regular feature of panegyric.¹³⁹ This anonymous orator deftly conveyed that sense with ‘all had one voice’ (*omnium ... una vox*), but at the same time this universality was combined with apparently individuated characterisation of a loyal, positive, and enthusiastic soldiery; accordingly, the *prosopopoeia* had an apparently representative function without sacrificing vividness. In this respect, the speech was reminiscent of Homeric ‘ $\tau\iota\varsigma$ speeches’, where an unnamed character was given a speech which is often representative of a more widely held opinion.¹⁴⁰ As a dramatic articulation of an emotive moment, therefore, this speech was authoritative if not reliable. The rhetoric was to be reprised a generation later, in Nazarius’ speech to Constantius’ son Constantine. At this point in the narrative, Nazarius related how an army of divine soldiers came to fight for the emperor: ‘This was their conversation, this they said within hearing: “We seek Constantine, we come as help for Constantine”’ (*Pan. Lat.* IV[10]14.4).¹⁴¹ It is notable that both of these speeches were short, fictitious and anonymous but representative of a group (of soldiers). In both cases too, the speech ornamented the narrative and reinforced the ideological substance, but did not constitute an argument that determined subsequent events.

Very different in scale and effect was the next example of *prosopopoeia* to appear in the Latin sources after that speech of 297. In the speech addressed to Constantine and Maximian in 307, the orator had an awkward political nicety to negotiate. The marriage of Constantine to Maximian’s daughter Fausta offered the orator great promise for suitable elaboration, but Maximian’s decision in 306 to end the political retirement he had begun in 305 was, on the face of it, much more problematic. This was hardly constitutional and presented the orator with a diplomatic challenge. His solution was a lengthy *prosopopoeia* (*Pan. Lat.* VII[6]10.5-11.4):

fecit enim Roma ipsa pro maiestate nominis sui ut ostenderet posse se etiam
imperatoribus imperare. abduxit exercitus suos ac tibi reddidit et, cum ad sedandos
animos auctoritatem priuati principis attulisses, supplices tibi manus tendens uel potius

¹³⁹ It is implied, for example, in Menander’s opening definition of the *Basilikos Logos*, (‘generally agreed amplification’, II.368); see also Pernot 1991, 401.

¹⁴⁰ De Jong 1987.

¹⁴¹ *haec ipsorum sermocinatio, hoc inter audientes serebant: ‘Constantinum petimus, Constantino imus auxilio.’*

queribunda clamavit: [11] ‘quousque hoc, Maximiane, patiar me quati, te quiescere; mihi libertatem adimi, te usurpare tibi illicitam missionem? an, quod diuo Augusto post septuaginta aetatis, quinquaginta imperii annos non licuit, tam cito licuit tibi? ideone te mihi ille, cuius tot aras tot templa tot nomina colo, Hercules dedit, ut tu in suburbano otis cedens usum dicatae mihi uirtutis amitteres? redde te gubernaculis meis et, quoniam tranquillo mari portum intrare properasti, uade per fluctus mei quidem amore sollicitus sed tua maiestate securus. et tamen per te tibi steterit, <si> iniuriam in mei restitutione patieris. imperasti pridem rogatus a fratre, rursus impera iussus a matre.’

For Rome herself followed the majesty of own name so that she showed she can even command emperors. She withdrew her own armies and restored them to you and since you had brought the authority of a retired emperor to calm their spirits, she stretched her suppliant hands to you or rather, in complaint, and shouted: ‘Maximian, how long am I to suffer myself to be shaken, you to be at rest, freedom to be taken from me, you to claim a discharge which is not permitted you? Or should it be that what was denied to Augustus after seventy years of age, fifty years of rule, was granted to you so quickly? Or did Heracles, whose altars, temples and names I honour so much, give you to me so that giving way to idleness on your suburban estate, you would give up the practice of virtue promised to me? Commit yourself to my command, and since you rushed to enter the port when the sea was calm, go through the waves, worried in your love for me but carefree in your majesty. And however, it will be a matter for you yourself if you suffer an injury in restoring me. Before you ruled when called upon by your brother [Diocletian]; rule again when told to by your mother’.

Because Rome herself was the speaker, the speech was much more in line with Menander’s description of *prosopopoeia* than the brief words of soldiers in the panegyrics of 297 and 321 (although that is not to trace a direct influence from the rhetor). In situation and rhetoric, the lines may recall the aggressive speech by the country (*patria*) given in condemnation of Catiline (Cicero, *Catilinarians* 1.18; see above), although the orator avoided the deconstruction of the figure which follows in Cicero’s speech (‘As I said, if the country were to say this to you, surely she ought to prevail, even if she cannot use force?’, 19). Rome’s speech in 307 was, of course, a fiction, but that fiction was sustained and so effected an authority that the orator alone could not muster. With three indignant questions, three subsequent imperatives (the last one creating the paradox ‘rule again when told to’), balanced phrasing, repetitions, polyptoton and the language of family relations arranged in homoeoteleuton (‘brother ... mother’) rather than *Diocletiano ... me*, the speech sustained passion. This animation could have lent itself to very dramatic delivery, as Quintilian recommended (see above). This was surely an opportunity for the orator to vary his speech with particularly memorable performance, perhaps playing Rome as a bossy mother rather than piously ascetic — such a melodramatic performance would have extended the aesthetic appeal of the panegyric.

It is a very short wait until the next *prosopopoeia*. It comes in the next chapter and consists of a brief exchange between Maximian and Jupiter, at a dramatic date of 305, and

Maximian's retirement. 'Maximian, what do you think Jupiter himself replied to you when you said with magnanimity "Take back, Jupiter what you lent"'? In fact, he replied as follows: "I did not hand this over to you as a loan, but for all time. I do not take it back, but I save it for you".¹⁴² This is an interesting counterpoint to the examples above from Eusebius and Julian where Greek panegyric texts gave in-character voice to an emperor (see also Claudian, below). Again here, the fiction is unflinchingly sustained, with the question itself logically undermining any claim to authenticity, but standing nonetheless. For this orator, the *prosopopoeia* of Rome and Jupiter generated a serious claim for the legitimacy of Maximian's return to imperial power and in that sense were an important part of the argument of the speech.

Constantine was the sole addressee of the next panegyric to contain *prosopopoeia*. Delivered in 313, the main focus of *Pan. Lat. XII(9)* is the defeat by Constantine of Maxentius and the recovery of Rome at the battle of the Milvian Bridge. The orator attributed three words only to the doomed usurper, in the context of his advice to his troops when stationed in the city. 'He would say, "Enjoy, waste, fritter"'.¹⁴³ Although brief, this is a notable addition to the dramatic range of panegyric, especially given that the authors of the four dyarchic and tetrarchic panegyrics (X[2], XI[3], VIII[4] and IX[5]) had foregone the opportunity to attribute direct speech to the usurpers, Carausius and Allectus. Greed and wastefulness were axiomatic of tyrants in antiquity, and this terse tricolon of imperatives in asyndeton efficiently characterised the sinister menace Maxentius allegedly posed to Roman order. Its brevity was part of the speech's force, but it was long and distinctive enough to have been highly dramatic in performance; and the imperfect tense of 'He would say' implies these words were repeated or habitual, something of a catchphrase to characterise Maxentius.

On 1 January 362, Claudius Mamertinus addressed his consular panegyric to the new emperor Julian, in Constantinople. We saw above how, a year later in Antioch, Libanius would use *prosopopoeia* as a means to account for Julian's willingness, without appearing treasonous, to engage Constantius II in battle (in November 361) — the gods told him that the military action would be their concern. Claudius Mamertinus seems to have faced greater challenges himself in 362; so soon after Julian's accession, many influential men in Constantinople would yet to be convinced of the new emperor's suitability for office, and would have been profoundly suspicious of the incoming consul from Gaul who addressed his speech of thanks to Julian in the Constantinopolitan Senate, in Latin.¹⁴⁴ Claudius Mamertinus was robust and even brazen in the face of the challenge, and it is of particular interest that *prosopopoeia* offered him too the rhetorical means to further his agenda. The figure featured four times in the speech (*Pan. Lat. III[11]*). In the first, Claudius Mamertinus quoted commendations of Julian's achievements as Caesar which were actually intended to incite hatred against him, including that of Constantius: 'At every meeting, as if out of kindness, they would throw out such comments "Julian has tamed Alamannia, Julian has raised up the

¹⁴² *quid enim putas tibi, Maximiane, Iouem ipsum respondisse, cum tu ingenti animo diceres 'recipe, Iuppiter, quod commodasti'? hoc profecto respondit 'non mutuuum istud tibi tradidi sed aeternum; non recipio sed seruo.'* *Pan. Lat. VII(6)12.6.*

¹⁴³ 'Fruimini' aiebat, 'dissipate, prodigite.' *Pan. Lat. XII(9)14.6.*

¹⁴⁴ Rees 2012, 212-15.

cities of Gaul from embers and ashes ...”. For inflaming odium, these voices were more powerful than every insult’.¹⁴⁵ Commentators have carefully and convincingly cross-checked with Ammianus to identify in this broadside Florentius (an official loyal to Constantius who had fled by January 362), but it is notable that the non-specific plural ‘they’ could have extended to any or all senators who were sympathetic to Constantius’ memory.¹⁴⁶ This *prosopopoeia* seems to have been designed to discomfort such men. The ‘quotation’ at 16.2 of Crassus’ words to his father-in-law Scaevola when the former felt unable to lobby passers-by for political support provided an elevating precedent for Claudius Mamertinus’ own behaviour; and at 17.4 Claudius Mamertinus contrived to quote his own words to himself, complete with opening vocative, when he realised what sort of leader he served in Julian. These *prosopopoeiae* denigrate opposition and promote the speaker, to combative effect; in *personae* and length, they generate a certain energy, but the situations themselves perhaps have a contrived air.¹⁴⁷ More contrived still is the speech’s longest *prosopopoeia*. An unnamed god was introduced to address two resurrected usurpers (*Pan. Lat.* III[11]13.3):

si hos deus paulisper uitae redditos adloquatur: ‘heus’, uerbi gratia, ‘Nepotiane atque Siluane, per infestos gladios praesentesque mortes imperium petiistis. at nunc ultro uobis potestas regnandi datur ut ea qua Iulianus conditione regnetis, ut pro omnium otio die noctuque uigiletis et, cum domini uocemini, libertati ciuium seruiatis, saepius proelium quam prandium capessatis, nihil cuiquam auferatis et ultro omnibus largiamini, nulli gratificemini, in neminem saeuatis, toto in orbe terrarum nullius uirginis fama uioletur, sit lectulus etiam sine concessis et legitimis uoluptatibus Vestalium toris purior, aestate Alamannicum puluerem hieme pruina Thraciae intectis uerticibus perferatis’

If a god addressed them, returned briefly to life, ‘Hey’, for the sake of words, ‘Nepotianus and Silvanus, you pursued imperial power through hostile swords and imminent deaths. But now, the power to reign is given to you spontaneously on condition that you rule as Julian did; that you remain awake day and night for everyone else’s peace and when you are called masters, you serve as slaves to your citizens’ freedom, you take up arms more often than you take dinner, you take nothing from anyone and you give generously to everyone, give favour to no-one, you rage against no-one, the reputation of no young woman in the whole world is violated; beyond the permissible and legitimate pleasures, the bed be purer than the Vestals couch; endure the summer dust of the Alamanni, the winter frost of Thrace, with uncovered heads’.

The speech attributed to the anonymous god here taunted the two unsuccessful claimants to the throne (Nepotianus in 350, Silvanus in 355) and so offered a novel means of expressing

¹⁴⁵ *in omnibus conuenticulis quasi per beniuolentiam illa iactantes ‘Iulianus Alamanniam domuit, Iulianus urbes Galliae ex fauillis et cineribus excitauit’. ... hae uoces fuerunt ad inflammanda odia probris omnibus potentiores.* 4.5-5.1.

¹⁴⁶ Nixon and Saylor Rodgers 1994, 399; García Ruiz 2006, 109-110.

¹⁴⁷ 58, 19 and 30 words respectively.

praise of Julian; if the hypothetical, counterfactual context of the speech rendered it unusually laboured, Claudius Mamertinus clearly thought it valuable. The speech asserted divine support for Julian and suggests his own legitimacy, both of which were points worth underlining at that particular time.

The latest author in the *Panegyrici Latini* — the man conventionally assumed to be the collection's editor¹⁴⁸ — was Pacatus Drepanius. In his speech to Theodosius of 389, he reworked phrasing from all eleven of the collection's earlier works; it is also notable how he re-set to his own agenda some rhetorical features from his predecessors too, one such being *prosopopoeia*. Three in-character speeches appeared, each of them elaborated to a fair length. The context for the first example is Theodosius' accession to the throne, ten years earlier (*Pan. Lat.* II[12]11.3-7):

expostulari hoc loco tecum rei publicae uerbis necesse est, quae in summam tua cunctatione formidinem a media spe relapsa tali aliqua te profecto, sed quam solus audires, uoce conuenit: 4. 'parumne me, Theodosi, hactenus distulere Fata ut tu insuper temptes moras augere Fatorum? An nescis rem tuam per momenta consumi? nescis me tibi tuisque decrescere? quidquid atterit Gothus, quidquid rapit Chunus, quidquid aufert Halanus, id olim desiderabit Arcadius. perdidit infortunata Pannonias, lugeo funus Illyrici, specto excidium Galliarum. 5. principum senior in tanta bella non sufficit; alter, etsi futurus sit aliquando fortissimus, adhuc tamen paruus est. tu dubitas excipere conlapsam et, ut nihil differas, sero reparandam? 6. hanc mihi gratiam refers quod te etiam felix desiderauit? quod cum me Nerua tranquillus, amor generis humani Titus, pietate memorabilis Antoninus teneret, cum moenibus Augustus ornaret, legibus Hadrianus imbueret, finibus Traianus augetet, parum mihi uidebar beata quia non eram tua? 7. quid tu mihi faceres si iuris tui esses? orat ecce te dominus meus, orat ecce te dominus adhuc tuus, et qui posset cogere mauult impetrare. imperium, quod ab imperatore defertur, tam tibi nolle iam non licet quam uelle non licuit.'

At this point it is necessary that the matter be raised with you in the words of the state, who at your delay had fallen back from a moderate hope to acute fear, and indeed addressed you in some such voice, but of a sort you alone heard: 4. 'Theodosius, have the Fates not stretched me enough so far, so that you try to increase their delays still further? Or are you unaware that your affairs are being consumed every minute? Are you unaware that I am shrinking for you and yours? Whatever the Goth wears away, whatever the Hun seizes, whatever the Alan plunders — that, Arcadius [Theodosius' son] will one day miss. In my misfortune I have lost the Pannonias, I grieve the death of Illyricum, I see the overthrow of the Gauls. 5. Of the leaders, the older [Gratian] is not enough for battles so great; the other [Valentinian II], even if at some point in the future he will be most brave, is however, still a child. Do you hesitate to lift up the state in her collapse and which, so that you waste no time, is to be restored at a late hour? 6. Is this the thanks you give me because I longed for you even when I was blessed? because when gentle Nerva ruled me, [or] Titus the love of the human race, [or]

¹⁴⁸ Pichon 1906.

Antoninus remembered for his piety, [or] when Augustus decorated me with walls, [or] Hadrian imbued me with laws, [or] Trajan extended me at the frontiers, I seemed to myself insufficiently happy because I was not yours? 7. What would you be doing for me if you were you own law? Look, my master [Gratian] begs you; look, the one still your master begs you; he who could force you prefers to secure your consent. You have no right now to decline the power which is offered by an emperor, just as you had no right to aspire to it'

There are clear parallels in situation and aesthetics with the *prosopopoeia* of Rome in *Pan. Lat.* VII(6) in 307: just as that orator used Rome's persuasive speech to account for Maximian's unconstitutional return to office, so Pacatus Drepanius used the State's appeal to overcome Theodosius' allegedly determined reluctance to rule (11.4); the speaker was characterised in both speeches as self-pitying and forceful in denunciation of the addressee; like Rome in VII(6), the style of the *Respublica* was graceful, with an opening trio of questions (in *diminuendo*), repetition, *asyndeton*, and verbal patterning. Pacatus Drepanius amplified his *prosopopoeia* with the catalogues of peoples, provinces, and emperors, so casting the speaker as informed and judicious. Two notable details differentiate these political *prosopopoeiae*: first, the orator of 307, speaking in Trier, attributed the speech to Roma, whereas Pacatus Drepanius, a Gaul speaking in Rome, attributes the speech to the *Respublica*, and so faced no obligation to adopt the voice of the City in front of her local citizens.¹⁴⁹ This would be in keeping with his earlier claim, no matter how disingenuous, that his own 'Transalpine' Latinity was inferior to that of the capital city (1.3). Secondly, where the earlier speech was introduced with the assertive '[she] shouted', the later one was much more diffident, with 'in some such voice, but of a sort you alone heard'. As we shall see, this more cautious introit was characteristic of the author.

His second *prosopopoeia* also has a debt within the *Panegyrici* collection, this time to XII(9) of 313 which gave the sinister three word speech to the usurper Maxentius. The majority of the second half of Pacatus Drepanius' speech gave an account of the usurpation of imperial power in the west by Magnus Maximus, and his subsequent defeat in war against Theodosius in 388. At the dramatic moment before Maximus' capture at Aquileia but after his separation from his troops, the usurper delivered a long soliloquy (*Pan. Lat.* II[12]38.2-3):

quotiens sibi ipsum putamus dixisse: 'quo fugio? bellumne temptabo? — ut quem uiribus totis ferre non potui, parte sustineam? Alpes Cottias obserabo, quia Iuliae profuerunt? peto Africam, quam exhausti? repeto Britanniam, quam reliqui? credo me Galliae? — sed inuisus sum. Hispaniae committo? — sed notus sum. 3. quid ergo faciam inter arma et odia medius? a tergo premor hostibus, a fronte criminibus. si morerer, euaseram. sed ecce nec animum sequitur manus nec manum gladius; labitur ferrum, tremit dextera, mens fatiscit. o quam difficile est miseris etiam perire!

How often we imagine he said to himself: 'Where am I fleeing? Will I try battle? — so I would withstand with part of my forces what I couldn't resist with all of them? Shall I

¹⁴⁹ On Pacatus Drepanius' Gallic identity, see Rees 2015.

bar off the Cottian Alps, since the Julian Alps were so helpful to me? Shall I seek Africa, which I drained dry? Do I go back to Britain, which I abandoned? Do I trust myself to Gaul — but I'm hated there; do I commit to Spain? — but I am known there

3. So what am I to do, stuck in the middle between weapons and hatred? From behind I'm pressed by the enemy, in front by my own crimes. If I were to die, I had escaped, but look, my hand doesn't obey my mind, nor my sword my hand; the blade slips, my right hand trembles, my mind grows weak. O how difficult it is even for the wretched to die!

The speech is introduced cautiously via indirect statement, but the *prosopopoeia* itself is intensely melodramatic. The quickfire series of plaintive deliberative questions (and pathetic answers) recalls the hopeless predicaments of tragic figures, particularly females such as Medea, Ariadne and Dido.¹⁵⁰ Maximus was feminised, yet remained too cowardly to kill himself. This entertaining amplification of the original characterisation of Maxentius in 307 was very opportunistic of Pacatus Drepanius; here in particular we might assume a highly theatrical delivery, with the orator 'milking' tones such as the sarcasm of 'so I would withstand ...' and 'since the Julian Alps were so helpful to me' and the self-pity of 'O how difficult it is ...', all no doubt to delight the approving audience.

The third and final *prosopopoeia* in the speech owed nothing to its predecessors in the collection. The context was an imaginary discussion about their contributions to Theodosius' successful campaign against Maximus between various personified virtues (*Pan. Lat.* II[12]40.3):

audio Constantiam dicere: 'bellum atrox periculosumque suscepi'; memorare Patientiam: 'immensum iter, tempus anni graue semper armata, saepe ieiuna toleraui'; tenere Prudentiam: 'partita sum militem et multiplicauit arte terrorem'; adserere Fortitudinem: 'bis confluxi cum hoste, bis uici'; omnes postremo clamare: 'quid tibi debemus, Fortuna, quam fecimus?' sed si illa dicat 'ego properationem militum iuui, ego fugam hostium praepediui, ego Maximum in muros coegi et quem uos cogebatis mori uiuum domino reseruauit'

I hear that Constancy says 'I undertook a fierce and dangerous war'; that Patience recounts 'I tolerated an immense journey, an oppressive time of year, always armed, often hungry'; that Prudence holds 'I divided up the soldiery and multiplied terror by my skill'; that Fortitude asserts 'Twice I fought with the enemy, twice I won'; finally, that they all exclaim 'Fortune, whom we created, what do we owe to you?' But if she were to say 'I helped the hastening of the soldiers, I obstructed the flight of the enemies, I drove Maximus behind the walls and I kept alive for his master the one whom you were trying to force to die'

¹⁵⁰ Soph. *Ajax* 457ff.; *Phil.* 1081ff., 1348ff.; Eurip. *Med.* 502ff.; Enn. *Med.* 284-5; Cat. 64.177ff.; Cic. *De Orat.* 3.214; Verg. *Aen.* 4.534ff.; Ovid *Met.* 8.108ff.; Sen. *Med.* 451ff.; see Rees 2013, 251-3.

In conception, this exchange perhaps recalls the councils of gods of epic poetry, although each character here spoke only very briefly. It represented an innovative way of bringing variety to panegyric oratory's obsession with virtues;¹⁵¹ perhaps this originality accounts for the awkwardly diffident introit, which (again) introduced the first five speeches in indirect discourse ('I hear that Constancy says' etc.) before Fortune's words are cast explicitly as hypothetical with the subjunctive mood ('if she were to say'). This virtual council of virtues was briefly told, with little scope for acute characterisation of individuals (unlike, for example, Prudentius' *Psychomachia* of a decade or so later); it perhaps lent itself to entertaining performance rather less than the speeches of the State and Maximus earlier in the panegyric.

In his *gratiarum actio* to Gratian for the consulship of 379, Ausonius three times gave a direct question to an imaginary objector to his claims. In each case, the speaker was anonymous and not characterised, and the question was brief. For example: 'somebody will interrupt, "yes, you have received all these benefits, but tell me, were they deserved?"'.¹⁵² This imaginary interlocutor allowed Ausonius to animate his justification of his oratorical programme, but the technique was not further developed. In Symmachus' panegyrics to Valentinian and Valens, *prosopopoeia* first occurs in *Oration* 1, addressed to Valentinian in 368 or 369. Here, Symmachus claims to quote Valentinian's words to his troops when they were faced with the external threat of the Alamanni invading on the Rhine frontier and the internal threat of the usurper Procopius. 'Most faithful fellow soldiers, direct your standards here against fierce peoples and the ferocious natives of the Rhine! This is a public enemy, that a private one; my first duty is a public victory, my second is my own personal vengeance. My dignity is challenged in one war, your property in another!' (*Or.* 1.19). The striving for rhetorical balance here underscored the emperor's selflessness. Finally, Symmachus twice used *prosopopoeia* to animate historical *exempla*: in his speech to Valentinian in 370, he briefly quoted Crassus ('Do you fear that the sound of trumpets might not reach your ears?' (*Or.* 2.5); and in his speech to Gratian of 369 or 370, Pompey is said to have replied to a question about his military training 'I soldiered under my own command!' (*Or.* 3.8). This was entirely in keeping with examples of the figure we have seen in other orators above, both Latin and Greek.

Summary and coda

The first summary observation refines Russell's assertion that 'there are many examples' (see above) — there are many more and much fuller examples of *prosopopoeia* in the Latin texts that survive than in the Greek. Secondly, if his characterisation of *prosopopoeia* as a 'poetical device' is upheld (by identification of its origins in epic verse, for example), from the evidence of this figure at least we can posit a closer alignment of Latin prose panegyric with verse aesthetics than is the case in the Greek equivalent for the same period.¹⁵³ Within that, it

¹⁵¹ Seager 1984; Rodriguez Gervas 1991; L'Huillier 1992; Menander Rhetor II.373.

¹⁵² Chapter 5. The other two instances are in direct succession, in chapter 7.

¹⁵³ For an analysis of the fourth century's 'aesthetic curve' via lexis, see Rees 2017.

is also noteworthy that any trajectory for the deployment of *prosopopoeia* in Latin prose is not linear, with for example, no or only very brief *prosopopoeiae* in most dyarchic, tetrarchic and Constantinian panegyrics, but more and fuller examples in the speeches by Claudius Mamertinus and Pacatus Drepanius many decades later. However, this sketch of the evolution of the Latin material does not comfortably accommodate the Ausonian or Symmachean panegyrics, all delivered after Claudius Mamertinus'. What in turn this suggests is that rhetorical aesthetics in the *Panegyrici Latini* collection may have had its own, internal and relatively hermetic ecosystem. In support of that hypothesis, we may note that although the speech by Rome to Maximian in *Pan. Lat.* VII(6) of 307 is an exception to the rule that extended *prosopopoeiae* do not occur until the second half of the fourth century, that speech seems to have been the inspiration and model for the appeal by the state to Theodosius in *Pan. Lat.* II(12) of 389.¹⁵⁴ Similarly, the three words attributed to Maxentius in *Pan. Lat.* XII(9) of 313 can be seen to be the kernel for the melodramatic soliloquy of Maximus in 389. It is also notable that these various summary points cast Menander in a curious light: with the same exception of *Pan. Lat.* VII(6), none of the surviving third or early fourth century Latin panegyrics elaborates a *prosopopoeia* beyond a few words; nor do *prosopopoeiae* from fourth century Greek panegyrics correspond closely with the observations about the figure made in the *Basilikos Logos*.

Neither Quintilian nor Menander nor Libanius addressed their recommendations to poets, and none of them was to know that the highest profile of any panegyrist active at the end of the 'long fourth' century would be a poet, writing at the court of Honorius. Some of Claudian's output was uncomplicatedly panegyric, namely his poems for the third, fourth, and sixth consulships of Honorius (396, 398, 404 respectively), that of Probinus and Olybrius (395) and that of Manlius Theodorus (399); and many others, such as his *Gothic War*, *War against Gildo* and invectives against Rufinus and Eutropius, have a conspicuously epideictic quality.¹⁵⁵ Claudian's career was a major and influential milestone in the history of rhetoric and poetics;¹⁵⁶ accordingly, his work represents an important coda for the fortunes of *prosopopoeia* in the 'long fourth' century. Only a brief discussion is possible here, but the evidence is decisive. Claudian frequently deployed extended *prosopopoeiae* in his hexameter panegyrics: Donald Russell observed that 'Claudian's or Sidonius' verse panegyrics differ mainly from their prose equivalents in the amount of mythology and *prosopopoeia* which they use.'¹⁵⁷ Claudian's examples include Rome and Africa to Jupiter (*Bell. Gild.* 17-127, 128-200), Rome to Theodosius (*Prob. et Olyb.* 136-63); the river Tiber (*Prob. et Olyb.* 236-

¹⁵⁴ Rees 2016, 138-9.

¹⁵⁵ Cameron 1970, 1-29; Ware 2012, 1-5.

¹⁵⁶ Some other poems by Claudian are broadly panegyric too; on 'panegyric-epic', see Ware 2012, 18-31; Gillett 2012.

¹⁵⁷ 1998, 24. Sidonius lies outside the chronological range of this study, but see, e.g. *To Anthemius* 341-86 (Rome); 440-515 (Rome); *To Majorianus* 56-349 (Africa), 351-67 (Rome); *On Avitus* 51-118 (Rome), 123-598 (Jupiter). Murray 2018, 241 overlooks the prose panegyrics VII(6) and II(12) when he writes 'Perhaps the only major addition which Claudian made to the prose tradition lies in his use of personification of Rome and other deities as characters to diversify the action, to plead with rulers for help and so on'.

62); Theodosius to Jupiter (*III Hon. Con. Pan* 33-38); Theodosius to Honorius (*IV Hon. Con. Pan.* 214-352; 370-418) and Honorius to Theodosius (352-68); Astraea to Manlius (*Con. Man.* 135-73); Urania to the Muses (*Con. Man.* 276-340); the Italian river Eridanus (metamorphized into a constellation) to the Visigothic leader Alaric (*VI Hon. Con. Pan.* 180-92), Alaric in despair (274-319), Rome to Honorius (361-425), Honorius to Rome (427-94).¹⁵⁸ The number, nature and length of these *prosopopoeiae* clearly differentiate Claudian from the prose panegyrics, which it seems he knew.¹⁵⁹ The panegyric for Honorius' sixth consulship (*Pan. Hon. Con.* VI) illustrates how integral *prosopopoeia* could be to the ethical and political argument. The river Eridanus addressed the enemy Alaric in a triumphalist sneer, similar in tone to Claudius Mamertinus' taunting of Nepotianus and Silvanus (180-92). Its status as both river and constellation confers Italian geography and cosmic authority on the speaker; Alaric is convincingly belittled.¹⁶⁰ His pathetic state was further emphasized in a long *prosopopoeia* in his own voice (274-319), recalling the representation of Maximus in despair by Pacatus Drepanius. And later in the panegyric, no longer tolerant of his absence, Rome addressed to Honorius a series of questions and an explicit note of complaint at his behaviour (361-8), as had the Roma in *Pan. Lat* VII(6) and the state in II(12). In fact, this and other panegyric poems by Claudian can read as a series of *prosopopoeiae* connected by (often) highly ecphrastic narrative. Menander had said of in-character speeches that they featured in recent panegyrics 'as if in a play' (see above); although in its context that claim is puzzling, encouragement to think of panegyrics — prose and verse — as texts with something in common with drama scripts foregrounds consideration of their performance. With their co-opting of other voices, the Latin hexameter panegyrics and various of the prose speeches, such as *Pan. Lat.* VII(6), III(11), and II(12), would have lent themselves to the sort of differentiated, dynamic performance Quintilian urged of *prosopopoeia* (see above); in comparison, the Greek material is rather less flamboyant. We must concede that the surviving material may offer us a distorted landscape, but viewed through the limited lens of *prosopopoeia*, and assuming Menander was a reliable witness to his own time, it seems the practice of prose panegyrists in the third century was not continuously and consistently sustained in the 'long fourth', and that at the very end of that period, Claudian took the examples of the *Panegyrici Latini* and expanded the figure's range hugely. Whether or not such differences between contemporary Greek and Latin rhetorical practices had any influence on the Greek-speaking poet's decision to travel to Italy to compose in Latin is probably a matter for speculation.

Bibliography

- Austin, R.G. (1933, 1960³) *M. Tulli Ciceronis Pro Caelio Oratio*. Oxford.
 Bernstein, N.W. (2013) *Ethics, Identity and Community in Later Roman Declamation*.
 Oxford.

¹⁵⁸ Dewar 1996, 264-7.

¹⁵⁹ Kehding 1899, 28-44; Cameron 1970, 254, 383; Rees 2016, 131-4.

¹⁶⁰ Dewar 1996, 179; Ware 2012, 140.

- Buckland, C.S. (2010) *To praise the emperor: Imperial panegyric and the epideictic tradition*. Saarbrücken.
- Cameron, A.D.E. (1970) *Claudian. Poetry and Propaganda at the Court of Honorius*. Oxford.
- Cameron, A.M. and S.G. Hall (1999) *Eusebius. Life of Constantine*. Oxford.
- Criboire, R. (2013) *Libanius the Sophist. Rhetoric, Reality and Religion in the Fourth Century*. Ithaca.
- Dewar, M. (1996) *Claudian. Panegyricus de sexto consulate Honorii Augusti*. Oxford.
- García Ruiz, M.P. (2006) *Claudio Mamertino Panegírico al Emperador Juliano*. Pamplona.
- Gibson, C.A. (2008) *Libanius's Progymnasmata: model exercises in Greek prose composition and rhetoric*. Atlanta, GA.
- Gibson, C. A. (2014) 'Libanius' *Progymnasmata*', in L. Van Hoof (ed.), *Libanius. A Critical Introduction*. Cambridge. 128-43.
- Gillett, A. (2012) 'Epic Panegyric and Political communication in the Fifth-Century West', in L. Grig and G. Kelly (eds.), *Two Romes. From Rome to Constantinople*. Oxford. 265-90.
- Hägg, T. and Rousseau, P. (2000) 'Introduction', in T. Hägg, and P. Rousseau (eds.), *Greek Biography and Panegyric in Late Antiquity*. Berkeley, CA. 1-28.
- Heath, M. (2004) *Menander. A Rhetor in Context*. Oxford.
- Heather, P. and J. Matthews (1991) *The Goths in the Fourth Century*. Liverpool.
- Heather, P. and D. Moncur (2001) *Politics, Philosophy and Empire in the Fourth Century. Selected Orations of Themistius*. Liverpool.
- Jong, I.J.F. de (1987) 'The Voice of Anonymity: $\tau\upsilon\varsigma$ -speeches in the *Iliad*', *Erans* 85: 69-84.
- Kehding, O. (1899) *De Panegyricis Latinis capita quattuor*. Marburg.
- Lausberg, H. (1998) *Handbook of Literary Rhetoric. A Foundation for Literary Study*. Leiden.
- L' Huillier, M-C. (1992) *L'Empire des Mots. Orateurs Gaulois et Empereurs Romains 3e et 4e Siècles*. Paris.
- MacCormack, S. (1975) 'Latin Prose Panegyrics', in T.A. Dorey (ed.), *Empire and Aftermath, Silver Latin II*. London. 143-205.
- Murray, O. (2018) 'The Classical traditions of panegyric and advice to princes', in G. Roskam and S. Schorn (eds.), *Concepts of Ideal Rulership from Antiquity to the Renaissance*. Turnhout. 217-54.
- Paxson, J.J. (1994) *The Poetics of Personification*. Cambridge.
- Pernot, L. (1993) *La Rhétorique de l'éloge dans le monde gréco-romain*. Paris.
- Pichon, R. (1906) 'L'origine du recueil des *Panegyrici Latini*. Appendix 1', in R. Pichon, *Les derniers écrivains profanes. Les Panégyristes, Ausone, le "Querolus", Rutilius Namatianus*. Paris. 270-91. (translated into English in Rees (ed.) 2012, 55-74).
- Rees, R.D. (ed.) (2012) *Latin Panegyric. Oxford Readings in Classical Studies*. Oxford.
- Rees, R.D. (2012) 'Bright lights, big city. Rome and the *Panegyrici Latini*', in L. Grig and G. Kelly (eds.), *Two Romes. From Rome to Constantinople*. Oxford. 203-22.
- Rees, R.D. (2013) 'Pacatus the poet doing Plinian prose', in B.J. Gibson and R.D. Rees (eds.), *Pliny the Younger in Late Antiquity (Arethusa special edition 46.2)*: 241-59.

- Rees, R.D. (2015) 'From Alterity to Unity in Pacatus Drepanius' Panegyric to Theodosius', *Talanta* 45: 41-53.
- Rees, R.D. (2016) 'Ghosts of Authors Past in Claudian's *De Bello Gildonico*', in V. Berlincourt, L. Galli Milić and D. Nelis (eds.), *Lucan and Claudian: Context and Intertext*. Heidelberg. 127-45.
- Rees, R.D. (2017) 'The Poetics of Latin Prose Praise and the Fourth-Century Curve', in J. Hernandez Lobato and J. Elsner, (eds.) *The Poetics of Late Latin Literature*. Oxford. 313-44.
- Rodríguez Gervás, M.J. (1991) *Propaganda Política y opinión Pública en los Panegíricos Latinos del Bajo Imperio*. Salamanca.
- Russell, D.A. (1983) *Greek Declamation*. Cambridge.
- Russell, D.A. (1998) 'The Panegyrists and Their Teachers' in M. Whitby, (ed.) *The Propaganda of Power: the role of panegyric in Late Antiquity*. Leiden. 17-50.
- Russell, D.A. and Wilson, N.G. (1981) *Menander Rhetor*. Oxford.
- Saylor Rodgers B. (1989) 'The metamorphosis of Constantine', *CQ* 39: 233-46.
- Seager, R. (1983) 'Some Imperial Virtues in the Latin Prose Panegyrics. The Demands of Propaganda and the Dynamics of Literary Composition', *Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar* 4 : 129-65.
- Vereecke, E. (1975) 'Le corpus des *Panegyriques Latins* de l'époque tardive: problèmes d'imitation', *L'Antiquite Classique* 44: 141-60 (translated into English in Rees (ed.) (2012) 251-64).
- Ware, C. (2012) *Claudian and the Roman Epic Tradition*. Cambridge.

LIBANIUS' IMPERIAL SPEECH TO CONSTANTIUS II AND CONSTANS (OR. 59); CONTEXT, TRADITION, AND INNOVATION

*Grammatiki Karla*¹

Libanius' imperial speech (*basilikos logos*)² for the emperors Constantius II and Constans (*Or.* 59) is one of his earliest works and one of our earliest extant Greek panegyrics from the fourth century.³ His speech presumes the existence of a tradition that is now lost to us, at least in the form of actual imperial panegyrics from the third and earlier fourth centuries. In this chapter I will examine Libanius' *Oration* 59, especially its thematic structure (*dispositio*) and motifs under the lens of antitheses such as 'tradition/innovation' or 'mimesis/originality'.⁴ I will treat *Oration* 59 as a hypertext and so examine its complex relationship with its pre-texts.

According to the literary theorist Genette, a hypertext is 'any text derived from a previous text either through simple transformation, which I shall simply call *transformation* or through indirect transformation, which I [Genette] shall label *imitation*'.⁵ The application of this methodology allows us to investigate how a fourth-century orator behaves towards his tradition and models, how he attempts to construct his own rules and to test himself in new and original ways. Yet by investigating his relationship with a rhetorical treatise of the late third century (Menander Rhetor) we may investigate the extent to which an orator expected an audience to be aware of the conventions of his tradition, and when, where, and why he chose to diverge from them.

I will look at the particularly interesting relationship between Libanius' *Oration* 59 and Menander's *Basilikos Logos*. Menander's work provides a set of rules on how to compose an imperial speech, based on tradition and on previous speeches and manuals relative to this topic, and as such it constitutes a 'literary Grammar', a handbook.⁶ As will become obvious below, Libanius had immediate access to this work, and used it as a model in order to structure and compose his speech. Furthermore, I will draw a synchronic comparison, on the one hand, between Libanius' *Oration* 59 and Menander's *Basilikos Logos*, and, on the other, Julian's *Orations to the Emperor Constantius* (*Or.* 1 and 3, both ca. 355) and Themistius'

¹ I am most grateful to the editors of this volume for their perceptive comments, and to my colleague and friend Io Manolessou for editing my English.

² The textual tradition preserves the title 'Βασιλικὸς εἰς Κωνσταντίον καὶ Κώνσταντα' (mss. D, C) or 'Ἐγκώμιον εἰς Κωνσταντίον καὶ Κώνσταντα' (mss. K, L) or simply 'εἰς Κωνσταντίον καὶ Κώνσταντα' (ms. J). On *basilikos* and *enkomion* see Pernot 1993, 77-8, 88-91. Cf. Men. Rh. II.368.3: 'The imperial oration is an encomium of the emperor' Ὁ βασιλικὸς λόγος ἐγκώμιόν ἐστι βασιλέως. On the titulature of panegyric in Late Antiquity see Pernot Chapter 1 in this volume.

³ See stylistic comments in Malosse 2014, 87-8.

⁴ The Greek text of *Oration* 59 used in this chapter is the edition by Malosse 2003, and the English translation by Dodgeon 1996, 164-205.

⁵ Genette 1997, 7.

⁶ For discussion of Menander Rhetor's status as a witness to a now-lost tradition of 3rd-century Greek panegyric, see the Introduction.

speeches to the Emperor Constantius (*Or.* 1-4, ranging from 347 to 357). The comparison of Libanius' relationship to Menander with that of his contemporaries who addressed the same emperor (Constantius) in their panegyrics will underscore the extent to which Menander's treatise should or could be treated as a normative text in Greek panegyric discourse of the mid fourth century.

I will attempt to show how Menander's treatise functions as an 'exemplary model' and simultaneously the way in which Libanius handles his model in order to signal his messages to the receivers of his work; in this sense we must determine how and why Menander's treatise acts as what the literary theorist Conte defines as a 'Model as Code' — as 'a system of conscious, deliberate rules that the author identifies as indicators of ways in which the text must be interpreted' — for Libanius' oration.⁷

Intertextual theory will be used in order to highlight potential tendencies which may constitute the poetics of Greek panegyric oratory in the early to mid-fourth century. For the purposes of such intertextual comparison, as methodological tools I employ terminology developed by Thomas in the field of classical Latin literature, and which are equally applicable to later Greek prose, to distinguish different degrees and modes of interaction of a later text with an earlier text:⁸ CASUAL REFERENCE, SINGLE REFERENCE, MARKED REFERENCE, CORRECTION, and MULTIPLE REFERENCE or CONFLATION.⁹ Thomas defines these as follows: CASUAL REFERENCE 'is quite simply the use of language that recalls a specific antecedent, but only in a general sense, where the existence of that antecedent is only minimally important to the new context, where, one could say, an atmosphere, but little more, is invoked' (pp. 117-118). SINGLE REFERENCE refers to a single locus, so that the reader may 'recall the context of the model and apply that context to the new situation' (p. 119); CORRECTION occurs when the author 'provides unmistakable indications of his source, then proceeds to offer detail that contradicts or alters that source' (p. 127). CONFLATION or MULTIPLE REFERENCE is 'a practice that allows the poet to refer to a number of antecedents and thereby to subsume their versions, and the tradition along with them, into his own' (p. 135). MARKED REFERENCE is reference in which the orator reveals his source by name.

The *Basilikos* of Libanius is addressed to both emperors, Constantius II and Constans, and is dated between AD 344 and 349.¹⁰ It was probably delivered in Nicomedia, although it was unlikely that the emperors were present. It was written at the request of an official of some kind, who commissioned Libanius to compose and deliver the piece.¹¹ The speech has

⁷ Both terms ('Exemplary Model' and 'Model as Code') come from Conte 1986, 31, applied there to classical epic.

⁸ Intertextual theory has fruitfully been applied to the *Panegyrici Latini* (e.g. Rees 2004; Ware 2018), but its full potential has not yet been realised in the field of late antique Greek panegyric.

⁹ The quotations are from the collected volume by Thomas 1999; in particular chap. 4: 'Virgil's *Georgics* and the Art of Reference' (pp. 114-141) published for the first time in *HSCP* 90 (1986) 171-198.

¹⁰ On the date of this oration see Callu 1987, 135-6; Portmann 2002, 22-43; Malosse 2001, 297-306; Malosse 2003, 7-11; Nesselrath 2012, 39.

¹¹ It is not clear who requested Libanius to deliver the panegyric. Likely candidates are the *praefectus praetorio orientis* (Consul in 348) Philippus (Lieu/Montserrat 1996, 153-9, esp. 158; Nesselrath 2012,

the following structure: a prologue (§§1-9) is followed by a section dealing with both emperors (§§10-55), in which the orator expands on the emperors' ancestors (Constantius I and Constantine), their birth and education up to their accession to the throne. Then a longish section follows (§§56-123), which sets out the military deeds and victories of Constantius II against the Persians and Goths. The close of this section presents the *epitedeumata* (accomplishments) of Constantius in general (§§121-123). The next part is short and deals with the other emperor, Constans (§§124-149), with his victories in the West and with his accomplishments in general. A section involving both emperors follows (§§150-173), in which the harmonious relationship between them and their union are stressed. The speech closes with the epilogue (§§166-173).¹²

It is quite obvious that apart from slight adaptations, due mostly to the fact that the speech is addressed to two emperors, the work follows the structure proposed by Menander (II.368.1-377.30) for an imperial speech (*basilikos logos*):¹³ *prooemia* (368.9-369.17); origin: native city and nation (369.17-370. 8); origin: family (370.8-371.3); birth (371.3-17); education, qualities shown in youth (371.17-372.2); accomplishments (ἐπιτηδεύματα) (372.2-13); importance of separate *prooemia* and comparisons to enhance the importance of the subject (372.14-25); actions (πράξεις) (372.25-373.6) in terms of the cardinal virtues: courage in war (373.6-375.6), justice (375.6-376.2), temperance (376.2-13), wisdom (376.13-23); the emperor's Fortune (376.24-31); final comparison (376.31-377.10); epilogue, which closes with prayers (377.10-30).¹⁴

In general Libanius follows the structural and thematic lines proposed by Menander, but it is interesting to investigate the modifications he applies in order to construct his own speech by changing his model, by demonstrating diversity and innovation. The intertextual dialogue is expressed through references to and omissions of Menander's rules.

References

Simple references

39-40), Philagrius, the *vicarius Ponticae* (Wiemer 1994, 513; Malosse 2003, 10-11), and Pompeianus, the governor of Bithynia. See Ross 2016, 300 n. 20.

¹² Cf. Malosse 2003, 13 and Callu 1987, 136-7 (brief structure of the speech); Malosse 2003, 16-24 (detailed structure).

¹³ The edition of the Greek text and the English translation are taken from Russell and Wilson 1981. In the view of Russell and Wilson 1981, 271-2 'The Latin *panegyrici* are less close to M[enander]'s scheme than their Greek contemporaries, though naturally they use many of the same topics. Illustration may often be found in the following: Aristid. *Or.* 35 ...; Julian, *Or.* 1; Liban. *Or.* 59; Themist. *Or.* 2, 3, 4; Procop. *Gaz.* Anastasius, CSHB i. 489 ff. ...'.

¹⁴ Russell and Wilson 1981, 271. This structure has much in common with the *Encomium* as part of *Progymnasmata*. See for example the *Encomium* in *Progymnasmata* by Aphthonius and Hermogenes (ed. Patillon). See also Pernot 1986, 35-7 for *topoi* in Menander's *Basilikos Logos*.

From the very start of the speech, from the *prooemium* onwards, Libanius implements two innovations in respect to his Menandrian model.¹⁵ Firstly, the speech, due to particular historical and political circumstances, is addressed to two emperors rather than to one.¹⁶ This is mentioned directly only once (*Or.* 59.6.2-8), and Libanius seems to be implying that this is due to the person who commissioned the speech.¹⁷ And although in the *prooemium*, up to this point, the wishes of the orator and his client have apparently coincided fully (see below), thereafter this is apparently no longer the case.

However, the orator takes rhetorical advantage of the motif of ‘doubleness’ and a contrast between ‘single-double’, adopting and amplifying it. This he achieves by following Menander’s own suggestion: ‘The *prooemia* of this speech also admits amplifications based on indefinite examples: e.g. as if we were to say, “And just as it is impossible to take the measure of the infinitive **sea** with our eyes, so it is difficult to take in the fame of the emperor in words”’.¹⁸ Libanius also makes use of amplifications based on very similar indefinite examples, by modifying this theme in such a way that it conforms to the specific circumstance (two kings) but also by extending the notion of content: ‘How can we avoid falling as far short of the measure of praise, as we would if we tried to measure **earth and sea** in a single day?’.¹⁹ ‘The sea’ has been amplified into ‘earth and sea’, which also incorporates the double and the contrast simultaneously.²⁰ These shared words/phrases here as well as in other passages (see below) could be taken as an indication that Libanius knew and alluded directly to Menander’s work.

¹⁵ See *Evagoras* and *Panegyricus* by Isocrates (the *prooemium*) and Pseudo-Aristides *Or.* 35 (Malosse 2003, 27). On this also Schouler 1984, 541-2.

¹⁶ The praise of two subjects appears in Greek literature from Pindar onwards. Menander mainly used the singular (βασιλεύς), although he also sometimes employs the plural (e.g. 368.16, 368.19-20) and Russell and Wilson remark: ‘it seems rash to infer from these passages that they were written under a plural reign (e.g. Diocletian and his colleagues), since the plural may simply generalize the statement’ (Russell and Wilson 1981, 272-3). As for double-panegyrics, two speeches have survived, the *Pan. Lat.* VII(6) to Maximian and Constantine in 307 and Themistius’ *Oration* 6 to Valens and Valentinian in 364 (Ross 2016, 318-19).

¹⁷ ‘But the proposer of the contest showed equal love for both men and did not consider our powers rather than how on the one occasion both emperors might be included, and in short was not able to separate fairly for eulogy those who were united both by natural disposition and by temperament and virtues’ (ἐπεὶ δὲ ὁ τε προβαλὼν τὸν ἄθλον ἴσῳ πόθῳ κεχρημένος εἰς ἀμφοτέρους οὐ τὴν ἡμετέραν δύναμιν ἐσκέψατο μᾶλλον ἢ ὅπως ἐνὶ καιρῷ περιληφθεῖεν ἀμφοτέροι ὅλως τε οὐκ εἶχε καλῶς ἐπὶ τῶν ἐγκωμίων διασπᾶν τοὺς καὶ φύσει καὶ γνώμῃ καὶ ταῖς ἀρεταῖς συνημμένους ...), *Or.* 59.6.2-6.

¹⁸ δέχεται δὲ τὰ προοίμια τοῦ λόγου καὶ ἐκ παραδειγμάτων ἀορίστων ἀνέξήσεις, οἷον ὡς ἂν εἰ λέγοιμεν, ὥσπερ δὲ πελάγους ἀπείρου τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς μέτρον οὐκ ἔστι λαβεῖν, οὕτω καὶ βασιλέως εὐφημίαν λόγῳ περιλαβεῖν οὐ ῥάδιον (*Men.Rh.* II.368.21-369.2).

¹⁹ πῶς οὐκ ἀνάγκη τοῦ μετρίου τοσοῦτον ὑστερεῖν, ὅσον περ ἂν εἰ γῆν καὶ θάλατταν ἐνεχειροῦμεν ἡμέρα μιᾷ μετρεῖν; (*Or.* 59.6.7-8)

²⁰ Cf. ‘So the double danger besets us, if we shall not only fail to do justice to what we do know, but shall also be silent upon more of the issues’ (καὶ περιέστηκεν ἡμᾶς διπλοῦς ὁ κίνδυνος, εἰ μὴ μόνον οἷς ἴσμεν οὐκ ἐξαρκέσομεν πρὸς ἀξίαν, ἀλλ’ εἰ καὶ τὰ πλείω σιωπήσομεν *Or.* 59.9.24-26).

The second challenge that Libanius faces is that this speech is a work commissioned for the emperor by a third party.²¹ Menander makes no mention of such a possibility.²² Libanius gradually introduces the presence of the person who ordered the speech. As early as the first line Libanius refers both to himself (emphatic use of two first-person verbs one after the other: Ἐμελλόν, οἶμαι) and to his client, albeit more vaguely ('Of my own accord and prompted by nobody I already had it in mind, I think, to embark on this speech ...').²³ Later (*Or.* 59.4) he comes back to the point and employs the motif 'I should have decided by myself to write this speech' ('... I was urging myself towards my subject without waiting for the signal to be raised by others').²⁴ However, now the right time is coming 'for bringing my ready zeal to the task',²⁵ because 'my intention and the request concurred'.²⁶ Further on, when Libanius notes that the effect of his speech is positive for the emperors, for Libanius himself, and for the one who commissioned the speech, he refers to his client as 'being the joint-cause of the speech' (ὁ τοῦ λόγου συναίτιος *Or.* 59.4.15).²⁷

Later, in the final reference to the person who commissioned the speech (*Or.* 59.6),²⁸ Libanius distinguishes the eagerness on the part of the proposer to praise simultaneously both emperors from his own position (ἐγὼ δέ). The orator himself would have employed a different approach to the issue: 'For, if it had been possible to divide up the enterprise and to refer in turn to each man, and now to settle in full the debt to the older, and a little later to return to the other contribution, even so we would not have been a match for their merits and in truth being so overwhelmed we would perhaps have retired'.²⁹ This, in addition to being an attempt at a *captatio benevolentiae*,³⁰ is also a discreet hint that the praise of both emperors simultaneously was his client's choice, rather than his own. In fact, he implies that he would have praised Constantius separately first and then Constans, which might indicate a preference for Constantius. This preference is also apparent in the current form of the speech,

²¹ See n. 13 above.

²² In the Classical period, this was common practice in the case of forensic speeches (cf. the case of Lysias). In Late Antiquity see *Pan. Lat.* IX(5) which has been commissioned by the *civitas Aeduarum* for the Emperor Constantius I.

²³ Ἐμελλόν, οἶμαι, μηδενὸς ἀνθρώπων παροξύνοντος αὐτόματος ὀρμήσειν ἐπὶ τὸν λόγον (*Or.* 59.1.1-2).

²⁴ διὰ μὲν δὴ ταῦτα καὶ ἔτι πλείω πρὸς τὴν ὑπόθεσιν ἐμαυτὸν ἐκίνουν οὐκ ἀναμένων παρ' ἐτέρων ἀρθῆναι τὸ σύνθημα (*Or.* 59.4.1-3).

²⁵ ἀλλὰ τοῦ τὴν προθυμίαν εἰς ἔργον ἀγαγεῖν τὸν καιρὸν ἐφεστάναι (*Or.* 59.4.5-6).

²⁶ καὶ συνῆλθον γνώμη τε καὶ παράκλησις (*Or.* 59.4.4).

²⁷ In Lieu's and Montserrat's English translation, this phrase is translated as 'the sponsor of the speech'.

²⁸ This client appears only in the *prooemium*. Thereafter, in the main part of the speech and in the epilogue, there is no further mention of him.

²⁹ εἰ μὲν γὰρ ἐνῆν διελεῖν τὸ ἀγώνισμα καὶ ἐν μέρει πρὸς ἑκάτερον ἀποδοῦναι καὶ νῦν μὲν τῷ πρεσβυτέρῳ τὸ ὄφλημα διαλυῖσαι, μικρὸν δὲ ὕστερον ἐπὶ τὴν ἑτέραν μερίδα μετελθεῖν, οὐδ' οὕτω μὲν ἂν πρὸς τὴν ἀξίαν ἠρκέσαμεν, οὐ μὴν τοσοῦτον ἂν ἴσως ἠττηθέντες ἀπήλθομεν. (*Or.* 59.6.22-2).

³⁰ 'Fishing for good will'.

since the parts dedicated to each emperor are very unequal in terms of size.³¹ This imbalance could further be interpreted as an echo of the rivalry between the two emperors, and as an attempt on the orator's behalf to gain the favour of the first (Constantius).³²

In this context, Libanius uses a metaphor from athletic games, comparing the proposer to a trainer, who also shares in the glory derived from the winners' crowns. The metaphor involving the language of athletics, both here and in other passages in the *prooemium*, where for example the sponsor is referred as 'the proposer of **the contest**',³³ are SIMPLE REFERENCES to the *prooemium* of Isocrates' *Panegyricus*.³⁴ At the very beginning of this work (*Or.* 4), Isocrates made a reference to athletic games. 'I have often marvelled at those who established panegyric festivals and set up **athletic contests**'.³⁵ In this way, Libanius links the prologue of his work with the *Panegyric* of Isocrates, using the same vocabulary ('ὥσπερ γὰρ ἐν τοῖς γυμνικοῖς ἀγῶσι ...' *or.* 59.4.13). However, the metaphor of athletic games is used in different ways in the two orators: in Isocrates in order to complain 'that the athletes are more highly honoured than intellectuals'³⁶ and in Libanius in order to compare athletic games with the oration, where the orator himself corresponds to the athlete and the proposer to the trainer.

Correction-multiple reference

There is a different way in which Libanius alludes to Menander's treatise in order to correct it in the prologue. Libanius modifies Menander's text ('Having, as we do, so many blessings from the emperors, it is **inappropriate** not to return them our due and proper offering')³⁷ through use of the superlative ('In the first place it would have been **most inappropriate**, since emperors do not hesitate to risk their lives to win our security ...'³⁸). Such verbal references show that Libanius uses Menander's text on imperial oration directly.³⁹

The correction of his model is achieved not only through the vocabulary, but also through the *exempla*. Whereas Menander's suggests that 'the *prooemia* of this speech also admit amplifications based on indefinite examples',⁴⁰ Libanius goes on to give a more ethical

³¹ By far the greater part (5274 words) is dedicated to Constantius, and only 1746 words to Constans (Malosse 2003, 14).

³² On the rivalry between the two emperors see Maraval 2013, 39-61, especially 42-44.

³³ ὃ τε προβαλὼν τὸν ἄθλον (*Or.* 59.6.2).

³⁴ For Isocrates' invention of the genre of panegyric, see Pernot in this volume.

³⁵ πολλάκις ἐθαύμασα τῶν τὰς πανηγύρεις συναγαγόντων καὶ τοὺς γυμνικοὺς ἀγῶνας καταστησάντων (*Or.* 4.1.1-2).

³⁶ Papillon 2004, 29 note 13.

³⁷ ἄτοπὸν ἐστὶ τοσοῦτων ἀγαθῶν παρὰ βασιλέων πειρωμένους ... (Men.Rh.II.368.15-17).

³⁸ πρῶτον μὲν γὰρ τῶν ἀτοπωτάτων ἂν ἦν, εἰ βασιλεῖς μὲν τοῖς αὐτῶν σώμασιν οὐκ ἀποκνοῦσι τὴν ἀσφάλειαν ἡμῖν κατακτώμενοι ... (*Or.* 59.1.4-6).

³⁹ The flagging of the intertextual dialogue between the texts by Libanius and Menander through the words τῶν ἀτοπωτάτων — ἄτοπον is also noted by Malosse (2003, 121 note 1).

⁴⁰ δέχεται δὲ τὰ προοίμια τοῦ λόγου καὶ ἐκ παραδειγμάτων ἀορίστων αὐξήσεις (Men. Rh. II.368.21-2).

dimension to his argumentation, by adding a comparison between farmers and intellectuals: ‘Secondly I considered it most disgraceful that, whereas those who work the fields offer the first fruits of their crops to the emperors, those who pass their lives in philosophy should abandon the public contribution that is their duty’ (*Or.* 59.2).⁴¹ Here again Libanius follows his model and simultaneously corrects it by giving an amplification based on a definite example (farmers/intellectuals).

Next, in accord with Menandrian precepts, Libanius mentions the great glory which the oration will win (368.11-15).⁴² Here again, Libanius employs the key-word **δόξα** (‘glory’) to evoke the argument of his model, but his own argument is different and corrects Menander’s. The success of his speech will ensure glory not only for the orator himself (as Menander claims) but also for the emperors, and for the one who has commissioned of the speech (*Or.* 59.4).⁴³ Some lines later (in §7), this motif is rhetorically amplified by a CASUAL REFERENCE to the argument of Plato’s *Menexenus* ‘defeat is more profitable than victory’.⁴⁴ The defeat of the oration by the deeds of the emperors is more beneficial than *vice versa*. At this point (*Or.* 59.7), Libanius makes a MULTIPLE REFERENCE connecting the Platonic allusion with the Menandrian prescriptions; by using the argument of Plato, that is the classical tradition, Libanius expands and corrects Menander.⁴⁵

The next issue touched upon by Libanius, ‘the difficulty of the task’, is the first in Menander’s model (368.9-11). Libanius evokes encomiastic tradition to bring this *topos* directly to the fore (‘It is the custom of those embarking on a speech of praise to criticize their own powers as being greatly deficient in describing the achievements as far surpassing mere words’).⁴⁶ He sets himself apart from the encomiastic tradition, only so as to be able to confirm it and identify himself with it, no matter how paradoxical this may sound. In other words, his argument is: this view is admittedly a *topos*, but I do not need any textbook example upon which to employ it, since ‘the present necessity would have provided the theme’.⁴⁷ At this point we can see a meta-rhetorical discourse emerging, which reveals the Libanius’ perception of his relation to the rhetorical tradition: although he knows its

⁴¹ ἔπειτα δὲ τῶν αἰσχίστων ἡγούμην τοὺς μὲν γεωργοῦντας ἀποφέρειν τῶν καρπῶν τοῖς βασιλεῦσι τὰς ἀπαρχάς, τοὺς δὲ περὶ τὴν φιλοσοφίαν διατρίβοντας τὴν ἐπ’ αὐτοὺς ἤκουσαν ἐγκαταλιπεῖν συντέλειαν ... (*Or.* 59.2.10-14). In place of the word ‘intellectuals’ Libanius used ‘philosopher’. On this Malosse 2003, 121 note 2.

⁴² See Proc. Gaz. *Or.* 2.1.23-6 for a similar sentiment.

⁴³ On the reference to δόξα and its association to historiography see Ross 2016, 307-8.

⁴⁴ ἡ νίκη αἰσχύνῃν φέρει, ἡ δὲ ἦττα, ἐὰν ἡττώμεθα, εὐδαιμονίαν (Plato, *Men.* 247a 5-6).

⁴⁵ It is worth noting that Libanius avoids using the actual words Τύχη/τύχοιεν (*Men.Rh.* II.368.13-14), replacing them by ‘τὴν εὐτυχίαν καρπούμενοι’ (*Or.* 59.7.14).

⁴⁶ Ἔστι μὲν οὖν ἕθος τοῖς ἐπιχειροῦσιν ἐγκωμιάζειν τὴν μὲν αὐτῶν καταμέμφεσθαι δύναμιν ὡς πολλὴν λειπομένην τῶν πραγμάτων, τὴν δὲ τῶν πραγμάτων ἀποθαυμάζειν ὑπερβολὴν ὡς πολλὰ νικῶσαν τοὺς λόγους. (*Or.* 59.5.17-20). Cf. Lib. *Or.* 11.6; Aristid. *Or.* 35.2; Xen. *Ages.* 1.1 (the citations in Russell/Wilson 1981, 272).

⁴⁷ πάντως ἂν τὴν παροῦσαν χρεῖαν εὐρεῖν ἡγοῦμαι τὸν λόγον (*Or.* 59.5.21-2). The paratextual comments on this point are of great interest: In ms. K there is *supra lect.* the comment τῷ Ἴσοκράτει, linking the passage with the *Panegyricus* of Isocrates (4.13) according to Malosse 2003, 122.

existence, he does not need it, but in the end he is trying to follow it in a different and innovative way.

Libanius employs various means, namely examples and argumentation, to elaborate the *topos* of the ‘difficulty of the task’. There are two main arguments, Libanius implies, that prove difficulty, namely quantity (one encomium has to praise both emperors, as required by his patron, § 6) and quality (the orator is not an eyewitness to the deeds of the emperors, § 8). The last argument evokes a historiographical statement.⁴⁸ Again a *topos*, which is proposed by Menander, has been elaborated through the classical and Hellenistic literary tradition. Here, he self-referentially distances himself from ‘those who have been judged worthy of the imperial palace and march away with the emperors on campaign and are well acquainted with what is done in peace day by day’.⁴⁹ Thus the orator achieves a rhetorical *captatio benevolentiae*, while simultaneously apologizing for his somewhat limited knowledge of imperial actions and claiming that his omission of certain issues will be due mainly to ignorance. Furthermore, in this way ‘he dissociates himself from the court and explicitly aligns himself with the Nicomedian audience’.⁵⁰

The same *topos* of the ‘inability of human speech to express the greatness of the subject’s deeds’ is also adopted in the *prooemium* (*Or.* 1.5-7) of Julian’s first oration to Constantius (dated approximately to 356/7). Here it seems clear that Julian is using what was already a rhetorical *topos* since Classical times, rather than drawing on Menander.⁵¹ Julian’s *Oration 2* (*The heroic deeds of the Emperor Constantius or on kingship*) begins with a Homeric example, that of Achilles (*Or.* 2[Wright].1-30), which diverges completely from Menander’s rules.

The *prooemium* of the Libanius’ imperial speech ends with a *diaporesis*:⁵² **‘From what point then is it right to make a beginning?’**⁵³ This is again a conflation, a MULTIPLE REFERENCE to Menander (‘in the form of the speaker’s uncertainty about the **point from**

⁴⁸ For further details on this see Ross 2016, 313-315.

⁴⁹ ὅσοι μὲν γὰρ βασιλικῶν αὐλῶν ἄξιοι κριθέντες καὶ στρατευομένοις συναπαίρουσι καὶ τῶν ἐπὶ τῆς ἡσυχίας παρ’ ἡμέραν πραττομένων οὐκ ἀπείρως ἔχουσι (*Or.* 59.8.17-21).

⁵⁰ Ross 2016, 314. Ross (2016) points out that the localized view of affairs from Nicomedia allows the orator to praise the emperor of the East (Constantius II) more extensively than the emperor of the West (Constans).

⁵¹ Pernot 1993, 302. On this *topos* in Julian’s *Or.* 1 see Tantillo 1997, 135-136. The same commonplace in Proc. Gaz. *Or.* 2.1.26-37. On the influence of literary models on Julian’s *Or.* 1 see Tougher 2012, 22-4, in particular on the Menandrian model *ibid.* 24-8 and Gladis 1907, 20-9. On the literary context and the intention of Julian’s *Or.* 1 see Ross 2018. On the contrary, the appearance of the *topos* in Libanius should be attributed more to Menander than to the earlier tradition, because it forms part of a more general adaptation of the Menandrian prologue, as is evident from the multiplicity of thematic and linguistic similarities.

⁵² *Diaporesis* or *dubitatio* is a rhetorical figure ‘whereby an orator or author pretends that he is altogether incapable of treating the subject matter at hand in a manner befitting its loftiness’ (Cain 2016, 115).

⁵³ Πόθεν οὖν ἄρξασθαι καλόν; (*Or.* 59.10.4).

which to make the **beginning** of the encomium')⁵⁴ and to Plato's *Menexenus* ('or how could we **rightly begin** our laudation of these valiant men ...?')⁵⁵. Julian in his first oration ('What then shall be the **beginning** of my speech and the **most suitable** arrangement?')⁵⁶ seems to be closer to Menander's prescription (consciously or not),⁵⁷ whereas Libanius will elaborate further the Platonic reference in the transition from the *prooemium* to the praise of the kin of each emperor (*Or.* 59.10.5-8).

Libanius makes a MARKED REFERENCE to Plato and in particular to the same passage from the *Menexenus* (237a): 'Let the saying of Plato be quoted of them (and it is more appropriate for them than for those of whom it was said), namely that "they were born good because they were sprung from good stock"'.⁵⁸ Libanius even states that it is more suitable in the present context than it was in the original. Malosse considers this an artful parody, since Plato uses the phrase of Athenian soldiers who have died for their country,⁵⁹ although in my view, it is simply a reference, rather than a parody, for two reasons. Firstly, Libanius himself corrects the context, in that he observes that Plato's expression is even more appropriate for his emperors, and secondly, because Julian too, in his transition from the *prooemium* to the main part of the speech, uses (*Or.* 1.3) passages recalling Plato's *Menexenus* (237a-b, 246d-e). Moreover, if one bears in mind the frequent allusions to Plato's *Menexenus* in *Oration* 59,⁶⁰ Libanius is probably intentionally evoking this Platonic work, because funeral orations and imperial panegyric are interrelated genres, since both belong to the epideictic genre.

Both Julian and Libanius make detailed mention of the royal family, with special emphasis on Constantius I and on their father Constantine,⁶¹ which again follows the Menandrian model: 'If neither his city nor his nation is conspicuously famous, you should omit this topic, and consider whether his family has prestige or not. If it has, work this up'.⁶² Indeed, in the case of the latter, Libanius finds the opportunity to sculpt the ideal model of the father-teacher and to deploy his own rhetorical theory as teacher of rhetoric (*Or.* 59.38).⁶³

Of special interest for any consideration of the relationship between the work of Libanius and that of Menander is the reference to the birth of the two emperors (*Or.* 59.23-29). Menander suggests the usage of exempla (*Men.Rh.* II.371.3-14):

⁵⁴ οἷον ὡς διαποροῦντος τοῦ λέγοντος **δοθεν** χρῆ τὴν **ἀρχὴν** τῶν ἐγκωμίων ποιήσασθαι (*Men.Rh.* II.369.13-16).

⁵⁵ ἢ **πόθεν** ἂν ὀρθῶς **ἀρξάμεθα** ἀνδρας ἀγαθοὺς ἐπαινοῦντες ... (*Plato, Men.* 237a 1-2).

⁵⁶ Τίς ἂν οὖν ἡμῖν **ἀρχὴ** καὶ τάξις τοῦ λόγου γένοιτο **καλλίστη**; (*Or.* 1.3.1-2).

⁵⁷ Gladis 1907, 22.

⁵⁸ λεγέσθω δὴ τὸ τοῦ Πλάτωνος ἐπ' αὐτοῖς μᾶλλον τούτοις ἢ 'κείνοις πρέπον εἰς οὓς εἴρηται, ὅτι ἀγαθοὶ δὲ ἐγένοντο διὰ τὸ φῦναι ἐξ ἀγαθῶν (*Or.* 59.10.5-8).

⁵⁹ Malosse 2003, 183.

⁶⁰ Chaps 87, 101 (expression), 119 MULTIPLE REFERENCE (Thucydides and Plato *Menexenus*), 160. On the influence of Thucydides in *Or.* 59 see Schouler 1984, 526-7, 535

⁶¹ See Seiler 1998. See also on the sources Wiemer 1994, 513-515; Malosse 2000.

⁶² ἐὰν δὲ μήτε ἡ πατρὶς μήτε τὸ ἔθνος τυγχάνῃ περίβλεπτον, ἀφήσεις μὲν τοῦτο, θεωρήσεις δὲ πάλιν, πότερον ἔνδοξον αὐτοῦ τὸ γένος ἢ οὐ. κἂν μὲν ἔνδοξον ᾖ, ἐξεργάση τὰ περὶ τούτου (*Men.Rh.* II.370.9-12).

⁶³ See 'Libanios' Bildungsideal' in Nesselrath 2012, 50 ff. and the note 47 in Wiemer 2014, 2013.

οὐκοῦν ἔστω σοι μετὰ τὴν πατρίδα καὶ μετὰ τὸ γένος τρίτον κεφάλαιον τὸ περὶ τῆς γενέσεως, ὡς ἔφαμεν, <καὶ> εἴ τι σύμβολον γέγονε περὶ τὸν τόκον ἢ κατὰ γῆν ἢ κατ' οὐρανὸν ἢ κατὰ θάλασσαν, [καὶ] ἀντεξέτασον τοῖς περὶ τὸν Ῥωμύλον καὶ Κῦρον καὶ τοιούτοις τισί. [τὰ] κατὰ τὴν γένεσιν [καὶ] γὰρ κάκεινοις συνέβη τινὰ θαυμάσια, **τῷ μὲν Κύρῳ τὰ τῆς μητρὸς** ὄνειρατα, τῷ δὲ τὰ περὶ τὴν λύκαιναν· κἄν μὲν ἦ τι τοιοῦτον περὶ τὸν βασιλέα, ἐξέργασαι, ἐὰν δὲ οἶόν τε ἦ καὶ πλάσαι καὶ ποιεῖν τοῦτο πιθανῶς, μὴ κατόκνει· δίδωσι γὰρ ἡ ὑπόθεσις διὰ τὸ τοὺς ἀκούοντας ἀνάγκην ἔχειν ἀβασανίστως δέχεσθαι τὰ ἐγκώμια.

‘After country and family, then, let the third heading, as we have just said, be ‘birth’, and if any divine sign occurred at the time of his birth, either on land or in the heavens or on the sea, compare the circumstances with those of Romulus, Cyrus, and similar stories, since in these cases also there were miraculous happenings connected with their birth – the dream of **Cyrus’ mother**, the suckling of Romulus by the she-wolf. If there is anything like this in connection with the emperor, work it up; if it is possible to invent, and to do this convincingly, do not hesitate; the subject permits this, because the audience has no choice but to accept the encomium without examination’

Libanius openly enters into a dialogue with Menander’s theoretical model, and *via* the *exempla* creates A MULTIPLE REFERENCE, which will touch upon both poetry and history (especially Herodotus and perhaps Plutarch) (*Or.* 59.23-24):

Μέλλων δὲ ἐπὶ τὰς εὐδαίμονας τῶν βασιλέων προβαίνειν γονὰς ἔννοιάν τινα λαμβάνω ποιητῶν τέ τινων καὶ τῶν ἐν ἱστορίαις ἀτόπων καὶ σκοπῶν εὐρίσκω μύθοις μὲν καὶ τερατείαις κεκοσμημένους τοὺς ἐν τοῖς ἔμπροσθεν ἀδομένους, λειπομένην δὲ ὅμως τὴν τῶν μύθων ἐξουσίαν τῆς ἐπὶ τοῖς παροῦσιν ἀληθείας. **Κῦρον** μὲν τοίνυν οἱ σεμνύοντες ὄψιν ἐν τοῖς ὕπνοις **Ἀστύαγει** γενέσθαι **φασίν**, ὡς ἐκ Μανδάνης τῆς ἐσομένης Κύρου μητρὸς ἀναβλαστήσειέ τε ἄμπελος καὶ τὴν Ἀσίαν ἅπασαν ἐπιλάβοι. ὑπὲρ δὲ Ἀλεξάνδρου τοῦ Μακεδόνοιο αἰσχυνθέντες εἰ πατρὸς νομίζοιτο Φιλίππου, δράκοντα συγκατακλίνουσιν Ὀλυμπιάδι πρὸς ἑκπληξιν τῶν μειρακυλλίων τὴν συνουσίαν συμπλάσαντες.

Now that I am about to proceed to the blessed birth of the emperors, I consider a notion from certain poets and those who record unusual events in their histories; and when I investigate I find that those who were celebrated in former times had their characters embroidered with stories and wondrous events, but that nevertheless the wealth of stories would fall short of the truth for these present characters. So, for instance, those who exalt **Cyrus say that Astyages** had a vision in his sleep, that a vine would spout forth from Mandane the future mother of Cyrus and would encompass all Asia. And those who feel it a disgrace for Alexander the Great, that he should be considered the son of Philip, make a snake bed down with Olympias and fabricate the union for the utter amazement of young boys.

This actually goes against Menandrian precepts, in that Libanius characterizes the stories of the kind proposed by Menander, which also appear in poets and historiographical texts, as inappropriate and untrue.⁶⁴ He discusses in greater detail (in comparison to Menander) the story of Cyrus, obviously drawing on Herodotus. He refrains at this point from mentioning Romulus (he will make use of this example when discussing the raising of the emperors, *Or.* 59.23), but instead mentions another popular example, the birth of Alexander the Great (probably drawing on Plutarch, Pseudo-Callisthenes or some other source now lost). Libanius uses these examples in order to establish a contrast with the dignity that characterizes the line of descent of the two emperors ('so the generation of these surpasses every strange tale and has required only itself to provide its dignity').⁶⁵ And later he claims that 'I shall refer to nothing merely for purposes of romance by diverting my account to the obscure, but I shall state what everyone knows'.⁶⁶ He goes on to describe the victories of their father, which coincided with the birth of the two emperors and are regarded as good portents. At the end of this section on the birth, all of this is aptly summed up by Libanius, who uses the technique of ring composition to do so: 'To put it concisely, either a reasoning surpassing all human nature was coming to his mind or the deliberation was being put into practice. Are not these things better than a vine flourishing in dreams, are they not surer signs than the flight of birds? Are they not more credible than a phenomenon of snakes?'⁶⁷

The way in which Libanius handles the literary *topos* of birth is rhetorically elaborate.⁶⁸ At this point, too, he enters into an intertextual dialogue with the previous tradition (MULTIPLE REFERENCES), in particular with Isocrates' *Panathenaikos* (*Or.* 12.1) and *Evagoras* (*Or.* 9.21), as allusions with the same *topos* and the same vocabulary to these works demonstrate.⁶⁹ The insistent questioning of these Menandrian *topoi* concerning birth and

⁶⁴ On the relationship between encomium and historiography in Libanius, see Ross 2016. On the tradition of mythology in Libanius see Schouler 1984, 746-60.

⁶⁵ οὕτως ἢ τῶνδε γένεσις πάντα ὑπερβᾶσα λόγον ἀλλόκοτον αὐτῇ μόνῃ πρὸς σεμνότητα κέχρηται (*Or.* 59.25.16-18).

⁶⁶ ἀνοίσω δὲ οὐδὲν εἰς μυθολογίαν εἰς ἀφανῆς ἀποφῆρων τὸν λόγον, ἀλλ' ἅ πάντες ἴσασις ἐρῶ. (*Or.* 59.26.24-25).

⁶⁷ συνελόντι δὲ εἰπεῖν, ἢ λογισμὸς ὑπὲρ ἅπασαν ἀνθρωπίνην φύσιν ἐπὶ νοῦν ἤρχετο ἢ τὸ βουλευθὲν εἰς ἔργον ἤγετο. ταῦτα τίνας ἀμπέλου θαλλούσης ἐν ὀνείρασις οὐκ ἀμείνω, τίνας ὀρνίθων πτήσεως οὐκ ἰσχυρότερα σημεῖα; τίνας δρακόντων φάσματος οὐκ ἀληθέστερα πρὸς πίστιν; (*Or.* 59.29.19-24).

⁶⁸ See Karla 2017, 140-4.

⁶⁹ 'When I was younger, I elected not to write the kind of discourse which deals **with myths nor that which abounds in marvels** and fictions.' Νεώτερος μὲν ὢν προηρούμην γράφειν τῶν λόγων οὐ **τοὺς μυθώδεις οὐδὲ τοὺς τερατείας** καὶ ψευδολογίας μεστός (Isoc. 12.1.1-3) — 'when I investigate I find that those who were celebrated in former times had their characters embroidered **with stories and marvels**' καὶ σκοπῶν εὐρίσκω **μύθοις μὲν καὶ τερατείας** κεκοσμημένους (Lib. 59.23.3-4). 'I prefer to say nothing of the portents, the oracles, **the visions appearing in sleep**, from which the impression might be gained that he was of superhuman birth' **περὶ οὗ τὰς μὲν φήμας καὶ τὰς μαντείας καὶ τὰς ὄψεις τὰς ἐν τοῖς ὕπνοις γενομένας**, ἐξ ὧν μειζόνως ἂν φανείη γεγονὼς ἢ κατ' ἀνθρώπον, αἰροῦμαι παραλιπεῖν (Isoc. 9.21.3-6) — 'those who exalt Cyrus say that Astyages had **a vision in his sleep**' Κῦρον μὲν τοίνυν οἱ σεμνύνοντες **ὄψιν ἐν τοῖς ὕπνοις** Ἀστυάγει γενέσθαι φασίν (Lib. 59.23.6-8).

descent, and the way that questioning is expressed seems to gradually become a rhetorical *topos* in its own right in imperial panegyrics.⁷⁰ Thus the distinction between poetry and panegyric occurs again in Julian's speech for Constantius (*Or.* 1.7), in which the same examples are used (Cyrus, Romulus, Alexander).⁷¹ In particular, doubts regarding the truth of the myths concerning the birth and descent of Alexander the Great are also to be found, in similar contexts, in Themistius (*Or.* 13.176a) and in Procopius of Gaza, in his speech for the Emperor Anastasius (*Or.* 2.27).

In the sections that follow, Libanius remains by and large faithful to the structure proposed by Menander.⁷² Each point is made in a manner similar to that adopted in the *prooemium*. The orator enters into a dialogue with his rhetorical model and sets his own rules, while offering his own idea of the ideal emperor⁷³ and all the while presenting his argumentation in an appropriate rhetorical manner.⁷⁴

Marked Omissions

Omissions in the speech of Libanius, in comparison to his model, are loaded with significance. The orator manages to send several messages to his audience by simply suppressing some structural elements or motifs proposed by Menander.

Some omissions seem to be caused by religious issues or differences. For example, in the *prooemium* the Menandrian *topos* that Libanius does not use is 'Fear God and honour the king' (II.368.17-21). Libanius may have avoided this commonplace because of historical and political circumstances and because he is pagan, whilst the emperors whom he is praising are Christian.⁷⁵ Thus any mention of pagan gods in the *prooemium* would have raised insoluble difficulties. However, since reference must always be made to religion in such a context and cannot be completely ignored, in the main part of this speech, Libanius employs the neutral term 'the best one' (ὁ κρείττων),⁷⁶ an expression also used by other pagan orators such as Menander (e.g. II.370.23; 375.16; 427.19), Julian (e.g. *Or.* 3.16.30; 6.13.2), Procopius of Gaza (e.g. *Or.* 2.3.60; 2.4.90).

At the end of the imperial speech Menander suggests making an allusion to Tyche (376.24-27), but Libanius seems not to heed this advice. In Lieu and Montserrat's view, the

⁷⁰ Caballero López 2003.

⁷¹ Here it is clear that this passage alludes to *Evagoras* (21). See on this, Tougher 2012, 33 n. 61. On poetry in prose Latin panegyrics see Ware 2017.

⁷² The structure in Russell and Wilson 1981, 271.

⁷³ As has already been demonstrated (Malosse 2003, 49-72), Libanius' *Or.* 59 constitutes a mirror of princes (Fürstenspiegel).

⁷⁴ Of course, one may find here, too, omissions or unequal reference to the virtues of the two emperors (see Malosse 2003, 37-8), but this will not concern us further here.

⁷⁵ See on this topic Wiemer 1994, 514; Cribiore 2013, 132 ff.; van Nuffelen 2014 and Sandwell 2007, 91-119, in particular p. 94 on *Or.* 59. Sandwell observes that 'references to religious allegiance are the exception rather than the rule in Libanius' writings' (2007, 91).

⁷⁶ *Or.* 59. 16, 48, 74, 122, 125, 142, 169. These references also in Sandwell 2007, 94 n. 14.

omission of the reference to Tyche is perhaps due to religious differences.⁷⁷ Considering that ‘the Tyche of Antioch was the tutelary deity of the city and was present from the city’s beginnings ...’⁷⁸ and so may have had religious significance for the Antiochean Libanius, Lieu and Montserrat are perhaps right. Libanius avoids mentioning fortune in *Or.* 59 at the points where Menandrian rules recommend it (see above), but in general the notion of fortune is not absent, and is in fact personalized once.⁷⁹ In my view, there is no reference to Tyche at this final point of the oration for a number of reasons. In at least two passages in the oration (§§ 32 and 149) Libanius emphasizes that the accomplishments of the emperors are not the result of fate, but, rather, of the excellence of their virtue.⁸⁰ Consequently, for Libanius to attribute at this point the emperors’ words and deeds to fortune would contradict what he has previously claimed.

Other omissions are due to practical reasons, because the kings do not possess the necessary attributes. For example, after the reference to birth and kin, the Menandrian model suggests a reference to nature (371.14-17), although, significantly, no such reference is to be found in Libanius, or indeed in Julian either. Furthermore, the final prayer, as recommended by Menander, is also omitted.⁸¹ Since both Constantius II and Constans were childless, this may be a reason why Libanius does not use this *topos*,⁸² although he could conceivably have attempted a variation of the prayer without the reference to children.

Omissions could be motivated by political reasons. For example, after the *prooemium*, Menander suggests making a reference to the homeland and the nation of the honorand: ‘After the *prooemia*, you will come to the topic of his native country ... if the city has no distinction, you must inquire whether his nation as a whole is considered brave and valiant ...’ and allows only one reason for omitting them: ‘if neither his city nor his nation is conspicuously famous, you should omit this topic, and consider whether his family has prestige or not’ (369.18-23).⁸³ Libanius, after the *diaporesis* ‘Where should I start from?’, omits the reference to the homeland and continues immediately to the praise of the subject’s family. This omission⁸⁴ is probably not due to practical reasons, as Lieu in his commentary

⁷⁷ 1996, 161. Cf. the critique of this view in Tougher 2012, 33 n. 60.

⁷⁸ Sandwell 2007, 40.

⁷⁹ Ten times in total (§§ 10, 12, 32, 59, 71, 85, 149, 157, 160, 167).

⁸⁰ See for example §149: ‘In short he wishes to be called emperor according to the excellence of his virtue rather than according to the better lot of his fortune’ (ὅλως τε βασιλεὺς ἐθέλει κεκληθῆσθαι τῷ τῆς ἀρετῆς ὑπερβάλλοντι μᾶλλον ἢ τῷ τῆς τύχης βελτίονι *Or.* 59.149.19-21).

⁸¹ ‘After this, you must utter a prayer, beseeching God that the emperor’s reign may endure long, and the throne be handed down to his children and his descendants’ (ἐπὶ τούτοις εὐχὴν ἐρεῖς αἰτῶν παρὰ θεοῦ εἰς μῆκιστον χρόνον προελθεῖν τὴν βασιλείαν, διαδοθῆναι εἰς παῖδας, παραδοθῆναι τῷ γένει, *Men.Rh.* II.377.28-30).

⁸² See the note in Malosse 2003, 216.

⁸³ Μετὰ τὰ προοίμια ἐπὶ τὴν πατρίδα ἤξεις ... ἂν δὲ μὴ ἡ πόλις ἐνδοξος ᾗ, ζητήσεις τὸ ἔθνος ἅπαν, εἰ ἀνδρεῖον ὑπείληπται καὶ ἄλκιμον ... ἐὰν δὲ μήτε ἡ πατρίς μήτε τὸ ἔθνος τυγχάνῃ περιβλεπτον, ἀφήσεις μὲν τοῦτο ... θεωρήσεις δὲ ἄλιον, πότερον ἐνδοξον αὐτοῦ τὸ γένος ἢ οὐ ... (*Men.Rh.* II.369.18-370.11)

⁸⁴ ‘Here Libanius makes a major departure from the precepts laid down by Menander (369.18-370.10) in omitting any praise for the patriae of the two emperors ...’ (Lieu 1996, 205).

thinks it is: ‘perhaps it is more difficult to eulogize two native cities’.⁸⁵ The comparison with Julian’s corresponding speech shows that the latter, in contrast to Libanius, in his speech to Constantius does make mention of three cities or regions, to Rome, his home city, to Constantinople, the city that reigns over all, and to the area of Illyria, the birthplace of Constantius.⁸⁶ It is likely that Libanius consciously avoids reference to Rome and particularly to Constantinople for political reasons, perhaps because of the competition between Nicomedia (where the speech is delivered), Antioch (the birthplace of Libanius), and Constantinople. Lieu’s interpretation that ‘Libanius did not wish to praise a city which had strong associations with Christianity from its very foundation’⁸⁷ is contradicted by the fact that Julian does refer to it, without any religious undertones (*Or.* 1.4). This suggests that Libanius, too, had he felt the need, could also have made a neutral mention of Constantinople, free of any religious overtones. After all, he later alludes to the rioting in Constantinople (in *Or.* 59.94-95) and refers there to the city in a SINGLE REFERENCE (‘the greatest of the cities in this part of the world, second only to the greatest of them all’),⁸⁸ a phrase which Aelius Aristides employs of Alexandria (*Or.* 26.26).⁸⁹ So, at the end of his speech, Libanius completely ignores Menandrian precepts. Thus there are no references to ‘the emperor’s Fortune’, to ‘the final comparison’, and to ‘closing with prayer in the epilogue’.⁹⁰

Although in the epilogue Menander proposes: ‘In this, you will speak of the prosperity and good fortune of the cities’,⁹¹ Libanius again abandons the Menandrian model and proceeds in his own fashion. With a *diaporesis*⁹² he wonders which is the greatest virtue of both emperors and enumerates their qualities in conjunction (*Or.* 59.166). He emphasizes in a speech which refers to divination that the emperors did not resort to oracles in order to predict the future (*Or.* 59.167), and concludes, ‘but all those who become good men despite ignorance of their destiny, are remarkable in success and in failure are blameless’.⁹³ This claim is perhaps connected to the next statement, to the effect that one should consider the youthful age of the two emperors with respect to the greatness of their accomplishments: ‘And perhaps he will find his amazement (τὸ θαῦμα) is greater at the youth of the accomplishments than at the scale of the accomplishments’.⁹⁴

⁸⁵ Lieu 1996, 205.

⁸⁶ Constantius II was born in Illyricum on 7 August 317. Constantius was born between 320 and 323 and his birthplace is unknown. Lieu 1996, 205; Tantillo 1997, 146, 160.

⁸⁷ Lieu 1996, 205.

⁸⁸ ... τὴν μεγίστην μὲν τῶν τῆδε πόλεων, τῆς δὲ ἀπασῶν μεγίστης δευτέραν (*Or.* 59.94.15-16).

⁸⁹ Malosse 2003, 200.

⁹⁰ The same omissions are to be found also in Julian. See on this Tougher 2012, 26.

⁹¹ (μετὰ τὴν σύγκρισιν οἱ ἐπίλογοι.) ἐν τούτοις ἐρεῖς τὰς εὐετηρίας, τὰς εὐδαιμονίας τῶν πόλεων ... (Men.Rh.377.9-11).

⁹² On the term see n. 52.

⁹³ ὅσοι δ’ ἂν ὁμοίως ἀγνοοῦντες τὸ πέρας ἄνδρες ἀγαθοὶ γίνωνται, καὶ κατορθοῦντες θαυμαστοὶ καὶ σφαλέντες ἄμεμπτοι (*Or.* 59.167.8-10). See the notes at Malosse 2003, 181 and 215.

⁹⁴ καὶ τάχα μείζον ἐν τῇ νεότητι τῶν πεποηκότων ἢ τῷ μεγέθει τῶν πεποημένων εὐρήσει τὸ θαῦμα (*Or.* 59.168.14-16).

In his epilogue, Libanius is evidently once more closely following Menandrian rules, whereby at this point he is required to mention the smooth functioning of cities and the happiness of their citizens, but he does so in a somewhat odd way. He refers to the origins of the world, when ‘the creator of the world’ created ‘all that human nature was going to need’⁹⁵ and distributed resources in the best possible fashion.⁹⁶ However, ‘this humanitarian scheme ... had previously been destroyed and ruined’ and the earth was split in two. Finally, his narration reaches the present: ‘but now what was hitherto separated came together and has been joined, and what so far had been torn apart has been restored to its proper condition’.⁹⁷

Libanius continues with an idealizing picture of life on land and sea, in the East and in the West, the perfection of which is due to the unity of the emperors. This picture is rendered through a metaphor taken from the domain of music and dancing,⁹⁸ A SIMPLE REFERENCE TO Aelius Aristides (*Disc.* 26.29).⁹⁹ The contrast between past (πάλαι) and present (νῦν) is maintained until the end of the epilogue. However, the scope is widened, in that Libanius now includes the genre of imperial speeches of the past and of the present. ‘And so those who in the past were ending their speeches have generally prayed that they would encounter more good fortune ... But now we can ask for nothing of which we have not long had experience. So this also must be a remarkable feature of the emperors, and they have left us nothing at all to look for’.¹⁰⁰ Again Libanius makes a MULTIPLE REFERENCE to the tradition of the panegyrics in a dialogue with rhetorical tradition, both older and contemporary, the effect of which is to make clear that Libanius will go his own, independent way.¹⁰¹

Model as Code

Libanius, in composing his panegyric to the two emperors, enters into a dialogue with his literary tradition. The way in which the orator handles Menander’s prescription for ‘how an

⁹⁵ ὁ συστησάμενος τὴν οἰκουμένην...καὶ ὅλως ὀπόσων ἔμελλεν ἀνθρωπεῖα δεήσεισθαι φύσις (*Or.* 59.169.22).

⁹⁶ According to Wiemer (1994, 514) God is depicted here in terms resembling *Genesis* 1, but Malosse (2003, 216) claims that there is a Platonic allusion.

⁹⁷ ἀλλὰ νῦν συνῆλθε μὲν καὶ συνῆπται τὸ τέως διηρημένον, κεκόμισται δὲ τὴν οἰκείαν τάξιν τὸ τέως διεσπασμένον. (*Or.* 59.170.4-6).

⁹⁸ ‘Now the sensible nations of the world, as though pitching one harmony in chorus, are singing together as their chorus leaders strike up the tune’ (νῦν τὰ σωφρονούντα τῆς οἰκουμένης γένη καθάπερ ἐν χορῷ μίαν ἀρμονίαν ἐντεινάμενα συνάδει δύο κορυφαίων ἐνδιδόντων τὸ μέλος *Or.* 59.172).

⁹⁹ Malosse 2003, 216. In general, chapters 171 and 172 contain at least two SIMPLE REFERENCES to works of Aelius Aristides. *Ibid.* 182 and 216.

¹⁰⁰ Οἱ μὲν οὖν ἔμπροσθεν παυόμενοι τῶν λόγων ἐπεικῶς ἠῦχοντο πλειόνων ἀγαθῶν τυχεῖν ... νῦν δὲ οὐδὲν αἰτῆσαι πάρεστιν οὐ μὴ πάλαι πάρεστιν ἢ πεῖρα. ὥστε καὶ τοῦτ’ ἂν εἴη τῶν βασιλέων ἐξαιρετόν, ὅτι μηδὲν ἡμῖν κατέλιπον ὃ ζητήσομεν. (*Or.* 59.173.24-9).

¹⁰¹ In the epilogue Julian (see for example *Or.* 1.39.23-39) and Themistius (for example *Or.* 1.17b-18b; 2.40a) likewise subsequently depart from Menandrian rules, in their emphasis on philosophy and the virtue of the emperor.

imperial speech must be composed' allows us to draw some conclusions about the aesthetic and the political messages of this particular oration.

In terms of aesthetics, it has become clear that the speech cannot be considered a blind application of Menandrian rules, as has been claimed in the past.¹⁰² Libanius uses this model directly, but as has been demonstrated, mainly in the domain of structure and themes, something which can also be said, to a lesser degree, also for the panegyrics of Julian, as well as the Latin panegyrics. At the time, adhering to a model did not entail lack of inspiration or contempt for the object of the praise.

For example, in the *protheoria* preceding the published version of Themistius' *Oration* 1 the editor claimed: 'This speech was delivered in Ancyra in Galatia, when he (Themistius) met the emperor for the first time, when he (Themistius) was still young. For this reason he had not yet mastered the genre'.¹⁰³ The last sentence could be interpreted in different ways, but if Vanderspoel is correct to the effect that 'it may simply indicate that Themistius' speech did not conform to the standard model for imperial panegyric as outlined by Pseudo-Menander Rhetor', that is very significant for the poetics of the panegyric in fourth century. The passage acquires even greater significance, if it is indeed the case that the writer of the summary was Libanius.¹⁰⁴

The way Libanius adapts the compositional precepts suggested by Menander's treatment of the genre of imperial speech shows that these recommendations are both a framework and a rhetorical tool which he can use to express his own thoughts, ideas, and techniques, albeit within the limits set by the sociopolitical and religious conditions of his period. The way he interacts with his model, which he does by using the same wording, by omitting or correcting *topoi*, or by making MULTIPLE REFERENCES, signals his own conception of the ideal form and content of an imperial speech. Furthermore, it also betrays his own individual personality, the personality of a pagan orator and teacher of rhetoric, as well as his political and religious attitudes. For example he handles in a subtle and discreet way the fact that he is a pagan orator called upon to compose a speech in praise of two Christian emperors. Libanius is not provocative and his omission or avoidance of various matters is perhaps evidence of an effort to maintain neutrality. The manner in which he handles Menander's precepts is a means for him to express indirectly his views, especially to an informed audience, who was aware of the earlier rhetorical tradition. Since the speech was addressed to the emperors in Nicomedia, because someone (an aristocrat or official) prompted Libanius to compose and deliver it, we can assume a mixed audience, an audience made up of the general population, officials, and learned men. Among the last there were also friends, students and opponents of Libanius.¹⁰⁵ Consequently, Libanius knows that a part of the actual audience expects to hear the encomiastic *topoi* and he meets their expectations,¹⁰⁶ but there is also another part (perhaps not so large) which will recognize the play with the

¹⁰² Malosse 2003, 73; Lieu and Montserrat 1996, 160.

¹⁰³ Οὗτος εἶρηται ἐν Ἀγκύρᾳ τῆς Γαλατίας ὅτε πρῶτον συνέτυχε τῷ βασιλεῖ νέος ὠν ἔτι· διόπερ οὐδὲ πάνυ κρατεῖ τῆς ιδέας (*Or.* 1.1).

¹⁰⁴ Ibid. n. 29. Heather and Moncur (2001, 76 n. 80) expresses doubt for this assumption.

¹⁰⁵ On the audience of Libanius' speeches see Cribiore 2013, 76-89.

¹⁰⁶ Cf. Julian *Or.* 3. 39.1-13.

form and the deviation from the norms, the speech as a code. In chapter 26 for example Libanius draws his audience's attention to the norms and, in order to satisfy his audience, he follows them. In chapter 53 he alludes to the horizon of expectations of his audience, according to which the example of Alexander should be used, but be presented as inferior.¹⁰⁷ As Nesselrath observed 'this learned interplay between author and recipients is surely not just meant for fun: it establishes a common bond between both sides and assures them that they share in a common literary heritage which also forms a large part of their cultural identity ...',¹⁰⁸

Of special interest, too, is the behaviour of contemporary orators writing in Greek, namely Themistius and Julian, with respect to this model in their own speeches for the Emperor Constantius.¹⁰⁹ In fact, Themistius in his speeches to the Emperor Constantius (*Or.* 1-4) does not follow Menander's rules, either in the *prooemium*, or indeed in his speeches in general.¹¹⁰ Instead he employs his own inspiration and rules of *elocutio*.¹¹¹ Julian's *First Panegyric* on Constantius remains faithful, by and large, to the Menandrian model as far as thematic lines concerned, although in their treatment he pursues his own course, expressing ideas and opinions from his own viewpoint, in accord with his personal rhetorical style.¹¹² It is evident that Libanius later read the speeches of Julian, as his letter to Julian (*Ep.* 369) shows. There Libanius claimed that his student (Julian) has surpassed him, and he praised his freedom of speech. One could perhaps consider that this comment is an indirect critique for his own imperial speech, which apparently had not the freedom to express his opinion and thoughts for the emperors.

Bibliography

- Caballero López, J.A. (2003) 'La herencia mitológica en los autores de la Segunda Sofística: la obra de Elio Aristides', in J.A. López Férez (ed.) *Mitos en la literatura griega hellenística e imperial*, Madrid. 209-32.
- Cain, A. (2016) *The Greek Historia Monachorum in Aegyptus. Monastic Hagiography in the Late Fourth Century*. Oxford.
- Callu, J.P. (1987) 'Un Miroir des Princes: le "Basilikos" libanien de 348', *Gerión* 5: 133-152.
- Conte, G.B. (1986) *The Rhetoric of Imitation. Genre and Poetic Memory in Virgil and Other Latin Poets*. (Translated, edited and with a foreword by C. Segal). Ithaca and London.
- Cribiore, R. (2013) *Libanius the Sophist. Rhetoric, Reality, and Religion in the Fourth Century*. Ithaca.

¹⁰⁷ For further interpretation of this passage see Portmann 1988, 131; Karla 2017, 143-4.

¹⁰⁸ Nesselrath 2014, 267.

¹⁰⁹ Himerius also wrote a speech for the Emperor Constantius in AD 351, of which only a fragment (*Him.* f. 1.6, ed. Colonna) has survived. See Penella 2007, 2 and the English translation of the fragment on pp. 273-4.

¹¹⁰ Details on these speeches in Vanderspoel 1995, 71-103. See also Heather 1998.

¹¹¹ See for example *Or.* 1.4-7 where he explicitly introduces himself as a 'rule-breaker'.

¹¹² Tougher 2012, 25-6.

- Dodgeon, M.H. (tr.) (1996) 'Libanius, Oratio LIX (Royal Discourse upon Constantius and Constans)', in S. Lieu and D. Montserrat, *From Constantine to Julian. Pagan and Byzantine Views, A Source History*. London. 164-205.
- Genette, G. (1997) *Palimpsests: Literature in the Second Degree*. (translated by C. Newman and C. Doubinsky). Lincoln, NB.
- Gladis, C. (1907) *De Themistii Libanii Iuliani in Constantium orationibus* (diss. Bratislava).
- Heather, P. (1998) 'Themistius: A political philosopher', in M. Whitby, *Propaganda of Power: the Role of Panegyric in Late Antiquity*. Leiden. 125-50.
- Karla, G. (2017) 'Die Macht des Exempels: Alexander der Grosse in den Reden des Libanios', *Rhetorica* 35: 137-60.
- Lieu S. and D. Montserrat (1996) *From Constantine to Julian. Pagan and Byzantine Views, A Source History*. London.
- Malosse, P.-L. (2000) 'Libanios, ses "témoins oculaires", Eusèbe et Praxagoras: le travail préparatoire du sophiste et la question des sources dans l'Éloge de Constance et de Constant', *REG* 113: 172-87.
- Malosse, P.-L. (2001) 'Enquête sur la date du discours 59 de Libanios', *Antiquité Tardive* 9: 297-306.
- Malosse, P.-L. (2003) *Libanios. Discours LIX*. Paris.
- Malosse P.-L. (tr. L. Van Hoof) (2014) 'Libanius' Orations', in L. Van Hoof (ed.), *Libanius. A Critical Introduction*. Cambridge. 81-106.
- Maraval, P. (2013) *Les Fils de Constantin: Constantin II (337-340), Constance II (337-361), Constant (337-350)*. Paris.
- Nesselrath, H.-G. (2012) *Libanios: Zeuge einer schwindenden Welt*. Stuttgart.
- Nesselrath, H.-G. (2014) 'Libanius and the literary tradition', in L. Van Hoof (ed.), *Libanius. A Critical Introduction*. Cambridge. 241-67.
- Papillon, T.L. (tr.) (2004) *Isocrates II*. Austin.
- Penella, R. J. (2007) *Man and Word. The Orations of Himerius*. Berkeley, CA.
- Pernot L. (1986) 'Les topoi de l'éloge chez Ménandros le Rhéteur', *REG* 99: 33-53.
- Pernot L. (1993) *La Rhétorique de l'éloge dans de monde Gréco-Romain*, 2 vols. Paris.
- Portmann, W. (2002) 'Rede für die Kaiser Constantius II und Constans (or. 59)', in G. Fatouros, T. Krischer, and W. Portmann, *Libanios. Kaiserreden*, Stuttgart. 19-120.
- Rees, R. (2004) 'Praising in Prose: Vergil in the Panegyrics', in R. Rees (ed.) *Memento Romane: Vergil in the Fourth Century*. London. 33-46.
- Ross, A.J. (2016) 'Libanius the Historian? Praise and the Presentation of the Past in Or. 59', *GRBS* 56: 293-320.
- Ross, A.J. (2018) 'The Constantinians' return to the West: Julian's depiction of Constantius in Or. 1' in D.W.P Burgersdijk and A.J. Ross (eds.), *Imagining Emperors in the Later Roman Empire*. Leiden. 183-203.
- Russell, D.A. and Wilson, N.G. (1981) *Menander Rhetor*. Oxford.
- Sandwell, I. (2007) *Religious Identity in Late Antiquity. Greeks, Jews and Christians in Antioch*. Cambridge.
- Schouler, B. (1984) *La tradition Hellenique chez Libanios*. 2 vols. Paris.
- Seiler, E.-M. (1998) *Konstantinos II. bei Libanios: eine kritische Untersuchung des überlieferten Herrscherbildes*. Frankfurt am Main.

- Tantillo, I. (1997) *La prima orazione di Giuliano a Costanzo: introduzione, traduzione e commento*. Roma.
- Thomas, R.F. (1999) *Reading Virgil and his Texts. Studies in Intertextuality*. Ann Arbor, MI.
- Tougher, S. (2012) 'Reading between the lines: Julian's *First Panegyric* on Constantius II', in N. Baker-Brian and S. Tougher (eds), *Emperor and Author: The Writings of Julian the Apostate*. Swansea. 19-34.
- Vanderspoel, J. (1995) *Themistius and the Imperial Court*. Ann Arbor.
- Van Hoof, L. (ed.) (2014) *Libanius. A Critical Introduction*. Cambridge.
- Van Nuffelen, P. (2014) 'Not the last pagan: Libanius between elite rhetoric and religion', in L. Van Hoof (ed.), *Libanius. A Critical Introduction*. Cambridge. 293-314.
- Ware, C. (2017) 'The Lies the Poets Tell. Poetry in Prose Panegyrics', in J. Elsner and J. Hernández Lobato (eds.), *The poetics of late Latin literature*. New York. 345-69.
- Wiemer, H.-U. (1994) 'Libanius on Constantine', *CQ* 44: 511-24.
- Wiemer, H.-U. (2014) 'Emperors and Empire in Libanius', in L. Van Hoof (ed.), *Libanius. A Critical Introduction*. Cambridge. 187-219.

PLAYING WITH CONVENTIONS IN JULIAN'S *ENCOMIUM TO EUSEBIA*: DOES GENDER MAKE A DIFFERENCE?

*Belinda Washington*¹

Introduction

Julian's fourth-century speech to Eusebia, the wife of Constantius II (referred to in this chapter as *Oration 3*), is the only extant prose encomium addressed to a female subject that survives from the Roman imperial period.² From the end of the same century we also have the *Laus Serenae*, Claudian's incomplete poem praising Serena, the cousin and mother-in-law of Honorius and wife of his general Stilicho.³ The appearance of female members of the imperial family in encomia to emperors may have been a more regular occurrence than the surviving evidence suggests.⁴ Nonetheless, Julian's decision to address his encomium to a woman was a bold and unusual choice.⁵ To have a woman as the sole subject of an encomium required the necessary adaptation of panegyric themes, but there is a surprising level of conformity between the two surviving female panegyrics and the recommended structure and themes popularised in treatises such as Menander Rhetor's *Basilikos Logos*.

In this chapter I will examine Julian's *Oration 3* with the aid of a close comparison to Claudian's *Laus Serenae*: both borrowed from an existing literary tradition of female praise, while also manipulating themes from male imperial encomia. I will consider how Julian played with the conventions of panegyric to create his encomium while showing off his flair as a panegyrist. First I will give a summary of the historical context of these works, since this informed the presentation of the women. Then I will look at the way Julian and Claudian both drew on the literary tradition of encomiastic portrayals of imperial women in ancient literature. A comparison will then be made between the content of *Oration 3* and the *Laus Serenae*. In the later poem, Claudian followed a structure and presentation similar to Julian's when praising his female subject.⁶ However, differences emerge in each panegyric due to the

¹ I would like to thank Alan Ross and Adrastus Omissi for all their advice and support. Thanks are also due to Gavin Kelly, Lucy Grig and the Kerr-Fry Bequest for enabling me to pursue my original thesis research that turned my attention to this oration. I would also like to thank Catherine Ware and the rest of the panel at the 9th Celtic Conference in Classics where an earlier version of this chapter was delivered, and Nicole Cleary, Alex Imrie and Calum Maciver for their help with my drafting of this chapter.

² Since this chapter refers to Wright's translations it will follow her numbering of the encomium as *Oration 3*: Wright 1913. However, the numbering by Bidez 1932, and Vatsend 2000, of the oration as 2 better reflects the chronological sequence of Julian's three imperial encomia.

³ The *Laus Serenae* is poem 30 in Claudian's *Carmina Minora*.

⁴ Vatsend 2000, 45-8, draws a similar conclusion.

⁵ Browning 1976, 75, notes the challenge Julian set himself by choosing a female subject; however, compare Vatsend 2000, 47-8.

⁶ The similarities have been noted by James 2001, 12.

respective author's underlying motivation, which becomes clearer through comparison.⁷ With these considerations in mind, it becomes apparent that the unusual gender of the subject of Julian's third oration was only one contributing factor to the shape of his encomium.

The Historical Context of *Oration 3* and the *Laus Serenae*

Both *Oration 3* and the *Laus Serenae* were composed in the West and in the second generation of a dynasty: the Constantinian dynasty for the former, and the Theodosian dynasty for the latter. Although separated by just a few decades, the court context in which the later work was written had changed dramatically from that of the former.

Julian wrote his first oration to Constantius II and his encomium to Eusebia soon after he was appointed Caesar by his cousin at the end of 355.⁸ As argued below, the oration to Eusebia was conceived by Julian as forming a diptych with *Oration 1* to Constantius (in which Eusebia was not mentioned). While the hindsight of Julian's later usurpation has encouraged scholars to view the praise of Constantius in the encomia as insincere, many judge Julian's encomium of Eusebia to be a genuine expression of gratitude for her promotion of his interests.⁹ The speech to Eusebia is a *χαριστήριος λόγος* or *gratiarum actio*, in which Julian thanked Eusebia for her actions on his behalf at court that culminated in his appointment as Caesar.¹⁰ Julian's relationship with his cousin was always turbulent. Julian's main anxiety regarding his relationship with Constantius in both *Orations 1* and *3* was the emperor's recent execution of Gallus, Julian's half-brother and Constantius' previous Caesar.¹¹ Eusebia's efforts described in the oration allowed Julian to reassert his loyalty to

⁷ The terms panegyric and encomium are used here in the looser modern sense; for their specific definitions as understood by ancient authors see Pernot in this volume.

⁸ The oration was written after Julian moved to Gaul as Caesar (1 December 355). The one dateable incident in the oration is Constantius' campaign on the Rhine (*Or.* 3.129b-c), which seems to refer to his campaign in summer 356, but could be a reference to his campaigning in Raetia in summer 355. Wright 1913, 273, Tougher 1998b, 107, and James 2012, 47, suggest winter 355/6. Athanassiadi 1992, 61-63, Vatsend 2000, 12-13, and Bidez 1932, 71, suggest winter 356/7. García Ruiz 2015, 170-73, suggests both orations were written for Constantius' adventus in Rome in 357, but then subsequently rewritten.

⁹ See Wright 1913, 273, Bidez 1932, 72, and Browning 1976, 75-76. García Ruiz 2015, 157-58, discusses this assumption in more detail. James 2012, 57, sees the portrayal of Eusebia as a purely literary construct.

¹⁰ Pernot 1993, 284-86, discusses this form of speech in more detail and the overlap with encomium. Vatsend 2000, 17-41, provides a detailed analysis of why *Or.* 3 is a *gratiarum actio*. Julian's describes Eusebia's role in the reversal in his fortunes at *Or.* 3.117b-119a, and 121a-c. For a revision of Eusebia's role see Aujoulat 1983, 425.

¹¹ See *Amm.* 14.11.21-3 and 15.2.7-8. Julian glossed over the specific details of the events between Gallus' death and his appointment as Caesar in *Or.* 3.118a-c. He provided more detail later: *Ep. ad Ath.* 273a-b. In this later work he also blamed Constantius for the death of members of his family in 337: *Ep. ad Ath.* 270c-d. Burgess 2008 5-51, provides an excellent reconstruction of the interregnum that followed Constantine I's death in 337.

the emperor following the execution of Gallus, and then against unnamed parties at court whose hostility towards Julian had led to a recent harshening of Constantius' attitude to him (118a-b).¹² The debt of gratitude that Julian owed to Eusebia justified his unusual decision to address a panegyric to a woman.

Julian's aims for both *Orations* 1 and 3 were multifaceted. His choice of a female subject for the latter, and the way it complements the former, demonstrated his confidence as an orator. The question of sincerity is complicated by the possibility of substantial revision to both works by Julian. This theory has been promoted by García Ruiz, who also sees Eusebia's encomium as part of a diptych with *Oration* 1.¹³ Her argument for substantial revision rests on the idea that *Oration* 1 was rewritten once Julian had grown confident in his position as Caesar.¹⁴ This is possible, but the contemporary elements which remain from both speeches' original composition seem to caution against the idea of major revision. The pretext for both orations appears to be Julian's need to affirm his loyalty to the imperial regime.

While *Oration* 3 was, it seems, conceived to complement *Oration* 1, Claudian's *Laus Serenae* was a stand-alone encomium addressed to Serena. It appears to have been unfinished and to have been written before the marriage of her daughter Maria to Honorius (in 398), since Maria is not mentioned.¹⁵ If the poem was unfinished, rather than incomplete, then it was never circulated — an argument sometimes also made about *Oration* 3, because of its female subject.¹⁶ The image conveyed from what we have of the poem complements Claudian's references to Serena elsewhere in his corpus: most prominently in the wedding poems celebrating the marriage of Serena's daughter, Maria, to the Emperor Honorius.¹⁷

The comparatively frequent appearance of Serena elsewhere in Claudian's oeuvre is one significant difference from Eusebia's isolated appearance in *Oration* 3. Julian only referred to Eusebia again in his *Letter to the Athenians*.¹⁸ The more frequent appearances by Serena in Claudian's corpus reflected the changed nature of the court and how it promoted itself through the wider imperial family. While Claudian wrote a poem in Latin for a relative

¹² Gallus' execution is never explicitly mentioned, but possibly referred to at *Or.* 3.121a-123a. Julian cautiously mentioned his brother's career as Caesar in *Oration* 1: 44d-45b.

¹³ García Ruiz 2015, 162-6; see also Athanassiadi 1992, 61-63.

¹⁴ García Ruiz 2015, 172-3. Vatsend 2000, 13, suggests that the argument for significant revision must remain inconclusive. Tougher 2012, 20-1, summarises Julian's campaigns as Caesar.

¹⁵ Consolino 1986, 15, observes that the poem is only missing a concluding section. As Cameron argues it seems likely that the poem was unfinished: 1970, 406. The lack of a reference to Maria and mention of Rufinus (*Carm. Min.* 30.232-6) suggest that it was begun in the early 390s — an earlier date than that put forward by Cameron 1970, xvi and 409.

¹⁶ See the section on Audience below.

¹⁷ Serena featured in eleven of Claudian's other poems: *Carm. Min.* 31, 46, 47, and 48; *Fescennine Verse* 2; *Epithalamium*; *De III Cons. Hon.*; *De Cons. Stil.*; *De VI Cons. Hon.*; *De Bello Get.*; and *De Bello Gild.* Serena's daughter Maria had the second most appearances for an imperial woman. Maria's most noteworthy appearances were in the four Fescennine verses and epithalamium which celebrate her marriage to Honorius.

¹⁸ She appears (by name) in *Ep. ad Ath.* 273a, 274a-b and 275b-d. Her portrayal in this later work does not revise her depiction in *Oration* 3.

of the emperor, Julian was an imperial relative praising someone who had married into the dynasty. The court had also undergone a dramatic evolution in the period in which Claudian was writing. The regimes of Arcadius in the East and Honorius in the West were the first to be permanently court-based: neither emperor ever had a military role. Honorius was reliant on his general Stilicho, marking the first evolution of the ‘ruling partnership model’ as recently dubbed by McEvoy.¹⁹ Honorius occupied a largely ceremonial role, while his *magister militum* Stilicho was effectively in charge and occupied the military role which used to be the focus of praise for the emperor in panegyrics. Claudian wrote under Stilicho’s patronage and any praise was ultimately directed at him.²⁰

Despite the works’ differences, as Busch has pointed out, Claudian drew on the same conservative tradition of praising a woman in literature that Julian skilfully manipulated.²¹ The narrow parameters by which a living imperial woman could be praised in literature had changed little across the imperial period. Their lack of visibility in contemporary literature was at odds with their more frequent appearances in art, coinage and building works.²²

The Literary Tradition of Imperial Female Praise

The well-established tradition of praising living imperial females across various genres and media dictated the presentation of Eusebia and Serena’s actions in their panegyrics. Throughout the imperial period, the public presentation of imperial women emphasised their piety and temperance (σωφροσύνη and *pudicitia*); this latter virtue was a key quality for the

¹⁹ McEvoy 2013, 162-9.

²⁰ Cameron originally viewed Claudian as Stilicho’s propagandist, 1970, 42, but latterly cautioned against the anachronistic implications of this term, 2015, 133-5. Gillett adeptly analyses Claudian’s innovation to the speaker-honorand-audience dynamic involved in his epic panegyrics: 2012, 266-89. Claudian’s praise of Serena conforms to the earlier model of this dynamic as defined by Gillett. Claudian may also have been responding to the greater prominence of eastern imperial women — see Busch 2015, 43-4. Theodosius I had made his wife, Aelia Flaccilla, the first Augusta since Constantius II’s mother Fausta, while Arcadius would promote his wife Eudoxia to Augusta in 400. Both women featured on coinage as Augustae. Honorius personally objected to Arcadius’ promotion of Eudoxia in a letter written to Arcadius: *Coll. Avell. 38 de persona sancti Iohannis*.

²¹ Busch 2015, 43.

²² In comparison with the first three centuries of imperial rule, fourth-century imperial women barely featured in material evidence. Vermeule 2000, 17-28, provides an overview of imperial women in art from Livia to Helena. Although imperial women appeared on coinage in the Julio-Claudian dynasty, the first coin-type for a living imperial woman did not appear until Agrippina the Younger. In later dynasties imperial women regularly had their own coin-types, but the practice appears to have stopped with the Tetrarchy. Some early fourth-century women had their own coin-types, mainly during Constantine I’s reign, but this did not become regular practice again until the fifth-century eastern Theodosian dynasty. Longo 2009, provides a comprehensive analysis of coinage for late antique imperial women. Prominent examples of imperial women’s appearances in monumental art include the Julio-Claudian Ara Pacis Augustae, and the Severan Arch of the Argentarii and imperial arch at Lepcis Magna. For further discussion of these monuments see Kleiner 1992, 90-9, 324-37 and 340-3.

presentation of both Eusebia and Serena.²³ The first imperial women, Octavia and Livia (respectively Augustus' sister and wife), received public honours based on the privileges given to the Vestal Virgins.²⁴ An emphasis on praise for a woman's religious piety was easily incorporated within the imperial Christian ideology of the late antique period via Christian benefactions and, in the generation after Serena, Christian insignia on their coinage.²⁵ Although Eusebia and Serena's familial piety was emphasized in their encomia, neither were lauded for their religious piety, but this is in keeping with the other encomia by Julian and Claudian.²⁶ There is an oblique reference to Serena's Christian piety towards the end of the *Laus Serenae*.²⁷ Julian vaguely described Eusebia's patronage in Rome (129b-d), which, although never specified by Julian, presumably included Christian benefactions, especially given the precedents set by Constantius' sister Constantina in the city.²⁸

In general throughout the imperial period it is surprising for an imperial woman to be mentioned at all in contemporary praise of the imperial *domus*, let alone to be the main focus.²⁹ In terms of encomium, other than our two late-antique works, the only woman who

²³ Gibson 2014, 140-3, discusses the importance of σωφροσύνη throughout Libanius' *prosgymnasata* (Julian's contemporary). At 143, Gibson points to its importance as a shared virtue between man and woman — an appropriate virtue therefore for Constantius and Eusebia in *Orations* 1 and 3.

²⁴ Dio 49.38.1-2, summarised the honours they received. See Boatwright 1991, 519, for further discussion.

²⁵ The Christian emblems on the reverse of coinage struck for Aelia Flaccilla (Theodosius I's first wife) set a precedent for later Theodosian women: e.g. *RIC* 9.48. See Longo 2009, 194-202, for further discussion. Drijvers 1992, 79-180, Georgiou 2013, 597-624, Brubaker 1997, 52-75, and Claus 2002, 355-6, analyse the promotion in the fifth century of the Christian fidelity displayed by the early fourth-century Augusta Helena, Constantine's mother.

²⁶ Noreña 2001, 158, discusses the importance of *pietas* in the promotion of imperial women in the early empire. Busch 2015, 44, describes the overlap between the traditional roman concept of *pietas* and the Christian Theodosian usage. Julian would have been well aware of the significant meaning of Eusebia's name. Constantius named a diocese Pietas for Eusebia: *Amm.* 17.7.6.

²⁷ *Carm. Min.* 30.223-5 seems to refer to Serena praying for Stilicho's return from campaign. See Consolino 1986, 13 and Cameron 1970, 190, for further discussion.

²⁸ The most famous example is perhaps Constantina's church for St. Agnes, which she commemorated with the acrostic inscription CONSTANTINA DEO (see *ILCV* 1768). Helena also carried out patronage in Rome: Drijvers 1992, 45-52. Brubaker 1997, 52-75, and Jones 2007, 139, discuss the influence of Helena's patronage on Constantina and other imperial women. An example of Serena's religious patronage can be found in the epigraph *ILCV* 1801, which describes her financial contributions to La Basilica di san Nazaro in Milan.

²⁹ In their lifetimes, imperial women tended to be celebrated more in material evidence, than literature: see Boatwright 1991, 519-20, who compares the benefactions by Livia and Octavia and the second-century imperial women. The most fulsome praise was reserved for posthumous celebration of certain imperial women, reaching a peak in the second century. Faustina the elder had more posthumous coin types than those produced during her lifetime; her husband, Antoninus Pius also set up a charitable scheme in her honour: see *RIC* 3.397-99. Levick 2014, 96, discusses her lavish posthumous honours. We have a number of funeral orations for female subjects. Hadrian delivered a eulogy for Matidia the elder: *CIL* 14.3579. In the 380s Gregory of Nyssa delivered funeral orations

was the sole subject of such a speech was Helen of Troy in Isocrates' oration from the fifth century BC, a subject of hypothetical praise.³⁰ In the Roman imperial period Antoninus Pius wrote to thank Fronto for his mention of Faustina in a speech.³¹ This reference indicated that a greater number of women may have been mentioned in the many lost panegyrics addressed to emperors. However, it is harder to discern whether any other imperial women were the sole subject of a panegyric. Menander Rhetor's late third-century treatise is concerned only with how to praise an emperor, while the *progymnasata* of Libanius, Julian's contemporary, provided no examples of encomia addressed to women. This seems to confirm that it was uncommon to have a woman as the sole subject of an encomium, and certainly by the time Julian was writing. In terms of extant evidence, there are earlier examples of other forms of literary praise for contemporary imperial women, which indicated the restrictions by which Julian and Claudian could praise their female subjects.³² This section will look at three such examples in reverse chronological order: the fourth-century mention of Fausta in a panegyric written in the generation before *Oration 3*, the second-century example of Pliny's *Panegyricus*, and a first-century senatorial decree from the reign of Tiberius.

The least instructive of the three, albeit most contemporary to *Oration 3*, is the panegyric for the marriage in 307 of Constantius' parents, Fausta and Constantine I (*Pan. Lat.* VII[6]). The anonymous author's principal focus is the political marriage forged by Fausta's father Maximian with Constantine. Even though Fausta was the embodiment of this political union, she is a marginal presence in the speech. She is not mentioned by name and her role is reduced to the part her marriage plays in forging another bond between her father and husband.³³ The portrayal of Fausta presents us with a distilled example of how praise of an imperial woman served to complement the male protagonists. The advantage of praising Fausta, like Serena, was her imperial kinship.³⁴ Eusebia, in contrast, was praised by an

for Aelia Flaccilla and her young daughter, Pulcheria (*PG* 46.878-92, and 46.864-78). See Consolino 1986, 11-12, for other examples.

³⁰ Isocrates criticised Gorgias' earlier encomium to Helen for being a defence rather than a speech of praise: 10.3. Isocrates' speech focussed more on the men in Helen's life, rather than the subject herself, particularly Theseus (10.18-38).

³¹ See *Ep.* 2.2 which refers to only a part of a speech mentioning Faustina (and therefore she was not the main subject of the oration). For the debate about whether this was Faustina the elder or younger see Champlin 1980, 86, and Haines 1919, 129. Nixon 1983, 88, notes that the distortion created by the extant evidence for panegyric leaves the impression that it was a late-antique phenomenon. See also James 2012, 48, and Vatsend 2000, 45-8. Consolino 1986, 10-11, and Angiolani 2008, 31 n.116, list encomiastic treatments of women throughout the imperial period.

³² A woman could be more freely praised in funerary inscriptions: see Hemelrijk 2004, 185-97, for some late republican examples.

³³ The author pays nearly as much attention to Constantine's previous union with Minervina (4.1) as he does to Fausta herself. Apart from Constantine and Maximian, the author's other main focus was the deceased Constantius I: 13.1-14.7. Rees 2003, 486-91, notes Fausta is only directly referred to in chapter 6 (in conjunction with her husband).

³⁴ Both Fausta and Serena were later celebrated for their maternal role. For Fausta see Julian, *Or.* 1.9c and *RIC* 7.292 (one of her many coin reverses to feature her with children). Serena's maternal role was emphasised in Claudian's poems which also mentioned her daughter, Maria e.g. *Epithalamium*,

imperial relative and therefore presents an interesting contrasting focus. This makes her a more surprising subject than Serena.

More instructive than Fausta's perfunctory appearance in *Pan. Lat.* VII(6) in literary approaches to praising women are Pliny's mentions of Plotina and Marciana in his panegyric for Trajan (*Pan.* 83.1-84.2). The emperor's wife and sister are only referred to briefly, but the way in which they are celebrated resonates with Julian's depiction of Eusebia in *Oration 3* (*Pan.* 84. 5-6):

te enim imitari, te subsequi student. ideo utraque mores eosdem, qui utraque tuos habet; inde moderatio, inde etian perpetua securitas. Neque enim umquam periclitabuntur esse privatae, quae non desierunt.

Their one aim is to model themselves on your example, and consequently their habits are the same being formed after yours. Hence their quiet contentment and untroubled serenity — they run no risk of being more than your subjects for that is what they have always been.³⁵

The deferential image promoted here of Plotina and Marciana foreshadows Julian and Claudian's later emphasis on their female subjects' temperance and love for their husbands.³⁶ Pliny's praise of the modesty (*modestia*) exhibited by Plotina and Marciana served as an extension of his praise of the emperor. Plotina received the most attention of the two women, while the praise of Marciana focused on the lack of rivalry with her sister-in-law. Pliny's comment about the concord between the women and their reluctance to receive the title Augusta implicitly criticised the preceding regime of Domitian — an emperor who gave his wife and niece the title.³⁷ This subtle criticism of Domitian shows how such praise, which ultimately was directed at Trajan and not his female relatives, served a specific contemporary purpose. Such tailoring of praise can also be seen in Julian and Claudian's encomia, which superficially echo Pliny's straightforward approach.

The necessity for limits within which (living) imperial women could be praised is best demonstrated by an early imperial example from the reign of Tiberius. The senatorial decree issued in the wake of the treason trial against Piso (10 December 20), the *senatus consultum de Cn. Pisone Patre*, featured a number of Tiberius' female relatives deemed worthy of praise for their actions in the affair.³⁸ This decree exhibited clear panegyric elements with

243. Eusebia never had children. Ammianus Marcellinus alleged that she twice conspired for the deaths of Julian's children by his wife Helena: 16.10.18-19. For further discussion see Tougher 2000, 94-101.

³⁵ Trans. Radice 1969.

³⁶ Vatsend 2000, 84-90, sees closer similarities between Eusebia's portrayal and later appearances of imperial women in panegyric, than with Pliny's portrayal of Plotina and Marciana.

³⁷ Pliny referred to the women's rejection of honours at *Pan.* 84.6. Plotina and Marciana would both eventually receive the title of Augusta.

³⁸ In addition to Livia (discussed below), other imperial women praised in the decree are Agrippina the Elder (137-9), Livilla, and her mother Antonia Minor (141-44). Livilla received specific praise for acting like a member of the imperial *domus*: 143-44.

its extensive praise of the imperial *domus* regarding a specific contemporary concern.³⁹ The publication of the decree throughout the empire also illustrated that the inclusion of praise for Tiberius' female relatives was judged as holding public appeal, but this is a rare example. We can see the delicate task Julian set himself in choosing to address a panegyric to a woman by examining the treatment of Livia, the first Augusta, in this decree and then Tacitus' later account of the same incident. Livia was the main recipient of praise among Tiberius' female kinswomen. The decree described the wise counsel Tiberius received from Livia, but also the restraint she showed in giving such advice, as she was careful to not exert undue influence (*senatus consultum de Cn. Pisone Patre*, 115-18):

Juliae Aug(ustae) optume de r(e) p(ublica) merita non partu tantum modo principis nostri, sed etiam multis magnisq(ue) erga cuiusq(ue) ordinis homines beneficis, quae, cum iure meritoq(ue) plurimum posse in eo, quod a senatu petere<t>, deberet, parcissime uteretur eo,

[Livia] was most well deserving of the republic not only because she gave birth to our *princeps* but also because of her many and great kindnesses to men of every order – although she rightly and deservedly should have the greatest influence in what she requested from the Senate, she used it most sparingly.⁴⁰

The qualifying remark about Livia's restraint in the use of her influence over her son was necessary because it emphasised her deference to the emperor which reflected well on him. Julian showed similar concerns in his praise of Eusebia by focussing on the different aspects of her temperance, which also correlates with Pliny's praise of Plotina and Marciana's *modestia*.⁴¹

Celebrating the temperance of these women was important because otherwise any praise would show the emperor in a bad light, because they would be seen as acting without his influence and so perhaps in spite of him. We can see this in Tacitus' reinterpretation in his *Annales* of the very actions for which Livia was celebrated in the senatorial decree. What is presented in Livia's lifetime as a positive influence was easily spun by Tacitus to criticise Livia and by extension Tiberius.⁴² Tacitus achieved this by removing the impression of Livia's restraint which was explicitly emphasised in the decree. As a consequence of Tacitus' reinterpretation Livia becomes a scheming woman who intruded into the male realm of politics. In both instances the representation of Livia, positive and negative, served to reflect

³⁹ Rees 2012, 29-31, lists the various prompts for imperial panegyrics in the *Panegyrici Latini* collection.

⁴⁰ The translation is taken from Potter and Damon 1999, 13-41.

⁴¹ Kolb 2010, 16, discusses the use of *modestia* for imperial women in general; North 1977, 35-48, traces the evolution of temperance as a feminine quality in Greek thought.

⁴² See Tac. *Ann.* 3.15.1-17.2. Cooley 1998, 199, summarises the different agenda in the decree and Tacitus' account of the affair. Delia 1991, 206, and Hemelrijk 2004, 191-3, discuss similar themes in representations of late republican women.

the emperor's character and reign. Similarly, the good conduct of Plotina and Marciana was another means by which Pliny could refine his positive image of Trajan.

As these earlier examples demonstrated, Julian's emphasis on the quality of temperance in *Oration 3* conformed to long-established audience expectation of female praise.⁴³ It was through the prism of Eusebia's temperance and love for her husband that Julian could then compliment Eusebia for the actions she carried out on his behalf. However, she was ultimately a deferential wife; any quality she possessed reflected positively on her husband.⁴⁴ Such emphasis was necessary because, according to Julian's account, it was due to Eusebia's persuasion of Constantius that the emperor revised his attitude towards Julian.⁴⁵ Without lauding Eusebia's modesty of conduct, her influence over her husband could be received negatively. In the *Laus Serenae*, Claudian also celebrated Serena's actions which benefitted her husband, but he sought a different effect, one which conformed more closely to Pliny's purpose, where the praise of Trajan's female relatives served simply as another avenue by which to praise the emperor himself.

Analysis of the Texts

Julian and Claudian's female encomia are united by their unusual subject matter, themes and general structure. Comparison between the encomia show interesting parallels with praise of the respective emperor, Constantius II and Honorius, in other works by these authors. Such comparison also shows these works to have been informed by the different relationship between speaker and subject and, in the case of Julian's encomium, audience.⁴⁶ This section will first set out the inconclusive issue of the intended audience for *Oration 3*, before considering its structure and themes and how these compared with the *Laus Serenae* and also Julian's first oration to Constantius II. The differences between the female panegyrics will then be examined through the prism of the relationships that were promoted in the works and which influenced their creation.

Audience

⁴³ García Ruiz 2012, 79-81, stresses the importance of the temperance prototype in material evidence for Julian's comparison of Eusebia with a statue of the virtue. As García Ruiz notes, the *pudicitia* coin type was popular for imperial women from Plotina to the end of the third century (when coinage for imperial women stopped during Diocletian's reign): 2012, 80.

⁴⁴ One of the few areas in which Julian described Eusebia as proactive was in arranging his marriage to Helena: *Or.* 3.123c-d. Ironically this marriage arrangement would certainly have been planned by Helena's brother Constantius because of the political importance of his Caesar's marriage. Claudian wrote a short poem to Serena thanking her for the arrangement of his marriage: *Carm. Min.* 31.

⁴⁵ Tougher 1998a, 598-9, argues convincingly that Eusebia was acting on Constantius' behalf.

⁴⁶ Consolino 1986, 13, outlines some key differences. Vatsend 2000, 22-41, and 93-117, provides a comprehensive analysis of the structure and topics used in *Oration 3*.

The *Laus Serenae* was probably never completed and therefore never delivered.⁴⁷ Serena's portrayal in some of Claudian's other published panegyrics shows that he deemed praise of her valuable in his promotion of a court that was dominated by his patron, Stilicho.⁴⁸ The absence of other panegyrics with female subjects make it hard to gauge Julian's intended audience. Occasional references made in the work suggest that it was certainly intended for circulation, if not oral delivery: in one aside Julian referred to a small audience for the speech (104a).⁴⁹ It is unclear whether this small audience was in Gaul or at Constantius' court; Julian could of course have delivered it in Gaul and then sent the written version to court, as seems to have been the case for *Oration 1*. Given the way *Oration 3* complemented and completed the structure of *Oration 1* (discussed below), the argument that it was eventually delivered to the court seems likely.⁵⁰

If *Oration 3* was sent to Constantius' court, another consideration is whether Eusebia was the intended audience.⁵¹ Julian often used the second person pronoun to address Constantius directly in *Oration 1*, whereas in *Oration 3* Eusebia is only mentioned in the third person.⁵² Julian's less straightforward references to Eusebia could have been due to her gender, but it is worth noting that in the *Laus Serenae* Claudian used the second person pronoun.⁵³ The exclusive use of the third person pronoun would be highly unusual in the case of a male subject, but it is hard to gauge whether the same can be said for a prose encomium for a woman, because of the lack of earlier comparative material.⁵⁴ The manner by which

⁴⁷ Hall 1986, 55, sets out the likely history of Claudian's *Carmina Minora* and suggests that it was assembled for publication after Claudian's death, probably at Stilicho's request.

⁴⁸ For further discussion about the audience for Claudian's published poems see Cameron 2015, 137, and 1970, 228-52; see also Gillett 2012, 269.

⁴⁹ Consolino 1986, 12-13, suggests both *Oration 3* and the *Laus Serenae* were intended for public performance. Hall 1986, 55, suggests it was intended for Serena and a small audience. A small audience as the target for the promotion of imperial women by a court was fairly typical in the early fourth century. Constantius and his brothers issued coinage as Augusti for Helena and Theodora which were limited to one mint in each brother's territory. For the political subversion behind these issues see Burgess 2008, 22-4.

⁵⁰ As *Oration 3* was a *gratiarum actio* it technically should have been delivered to Constantius and not Eusebia, since Constantius was ultimately responsible for Julian's appointment. However, if her encomium functions as the counterpart to *Oration 1* then this seems less jarring, because together the orations function (superficially at least) to praise Constantius.

⁵¹ Tougher 2012, 21-2, summarises the debate about the delivery of *Oration 1*. Tougher 1998b, 109-10, Athanassiadi 1992, 61, and García Ruiz 2015, 157-8, suggest *Oration 3* probably was sent to Constantius' court. Wieber 2010, 258, suggests that Julian's wife Helena was in the audience in Gaul. Vatsend 2000, 14-16, argues that no firm conclusion can be made.

⁵² Julian preferred to refer to Eusebia as Βασίλις ('queen'): e.g. 115C.

⁵³ Claudian's consistent use of the apostrophe could simply be due to the poetic form of his encomium. James 2012, 47-8, considers it unlikely that Julian's use of the third person pronoun was because of the subject's gender; see also Vatsend 2000, 15.

⁵⁴ Lib. *Or.* 59 provides a rare example of imperial subjects (the absent Constantius II and Constans) addressed in the third person in a panegyric. See also the (very) fragmentary anonymous panegyric to Constantine I which was translated and analysed by Barnes 2011, 198-200. Emperors were normally addressed in the second person, even if they were absent from a panegyric's delivery: e.g. Nazarius,

Julian addressed her could have been a convention because of her gender, or could simply indicate that she was not present at the speech; if the reason is the latter it is interesting to note the use of the second person pronoun in *Oration 1*.⁵⁵

Structure and Themes

Throughout *Oration 3*, Julian repeated his anxiety about addressing an encomium to a woman, for example (104c-d):

πρὸς δὲ αὖ τούτοις παθεῖν μὲν εὖ καὶ τυχεῖν τινος ἀγαθοῦ, σμικροῦ τε ὁμοίως καὶ μείζονος, οὐδὲν ἔλαττον παρὰ γυναικὸς ἢ παρὰ ἀνδρὸς δεξόμεθα, τὴν δὲ ἐπ' αὐτῶ χάριν ἀποτίνειν ὀκνήσομεν;

Shall we consent to accept kind treatment from a woman no less than from a man, and to obtain some boon whether small and great, and then hesitate to pay the thanks due?⁵⁶

Julian's expression of anxiety here ennobles his decision nevertheless to write an encomium for a woman. Although it is probable that imperial women made more regular appearances in panegyrics addressed to emperors than the extant evidence suggests, to have a woman as the sole subject of an encomium is striking. Julian's anxiety therefore seems justified; however, at the same time this repeated concern underlines the novelty of his speech, drawing attention to the fact he was writing epideictic oratory.⁵⁷ Despite its unusual subject matter, both *Oration 3* and the *Laus Serenae* move through many of the topics recommended by Menander Rhetor in his treatise for a male subject, the *Basilikos Logos*. Menander Rhetor recommended for the first part a *prooemium* (2.368.5-369.17), native country (2.369.17-370.9), ancestry (2.370.9-30), and then birth and upbringing (2.370.30-372.2). He then advised that the main section focussed on accomplishments in war and peace, subdivided by virtues (2.372.2-377.9); and a peroration and prayer, the last element of which is missing from *Oration 3* (2.377.9-30).⁵⁸

Pan. Lat. IV(10) (to Constantine), Themistius *Or.* 13 (to Gratian) and, of course, Julian's *Or.* 1. Rees 2002, 8-15, discusses imperial *praesentia* and specifically how Nazarius managed his imperial subject's absence.

⁵⁵ See Ross in this volume for a fuller discussion of audience and the significance of the use of the first- and second-person pronoun. His description of a greater focus on the orator himself in a *gratiarum actio* is in keeping with *Oration 3*. Rees 2003, 447-92, explores the variety of effects achieved in panegyrics through different forms of address.

⁵⁶ All translations of *Oration 3* are taken from Wright 1913.

⁵⁷ Julian devoted 104b-106b to his concern over having a female subject, drawing on Homeric authority to justify his choice – a tactic advised by Menander Rhetor for a male subject: II.368.5-369.17.

⁵⁸ García Ruiz 2015, 163-4, notes the similarities between Menander's treatise and both of Julian's orations; see also Tougher 2012, 24-8, and James 2001, 12. Vereecke 1975, 141-57, argues against reading too much into similarities with such treatises. He makes the pertinent point that such

Menander Rhetor recommended Homeric examples in a *prooemium*, which Julian fulfilled and sustained throughout his speech to Eusebia and *Oration 1* to Constantius.⁵⁹ After discussing Eusebia's ancestry in *Oration 3*, Julian then adjusted his approach to accommodate the gender of his subject better. Instead of focussing on her upbringing, Julian chose to concentrate on her marriage. Claudian moved through the same thematic sequence, with one minor switch in order between 'native country' (50-69) and 'ancestry' (34-49). Similar to *Oration 3*, Serena's marriage became the focus of the second part; and it is through the theme of marriage that her actions were justified in intercepting, it seems, a plot against Stilicho (30.115-236).

Both Julian and Claudian focussed on their subjects' virtues in the second half of their speeches, which also both fleetingly referred to court conspiracies and the women's roles in overcoming them. Julian described how the choice of Eusebia as a wife served to reward Constantius for his virtues (109c-d):

ἐν μὲν γὰρ τούτων οὐδὲν ἐξαρκεῖν δοκεῖ πρὸς κοινωνίαν Βασιλέως, πάντα δὲ ἅμα,
ὥσπερ θεοῦ τινοῦ ἀγαθῷ Βασιλεῖ καλὴν καὶ σώφρονα πλάττοντος τὴν νύμφην

For no single one of these endowments is thought to suffice for an alliance with an emperor, but all together, as though some god were fashioning for a virtuous emperor a fair and modest bride.

The foreshadowing of Julian's discussion of Eusebia's qualities with Constantius' virtues seems like a necessary component of praising a woman, which fits with Julian's repeatedly expressed anxiety about his subject's gender. In the second part Julian did not focus on deeds in war, as Menander advised. Instead, Julian described Eusebia's actions which were driven by her wifely fidelity, explaining that this is to be preferred to martial exploits by women (127c-129b).⁶⁰ Eusebia's marriage is the dominant motif for the rest of the oration and the framework within which Julian discussed her virtues: her wisdom (φρόνησις), clemency (πραότης), temperance (σωφοσύνη), benevolence (φιλανθρωπία), and reasonableness/goodness (ἐπέικεια).⁶¹ Julian attributed these virtues to Constantius as well in

structural and thematic similarities naturally arise when writing a panegyric. See the Introduction for further discussion.

⁵⁹ Men.Rh. II.368-379.30. See García Ruiz 2015, 162, for a breakdown of the structure. Vatsend 2000, 93-5 and 104-10, and Wieber 2010, 258-60, discusses the many Homeric examples used in *Oration 3*. Consolino 1986, 15, notes the structural similarity between the *Laus Serenae* and the treatise. For Libanius' interaction with Menander's treatise, see Karla in this volume.

⁶⁰ In contrast, Claudian described Serena's concern for Stilicho in his military exploits (186-224). The image of the *dux femina* was rarely a positive one — for further discussion see Santoro L'Hoir 1994, 6-12, on Tacitus' negative portrayals of Julio-Claudian women.

⁶¹ The last of these virtues does not appear in Julian's initial list (112b-c), but in his final summary of Eusebia's qualities at 129d.

Oration 1 with an emphasis on the emperor's temperance, which is a key virtue for Eusebia in *Oration 3*.⁶²

Although Julian's declared motivation for his encomium was based on Eusebia's benevolence towards him, the two key virtues in his praise for her were temperance (σωφροσύνη) and love for her husband (φιλανδρία). These two virtues made her actions on Julian's behalf acceptable.⁶³ The importance of these qualities is best encapsulated in one of Julian's many comparisons between Eusebia and Penelope, drawing once again on Homeric authority to justify his praise, in which he explained why Penelope's passively benign example was to be preferred over other famous women (127c):

καίτοι ἐπὶ ταύτης οὐδὲν Ὅμηρος εἰπεῖν ἔσχε πλέον τῆς σωφροσύνης καὶ τῆς φιλανδρίας
καὶ τῆς ἐς τὸν ἑκυρὸν ἐπιμελείας καὶ τὸν παῖδα

And yet in her case Homer had no more to tell than of her discretion and her love for her husband and the good care she took of her father-in-law and her son.

Claudian's praise of Serena also included Penelope as an important point of comparison for his subject's temperance. In a key passage in the *prooemium*, Claudian reimagined the *Odyssey* as serving to demonstrate Penelope's temperance (25-6): 'The glory goes to Penelope, and such a stage has been set for her chastity alone'.⁶⁴ Claudian's emphasis on his subject's temperance showed that he too was working within a tradition of literary praise which restricted the range of qualities (and actions) that one could compliment an imperial woman for exhibiting.

The adjustments that Julian made because of his subject's gender in the second part of the oration complement the sequence expected in this type of genre very effectively, particularly if the work is viewed as a companion piece to *Oration 1*. In the second part of the oration, Eusebia's marriage acts as the prism through which all her virtues are demonstrated. This focus was necessary for Julian to praise Eusebia without encouraging criticism, but this emphasis also complemented Julian's structure of *Oration 1*.⁶⁵ Menander Rhetor recommended referring to a (male) subject's marriage, if suitable, under the virtue of temperance (Men.Rh. II.372.14-377.9). Such an idea was already practiced in the panegyric

⁶² Bidez 1932, 82 n.2, summarises the different meanings of temperance to describe a woman. Julian held up Constantius' temperance as an example to both men and women: *Or.* 1.46d-47a.

⁶³ Hemelrijk 2004, 190, presents a similar idea for funerary inscriptions.

⁶⁴ *Penelopae decus est atque uni tanta paratur scaena pudicitiae*. All translations of Claudian's poems are from Platnauer 1922 (with some amendments). Consolino 1986, 13 and 18, considers the Penelope comparisons in *Oration 3* and the *Laus Serenae* and finds them more predictable than does García Ruiz 2015, 167-68. Polybius described the use of Penelope as a topic in school exercises: 12.26b. Claudian used a variety of Greek and Roman examples of praiseworthy women. For his Greek and Roman influences see respectively Consolino 1986, 13, and Cameron 2015, 146.

⁶⁵ García Ruiz 2015, 162-6 and Bidez 1932, 71-2, make the argument that because of the way *Oration 3* complemented the structure of *Oration 1* they formed a diptych.

genre — as demonstrated in Pliny’s *Panegyricus*.⁶⁶ Julian did not refer to Constantius’ marriage in *Oration 1*; the only woman referred to was Constantius’ mother Fausta (*Or.* 2.9b-c).⁶⁷ However, the marriage is the framework for the main part of *Oration 3*, in which Julian praised Eusebia’s actions and her virtues. The close interaction Julian created between *Orations 1* and *3* reinforced the principal message of the praise he directed at Eusebia: his praise for her actions was warranted because she acted out of wifely duty. *Oration 3* acts as an adjunct to *Oration 1*, just as Eusebia is praised for her deference to her husband in her encomium. Julian emphasised this when justifying Constantius’ faith in Eusebia’s advice (*Or.* 3.114c):

τε αὐτῷ γέγονε κοινωνὸς καὶ πρᾶον ὄντα φύσει τὸν Βασιλέα καὶ χρηστὸν καὶ εὐγνώμονα πρὸς ἃ πέφυκε παρακαλεῖ μᾶλλον πρεπόντως καὶ πρὸς συγγνώμην τὴν δίκην τρέπει.

[Eusebia] has come to be the partner of her husband’s counsels, and though the emperor is by nature merciful, good and wise, she encourages him to follow yet more becomingly his natural bent, and ever turns justice to mercy.

Julian diverted attention from his use of a conventional and prosaic structure by saying that he would adhere to the structure of Homer’s praise for Arete in *Odyssey*, 7.54 (105a-106b).⁶⁸ He also deployed numerous literary devices common to panegyric, such as his frequent protestations that he lacked rhetorical skill in order to emphasise the sincerity of his praise (126b).⁶⁹ This *recusatio* is misleading, as is demonstrated not only by the interplay Julian created with *Oration 1*, but also by his awareness of the traditional presentation of females in imperial propaganda. Julian explicitly stated his awareness of popular themes in encomia in both *Orations 1* and *3* (*Or.* 1.10c, 16a, 17c, and 41b; and *Or.* 3.111b-c, 119d-120a). In *Oration 3* Julian justified his use of set themes as demonstration of his gratitude to Eusebia, because it showed the education he received because of her donation of a library to him, which he displayed with a lengthy digression on books (123b-126b).⁷⁰

⁶⁶ Vatsend 2000, 43-5, examines σωφροσύνη as a panegyric topos. García Ruiz 2012, 76-9, analyses in detail the significance of Julian’s comparison of Eusebia to a statue of temperance.

⁶⁷ Moser 2018, 280-1, provides a useful summary of why it was useful for Constantius (and Julian in *Oration 1*) to rehabilitate the memory of Fausta in Rome, the city where she was born.

⁶⁸ Tougher 1998b, 111-112, argues that Julian did follow this structure; for the opposing view see García Ruiz 2012, 4. Wieber 2010, 266, observes that this Homeric comparison aligns Julian with the figure of Odysseus. Höfer 1965, 1214, lists ancient references associating Arete with temperance (Eusebia’s key virtue in *Oration 3*).

⁶⁹ Towards the end of *Oration 3* Julian used *praeteritio* to allude to the wealth of information he could provide about Eusebia’s acts of patronage in Rome (123c-d). Like his contemporary Themistius, Julian adopted a philosophical persona to emphasise his sincerity (e.g. 120b-d). Tougher 2012, 22-4, summarises the similarities between the approaches of Julian, Themistius, and Libanius.

⁷⁰ Other digressions include a history of the office of consul (*Or.* 3.107d-109a), comparison between Eusebia’s mother and Penelope (110a-c), and Greece (118c-119d). Rees, 2010, 105-21, discusses the regularity of narrative in panegyric and the variety of effects achieved.

Relationship Dynamics

Serena's standing as a blood relative of the emperor shaped a key aspect of Claudian's praise, one which Julian could not draw on for Eusebia, who had married into the imperial family. Claudian applied techniques that were used in the early imperial period to praise members of the imperial family within the hierarchy of the imperial *domus*.⁷¹ In one passage, Serena was able to calm her uncle Theodosius following his return from battle, although his immediate family had been unable to do so (134-9):

Et quotiens, rerum moles ut publica cogit,
tristior aut ira tumidus flagrante redibat,
cum patrem nati fugerent atque ipsa timeret
commotum Flaccilla virum, tu sola frementem
frangere, tu blando poteris sermone mederi.
adloquiis haerere tuis, secreta fateri.

Often when he was troubled by anxieties of public business,
he returned home overwhelmed by sadness or burning with anger,
when his own sons fled their father and even Flaccilla feared
to approach her exasperated husband, you alone were able to subdue
his rage, you alone could assuage him with small talk,
hanging on your reassuring words he would confess his secret thoughts.

Serena takes her place in the family hierarchy above her aunt, Aelia Flaccilla, and Arcadius and Honorius. Claudian presented a similar image of Honorius' relationship with Theodosius in the third consulship to Honorius (3.22-4), in which once again only the subject (Honorius) was able to calm Theodosius:

reptasti per scuta puer, regumque recentes
exuviae tibi ludus erant, primusque solebas
aspera complecti torvum post proelia patrem

As a child you crawled among shields, and fresh-won spoils
of monarchs were your entertainment, and you were used to being the first
to embrace your stern father after harsh battles.

Here Honorius' closeness to his father was to the detriment of his elder brother, the eastern Augustus Arcadius. It is interesting to note the parallels between Claudian's praise of

⁷¹ See above for the hierarchy established in Tiberius' family in the *senatus consultum de Cn. Pisone Patre*. Serena is consistently presented as the senior woman at court (and a maternal figure for Honorius): see *Epithalamium*, 39-43.

Honorius and Serena. Both depictions served to reflect well on Stilicho's position at court by reinforcing his connection with Theodosius through the close ties of kinship he had with the deceased emperor's 'favourite' relatives.

Claudian's portrayal of Serena and Theodosius' relationship is similar to the relationship dynamic between Constantius and Eusebia as portrayed by Julian: the woman brings out the emperor's better character.⁷² Although Serena is described as acting on Stilicho's behalf at court in his absence, unlike Eusebia her actions do not modify her husband's behaviour (226-36). Serena does not shape Stilicho's opinion in the way that Eusebia counsels Constantius.

Claudian's praise of Serena, although bestowed more freely than by Julian and some of the earlier examples mentioned above, is essentially an embellished version of the image drawn by Pliny of Plotina and Marciana. The respective virtues of each woman reflect upon a man's good character. Their benign virtue is emphasised by the quality of temperance, which conformed to the feminine ideal of deference to the *paterfamilias*.⁷³ Notionally Julian also presented Eusebia as an extension of Constantius' qualities: her actions complement Constantius' character, just as her encomium complemented *Oration* 1. However, the virtues that Eusebia fostered in Constantius, inherent as they may have been, changed his attitude towards Julian. This shows Eusebia's complicated and valued role as an interface between the emperor and his Caesar. Julian addressed these issues via his unusual encomium because it presented him with another avenue by which to reaffirm his loyalty to Constantius. Julian's literary flair and playful encomium, including his digressions about his anxiety for his choice of subject, helpfully distract from the details of this central issue.

Conclusion

Julian's encomium to Eusebia played on gender and genre expectations. It seems that both Claudian and Julian had to counterbalance their unusual choice of subject by adopting a conservative and conventional structure. Just as Menander Rhetor prescribed mentioning an imperial subject's wife (if warranted) under the topic of the (male) subject's marriage, both Julian and Claudian centred their praise of their female subjects on marriage. The emphasis on temperance as a key virtue in both cases avoided any suggestion that the women's close marital relationship could be seen as interference in political matters. This emphasis was part of a long-established tradition for praise of women in literature. To the greatest extent possible, the female subjects only passively displayed their qualities. It was necessary that both women be presented in such a manner so that their husbands could shine as the ultimate focus of praise. Towards the end of Claudian's poem, Serena was praised for acting out of wifely duty during Stilicho's absence from court, but in doing so she is shown as protecting her husband's interests (232-6). Julian also promoted Eusebia's actions as being driven by

⁷² The marriages of both women are described as their husbands' rewards for military victories: *Carm. Min.* 30.178-180 and *Or.* 3.110c-d.

⁷³ Claudian conveyed this image for his praise of Proba in his early (non-imperial) panegyric to Olybrius and Probinus: *Olyb. et Probinus*. 192-204.

wifely duty. However, Claudian's presentation conformed to Pliny's model: the woman's praiseworthy qualities were an extension of the emperor/*de facto* ruler's virtues. In contrast, Julian reversed this model, because in *Oration 3* Constantius responded to Eusebia's virtues, and not the other way around. This could easily be read negatively as female interference in politics and reveals the challenge that Julian had set himself by choosing to praise Eusebia for her assistance in his various troubles.

It seems that having a woman as the main subject of an encomium only mattered as much as the writer wanted it to. The role Eusebia played working in the interests of Julian — as revealed in the speech — showed that her position in this complicated three-way relationship facilitated a dialogue between Julian and Constantius. She held a practical role as an intermediary between the emperor and his Caesar. Julian chose to celebrate this with his unorthodox choice of subject for a panegyric, which followed the established narrow guidelines within which a female member of the current imperial regime could be praised. Julian's praise of Eusebia worked on many different levels, while Claudian's celebration of Serena mirrored his panegyrics addressed to the emperor Honorius, which all ultimately praised Stilicho. The motivation for Julian's encomium was his gratitude towards Eusebia for her actions on his behalf at court — a tricky issue to address because these endeavours revised Constantius' attitude towards Julian. The literary challenge of praising a woman via a medium monopolised by male subjects also presented an enticing prospect for someone clearly skilled in rhetoric, despite Julian's protestations that he lacked such training.⁷⁴ Alongside these considerations Eusebia presented Julian with another means by which he could praise Constantius and reaffirm his loyalty following the unsettled events which led to his appointment as Caesar. The gender of Julian's subject for *Oration 3* is of great interest, but it is just one contributing factor to his presentation of Eusebia.

Bibliography

- Angiolani, S. (2008) *Elogio dell'imperatrice Eusebia (Orazione II)*. Naples.
- Athanassiadi, P. (1992²) [1981]. *Julian and Hellenism. An Intellectual Biography*. London.
- Aujoulat, N. (1983) 'Eusébie, Hélène et Julien', *Byzantion* 53: 421-52.
- Barnes, T.D. (2011) *Constantine. Dynasty, Religion and Power in the Later Roman Empire*. Oxford.
- Bartsch, S. (1994) *Actors in the Audience. Theatricality and Doublespeak from Nero to Hadrian*. London.
- Bidez, J. (1932) *L'Empereur Julien. Oeuvres Complètes. Tome I*. Paris.
- Boatwright, M.T. (1991) 'The Imperial Women of the Early Second Century A.D.', *AJP* 112: 513-40.
- Browning, R. (1976) *The Emperor Julian*. Berkeley.
- Brubaker, L. (1997) 'Memories of Helena: Patterns in Imperial Female Matronage in the Fourth and Fifth Centuries', in L. James (ed.), *Women, Men and Eunuchs. Gender in Byzantium*. London. 52-75.

⁷⁴ Soc. *HE*. 3.1, described Julian's rhetorical education.

- Burgess, R.W. (2008) 'The Summer of Blood: The "Great Massacre" of 337 and the Promotion of the Sons of Constantine', *DOP* 62: 5-51.
- Busch, A. (2015) *Die Frauen der theodosianischen Dynastie: Macht und Repräsentation kaiserlicher Frauen im 5. Jahrhundert*. Stuttgart.
- Cameron, A. (1970) *Claudian: Poetry and Propaganda in the court of Honorius*. Oxford.
- Cameron, A. (2015) 'Claudian Revisited', in A. Cameron (ed.), *Wandering Poets and Other Essays on Late Greek Literature and Philosophy*. Oxford. 133-46.
- Champlin, E. (1980) *Fronto and Antonine Rome*. London.
- Clauss, M. (2002) 'Die Frauen der diokletianisch-konstantinischen Zeit', in H. Temporini-Gräfin Vitzthum (ed.), *Die Kaiserinnen Roms von Livia bis Theodora*. Munich. 340-69.
- Consolino, F.E. (1986) *Elogio di Serena*. Venice.
- Cooley, A.E. (1998) 'The Moralizing Message of the Senatus Consultum de Cn. Pisone Patre'. *G&R* 45: 199-212.
- Delia, D. (1991) 'Fulvia Reconsidered', in S.B. Pomeroy (ed.), *Women's History and Ancient History*. Chapel Hill, NC. 197-217.
- Drake, H. (2012) "'But I digress...": Rhetoric and Propaganda in Julian's Second Oration to Constantius', in N. Baker-Brian and S. Tougher (eds), *Emperor and Author: The Writings of Julian the Apostate*. Swansea. 35-46.
- Drijvers, J.W. (1992) *Helena Augusta. The Mother of Constantine the Great and the Legend of her Finding the True Cross*. Leiden.
- García Ruiz, M.P. (2012) 'Significado de σωφροσύνη (ἀντή) en el *Encomio a Eusebia* de Juliano', *Emerita* 80: 69-87.
- García Ruiz, M.P. (2015) 'Una Lectura Conjunta del Primer *Encomio A Constancio* y el *Encomio A Eusebia* de Juliano', *Journal of Classical Philology* 19: 155-73.
- Georgiou, A. (2013) 'Helena: The Subversive Persona of an Ideal Christian in Early Byzantium', *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 21: 597-624.
- Gibson, C.A. (2014) 'Libanius' *Prosgymnasmata*', in L. Von Hoof (ed.), *Libanius: A Critical Introduction*. Cambridge. 128-143.
- Gillett, A. (2012) 'Epic Panegyric and Political Communication in the Fifth-Century West', in L. Grig and G. Kelly (eds), *Two Romes: Rome and Constantinople in Late Antiquity*. Oxford. 265-90.
- Haines, C.R. (tr.) (1919) *Fronto. Correspondence. Volume I*. London.
- Hall, J.B. (1986) *Prolegomena to Claudian*. London.
- Hemelrijk, E.A. (2004) 'Masculinity and Femininity in the *Laudatio Turiae*', *Classical Quarterly* 54: 185-97.
- Höfer, O. (1965) 'Sophrosyne', in W. H. Roscher (ed.), *Ausführliches Lexikon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie*. Hildesheim.
- James, L. (2001) *Empresses and Power in Early Byzantium*. London.
- James, L. (2012) 'Is there an Empress in the Text? Julian's *Speech of Thanks* to Eusebia', in N. Baker-Brian and S. Tougher (eds), *Emperor and Author: The Writings of Julian the Apostate*. Swansea. 47-59.
- Jones, H. (2007) 'Agnes and Constantia: Domesticity and Cult Patronage in the Passion of Agnes', in K. Cooper and J. Hillner (eds), *Religion, Dynasty, and Patronage in Early Christian Rome*. Cambridge. 115-39.

- Kleiner, D.E.E. (1992) *Roman Sculpture*. London.
- Kolb, A. (2010) *Augustae. Machtbewusste Frauen am römischen Kaiserhof? Herrschaftsstrukturen und Herrschaftspraxis II*. Berlin.
- Levick, B. (2014) *Faustina I and II. Imperial Women of the Golden Age*. Oxford.
- Longo, K. (2009) *Donne di Potere nella Tarda Antichità. Le Auguste attraverso Le Immagini Monetali*. Reggio Calabria.
- Mattingly, H. and E.A. Sydenham (eds) (1930) *Roman Imperial Coinage*. Vol. 3: A.D. 138-192. London.
- Mattingly, H., C.H.V. Sutherland, R.A.G. Carson and J.W.E. Pearce (1951) *Roman Imperial Coinage*. Vol. 9: A.D. 364-495. London.
- McEvoy, M. (2013) *Child Emperor Rule in the Later Roman West, AD 367-455*. Oxford.
- Moser, M. (2018) *Emperor and Senators in the reign of Constantius II: Maintaining Imperial Rule between Rome and Constantinople in the Fourth Century AD*. Cambridge.
- Nixon, C.E.V. (1983) 'Latin Panegyric in the Tetrarchic and Constantinian period', in B. Croke and E.M. Emmett (eds), *History and Historians in Late Antiquity*. Sydney. 88-99.
- Noreña, C.F. (2001) 'The Communication of the Emperor's Virtues', *JRS* 91: 146-68.
- North, H. F. (1977) 'The Mare, the Vixen, and the Bee. *Sophrosyne* as the Virtue of Women in Antiquity', *ICS* 2: 35-48.
- Pernot, L. (1993) *La rhétorique de l'éloge dans le monde Gréco-Romain*. Paris.
- Platnauer, M. (tr.) (1922) *Claudian. Volume I and II*. Cambridge, MA.
- Potter, D.S. and C. Damon (1999) 'The "Senatus Consultum de Cn. Pisone Patre"', *AJP* 120: 13-42.
- Radice, B. (tr.) (1969) *Pliny the Younger: Letters, Volume II. Books 8-10*. Cambridge, MA.
- Rees, R. (2002) *Layers of Loyalty in Latin Panegyric. AD289-307*. Oxford.
- Rees, R. (2003) 'Talking to the Tetrarchs: the Dynamics of Vocative Address', in C. Deroux (ed.), *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History XI*. Brussels. 447-92.
- Rees, R. (2010) 'The Form and Function of Narrative in Panegyric', in A. Erskine and D.H. Berry (eds), *Form and Function in Roman Oratory*. Cambridge. 105-121.
- Rees, R. (2012) 'The Modern History of Latin Panegyric', in R. Rees (ed.), *Latin Panegyric*. Oxford. 3-48.
- Russell, D.A. and N.G. Wilson (trs.) (1981) *Menander Rhetor*. Oxford.
- Santoro L'Hoir, F. (1994) 'Tacitus and Women's Usurpation of Power', *The Classical World* 88: 5-25.
- Sutherland, C.H.V. and R.A.G. Carson (eds.) (1967) *Roman Imperial Coinage*. Vol. 6: A.D. 294-313. London.
- Sutherland, C.H.V. and R.A.G. Carson and P.M. Bruun (eds.) (1966) *Roman Imperial Coinage*. Vol. 7: A.D. 313-337. London.
- Tougher, S. (1998a) 'The Advocacy of an Empress: Julian and Eusebia', *CQ* 48, 595-9.
- Tougher, S. (1998b) 'In Praise of an Empress. Julian's Speech', in M. Whitby (ed.), *The Propaganda of Power: The Role of Panegyric in Late Antiquity*. Leiden. 105-204.
- Tougher, S. (2000) 'Ammianus Marcellinus on the Empress Eusebia: A Split Personality?', *G&R* 47: 95-101.

- Tougher, S. (2012) 'Reading between the Lines: Julian's *First Panegyric* on Constantius II', in N. Baker-Brian and S. Tougher (eds), *Emperor and Author: The Writings of Julian the Apostate*. Swansea. 19-34.
- Vatsend, K. (2000) *Die Rede Julians auf Kaiserin Eusebia. Abfassungszeit, Gattungszugehörigkeit, panegyrische Topoi und Vergleiche, Zweck*. Oslo.
- Vereeke, E. (1975) 'Le Corpus des *Panegyriques Latins* de l'époque tardive: problèmes d'imitation', *L'Antiquité Classique* 44: 141-60.
- Wieber, A. (2010) 'Eine Kaiserin von Gewicht? Julians Rede auf Eusebia zwischen Geschlechtsspezifität, höfischer Repräsentation und Matronage', in A. Kolb (ed.), *Augustae. Machtbewusste Frauen am römischen Kaiserhof? Herrschaftsstrukturen und Herrschaftspraxis II*. Berlin.
- Wright, W.C. (tr.) (1913) *The Works of the Emperor Julian. Volume 1-2*. London.

JULIAN AND CLAUDIUS MAMERTINUS: PANEGYRIC AND POLEMIC IN EAST AND WEST

*Shaun Tougher*¹

Introduction

This chapter will compare the panegyrics of Julian on Constantius II and Eusebia with the speech of thanks to Julian by Claudius Mamertinus on the occasion of Mamertinus' inauguration as consul prior for 362.² Such a comparison serves perfectly the aim of this volume to study together both Latin and Greek panegyrics, for Julian wrote in Greek whilst Mamertinus wrote in Latin. Further, Julian's texts were composed in the West whilst Mamertinus delivered his in the East, in Constantinople. New questions can be asked about Latin and Greek panegyric by bringing the texts into dialogue; their proximity in time, context and subject matter make for a rewarding case study. Since Mamertinus' text is a speech of thanks the most obvious comparison is with Julian's speech of thanks to Eusebia, though there are obvious differences too, including the specific contexts, and the sex of the subjects of the thanks.

Whilst there has been much research published on Mamertinus' speech in its own right,³ and equally on Julian's panegyrics,⁴ it is the case that the panegyrics of Julian and the speech of thanks of Mamertinus are not often brought together for sustained comparison. An exception is the work of García Ruiz, who has compared Mamertinus' speech with Julian's

¹ I would like to thank the editors for their patience and encouragement. The chapter has benefited greatly from their insightful observations.

² In this chapter translations from Mamertinus' *Speech of Thanks* are taken from Lieu 1989, and translations of Julian's works are from Wright 1913. I also follow the numbering of Julian's works utilised by Wright.

³ Blockley 1972; Lieu 1989, 3-38; Nixon and Saylor Rodgers 1994, 386-436; and Rees 2012, 212-15.

⁴ Tougher 1998, 2012; Curta 1995; Tantillo 1997; Drake 2012; and James 2012.

early writings.⁵ However, there is scope for further revealing comparison. García Ruiz concentrates in particular on philosophical and rhetorical doctrines in the texts (considering *virtus*, *iustitia*, *moderatio*, and *civilitas*), but this chapter will look beyond imperial ideology to examine the construction and depiction of the history of the age of Constantius II by Julian and Mamertinus. This entails consideration of the subject of polemic too, since Mamertinus contrasts the admirable Julian with his objectionable cousin. The chapter will also look beyond the panegyrics of Julian to consider how other writings of his might have affected Mamertinus' speech of thanks, in particular the *Letter to the Athenians*, which Julian wrote when Mamertinus was with him on his progress eastwards to Constantinople in 361.

The *Letter to the Athenians* is especially important to consider as Julian wrote it to justify his open opposition to his cousin the Emperor Constantius II following his own acclamation as Augustus by his troops in Gaul in the spring of 360. It contains both polemic and panegyric, as it is concerned to denigrate the reputation of Constantius but also to vaunt the achievements of Julian.⁶ Thus it constitutes a vital text to examine in conjunction with Julian's previous panegyrics on Constantius and Eusebia, but also with the speech of thanks of Mamertinus; not only is there the question of how it might have influenced Mamertinus' speech (especially as Mamertinus must have been at Julian's side when he wrote the letter), but also how Julian might have rewritten or developed elements of his panegyrics in the letter. The *Letter to the Athenians* also marks the transitioning identity of Julian across the main texts considered in this chapter, from the ostensibly deferential Caesar in the panegyrics, to an opposing 'Augustus' in the letter, to a sole legitimate Augustus in the speech of Mamertinus. The shifting status of Julian is important to consider in relation to the messages the texts convey. The chapter will focus its discussion by exploring some specific elements in Mamertinus' speech, namely cities (especially Constantinople and Athens), philosophy, court (primarily women and eunuchs), and family (namely the treatment of Nepotianus). These subjects are chosen because they are particularly prominent in the assessment of emperors by late Roman orators and historians, as will be seen, and thus constitute key elements of the depiction of the history of the period. The chapter will compare and contrast how Julian treats the same subjects. It will be argued that Julian's own writings were fundamental in forming the characterisation of this crucial period of Roman history, but also that Mamertinus' emphasises and concerns were not necessarily the same as Julian's, possibly since Mamertinus was now addressing a sole legitimate Augustus, as noted. It is evident, for example, that Mamertinus' attack on Constantius is less extreme than Julian's because of changed circumstances, as he makes clear: Julian is now Constantius' heir.⁷ It is also important to consider the possibility that Julian's later writings might have

⁵ García Ruiz 2008b. She has also published much other relevant work, e.g. on Julian's panegyrics on Constantius and Eusebia (2015), on Mamertinus and Libanius on the image of Julian (2008a), as well as an edition and commentary on Mamertinus' speech (2006). For an earlier edition and commentary see Gutzwiller 1942.

⁶ For the *Letter to the Athenians* see for instance Humphries 2012.

⁷ On Julian's changed political circumstances on the death of Constantius see for instance Tougher 2007, 44-6. The change is symbolised by Julian's respectful participation in the funeral and burial of his cousin.

been influenced in turn by Mamertinus' speech. It is the bringing together of Julian's writings with the speech of Mamertinus in a close comparison of specific aspects that allows for new questions to be asked of the relationship between Greek and Latin texts and of the longevity of panegyric depictions, but also of the relationship between the two men.

Julian and Claudius Mamertinus

In previous study of Julian's panegyrics, when they have been compared to the work of other exponents it is usually his famous contemporaries and 'teachers' who wrote in Greek, Libanius and Themistius.⁸ This volume, however, encourages comparison with Latin authors. In the case of Julian this is obviously supplied by Claudius Mamertinus, who appears it seems in the guise of a friend and agent rather than a teacher. It is evident that Mamertinus' career took off under Julian after he was appointed Caesar in 355 and dispatched to Gaul. Mamertinus described himself as already being old when he became consul in 362.⁹ He spent much of his time in the company of the Caesar in the West, and then in the East too, especially in Julian's early reign when he was still in Constantinople; significantly, Mamertinus was one of the judges at the trials at Chalcedon.¹⁰ These trials were of the utmost importance in the establishment of the new ruler Julian, as they were distinguished by the condemnation of several of Constantius' civil officials seen as critical in his regime, including the grand chamberlain Eusebius and the notary Paul 'the Chain', figures unpopular with the military officials of Constantius II but also seen as enemies of Julian and his executed half-brother Gallus.¹¹

Mamertinus is first visible in Julian's administration in 361; when leaving Rauraci on the upper Rhine to begin his march eastwards he made various staff arrangements, reported by Ammianus.¹² These included putting Mamertinus in charge of sacred largesses (*Mamertino largitiones curandas*), possibly replacing the doomed Ursulus, who was by this date in the East.¹³ Julian presumably encountered Mamertinus in Gaul, and it is thought that he was of a prominent Gallo-Roman family or at least had been a resident for a long time; he was probably a westerner since he gave his speech of thanks to Julian in Latin.¹⁴ Having been put in charge of the sacred largesses Mamertinus was subsequently made praetorian prefect in Illyricum, and then when Julian was at Naissus he was designated as consul prior for 362.¹⁵ Further promotions followed after the death of Constantius II; Mamertinus became praetorian

⁸ See for example Tougher 2012.

⁹ *Pan. Lat.* III(11)17.2, 18.5.

¹⁰ For Mamertinus see Jones, Martindale and Morris 1971, 540-41 (Claudius Mamertinus 2).

¹¹ For an account of the trials see Amm. 22.3 For comment on the trials see for instance Bowersock 1978, 66-70; Tougher 2007, 44-6.

¹² Amm. 21.8.1.

¹³ See also *Pan. Lat.* III(11)1.4 (*aerarium publicum*). For Ursulus see Jones, Martindale and Morris 1971, 988 (Ursulus 1).

¹⁴ See Lieu 1989, 4; Nixon and Saylor Rodgers 1994, 387.

¹⁵ *Pan. Lat.* III(11)1.5, 2.1, 15.2-5.

prefect of Italy and Africa too.¹⁶ As already noted, he was appointed one of the judges of the famous trials at Chalcedon which marked Julian's early reign, but he was also a judge in the case of the Aquileia affair.¹⁷ Aquileia had declared for Constantius at the time of Julian's march eastwards in 361 and had had to be besieged; the siege only ended with the confirmation of the death of Constantius, and subsequently those deemed chiefly responsible for the opposition (Nigrinus a cavalry commander, and the decurions Romulus and Sabostius) were tried and executed.¹⁸ Mamertinus was absent, however, from the ill-fated Persian expedition. After the death of Julian in June 363 Mamertinus' career continued briefly under Jovian and then Valentinian and Valens, but in 365 he was accused of peculation and replaced as praetorian prefect of Italy, Africa, and Illyricum by Vulcacius Rufinus (ironically, the maternal uncle of Gallus, Julian's half-brother who had been executed in 354).¹⁹

The Speech of Thanks

The apparent intimacy between Julian and Mamertinus is of course reflected by the fact that Mamertinus was made consul prior for 362 and by the speech of thanks he wrote and delivered to Julian on his inauguration as consul. The speech is preserved in the collection of the *Panegyrici Latini*, as the third text in the manuscript, but the eleventh chronologically, the latest apart from Pacatus' to Theodosius I, which is second in the collection but twelfth chronologically, dating to 389 (so, *Pan. Lat.* III(11)). As a speech of thanks from a consul to an emperor it matches the first and most famous speech in the collection, Pliny the Younger's speech of thanks to Trajan from 100. Mamertinus' proximity to Julian, and presumably his familiarity with Julian's writings and views, lends the prospect of a comparison of his text with those of Julian tantalising. Here there arises the question of Mamertinus' knowledge of Greek. Rees has raised the possibility that Mamertinus was monoglot, but it is likely that as an evidently educated man he had some Greek.²⁰ Equally, while Julian was a celebrated Hellenophile he had some Latin ability.²¹ In any case, it is likely that Julian's letter to the Senate in Rome (written at the same time as his letters to the Athenians, Corinthians and Spartans) was written in Latin, so Mamertinus could have accessed Julian's presentation of events from it.²²

Since Mamertinus' text is a speech of thanks, the most obvious comparison with Julian's panegyric writings is with the *Speech of Thanks* to Eusebia, but a key aspect to consider is the Emperor Constantius II himself. Constantius appears within the speech of thanks to Eusebia as well as being the honorand of Julian's two other panegyrics. While Julian ostensibly praised Constantius, Mamertinus' treatment of the emperor was explicitly

¹⁶ Amm. 26.5.5.

¹⁷ See Amm. 22.3.1, 21.12.20.

¹⁸ See Amm. 21.11-12.20.

¹⁹ Amm. 27.7.1-2.

²⁰ See Rees 2012, 213.

²¹ For Julian and Latin see for example Bouffartigue 1992, 108-10, 404-12, 500-1; Amm. 16.5.7.

²² For Julian's letter to the Senate see Amm. 21.10.7.

polemical; he contrasted the admirable Julian with his objectionable cousin. In his speech Mamertinus praised Julian, thanking him for appointing him as consul but also for two other recent honours, his appointments as count of the sacred largesses and as praetorian prefect; Mamertinus emphasised that he was honoured by Julian three times in one year, even repeating what the honours were (21.5-22.2). As for Julian, he was portrayed as the reconqueror of Gaul, and as the restorer of empire and of liberty. In this image of Julian, vital contrast is provided by the figure of Constantius II and his regime, and of previous emperors generally.²³ Mamertinus dwelt on the jealousy of Constantius at the success of Julian, the corruption of governors and the court, and the luxurious (and hence expensive) lifestyles adopted.²⁴ These vignettes contrasted sharply with the image of the virtuous, austere, and beloved Julian. Thus the speech acted as both panegyric and polemic, just like Julian's *Letter to the Athenians*.

This dual character of Mamertinus' speech contrasted also with the apparent purpose of the panegyrics of Julian on Constantius and Eusebia, as noted. However, even in Julian's speeches there was the opportunity for self-reference and auto-panegyric. This is most obvious in the speech of thanks to Eusebia, for Julian had to record the good deeds the empress performed for him and constructed a positive image of himself as an innocent virtue-loving philosopher.²⁵ Clearly Mamertinus in his speech celebrated himself also, as a virtuous and worthy recipient of the emperor's favour. Speeches of thanks clearly allowed authors greater opportunity to talk about themselves than general speeches of praise, as they had to explain why they were thanking the honorand;²⁶ invective also offered this opportunity as the author had to explain their opposition to the subject, as seen in Julian's *Letter to the Athenians*, which also shaped Mamertinus' speech of thanks.

There is clearly scope for a detailed comparison of how Julian and Mamertinus constructed the image of Constantius II, but that is beyond the capacity of this chapter. Rather, some specific subjects will be focused on in order to explore how the history of the period is defined through panegyric by both Mamertinus and Julian, and to consider the interrelationship between the texts. These specific subjects also connect with other of Julian's writings, most obviously his *Letter to the Athenians*, which justified his opposition to Constantius in summer 361 (defending himself and denigrating Constantius), just as Mamertinus appears to have done in the early days of Julian's regime in Constantinople. The topics to be considered are, as specified above, cities (especially Constantinople and Athens); philosophy; court (primarily eunuchs and women); and family (the characterisation of Nepotianus).

²³ See for instance Blockley 1972.

²⁴ For example, *Pan. Lat.* III(11)3, 11, and 19.3-5.

²⁵ See Tougher 1998, esp. 119-21. This makes one think also of Julian's *Letter to Themistius*, which may also date to early in Julian's Caesarship: see for instance Swain 2013, 53-63, and the comments of Curta 1995, 203-8.

²⁶ Ausonius (*Grat. Act.* 13.61) even seems to suggest that *gratiarum actio* and imperial praise follow distinct and even conflicting agendas. See Ross in this volume for further discussion of this passage.

Cities

In Mamertinus' speech there was a strong focus on cities, most notably Constantinople. Constantinople featured as the site of Mamertinus' speech and the location of the Senate. It was also appropriate for Mamertinus to mention as it was the city of Julian's birth (2.3), a fact reinforced by Mamertinus when he recorded an incident which occurred when Julian was still at Naissus. When it was reported to Julian that a grain ship had been sighted heading to Constantinople he remained calm at this news, asserting 'nothing was lost to him which came to that city'.²⁷ Mamertinus remarked that 'We attributed these words to his well-known love for his fatherland', though of course with hindsight Julian's words appeared prophetic since he was soon ensconced as sole Augustus in Constantinople.²⁸ Interestingly, Julian's association with Constantinople featured in another oration delivered in Constantinople during Julian's residence there as Augustus, that of the sophist Himerius (*Or.* 41).²⁹ In this oration the subject of Constantinople is much more developed. In comparison Mamertinus said much less about Julian's relationship with the city, and one might wonder if Julian felt a certain amount of ambivalence about Constantinople as it was the foundation of Constantine, had difficult family associations, and had developed a special relationship with Constantius II,³⁰ but the different natures of the speeches should be remembered. Himerius wrote in praise of the emperor and Constantinople specifically, whereas Mamertinus wrote a speech of thanks for his promotion to the consulship. Himerius' speech, however, does usefully underscore the importance of the subject of cities within praise of emperors, an element of praise that both Mamertinus and Julian adhered to.

Mamertinus also utilised cities to demonstrate the revival of empire that Julian effected, such as his account of Julian's journey down the Danube which brought about the restoration of cities' fortunes (7.3). However, Mamertinus concentrated on Greece in particular (8.1). Wondering how Greece might praise Julian's journey down the Danube given its eloquence and effectiveness in praising deeds, Mamertinus provided examples of Julian's munificence to Greece (9). Asserting that Nicopolis in Epirus, Athens, and Eleusis had all been in a bad way previously and benefited from a general restoration under Julian, Mamertinus stated 'it is sufficient only to note that all the cities of Macedonia, Illyria and the Peloponnesus, thanks to one or two letters from the hand of our all-powerful emperor, enjoyed a sudden resurgence of youth'. The specifying of Nicopolis, Athens and Eleusis deserves further reflection. Nicopolis was associated with Augustus' victory over Antony and Cleopatra, being built to commemorate the battle of Actium of 31 BC. Mamertinus made this explicit, observing that Nicopolis had been built by 'the divine Augustus...by way of a trophy, as a monument to the victory of Actium';³¹ thus he cast Julian as a new Augustus, admirable victor in a civil war. As for Athens, it is associated by Mamertinus with the liberal arts, entirely appropriate given

²⁷ *nihil esse peccatum, non sibi perisse quae ad hanc urbem frumenta venissent.* 14.6.

²⁸ *nos vocem illam noti amoris in patriam putabamus.* 14.6.

²⁹ Penella 2007, 34-63.

³⁰ On Constantius' patronage of Constantinople see Henck 2001 and now Moser 2018, esp. 131-68.

³¹ *divus Augustus in monumentum Actiacae victoriae trophaei instar exstruxerat.* *Pan. Lat.* III(11)9.2, Lieu 1989, 20.

Julian's interest in and association with the city, having studied there briefly in the summer of 355, a fact Julian himself dealt with in his speech of thanks to Eusebia and in the *Letter to the Athenians*. Mamertinus might have included the subject of Athens to echo Julian, and to please him, but equally it might just have been an obvious exemplary city to include in his section on the revival of cities in Greece under Julian. As for Eleusis, it of course had religious significance as the site of the celebration of the mysteries of the cult of Demeter and Persephone, though Mamertinus did not spell this out. Its relevance to the religious programme of Julian must nevertheless have been evident. The mention of Eleusis also emphasised the significance of Athens again; Julian was initiated into the mysteries when he was studying there.³²

Just like Mamertinus, Julian had drawn on the subjects of cities and Greece in his praise of Constantius and Eusebia. In his first panegyric on Constantius (*Or.* 1) Julian emphasised the emperor's association with Constantinople. It featured as one of the cities that claimed to be his native land (5d). Constantine's achievement in founding Constantinople is recorded (8b-c), and it is subsequently described as the city of Constantius' ancestors (41a). For Julian, as noted, Constantinople was indeed the city of his birth, not just a city that his family was associated with.

The revival of cities was a common element of imperial praise, and Julian included it in the first panegyric on Constantius, in a section on the generosity of the emperor to cities (43a). Athens, however, had a particular place in Julian's panegyrics, and not just in relation to himself. In the first panegyric on Constantius Julian emphasised Constantine's own attention to Athens (8c-d), asserting that 'during his whole life he honoured her in word and deed'.³³ Julian illustrated this by the holding of the title of General of the Athenians by Constantine, the setting up of a statue and inscription in his honour by the city, and his provision of a wheat allowance for Athens. The title of General of the Athenians is thought by this date to refer to the ensuring of the food supply of the city, rather than a military role.³⁴ Of course, Athens had a more well-known relevance for Julian himself, and featured in his speech of thanks to Eusebia (*Or.* 3). On his being sent to Greece and Athens by the court in 355, Julian asserted that Eusebia was key in this decision, since she knew his love of literature. Julian hailed Greece as his 'true fatherland'.³⁵ He digressed on Greece as a site of learning and philosophy, and remarked that Eusebia herself 'honoured the name of philosophy' (120b).³⁶ Athens featured elsewhere in Julian's writings too, most obviously the *Letter to the Athenians*, written when he was at Naissus. In the letter, while denigrating Constantius, Julian recalled his own special relationship with the city, and promised Athens favours in future (287d). This has resonance with Mamertinus' own mention of the 'one or

³² Eunapius, *VS* 475. For comment see Penella 1990, 123; Smith 1995, 135-6. In 362 Julian appointed a priestess of Demeter as priestess of the Mother of the Gods too: *Ep.* 42, To Callixeine.

³³ ἄς ἐκεῖνος ἔργοις καὶ λόγοις τιμῶν τὸν πάντα χρόνον διετέλει. 8c-d.

³⁴ See Gehn 2016, 191. On Constantine and Athens see also Lenski 2016, 210-12.

³⁵ τὴν ἀληθινὴν...πατρίδα. 118d.

³⁶ τιμῶσα τὸ φιλοσοφίας ὄνομα. 120b.

two letters' that Julian wrote, letters written in Naissus when Mamertinus was himself with Julian.³⁷

Thus Mamertinus echoed Julian, and panegyric practice generally, by utilising cities as a means of celebrating the origins and munificence of the emperor. Constantinople was inevitable, but the focus on Greece and its cities reflected the Hellenic associations and concerns of Julian. However, Mamertinus seems not to have been a mere echoer of Julian. It is a notable oddity that Mamertinus gave his speech of thanks to the notoriously Hellenophile emperor in his native city in Latin. Indeed Rees has suggested that Mamertinus takes the opportunity to mock both Constantinople and Greece. Rees remarks that Mamertinus' 'apparently flattering exclamation *o facundia potens Graecia!* ("O Greece, powerfully eloquent!" 8.1) is made to look sneeringly insincere by the focus on exaggeration and mythologizing that he cites as examples of this national trait'.³⁸ Further, Rees asserts that Mamertinus 'ridiculed' the name of Constantinople, finding his reference to its founding by Constantine 'mealy-mouthed'. These points contribute to Rees' view of Mamertinus' speech as 'an assured, cocky display', characterised by 'brazen Latinity'.³⁹ Certainly, as noted, the fact that Mamertinus gave his speech in Constantinople before the Hellenophile Julian in Latin creates an odd effect, but Rees perhaps takes things too far. The reference to exaggeration and mythologizing could be taken as a shared joke, one that Greeks were happy to laugh at too. The reference to the name of Constantinople is limited but not ridiculing, I would argue, and in any case it would seem odd to mock Julian's city of birth. It is important to consider further anyway the identity of Constantinople. As a re-founding of Byzantium by Constantine perhaps its Greekness was now in question. As seen, in the *Letter to the Athenians* Julian contrasted his origin by birth with his 'true fatherland' of Greece. Mamertinus emphasised rather Constantinople as Julian's place of birth. This does not necessarily mean that Mamertinus was correcting Julian, just that each text has a very particular context. Interestingly, Himerius in *Oration* 41 found a neat way to bridge the two positions; he asserted that Byzantium had been a colony of Athens anyway.⁴⁰ A further point to remember is that the Senate of Constantinople was a Latin-speaking body, so Mamertinus' speech being in Latin is perfectly understandable; Moser declares that 'Mamertinus' Latin speech was, then, rather a mark of respect to the new senate and its membership'.⁴¹ Further, the Latinity of the speech, even if it was not a conscious choice but the only language in which Mamertinus could have produced a speech of this nature, also reflected its emphasis on the restoration of the liberty of the Republic under Julian, and the Romanness of this Hellenophile emperor.

Philosophy

³⁷ *unis an binis epistulis*. 9.4.

³⁸ Rees 2012, 213.

³⁹ Rees 2012, 215.

⁴⁰ Penella 2007, 59.

⁴¹ Moser 2018, 329.

In Mamertinus' speech he referred not just to the revival of cities under Julian but to that of learning and philosophy too. He declared that Julian has revived 'the forgotten pursuit of the literary arts. As for the study of philosophy, so recently under suspicion... you have... seated it upon the imperial throne'.⁴² Once again praise of Julian was combined with a dig at Constantius, implying that philosophy had been neglected under this emperor, though this was far from the case as Nick Henck's important article entitled 'Constantius' *paideia*, intellectual milieu and promotion of the liberal arts' has demonstrated.⁴³

Philosophy and philosophers also formed a strong theme in Julian's panegyrics. In the first panegyric Julian cast himself as trained in philosophy (*Or.* 1.3c-d), and he also adopts the persona of a philosopher in the second panegyric on Constantius (*Or.* 2), engaging with Platonic ideas.⁴⁴ In the speech of thanks to Eusebia his status as a philosopher is a vital part of his self-image as someone not interested in holding imperial power (*Or.* 3.120b-d). As already seen, the empress herself is also celebrated for her respect for philosophy. Mamertinus' casting of the reign of Constantius as one characterised by lack of concern for philosophy is contradicted too by Julian's mention of the fact in his speech against the Cynic Heraclius that this philosopher had also visited the court of Constantius in Milan (*Or.* 7.223d). It is clear that Constantius was keen to patronise philosophy and was even seen as a philosopher himself, just like Julian, demonstrated by his relationship with Themistius and the depiction of him by Themistius.⁴⁵ Indeed Julian's own letter to Themistius written in response to a letter he had had from Themistius following his appointment as Caesar in November 355, urging him to give up the contemplative life and embrace an active one, confirms the important place of the concept of the ruler as philosopher in panegyric of the period, even if Julian rejected Themistius' understanding of it.⁴⁶

Indeed the Constantinian dynasty as a whole showed interest in philosophy and philosophers, as illustrated by Eunapius' *Lives of the Philosophers and Sophists*.⁴⁷ While this text had much to say about Julian and his relationships with Neoplatonic philosophers such as Maximus of Ephesus it also pointed to the wider imperial interest in such figures. Constantine himself was associated with the philosopher Sopater, who went to the court of Constantine and was made an assessor by the emperor.⁴⁸ Eunapius asserted that Constantine was captivated by Sopater, and that the 'court [was] converted to the study of philosophy'.⁴⁹ The fact that Sopater ended up being executed under Constantine does not take away from the interest in philosophy expressed. Eunapius also provided a rich example of this from the reign of Constantine's youngest son Constans (337-350). He recorded a visit of the Christian

⁴² *tu extincta iam litterarum studia flammasti, tu Philosophiam paulo ante suspectam... in regali solio conlocasti*: 23.4.

⁴³ Henck 2001.

⁴⁴ See for instance Athanassiadi 1992, 64-6; Curta 1995.

⁴⁵ See for instance Vanderspoel 1995, 71-113; Heather and Moncur 2001, 43-135.

⁴⁶ On Julian's letter to Themistius see most recently Swain 2013, who has argued for dating the letter to early in Julian's Caesarship.

⁴⁷ For Eunapius and his text see for instance Penella 1990.

⁴⁸ On Sopater see for instance Penella 1990, 49-53.

⁴⁹ Βασιλείαν ἄρτι φιλοσοφεῖν μεταμανθάνουσαν: 462, ed. trans. Wright 1921, 380-1.

sophist Prohaeresius, who taught in Athens, to the court of Constans in Gaul (492).⁵⁰ Summoned by Constans, Prohaeresius sat at the emperor's table. He made a display of his abstinence and self-denial, and drank freezing cold water from the Rhine. (Perhaps Mamertinus himself was witness to the visitation of Prohaeresius.) The emperor then dispatched him to Rome, to show him off there. Constans also endowed Prohaeresius with a gift when he took his leave to return to Athens; the emperor arranged for islands to pay tribute to Athens to fund a corn supply, and he named Prohaeresius as stratopedarch (food controller).

Thus Constantinian emperors did make a show of respecting intellectuals, and also embraced education themselves. It is known from Ausonius that his maternal uncle Arborius befriended Constantine's exiled half-brothers in Tolosa and went on to teach in Constantinople itself, where he became tutor to a Caesar (probably Dalmatius).⁵¹ Further, Exsuperius of Tolosa was tutor at Narbo to the sons of Dalmatius, Dalmatius and Hannibalianus, the cousins of Constantius II and Julian.⁵² It is likely, then, that Constantine ensured that his children did have a good education; Crispus was tutored by Lactantius, for instance.⁵³ This education probably extended to Constantine's daughters as well. It has recently been suggested by Trout that the fourteen-line hexameter inscription recording the dedication of the church of St Agnes in Rome in the voice of Constantina, Constantine's eldest daughter and one-time wife of her cousin Hannibalianus, could indeed have been written by her.⁵⁴

Thus once again Mamertinus mixed praise of Julian with invective against Constantius, concealing Constantius' own concern for philosophy and literature and the wider imperial interest on the part of the Constantinian dynasty. Mamertinus' combining of praise and invective recalls in particular the model of the *Letter to the Athenians*, as has been observed. In this respect it is interesting that Julian emphasised his own attachment to philosophy in the letter. He noted that it was philosophy that kept him unharmed by his captivity at Macellum, unlike Gallus (271d-272a). As in the speech of thanks to Eusebia, he asserted again that he had no desire for imperial office or power; his removal from Athens was not welcome (*Or.* 3.273c, 275a-b). It is also clear from Julian's letter to the Athenians that he associated his philosophy and philosophical nature with his identity as a pagan, with his attachment to the gods. Likewise, it seems that Mamertinus had a very specific connotation of philosophy in mind. He remarked in particular on the fact that under Julian men were now able to look up at the stars again, something that they had been afraid to do (23.5). Although Christians could have astrological inclinations,⁵⁵ this seems to be a reference to paganism, which his mention of Eleusis had also pointed to. The remark found distinct echoes in Julian's comment in his hymn to Helios (dating to December 362) about his enthusiasm for gazing at the heavens on cloudless nights, to such an extent that he was mistaken for an astrologer (*Or.* 4.130b-131a). Thus while Constantius had been depicted as a philosopher and had demonstrated interest in

⁵⁰ Ed. trans. Wright 1921, 506-11. For Prohaeresius see for instance Watts 2006, 48-78.

⁵¹ *Parentalia* 3.15-16, and *Professores* 16.11-15. See also Green 1991, 352-3; Hopkins 1961, 242.

⁵² *Professores* 17.8-13.

⁵³ Jerome, *De viris illustribus* 80.

⁵⁴ Trout 2015. See also Harries 2012, 262 and 266-7; Jones 2007; Brubaker 1997, 59-60.

⁵⁵ See for instance Heine 2010, 110-12.

philosophy, the philosophy favoured by Julian and reflected in Mamertinus was of a different nature.

Court

Mamertinus also praised Julian and attacked Constantius on the grounds of the nature of their courts. He mentioned the venal nature of the governors of Constantius (for example at 1.4). On the subject of the appointment of officials he alleged that very few received office on merit but secured them through winning the favour of ‘the most abandoned of the courtiers’.⁵⁶ He asserted that to this end those most in favour with the emperor were cultivated, not just men but women (*mulierculas, feminas*) and eunuchs (*spadones*).

The venal governors and corrupt eunuchs of Constantius also featured strongly in the writings of Julian. In his *Letter to the Athenians* Julian dealt with the corrupt regime of Constantius and the corrupt nature of its officers, including the praetorian prefect Florentius whose avarice he says he opposed when Caesar in Gaul (282c). Again, in his speech against the Cynic Heraclius Julian created a myth of his own life which reflected on the nature of the regime of Constantius. Asked by Helios about the disposition of Constantine’s heir Constantius, and of his shepherds and herdsmen, Julian replied (*Or.* 7.232a-c):

Ὁ μὲν μοι...δοκεῖ νυστάζειν τὰ πολλὰ καὶ καταδύομενος λεληθότως ἡδυπαθεῖν, τῶν ποιμένων δὲ ὀλίγον μὲν ἐστὶ τὸ ἀστεῖον, τὸ πλῆθος δὲ μοχθηρὸν καὶ θηριῶδες. ἐσθίει γὰρ καὶ πιπράσκει τὰ πρόβατα καὶ ἀδικεῖ διπλῆ τὸν δεσπότην. τά τε γὰρ πόμνια αὐτοῦ φθείρει καὶ ἐκ πολλῶν μικρὰ ἀποφέρων ἄμισθον εἶναί φησι καὶ ὀδύρεται.

He seems to me...to be for the most part asleep, sunk in forgetfulness and devoted to pleasure; and of his shepherds a few are honest, but most are vicious and brutal. For they devour or sell his sheep, and doubly injure their master, in that they not only ruin his flocks but besides that they make great gain and return him but little thereof, while they declare with loud complaint that they are defrauded of their wages.

Even in his first panegyric to Constantius Julian alluded to the fact that Constantius gave others the means of luxury (16b), and that taxation was occasionally increased (21d).⁵⁷ He also asserted that Constantius was loyal to his friends, even if they proved unworthy (46c). Julian could use panegyric as a vehicle for criticism, and the genre could have the character of advice literature.⁵⁸ Mamertinus himself remarked on the fact that Julian was an excellent judge of friends, but tolerated their faults if they proved imperfect.⁵⁹ There is certainly no need to think of Julian as a nervous or constrained speaker during his Caesarship, witness his

⁵⁶ *Ceteri vero perditissimum quemque ex aulicis frequentabant.* 19.4.

⁵⁷ See also Tougher 2012, 27.

⁵⁸ See Tougher 2012.

⁵⁹ Note, however, that Mamertinus made a very similar remark about Julian: *Pan. Lat.* III(11)26.5.

assertive and robust *Letter to Themistius*, challenging the views and knowledge of the established rhetor and philosopher.

In depictions of the court of Constantius the role of eunuchs within the regime is especially notorious, and Mamertinus dwelt on this. His remarks are often cited in relation to the development of an institutional presence of eunuchs at the late Roman court and the questions of the power of eunuchs and their gender identity; he observed that eunuchs are ‘so to speak, exiles from the society of the human race, belonging neither to one sex nor the other’.⁶⁰ Unsurprisingly this aspect of the court of Constantius II was not celebrated in Julian’s panegyrics, but it is milked in his *Letter to the Athenians* where he invoked the malign influence of the grand chamberlain (*praepositus sacri cubiculi*) Eusebius. He asserted that it was to gratify a eunuch his chamberlain that Constantius gave up Gallus (272d), and that the eunuch kept Julian and Constantius apart (274a-b).⁶¹ Later, in his *Misopogon*, he remarked that his tutor Mardonius was a eunuch, ‘a word which, twenty months ago, was constantly heard and revered, though it is now applied as an insult and a term of abuse’.⁶² Thus Mamertinus in his speech echoed the hostile comments of Julian, but then in turn Julian echoed Mamertinus. The nature of Constantius’ court, and the role of eunuchs within in, would have been very fresh in the mind of Mamertinus and his contemporaries, given the setting up of the trials at Chalcedon and the judgements issued, including the condemning to death of Constantius’ praetorian prefect Florentius and grand chamberlain Eusebius.

So far so familiar. However, the mention of women is more arresting, and was key in the decision to analyse Mamertinus and Julian together in this chapter. Mamertinus’ statement is of course echoed some thirty years later in Ammianus’ famous observation in his obituary on Constantius II that the emperor was ‘to an excessive degree under the influence of his wives, and the shrill-voiced eunuchs, and certain of the court officials’.⁶³ While it is easy to follow the anti-eunuch and anti-courtier rhetoric in other writings (for example Libanius, and Julian himself as we have seen),⁶⁴ the attack on women by Mamertinus seems more puzzling. Whom did Mamertinus have in mind?

In Mamertinus’ attack on women there was a strong contrast with the writings of Julian, for he famously praised Eusebia for being kind and helping him, both in the *Speech of Thanks* and the *Letter to the Athenians*. It seems odd then that Mamertinus conjured up such a divergent image of the role of women at the imperial court. Although he did not spell it out, it seems likely that Mamertinus included, or meant primarily, imperial women. Of course Eusebia’s actions could be construed in less positive ways, as interfering in politics, and they

⁶⁰ *quos quasi a consortio humani generis extorres ab utroque sexu aut naturae origo aut clades corporis separavit*. 19.4. On eunuchs at the late Roman court see for instance Hopkins 1963, and 1978, 172-96; Tougher 2008, 36-53.

⁶¹ In the *Letter to the Athenians* he also notes that Eusebia showed kindness to him through the eunuchs of her household (274b).

⁶² τὸ πολυθρύλητον τοῦτο δὴ πρὸ μηνῶν μὲν εἴκοσι προσκυνούμενον ὄνομα, νυνὶ δὲ προφερόμενον ἀντ’ ἀδικήματος καὶ ὀνείδους. 352a-b.

⁶³ *uxoribus et spadonum gracilentis vocibus et palatinis quibusdam nimium quantum addictus*: 21.16.16, trans. Rolfe 1940, 183. For further discussion of this depiction of the role of women and eunuchs see Tougher forthcoming.

⁶⁴ For Libanius on eunuchs see for instance *Or.* 18.130 and 152.

were indeed presented in a more sinister light by later authors Ammianus and Zosimus, who drew on the hostile history of Eunapius.⁶⁵ One should also think of the stories about Eusebia preserved in the summary of the fifth-century church history of Philostorgius, where she was cast as a more formidable and aggressive character.⁶⁶ Closer in time to Mamertinus and Julian, Eutropius in his *Breviarium* (dated to 369) remarked on the undue influence of Constantius' wives upon the emperor (10.15.2). Thus the image painted by Mamertinus of the negative role of women at the court of Constantius is echoed by later historians.

It is striking that this image painted by Mamertinus appears to contradict or throw into question what Julian himself had presented very recently. Perhaps Mamertinus was alluding to other imperial women, such as Constantius' sisters Constantina (Gallus' wife) and Helena (Julian's wife). Constantina is later depicted by Ammianus in dark hues, conjuring up an image of her and her husband in Antioch as partners in savagery, with the Caesar Gallus being encouraged in his crimes by Constantina.⁶⁷ She also appeared as a significant political player in Philostorgius' *Church History*.⁶⁸ Helena is a more blank character in the historical record but perhaps as a sister of Constantius II she was tainted by association. Libanius' *Oration 37*, dating to after 365, attested to an accusation that Julian had had Helena poisoned.⁶⁹ However, Julian had ensured she was buried with her sister Constantina in her mausoleum in Rome.⁷⁰ Possibly Mamertinus was casting even further back, to figures such as Constantine's wife Fausta and his mother Helena.⁷¹ If not just imperial women were envisioned, Ammianus' story of Assyria the wife of Barbatio the master of infantry comes to mind; they were both executed for treason in 359, as they anticipated Constantius' death and his replacement by Barbatio (18.3).

In the subject of women then there is a striking contrast between Julian's comments and actions regarding Eusebia and Helena, and Mamertinus' speech, soon into the new regime. As noted, even in his *Letter to the Athenians* Julian maintained the image of the helpful Eusebia that had been enshrined in his speech of thanks to the empress. Presumably he could have attacked her in the letter too. Perhaps, however, the positive image of Eusebia served to highlight the negative image of Constantius. An image of such an active and influential wife may have been read as a sign of his failings as a man anyway. Further, since Eusebia had died by the time Julian wrote the letter there was probably no point in revising the depiction of her. Helena had died by then too, so when Julian became sole emperor there was already a lack of imperial females in existence. There was of course Constantius' widow Faustina, together with her baby daughter Constantia. What their role was during Julian's reign is unclear, though they were obviously still alive as they resurfaced during the attempted usurpation of Procopius in 365-366, when he appropriated them to demonstrate his

⁶⁵ On Ammianus' depiction of Eusebia see for instance Tougher 2000.

⁶⁶ See for instance Philostorgius 4.7 and 76.a; Amidon 2007, 67-8 and 96-7.

⁶⁷ Amm. 14.1.2-8, 7.4, 9.3, 11.6 and 22.

⁶⁸ Philostorgius 3.22; Amidon 2007, 57.

⁶⁹ See Criore 2016, 44-62.

⁷⁰ Amm. 21.1.5. For the mausoleum, better known today as the church of Santa Costanza, see for instance Johnson 2009, 139-56.

⁷¹ For Fausta and Helena see for instance Harries 2012, 258-62.

legitimacy as a relative of the imperial family.⁷² One wonders if Julian contemplated marrying Faustina himself. If he did so he evidently rejected the idea, and chose not to marry at all. Mamertinus' comments on women were presumably ventured with the expectation that the emperor would approve. His assertions regarding women in a public speech to Julian thus indicated that just as the new emperor moved against eunuchs he took a stand against women at court too, for political reasons, not (just) because of his famed self-control. This suggests that Constantinian women were perceived as powerful figures.⁷³

Family

The mention of women in Mamertinus' speech raises the subject of family. Indeed, the whole speech has a family aspect since it dealt with the relationship of, and differences between, the cousins Constantius II and Julian. Another family element to the speech that deserves to be discussed is the appearance of Nepotianus. Nepotianus was the son of Constantine the Great's half-sister Eutropia (possibly her husband was Virius Nepotianus, consul for 336).⁷⁴ Eutropia was a full sister of Julian's father Julius Constantius, and Nepotianus was a cousin of Julian and Constantius. He was not killed in the 'great massacre' of 337, and surfaced in Rome in 350 at the time of the murder of Constans and the usurpation of Magnentius. Nepotianus was acclaimed emperor in Rome, but he and his mother were killed soon after by supporters of Magnentius.

In Mamertinus' speech Nepotianus was paired with Silvanus as an example of those from recent history who had an insane lust for power (13.1-3). Silvanus was the master of infantry in Gaul turned usurper, famously taken out in 355 by a team sent to Gaul by Constantius, which was headed by the master of cavalry in the East Ursicinus and included Ammianus himself.⁷⁵ Mamertinus, utilising the device of *prosopopoeia*,⁷⁶ imagined that one of the gods brought them back to life and offered them the throne on the condition that they rule in the admirable manner of Julian. Mamertinus asserted that 'their delicate ears would not be able to sustain the impact of the very words: terrified by such a regime they would take a great dislike not merely to the purple but to life itself and would hasten to retire to some region lower even than hell itself!'.⁷⁷ Thus Mamertinus presented Nepotianus as an unworthy usurper, unlike his fellow Constantinian cousin Julian who was presented as a worthy and legitimate emperor.

⁷² Amm. 26.7.10, 26.9.3. Constantia went on to marry Gratian, the son of Valentinian I and Marina Severa. See now McEvoy 2016, who suggests Faustina and Constantia must have remained at Constantinople c.363-5.

⁷³ For further discussion see Tougher forthcoming.

⁷⁴ For Nepotianus and Eutropia see for instance Jones, Martindale and Morris 1971, 316 (Eutropia 2), and 624 (Iul. Nepotianus 5); Chausson 2007, 129-33.

⁷⁵ Amm. 15.5. For this episode see now Ross 2016, 80-95.

⁷⁶ For *prosopopeia* in late antique panegyric see the chapter by Roger Rees in this volume, which also discusses this example.

⁷⁷ *profecto verborum ipsorum molestiam delicatae aures non poterunt sustinere; tantis negotiis territi non modo imperium sed etiam vitam perosi ad inferiores aliquos inferos redire properabunt.* 13.3.

As with the case of women, Mamertinus' treatment of Nepotianus provided a contrast with the writings of Julian. Julian dealt with the figure of Silvanus in his first panegyric on Constantius (48c) and in the second panegyric (98c-99a), referring to his usurpation and death. Julian also dealt with the usurpers Vetricius and Magnentius; he began the first panegyric with the cases of these two men, and remarked in the second panegyric that Constantius II avenged the death of his brother Constans (95a).⁷⁸ However, Julian did not mention Nepotianus. How can this difference with Mamertinus be accounted for? Could it be that Julian deliberately avoided mentioning a family member as it might have been a sensitive topic for Constantius and himself at the time of writing? Alternatively, perhaps Nepotianus was simply not relevant to the subject of his praise; Constantius had not defeated Nepotianus, and if anything in fact the death of Nepotianus (and Eutropia too) was another factor in Constantius' war of revenge against Magnentius; as Julian observed, this usurper had committed crimes against Constantius' own house (*Or.* 1.33d; and see also *Or.* 2.58c-d). Nepotianus like Constans was a victim of Magnentius, and if anything his acclamation as Augustus in Rome in 350 had been an attempt to assert the position of the Constantinian dynasty.

The question should really be, why did Mamertinus include Nepotianus as a recent infamous usurper?⁷⁹ Given his very brief tenure of imperial office it seems an odd choice, doubly so as this was a cousin of Julian. However, Nepotianus does seem to have become a negative figure. Sextus Aurelius Victor, who met Julian at Sirmium in 361 and was then summoned to Naissus by him,⁸⁰ commented in his *Caesars* (written in Latin and completed in Spring 361) on the 'brutish nature' of Nepotianus, referring to the killings in Rome at this time.⁸¹ Eutropius soon after echoed this verdict in his *Breviarium* (10.11). (It would have been interesting to know how Ammianus treated Nepotianus in the 'lost' books of his history, if indeed they ever existed.⁸²) Mamertinus' choice of Nepotianus still seems strange though, given the family connection with Julian. However, it does fit and reinforce Mamertinus' general stance that although Julian was the legitimate heir of Constantius he was in fact an exceptionally admirable member of the Constantinian family; Constantius himself and unspecified women were unworthy of imperial power, and so too was Nepotianus. The message was that Julian deserved to be emperor on his own merits, not because of the family he happened to belong to.

One can also wonder, however, why Mamertinus did not select Magnentius as a recent notorious usurper. Julian certainly dwelt on him in his panegyrics on Constantius. Perhaps to have mentioned him would have recalled a celebrated success of Constantius. Further, perhaps it was not politic to do so as the attitude towards Magnentius seems to have shifted;

⁷⁸ See also for instance *Or.* 1.26c, 30b-31b, 34a-b, 47c-d, 55c-d; *Or.* 2.76c-77c.

⁷⁹ On the choice of Silvanus and Nepotianus see also the discussion in Omissi 2018, 214-15, who suggests that it was in part the shortness of the reigns of Silvanus and Nepotianus that recommended them to Mamertinus for the point that he wanted to make.

⁸⁰ *Amm.* 21.10.5-6.

⁸¹ *stolidum ingenium.* 42.7. Trans. Bird 1994, 52.

⁸² Rees 2014.

Julian considered him a legitimate emperor in his *Caesars*, even if he identified him as one who in reality had achieved nothing of note (315d-316a).⁸³

Mention of the *Caesars* raises one final intriguing point of comparison between the speech of Mamertinus and the writings of Julian. Mamertinus utilised the conceit of a god (unspecified) bringing back to life and quizzing Nepotianus and Silvanus about the character of imperial rule. This immediately reminds one of the device Julian used in his *Caesars*, where the gods staged a contest to decide who had been the best ruler, Hermes acting as the main interrogator of those emperors selected to compete (Julius Caesar, Octavian, Trajan, Marcus Aurelius, and Constantine, as well as Alexander the Great).⁸⁴ Julian wrote the *Caesars* for the Saturnalia when he was sole emperor, so it dates to either December 361 or December 362; generally 362 is preferred, partly on the grounds that Julian would not have had the time to write it in December 361.⁸⁵ Could it thus be that Julian was inspired by Mamertinus? Alternatively, if one believes that the *Caesars* was indeed written in 361,⁸⁶ did Mamertinus deliberately redeploy the same device for the emperor a matter of weeks later? Either way, the use by both men of *prosopopeia* in this fashion suggests interaction between Greek and Latin literature.

Conclusions

In the shaping of the historiographical image of Constantius II and his regime there is no doubt that Julian played a key role through his various writings, most famously his *Letter to the Athenians* and his *Misopogon*, but also his panegyrics, especially the first panegyric to Constantius and his speech of thanks to Eusebia. However, Mamertinus was also key in the shaping of the image of Constantius and his regime, and in many respects anticipated the polemical image presented by Ammianus. This also holds true for how Mamertinus depicted Julian and his regime; as Ammianus confessed, his own treatment of Julian would verge on panegyric (16.1.3). Within this critical nexus of Julian, Mamertinus and Ammianus, in the matter of East and West and of Latin and Greek there is found the intriguing facts that Julian wrote his panegyrics in the West in Greek, Mamertinus wrote his speech of thanks in the East in Latin, and Ammianus, a self-confessed Greek (31.16.9), wrote his history in Latin. This highlights and emphasises the co-dependency of work in both Latin and Greek for the shaping of the images of Constantius and Julian. However, it is important to appreciate that Mamertinus was not just an echoer of Julian. As has been seen in this chapter he could treat topics in different ways and address different topics, such as his assertion about the influence of women within the court and the focus on Nepotianus as an unworthy usurper. These differences reflect the fact that by New Year 362 there existed a different political context, with Julian now established in power, whereas Julian wrote his panegyrics and the *Letter to*

⁸³ On the avoidance of Magnentius see also Nixon and Saylor Rodgers 1994, 412 n.85, and Omissi 2018, 215.

⁸⁴ For the *Caesars* see now for instance Tougher 2018.

⁸⁵ See for example Smith 2013, 211 and n. 16.

⁸⁶ For the argument for 361 see for instance Bouffartigue 1992, 402-3.

the Athenians, which combined invective and panegyric, before he had become the heir of Constantius II. Further, it is possible that Mamertinus' speech influenced Julian's subsequent writings, such as the speech against the Cynic Heraclius and (possibly) the *Caesars*. Thus the dynamic between the two men and their writings merits and rewards closer study.

Bibliography

- Amidon, P.R. (tr.) (2007) *Philostorgius*, Church History. Atlanta, GA.
- Bird, H.W. (tr.) (1994) *Aurelius Victor: De Caesaribus*. Liverpool.
- Blockley, R.C. (1972) 'The Panegyric of Claudius Mamertinus on the Emperor Julian', *The AJP* 93: 437-50.
- Bouffartigue, J. (1992) *L'Empereur Julien et la culture de son temps*. Paris.
- Bowersock, G.W. (1978) *Julian the Apostate*. London.
- Brubaker, L. (1997) 'Memories of Helena: patterns in imperial female matronage in the fourth and fifth centuries', in L. James (ed.), *Women, Men and Eunuchs: Gender in Byzantium*. London and New York. 52-75.
- Chausson, F. (2007) *Stemmata aurea: Constantin, Justine, Théodose. Revendications généalogiques et idéologie impériale au IV^e siècle ap. J.-C.* Rome.
- Criore, R. (2015) *Between City and School: Selected Orations of Libanius*. Liverpool.
- Curta, F. (1995) 'Atticism, Homer, Neoplatonism, and *Fürstenspiegel*: Julian's second panegyric on Constantius', *GRBS* 36: 177-211.
- Drake, H. (2012) "'But I digress...": Rhetoric and propaganda in Julian's second oration to Constantius', in N. Baker-Brian and S. Tougher (eds.), *Emperor and Author: The Writings of Julian the Apostate*. Swansea. 35-46.
- García Ruiz, P. (2006) *Claudio Mamertino, Panegírico (Gratiarum Actio) al Emperador Juliano*. Navarra.
- García Ruiz, P. (2008a) 'La evolución de la imagen política del emperador Juliano a través de los discursos consulares: Mamertino, *Pan.* III [11] y Libanio, *Or.* XII', *Minerva* 21: 137-53.
- García Ruiz, P. (2008b) 'Una lectura de la *gratiarum actio* de Claudio Mamertino a la luz de los primeros escritos de Juliano', *Emerita* 76: 231-52.
- García Ruiz, P. (2015) 'Una lectura conjunta del primer *Encomio a Constancio* y el *Encomio a Eusebia* de Juliano', *Journal of Classical Philology* 19: 155-73.
- Gehn, U. (2016) 'Athens', in R.R.R. Smith and B. Ward-Perkins (eds.), *The Last Statues of Antiquity*. Oxford. 190-99.
- Green, R.P.H. (1991) *The Works of Ausonius*. Oxford.
- Gutzwiller, H. (1942) *Die Neujahrsrede des Konsuls Claudius Mamertinus vor dem Kaiser Julian. Text, Übersetzung und Kommentar*. Basel.
- Harries, J. (2012) *Imperial Rome AD 284 to 363: The New Empire*. Edinburgh.
- Heather, P., and D. Moncur (2001) *Politics, Philosophy, and Empire in the Fourth Century: Select Orations of Themistius*. Liverpool.
- Heine, R.E. (2010) *Origen. Scholarship in the Service of the Church*. Oxford.

- Henck N. (2001) 'Constantius' paideia, intellectual milieu and promotion of the liberal arts', *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 47: 172-87.
- Hopkins, K. (1961) 'Social mobility in the later Roman empire: the evidence of Ausonius', *CQ* 11: 239-49.
- Hopkins, K. (1963) 'Eunuchs in politics in the later Roman empire', *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 189: 62-80.
- Hopkins, K. (1978) *Conquerors and Slaves*. Cambridge.
- Humphries, M. (2012) 'The tyrant's mask? Images of good and bad rule in Julian's *Letter to the Athenians*', in N. Baker-Brian and S. Tougher (eds.), *Emperor and Author: The Writings of Julian the Apostate*. Swansea. 75-90.
- James, L. (2012) 'Is there an empress in the text? Julian's *Speech of Thanks to Eusebia*', in N. Baker-Brian and S. Tougher (eds.), *Emperor and Author: The Writings of Julian the Apostate*. Swansea. 47-59.
- Johnson, M.J. (2009) *The Roman Imperial Mausoleum in Late Antiquity*. New York, NY.
- Jones, H. (2007) 'Agnes and Constantia: domesticity and cult patronage in the Passion of Agnes', in K. Cooper and J. Hillner (eds.), *Religion, Dynasty, and Patronage in Early Christian Rome, 300-900*. Cambridge. 115-39.
- Jones, A.H.M., Martindale, J.R., and Morris, J. (1971) *The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire*. Vol. 1: A.D. 260-395. Cambridge.
- Lenski, N. (2016) *Constantine and the Cities: Imperial Authority and Civic Politics*. Philadelphia.
- Lieu, S.N.C. (ed.) (1989²) [1986] *The Emperor Julian: Panegyric and Polemic*. Liverpool.
- McEvoy, M. (2016) 'Constantia: the Last Constantinian', *Anthichthon* 50: 154-79.
- Moser, M. (2018) *Emperor and Senators in the Reign of Constantius II: Maintaining Imperial Rule between Rome and Constantinople in the Fourth century AD*. Cambridge.
- Nixon, C.E.V. and B. Saylor Rodgers (1994) *In Praise of Later Roman Emperors: The Panegyrici Latini. Introduction, Translation, and Historical Commentary*. Berkeley and Los Angeles, CA.
- Omissi, A. (2018) *Emperors and Usurpers in the Later Roman Empire: Civil War, Panegyric, and the Construction of Legitimacy*. Oxford.
- Penella, R.J. (1990) *Greek Philosophers and Sophists in the Fourth Century A.D. Studies in Eunapius of Sardis*. Leeds.
- Penella, R.J. (2007) *Man and the Word: The Orations of Himerius*. Berkeley, CA.
- Rees, R. (2012) 'Bright lights, big city: Pacatus and the *Panegyrici Latini*', in L. Grig and G. Kelly (eds.), *Two Romes: Rome and Constantinople in Late Antiquity*. New York, NY. 203-22.
- Rees, R. (2014) 'Intertitles and deliberate misinformation in Ammianus Marcellinus', in L. Jansen (ed.), *The Roman Paratext: Frame, Texts, Readers*. Cambridge. 129-42.
- Rolfe J.C. (tr.) (1940) *Ammianus Marcellinus*, vol. 2. Cambridge MA.
- Ross, A.J. (2016) *Ammianus' Julian: Narrative and Genre in the Res Gestae*. Oxford.
- Smith, R. (1995) *Julian's Gods. Religion and Philosophy in the Thought and Action of Julian the Apostate*. London.

- Smith, R. (2013) 'Serious fun in a potted history at the *Saturnalia*? Some imperial portraits in Julian the Apostate's *Caesars*, a medallion-image of Julian and the "Gallienae Augustae" *aurei*', *Histos* 7: 205-68.
- Swain, S. (2013) *Themistius, Julian, and Greek Political Theory under Rome. Texts, Translations, and Studies of Four Key Works*. Cambridge.
- Tantillo, I. (1997) *La prima orazione di Giuliano a Costanzo: introduzione, traduzione e commento*. Rome.
- Tougher, S. (1998) 'In praise of an empress: Julian's *Speech of Thanks to Eusebia*', in Mary Whitby (ed.), *The Propaganda of Power: The Role of Panegyric in Late Antiquity*. Leiden. 105-23.
- Tougher, S. (2002) 'Ammianus Marcellinus on the empress Eusebia: a split personality?', *G&R* 47: 94-101.
- Tougher, S. (2007) *Julian the Apostate*. Edinburgh.
- Tougher, S. (2008) *The Eunuch in Byzantine History and Society*. London.
- Tougher, S. (2012) 'Reading between the lines: Julian's *First Panegyric* on Constantius II', in N. Baker-Brian and S. Tougher (eds.), *Emperor and Author: The Writings of Julian the Apostate*. Swansea. 19-34.
- Tougher, S. (2018) 'Julian Augustus on Augustus: Octavian in the *Caesars*', in P.J. Goodman (ed.), *Afterlives of Augustus, AD 14-2014*. Cambridge. 87-102.
- Tougher, S. (forthcoming) 'Eusebia and Eusebius'.
- Trout, D.E. (2015) 'Vergil and Ovid at the tomb of Agnes: Constantina, epigraphy and the genesis of Christian poetry', in J. Bodel and N. Dimitrova (eds.), *Ancient Documents and their Contexts*. Leiden. 263-82.
- Vanderspoel, J. (1995) *Themistius and the Imperial Court: Oratory, Civic Duty, and Paideia from Constantius to Theodosius*. Ann Arbor, MI.
- Watts, E.J. (2006) *City and School in Late Antique Athens and Alexandria*. Berkeley, CA.
- Wright, W.C. (tr.) (1913) *The Works of the Emperor Julian*. 2 vols. London.
- Wright, W.C. (tr.) (1921) *Philostratus, Lives of the Sophists. Eunapius, Lives of the Philosophers*. London.

HOW TO PRAISE A CHRISTIAN EMPEROR: THE PANEGYRICAL EXPERIMENTS OF EUSEBIUS OF CAESAREA

James Corke-Webster

Introduction

The late third and early fourth century represents a high point for our knowledge and understanding of ancient panegyric. This is largely due, of course, to the survival of the *Panegyrici Latini*, the collection of Gallic orations that preserves a snapshot of how several panegyrists in those western provinces manoeuvred through the changing political and religious landscape. However, none of these panegyrics deal directly with the new emperor Constantine's Christianity (though their oblique references to his 'conversion' have occasioned much fevered comment).¹ Moreover, none of these orators is — openly at least — a Christian. And in fact after Constantine, though there would be numerous Christian emperors, we have very few (extant) examples of Christian panegyrists systematically engaging with the Christianity of their emperor.² Panegyric as it was traditionally practiced does not seem to have been a genre receptive to the Christian revolution.

The main exception to this trend is the maverick bishop and scholar Eusebius of Caesarea.³ In the second and third decades of the fourth century Eusebius explored the new challenge of how praise a Christian emperor. But his efforts were complicated, and represent a series of experiments with the genre.⁴ Initially, he used Constantine as the capstone to his epic narrative history of early Christianity, the *Ecclesiastical History* (*Historia ecclesiastica*). Books 8-10 see the emperor praised in the language and form of traditional panegyric. Later he delivered a speech in praise of the emperor at the celebration of the latter's thirty-year reign, published as the *In Praise of Constantine* (*Laus Constantini*). And at the very end of his life he published a half-biography, half-panegyric shortly after the emperor's death, the famed *Life of Constantine* (*Vita Constantini*).

All three Eusebian 'panegyrics' are thus rather odd in form. Upon inspection, they prove rather odd in content too. In the *History* we find the emperor at times rather overshadowed by the Christian God. More extraordinary, alongside the narrative praise of the emperor is an actual quoted panegyric, but of a bishop. In the *Praise*, Eusebius unapologetically focuses almost entirely on the divine, and relegates Constantine to the role of divine conduit, and in so doing seems to assimilate him with the role of his own panegyrist. He also praises the bishops he thinks best qualified to deliver such new

¹ The literature on Constantine's conversion is vast; on references to it in the *Panegyrici Latini* see especially Odahl 1990 and Van Dam 2011, 101-154.

² For surveys of Christian panegyric in late antiquity see for the Latin world, MacCormack 1975, 166-174 and, for the Greek, Kennedy 1983, 180-264.

³ Ambrose's funeral orations to the Emperors Valentinian and Theodosius represent two later examples.

⁴ In keeping with the generic fluidity of the age; see e.g. Greatrex & Elton 2015.

panegyrics. In the *Life*, this simultaneous muting of the emperor and elevation of the bishop reach their culmination when the role of emperor and bishop are famously equated.

It is no coincidence that the innovative exploration of form and content coincide with a new task. In this tripartite exploration we are seeing one of the greatest literary minds of his day wrestling with the rhetorical consequences of a Christian emperor — how the new faith affected how to praise him, who should do so, and the relationship between author and subject. This new situation catalysed new paths in this schematic but flexible genre, problematized the roles of emperor, bishop, and orator, and ultimately eroded the boundaries that separated panegyric subject and author. In these experiments, I propose, Eusebius laid the groundwork for the new landscape of religious and political authority that would shape fourth century history.

Embedded Panegyric: Emperor and Bishop in the *Ecclesiastical History*

Eusebius is best known for his *History*, his narrative of the first three hundred years of early Christianity under the Roman Empire. This account climaxes with Constantine's final victory in 324, but the degree to which Eusebius was a publicist and even propagandist for that emperor has been vigorously debated. Traditionally, he was seen in an unflattering light in precisely these terms, though this was a judgment often formed by reading the *History* together with the *Life* (which we will consider below).⁵ In the 1980s Timothy Barnes' pioneering work drove a wedge between historian and emperor, demonstrating that Eusebius was not a court figure — resident as he was in Caesarea — and arguing that much of the *History* was written in the third century before Constantine had acceded to power.⁶ But while Barnes' characterisation of the relationship between Constantine and Eusebius has met with scholarly approval, his dating of the *History* has been corrected. Richard Burgess has demonstrated that the first edition of the *History* was produced between 311 and 314 and consisted of (versions of) Books 1-9, thereby affirming indirectly that the *History* was always intended to climax with Constantine, albeit together with his co-emperor Licinius.⁷

With the transition from Book 7 to Book 8, the *History* moved into Eusebius' own lifetime. Eusebius thus exchanged, in traditional terms, the realm of historiography for that of panegyric.⁸ Many of the positive descriptions of both Constantine and Licinius conform to the topics — and even the order — of material in contemporary panegyric — family,

⁵ Most famously Burckhardt 1853, 326.

⁶ Barnes 1981.

⁷ Burgess 1997. Neri 2012 has more recently proposed again a first edition of 311 consisting of Books 1-8, but this has not yet swayed consensus. The suggestion of Johnson 2013, 104-112, would also mean Constantine and Licinius were in view from the *History*'s beginnings.

⁸ On this (loose) distinction see MacCormack 1975, 151-4. There seems to have been a heightened awareness of it in late antiquity; it is made explicitly, for example, at the end of both Eutropius' *Breviarium* and Ammianus Marcellinus' *Res Gestae*. See Kelly 2007a and, in more detail, Kelly 2007b.

upbringing, military prowess, philanthropy, government, munificence, etc.⁹ But these traditional descriptions are bathed in a Christian glow. Constantine is repeatedly said to excel in the traditional virtues of the good Roman emperor by merit of his Christianity. This is natural for a Christian exploring how to praise an emperor, and I have analysed this in detail in a recent monograph.¹⁰ But things become even more interesting when we consider the balance of praise afforded to emperor and God here.

Throughout the final books of the *History* Constantine relies on God's assistance. That in itself was not unusual, since demonstrating an emperor's intimacy with the gods, and thus the likely success of their enterprises, had always been important in panegyric. The parallels between Eusebius' account of Christian support and that of the two non-Christian panegyrics of 310 and 313, which mention Constantine's relationship with alternatively Apollo and an unnamed deity, have been thoroughly analysed.¹¹ Panegyrists would often praise the gods first, and then men for their good fortune in receiving divine blessings.¹² On the face of it, then, the ending to the *History* is not unusual (*Hist. eccl.* 10.9.7):¹³

ἀφήρητο δ' οὖν ἐξ ἀνθρώπων πᾶν δέος τῶν πρὶν αὐτοὺς πιεζόντων, λαμπρὰς δ' ἐτέλουν καὶ πανηγυρικὰς ἐορτῶν ἡμέρας, ἦν τε φωτὸς ἔμπλεα πάντα, καὶ μειδιῶσι προσώποις ὄμμασί τε φαιδροῖς οἱ πρὶν κατηφεῖς ἀλλήλους ἔβλεπον, χορεῖται δ' αὐτοῖς καὶ ὕμνοι κατὰ πόλεις ὁμοῦ καὶ ἀγροὺς τὸν παμβασιλέα θεὸν πρότιστα πάντων, ὅτι δὴ τοῦτ' ἐδιδάχθησαν, κάπειτα τὸν εὐσεβῆ βασιλέα παισὶν ἅμα θεοφιλέσιν ἐγέραιρον

So then, there was taken away from men all fear of those who formerly oppressed them; they celebrated brilliant and panegyric days of festivals; all things were filled with light, and men, formerly downcast, looked at each other with smiling countenances and beaming eyes; with dancing and hymns in city and country alike they gave honour first of all to God the universal Sovereign, for this they had been instructed to do,¹⁴ and then to the pious sovereign with his sons beloved of God...

This passage conforms to the proper ending to an imperial panegyric, namely that the orator urges the audience to pray to the gods for the well-being of the emperor (see for example *Men. Rh.* II.377.9-28). In Eusebius, though, the audience is not praying to god for imperial safety but simply praising god — and praising him as a 'Sovereign' in the same language used for the emperor — before praising the emperor.

⁹ As laid out, for example, in Menander Rhetor's *Basilikos Logos* (bearing however in mind the caution of Russell 1998 that most panegyrists in late antiquity were following standard practice rather than this particular treatise, whose importance has been over-estimated because of its survival). For further discussion, see the Introduction.

¹⁰ Corke-Webster 2019a.

¹¹ See above n.1.

¹² Discussed in Russell 1998, 18-21.

¹³ Translations adapted from Lawlor & Oulton 1927-28; Greek text from Bardy 1952-8.

¹⁴ This is clearly a reference to religious teaching. The person(s) delivering it are unclear, but it is intriguing to read it alongside the repeated description of the emperor as instructor that we encounter in the *Praise* and the *Life* (on which more below).

Moreover, this closing passage of the *History* harks back to a striking contrast at its start. The reference to ‘panegyric days of festivals’¹⁵ here echoes that same language in Eusebius’ opening gambit, that ‘we shall here place the perfect and panegyric discourse on the restoration of the churches’ (*Hist. eccl.* 10.1.3).¹⁶ The context of that oration is later described as being during ‘festivals of dedication in the cities and consecrations of the newly built houses of prayer’ (*Hist. eccl.* 10.3.1).¹⁷ If festivals with panegyrics praising God as emperor are a slight variation from the norm, festivals with panegyrics on the erection of churches are entirely new.

Eusebius’ panegyric on the churches is the longest quoted document in the *History* and explicitly called — and titled as — a panegyric. Moreover, as Laurent Pernot points out, this is also a panegyric ‘proper’, in that it is delivered, as was traditional, at a festival.¹⁸ But it is decidedly untraditional in that while the chapter heading calls it a ‘Panegyric on the joyful condition of affairs’ (*Hist. eccl.* 10.4),¹⁹ in the main text it is called ‘Panegyric on the building of the churches, addressed to Paulinus, bishop of the Tyrians’ (*Hist. eccl.* 10.4.1; see too 10.1.3).²⁰ In other words, the narrative praise of Constantine in Book 10, which highlights divine agency, is juxtaposed with an explicit panegyric delivered not to an emperor but a bishop. To an ancient audience, I suggest, the contrast would have been striking.

Eusebius explicitly acknowledges that this breaks new ground. He has included this episcopal panegyric in response, he says, to the exhortation of the divine Spirit to ‘sing unto the Lord a new song’ (*Hist. eccl.* 10.1.3; see too 10.1.4; 10.4.9 etc.).²¹ Songs or hymns were appropriate for the divine; but Book 10 will blur the distinction between this and traditional panegyric. The first sentence of Book 10 begins with the statement: ‘Thanks be to God, the Almighty and sovereign of the universe, for all things’,²² language indicative of a traditional expression of gratitude to an emperor. From its outset, the *History* suggests that traditional religious rhetoric — hymns — will here meet traditional imperial rhetoric — panegyric.²³ In the panegyric on the churches we see the first manifestation of this. Despite the fact that Constantine and Licinius’ policies have prompted and funded these rebuildings, God and the bishop Paulinus receive the credit. God is named ‘the Author’ of the gift of the churches (*Hist. eccl.* 10.1.5),²⁴ and Paulinus described as ‘in every respect most excellent and beloved of God, by whose zeal and enthusiasm the temple in Tyre, surpassing in splendour all others

¹⁵ πανηγυρικὰς ἑορτῶν ἡμέρας. Oulton’s translation omits the force of πανηγυρικὰς, the use of which is of particular interest here given the beginning of Book 10.

¹⁶ τὸν τέλειον ἐνταῦθα καὶ πανηγυρικὸν τῆς τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν ἀνανεώσεως λόγον κατατάξομεν.

¹⁷ ἐγκαινίων ἑορταὶ κατὰ πόλεις καὶ τῶν ἄρτι νεοπαγῶν προσευκτηρίων ἀφιερώσεις.

¹⁸ See Pernot in this volume.

¹⁹ Πανηγυρικὸς ἐπὶ τῇ τῶν πραγμάτων φαιδρότητι.

²⁰ ΠΑΝΗΓΥΡΙΚΟΣ ΕΠΙ ΤΗ ΤΩΝ ΕΚΚΛΗΣΙΩΝ ΟΙΚΟΔΟΜΗ ΠΑΥΛΙΝΩΙ ΤΥΡΙΩΝ
ΕΠΙΣΚΟΠΩΙ ΠΡΟΣΠΕΦΩΝΗΜΕΝΟΣ.

²¹ ἄσατε τῷ κυρίῳ ἄσμα καινόν.

²² Θεῷ δὴ χάρις ἐπὶ πᾶσιν τῷ παντοκράτορι καὶ βασιλεῖ τῶν ὅλων.

²³ On religious rhetoric in antiquity see Pernot 2006.

²⁴ τοῦ αἰτίου.

in Phoenicia, had been erected' (*Hist. eccl.* 10.4.1; see too 10.4.2).²⁵ The usual panegyric onus to praise God before emperor is exacerbated in this first Christian account of a Christian emperor by the inclusion of an explicit panegyric praising a bishop and ascribing him credit for the emperor's policies. The jarring effect would only have been further enhanced by the fact that emperors' building work was a traditional locus for panegyric.²⁶

There is also a second blurring of roles here. The deliverer of this panegyric is Eusebius himself, despite his rather modest self-characterisation as 'one of those of moderate capability' (*Hist. eccl.* 10.4.1).²⁷ Moreover, he was not alone in speaking: 'every one of the Church's rulers that were present... delivered panegyric orations, inspiring the festal assembly' (*Hist. eccl.* 10.3.4).²⁸ Panegyrics could be delivered by a variety of agents — members of the court (often, as in the case of Pliny, the most famous panegyrist of all, on the occasion of their own assumption to public office, the consulship in particular), teachers of differing seniority (whether rhetoricians, grammarians or philosophers), and emissaries of provincial cities — but they all shared an advanced elite education.²⁹ Moreover, delivering panegyrics brought further honour to the speaker.³⁰ There is thus a second shift being hinted at here, not of subject but of author, as Eusebius adds bishops to the possible candidates for this public role and the honour it brought.

The *History* was not a panegyric delivered in the emperor's presence. It was a work of scholarship written in Caesarea, far from the court, for an audience of Christians, and in the first instance for Eusebius' fellow bishops (the dedicatee of Book 10 was the same Paulinus to whom the panegyric was addressed; *Hist. eccl.* 10.1.2).³¹ There is no evidence that the emperor ever read it, that he asked or even wanted to do so, or that Eusebius hoped he would. On historiographical grounds it is in keeping with the rest of the *History*, which is focused on the history of the church and its members. Emperors serve to demonstrate Christianity's value as a locus for traditional Roman virtues. The diminishing of the emperor's role, and promotion of Paulinus and his fellow bishops, is thus perhaps not particularly shocking given geography, audience and context. Nevertheless, the awkward and clearly deliberate juxtaposition of the Constantinian material with a panegyric to a bishop hints at an uneasiness with the place of panegyric in Christian public discourse.

Transferred Panegyric: God as Emperor and Emperor as Orator in the *In Praise of Constantine*

²⁵ τὰ πάντα ἀρίστου καὶ θεοφιλοῦς... οὗ διὰ σπουδῆς ὁ μάλιστα τῶν ἀμφὶ τὸ Φοινίκων ἔθνος διαπρέπων ἐν Τύρῳ νεῶς φιλοτίμως ἐπεσκεύαστο.

²⁶ See e.g. MacCormack 1975, 155-6; Whitby 1998b, 3.

²⁷ τις... τῶν μετρίως ἐπιεικῶν.

²⁸ ἐκίνει δὲ καὶ λόγους ἅπας τῶν παρόντων ἀρχόντων πανηγυρικούς... θειάζων τὴν πανήγυριν.

²⁹ On the identity of the panegyricists see now Omissi 2018, 54-6; on their education Russell 1998.

³⁰ Pernot 2015, 86.

³¹ On the audience of the *History* see Corke-Webster 2019a, 62-5

A decade after he completed the *History*, Eusebius built on the oratorical experience he had gained in Tyre by delivering a panegyric proper in Constantinople. This was given in celebration of Constantine's *tricennalia* on 25 July 336, in the imperial palace to Constantine, the Caesar Constantius, and the imperial court (*Vit. Const.* 4.46).³² But though this was no longer before provincial bishops, the blurred relationships between emperor, bishop, and orator hinted at in the *History* are further exacerbated here in both the form and content of this second Eusebian panegyric experiment.

First, what has been transmitted as the *Praise* is now usually believed to be two separate speeches. Hal Drake has argued that the first half is the tricennial panegyric proper, the second another Eusebian speech, delivered at the dedication of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem in 335, to a largely clerical audience (*Vit. Const.* 4.33; 4.45.3).³³ But scholars have not emphasised enough that this enduring confusion over the identity and integrity of the orations exists in large part because of Eusebius' desire to associate them. In the *Life* Eusebius promises to publish as appendices not only his tricennial oration, but also a description of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre (*Vit. Const.* 4.46). The exact nature of the latter — which does not exactly correspond to the second oration transmitted in the *Praise* — remains debated.³⁴ But regardless, it is clear that Eusebius intended his praise of the emperor be transmitted and read alongside praise of clerics and churches. In that the *Praise* resembles Book 10 of the *History*.

Second, Eusebius also promises to append an example of Constantine's own orations, 'which he entitled, "To the assembly of the saints", dedicating the work to the Church of God' (*Vit. Const.* 4.32).³⁵ Moreover, in a knowing aside, Eusebius comments that he is adding it 'so that none may think our assertions about his speeches to be mere rhetoric'.³⁶ So Eusebius' panegyric on Constantine was also to be transmitted with a panegyric where the emperor himself celebrated the saints dedicated to the church. The emperor is thus memorialised not only not only as emperor but as orator, or, to put it another way, as both subject and author of panegyric.

The blurring of roles achieved by the juxtaposition of these three documents is exacerbated when we turn to their content. Eusebius begins the *Praise* by acknowledging that this will be an unusual panegyric: 'I have come forth to sing you the royal praises in a newer strain' (*Laus Const.* Pr. 2).³⁷ The language here again blurs divine hymns and royal panegyric. Eusebius goes on to elaborate how he plans to eschew the emperor's mundane activities and focus instead on his piety. But his radical approach goes rather further, since

³² For the dating see Drake 1975a.

³³ Drake 1975b, 30-9.

³⁴ Drake 1975b, 40-5, argues that this second preserved speech was what Eusebius intended to include; Barnes 1977 argues instead that this was appended in error by a literary executor since, according to Barnes, the *Life* remained unfinished at Eusebius' death (see below n.55).

³⁵ ὃν ὁ αὐτὸς ἐπέγραψε "Τῷ τῶν ἁγίων συλλόγῳ", τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ ἀναθεῖς τὴν γραφὴν. On this see further Roger Rees in this volume.

³⁶ ὡς μή τις κόμπων εἶναι νομίσειε τὴν ἡμετέραν ἀμφὶ τῶν λεχθέντων μαρτυρίαν.

³⁷ ἦκω δὲ βασιλικῶν ὕμνων καινότερας ᾠδῆς ἐν ὑμῖν ἀπαρξόμενος. Translations adapted from Drake 1975b; Greek text from Heikel et al. 1902.

while we do hear in traditional fashion about the emperor's virtues (for example *Laus Const.* 5), this material is actually rather limited.³⁸ As, in fact, is any material on the emperor. The focus is not on earth at all, but rather in heaven. Eusebius even says as much explicitly when he describes the *Praise* in the *Life* — rather differently than in its own prologue — as ‘a second opportunity to praise God, the Universal Sovereign, in the imperial palace’ (*Vit. Const.* 4.46).³⁹

Commentators on the *Praise* have long noted this shift of emphasis. Most famously, Norman Baynes used this text to highlight Eusebius' famous political theology — which he posited was based on Hellenistic models of kingship — whereby earthly rule directly echoed divine rule.⁴⁰ A decade later Raffaele Farina argued that Constantine was only the apparent subject of the *Praise*, but that Eusebius was really painting a portrait of the ideal Christian Prince.⁴¹ Most persuasively, another decade on, Hal Drake's work attributed the blurring in the *Praise* of language of ‘sovereignty’, used of both God and emperor, to the deliberate circumspection of an emperor concerned above all with consensus.⁴² None of this work however does justice to how extraordinary such radical displacement of the emperor is in a panegyric supposedly delivered before the emperor and his court. The increase in divine agency we saw at the end of the *History* is taken to extremes here. This is clearest from close consideration of the opening of the panegyric proper (*Laus Const.* 1.1):

Πανήγυρις μὲν αὕτη βασιλέως μεγάλου. χαίρωμεν δ' ἐν αὐτῇ θειάζοντες λόγων ἱερῶν παιδεύμασιν οἱ βασιλικοὶ παῖδες, ἐξάρχει δ' ἡμῖν τῆς ἐορτῆς ὁ μέγας βασιλεύς. μέγαν δ' ἐγὼ βασιλέα καλῶ τὸν ἀληθῶς μέγαν· τοῦτον δ' εἶναί φημι (οὐ νεμεσσήσει δὲ παρὼν βασιλεύς, ἀλλὰ καὶ συνευφημήσει τῇ θεολογίᾳ) τὸν ἐπέκεινα τῶν ὄλων, τὸν πάντων ἀνώτατον, τὸν ὑπέρτατον, τὸν ὑπερμεγέθη, οὓς θρόνοι μὲν τῆς βασιλείας ἀψίδες οὐράνιοι, γῆ δ' ὑποπόδιον αὐτοῦ τῶν ποδῶν.

This is, then, a panegyric of the Supreme Sovereign. And let us, the royal children, inspired by the lessons of sacred writings, rejoice in the fact that the author of our festival is the Supreme Sovereign. And I mean by “Supreme Sovereign” the One who is truly supreme; this one, I say — nor will the sovereign who is present resent it, but rather will he join in praise of the divine teaching — is the One who is Above the Universe, the Highest of All, the Greatest, the Supreme Being, whose kingdom's throne is the vault of the heavens above, while the earth is footstool for His feet.

That Eusebius knows how shocking this beginning is for his readers is clear from the language used. In the same breath that he emphasises the traditional setting Eusebius

³⁸ Pace. Drake 1975b, 37.

³⁹ τοῦτο δεύτερον ἐν αὐτοῖς βασιλείοις τὸν ἐπὶ πάντων βασιλέα θεὸν δοξάσαντες.

⁴⁰ Baynes 1955; though see the criticism of the proposed Hellenistic origins in Cameron 1991, 132 n.33.

⁴¹ Farina 1966.

⁴² Drake 1975b, 61-74. See too later, presenting a holistic vision of Constantine based on this central tenet, Drake 2000.

radically shifts his subject. A festival was, as we saw above, the proper place for epideictic oratory, but the subject described in traditional royal language is not the emperor, as we might expect, but God. Eusebius then explicitly clarifies, in case we had missed it, that his subject is not the emperor. It is difficult too not to see in the description of God as ‘truly supreme’ an implicit denigration of the emperor. Displaced from centre stage, the emperor is allocated a new role, since if he is joining in praise, he is in some sense akin to panegyrist. And in a final linguistic blurring, Eusebius speaks of himself and the other attendees, using imperial language, as ‘royal children’. From the very start, Eusebius makes clear that while the setting and the language may be traditional, we are in new panegyric territory.

The oration that follows lives up to this billing. It is not just that God is the focus of the majority of its praise, but that He is described as the true source of the cardinal virtues that in panegyric are usually the preserve of the emperor: ‘For He who alone is God, alone is wisdom. He alone is good in His own essence. He alone is strong in real strength, and the Parent of Justice itself, the Father of Reason and Wisdom, the Source of light and life, the Holder of Truth and Virtue’ (*Laus Const.* 3.6).⁴³ The passage climaxes in no uncertain terms: God is thus ‘the Leader of the Empire itself, and of every form of rule and power’ (*Laus Const.* 3.6).⁴⁴ Where traditional panegyric might speak of emperors reflecting divine brilliance, in Eusebius’ writing, the latter has become the prime focus. God here displaces the emperor *as emperor*.

In this passage and elsewhere Constantine is still described as ruler, but one in a distinctly secondary position. We read how God-as-emperor, in response to Constantine’s devotion ‘values the minister of a sacrifice both holy and fit, and bestows on him additional long periods of rule’ (*Laus Const.* 3.1).⁴⁵ But the emperor’s role has become rather ambiguous. When Eusebius does move the spotlight onto Constantine it is often to highlight activity more appropriate to a member of the court or the panegyrist himself. The emperor is regularly described as a teacher or conduit of the divine (*Laus Const.* 9.10):

οὕτω δὴ βασιλεὺς αὐτός, ὃ τῆς παραδόξου ἀκοῆς, λόγων εὐκτηρίων διδάσκαλος τῷ αὐτοῦ στρατῷ καθίστατο, εὐχὰς τε εὐσεβεῖς θεσμοῖς ἀκολούθως παρείδου θείοις, ἄνω μὲν αἴροντας εἰς οὐρανὸν μετεώρους τὰς χεῖρας, ἀνωτάτῳ δ’ ἐπὶ τὸν ἐπουράνιον βασιλέα τοὺς τῆς διανοίας παραπέμποντας ὀφθαλμούς, κάκεινον ταῖς εὐχαῖς νίκης δοτῆρα σωτῆρα φύλακά τε καὶ βοηθὸν ἐπιβοωμένους.

Thus indeed did the sovereign himself — incredible as it sounds — become the teacher of rules of worship to his army, and he transmitted pious prayers in accordance with divine ordinances — to raise their outstretched hands above toward heaven while fixing

⁴³ μόνος μὲν γὰρ σοφὸς ὁ καὶ θεὸς μόνος. ὁ δ’ αὐτὸς τὴν οὐσίαν ἀγαθὸς μόνος, ἰσχύι τε δυνατὸς αὐτὸς μόνος, καὶ γεννήτωρ μὲν αὐτῆς δικαιοσύνης, πατὴρ δὲ λόγου καὶ σοφίας, πηγὴ τε φωτὸς καὶ ζωῆς, ἀληθείας τε καὶ ἀρετῆς ταμία.

⁴⁴ καὶ δὴ βασιλείας αὐτῆς ἀρχῆς τε πάσης καὶ ἐξουσίας καθηγεμών.

⁴⁵ τῆς τε σεμνῆς καὶ καλλιπρεποῦς θυσίας τὸν ἱεροφάντην ἀγάμενος προσθήκας αὐτῷ μακρῶν περιόδων τῆς βασιλείας προστίθησιν.

the eyes of the mind on the highest point, the Heavenly Sovereign, and then to invoke Him in their prayers as Giver of Victory, Saviour, Guardian, and Rescuer.

This passage begins with emperor described as teacher, with Eusebius again revelling in the shock factor of describing an emperor so in a panegyric — ‘incredible as it sounds’. Constantine is not ruler but conduit, and his instructions are on how to praise a sovereign, described again in classical panegyric language — ‘Giver of Victory, Saviour, Guardian, and Rescuer’. Later we read that ‘the sovereign himself is the herald’ (*Laus Const.* 10.4).⁴⁶ Yet again, Eusebius is at pains that his audience realise the oddity of the description: ‘Yes, this is surely the greatest miracle — that so great a sovereign has cried out at the top of his voice to the whole world and, like some interpreter of the All-Ruling God, has summoned all under his care alike to knowledge of The Being’.⁴⁷ In a genre characterised by stock formulae and set tramlines,⁴⁸ where even the best examples of the genre play with and adapt set tropes, Eusebius’ praise of the emperor as orator has broken fresh and shocking ground.

The language of this final comment, which comes at the end of the tricennial oration proper, is particularly intriguing given that in the second half of what is now printed as the *Praise* — but which is actually the originally separate speech from the dedication of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre — Eusebius describes himself in similar terms: ‘I pray that I may be a kind of interpreter of your intentions and become the reporter of your devout soul... in order to teach all that is necessary and proper...’ (*Laus Const.* 11.7).⁴⁹ Eusebius is not directly equating himself with his emperor, instead placing himself in an interpretative chain — Constantine is the interpreter of God; Eusebius of Constantine. But if Constantine is co-sovereign, he is also undeniably co-orator. And this is not only an apparent demotion for the emperor; it is a promotion for his bishop. We thus also find here a development of the second tendency we encountered in the *History*, the elevation of bishops as panegyrists.

The beginning of the *Praise* is in fact an extended comparison of this panegyric and this panegyrist with other (inferior) examples of that group (*Laus Const.* Pr.2):

μυρίων δ' ἀμφὶ τὴν αὐτὴν ἐμοὶ σπευδόντων πορείαν, πάτον ἀνθρώπων ἀλεινῶν αὐτὸς τὴν ἀτριβῆ βαδιοῦμαι, ἧς οὐ θέμις ἀνίπτους ἐπιβαίνειν ποσίν. οἱ μὲν γε δημῶδεις μεираκίων τε σοφίσμασι πεπατημένους μετιόντες λόγους μοῦσαν τε ἠδεῖαν καὶ πάνδημον ἀσπαζόμενοι θνητὰς ἀκοὰς θνητοῖς διηγῆμασι θελγόντων, ἠδονῆ τὸ κριτήριον ἀποδόντες· οἱ δ' αὐτῆς μύσται τῆς καθόλου σοφίας, θείων ἐπιστήμης ἅτε καὶ ἀνθρωπίνων ἐπήβολοι, τὴν τοῦ κρείττονος ἐκλογὴν ἐν ἀγαθοῦ μοίρα θέμενοι τὰς αὐτοῦ βασιλέως θεοπρεπεῖς ἀρετὰς φιλοθέους τε πράξεις τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων προὔτιμησάν τε καὶ εἶλοντο, δευτέροις ἀνυμεῖν τὰ δεύτερα τῶν καλῶν παραχωρήσαντες.

⁴⁶ κηρύττει τε βασιλεὺς αὐτός.

⁴⁷ τὸ δὲ μέγιστον θαῦμα ὅτι δὴ τοσοῦτος βασιλεὺς μέγιστη φωνῆ τῷ παντὶ κόσμῳ οἷά τις ὑποφήτης τοῦ παμβασιλέως θεοῦ κέκραγεν, πάντας ὁμοῦ τοὺς ὑπ' αὐτῷ ποιμαινομένους ἐπὶ τὴν τοῦ ὄντος γνῶσιν ἀνακαλούμενος.

⁴⁸ Whitby 1998b, 11.

⁴⁹ ὑπερμηνευτὴς τις εἶναι τῆς σῆς διανοίας καὶ τῆς φιλοθέου ψυχῆς ἄγγελος ὑπάρχειν εὐχόμενος, διδάσκων πάντα ἃ δεῖ καὶ προσήκει παιδεύεσθαι πάντα.

Though countless are those contesting the same route with me, I myself, ‘spurning the beaten path of mankind,’ shall travel the pristine one, on which it is not proper to walk with unclean feat. For popularizers pursue phrases crammed with puerile conceits and embrace an eloquence both saccharine and vulgar, since in order to please a mundane audience they must make pleasure their criterion and limit themselves to mundane accomplishments. But experts in universal wisdom itself, since they are acquainted with divine as well as moral science, approve the choice of the Higher Power and have honoured and exalted the sovereign’s own godlike virtues and pious acts above his human ones, leaving it to lesser men to celebrate the lesser of his fine points.

Eusebius here not only places his own, novel panegyric in a new category above normal examples of the genre, but himself and his fellows — that is to say, bishops — in a superior category of panegyrist. Mainstream panegyrists are ‘popularizers’ and ‘lesser men’. There is also implicit praise of — or threat to — the reader; those that prefer the speeches of the inferior orators are dismissed in parallel as a ‘mundane audience’.⁵⁰

This elevation of bishops is reiterated in the final sentences of the *Praise*: ‘No longer as formerly do the babblings of godless men fill the royal chambers, but rather priests and celebrants of God now keep solemn festivals with hymns to the royal piety’ (*Laus Const.* 10.5).⁵¹ Here again we see the blurring of hymn and panegyric — hymns fit for gods, directed at an emperor, but for his piety. Those capable of delivering these new hybrid speeches are a superior type of panegyrist. And that those should be bishops is entirely logical when we consider that, as Laurent Pernot has argued, orators — the sophists of the high empire in particular — were akin to holy men.⁵² Moreover, Eusebius’ comment comes immediately after the description of God as interpreter, discussed above (*Laus Const.* 10.4). Like the bishops, Constantine’s qualification for praising God is also his holiness. Eusebius’ concluding remarks thus deliberately encourage his listeners and readers to see them as aligned. Not only is the emperor’s position qualified, but a new, elevated position is established for bishops too — a new type of orator for a new type of emperor.

Blended Panegyric: Emperor as Bishop in the *Life of Constantine*

⁵⁰ The unusual nature of this oppositional stance becomes even clearer when considered in the light of Alan Ross’ chapter in this volume, which argues that panegyrists align themselves with their surrounding audiences.

⁵¹ καὶ δὴ μέσοις βασιλείων οἴκοις οὐκ ἔθ’ ὡς τὸ πρὶν ἀνδρῶν ἀθέων φλήναφοι, ἱερεῖς δὲ καὶ θιασῶται θεοῦ βασιλικῆς ὕμνοις εὐσεβείας σεμνυνόμενοι πανηγυρίζουσιν.

⁵² Pernot 2006, 246. We might compare Eusebius’ description of the kiss given to the young Origen by his father Leonidas in recognition of his intellectual and spiritual potential (*Hist. eccl.* 6.2.11), and Eunapius’ description of how an adoring crowd licked the chest of the sophist Prohaeresius (Eunap. *VS* 10.5.4).

Eusebius' final exploration with panegyric came in the enigmatic *Life*, published after the death of its subject on 27 May 337 and shortly before the death of its author. Once again, it is by no means straightforward in form. The *Life* has an odd mix of generic markers, which traditionally led to doubts over its authenticity,⁵³ but is now generally attributed to Eusebius' proven literary inventiveness. In this case he tried to convert a narrative extension of the *History* begun after 324 into a posthumous panegyric of Constantine, resulting in a curious hybrid.⁵⁴ Scholars disagree on whether it was completed, and thus how well joined are — and how clearly one can distinguish between — the panegyric and historical parts.⁵⁵ But regardless, in this third and final panegyric experiment we see not simply the role blurring of the *History* and *Praise* but, I argue, an attempt to rationalize it.

As in his earlier experiments, much of the panegyric material here is largely traditional. Eusebius is explicit that 'the occasion demands that I offer unrestrained praises in varied words of the truly Blessed One' (*Vit. Const.* 1.11.2),⁵⁶ referring unambiguously to the emperor.⁵⁷ And though Eusebius says he will avoid topics usual to panegyric (*Vit. Const.* 1.11.1), Rudolph Storch has highlighted as typical the fourfold scheme employed in the *Life* whereby all success and benefit derive from divine favour, bestowed as a reward for piety, indicated in military victory, and producing peace and unity in the realm.⁵⁸ This in part echoes the earlier praise of the emperor in the *History*.⁵⁹ Other more unusual material — such as the preference of Moses to more traditional heroes of late antique panegyric like Trajan or Marcus Aurelius — has been much discussed.⁶⁰ But, I suggest, the *Life* also takes further the more unusual features of Eusebius' earlier panegyric experiments.

In the *Life* we again regularly meet the emperor as teacher and orator interpreting the will of the true Sovereign. We have already seen Eusebius' mention of Constantine's own *Oration* (*Vit. Const.* 4.46). But we learn too that Constantine 'would take the books in his hands and apply his mind to the meaning of the divinely inspired oracles, and would then render up lawful prayers with the members of the imperial household' (*Vit. Const.* 4.17).⁶¹ That privileged knowledge of the divine meant that his sons found that 'their father by

⁵³ See in particular Winkelmann 1962 and the summary of previous scholarship in Cameron & Hall 1999, 4-9.

⁵⁴ See Barnes 1989 and Barnes 1994; see too Barnes 1981, 264-271, picking up but inverting the thesis of Pasquali 1910 (who thought a draft panegyric had been converted into a political pamphlet).

⁵⁵ Barnes (see above n.3354) considers the experiment unfinished, and the parts clearly distinguishable. Cameron 1997 suggests that we treat it as a finished product; see too Cameron & Hall 1999, 1 & 29-30; and Williams 2008, 35-6.

⁵⁶ τοῦ καιροῦ λοιπὸν ἐπιτρέποντος ἀκωλύτως παντοίαις φωναῖς τὸν ὡς ἀληθῶς μακάριον ἀνυμνεῖν.

⁵⁷ Translations adapted from Cameron & Hall 1999; Greek text from Winkelmann 1975.

⁵⁸ Storch 1971. See earlier Pasquali 1910, and more recently the brief summary in Cameron & Hall 1999, 29-33.

⁵⁹ See e.g. Hall 1993a and Hall 1993b.

⁶⁰ Noting the absence of the traditional imperial parallels in particular see Williams 2008, 49-50; on the famed Moses typology see Hollerich 1989; Wilson 1998; Rapp 1998; Inowlocki 2007; Williams 2008, 36-42; and Damgaard 2013.

⁶¹ μετὰ χαῖράς γέ τοι λαμβάνων τὰς βίβλους τῆ τῶν θεοπνεύστων λογίων θεωρία προσανεῖχε τὸν νοῦν, εἶτ' εὐχὰς ἐνθέσμουσιν σὺν τοῖς τὸν βασιλείον οἶκον πληροῦσιν ἀπεδίδου.

himself was all the instruction they needed' (*Vit. Const.* 4.52.1).⁶² The praetorians also 'adopted the emperor as their tutor in religious conduct' (*Vit. Const.* 4.18.1)⁶³ and 'he was himself the instructor in prayer to all the soldiery' (*Vit. Const.* 4.19.1).⁶⁴ Constantine's audience is wider too: 'he repeatedly made public appearances without calling upon speechmakers... Consequently when he gave the invitation, countless multitudes rushed to join the audience to hear the emperor's philosophy' (*Vit. Const.* 4.29.1).⁶⁵ What comes next is most telling (*Vit. Const.* 4.29.2):

εἰ δὲ πῆ λέγοντι θεολογίας αὐτῷ παρήκοι καιρός, πάντως που ὄρθιος ἐστὼς
συνεστραμμένῳ προσώπῳ κατεσταλμένη τε φωνῇ, μυεῖν ἔδοξεν ἂν τοὺς παρόντας σὺν
εὐλαβείᾳ τῇ πάσῃ τὴν ἔνθεον διδασκαλίαν, εἴτ' ἐπιφωνούντων βοαῖς εὐφήμοις τῶν
ἀκροωμένων, ἄνω βλέπειν εἰς οὐρανὸν διένευε καὶ μόνον ὑπερθαυμάζειν καὶ τιμᾶν
σεβασμίῳ ἐπαίνοις τὸν ἐπὶ πάντων βασιλέα.

If while speaking he had occasion to mention God, standing quite straight with intense face and subdued voice, he would seem to be initiating the audience with deep awe in the inspired doctrine, and then when the hearers let out favourable exclamations he would indicate that they should look to heaven and save the adulation and honour of their reverent praises for the Sovereign over all.

Here then we find confirmation of what was implicit in the *Praise* — the emperor himself affirms his subordinate status as he acts as panegyrist. On one occasion in the *Life* we read how Constantine castigated an orator who, too fulsome in his praise, seemed to align the emperor with Christ; Constantine instead says he only wants to be thought worthy of being 'the slave of God' (*Vit. Const.* 4.48).⁶⁶ Eusebius boasts, on the other hand, that the emperor was very pleased with his own panegyric (*Vit. Const.* 4.46). The portrayal of the emperor may or may not be historical here. But it certainly fits the portrait of the emperor that Eusebius had been progressively developing for the last twenty years. Aligning the emperor with the divine is castigated; subordinating him is endorsed, and by the emperor himself. As Eusebius presents it, his new style of panegyric is court-approved.

The *Life* also furthers Eusebius' gradual elevation of the panegyrist, for example by describing the emperor as one who 'alone has publicly proclaimed to all the word of Christ' (*Vit. Const.* 4.75)⁶⁷ and himself as having a duty 'above all others to give to every one... our

⁶² αὐτοῖς μόνος ὁ πατήρ εἰς διδασκαλίαν ἐπήρκει.

⁶³ βασιλέα διδάσκαλον εὐσεβῶν ἐπεγράφοντο τρόπων.

⁶⁴ τῆς εὐχῆς δὲ τοῖς στρατιωτικοῖς ἅπασι διδάσκαλος ἦν αὐτός. Rapp 1998, 283, discusses Constantine's depiction here in terms of Jewish and Hellenistic conceptions of kingship, where the king as arch-priest was the leader of the people in prayer.

⁶⁵ σχολῇ δὲ λογογραφῶν συνεχεῖς ἐποιεῖτο τὰς παρόδους... διὸ δὴ συνεκάλει μὲν αὐτός, μυρία δ' ἔσπευδεν ἐπ' ἀκρόασιν πλήθῃ φιλοσοφούντος ἀκουσόμενα βασιλέως.

⁶⁶ τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ δουλείας. Using such imagery of slavery for the subject of imperial panegyric again represents a reversal of the normal standards of the genre, where slave imagery would be used of emperors' defeated opponents; discussed in Lunn-Rockcliffe 2010, 326.

⁶⁷ μόνου δὲ τοῖς πᾶσι πεπαρρησιασμένως τὸν τοῦ Χριστοῦ κηρύξαντος λόγον.

own unreserved account of good things' (*Vit. Const.* 1.10.2).⁶⁸ Moreover, emperor and bishop are not just described, in similar language, as being engaged in similar activities, but the bishop seems the more successful. If Eusebius' speech was supposedly met with acclaim by the emperor, the same cannot be said of the latter's own sermons: 'they [his listeners] were slow to learn and deaf to what is good; they would cheer his words with cries and acclamations of approval, but in practice they ignored them through greed' (*Vit. Const.* 4.29.5; see too 4.30.2).⁶⁹ Emperors and bishops are not just aligned; the implication is that as orators and teachers the latter are the more effective.⁷⁰

This leads us to arguably the two most discussed phrases of the *Life*, namely the 'episcopal equivalencies' whereby Constantine is described as a bishop. The more famous of the two passages records the emperor himself saying, "You are bishops whose jurisdiction is within the Church: I also am a bishop, ordained by God to overlook whatever is external to the Church" (*Vit. Const.* 4.24.1).⁷¹ The second — less discussed but in my opinion equally important, since it reflects Eusebius' appropriation of the sentiment — describes Constantine as 'like a universal bishop appointed by God' (*Vit. Const.* 1.44.1).⁷² Throughout the *Life* the emperor is depicted among bishops — on campaign (*Vit. Const.* 1.42.1; 2.4.1-2; 4.56.2-3), at court (*Vit. Const.* 2.63, see too 1.56.1), at dinner (*Vit. Const.* 1.42.1; 3.15.1-2; 4.24.1; 4.46). And he is described as acting as a bishop himself, as for example at councils, where 'he took his seat among them as if he were one voice among many' (*Vit. Const.* 1.44.2; see too 3.10.5).⁷³ This is entirely in keeping with the wider oddities of Eusebius' praise of Constantine.

Read within the long-term development of Eusebius' thinking, this final assimilation of emperor as bishop is no surprise, but rather reflects the climax of a twenty-year trajectory. Not only had Eusebius increasingly praised Constantine as teacher and orator; he had also systematically proposed bishops as appropriate authors and subjects of panegyrics. If we began with a bishop, Paulinus, in the place of an emperor, we have ended up with an emperor explicitly in the role of a bishop. In these famous phrases from the *Life* then, the increasing blurring of subject and author in Eusebius' Christian panegyric is complete.

Conclusion

Over the last twenty years of his life, Eusebius of Caesarea, in three works and three (or more) genres, tried his hand at panegyric. His experimentation was catalysed by a new

⁶⁸ εἴ τισιν ἄλλοις, καὶ ἡμῖν αὐτοῖς ἀγαθῶν ἀφθονον ἀκοὴν κηρύττειν ἄπασιν. Described in passing as a 'daring analogy' by Cameron 1991, 54.

⁶⁹ οἱ δ' ἄρ' ἦσαν δυσμαθεῖς καὶ πρὸς τὰ καλὰ κεκωφωμένοι, γλώττη μὲν καὶ βοᾷς εὐφήμοις ἐπικροτοῦντες τὰ λεγόμενα, ἔργοις δὲ κατολιγοροῦντες αὐτῶν δι' ἀπληστίαν.

⁷⁰ A picture that could of course be painted securely since the imperial subject was now dead.

⁷¹ ἀλλ' ὑμεῖς μὲν τῶν εἴσω τῆς ἐκκλησίας, ἐγὼ δὲ τῶν ἐκτὸς ὑπὸ θεοῦ καθεσταμένος ἐπίσκοπος ἂν εἶην.

⁷² οἷά τις κοινὸς ἐπίσκοπος ἐκ θεοῦ καθεσταμένος.

⁷³ καθῆστο τε καὶ μέσος ὡσεὶ καὶ τῶν πολλῶν εἷς.

question not faced by earlier panegyrists — how to praise a Christian emperor. That new context produced a shift in how panegyrics approached the language of royalty and divinity and the relationship between the two. His first grappling with this problem, his *Caesarean History*, described the emperor in largely traditional panegyric language, but took praise of divine agency further than was usual, and attributed the emperor's successes to his new Christian faith. This is perhaps what we would expect of someone in his position. But in Book 10 he took an additional and unexpected step, celebrating Constantine's policy of church building by quoting in full a formal panegyric addressed to the bishop of one of those churches. Twenty years later he delivered a panegyric proper before the emperor and his court. Despite the new environment, he doubled down on his position. His audience heard a new kind of imperial panegyric almost without an emperor, who when he did appear, was in danger of being mistaken for a panegyrist himself. Bishops, on the other hand, were celebrated as the favoured purveyors of this new kind of speech. Finally in the *Life*, we meet an emperor not only reprising this role as teacher and orator but explicitly described as bishop.

The emperor does not come out badly from this tripartite portrayal. He is not criticized, and the constant association with the divine allows for a kind of indirect praise that we might call 'deflected panegyric'. But there is nevertheless an undeniable twofold tendency at work here — the subordination of the emperor, in the face of the true (divine) sovereign, to the position of pious interpreter, and the elevation of the bishop, since he holds the same position. These first examples of imperial panegyric in the hands of a Christian orator seek to equate the ruler of the Roman political world with the leaders of the Christian faith, and vice versa.

In some ways the impetus behind these tendencies is obvious. The reason so few Christians composed panegyrics must in part have been because the hyperbolic claims required by the form sat uncomfortably alongside a Christian aesthetic that valorized humility and saw such claims as appropriate only for God.⁷⁴ In attempting Christian panegyric, praising God as much as the emperor was a natural strategy for Eusebius. The emperor could in turn be celebrated as God's chosen representative. It is also entirely understandable that at a moment when the structures of the Empire were in flux Eusebius saw an opportunity to elevate his own position and that of his fellow bishops.⁷⁵ But there is more going on here, to which I suggest the episcopal equivalency, the apex of Eusebius' panegyric experiments, is the key.

⁷⁴ MacCormack 1975, 169, suggests that no tradition of Christian imperial panegyric emerged because the genre had traditionally focused on military success and warlike virtues. But Eusebius' willingness to discuss both perhaps tells against this suggestion. She suggests as a further motivating factors that panegyrics had emphasized the pagan nature of the Tetrarchy, and that the kind of festivals where panegyrics were traditionally delivered were associated with persecution. But tetrarchic examples did not define the genre in antiquity as they have a tendency to do today, and Christians did not reject all literary forms associated with paganism or its festivals.

⁷⁵ See Corke-Webster 2019a. On 'the ceremonial distance between orator and emperor', see Ware, 2014, 98; this article more generally explores other apparently subversive motifs in *Pan. Lat.* VI(7).

Describing the emperor as a bishop has traditionally been seen by some scholars as the core of a radical model of Caesaropapism.⁷⁶ At the other end of the spectrum, it has been dismissed as dinner-party talk not to be taken too seriously.⁷⁷ I have argued elsewhere that this equivalency be read instead as a deliberate Eusebian attempt to define and delimit the emperor's interactions with the church.⁷⁸ In the *History*, Eusebius had carefully constructed a model of legitimate episcopal authority based around intellectual (and specifically text-based) authority, the pastoral support it enabled, and collectivity. The *Life* works to paint Constantine in the same way with the aim, I suggest, of dictating the terms on which a (Christian) emperor should properly engage with bishops — that is to say, on their terms, as an equal, rather than as an external and dominant force. This fits well into its historical context, since it was likely written for Constantine's sons after their bloody accession of summer 337, by which point Eusebius had experienced first-hand Constantine's heavy-handed interactions with the church.

In that light the panegyric trajectory we have traced here acquires new force. Eusebius' panegyric experiments are not just multiple attempts at praising a Christian emperor. They represent his ongoing wrestlings with the authority of both emperors and bishops. Eusebius had from the start wanted to elevate the influence of the latter, and saw in the increasing proximity between church and state in his lifetime an opportunity to promote just that. But he also realized relatively quickly, I think, that those same circumstances meant that the interest of the latter could prove a threat to the autonomy of the former.⁷⁹ Constantine's reign proved him correct on both scores. Eusebius therefore sought to level the playing field. He did so, on the one hand, by proposing bishops as the new panegyrists and hinting that they could be those speeches' subjects too, and, on the other hand, by subordinating as their subject the emperor to God, and suggesting that the emperor could also be described as panegyrist. By such means Eusebius attempted to redefine and dictate the roles and relationship of emperors and bishops for an audience that included both.

It is telling that he found a receptive medium for these aims in panegyric. Such manoeuvring was entirely in keeping with earlier use of the medium. Panegyric was precisely the place to better position oneself and one's special interest group, to angle for rewards and deflect punishments, to steer the influential, and to become so oneself.⁸⁰ At the same time, however, it was ultimately a genre traditionally in the service of the status quo. As Averil Cameron puts it, 'The orators did not advocate upsets to the political or social system; rather, they confirmed its structure and reminded their audiences of its articulation and of their place within it.'⁸¹ Read in that light, Eusebius' experiments were both rooted in tradition and pushed beyond it. He too used panegyric as a tool to realign his and his peers' position within power networks. Where many of our other extant panegyrics did so in geographical terms (as

⁷⁶ De Decker & Dupuis-Masay 1980.

⁷⁷ Barnes 1981, 270, and Cameron and Hall 1999, 320.

⁷⁸ Corke-Webster forthcoming, which expands upon the paragraph that follows.

⁷⁹ On this see too Corke-Webster 2019b.

⁸⁰ Such readings of ancient panegyric were pioneered by the essays in Whitby 1998; see too Rees 2002.

⁸¹ Cameron 1991, 82.

with the Gallic orators, for example), Eusebius' advocacy on behalf of bishops was religious and cultural. But he also, I have argued here, employed it rather more radically to mould the relationship between church and state as it was coming into being. By praising emperor and bishop in the same terms he brought them together and ultimately, I suggest, laid the groundwork for the running battle over the authority and purview of church and state that would escalate so famously in the later fourth century, and ultimately define the landscape of the mediaeval and modern world.⁸²

Bibliography

- Bardy, G. (1952-58) *Eusèbe de Césarée, Histoire ecclésiastique*. Paris.
- Barnes, T.D. (1989) 'Panegyric, History and Historiography in Eusebius' *Life of Constantine*', in R. Williams (ed.), *The Making of Orthodoxy: Essays in Honour of Henry Chadwick*. Cambridge. 94-123.
- Barnes, T.D. (1994) 'The Two Drafts of Eusebius' *Life Constantini*', in T.D. Barnes (ed.) *From Eusebius to Augustine*. Aldershot.
- Barnes, T.D. (1977) 'Two Speeches by Eusebius', *GRBS* 18: 341-345.
- Barnes, T.D. (1981) *Constantine and Eusebius*. Cambridge, MA.
- Baynes, N. (1955) *Byzantine Essays and Other Essays*. London.
- Burckhardt, J. (1853 [rep. 1898]) *Die Zeit Constantin's des Grossen*. Leipzig.
- Burgess, R. (1977) 'The Dates and Editions of Eusebius' *Chronici Canones and Historia Ecclesiastica*', *JTS* 48: 471-504.
- Cameron, A. (1997) 'Eusebius's *Vita Constantini* and the Construction of Constantine' in S. Swain and M. Edwards (eds.) *Portraits: The Biographical in the Literature of the Empire*. Oxford. 245-74.
- Cameron, A. & S.G. Hall (1999) *Eusebius' Life of Constantine. Introduction, translation and commentary*. Oxford.
- Cameron, A. (1991) *Christianity and the Rhetoric of Empire*. Berkeley, CA.
- Corke-Webster, J. (2019a) *Eusebius and Empire: Constructing Church and Rome in the Ecclesiastical History*. Cambridge.
- Corke-Webster, J. (2019b) 'Emperors, Bishops, Art and Jurisprudence: The Transformation of Law in Eusebius of Caesarea', *EME* 27: 12-34.

⁸² Of particular interest in this regard, given his knowledge of Eusebius, is Sozomen's use of embedded panegyric to emphasize Theodosius I's piety and learning as well as to praise bishops, leading him to state explicitly (in the context of Constantine's burial) the precedence of bishops over emperors in holy places (*Hist. eccl.* 2.34). See the discussion in Urbainczyk 1998, who suggests that in this, and in more generally downplaying Constantine's intervention in internal church affairs, Sozomen was seeking to mould the young Theodosius II's mode of government. Urbainczyk notes that Sozomen's attitude is different from that of Socrates, but argues that Socrates is more Eusebius' heir than Sozomen. Given our discussion here, Sozomen seems—in this regard at least—the better heir; on that note, it is worth stressing that while Socrates begins his work with criticism of Eusebius (*Hist. eccl.* 1.1.1) Sozomen begins his with approbation (*Hist. eccl.* 1.1.12).

- Corke-Webster, J. (forthcoming) 'A Bishop's Biography: Eusebius of Caesarea's *Life of Constantine*', in K. de Temmerman (ed.) *Oxford Handbook of Ancient Biography*. Oxford.
- Damgaard, F. (2013) 'Propaganda Against Propaganda: Revisiting Eusebius' Use of the Figure of Moses in the *Life of Constantine*', in A. Johnson & J. Schott (eds.), *Eusebius of Caesarea*. Cambridge, MA. 115-132.
- De Decker, D. and G. Dupuis-Masay (1980) 'L'"episcopat" de l'empereur Constantin', *Byzantion* 50: 118-57.
- Drake, H.A. (1975a) 'When Was the *De Laudibus Constantini* Delivered?' *Historia* 24: 345-56.
- Drake, H. (1975b) *In Praise of Constantine: A Historical Study and New Translation of Eusebius' Tricennial Orations*. Berkeley, CA.
- Drake, H.A. (2000) *Constantine and the Bishops: The Politics of Intolerance*. Baltimore, MD.
- Farina, R. (1966) *L'Impero e l'Imperatore cristiano in Eusebio di Cesarea. La prima teologia politica del cristianesimo*. Zurich.
- Greatrex, G. and H. Elton (eds.) (2015) *Shifting Genres in Late Antiquity*. Farnham.
- Hall, S.G. (1993a) 'The Use of Earlier Eusebian Material in the *Life Constantini*, I.58-59', *Studia Patristica* 24: 96-101.
- Hall, S.G. (1993b) 'Eusebian and Other Sources in the *Life Constantini*, I', in H.C. Brennecke, E.L. Grasmück & C. Marksches (eds.) *Logos: Festschrift für Luise Abramowski*. Berlin/ 239-63.
- Heikel, I.A. et al. (eds.) (1902) *Eusebius Werke*. 9 vols. Leipzig.
- Hollerich, M.J. (1989) 'The Comparison of Moses and Constantine in Eusebius of Caesarea's *Life of Constantine*', *Studia Patristica* 19: 80-85.
- Inowlocki, S. (2007) 'Eusebius' Appropriation of the Figure of Moses in an Apologetic Context', in A. Graupner and M. Wolter (eds.) *Moses in Biblical and Extra Biblical Traditions*. Berlin. 241-55.
- Johnson, A. (2013) *Eusebius*. London.
- Kelly, G. (2007a) "'To Forge Their Tongues to Grandeur Styles": Ammianus' Epilogue', in J. Marincola (ed.), *A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography*. Malden. 453-458.
- Kelly, G. (2007b) 'The Sphragis and Closure of the *Res Gestae*', in J. den Boeft, D. den Hengst, H. Teiter and J.W. Drijvers (eds.) *Ammianus After Julian: The Reign of Valentinian and Valens in Books 26-31 of the Res Gestae*. Leiden. 219-41.
- Kennedy, G.A. (1983) *Greek Rhetoric Under Christian Emperors*. Princeton.
- Lawlor, H.J. & J.E.L. Oulton (eds.) (1927-8) *Eusebius. The Ecclesiastical History and the Martyrs of Palestine*. 2 vols. London.
- Lunn-Rockliffe, S. (2010) 'Commemorating the Usurper Magnus Maximus: Ekphrasis, Poetry, and History in Pacatus' Panegyric of Theodosius', *JLA* 3: 316-36.
- MacCormack, S. (1975) 'Latin Prose Panegyrics', in T.A. Dorey (ed.) *Empire and Aftermath: Silver Latin II*. London. 143-205.
- Neri, V. (2012) 'Les éditions de *l'Histoire ecclésiastique* (livres VIII-IX): bilan critique et perspectives de la recherche', in S. Morlet & L. Perrone (ed.), *Eusèbe de Césarée. Histoire ecclésiastique. Commentaire, Tome 1: Études d'introduction*. Paris. 151-83.

- Odahl, C. (1990) 'A Pagan's Reaction to *Constantine's Conversion* — Religious References in the Trier *Panegyric* of A.D. 313', *Ancient World* 21: 45-63.
- Omissi, A. (2018) *Emperors and Usurpers in the Later Roman Empire: Civil War, Panegyric, and the Construction of Legitimacy*. Oxford.
- Pasquali, G. (1910) 'Die Composition des Life Constantini des Eusebius', *Hermes* 46, 369-86.
- Pernot, L. (2006) 'The Rhetoric of Religion', *Rhetorica* 24: 235-54.
- Pernot, L. (2015) *Epideictic Rhetoric: Questioning the Stakes of Ancient Praise*. Austin, TX.
- Rapp, C. (1998) 'Comparison, Paradigm and the Case of Moses in Panegyric and Hagiography', in M. Whitby (ed.), *The Propaganda of Power*. Boston, MA. 277-98.
- Rapp, C. (1998) 'Imperial Ideology in the Making: Eusebius of Caesarea on Constantine as "Bishop"', *JTS* 49: 685-95.
- Rees, R. (2002) *Layers of Loyalty in Latin Panegyric: AD 289-307*. Oxford.
- Russell, D. (1998) 'The Panegyricists and their Teachers', in M. Whitby (ed.), *The Propaganda of Power*. Leiden. 17-49.
- Storch, R.H. (1971) 'The Eusebian Constantine', *Church History* 40: 145-55.
- Urbainczyk, T. (1998) 'Vice and Advice in Socrates and Sozomen', in M. Whitby (ed.), *The Propaganda of Power*. Leiden. 299-310.
- Van Dam, R. (2011) *Remembering Constantine at the Milvian Bridge*. Cambridge.
- Ware, C. (2014) 'The *Severitas* of Constantine: Imperial Virtues in *Panegyrici Latini* 7(6) and 6(7)', *JLA* 7: 86-109.
- Whitby, M. (ed.) (1998a) *The Propaganda of Power: The Role of Panegyric in Late Antiquity*. Leiden.
- Whitby, M. (1998b) 'Introduction', in M. Whitby (ed.), *The Propaganda of Power: The Role of Panegyric in Late Antiquity*. Leiden. 1-13.
- Williams, M.S. (2008) *Authorised Lives in Early Christian Biography: Between Eusebius and Augustine*. Cambridge.
- Wilson, A. (1998) 'Biographical Models: The Constantinian Period and Beyond', in S.N.C. Lieu (ed.), *In Constantine: History, Historiography and Legend*. London. 107-135.
- Winkelman, F. (1962) 'Zur Geschichte des Authentizitätsproblems der *Vita Constantini*', *Klio* 40, 187-243.
- Winkelman, F. (1975) *Eusebius Werke, Band 1.1: Über das Leben des Kaisers Konstantin*. Berlin.

NEOPLATONIC PHILOSOPHY IN TETRARCHIC AND CONSTANTINIAN PANEGYRIC

Diederik Burgersdijk¹

Introduction

By the early fourth century AD, the study and re-interpretation of Plato (a movement that has become known to modern scholarship as ‘Neoplatonism’) had established itself, amidst a host of other worldviews that were inherited from earlier antiquity, as the leading philosophy among pagan intellectuals.² This was a period during which both oratory and philosophy made developments in longstanding traditions in both Greek and Latin. Greek philosophy had been transferred to the Latin domain by the efforts of Cicero, along with many other philosophers who followed the New Academy or Stoic schools.³ Oratory, despite the grand achievements of Cicero and the models he provided, remained a particularly Greek matter, to judge from the extant handbooks that were at the orators’ disposal. Yet, when fourth-century panegyric orators have been put in the context of more contemporary literature, it has frequently been with these rhetorical handbooks and treatises (as discussed in the Introduction to this volume). Otherwise, recent scholarship has examined the *Panegyrici Latini XII* (henceforth *Pan. Lat.*), the principal collection of late third- and early fourth-century laudatory speeches in Latin, within longer literary traditions, especially via intertextuality to prose and verse texts of the late Republic and early Empire.⁴

Hardly any attempt has been made, however, to place the Gallic *Pan. Lat.* in the wider literary and intellectual contexts of their own times, especially not of contemporary philosophy. This may be explained by, on the one hand, a relative lack of literary sources from the same period, and, on the other hand, assumptions about the knowledge and skills of the orators themselves, especially the supposition that Greek and Latin speaking parts of the Roman empire were strictly divided and that these Latin orators could not know Greek philosophical literature. There are, however, reasons to suppose that lively contacts thrived between the eastern and western parts of the empire, at least in a cultural sense, while

¹ I thank the editors of this volume for their acute and insightful remarks on earlier versions of this paper, and Alan Ross for organizing the panel on panegyric at the Celtic Conference in Classics in Dublin 2016.

² Edwards 2015 surveys the plurality of philosophies and theologies during the Constantinian period. For Neoplatonism (especially as represented by Plotinus and Porphyry) see especially ‘What is Neoplatonism’, 42-4.

³ For Cicero, Stoicism and the so-called New Academy, see Long 2003, 197-203, who also provides an overview and analysis of Roman philosophers, their allegiance (Platonist, Christian, etc.) from the Hellenistic period to Late Antiquity.

⁴ Notably Vergil for poetry, Cicero for rhetoric (see the numerous references in Nixon and Saylor Rodgers’ apparatus, 1994, *passim*). In terms of rhetorical manuals, Menander Rhetor is regularly quoted, without proof of direct use however (see Introduction). For the composition of the twelve speeches, finalized in 389 most probably by Pacatus, see Rees 2012, 28.

intellectuals of both parts of the empire do appear to be skilled in both languages. The Latin orator Eumenius (*Pan. Lat.* IX[4]17.3), for example, boasts about his Athenian background via his grandfather, who was held in high esteem as an orator in Athens, Rome, and Gaul.

A third factor of the relative neglect of placing panegyric in its philosophical context may be the very different natures of oratory in general (and panegyric specifically) on the one hand and philosophy on the other. In terms of their goals, whereas the former delivers a plea, convinces an audience, or shows off eloquence, the latter claims to aim at truth, in either ethics, physics or logic. Philosophers especially in the Platonic tradition had long defined themselves in opposition to oratory and expressed their diffidence to it, largely because what they defined as the flattery (*adulatio*, or *κολακεία*) needed for oratorical success, could not be reconciled with truth.⁵ In the following, I argue that this strict distinction (which had always been the construct of philosophers rather than rhetoricians) does not prevent Latin orators using philosophy in their speeches; indeed, philosophy's claims to truth, as the Greek philosopher-orator repeatedly shows, could actually be deployed to enhance credibility of their speeches and even incite the addressee to achieve the best possible position for the state. It is my aim in this chapter, then, to place the late third and early fourth speeches of *Pan. Lat.* in the philosophical and literary context of their time, of which the most important context, Neoplatonism, has been largely neglected in the study of oratory (at least for tetrarchic and Constantinian panegyric).⁶ The image of a ruler, his position in the cosmos, and his imperial virtues are themes that had been lavishly treated in Platonic philosophy and revived in Neoplatonism, a revival which, as will be argued here, extends to Latin imperial panegyrics.⁷

The Gallic panegyrics and the explosion of Neoplatonic philosophy were coeval phenomena. Porphyry was by far the most prominent Neoplatonic philosopher active in Diocletian's capital Nicomedia, while in his later life he led, first as a pupil of Plotinus, a Neoplatonic circle in Rome. Porphyry's works mostly date from the early years of the fourth

⁵ See Murray 2018 on rhetoricians' opposition to philosophers, with examples of authors who 'converted' from the one domain to the other (Dio of Prusa: 2018, 219 and 229); Fox 2007, 371-3 on the hierarchy between the two (in Thucydides, Cicero and Quintilian); Pernot 2017 about Greek and Latin oratory in the Second Sophistic. The discussion whether rhetoric is compatible with truth is famously held in Plato's *Gorgias*, e.g. 463b-c, for which see López Eire 2007, 341.

⁶ That Neoplatonism was an active force upon composers of panegyric during the middle of the fourth century is far more accepted, see e.g. the attention paid to the subject by the Emperor Julian (Curta 1995), or the rhetor Themistius (Elm 2012, 99n. 52). Christians of the time knew Neoplatonic philosophy, if not Plato's work directly (Elm 224 and n. 37 about Gregory Nazianzus). The historical situation by then was different from the period described here, and moreover dominated by Greek writing orators and authors. See also Heath 2009.

⁷ Neoplatonism is absent from both the *Cambridge Companion to Ancient Rhetoric* (Gunderson 2009) and the *Blackwell Companion to Roman Rhetoric* (Dominik and Hall 2010). Both volumes elide any discussion of late third- or early fourth-century oratory. And whereas the *Oxford Companion* (MacDonald 2017) does treat Sophism and Stoicism in relation to rhetoric, no attention is paid to Neoplatonism. Conversely, handbooks on Neoplatonism (of which several have appeared in the past few years, notably Remes & Slaveva-Griffin 2014) do not take rhetoric into account. Fowler 2014 is important for the reception of Plato and Greek rhetoric in the so-called third sophistic, but does not include the late third- and early fourth-century Latin speeches.

century and were written during his time in Rome. Among several other writings, he edited the works of his teacher Plotinus (ca. 205-270), and wrote a biography of his venerated teacher that appeared in AD 301, also in Rome.⁸ Plato's *Timaeus*, a seminal work for Platonic cosmology, had already been translated into Latin by Cicero, but received a new translation by the Neoplatonic philosopher Calcidius sometime before 321 that is testament to the popularity of Platonism among western, Latin-speaking elites.⁹ The *Timaeus'* cosmology — a worldview in which the Demiurge functions as creator of the universe, below which Soul is one and indivisible, with a range of demons as intermediaries between the human and divine world — was of fundamental importance to Porphyry's concept of the three hypostases, or types of being, which are Soul, Intellect, and the One.¹⁰

Later in the first quarter of the fourth century, the Neoplatonic school was dominated by Porphyry's student Iamblichus from Chalkis in Syria. It was precisely during these years, when Plotinus' works were being disseminated and popularised by Porphyry, that five extant *panegyrici* were addressed to Constantine.¹¹ All five orations were delivered either in Rome, where Neoplatonism thrived, or Trier, the home of Greek-reading intellectuals. Thus it can be assumed that the orators, being well-educated intellectuals were in close contact with the empire's political centres were well acquainted with the thoughts, texts and traditions in which they stood. The study of the adoption or refraction of Neoplatonic themes within Latin panegyric can also be justified by the evident profusion of Neoplatonism through a range of other contemporary genres, especially among Christians. Lactantius provides an important example of the flow of Neoplatonic thought to Latin texts.¹² Although opposed to Porphyry's

⁸ Plotinus: Brisson & Pradeau 2006, Emilsson 2017, Gerson 2017; Porphyry: Becker 2016, Chase 2017; Iamblichus: Finamore & Dillon 2002, Edwards 2015, 44-9, Finamore 2017. Eunapius of Sardis in his *Lives of Philosophers and Sophists* (VPS) 454 states that the works by Plotinus were more widely read, even more than Plato's, and equally among intellectuals as other audiences.

⁹ See Sedley 2013 for Cicero as a reader of the *Timaeus*, a translation of which he must have made between June 45 and his death in December 43 BC. Also a generation prior to Cicero Posidonius had written a commentary, now lost. Calcidius translated *Timaeus* up to chapter 53. The date of Calcidius' writing is not known, but it is assumed that he wrote in the first quarter of the fourth century, possibly dedicating his translation and commentary to Hosius, the Emperor Constantine's confidant (Magee 2016, viii-ix). For a discussion of date see Hoenig 2018, 434.

¹⁰ Described by Plotinus, *Enn.* V.1. See Emilsson 2017, 37. The term *hypostasis* has no particular meaning in Plotinus, but is a notion that Porphyry was to give its Neoplatonic interpretation (Kalligas 2014, 229). Wilberding 2006 on all aspects of Plotinus' cosmology in the philosophical tradition.

¹¹ My focus will be on the speeches XII(9) from AD 313 (performed in Trier by an anonymous orator) and IV(10) from 321 (Rome) by Nazarius. The other two speeches addressed to Constantine are VI(7) and V(8) from 310 and 311 respectively, both held at Trier. A fifth speech VII(6) dates from 307 (Trier) and is addressed to both Maximian and Constantine. The first two speeches were composed in a period in which Constantine presumably changed religious preference from paganism to Christianity.

¹² For Eusebius and Neoplatonism in the Constantinian period, see Edwards 2015, 60 and n.68, particularly for cosmological issues. Torres Guerra 2013[2015] attempts to prove the bilingualism of Constantine's biographer Eusebius, in mastering both Greek as well as Latin, as well as the emperor's understanding of spoken Greek. For Eusebius' use of Plato, especially *Timaeus*, in a Christian context, see Karamanolis 2014.

doctrine, he appropriated much of the Neoplatonists' vocabulary and terminology, such as, for example, the epithet of *summus deus* for the 'highest god'.¹³ Neoplatonism was the dominant interlocutor for Christian intellectuals who grappled with the nature of the cosmos, and the place of the Roman Empire and its emperor within it. The orators of the *Pan. Lat.* likewise drew on this common philosophical currency.

Neoplatonic Political Philosophy

What could Neoplatonism offer a provincial Gallic rhetor as he prepared to address the emperor? Once the answer to that question might have been 'not very much', as Neoplatonism was long considered to be a philosophical movement that was at best indifferent to the world of politics, if not outright hostile. Neoplatonism's focus on philosophical contemplation implied a withdrawal from public life, not active engagement in politics. The absence of any late antique commentary or paraphrase on Plato's political works such as *Republic* or *Laws*, seemed to confirm this view, but Dominic O'Meara has demonstrated that, far from being apolitical, Neoplatonist authors did have a coherent view of political philosophy that articulated ideals for a ruler, his position within the cosmos, and the role of virtues in improving his reign.¹⁴

The central tenet of Platonism, and the ideal for a king, is 'likeness to God as far as possible', as argued by Plato in his *Theaetetus*.¹⁵ This likeness for Neoplatonists is achieved by contemplating the Good, and the ascent of the soul towards contemplation of the One, which is the highest principle coinciding with the Good. Having attained union with the One, a spiritual journey for the philosopher that may as good be a worldly ruler, the statesman may as well do good in his own worldly realm: having contemplated Good, the philosopher is bound to act accordingly.¹⁶ The Neoplatonic ideal king achieves contemplation of the Good via a four-part scale of hierarchically ordered virtues, first the so-called 'political' virtues (which condition how a human interacts with his or her fellow humans), to the 'purificatory', the 'theoretical' and finally the 'paradigmatic' virtues (which concern how the human soul

¹³ DePalma-Digeser 2000, 64-84 on Lactantius' relation to Neoplatonism and stance towards Porphyry. Neoplatonism as a public philosophy, practiced by several religiously defined groups: Palma Digeser 2012, 72-97. For Lactantius' conception of *summus deus*, drawing on either Cicero's *De Natura deorum* or Plato's *Timaeus*, see Meinking 2014, 111-12.

¹⁴ O'Meara 1999, 281 on the Neoplatonist philosopher-king; virtues as a way of attaining the good: 2004, 43.

¹⁵ θεῶν ὁμοιωθῆναι, Plotinus referring to Plato in *Enneads* 1.2.1. See further Armstrong 2003 on Plato's concept of 'becoming like god'; O'Meara 2003, 3. Palma Digeser 2012, 89 on divine assimilation, quoting from Plotinus *Enn.* 1.2.123-6. See now Hunter 2018, 209 for the Homeric tradition in which Plato's 'becoming like god' can be placed.

¹⁶ O'Meara 1999, 281 and Plotinus 6.9, 7, 20-8; cf. Van den Berg 2005, 102-4. The idea is, in the end, derived from Socratic determinism, as voiced in Plato's dialogue *Protagoras* (e.g. 360e), that he who knows good acts accordingly; that good action depends on knowledge (cf. Plato's *Republic* 4.428b: good counsel for the state is based on knowledge, not ignorance).

interacts with Intellect and the divine).¹⁷ The political virtues are the first step towards divinization, and becoming like God, which again leads to a need for the philosopher who has contemplated the One to return to earth and willingly share his contemplation via ruling well, and turning contemplation into action. The philosophical dimension of kingship, present in Platonic philosophy, is also reflected in the representation of Roman emperors in the era under discussion.

It was O'Meara who showed that this becoming like God in Neoplatonist thought applies to the statesman, whose challenge it is to bring the human virtues into harmony and thereby coming closer to divinity, even if divinity itself stands above virtue.¹⁸ Divinization equals becoming virtuous, 'just and pious with wisdom', as expressed in *Theaetetus* (176b1-2). According to Plotinus 1.2.7.26-8 this maxim is the ultimate goal of political philosophy, even if for Plato the ultimate goal of this branch of philosophy was the good of the state (followed by Aristotle in his *Nicomachean Ethics*).¹⁹ For Plotinus, a difference has to be made between theoretical philosophy and practical philosophy, of which the former has a divine dimension (in this, the statesman or philosopher has to attain to the goal described above), while the latter manifests itself in taking care of other humans, by legislation and judicial action. The soul of the statesman-philosopher in an autocratic or monarchical state is, then, the intermediate between the divine world and the material world inhabited by humans.²⁰ In order to rule, the statesman has to possess political virtues in his 'inner republic of the soul', an imitation of which has to be projected onto the state.²¹

By philosophizing (*contemplatio*, or θεωρία), he can come closer to the immaterial world and approach the highest god, which puts a special responsibility on the emperor's shoulders — from this point forward, he can start to take action (πρᾶξις).²² It is at the point of virtuous action that neoplatonic philosophy and panegyric orator coincide most closely. The orator describes, or praises, the emperor in his ideal role, but at the same time incites him to follow certain patterns of expected behaviour. The aim of philosophy in general is ἀναγωγή ('leading up') of the soul: the orator has to extoll and incite the addressee to reach this very same goal, to contemplate the Good.²³ The ideal ruler needs to apply a certain set of virtues pertaining to imperial rule, a theme that is omnipresent in late antique discourse, to which we

¹⁷ O'Meara 2003, 44 following Porphyry, *Sentences* 32, an addition by Porphyry to Plotinus' doctrine of virtues, about which see below.

¹⁸ 2003, chapter 1, especially p.8-9.

¹⁹ Wallis 1995², 3 defines the 'undifferentiated unity' as 'a state in which sensuous imagery and conceptual thought are transcended, the mind becomes perfectly unified and individual limitations are felt to be abolished.'

²⁰ On the philosopher-king in Plato and Neoplatonism: O'Meara 2003, 73-83, with king Minos as the prototype of the good king, as described in *Enn.*6.9 (see also DePalma Digeser 2012, 87-8).

²¹ The analysis follows O'Meara 2017 closely. See for the inner republic, Plotinus *Enn.* 1.2.1.17-21, to which the more outward directed action as formulated by Porphyry may be added (note 17).

²² We can see this reflected in speech by the orator of 28, who states that the emperor dwells 'at the summit of empire' (*in vertice imperii*), or 'in that most exalted pinnacle of human affairs' (*in tam arduo humanarum rerum fastigio*). O'Meara 2003, 74-5 about the relation between θεωρία, πρᾶξις and, finally, ποιήσις (creating, production). The division is based on Aristotle, see *Enn.* 3.8.

²³ O'Meara 2003, 51; Plotinus 1.3, 1, 6.

will return. Furthermore from Plato, in his seventh and eighth letters, stem two of the oldest examples of *speculum principis*, ‘mirror of princes’, in which the ideal ruler was sketched.²⁴ In the seventh letter three principles are mentioned: (1) 7.326: philosophers become rulers or rulers become philosophers by some dispensation of providence, (2) 7.322: the ruler has to be consistent in conduct, and (3) 7.336: the ruler has to liberate the state from slavery, introduce liberty, and designs laws.²⁵ To attain the goals as set by Plato, the ruler has to show self-restraint and temper his passions.²⁶ He has to control himself in order to rule others, a ‘Socratic principle’.²⁷ This same principle recurs in Porphyry and Plotinus, who see self-restraint, or σωφροσύνη, as the way to reach the transcendent good by the inward turn of the soul.²⁸ Self-restraint may be rendered in Latin as *continentia*, a notion that frequently occurs in panegyric.

Neoplatonic Theology in Constantinian Latin panegyric

For those living under the Roman Empire, the emperor occupied a special position in the universe, as he dwelt on the top of human affairs and remained very close to the upper world. This position correlates with the image of the ruler in imperial panegyric, being at ‘that sacred pinnacle of divine power.’²⁹ The five speeches addressed to Constantine in the *Panegyrici Latini* constitute an important source for the development of Constantine’s reign from co-ruler in the Tetrarchy to sole-ruler in the West, between 307 and 321, in which the ideals described above are reflected. During this period, the Roman Empire not only experienced a change of rulership, but also of theological orientation, through Constantine’s support for Christianity. Having identified Neoplatonic overtones in the presentation of the ruler in panegyric, we now consider how in this era of theological transformation the emperor vis-à-vis the highest cosmic power is presented. At first sight, although divine support is an important element in panegyric praise, it is striking that no specific god seems to be mentioned in the speeches. Most commentators do not go beyond the observation that the orators employ a god of a very general nature, a *deus* or *divinitas* that may please and be inoffensive to everyone, including Christians.³⁰ In spite of precise analysis of divine language

²⁴ Even if the letter is not by Plato himself, then it is still Platonic; a majority of scholars nowadays tend to assume Plato’s authorship, see Burnyeat & Frede 2015, 100 n.6 for discussion. Neoplatonists considered the seventh letter as authentic beyond doubt, *ibid.* 129 n.24.

²⁵ Dispensation of providence: Burnyeat & Frede 73. For the idea of liberty in Neoplatonism: Collette-Dučić 2014 (as to freedom of choice); Adamson 2014 (in relation to fate); the act of lawgiving: O’Meara 2017, 474-5.

²⁶ Ware 2014, 91.

²⁷ Rosillo López 184, with reference to Isoc. *Evagoras* 2.29.

²⁸ Plotinus 1.2.6 τὸ δὲ σωφρονεῖν ἢ εἴσω πρὸς νοῦν στροφή (‘Restraint (*Sophrosyne*) is its inward bending towards the Intellectual-Principle).

²⁹ VII(6)6.1: *sacrum istud fastigium divinae potestatis*; tr. Nixon and Saylor Rodgers 1994, 198. See Saylor Rodgers 2012, 246.

³⁰ Barbara Saylor Rodgers made an inventory of the vocabulary with regard to matters divine, and concluded, for Nazarius and his predecessor from the year 312 at least, that the orators ‘are apparently

in the panegyrics, the cultural context in which this language is practiced has not been taken into further consideration. It is my contention that the language nearly fits the Neoplatonic pagan philosophy of its time.

Firstly, the theme of the emperor as ‘present god’ (*praesens deus*), which has its roots in the Augustan era but is a common feature of the *Pan. Lat.*, may be seen in Neoplatonic light. A *praesens deus* in panegyric may be seen as a manifestation of a god in earthly context, to be perceived among mortals, normally in order to intervene in human affairs.³¹ The theme of divine assistance goes back to Homeric imagery.³² In speech VIII(4)19 from 298 AD, the orator describes Constantine’s father Constantius I as a being ‘descended from the heavens’ (*ut caelo delapsus*). The formula (*de*) *caelo delapsus* is firmly based in traditional Roman theology, but always used either of a god (e.g. Venus bringing the deceased Caesar’s soul to heaven in Ovid’s *Metamorphosis* 15.840-50), or of an apotheosized ruler (such as Romulus in Livy, 1.16.6).³³ Here, the living and ruling emperor is presented as descending from heaven as ‘avenger and liberator’ (*vindex et liberator*) from the ‘high pinnacle’ (as described above) in order to take action in human affairs. The situation may be read in a contemporaneous cultural context, informed by Neoplatonic conceptions of the ruler: in that case, (*de*) *caelo delapsus* may be interpreted as a Neoplatonic *katabasis* (or *kathodos*), a descent that means that the soul coming from above is embodied in a human existence. In a context of statemanship, it was important for the soul to later return to earth to communicate its newfound goodness and elevate the rest of humanity.³⁴

monotheists, though a particular brand of monotheism cannot be definitely established for either’, while Nazarius in his speech from 321 AD describes ‘a supreme being’ inhabiting in heaven, ‘the most powerful divinity vaguely, namelessly’: Saylor Rodgers 2012, 315.

³¹ See now Ware 2018, 122-4 for the emperor as *praesens deus* and the evocation of a Vergilian Golden and Zangenberg 2018, 44 for Diocletian as a ‘present and visible Jupiter’, *Pan.Lat.* XI(3)10.5.

³² See for the theme of the epiphany in Homer, and the theory of ‘seeing’ (*theoria*) a god in Plato, Platt 2001, 57-60. From the Homeric epiphany, the Roman concept of *praesens deus* is derived, for which in panegyric, see Kolb 2004 (though not interpreted in any Platonic form). In VI(7)22.1 Constantine, after the gods have secured peace, is addressed and described as a *praesentissimus deus*, due to visit the Apollo’s groves — an emperor’s epiphany in its most pure form.

³³ Cic. *Harusp. Resp.* 62 is revealing in that it describes the apparently common ideas about a deity descending from heaven: *Nolite enim id putare accidere posse ... fieri, ut deus aliqui delapsus de caelo coetus hominum adeat...* (‘For you must not think that that can happen ... that some god can descend from heaven and mingle in the gatherings of men...’, tr. N.H. Watts, LCL 158 [1923] 399). Ogilvy (1965, 86), commenting on Livy 1.16.6 (Romulus’ descent from heaven) sees *de caelo delapsus* as typical for the late republican and Augustan poets, and quotes instances from Lucretius, Propertius, Ovid, and Vergil. For *caelo*, as in the present passage, instead of *de caelo*, see Verg. *A* 7.620 and Ovid. *Met.* 1.212.

³⁴ The translation ‘as one who had descended from heaven’ (Nixon and Saylor Rodgers 1994, 140) may be preferred to ‘as if fallen from the sky’ (Saylor Rodgers 2012, 304), while both miss the Neoplatonic overtones. For the idea of ‘descent’ into human, material existence, see Remes 2009, 112-3 (normally conceived as the descent into a body by birth). For the voluntary descent of the divine into bodily existence and the material world, see Plotinus 4.8.5.24 and Fleet 1995, 143-4; O’Meara 2003, 76.

The vocabulary of divinity surrounding the emperor in speech XII(9), delivered in Trier in 313, who is addressed traditionally in 1.1 as *sacratissime imperator* ('most revered emperor'), may be seen in the same Neoplatonic light. The *sacratissimus imperator* is patently panegyric language, but is also consistent with the Neoplatonic idea of the king's *sanctitas* ('moral purity').³⁵ The emperor, clearly endowed with divine power, is often attributed with the quality of *numen* ('divine will').³⁶ The question is whether *numen* is an external god, or refers to the divine power of the emperor himself, as the term seems to be used both ways.³⁷ In 4.2, it appears that a leading *ratio* dwells within the emperor's mind, being a kind of *prudencia* ('providence'): 'Or did this guiding principle lead you — for each has his own providence as a god'.³⁸ The 'guiding principle' (*ratio*) here must apparently not be conceived as an 'external god', such as the *Nous* described above, but is defined here as an 'inner god', called *prudencia* ('wisdom').

Still, *ratio* represents the highest faculty of the soul, and may still be in direct contact with the highest *Nous*.³⁹ The inner god has all the appearances of the Socratic δαιμόνιον, a conscience which discerns between good and bad, linked with a supernatural being in Neoplatonic doctrine.⁴⁰ Other instances do however refer to an external divine being: Constantine is helped by Justice herself (4.2: *pro te tamen Iustitia pugnabat*) and guided by divine precepts (4.4: *divina praecepta*).⁴¹ All the terms are of such a general nature, that no god from the early fourth century may seem to be indicated as Constantine's personal protector. Still, there appears to be one, in 2.5: 'You must share some secret with that divine mind, Constantine, which has delegated care of us to lesser gods and deigns to reveal itself to

³⁵ Woudhuysen 2018, 174 and n.99 on the specifically panegyric overtones of *sacratissimus*.

Plotinus 5.1,6 theorizes that everything seeing or understanding the good is good itself, because it forms, being close, an image of it. In 1.23-6, Plotinus treats moral excellence as a result of coming closer to god (O'Meara 2003, 9).

³⁶ *numen* - 'divine will'. 10.3: *divina virtus* ('divine virtue'); 11.4: *divino monitus instinctu* ('driven by divine inspiration', both for Constantine); 26.5 *divina suboles tua* ('your divine offspring', Constantine's son Crispus). For *sanctitas*, see Van Winden 1959, 35).

³⁷ XII(9)1.1: *res a numine tuo gestas* ('your deity's accomplishments'); 4.1: *quid in consilio nisi divinum numen habuisti* ('what did you have as counsel if not a divine power'), repeated in 4.5: *divino consilio, ... hoc est, tuo* ('divine inspiration, ... that is, your inspiration'); 5.5: *numini tuo* (in a wordplay with *nomini*, 'name'), and various other places.

³⁸ *an illa ratio te ducebat - sua enim cuique prudentia deus est*. Cf. Cic. *Ac.* 1.29 and *Nat. D.* 2.58 for *prudencia* as a divine force of cosmic proportions. Nixon and Saylor Rodgers (1994, 299) 'calculation' for *ratio*, and 'prudence' for *prudencia* may be reconsidered given the cosmic dimensions.

³⁹ For this reason, it might even be considered to spell *ratio* with a capital *R*.

⁴⁰ The characteristics of *daimones* according to the second century Platonic philosopher Maximus of Tyre (*Dial.* 8.8 'What was Socrates' Divine Sign?') are that they belong to 'a race of secondary immortal beings ... who have their station in the space between earth and heaven', that they are 'more closely related to men than to the gods, but more closely concerned than the gods with men', and do appear to men: see Platt 2011, 235 and Trapp 1997, 67-83. Den Boeft (1977, 38) points out that Calcidius considers care for humans a particular duty of demons.

⁴¹ 'Justice fought for you' / 'Divine precepts'. The god that helps the emperor is referred to as *quisnam deus* (2.4), *deus ille mundi creator et dominus* (13.2), *summus rerum sator* (26.1).

you alone'.⁴² Here, the panegyrist explicitly identifies a hierarchy of divinities under highest divine being, to which we will return below.

The description *divinitas* as protector god of the emperor had been chosen by the Roman senate when dedicating the triumphal Arch to Constantine in 315. The text reads that he won the victory 'at the inspiration of the divinity and greatness of the mind' (*instinctu divinitatis mentis magnitudine*, *ILS* 694). This is also the formula encountered in *Pan. Lat.* XII(9)11.4, 'advised by divine inspiration' (*divino monitus instinctu*), which reveals a pagan, Rome-centered vocabulary.⁴³ The (equally divine) *mens* is elaborated in the conclusion of the same speech, 26.1, which is explicit about that supernatural being as 'some kind of force and divine mind' (*quaedam vis mensque divina*), entirely mixed with the elements, that moves by itself. The divine power has 'the greatest goodness' (*summa bonitas*) and 'power' (*potestas*) in it. Nine years later, in 321, the next orator, Nazarius, addresses the same topic in a speech to the same emperor, in Rome. Here, the highest being is defined as 'God, the ruler of things' (*rerum arbiter deus*, 7.3) and in three cases as 'majesty' (*maiestas*).⁴⁴ In both the orators' theology the supreme power (XII: *summe rerum sator* / IV: *rerum arbiter deus*) is the highest judge of right and wrong and exerts his power on the living.⁴⁵ Between 313 and 321, these panegyrists give special attention to the exact nature of a highest deity in precisely the period when imperial ideology tended to monotheism, even if the exact development of Constantine's sympathies for a specific religion are still a matter for debate. It can be questioned whether the orators indeed responded to Constantine's emerging Christianity, or were interested in the new religion at all. While possibly trying to accommodate Constantine's change of religious course, the orators do not appear to be outwardly Christian in their oratory, refusing to adopt other agenda's than their own. Rather, they were steeped in Neoplatonic philosophy, that they naturally used for the design of their speeches.

Neoplatonic Demonology

⁴² *Habes profecto aliquod cum illa mente diuina, Constantine, secretum, quae delegata nostri diis minoribus cura uni se tibi dignatur ostendere.* (tr. Nixon and Saylor Rodgers 1994, 296). Cf. for *divina mens* 16.2, 26.1.

⁴³ The word *instinctu* ('inspiration') has a particularly pagan sound, and is used by Calcidius in his *Commentary on Plato's Timaeus* 1.26, see Lenski 2008. In Quintilian 10.1.81 *instinctus* refers particularly to an orator's Platonic inspiration: *Delphico videatur oraculo instinctus* ('he [the orator] appears to be incited by the Delphic oracle'), and equally in 12.10.24 *instinctis divino spiritu vatibus* ('poets incited by divine inspiration'). Cicero's *instinctus divinus* in *de divinatione* 1.12, 34 and 66 may be read in the same Platonic light.

⁴⁴ Saylor Rodgers 2012, 314 n.52: the use of *deus* ('god') without qualification by *ille* ('that') or any other modifier is exactly the way a monotheist would describe the deity.

⁴⁵ Lenski 2008, 241 n.129 has read the god-description in a Neoplatonic light: 'Here the panegyrist moves the discourse into a more abstract and ethereal realm that surely reflects an attempt to describe Constantine's conception of the Christian God, but he does so in fundamentally pagan — neo-Platonic — terms and using vocabulary repeated on the arch (*mensque divina*) and in the evocatio formula (*sive . . . sive*).' (referring to the inscription on the Arch of Constantine, *CIL* 6.1139).

Nazarius' deity is a far more active force in human affairs compared to his predecessor's from 313 AD. While the earlier orator only deduces the presence or absence of an unknown deity from the events happening on earth, Nazarius attributes an active force to the deity in controlling events. It is, furthermore, important to consider the position of both passages in their respective speeches: in the speech of 313, the reference to the deity implies that the emperor is the highest reigning god, or shares his *consilium* with him. *Prudentia*, moreover, a divine characteristic as we have seen, was an important trait in the orator's religious framework, and is used no less than five times by Nazarius, always with regard to the emperor.⁴⁶ In 7.3-4, Nazarius describes the deity's activity of looking into men's hearts: 'God the ruler of things regards us from on high and, although human minds have deep hiding places for their thoughts yet divinity winds its way in when it will explore the whole'.⁴⁷ This corresponds with Plotinus' (2.9.9) image of a god or gods that look onto the people on earth from above.⁴⁸

As signalled above, it may well be that the Neoplatonic philosopher Calcidius informed the Latin speaking part of intellectuals in the Western part of the empire with his translation of Plato's *Timaeus*. The faculty of looking into men's heart is also mentioned by Calcidius, although they are divided between different classes of eternal beings, gods and demons alike. There is a class of *angeli* that Calcidius (133) describes as wise, 'in that it is all-knowing, sees into the thoughts of men' (*quod omnia sciat cogitationesque hominum introspicat*); in 188 the *daemones* are called the ones 'who inspect and observe merits' (*inspectatores speculatoresque meritorum*). Applied to Nazarius' presentation of Constantine's victory according to Nazarius, the soldiers are said to have observed heavenly armies, IV(10)14.1, who appear before the soldiers' eyes, 'descended from heaven and sent by a divine power' (*caelo lapsi, divinitus missi*). Normally, heavenly creatures do not appear before human eyes, because humans are not naturally able to see them — so Nazarius, in line with common conceptions from Homer onwards.⁴⁹ Superhuman creatures that descend into the material world run the risk of being infected by their descent, and therefore flee the infection (*contagium*), as the material world is connected with vice.⁵⁰ The material world consists of

⁴⁶ *Providentia* in Nazarius occurs with the adjectives (in 9.3) 'heavenly' (*caelestis*, 10.2) and 'on high' (*excellens*, in 11.4, 19.2, 33.2). Only in one other speech, III(11)25.1, a *divina prudentia* occurs. In Calcidius 188 *providentia* is treated as the second highest level of gods after the *summus deus*, while the third and fourth level are defined by the *secunda mens intellectusque* that guards the law, and the fourth the *daemones inspectatores speculatoresque*.

⁴⁷ *Spectat enim nos ex alto rerum arbiter deus et, quamvis humanae mentes profundos gerant cogitationum recessus, insinuat tamen sese totam scrutatura divinitas.*

⁴⁸ Derived from Plato's *Laws* 10.904, see DePalma Digeser 2012, 84.

⁴⁹ See further in 14.1: 'divine things are not in the habit of coming before men's eyes, because the unmixed and incorporeal substance of their subtle nature eludes our dull and darkened vision...'

⁵⁰ Plotinus on 'seeing', 3.6.3: '...if an immaterial thing is to be affected it loses that by which it is permanent; just as in the case of vision, the seeing faculty is actualized while the eye is affected' (tr. Fleet 1995, 9). Finamore 2018, 374-5 on demons in Iamblichus' works descending to the material realm, where they may be affected. Nazarius IV(10)16.2 speaks about the emperor's mind as 'separate from human contact, entirely pure, utterly sincere' (*[mens tua] mortali contagione secreta,*

matter, which is also the bearer of evil.⁵¹ The clause *de caelo lapsi* again indicates a *κατάβασις*, just as in the case of Constantius' arrival in Britain, and indeed, the heavenly army appears to be led by this same Constantius as *divus*. Thus was the conception in Neoplatonic philosophy of the role of a descended statesman, as we have seen above. Also the term *κάθοδος* is used by Plotinus for this phenomenon, often based on the passage in Plato's *Timaeus*,⁵² where a chariot is invoked as a means to convey the soul to the earthly realm.⁵³

The heavenly creatures are part of a long tradition of divine support in human warfare, stretching back to Homer.⁵⁴ In Platonic philosophy, the intermediaries between the eternal imperishable and the temporary human world had transformed into heroes and demons. The intermediaries who exert their care upon the mortals, or lesser men as Nazarius described them, are defined by Calcidius *comm. in Plat. Tim.* 134 as *daemonas*, who pay obedience to heaven and also take care of earthly matters.⁵⁵ These demons, who cannot be noticed by the human senses ('removed from our vision and other senses') are transparent (*perspicua*) because of the matter of which they consist is 'pure ether and limpid air' (*ex aetheris serenitate et aeris liquore*) — the reason why the appearance of Nazarius' heavenly army must be considered a supernatural phenomenon that predicts a victory for the mortal army on its march.⁵⁶ Of these demons, there are two types: the good and the bad. The good care for the people on earth, 'engaged in the care of human beings' (*diligentiam hominibus impertiens*, *ibid.* 135), while the others are not beneficial and affected by 'the filth of corporeal density', 'and [they] have an excessively high level of communication with matter, which the ancients referred to as the malign soul' (*habentque nimiam cum silva communionem, quam malignam animam veteres vocabant*, 135)

Thus, the realm between mortal men and immortal gods, and the relationships between these several types of being as described by Nazarius, can, apart from being seen in an epic light, be understood in a long-established Platonic tradition. The vocabulary and theology are in concordance. The highest mind as described by Nazarius looks into the hearts and thoughts

pura omnis, funditus sincera), with the result that [*mens tua*] *ubique se promerendo deo praestet* ('[your mind] manifests itself everywhere in winning over god').

⁵¹ As expounded in *Enn.* 1.8.8 and 2.4.16, where it is stated that matter is evil, because it is in want of good.

⁵² See Plotinus *Enn.* 4.3.15, Porph. *De antro nymph.* 11; Peters 1967, 139; Plato *Tim.* 41d-e, and Phaedrus 247b.

⁵³ Cf. *Pan. Lat.* XI(3)8.3-5 where a comparable image is used: Diocletian and Maximian borrow the chariots of the sun and the moon in order to convene in Milan. See further for Aristotle's interpretation of the vehicle: Peters 1967, 139.

⁵⁴ Given the continuous Homeric tradition, from which many examples were derived to shed light on practically all aspects of life, it is often hard to pinpoint from what literary or philosophical predecessor certain thoughts are taken. For the Platonic conception of Homeric theology, see Hunter 2018, 87-91.

⁵⁵ According to Diotima in Plato's symposium, 'the daemonic is the means of all society and converse of gods with men and of men with gods (...). Whoever has skill in these affairs is a daemonic man' (quoted by Platt 2011, 331).

⁵⁶ Nazarius, IV(10)14.1. On visibility and *perspicuitas*, Den Boeft 1977, 34 and 36 (Calcidius 134).

of mortal people, while Calcidius' god sees into the thoughts of men. The 'care for earthly matters' (*terrena curantibus*) and 'diligence for humans' (*diligentiam hominibus impertiens*) is — according to Calcidius — entrusted to demons, just as Nazarius describes the role of the 'lesser gods', who are responsible for human care (2.5, see above). The highest mind does not show himself, but only the emperor has a hot-line to this divine being and is able to observe him, while he can be observed by the highest mind as well. In case the emperor shows himself worthy to descend to the level of lower men, this is described as if he were a god, in other (Neoplatonic) words, a *κάθοδος*. Lower gods, in contrast, can be seen by common mortals, although they are transparent and normally refrain from getting into contact with earthly matter, which contains evil, in order to avoid *contagium* (Calcidius), of which the emperor's mind is completely free (Nazarius).

Imperial virtues

A further aspect of the Latin panegyrics that may ultimately derive from Neoplatonic thought relates to the qualities for which the emperors are praised. As we have seen, Plato formulated four cardinal virtues, the acquisition of which in Neoplatonist theory was considered the first step for the statesman to climb in order to attain contemplation of the good. They also governed the statesman's interaction with his fellow humans.⁵⁷ At the turn of the fourth century, judging from panegyrics, the use of virtues in oratory had exponentially grown, as there are some ninety imperial virtues to be listed from the *Pan. Lat.* (Ware 2014, 89). In Nazarius' speech to Constantine from the year 321, an accumulation of imperial virtues occurs in the section 9.3-10.4.⁵⁸ *Temperantia* ('self-control') and *prudentia*, sometimes augmented with *pietas* ('dutiful respect'), are two out of four cardinal virtues, together with *fortitudo* ('bravery') and *iustitia* ('justice').⁵⁹ The virtues, a set of rules for good government of the city (or a Greek polis), are described by Plato in his *Republic* 4.426-35 as 'fortitude' (*ἀνδρεία*), 'self-control' (*σωφροσύνη*), 'justice' (*δικαιοσύνη*) and 'wisdom' (*σοφία*), and in Protagoras 330b 'piety' *ὁσιότης* (*pietas*) is added.⁶⁰ All of the mentioned virtues are also treated by Plotinus as the requisites for ideal rule in his treatise *On virtues*, in his *Enneads* 1.2, which may well have informed the orator.⁶¹ The Neoplatonic interest in the theme may show a shared culture among the orators and Neoplatonic philosophers.

⁵⁷ See 'Neoplatonic Political Philosophy', above.

⁵⁸ An inventory leads to sixteen occurrences of ten imperial virtues: *concordia* (9.3 bis, 9.5, 10.2, 10.4), *venia* (9.3), *prudentia* (9.3, 10.2), *temperantia* (9.4), *virtus* (9.4, 10.4), *gravitas* (9.5), *modestia* (9.5), *decus* (9.5), *pietas* (10.2), *honestas* (10.3). The imperial virtues are the same as the political virtues mentioned above, the first and lowest set which one should attain: Porphyry *Sent.* 32.

⁵⁹ *fortitudo*: IV(10)6.5, 21.2, 33.2, 33.4 and *iustitia*: mentioned in 15.3 and 26.1.

⁶⁰ Aristotle (*Rhet.* 1366b1) augments the series with magnificence, magnanimity, liberality and gentleness. Plato's 'wisdom' (*σοφία*) correspond with Neoplatonic *φρόνησις* 'practical wisdom' (O'Meara 2003, 40).

⁶¹ Ware 2014, 89, again, states about the virtues in *Pan. Lat.*: 'Many are related, having evolved from one of the Platonic or Augustan canonical virtues...' [italics are mine].

How does this doctrine of virtue apply to the cosmic world order, which in Plotinus' philosophy prevailed over the earthly affairs? While in Neoplatonism three worlds are distinguished, the perishable human world, the immaterial world, and the farthest ends of the universe,⁶² this conception comes very close to the world of Ideas, as sketched by Plato in his *Republic*. A human being may come closer to the world of the Ideas, which will initially blind him in observation. In the phrase in the passage of Nazarius mentioned above (9.4), 'ugly cowardice casts down its eyes when virtue's beauty (*pulchritudo virtutis*) is set before it', we see that a personified *ignavia* puts down her eyes when confronted with the virtue of *temperantia*. *Temperantia* is presented as 'beautiful', which agrees with the Neoplatonic idea that all virtues are part of the idea of beauty (cf. Plotinus 1.6.1: 'the beauty of the virtues', τὸ τῶν ἀρετῶν κάλλος). The same idea is expressed earlier in the speech, where it is stated that 'confrontation with an object of veneration repulses the seeker in the entranceway, and any who have approached closer have been blinded and lost the faculty of sight, which is what happens to the eyes when they are directed at the sun'.⁶³ The formulation sheds further light on the Neoplatonic substrate that pervades a large part of Nazarius' thinking: when confronted with beauty, veneration for the object blinds the eyes.⁶⁴

In IV(10)16.1, Nazarius describes how Constantine's *pietas* saved Rome. *Pietas* (as the fifth after the four cardinal virtues) is, according to Plotinus, achieved when all cardinal virtues work together.⁶⁵ It appears that in Nazarius, the virtues have a purificatory function, as becomes clear from the description of the mind in the next sentence: 'separate from mortal contact, entirely pure, utterly sincere' (*contagione secreta, pura omnis, funditus sincera*). As we saw in our survey of Neoplatonic political philosophy, purificatory virtues can bring men, in particular statesman, closer to god. Purification derives from virtue, a necessary condition as the only means for mortal men to reach this highest goal in the context of platonic morality.⁶⁶ The virtue that has the ability to purify the mind is a specifically Neoplatonic function, extending Plato's philosophy of the virtues to stabilize the state, in order to do justice to its divine origin.⁶⁷ The emperor in the meantime is guarded and protected by the highest divinity. Also the state itself can be purified by the sheer use of virtue, following the leader of the state, as appears from 32.8: the city, after having been liberated from the evil

⁶² Smith 1974, 61.

⁶³ tr. Nixon and Saylor Rodgers 1994, 348: *inquirentem repellit obiecta veneratio, et si qui mente propius adierunt, quod oculis in solem se contendentibus evenit, praestricta acie videndi facultate caruerunt.*

⁶⁴ ...confrontation with an object of veneration repulses the seeker in the entranceway, and any who have approached closer have been blinded and lost the faculty of sight, which is what happens to the eyes when they are directed at the sun. Nixon and Saylor Rodgers compare *Pan. Lat.* 11.2.1 to this passage (1994, 348 n.24).

⁶⁵ Plotinus, *Enn.* 1.2.123: if the four cardinal virtues are respected in the political realm, this leads to the state's progress.

⁶⁶ O'Meara 2003, 8-9.

⁶⁷ Plot. *Enn.* 1.2; Porph. *Sent.* 34, as quoted by Palma Digeser 2012, 90 n.99.

tyrant, exalts with ‘joy [which]... is immediately pure’).⁶⁸ The emperor should promote the virtues among citizens, which will bear fruit for the state, 33.1.⁶⁹

Conclusion

In the above, we have shown how tetrarchic and Constantinian panegyric, particularly the speeches of 313 and 321, show signs of being influenced by the leading contemporaneous philosophy, Neoplatonism as represented by Plotinus, Porphyry and Iamblichus, and the continuing relevance of Plato’s *Timaeus*. A key question for a Neoplatonic reading of the *Panegyrici Latini* is whether Latin speaking panegyrists did have knowledge of Greek philosophical thought, and whether they were prepared to use the concepts in their oratory. For both of the questions, there are several passages, representations of themes (emperorship, theology, virtue-doctrine) and lexical correspondences that allow us assume that the panegyrists did indeed draw on Neoplatonic concepts. Moreover, contemporary philosophers did not construct a rigorous boundary between philosophy and rhetoric, in contrast to their Classical predecessors, and instead often combined rhetorical treatises and philosophical theory albeit the latter did have the greater prestige. For panegyrists, philosophy is certainly not a goal in itself, but it appears that philosophical concepts, commonly known thanks to the Neoplatonic philosophers, did inform the images as presented in the speeches.

How the orators’ activity was received by a contemporaneous audience remains to be investigated. The first addressees, the emperors, may have reacted differently to speeches of comparable tradition in the course of time, depending on the historical circumstances and religious convictions. Some of Porphyry’s works were later to be censured by Constantine, which reveals later Christian thought about the once leading philosophical current. At the same time, philosophical concepts developed by Neoplatonism were greatly influential on Christian thought, as attested for example by the works of Constantine’s defender Eusebius of Caesarea, as was noted above. Given the parallels in thought and themes above, one might assume that not only the well-educated orators delighted in their production of learned speeches, but that also an audience was present to appreciate the learned pieces of oratory. The emperor and his circle may have belonged to that particular ambiance.

This chapter has identified how a few strands of contemporary philosophy underpins the cosmology and ethics of, principally, two of the *Panegyrici Latini*. It has provided a positive answer to the question whether Gallic panegyric should indeed be read, as later Greek panegyric apparently can, in a Neoplatonic light, but the extent to which Neoplatonism informed the other Latin panegyrics deployed Neoplatonic motifs remains subject to further investigation and evaluation. The circumstances in which the speeches were produced are far from clear, while contemporaneous literature and the literary traditions in which they stood can only be reconstructed on the basis of scattered evidence. This contribution is meant to

⁶⁸ *gaudium, ...statim purum est*. For the opposition of the good emperor with the evil tyrant, which corresponds with the opposition between virtue and vice, see Van Winden 1959, 35 (and Calcidius 270).

⁶⁹ Plotinus Enn. 2.9; DePalma Digeser 2012, 92.

stretch up the limits of the authors' horizons a little further, in order to liberate the collection from relative isolation, and place them anew in their cultural and historical context. That context goes beyond the reading of many of the panegyric tropes and figures as mere allusions to an epic past, dominated by Vergil and Ovid, but by presenting the praise of the emperor as a socially relevant and politically urgent act of societal devotion. Invoking current philosophical thought with deep traditions in the classical world is certainly helpful for the orator to push his own ideas and hidden agendas forward.

Bibliography

- Adamson, P. (2014) 'Freedom, providence and fate', in P. Remes and S. Slaveva-Griffin (eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Neoplatonism*. Oxford. 437-52.
- Armstrong, J.M. (2003) 'After the Ascent: Plato on Becoming like God', *Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy* 26: 171-83.
- Athanassiadi, P. and M. Frede (eds.) (1999) *Pagan monotheism in late Antiquity*. Oxford.
- Becker, M. (ed.) (2016) *Porphyrius, Contra Christianos. Neue Sammlung der Fragmente, Testimonien und dubia mit Einleitung, Übersetzung und Anmerkungen*. Berlin.
- Boeft, J. den (1977) *Calcidius on Demons, Commentarius ch. 127-136*. Leiden.
- Brisson, L. & J.-F. Pradeau (2006) 'Plotinus', in M.L. Gill & P. Pellegrin (eds.) *Blackwell Companion to Ancient Philosophy*. Oxford. 577-96.
- Burnyeat, M. & M. Frede (2015) *The Pseudo-Platonic Seventh Letter*. Oxford.
- Cline, R. 2011 *Ancient Angels. Conceptualizing Angeloi in the Roman Empire*. Leiden.
- Chase, M. (2018) 'Porphyry', in H. Tarrant, D.A. Layne, D. Baltzly & F. Renaud (eds.) *Brill's Companion to the Reception of Plato in Antiquity*. Leiden. 336-50.
- Chiaradonna, R. (2013) 'Platonist approaches to Aristotle: from Antiochus of Ascalon to Eudorus of Alexandria (and beyond)', in M. Schofield (ed.), *Aristotle, Plato and Pythagoreanism in the First Century BC. New Directions for Philosophy*, Cambridge. 28-53.
- Collette-Dučić (2017) 'Plotinus on founding freedom in Ennead VI.8[39]', in P. Remes and S. Slaveva-Griffin (eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Neoplatonism*. Oxford. 421-36.
- Curta, F. (1995) 'Atticism, Homer, Neoplatonism, and Fürstenspiegel: Julian's Second Panegyric on Constantius', *GRBS* 36: 177-211.
- DePalma Digeser, E. (2000) *The Making of a Christian Empire. Lactantius and Rome*. Ithaca, NY.
- DePalma Digeser, E. (2012) *A Threat to Public Piety. Christians, Platonists, and the Great Persecution*. Ithaca, NY.
- Dillon, J. (1977) *The Middle Platonists*. Ithaca, NY.
- Dillon & Gerson (2004) *Neoplatonic Philosophy*. Indianapolis, IN.
- Dominik, W.J. (2016) 'The Development of Roman Rhetoric', in M. MacDonald (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Rhetorical Studies*. New York, NY. 159-72.
- Edwards, M. (2015) *Religions of the Constantinian Empire*. Oxford.
- Elm, S. (2012) *Sons of Hellenism. Fathers of the Church. Emperor Julian, Gregory of Nazianzus, and the Vision of Rome*. Berkeley, CA.

- Emilsson, E.K. (2017) *Plotinus*. London.
- Farina, R. (1966) *L'impero e l'imperatore cristiano in Eusebio di Cesarea: La prima teologia politica del cristianesimo*. Zürich.
- Finamore, J.F. & J.M. Dillon (ed.) (2002) *Iamblichus, De Anima. Text, Translation, Commentary*. Leiden.
- Finamore, J. (2018) 'Iamblichus, the Commentary Tradition, and the Soul', in H. Tarrant, D.A. Layne, D. Baltzly and F. Renaud (eds.), *Brill's Companion to the Reception of Plato in Antiquity*. Leiden. 366-80.
- Fleet, B. (1995) *Plotinus Ennead III.6. On the Impassivity of the Bodiless*. Oxford.
- Fowden, G. (1982) 'The pagan holy man in late antique society', *JHS* 102: 33-59.
- Fowler, R. (ed.) 2014 *Plato in the Third Sophistic*. Berlin.
- Fox, M. (2007) 'Rhetoric and Literature at Rome', in W. Dominik and J. Hall (ed.), *A Companion to Roman Rhetoric*. Oxford. 369-81.
- Gerson, L.P. (2018) 'Plotinus and Platonism', in H. Tarrant, D.A. Layne, D. Baltzly and F. Renaud (eds.), *Brill's Companion to the Reception of Plato in Antiquity*. Leiden. 316-35.
- Gildenhard, I. (2013) 'Of Cicero's Plato: fictions, Forms, foundations', in M. Schofield (ed.), *Aristotle, Plato and Pythagoreanism in the First Century BC. New Directions for Philosophy*. Cambridge. 225-75.
- Hatzimichali, M. (2013) 'The texts of Plato and Aristotle in the first century BC', in M. Schofield (ed.), *Aristotle, Plato and Pythagoreanism in the First Century BC: New Directions for Philosophy*. Cambridge. 1-27.
- Hoenig, C. (2018) 'Calcidius', in H. Tarrant, D.A. Layne, D. Baltzly and F. Renaud (eds.) *Brill's Companion to the Reception of Plato in Antiquity*. Leiden. 433-47.
- Heath, M. (2009) 'Platonists and the Teaching of Rhetoric in Late Antiquity', in P. Vassilopoulou and S. Clark (ed.), *Late Antique Epistemology: Other Ways to Truth*. London. 143-59.
- Hunter, R. (2018) *The Measure of Homer. The Ancient Reception of the Iliad and the Odyssey*. Cambridge.
- Kalligas, P. (2014) *The Enneads of Plotinus. A Commentary. Volume I*. Princeton, NJ.
- Karamanolis, G. (2014) 'The Platonism of Eusebius of Caesarea', in R. Fowler (ed.), *Plato in the Third Sophistic*. Berlin. 171-91.
- Kolb, F. (2004) 'Praesens deus. Kaiser und Gott unter der Tetrarchie', in E. Demandt (ed.) *Diokletian und die Tetrarchie. Aspekte einer Zeitenwende*. Berlin. 27-37.
- Lenski, N. (2008) 'Evoking the Pagan Past: *Instinctu divinitatis* and Constantine's Capture of Rome', *Journal of Late Antiquity* 1: 204-257.
- Lévy, C. (2006) 'The New Academy and its Rivals', in M.L. Gill & P. Pellegrin (eds.) *Blackwell Companion to Ancient Philosophy*. Oxford. 448-64.
- Long, A.A. (2003) 'Roman Philosophy', in D. Sedley (ed.), *Cambridge Companion to Greek and Roman Philosophy*. Cambridge. 184-210.
- López Eire, A. (2007) 'Rhetoric and Language', in I. Worthington (ed.), *A Companion to Greek Rhetoric*. Oxford. 336-49.
- MacDonald, M.J. (ed.) (2017) *The Oxford Handbook of Rhetorical Studies*. Oxford.
- Magee, J. (ed., tr.) (2016) *Calcidius. On Plato's Timaeus*. Cambridge MA.

- Meinking, K.A. (2014) 'Sic traditur a Platone: Plato and the philosophers in Lactantius', in R. Fowler (ed.), *Plato in the Third Sophistic*. Berlin. 101-19.
- Murray, O. (2018) 'The Classical Traditions of Panegyric and Advice to Princes', in G. Roskam and S. Schorn (ed.), *Concepts of Ideal Rulership from Antiquity to the Renaissance*. Turnhout. 217-54.
- Nixon, C.E.V. and B. Saylor Rodgers (1994) *In Praise of Later Roman Emperors. The Panegyrici Latini. Introduction, translation and historical commentary, with the Latin text of R.A.B. Mynors*. Berkeley, CA.
- Ogilvy, R.M. (1965) *A Commentary on Livy Books 1-5*. Oxford.
- O'Meara, D.J. (1999) 'Neoplatonist Conceptions of the Philosopher-King', in J.M. Van Ophuijsen (ed.), *Plato and Platonism*, Washington, DC. 278-91.
- O'Meara, D.J. (2005) *Platonopolis: Platonic Political Philosophy in Late Antiquity*. Oxford.
- O'Meara, D.J. (2017) 'Political Theory', in P. Remes and S. Slaveva-Griffin (eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Neoplatonism*. Oxford. 471-83.
- Pepe, C. (2013) *The Genres of Rhetorical Speeches in Greek and Roman Antiquity*. Leiden.
- Pernot, L. (1993) *La rhétorique de l'éloge dans le monde gréco-romain*. Paris.
- Pernot, L. (2017) 'Greek and Latin Rhetorical Culture', in D.S. Richter and W. A. Johnson (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of the Second Sophistic*. Oxford. 205-216.
- Peters, F.E. (1967) *Greek Philosophical Terms: A Historical Lexicon*. New York, NY.
- Platt, V. (2011) *Facing the Gods. Epiphany and Representation in Graeco-Roman Art, Literature and Religion*. Oxford.
- Rees, R.D. (2002) *Layers of Loyalty in Latin Panegyric AD289-307*. Oxford.
- Rees, R.D. (ed.) (2012) *Oxford Readings in Classical Studies. Latin Panegyric*. Oxford.
- Remes, P. (2009) *Neoplatonism*. Stocksfield.
- Remes, P. & S. Slaveva-Griffin (eds.) (2014) *The Routledge Handbook of Neoplatonism*. Oxford.
- Rosillo López, C. (2011) 'Praising Constantine: Towards the Construction of an Autocratic Ruler's Image Between the Roman Republic and the Empire', in C. Smith and R. Covino (eds.), *Praise and Blame in Roman Republican Rhetoric*. Swansea. 181-98.
- Russell, D.A. and N.G. Wilson (1981) *Menander Rhetor*. Oxford.
- Saylor Rodgers, B. (2012) 'Divine Insinuation in the *Panegyrici Latini*', in R.D. Rees (ed.), *Latin Panegyric*. Oxford. 289-334.
- Schofield, M. (ed.) (2013) *Aristotle, Plato and Pythagoreanism in the First Century BC. New Directions for Philosophy*. Cambridge.
- Sedley, D. (2013) 'Cicero and the *Timaeus*', in M. Schofield, M. (ed.) *Aristotle, Plato and Pythagoreanism in the First Century BC. New Directions for Philosophy*. Cambridge. 187-205.
- Smith, A. (1974) *Porphyry's Place in the Neoplatonic Tradition*. The Hague.
- Smith, A. (2016) *Plotinus, Ennead I.6: On Beauty. Translation with an Introduction and Commentary*. Las Vegas, NV.
- Smith, G. (2012) 'Physics and Metaphysics', in S.F. Johnson (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Late Antiquity*. London. 513-61.
- Tarrant, H., D.A. Layne, D. Baltzly and F. Renaud (eds.) (2018) *Brill's Companion to the Reception of Plato in Antiquity*. Leiden.

- Torres Guerra, J.B. (2013[2015]) 'The Bilingual Emperor: Eusebius of Caesarea's *Vita Constantini*', *Talanta* 45: 13-24.
- Trapp, M.B. (ed.) (1997) *Maximus of Tyre. The Philosophical Orations*. Oxford.
- Van den Berg, R. (2005) 'Live unnoticed! The invisible Neoplatonic Politician', in A. Smith (ed.), *The Philosopher and Society in Late Antiquity. Essays in Honour of Peter Brown*. Swansea. 101-15.
- Wallis, R.T. (1995²) *Neoplatonism*. Indianapolis.
- Ware, C. (2014) 'The Severitas of Constantine: panegyric virtues in Panegyrici Latini 7(6) and 6(7)', *Journal of Late Antiquity* 7: 86-109.
- Ware, C. (2018) 'Constantine, the Tetrarchy, and the Emperor Augustus', in D. Burgersdijk and A.J. Ross (eds.), *Imagining Emperors in the Later Roman Empire*. Leiden. 113-36.
- Wilberding, J. (2006) *Plotinus' Cosmology. A Study of Ennead II.1 (40). Text, Translation and Commentary*. Oxford.
- Windien, J.C.M. van (1959) *Calcidius on Matter: his Doctrine and Sources: a Chapter in the History of Platonism*. Leiden.
- Woudhuysen, G. (2018) 'Uncovering Constantine's Image', in D. Burgersdijk and A.J. Ross (eds.), *Imagining Emperors in the Later Roman Empire*. Leiden. 158-82.
- Zangenberg, J. (2018) 'Scelerum inventor et malorum machinator. Diocletian and the Tetrarchy in Lactantius, *De mortibus persecutorum*', in D. Burgersdijk and A.J. Ross (eds.), *Imagining Emperors in the Later Roman Empire*. Leiden. 39-62.

ROMAN AND GALLIC IN THE LATIN PANEGRYRICS OF SYMMACHUS AND AUSONIUS

Robert R. Chenault¹

The panegyrics composed by the Roman aristocrat Q. Aurelius Symmachus and the Gallic senator Decimius Magnus Ausonius have largely missed out on the recent surge of scholarly interest in this quintessentially late Roman genre.² Ironically, despite the eminent status and reputation these authors enjoyed in their own time, their orations are much less studied today than those of the often anonymous authors of the *XII Panegyrici Latini*. Because their panegyrics were never part of this collection, they have likewise been excluded from the notable scholarly efforts devoted to these texts, including the critical editions by Galletier and Mynors, the translation and commentary by Nixon and Saylor Rodgers, and the ongoing collaborative research project directed by Gibson and Rees.³ Additional factors have also conspired against these texts. Ausonius' speech of thanks (*gratiarum actio*) suffers from being a prose work by an author regarded primarily as a poet. Symmachus' three panegyrics, however, have surely received the roughest treatment: their transmission as one of the erased lower scripts in a palimpsest that was rewritten in the seventh century was entirely fortuitous, and their fragmentary state makes them less attractive to translators and literary critics alike.⁴

Nevertheless, Symmachus' panegyrics, addressed to Valentinian I and Gratian, and Ausonius' speech of thanks to Gratian, deserve to be studied both together and alongside the other Latin panegyrics of the fourth century, not just as part of single-author editions and commentaries, especially since Symmachus and Ausonius likely knew the speeches in the *XII Panegyrici Latini*.⁵ Chronologically, the three panegyrics of Symmachus, given in 369-70, and Ausonius' oration in 379, slot neatly into place between the speeches of Mamertinus in 362 and Pacatus Drepanius in 389.⁶ Moreover, these four speeches also share with the other

¹ Special thanks to Alan Ross for the initial invitation to contribute to his session on fourth-century panegyric at the Celtic Conference in Classics in June 2016 and to both Alan Ross and Adrastus Omissi for their many useful comments and exemplary editorial efficiency.

² The standard editions and translations of Symmachus' orations are Seeck 1883; Pabst 1989; Callu 2009. See also the useful English translation of the first two orations by Hall 1977 and the Italian translation and commentary on *Or.* 1 by Del Chicca 1984. In addition, B. Saylor Rodgers has posted online translations with notes of Symmachus' *Or.* 1-7 at <https://www.uvm.edu/~bsaylor/>. For Ausonius, see the commentary and critical edition by Green 1991; 1999.

³ Galletier 1949-55; Mynors 1964; Nixon and Saylor Rodgers 1994. Research project: <https://www.st-andrews.ac.uk/classics/panegyric/>.

⁴ On this palimpsest, which derives from the Bobbio codex that also included extensive remains of Fronto's letters, see Seeck 1883, v-x; Hall 1977, xxxix-xlv; Sogno 2006, 1-2; Callu 2009, xx-xxxii.

⁵ For a welcome recent treatment of all surviving fourth-century Latin prose panegyrics together, see Rees 2017, with this important finding at 342-3.

⁶ The dates of Symmachus' three panegyrics are not universally agreed, except that *Or.* 2 must date to 1 January 370. I follow the traditional dating of *Or.* 1 to February 369, first established by Seeck 1883, xlvi-xlvii, ccx-ccxi. For the more recent view that *Or.* 1 was delivered in February 368, see

Latin panegyrics the same geographical connection with Gaul: all four were given in Trier, and both orators were trained by masters of the Bordeaux school of rhetoric. Finally, it is also productive to consider these four speeches as a group.⁷ Not only were the two authors epistolary friends, but Ausonius was likely in the audience when Symmachus delivered his panegyrics.⁸ Because these speeches were all given in the same location only a few years apart and have one honorand in common (Gratian), many variables can be held constant, allowing for subtle differences to be seen more clearly.

In at least one important respect, however, the panegyrics of Symmachus are unlike the other Latin panegyrics of the fourth century, for these are the only extant panegyrics by a senator from Rome; the others were all written by Gallic orators. Moreover, the fourth century was a unique period in Roman history, the only time when the city of Rome was not the political centre of the Roman state, a circumstance exemplified by the near-total absence of emperors from Rome. In particular, between Constantine's final visit to Rome in 326 and Theodosius's visit in 389, there is only one securely attested instance of an imperial visit to Rome, that of Constantius II, who spent one month there in 357.⁹ The prolonged absence of emperors from Rome explains why Symmachus had to travel all the way to the snows of northern Gaul (a journey of at least three weeks under the most favourable conditions) in order to deliver his speeches in Trier before an emperor who had probably never been to Rome even once. How did a senator from Rome talk about this unprecedented situation in which the Roman Empire appeared to have been turned inside-out, with the centre now the periphery and the periphery now the centre?¹⁰

The goal of this chapter is to identify elements within Symmachus' panegyrics that expressed an identifiable 'Rome perspective' and thereby assess the degree to which they were distinct from the panegyrics composed by the Gallic orators. Arising as it does from the historical context of the fourth-century empire, this question runs counter to the prevailing thrust of the few literary studies devoted to Symmachus' panegyrics, which have tended to focus instead on the degree to which they conformed to the conventions of the genre.¹¹ Although his panegyrics rarely if ever mentioned Rome directly (at least in their extant portions), they did contain subtle touches that lent a Roman inflection to the standard themes of imperial panegyric.¹² These can be discussed under two headings. First, certain passages drew attention to the Republican past, a set of traditions which by definition pre-dated both emperors and provincial senators. Second, Symmachus used particular features of the Roman

Chastagnol 1987; Lizzi Testa 2004, 430-31, 447-54; Callu 2009, 48 n. 9, 51 n. 1; Rees 2017, 314. Concerning *Or.* 3, see the persuasive argument of Del Chicca 1987, who dates this speech to 3 January 370.

⁷ For one such discussion, see Pabst 1989, 243-56.

⁸ Shanzer 1998, 290.

⁹ Barnes 1975 argues for visits by Constans in 340 and Gratian in 376, but he prints the first as questionable in 1993, 225 and retracts the second in 1999.

¹⁰ For the fourth-century Roman Empire as 'inside out', see Van Dam 2010, 28-30; Ward-Perkins 2014.

¹¹ E.g. Hall 1977; Del Chicca 1984.

¹² Indeed, the word 'Rome' does not occur anywhere in the extant portions of Symmachus's three panegyrics: Pabst 1989, 245.

cityscape in order to assert, skilfully and carefully, the unique status of his native city as the only true centre of the Empire.

The Republican Past

As a senator of Rome, Symmachus was in a uniquely authoritative position to employ and interpret Republican precedents and examples. These touches, however, were so lightly dabbed around the edges of stock themes that they are best illustrated through comparison with thematically similar passages in Ausonius' speech, in order to elucidate the particular preoccupations of each orator and the ways in which each positioned himself in relation to the emperor he praised.

The Language of Elections

One of the more conspicuous strategies of legitimation found in Symmachus's panegyrics is the use of terminology meant to evoke the aura of a Republican election to describe the selection of Valentinian I as emperor in 364. Faced with the awkward fact that Valentinian's name had not been the first one on people's lips following the sudden death of Jovian, Symmachus portrayed this delay (during which the Empire was without an emperor for nine days) as being the result of a genuine contest in which Valentinian was judged the most deserving candidate.¹³ Symmachus cast Valentinian's accession in terms of a Republican election of a Roman magistrate by sprinkling his account with the technical terms of Republican elections: 'Campaigning ceased, because a worthy man stood out. Who is surprised that support (*suffragia*) did not converge on you at once?'¹⁴ In Republican times, *suffragium* had signified a vote cast by a Roman citizen in the electoral assembly; by the late imperial period, it usually meant the 'support of an influential person'.¹⁵ Thus this word both aptly described the council of senior officials that selected Valentinian as emperor and simultaneously evoked the hallowed procedures of a Republican election. This seamless blending of 'republican' and 'imperial' would not have struck contemporaries as incongruous, because the consulship in the fourth century was often held by emperors themselves. In the Chronograph of 354, for example, the illustrations of the two consuls for the year depicted the two reigning emperors in their consular robes (Constantius II and Gallus Caesar).¹⁶ The consular robe Gratian presented to Ausonius in 379 even contained a portrait of the deified Constantius II (father of Gratian's wife Constantia) woven into it.¹⁷

¹³ For the other candidates discussed, see Zos. 3.36.1; Amm. 26.1.4-5. On the circumstances of Valentinian's accession, see Potter 2004, 521-22.

¹⁴ *Cessabat ambitus, quia dignus extabat. ecquis miratur non ilico in te conversa suffragia?* Symm. Or. 1.8.

¹⁵ For this fourth-century meaning, see e.g. ILS 2941; on the evolution of the term, see Ste. Croix 1954.

¹⁶ Salzman 1990, Figs. 13-14.

¹⁷ Aus. *Grat. Act.* 11.53.

After his designation by his fellow officers, Valentinian's selection was endorsed and confirmed through acclamation by the soldiers. Symmachus characterized the massed soldiery as an electoral assembly: 'How very worthy of the leadership (*principatu*) of so great an empire (*imperium*) were these elections (*comitia*)! Free men were deciding to whom they would be subject'.¹⁸ Symmachus was seemingly alluding to the *comitia centuriata*, the assembly that elected consuls in the Republic, or perhaps to the even more archaic *comitia curiata*, the assembly whose main function was to pass the annual law conferring *imperium* on magistrates.¹⁹ Interestingly, however, Symmachus did not describe the soldiers' acclamations as *suffragia*, although this, too, was a current meaning of the term in the fourth century. On the contrary, he disparaged popular *suffragium* as a flawed mechanism, characteristic of electors who lacked first-hand knowledge of the man they were endorsing, in contrast to these soldiers, who knew Valentinian by direct experience.²⁰

Instead, Symmachus surprisingly characterized the acclamation of Valentinian by the soldiers in terms that evoked not the massed centuries of the people, but rather the considered deliberations and decisions of the Senate. The soldiers' approval of Valentinian was the product of the 'senate of the camp' (*castrensis senatus*); their acclamation of Gratian was a 'decree of the camp' (*castrensia decreta*).²¹ Paradoxically, then, the selection of Valentinian was the product of a collaboration between an assembly of soldiers imbued with the judgement and respectability of the Senate and a council of high officials who voted for the most worthy candidate — an unexpected inversion of the usual characteristics and actions of the Senate and People. Far from being an indication that the Senate was renouncing its claim to participate in the creation of emperors, this was a sign that the other elements of the state, notably the army, had acted with the dignity and virtue characteristic of the Senate.²² Only elections of this type were 'worthy of the leadership of so great an empire', for they surpassed the unseemly and divisive contests of the old Republic; indeed, they reflected and enacted consensus within the state. Moreover, they foreshadowed the harmonious balance and intermingling that characterized relations between the civilian aristocracy and military high command under Valentinian: 'now the good fortune of camp and curia is equal... Often do we exchange togas for military cloaks, and frequently we clothe warriors in consular robes'.²³

Symmachus returned to the election conceit in his panegyric of Gratian, in which he described the soldiers who acclaimed Gratian as Augustus in 367 as an 'assembly for the purple' (*comitia purpurae*). This time he embroidered the image with a recondite technical

¹⁸ *Digna plane comitia tanti imperii principatu! decernebant liberi cui deberent esse subiecti*, Symm. Or. 1.9. Ammianus (26.2.2) turned Symmachus's image on its head by describing Valentinian's acclamation as the 'semblance of an election' (*comitiorum specie*); for the likelihood that Ammianus knew and responded to Symmachus's panegyrics, see Sabbah 1978, 332-5.

¹⁹ On the organization and procedure of the various Republican assemblies, see Lintott 1999, 40-64.

²⁰ Symm. Or. 1.9.

²¹ Symm. Or. 1.3, 1.9.

²² Pabst 1989, 183-5. For the negative view that Symmachus was commenting on the Senate's loss of power, see Straub 1939, 33-4.

²³ *castrorum curiaeque parem nunc esse fortunam ...togas paludamentis saepe mutamus, armatis trabeas frequenter induimus*. Symm. Or. 1.23.

term, praising Gratian for conferring the ‘consul’s prerogative’ (*praerogativam consulis*) on the assembly.²⁴ In Republican elections, the *praerogativa* was the century chosen by lot to vote first in the centuriate assembly that elected the consuls. Because the vote of the *praerogativa* nearly always foretold the winner, it was regarded as an omen.²⁵ In Gratian’s ‘election’, the auspicious first vote, instead of being limited to one century only, belonged to the assembled soldiers *en masse*, whose enthusiastic acclamation was therefore an even more powerful expression of divine favour. By repurposing the terminology of Republican elections, Symmachus successfully created a new, updated image of elections as expressions of a perfectly unified body politic, a consensus that rendered these emperors’ elevations to imperial power — which had not been free of controversy — completely regular, legitimate, and consistent with Roman tradition.²⁶

Symmachus’ favourable appropriation and revaluation of Republican voting terminology was distinct from the procedure of most other contemporary writers. The historian Ammianus Marcellinus was exceptional in implying a positive estimation of competitive Republican politics: ‘*although* the tribes have long been inactive and the centuries at peace, and there are no contests for votes’, nevertheless the Senate and People of Rome continue to enjoy universal respect throughout the world.²⁷ Other panegyrists, however, dwelled on the virtues of the effortless imperial present and criticized the undignified behaviour once required of Republican candidates. For example, in his speech of thanks to Julian in 362, Claudius Mamertinus gratefully listed all the toils and indignities of campaigning he had been spared: he did not have to learn the names or tribes of voters, shake their hands or smile at them, or feign friendship with strangers or the low-born.²⁸ Instead, his designation as consul emanated from the ‘voting place of [Julian’s] sacred breast’.²⁹

When Ausonius thanked Gratian for his designation as consul in 379, he, too, boasted of the ease of his victory: he was spared the hassle of pressing palms, dispensing bribes, and suffering the indignity of a popular vote. Up to this point, Symmachus might have agreed with this sentiment, but Ausonius proceeded to sweep up even the respectable political classes: ‘The Roman people, the Campus Martius, the equestrian order, the Rostra, the voting pens, the Senate and Curia — Gratian alone was all of these for me’.³⁰ Searching for the right historical analogy, Ausonius specifically rejected both the *comitia tributa* and the *comitia centuriata*; instead, he likened his designation as consul to the process of cooptation used to fill vacancies in the college of pontiffs — a mechanism that excluded any input from the crowd or, implicitly, the Senate: Gratian’s choice was shared only with God.³¹ Both

²⁴ Symm. *Or.* 3.3.

²⁵ Taylor 1966, 91; Nicolet 1980, 260-4.

²⁶ On the crucial role of consensus as ‘binding link’ between Republic and Empire, see Lobur 2008, 29-36.

²⁷ *et olim licet otiosae sint tribus pacataeque centuriae et nulla suffragiorum certamina*, Amm. 14.6.6.

²⁸ *Pan. Lat.* III(11)16.1.

²⁹ *in sacri pectoris comitio*, *Pan. Lat.* III(11)15.2.

³⁰ *Romanus populus, Martius campus, equester ordo, rostra, ouilia, senatus, curia, unus mihi omnia Gratianus*. *Aus. Grat. Act.* 3.13.

³¹ *Aus. Grat. Act.* 9.42.

Mamertinus and Ausonius distanced their appointments from anything that sounded like a Republican process, stressing instead their role as favoured recipients of an imperial benefaction.

In contrast, Symmachus emphasized at least the reputable aspects of Republican procedure, particularly the involvement of the Senate. Indeed, when Symmachus was in Ausonius's position, giving thanks to Gratian for designating his father as consul for 377, he, too, hailed the absence of corrupt popular voting but praised his fellow senators' role in initiating the selection of his father, who 'had the sort of electors that antiquity had for candidates ... our elections are conducted between emperors and Senate; the election is by equals, the ratification by superiors'.³² Ausonius, on the other hand, could imagine dispensing with elections altogether. According to his fawning commentary on the letter Gratian had sent to him announcing his designation, Gratian represented himself as consulting God about the appointment. It was God's blessing, not the participation of the Senate or People, that bestowed a superior legitimacy on his consulate: 'What elections (*comitia*) were ever better-attended than these, for which God has furnished the design and the emperor his compliance?'³³ This distinction in the two orators' treatment of the election conceit can be explained by their different backgrounds. Ausonius was a Gallic senator whose status was owed almost exclusively to his close personal relationship with Gratian; Symmachus, as a senator of Rome, described the honours accorded his family as the product of a consensus and partnership between the emperor and the Senate.³⁴

Principals and Tutors

The same pattern can be seen in their treatment of another shared theme, namely young Gratian's marvellous ability to manage the business of empire while simultaneously receiving a liberal education. In developing this theme, the two speakers invoked quite different examples of pairs of leaders and tutors. While Ausonius named predecessors from the imperial age, Symmachus offered Republican examples; moreover, each orator exploited these pairings to establish a distinctive authorial stance.

Befitting his status as Gratian's tutor, Ausonius cited other pairs of emperors and tutors, which he variously dismissed as unworthy precedents or inferior comparisons.³⁵ His Gallic colleagues, for example, had once taught certain unnamed members of the house of Constantine, but those princes had been mere Caesars, not Augusti.³⁶ Seneca had been the teacher of Nero, but despite his vast wealth he had never been a consul (an error: Seneca had

³² *Tales collega vester suffragatores habuit quales antiquitas candidatos...inter senatum et principes comitia transiguntur: eligunt pares, confirmant superiores*, Symm. Or. 4.7.

³³ *quae comitia pleniora umquam fuerunt quam quibus praestitit deus consilium, imperator obsequium?*Aus. Grat. Act. 9.44.

³⁴ This rhetoric of consensus was also a prominent feature of the inscriptions that accompanied honorific statues of Roman senators: see Chenault 2012, 115-17.

³⁵ Aus. Grat. Act. 7.31-3.

³⁶ Two teachers fit this description: Ausonius' maternal uncle, Aemilius Magnus Arborius, had taught a Caesar: Aus. Prof. 16.9-18, with Booth 1978, 244-8; Exsuperius had taught the sons of Flavius Dalmatius at Narbo: Prof. 17.8-11.

been a suffect in 55 or 56).³⁷ Quintilian and Julius Titianus are dismissed as having merely enjoyed the honorary rank of consul without holding the actual office.³⁸ All these precedents are rejected as inferior; the only one Ausonius accepts as a worthy comparison is that of Fronto and Marcus Aurelius. Ausonius claimed not to vie with Fronto, at least as an orator, but he disparaged him at some length as a suffect consul who had served for only two months, a mere one-sixth of the year; Fronto's consulate, he joked, was the type served under other (i.e. ordinary) consuls.³⁹

Aside from a brief remark on the cruelty of Nero and an almost parenthetical comparison of Gratian and Marcus, it was clearly the first element in these pairs that interested Ausonius. All these tutors were, like Ausonius, from the western, Latin-speaking provinces. The Constantinian tutors, Arborius and Exsuperius, were natives of Aquitaine; Seneca and Quintilian were Spaniards; Titianus taught in Gaul; Fronto hailed from Cirta in Numidia. In short, each of these teachers was a provincial who rose through merit and imperial favour to become an influential advisor and attain consular rank, thus replicating the social background and career trajectory of Ausonius himself.

Symmachus, too, listed famous examples of pairs of leaders and tutors, but his came from the Middle Republic, that golden age of the Roman Senate, not from the imperial period.⁴⁰ Gratian's ability to keep up with his school lessons while on campaign made it possible to believe that Fulvius Nobilior really had been accompanied into battle by the poet Accius, and Scipio Aemilianus by the philosopher Panaetius, not to mention Alexander the Great and his phalanx of philosophers who had conquered the East. By naming senators rather than emperors as his exemplary leaders, Symmachus subtly reminded his audience in Trier that senators at Rome evaluated military success and personal virtue across a much longer span of time and could thereby draw on traditions that did not necessarily include emperors at all.

The contrast in their treatment of this theme reveals the different priorities and aspirations of the two orators. Ausonius was clearly more interested in the tutors than in the emperors they served, some of whom were not even named. Moreover, it was precisely his former role as Gratian's tutor that had provided him with the store of material to make his own speech of praise distinctive and original. Not only did he have first-hand knowledge of Gratian's private character, but he could draw on their past relationship for the assurance to read the emperor's letter of appointment aloud and comment on its style, thereby weaving praise of his own achievement as a teacher into his praise of Gratian.⁴¹ By contrast,

³⁷ On the date of Seneca's suffect consulship, see Griffin 1976, 73 n. 6, and Braund 2015, 21-2, both of whom place it in 56; Camodeca 1986, however, argues for 55.

³⁸ Quintilian was briefly tutor to the two sons of Flavius Clemens, Domitian's cousin: Barnes 1986, 234. Julius Titianus may have been tutor to the son of Maximinus: Syme 1968, 185-6.

³⁹ Fronto's suffect consulship was in 143: see Champlin 1980, 80, and for a discussion of the themes and content of Fronto's lost *gratiarum actio*, pp. 83-6.

⁴⁰ *Symm. Or.* 3.7.

⁴¹ *Aus. Grat. Act.* 10.45-9. For self-praise in Ausonius's speech, see Lolli 2006, esp. 722-6; on his praise of Gratian's private character as a distinguishing feature of his panegyric, see Gibson 2018, 279-87.

Symmachus reserved the fuller descriptions for the senators and relegated their teachers to merely a perfunctory mention. Indeed, one of the tutors' names was incorrect: it was Ennius, not Accius, who had accompanied Fulvius Nobilior, a mistake he corrected when he recycled this material in a letter he wrote to Ausonius in 378 to congratulate his friend on his designation for the consulship.⁴² Formally, Ausonius and Symmachus were both lauding an emperor named Gratian, but in so doing they were also thinking about their own relationships with the emperor and their own place in the great sweep of Roman history.

The Uniqueness of Rome

Apart from his seemingly greater reverence for the senatorial and Republican past, Symmachus also took advantage of his opportunity to remind the emperor and his court of the unique status of Rome. While these were hardly the dominant notes of his panegyrics, they imparted a distinctive flavour to otherwise fairly predictable material. In addressing an emperor who probably had never been to Rome, either as emperor or as a private citizen, Symmachus needed to find ways to bridge not only the geographical but also the cultural distance between Rome and Trier.⁴³ To make his case, Symmachus politely hinted that Rome remained the only true capital of the Empire and the most appropriate venue for the display of imperial victory.

For his part, Ausonius' focus in his speech is resolutely on the personal, everyday qualities of Gratian and his own unique relationship with the emperor; indeed, he disavows any intention of rehearsing the usual themes of imperial panegyric.⁴⁴ Thus he pays relatively little attention to broader imperial dynamics; Rome itself is barely mentioned. In the only passage that names multiple cities, Ausonius contrasts the consular ceremonies taking place in Trier with those of the other big cities of the Empire. While Rome observes these rites as a matter of custom, the other cities do so out of a love of self-indulgence and riotous behaviour. The presence of Gratian lends special dignity to the festivities in Trier, but the point is not that Trier thereby competes with Rome but that it surpasses its rivals in the second tier: Constantinople, Antioch, Carthage, and Alexandria (but not Rome) are each denigrated with a brief insult.⁴⁵ Symmachus and Ausonius, therefore, seem to share a couple of assumptions. They agree on Rome's primacy within the Empire, and when they write about Rome, they do so as a specific city that can be discussed in relation to other cities, rather than as an abstract idea or ideal.

The City of Triumphs

⁴² Symm. *Ep.* 1.20.2, with Callu 2009, 63 n. 1.

⁴³ Pabst 1989, 244.

⁴⁴ Aus. *Grat. Act.* 2.8-9, 13.61-2.

⁴⁵ Aus. *Grat. Act.* 7.34. Although Gratian's absence is implied at 7.34, 'soon [to be] in company with the author of that kindness' (*mox cum ipso auctore beneficii*), his recent arrival in Gaul after a rapid journey from Thrace is rapturously celebrated at 18.80-2. His presence is taken for granted by e.g. Lolli 2006, 707; Gibson 2018, 270.

One obvious way by which Symmachus could make the old capital meaningful to Valentinian, a military man more at home on the frontiers, was, logically enough, the triumph, a ceremony that could only be held properly in Rome. In order to demonstrate how fitting a triumph would be for Valentinian, Symmachus contrasted the emperor's tireless campaigning on the frontier with the dissipation that sullied the achievements of the great men of the past. Again, he began by naming three Republican generals whose victories could not erase memories of their self-indulgence: Scipio Africanus (the Elder) had conquered Carthage, but not before he 'traipsed around Sicily for a long time wearing a philosopher's cloak'.⁴⁶ Lucullus had failed to finish off Mithridates because he was distracted by Pontic luxury. Antony had scored victories over the Persians but he 'melted away' with love for an Egyptian queen. 'These are those triumphal men, continually absorbed in dainty affairs, hunting out pleasant shores and luxurious lands'.⁴⁷ If triumphs had been awarded to such flawed generals as these, he implied, surely Valentinian was even more deserving of Rome's highest honour.

Following this catalogue of Republican examples, Symmachus continued with four more drawn from the imperial age. Augustus had spent immense amounts of treasure reconfiguring the coastline around Baiae. (Misleadingly, Symmachus implied that these massive works were part of a vanity pleasure project, rather than for the war with Sextus Pompey.) Tiberius had withdrawn to island retreats to sail and swim. Antoninus Pius was overly fond of his vacation home on the Italian coast. Marcus Aurelius spent his free time giving philosophy lectures in Athens.⁴⁸ In both sets of examples, Symmachus criticized high-achieving emperors for taking extended vacations outside Rome. Valentinian, of course, surpassed all these great men. Like the Republican generals, he had conquered foreign peoples, but without succumbing to luxury; unlike the emperors, he was not tempted to shirk the burdens of rule by going on holiday.

Symmachus used these examples to articulate a sharp contrast between Gaul, a land of unremitting toil by an emperor who had 'not yet tasted the fruits of imperial rule', and Rome, the one place where he could be properly recognized for his victories.⁴⁹ If Valentinian would only come to Rome, Symmachus implied, he could both equal the Republican heroes with a richly deserved triumph and surpass his imperial predecessors by choosing to take his leisure (*otium*) in the capital, traditionally a place of business (*negotium*), rather than in morally dubious vacation spots. Symmachus did not go further than a veiled suggestion: 'you deny to yourself the repose you provide to others. Amid so many thousands of laurels, not yet do you

⁴⁶ *Sed diu in Sicilia palliates erravit* (*Or.* 1.16).

⁴⁷ *Hi sunt illi triumphales viri, delicatis negotiis frequentibus occupati, amoena litorum terrarumque opima sectantes*, *Symm. Or.* 1.16. For Scipio's Greek tastes, see *Liv.* 29.19.11; the luxury of Lucullus and Antony's uxorious devotion to Cleopatra were proverbial. Additional references to the ancient sources that mention their flaws are collected by Hall 1977, 69-70.

⁴⁸ For discussion of these imperial examples, see Hall 1977, 71-2; Callu 2009, 47-8.

⁴⁹ *Symm. Or.* 1.15, *nondum degustatis imperii bonis*.

depart for a triumph'.⁵⁰ Symmachus was gently reminding Valentinian that because he had been detained so long in Gaul, he had not yet visited Rome and was now marking the end of his fifth year in power in the frozen north.⁵¹

The fact that a senator of Rome would have to travel to northern Gaul to urge an emperor to come to Rome reflects the changed political geography of the Roman Empire in the fourth century. Rome, the traditional centre, now found itself on the very margins of the political world, while Trier, formerly a peripheral city, was effectively the seat of Roman power in the northwest provinces for much of the fourth century. In the early Empire, the Senate had occasionally sent an official embassy to an emperor who tarried too long in the provinces to implore him to hasten his return to Rome. Such requests had been mere exercises to demonstrate the Senate's loyalty and affection for its *princeps*, rather than expressions of genuine worry that the emperor simply might not return.⁵² In the fourth century, however, when emperors scarcely ever came to Rome, such a suggestion took on greater significance. Symmachus here was attempting to put Rome on Valentinian's map. Seen from the perspective of the northwest provinces, Rome was an afterthought. An emperor like Valentinian seemed to be operating with a mental map of the Roman Empire that resembled the one painted on the wall of the new school at Autun in the late 290s. In describing this map, a Gallic panegyrist mentioned the many frontier zones of the Empire where emperors were scoring military victories but omitted to mention Rome itself; evidently, since no emperor lived there, nothing worth mentioning was happening there.⁵³

Rivers and Bridges

During the summer of 369, Symmachus certainly and Ausonius probably accompanied Valentinian on his expedition to the Upper Rhine.⁵⁴ This trip proved to be a fruitful source of material for their literary compositions. The homeward journey from Bingen to Trier may have inspired the opening lines of Ausonius's poem *Moselle*.⁵⁵ The events of this campaign also became the focus of Symmachus' second panegyric, delivered before Valentinian on 1 January 370 to mark the inauguration of the emperor's third consulate.

Each writer used the Rhine to articulate a sense of place for a different river and city dearer to his heart. For Ausonius, the Rhine is increased not solely by the waters but also by the glories of the Moselle, which flows 'from the walls of the imperial city and has witnessed the joint triumphs of father and son'.⁵⁶ Trier is an imperial city because it is there that

⁵⁰ *quietam tibi negas quam ceteris praestas. inter tot milia laurearum nondum digrederis ad triumphum*, Symm. Or. 1.16. On the senatorial suggestions in Symmachus's panegyrics, see further MacCormack 1975, 175-6.

⁵¹ Symm. Or. 1.15. On the date of this speech, see above n. 6.

⁵² On senatorial embassies in the early Empire, see Millar 1977, 353.

⁵³ *Pan. Lat.* IX(5)20.2-21.3, with Van Dam 2007, 35.

⁵⁴ Shanzer 1998, 287-8.

⁵⁵ Green 1991, 456, however, cautions against assuming that these lines refer to a specific historical event.

⁵⁶ *Aus. Mos.* 420-22, *nec praemia in undis / sola, sed Augustae veniens quod moenibus urbis / spectavit iunctos natique patrisque triumphos*.

emperors live and it is from there that tidings of their victories flow downstream to the Rhine. Neither in his poem nor in his speech of thanks, however, does Ausonius catalogue the sorts of buildings and benefactions with which emperors in the fourth century had made Trier into ‘Belgian Rome’.⁵⁷

In contrast, Symmachus stressed the feats of imperial engineering that had tamed the Rhine and transformed it into a docile subject of Rome. Symmachus witnessed the forts being built along the Rhine, including one laid out by Valentinian’s own ‘fortunate right hand’.⁵⁸ He was equally impressed by the ease with which the emperor constructed a pontoon bridge to span the Rhine in a single day. ‘The Rhine, a river that had never before been navigated casually, carried safe paths on its swollen waters. A line of vessels, lashed together in the manner of a path with earth spread ovetop, dug into the outermost edges of the banks’.⁵⁹

Symmachus returned to the construction of this pontoon bridge on the Rhine in a panegyric addressed to the young emperor Gratian, perhaps delivered two days later on 3 January 370.⁶⁰ After duly praising its impressive engineering, Symmachus used this bridge to remind the emperors that no such bridge could compare to the permanent bridges that spanned the Tiber in Rome — bridges that also functioned as eternal monuments to Valentinian and his family. Although the Rhine and the Tiber could both boast bridges built by Valentinian, Symmachus reminded his audience that the bridges and the rivers were not created equal. In an indignant apostrophe to the Rhine, he warned (Symm. *Or.* 3.9):

En noster bicornis, cave aequalem te arbitrere Tiberino, quod ambo principum monumenta gestatis: ille redimitus est, tu subactus. Non uno merito pons uterque censetur: victus accepit necessarium, victor aeternum; pretiosior honori datus est, vilior servituti.

Look here, now that you and your two horns are ours, be careful not to think yourself the equal of the Tiber, just because you both sport works built by our emperors: he has been crowned, you have been subdued. The two bridges are not assessed at the same level of merit: the conquered river has received a necessary one, the conquering river an eternal one; the more splendid bridge was bestowed as an honour, the cheaper one as a mark of slavery.

The comparison between the bridges was especially appropriate in the context of a speech addressed to Gratian in January 370. Only a few weeks or months earlier, the emperors had sponsored repairs to a bridge in Rome, which was to be renamed for ‘the triumphal prince

⁵⁷ For this epithet, see Vollmer and Rubenbauer 1926, discussing an epitaph found at Trier, most likely from the fourth century: *Belgica Roma mei, non mea, digna fuit* (I owe this reference to R. Van Dam).

⁵⁸ Symm. *Or.* 2.18.

⁵⁹ *Rhenum numquam antehac temere navigatum tumentibus aquis itinera tuta portasse. Semitae in morem nexa navigia constrato desuper solo riparum extima momorderunt*, Symm. *Or.* 2.26.

⁶⁰ For this date, see above n. 6.

Gratian' and 'consecrated to the eternity of the imperial name'.⁶¹ Symmachus' praise of the 'eternal' bridge in Rome thus echoed the official language recorded in its dedicatory inscription and pointedly distinguished it from the temporary pontoon bridge Valentinian had built across the Rhine. Beneath this comparison of the two bridges, Symmachus was articulating the traditional Roman perspective on the proper relationship between Rome and the frontier provinces: Rome was still the agent of conquest, exerting its will on barbarian landscapes and peoples — notwithstanding that it was Valentinian who was the instrument of conquest, and Valentinian's bond with Rome remained unconsummated.

Symmachus also had a personal motive for urging the emperor to come to Rome to see its magnificent bridges, for his own father, Avianus Symmachus, had been closely involved in the rebuilding of another of the Tiber bridges. Work on this bridge had begun during Avianus' urban prefecture (364-65), and several years later, the ex-prefect had been granted the extraordinary honour of presiding at the dedication ceremony, which coincided with the fifth anniversary of Valentinian's ascent to the throne. This bridge, newly renamed for Valentinian, included statues of Augustan Victory, paid for by the Senate and People of Rome but overseen and dedicated by Avianus.⁶² Thus in reminding Valentinian and Gratian about the splendour of their new bridges on the Tiber, Symmachus was both encouraging the emperors to come to Rome and alluding to the prominent role his family had played in the construction, decoration, and dedication of one of these bridges.⁶³

Bridges thus served as a useful metaphor for talking about the relationship between Rome and the frontier regions. Symmachus used the symbolic potential of Valentinian's bridges to reassert the traditional centrality of Rome in the Empire. Finally, it could be said that Symmachus himself functioned as a kind of 'bridge' between Rome and Trier, Senate and emperor. As the official representative of the Senate, Symmachus carried a distinctly Roman message to the court in Trier and hinted that Valentinian should return the favour by visiting Rome. Failing that, Symmachus concluded by promising that he himself would become a messenger from court, spreading the news of Valentinian's deeds along the route he would take back to Italy (Symm. *Or.* 2.31):

*Ego testis fungar officio. Ibo per urbes, ibo per populos iactantior victore
laudato. Dicam Senatui plebique Romanae: 'Fasces in provincias novas mittite,
trans Rhenum iudices praeparate'.*

⁶¹ *ILS* 772, [Gra]tiani triumphalis principis pontem aeternitati Augusti nominis consecratum. The *pons Gratiani* was a reconstruction of the *pons Cestius*, built in the late Republic to join the Tiber island to the right bank; the modern Ponte S. Bartolomeo is built on its foundations: see Degraffi 1999. For the dating of this bridge to 369, see Del Chicca 1987; Pabst 1989, 158 n. 44; Niquet 2001, 140.

⁶² *CIL* 6.31403-4. Avianus' dedication of the *pons Valentiniani* is also attested by *CIL* 6.31402 = *ILS* 769 and *Amm.* 27.3.3. On the identification of this bridge, see Dey 2011, 181-83, 310-14.

⁶³ Avianus evidently carried out not just the dedication, but the actual (re)construction of the bridge: see *Amm.* 27.3.3, <et ambitioso ponte exultat atque firmissimo, quem con>didit ipse, et magna civium laetitia dedicavit, with Den Boeft et al. 2009, 45, who note that Gelenius must have found these missing words in the now lost Hersfeldensis manuscript; Niquet 2001, 143.

I shall perform the function of a witness. I shall go through the cities, I shall go through the peoples, prouder than the victor I have praised. I shall say to the Senate and Plebs of Rome: ‘Dispatch the *fasces* to new provinces; prepare officials for service across the Rhine’.

It was this mission and itinerary that the Gallic orator Pacatus Drepanius promised to perform in reverse in 389; after delivering his panegyric in Rome, he would return to Gaul spreading the good news of Theodosius all along the way.⁶⁴ So long as emperors continued to reside far from Rome, such journeys helped to articulate a relationship between centre and periphery, even when it was no longer entirely clear which was which.

Conclusion

In assessing the degree to which a distinct ‘Rome perspective’ can be glimpsed in Symmachus’ panegyrics in Trier, it is important to remember that the main function of a panegyric was to praise the emperor, and to do so within a genre that was exceedingly standardized, highly ceremonial, and cautiously scripted. Thus it would be a great exaggeration to claim that Symmachus delivered a full-throated defence of *urbs Roma* at Valentinian’s court in Trier. On the contrary, most of what Symmachus said in his panegyrics in Trier — including the narrative of Valentinian’s elevation to imperial power, his promotions of his brother and son, and his activities on the Rhine — could have been said by any orator, including and perhaps especially a Gallic one. For example, Symmachus praised Valentinian for not going east to help his brother Valens suppress the revolt of Procopius, because the emperor considered it more important to safeguard the Gallic frontier.⁶⁵ Similar concerns that Gaul was only truly safe when an emperor was physically present were commonly expressed by the Gallic orators of the Latin panegyrics.⁶⁶ Nor is it surprising that Symmachus might echo the themes of Gallic orators: Symmachus himself had received his training in rhetoric from an orator of the Bordeaux school and would later seek a Gallic teacher for his son.⁶⁷

Therefore, on balance, his subtle ‘Rome perspective’ appears only in a few places around the margins of content that was largely standard and predictable: the prominence of Republican election terms, a proclivity for Republican examples, a gentle nudge to a military emperor to visit Rome and celebrate a triumph, and an open invitation to come see the newly completed bridges in the capital. If these traces seem faint, that is simply an indication of how strong the conventions of the genre were, or perhaps a sign that Symmachus quite sensibly calibrated his message to his audience. Symmachus was capable of expressing a ‘Rome perspective’ more boldly, as he did in his speeches in 376, which were full of praise for Gratian for restoring the proper harmony that ought to prevail between emperor and

⁶⁴ *Pan. Lat.* II(12)47.5.

⁶⁵ *Symm. Or.* 1.17-18.

⁶⁶ E.g. *Pan. Lat.* III(11)4.1; IX(5)4.1; VIII(4)6.1; X(2)5.1.

⁶⁷ In a letter probably addressed to Ausonius, Symmachus described his teacher as *Garumnae alumnus*: *Ep.* 9.88.3, with Roda 1981; *Ep.* 6.34, Gallic teacher for his son.

Senate. Those speeches, however, were delivered on his home turf, surrounded by his peers in the Senate, not before an emperor notorious for his explosive temper. Like any well-trained orator, Symmachus skilfully modulated his ‘Rome perspective’ in accordance with time, place, audience, and occasion — just as he was doubtless trained to do by his Gallic teacher.

Bibliography

Abbreviations used in chapter:

CIL = *Corpus inscriptionum latinarum*. Berlin.

ILS = Dessau, H. (ed.) (1892) *Inscriptiones Latinae Selectae*. Vol. 1. Berlin.

Barnes, T.D. (1975) ‘Constans and Gratian in Rome’, *HSCP* 79: 325-33.

Barnes, T.D. (1986) ‘The Significance of Tacitus’ *Dialogus de Oratoribus*’, *HSCP* 90: 225-44.

Barnes, T.D. (1993) *Athanasius and Constantius: Theology and Politics in the Constantinian Empire*. Cambridge, MA.

Barnes, T.D. (1999) ‘Ambrose and Gratian’, *Antiquité Tardive* 7: 165-74.

Booth, A.D. (1978) ‘Notes on Ausonius’ “Professores”’, *Phoenix* 32, 235-49.

Braund, S. (2015) ‘Seneca *Multiplex: The Phases (and Phrases) of Seneca’s Life and Works*’, in S. Bartsch and A. Schiesaro (eds.), *The Cambridge Companion to Seneca*. New York, NY. 15-28.

Callu, J.-P. (ed. and tr.) (2009) *Symmaque Tome V: Discours—Rapports*. Paris.

Camodeca, G. (1986) ‘I consoli del 55-56 e un nuovo collega di Seneca nel consolato: P. Cornelius Dolabella (TP.75 [= 140] + 135)’, *ZPE* 63: 201-15.

Champlin, E. (1980) *Fronto and Antonine Rome*. Cambridge, MA.

Chastagnol, A. (1987) ‘Les *quinquennalia* de Valentinien 1^{er} et Valens’, in H. Huvelin, M. Christol, and G. Gautier (eds.), *Mélanges de numismatique offerts à P. Bastien à l’occasion de son 75^e anniversaire*, Wetteren. Belgium. 255-66.

Chenault, R.R. (2012) ‘Statues of Senators in the Forum of Trajan and the Roman Forum in Late Antiquity’, *JRS* 102: 103-32.

Degrassi, D. (1999) ‘Pons Cestius’, in E.M. Steinby (ed.), *Lexicon Topographicum Urbis Romae*, Vol. 4. Rome. 108-9.

Del Chicca, F. (tr.) (1984) *Q. Aurelii Symmachi V.C. Laudatio in Valentinianum seniore Augustum prior*. Rome.

Del Chicca, F. (1987) ‘Per la datazione dell’*Oratio* 3 di Simmaco’, *Athenaeum* (n.s.) 65: 534-41.

Den Boeft, J., J.W. Drijvers, D. Den Hengst, and H.C. Teitler (2009) *Philological and Historical Commentary on Ammianus Marcellinus XXVII*. Leiden.

Dey, H.W. (2011) *The Aurelian Wall and the Refashioning of Imperial Rome, A.D. 271-855*. Cambridge.

Galletier, É. (ed. and tr.) (1949-55) *Panegyriques latins: texte établi et traduit par Édouard Galletier*. Paris.

- Gibson, B. (2018) 'Gratitude to Gratian: Ausonius' Thanksgiving for His Consulship', in D. Burgersdijk and A.J. Ross (eds.), *Imagining Emperors in the Later Roman Empire*. Leiden. 270-88.
- Green, R.P.H. (ed.) (1991) *The Works of Ausonius: Edited with Introduction and Commentary*. Oxford.
- Green, R.P.H. (ed.) (1999) *Decimi Magni Ausonii Opera*. Oxford.
- Griffin, M.T. (1976) *Seneca: A Philosopher in Politics*. Oxford.
- Hall, R.G. (tr.) (1977) *Two Panegyrics in Honor of Valentinian I by Q. Aurelius Symmachus: A Translation and Commentary* (diss. Univ. of North Carolina-Chapel Hill).
- Lintott, A. (1999) *The Constitution of the Roman Republic*. Oxford.
- Lizzi Testa, R. (2004) *Senatori, Popolo, Papi: Il governo di Roma al tempo dei Valentiniani*. Bari.
- Lobur, J.A. (2008) *Consensus, Concordia, and the Formation of Roman Imperial Ideology*. New York, NY.
- Lolli, M. (2006) 'Ausonius: die "Gratiarum actio ad Gratianum imperatorem" und "De maiestatis laudibus". Lobrede auf den Herrscher oder auf den Lehrer?', *Latomus* 65: 707-26.
- MacCormack, S.G. (1975) 'Latin Prose Panegyrics', in T.A. Dorey (ed.), *Empire and Aftermath: Silver Latin II*. London. 143-205.
- Millar, F. (1977) *The Emperor in the Roman World (31 BC-AD 337)*. London.
- Mynors, R.A.B. (ed.) (1964) *XII Panegyrici Latini: Recognovit brevique adnotatione critica instruxit R.A.B. Mynors*. Oxford.
- Nicolet, C. (tr. P.S. Falla) (1980) *The World of the Citizen in Republican Rome*. Berkeley, CA.
- Niquet, H. (2001) 'Die valentinianische Dynastie und Rom: das Selbstverständnis der Kaiser und ihre Haltung zur Senatsaristokratie im Licht von Bau- und Ehreninschriften', in G. Alföldy and S. Panciera (eds.), *Inschriftliche Denkmäler als Medien der Selbstdarstellung in der römischen Welt*. Stuttgart. 125-47.
- Nixon, C.E.V. and B. Saylor Rodgers (1994) *In Praise of Later Roman Emperors: The Panegyrici Latini: Introduction, Translation, and Historical Commentary, with the Latin text of R.A.B. Mynors*. Berkeley, CA.
- Pabst, A. (ed. and tr.) (1989) *Quintus Aurelius Symmachus Reden*. Darmstadt.
- Potter, D.S. (2004) *The Roman Empire at Bay: AD 180-395*. New York, NY.
- Rees, R. (2017) 'The Poetics of Latin Prose Praise and the Fourth-Century Curve', in J. Elsner and J. Hernández Lobato (eds.), *The Poetics of Late Latin Literature*. Oxford. 313-44.
- Roda, S. (1981) 'Una nuova lettera di Simmaco ad Ausonio? (a proposito di Symm., *Ep.* IX, 88)', *REA* 83: 273-80.
- Sabbah, G. (1978) *La méthode d'Ammien Marcellin: recherches sur la construction du discours historique dans les Res Gestae*. Paris.
- Salzman, M.R. (1990) *On Roman Time: The Codex-Calendar of 354 and the Rhythms of Urban Life in Late Antiquity*. Berkeley, CA.
- Seeck, O. (ed.) (1883) *Q. Aurelii Symmachi quae supersunt*. Monumenta Germaniae historica. Auctores antiquissimi 6.1. Berlin.

- Shanzer, D.R. (1998) 'The Date and Literary Context of Ausonius' *Mosella*: Ausonius, Symmachus, and the *Mosella*', *Beiträge zur Altertumskunde* 92: 284-305.
- Sogno, C. (2006) *Q. Aurelius Symmachus: A Political Biography*. Ann Arbor, MI.
- Ste. Croix, G.E.M. de. (1954) 'Suffragium: From Vote to Patronage', *British Journal of Sociology* 5: 33-48.
- Straub, J. (1939) *Vom Herrscherideal in der Spätantike*. Stuttgart.
- Syme, R. (1968) *Ammianus and the Historia Augusta*. Oxford.
- Taylor, L.R. (1966) *Roman Voting Assemblies from the Hannibalic War to the Dictatorship of Caesar*. Ann Arbor, MI.
- Van Dam, R. (2007) *The Roman Revolution of Constantine*. Cambridge.
- Van Dam, R. (2010) *Rome and Constantinople: Rewriting Roman History During Late Antiquity*. Waco, TX.
- Vollmer, F. and H. Rubenbauer (1926) 'Ein verschollenes Grabgedicht aus Trier', *Trierer Zeitschrift* 1: 26-30.
- Ward-Perkins, B. (2014) 'A Most Unusual Empire: Rome in the Fourth Century', in C. Rapp and H.A. Drake (eds.), *The City in the Classical and Post-Classical World: Changing Contexts of Power and Identity*. New York, NY. 109-29.

CIVIL WAR AND THE LATE ROMAN PANEGYRICAL CORPUS

Adrastos Omissi

It is a fact rarely remarked upon that the late Roman panegyric corpus displays a recurrent and sustained interest in the subjects of usurpation and civil war. Never, in English, has the apparent fixation of late Roman orators upon their emperors' domestic enemies been made the subject of sustained enquiry, nor has much attempt been made to understand the basis for this obsession or the profit that it can be made to yield for modern historians.¹ This may be, in part, because the topic of civil war in the late Empire has itself not proved a particularly congenial one to historical research.² The problem, ultimately, is historiographical. When an emperor fell from power, his name was erased from inscriptions, his statues were mutilated, and his legal enactments cancelled.³ Those close to him — those who escaped the executioner — would take action to distance themselves from the taint of his association, for to have allied oneself to a usurper was a dangerous thing.⁴ For those who wrote history, to extend their narrative into the reign of the emperor under whom they wrote was thus too dangerous a thing to do, for history's forensic gaze had no place in the life of a living emperor.⁵ Thus, our sources for moments of political conflict are clouded by intentional forgetting and by the *ex post facto* rationalisation of later realities. Winners become heroes, losers become villains.

Ironically, this problem finds its best exposition in the pages not of a modern historian, but in those of fourth century author of a biography of the second century usurping emperor Pescennius Niger (193-4) (*HA Pesc. Nig.* 1.1-2):

¹ This statement was true at time of initial writing, though now see Omissi 2018. In general, disinterest in this theme is detectable in much of the translated material relating to the panegyric corpus. Nixon and Saylor Rodgers 1994, have much to say on the emperor's interaction with his barbarian enemies, but far less on civil war. Heather and Moncur 2001, in their translation of some of Themistius' panegyrics, chose not to translate either Them., *Or.* 2 and 4, both of which contain interesting material relating to the war between Constantius and Magnentius, or the fascinating *Or.* 7, which describes the revolt of Procopius in 365. Symmachus' *Or.* 1 (which is likewise concerned with the rebellion of Procopius) is only available in English in an unpublished online translation (admittedly, an excellent one) by Barbara Saylor Rodgers. Explicit considerations of the way in which usurpers are dealt with across more than one panegyric can be found Lassandro 1981; Grünwald 2004, 80-86; Szidat 2010, 25-42. Notably, these works all originate outside Anglophone scholarship (though Grünwald has, helpfully, been translated by John Drinkwater). See also Barnes 1996 and Neri 1997.

² Wardman 1984 is perhaps the only dedicated text on the subject in English (though see Elbern 1984 and Szidat 2010 in German). Note also Wienand 2015, and Omissi 2018.

³ Varner 2000 and 2004; Hedrick 2000; and Flower 2006.

⁴ E.g. Sogno 2006, 68-76.

⁵ As witnessed by numerous late Roman historical texts, which explicitly end their narrative with the commencement of a living emperor's reign: Amm. XXXI.16.9; Eutr. X.18; *HA Quad. Tyr.* 15.10; Fest. 30; Jer. *Chron.* praef.

Rarum atque difficile est ut, quos tyrannos aliorum victoria fecerit, bene mittantur in litteras, atque ideo vix omnia de his plene in monumentis atque annalibus habentur. primum enim, quae magna sunt in eorum honorem ab scriptoribus depravantur, deinde alia supprimuntur, postremo non magna diligentia in eorum genere ac vita requiritur, cum satis sit audaciam eorum et bellum, in quo victi fuerint, ac poenam proferre.

It is an unusual thing, and a difficult one, to set fairly in writing the deeds of those made tyrants by the victory of others, and thus few things concerning them are kept in the records and histories. For in the first place, the great deeds that did them honour are perverted by authors; secondly other things are suppressed; lastly no great care is taken in researching their ancestry and life, since it seems enough to mention their effrontery, the battle in which they were conquered, and their punishment.

This complaint is a reasonable one. Pescennius Niger was an imperial legate in Syria, who seized imperial power when he heard of the murder of the Emperor Pertinax. His reign lasted little more than a year, for he was defeated in a series of bloody battles by another usurper, the former governor of Pannonia Superior, Septimius Severus, who, like Niger, had seized power when he heard of Pertinax's death. Severus' victory made him an emperor, and thus populated the historical record with a wealth of source material concerning his life and reign; Niger's defeat made him a usurper, creating a wall of silence around him that, at a remove from events any greater than a single human lifetime, was difficult if not impossible to penetrate.

Septimius and Niger were long dead by the beginning of the period with which this volume is concerned, but the pattern of usurpation and civil war that they played out, and which made itself felt so starkly in the historical record, was one regularly repeated during the fourth century. Of the fifty men who, between 284 and 423, claimed the title of Augustus, thirty five of them — nearly three quarters — died at Roman hands, whether killed in civil war, executed by their conqueror, or assassinated by their subjects.⁶ Three of the late

⁶ Twenty three of these emperors are generally thought of as 'legitimate': *Carinus*, Diocletian, *Maximian*, Constantius I, Galerius, *Severus*, *Maximin Daia*, Constantine I, *Licinius*, *Constantine II*, Constantius II, *Constans*, Julian, Jovian, Valentinian I, Valens, *Gratian*, Valentinian II, Theodosius I, Arcadius, Honorius, Theodosius II, Constantius III (with emperors killed by Romans in italics). We might add to this count that Valentinian II may well have been murdered by his general Arbogast, and if not was driven to suicide by him. The other twenty seven are generally considered illegitimate usurpers, and all died at Roman hands: Sabinus Iulianus (284-85?), Iulianus (286?-97?), Carausius (286-293), Allectus (293-296), L. Domitius Domitianus (297?296?), Aurelius Achilleus (297-298?), Eugenius (303), Maxentius (306-12), L. Domitius Alexander (308-10), Calocaerus (333/4), Magnentius (350-53), Nepotianus (350), Vetrano (350), Silvanus (355), Procopius (365-66), Marcellus (366), Firmus (372?-375?), Magnus Maximus (383-88), Eugenius (392-94), Marcus (406-7), Gratian (407), Constantine III (407-11), Maximus (409-11), Priscus Attalus (409-10, 414-15), Jovinus (411-13), Sebastianus (412-13), and Heraclianus (413). To these, furthermore, we might add a shadowy rank of subordinate Augusti and Caesars, men (and boys) created by this or that emperor as

Empire's four great dynasties — the Tetrarchy of Diocletian, the house of Constantine, and the house of Theodosius — were (or at least can be plausibly argued to have been) established by the usurpation of their founding member, and during forty eight of the 140 years between 284 and 423, there was open civil war between regions of the Empire; that is to say, on average, a little more than one year in three in the late Empire saw Rome's armies engaged in fighting one another.

The processes that the biographer of Pescennius Niger laments are at work nowhere more clearly than in panegyrics, which praise the victors of civil war and blacken the names of their enemies. The message of panegyric was always tuned to the song of the victor, and we possess no panegyric delivered to someone who was later blackened as a tyrant.⁷ Yet it is precisely this feature of the panegyrics that make them the most fertile source possible for the study of civil war in the later Empire. Panegyrics may not allow us to view the reigns of a fallen emperor (like Niger) with the same clarity with which we can view that of his conqueror, nor can they permit us to understand civil war and usurpation from anything other than the victor's perspective. What they do give, however, is two very important insights that are otherwise generally lacking from other sources: firstly, an abundance of detail on the subject of civil war, and, secondly, an enviable contemporaneity to events that they describe, events which always took place within the living memory of speaker, honorand, and audience, and to which, in many instances, the panegyrists were first-hand witnesses. In the remainder of this chapter, we will explore these two facets of the panegyric corpus and how they manifest themselves in relation to the topics of civil war and usurpation.

Panegyric: a genre obsessed with civil war

Given that it was the business of panegyrics to praise emperors, smoothing away or simply ignoring potentially controversial details to be found in their past, and given the stated distaste which many Romans claimed to feel concerning the issue of civil war, one might expect that the emperor's civil wars would be a subject rarely touched upon by panegyrics.⁸ In fact, quite the opposite is true. The corpus of panegyrics delivered between 284 and 423 may be said to contain a total of 62 speeches.⁹ Of these, no fewer than 24, very nearly one third, directly describe usurpations and civil wars, distributed as follows (with panegyrics listed in chronological order of delivery):

pawns to be used in the game of power politics: Valens (316), Martinianus (324), Decentius (351-53), Flavius Victor (384-88), and Constans II (409-11).

⁷ Perhaps the only partial exception to this rule is Maximian, who received *Pan. Lat.* X(2) and XI(3), but whose reputation was later — temporarily — blighted under Constantine.

⁸ Note that though Menander Rhetor advises both the inclusion of *foreign* enemies and the comparison to *hypothetical* tyrants, he gives no advice for dealing with enemy emperors: Russell and Wilson 1981, 87, 91.

⁹ For a full list of these, see the Appendix.

- The British Empire of Carausius and Allectus against the Tetrarchs, 286-96: *Pan. Lat.* X(2) and VIII(4);
- Maximian against Constantine, 310: *Pan. Lat.* VI(7);
- Maxentius against Constantine, 312: *Pan. Lat.* XII(9), IV(10), and Lib., *Or.* 59;
- Constantine against the Tetrarchs and Licinius: Euseb., *Laus Const.* and *Vit Const.*;
- Magnentius and Vetranio against Constantius, 350-53: Jul., *Or.* 1, Them., *Or.* 2, 4, 3; and Jul., *Or.* 2;
- Julian against Constantius, 360-61: *Pan. Lat.* III(11), Lib., *Or.* 13, and 12
- Procopius against Valens, 365-66: Them., *Or.* 7, Symm., *Or.* 1, and Them., *Or.* 8;
- Magnus Maximus against Theodosius, 387-88: *Pan. Lat.* II(12); Claud., *de. III Cons. Hon., de IV Cons. Hon., de VI Cons. Hon.*

These twenty four speeches reach across both the chronological span of the period and across the Empire's two official languages. Of the eight named authors who have left panegyrics to us among their collected works — Eusebius, Himerius, Libanius, Julian, Themistius, Symmachus, Ausonius, and Claudian — six delivered speeches that dealt directly with the theme of civil war, and Ausonius' *gratiarum actio* (as we will see below) touches upon the question of usurpation, if more obliquely. Of the eleven speeches in the *Panegyrici Latini* collection, seven discuss the subject of civil war directly. Between them, these panegyrics thus constitute a record, however circumspect, of a significant minority of the major civil wars that took place in the period 284-423.

This obsession with the narration and recollection of civil war is visible at a macro level, but it is also visible when we tighten our focus to the level of an individual narrative. Panegyrics not only return to the theme of civil war with surprising tenacity, but when they do so, they frequently provide us with a level of detail that make our surviving historical texts look frankly impressionistic. To give a single example: as can be seen, two speeches from the *Panegyrici Latini* (X(2) and VIII(4)) concern themselves with the British Empire of Carausius and Allectus (286-296), which held Britain and (intermittently) parts of northern Gaul against first the Dyarchy and later the Tetrarchy. Any student of the political history of this period, whatever their own particular area of interest, will know that whilst the Tetrarchy stands out in sharp historiographical contrast to the shadowy years of the third century crisis that preceded it, nevertheless we are painfully ill-supplied with concrete historical detail and often flounder on even fairly straightforward points of chronology. Our main historical witnesses to the reign of the two British usurpers are the attenuated and confused summaries to be found in the pages of Aurelius Victor's *de Caesaribus* and Eutropius' *Breviarium*. Together, these two texts devote a total of 308 words of Latin text to their (overlapping and occasionally contradictory) narratives of the British Empire, its origins, the course of its history, and its eventual destruction.¹⁰ By contrast, the two *Panegyrici Latini* devote more than 2,200 words to their accounts of the period, about a sixth of this in *Pan. Lat.* X(2), the remainder in *Pan. Lat.* VIII(4). This is approaching an order of magnitude more.

¹⁰ Aur. Vict. *Caes.* 39.20-21, 39-41; Eutr. 9.21-22.

More words, of course, do not necessarily equate either to more detail or to more valuable detail. Certainly, the narratives given in the panegyrics and in the histories are of a very different character. The former are decidedly opaque in comparison to the latter and, at least on first contact, seem to prove little more than a turgid knot of rhetoric, of polemic, and of flattery. An example of this may be helpful to give a flavour of the problem we encounter when attempting to interpret the panegyrics (*Pan. Lat.* VIII[4]12.2):

Nam et accesserat diuturna sceleris impunitas quae desperatorum hominum inflarat audaciam, ut illam inclementiam maris, quae victoriam vestram fatali quadam necessitate distulerat, pro sui terrore iactarent, nec consilio intermissum esse bellum sed desperatione omissum crederent, adeo ut iam communis poenae timore deposito archipiratam satelles occideret et illud auctoramentum tanti discriminis putaret imperium.

For, in addition, long impunity for the crime had enflamed the audacity of these desperate men, so that they put it about that that inclemency of the sea, which, by some necessity of fate had delayed your victory, was instead fear of them, and they believed that the war had not been interrupted by a deliberate decision, but abandoned in despair, to such a degree that, fear of a common punishment having been set aside, one of the accomplices of the archpirate killed him, thinking imperial power to be recompense for such a crime.

The clauses here heap one upon the other with great rhetorical flavour, but seemingly without much concern to convey information or even meaning. Even at the level of basic narrative, however, this apparent objection does not stand up to close inspection. Though the information that the historians and the panegyrists provide is certainly different (details like Carausius' Menapian origins, or the reasons for his original usurpation, are not to be found within the speeches), nevertheless, we are able to build a far more detailed narrative of the interaction between the two rival Empires and the military campaigns that they waged against one another from the account given in the panegyrics. Victor and Eutropius give us a bald account indeed, and from them we learn only the outline of Carausius' reason for usurping power, that he held power for either six or seven years, that an attempt to defeat him resulted in a peace treaty, that he was murdered by his subordinate, Allectus, and that Allectus was himself overthrown a little later by Constantius. These accounts are rich with chronological inaccuracies, not least that both place Carausius' initial rebellion at the same time as the usurpation of Aurelius Achilleus in Egypt (it actually occurred eleven years earlier) and that Eutropius places Maximian's promotion to Caesar after Carausius' usurpation (it actually occurred two years earlier). By contrast, the panegyrics provide a rich and detailed narrative, albeit one that can only be properly interpreted in coordination with the historians.¹¹ They allow for the production of a considerably more nuanced chronology and a far more detailed understanding of the campaigns that Maximian waged in northern Gaul against Carausius in 288. They allow us to ascertain that a naval expedition against Britain in 289 or 290 was a

¹¹ On the purpose of narrative within the context of panegyric, see Rees 2010, esp. 108-18.

failure, that the peace between Carausius and the Dyarchs that lasted from 289/90-93 was a cold one, and to reconstruct the details of both Constantius' capture of Gesoriacum (Boulogne) in 293 and his two-pronged invasion of Britain in 296.¹²

In fact, this position is far from unusual. *Pan. Lat.* VI(7) is a vital witness to the usurpation of Maximian in 310, an event that historical texts pass over in virtually total silence; *Pan. Lat.* XII(9) and IV(10) together allow the reconstruction of Constantine's invasion of Italy in 312 in a level of detail that would otherwise be wholly impossible; Julian's account, in his *Or.* 1, of the oratorical defeat of the usurper Vetranio in 350 is much the fullest description of this bizarre event; and Pacatus' *Pan. Lat.* II(12) is the most detailed record of Theodosius' campaign against Magnus Maximus in 388 that we possess. Were we reliant only on narrative histories and the shadowy hints that can be gleaned from coinage and from occasional, isolated inscriptions, Carausius and Allectus would be little more than names to us. Whilst the situation may be a little less severe for other usurpers, nevertheless, the point remains that much of the evidence upon which we have to draw for usurpation and for civil war in the later Empire is to be found within the panegyrics.

Panegyrists: primary witnesses

That panegyrics are often our most detailed witnesses to moments of civil war in the later Empire is — though it has not been recognised in modern literature anywhere near as widely as it deserves to be — relatively uncontroversial. In most cases, it is a simple point of fact, and therefore easy to prove. No one would, I hope, argue with my contention (above), that *Pan. Lat.* X(2) and *Pan. Lat.* VIII(4) say *more* about the British Empire than do Aurelius Victor and Eutropius, or that other comparable examples can be adduced. More probable grounds for objection, however, are likely to be found when we begin to assess the *quality* of the historical information that panegyrics have to offer. The orator's job was to praise the emperor, and it was an aim that he would pursue with little regard to accuracy or fairness.

As I have already tried to demonstrate, however, even at the level of constructing firmly positivist narrative, the panegyrics can in fact be used to complement the ostensibly more 'historical' accounts of later writers, who are thus revealed to be painting in distinctly broad brushstrokes. In part, it is the very contemporaneity of the panegyrists that allows them this unique level of detail. The very longest amount of time that separated the composition and delivery of one of our surviving panegyrics from the moments of civil war that it discussed were the eight and half years that separated the delivery of Nazarius' *Pan. Lat.* IV(10) in March 321 and Maxentius' death at the Milvian Bridge in October 312, and the (perhaps) nine years that separated the usurpation of Magnentius in 350 from the putative date of composition of Julian's *Or.* 2 in 359.¹³ More commonly, however, orators spoke within only a few years or even months of the events that they discussed.

¹² Casey 1994, 106-39.

¹³ On the date of these speeches, see (respectively) Nixon and Saylor Rodgers 1994, 338 and Curta 1995, 195-6.

Nor is this all that recommends the panegyrists as witnesses. On occasion, orators conformed to the worst stereotypes of the genre — closeted literati who read much and acted little, men who had little practical experience of the world that they described. But this is a hard charge to level at any of the authors of our surviving speeches, most of whom had direct experience of imperial politics and some of whom were, in fact, direct witnesses of the events that they describe, or had access to such individuals.¹⁴ The orator of *Pan. Lat.* VIII(4), whom we have already had several occasions to mention, is again a convenient example. His own oration makes clear that his relationship to Constantius, the honorand of his speech, went back many years; he had been introduced to the court of the Emperor Maximian through Constantius' patronage in the days before the latter was made emperor and he had, as a result of this, delivered a panegyric to Maximian and had been awarded some high office. Following this, he had gone on campaign with Constantius in the 280s or 290s, and he was still serving with him in 293 when Constantius was promoted to Caesar.¹⁵ Furthermore, at several points in his oration he makes explicit that he had gathered some, at least, of the material for his speech by talking to members of Constantius' army.¹⁶ He was a man well qualified to speak on the British Empire and its demise.

Almost as important, however, as the fact that orators possessed — or had access to — first-hand knowledge of the events that they described is the fact that the speeches were delivered to *audiences* who also possessed such knowledge. Imperial panegyrics were performed before large and diverse audiences, the core of which would usually consist of the emperor himself accompanied by his senior generals and civilian officials. But even outside this senior core, by reason of their very attendance at such an occasion, all members of the audience of a panegyric could be expected to be politically conscious individuals who were engaged with contemporary events either as participants or, at the very least, as interested parties. The awareness of this fact, that an orator's audience would already be well informed on the events the orator described — potentially better informed, indeed, than the orator himself — imposed important limitations on the content of the speech, forcing some unexpectedly candid admissions.

One of the most interesting examples of this is to be found in *Pan. Lat.* VI(7), a speech delivered in the summer of the year 310, perhaps as little as a month after the usurpation of the former Emperor Maximian. Maximian had, in 308, been forced for the second time in his life to resign from an imperial power he clearly considered rightfully his. In 310, whilst Constantine was distracted by campaigning against the Franks from a base at Cologne, Maximian thus donned the imperial regalia, announcing to soldiers gathered at Arles that news had come from the Rhine frontier that Constantine had died. He marched east to the coastal stronghold of Marseilles where Constantine, marching from the north, besieged him. The orator devotes some 20 lines of colourful narrative to the account of Constantine's siege of this well fortified city, asserting with confidence that despite the city's naturally secure position, Constantine's soldiers would easily have been able to take it. Then, however, he checks the impetus of his narrative with a surprising statement (*Pan. Lat.* XII[3].20.1-2):

¹⁴ Omissi (forthcoming).

¹⁵ *Pan. Lat.* VIII(4).1.1-3.1. Galletier 1949-55, I, 71-2; Nixon and Saylor Rodgers 1994, 104-5.

¹⁶ *Pan. Lat.* VIII(4).15.1, 16.3.

Sed o singularem tuam, Constantine, pietatem et sua semper officia etiam inter arma servantem! Signum receptui dedisti et victoriam distulisti, ut omnibus tibi liceret ignoscere, ne quid atrocius faceret miles iratus quam clementiae tuae natura pateretur. In quo licet optimi imperatoris sollicitudine caveris ut inducti in fraudem milites paenitendi tempus acciperent atque ultro veniam precarentur...

But o what singular piety, Constantine, ever guarding you in your duty even on the field of battle! You gave the signal for retreat and you put off your victory so that you might be permitted to pardon all and so that an angry soldier might not act with more violence than your natural clemency would suffer. It must be granted in this that with the solicitude of a most excellent emperor you took care to ensure that soldiers led into delusion would be given time for repentance and might of their own volition beg for pardon...

That the orator had decided to discuss this incident at all is a result of its having been such breaking news at the time of the speech's delivery. The occasion of the speech was the anniversary of the foundation of the city of Trier, but the orator had little indeed to say about the city itself — the pace of political change was too fast for him to devote much time to urban histories. An event as momentous as the usurpation, defeat, and ultimate suicide of Constantine's onetime *auctor imperii* could hardly pass without comment. What is so interesting in this passage, however, is not so much that the orator chose to speak about this at all, but rather the details he chose to include. Behind the palpably absurd notion that Constantine called off his army in order to give his (formerly loyal) soldiers within the city the opportunity to seek pardon, what we can clearly see is that the assault on the city was a failure. After having attempted through force to break Marseilles' defences, Constantine clearly resorted to negotiation with the soldiers within, who must have realised that their options were disastrously limited, and who were thus induced to yield up their rebellious emperor.

No orator could give an account of the siege that openly called into question Constantine's abilities as a general (and, indeed, his own personal *virtus*, his manly courage). Yet it was hardly a glorious tale. Recasting this failure as the working of Constantine's clemency was an oratorical trick par excellence. The very fact that the orator included it at all, however, is a result of the fact that he spoke before an audience who knew very well that Constantine had failed to take Marseilles by force. The panegyrist might be able — with all the audacity that only a panegyrist could manage — to somehow turn this failure to Constantine's credit, but he could not pretend the events had been other than they were. To simply fabricate a narrative, as, for example, did Lactantius, in which there was no failed assault and the gates of the city were simply thrown open to Constantine, was not possible to an orator speaking directly to those who had been involved in the very campaign he described.¹⁷

¹⁷ Lact. *de Mort.* 29.

Details such as these are fascinating opportunities to peak behind the golden screen created by orators' praise of the emperor. Such opportunities are however uncommon, as only rarely did orators find themselves in the difficult position of having to speak on a topic they would rather avoid. In general, the recommended tactic for an orator to employ when confronted with detail that would detract from the emperor's praises or in any way displease him, was simply to ignore it. As with so many panegyric quirks, however, this tendency of composition can also be made to yield valuable historical insights, if handled carefully. During the period in which first Dyarchy and then Tetrarchy vied against the British Empire of Carausius and Allectus, three surviving panegyrics were delivered, *Pan. Lat.* X(2), XI(3), and VIII(4). X(2) was delivered in (probably) in the spring of 289, shortly after the recapture of northern Gaul. Describing the preparations of an enormous naval outfit for the conquest of Britain, the orator looked forward to the invasion of Britain and Carausius' final defeat in the coming campaigning season. Yet, two years later, when another orator addressed Maximian on the occasion of his birthday, no mention of the expedition — indeed of the British Empire — is to be found anywhere within the speech.¹⁸ From this, we can easily infer that the expedition was a total failure. Thus, when we find that a given topic has been omitted from a panegyric, we are then forced to ask why. Silences, in this way, can speak as loudly as words.

In all of the panegyric corpus, one of the most jarring of these 'loud silences' is that of Ausonius' *gratiarum actio*, delivered at Trier towards the end of 379 in thanksgiving to Gratian for having made Ausonius consul for that year. 379 was a significant year. In the preceding year, the Emperor Valens, Gratian's uncle, had been killed in battle against the Goths at Adrianople. That autumn, so our historical sources have it, Gratian recalled from semi-exile Theodosius the Younger, the son of a general who had been executed for treason by Gratian's father just a few years previously. Theodosius, we are told, was given military responsibility for the Balkans, now overrun with unchecked Gothic invaders. His victories in this period were so spectacular that, on 19 January 379, Gratian met him at Sirmium and declared him Augustus of the eastern Empire. This was an extraordinary promotion, handing over to Theodosius not only supreme power, but management of an Empire in a perilously chaotic condition. It implied an unshakeable confidence on Gratian's part in the new appointee; not only in Theodosius' ability to stem the Gothic tide, but also in his loyalty to Gratian's own house.

Viewed from the East, this story can be seen convincingly represented in three panegyrics delivered to Theodosius by the orator Themistius: his *Or.* 14 of 379, *Or.* 15 of 381, and *Or.* 16 of 383. Across these three speeches, Themistius extols the close partnership existing between the two emperors, describing them, in *Or.* 15, as twin helmsmen sailing the ship of state through the storm that had beset it.¹⁹ The support of Gratian, the purple stamp of the senior emperor then reigning, was a vitally important ideological tenet of the Theodosian regime. Theodosius' panegyrist made sure to underscore this connection.

¹⁸ It is possible, though unlikely, that these two speeches were in fact delivered by the same author. For consideration of this, see Rees 2002, 193-204.

¹⁹ Them., *Or.* 15.194d-198b; Heather and Moncur 2001, 218-21, 233, and 255-7 (note that distance was beginning to grow between them in Themistius' presentation by *Or.* 16). For these speeches, see also Stone's chapter in this volume.

Ausonius' panegyric, however, gives us nothing of the sort. Even were it not for the unprecedented situation in the Balkans, it would be normal practice for an orator delivering a panegyric to an emperor who was a member of a college to mention his emperor's colleagues. To pass over other living emperors without mention was almost always a sign of more or less open hostility; thus, in 321, the orator Nazarius utterly ignored Licinius and his son, the infant Caesar Licinius, despite the fact that the occasion for Nazarius' panegyric was the Caesar Licinius' *quinquennalia* (along with that of Crispus and Constantine II, who *were* considered).²⁰ Yet at a moment in which our (pro-Theodosian) historical sources would have us believe Gratian had placed unwavering confidence in Theodosius, one of Gratian's closest confidants could describe the Balkan crisis without so much as passing reference to the new emperor (Aus., *Grat. Act.* 2.7-8):

Ago igitur gratias, optime imperator, ac si quis hunc sermonem meum iisdem verbis tam saepe repetitum inopiae loquentis assignat, experiatur hoc idem prosequi, sed nihil poterit proferre facundius. Aguntur enim gratiae, non propter majestatis ambitum, nec sine argumentis, imperatori fortissimo: testis est uno pacatus anno et Danubii limes et Rheni; liberalissimo: ostentat hoc dives exercitus; indulgentissimo: docet securitas erroris humani; consultissimo: probat hoc tali principe Oriens ordinatus; piissimo: hujus vero laudis locupletissimum testimonium est pater divinis honoribus consecratus, instar filii ad imperium frater ascitus, a contumelia belli patruus vindicatus, ad praefecturae collegium filius cum patre conjunctus, ad consulatum praeceptor electus. Possum ire per omnes appellationes tuas, quas olim virtus dedit, quas proxime fortuna concessit, quas adhuc indulgentia divina meditatur. Vocarem Germanicum deditione gentilium, Alemanicum traductione captorum, vincendo et ignoscendo Sarmaticum.

For I am giving thanks, not in order flatter your majesty, nor without offering proof to a most valiant emperor: witness that the Rhine and Danube both have been pacified in a single year; to a most generous emperor: the wealth of the army shows this; to a most mild emperor: the safety of human error shows this; to a most learned emperor: the organisation of the East by so great a *princeps* shows this; to a most pious emperor: and there is most ample evidence of this tribute — his father [Valentinian I], consecrated with divine honours, his brother [Valentinian II], adopted to Empire as if he were a son, his uncle [Valens], avenged for the affront he suffered in war, a son and father,²¹ joined in a prefecture, his teacher, elected to the consulship. I could run through these titles, which your valour has won for you thus far, which Fortune has so recently granted, and which divine concession is still devising for you: I may call you Germanicus, because of the surrender of that people to you, Alamannicus, because you carried over their captives, Sarmaticus, because you conquered and forgave them.

²⁰ Crispus and Constantine II are routinely described in the speech without reference to Licinius, e.g. *Pan. Lat.* IV(10)3.5-5.8, 36.3-5.

²¹ Ausonius and his son, Thalassius.

Indeed, across the nearly 500 lines of his speech, Theodosius is never so much as hinted at. Though Ausonius predicts that great men will go on to enjoy the consulship, and he eagerly looks forward to Gratian's own future tenure of that office, he has not a word to say for Theodosius, consul designate with Gratian for the following year.²² The speech describes how Gratian selected Ausonius as consul whilst at Sirmium (which city Ausonius explicitly names) without dropping in mention of Theodosius' proclamation there. It even dwells on the fact that Gratian was unable to attend Ausonius' consular inauguration at Trier in January 379 without bothering to mention that it was the proclamation of an emperor in the Balkans that was keeping him away.²³ A potential conclusion to draw from this astoundingly determined effort to ignore Theodosius, therefore, is that it was common knowledge to Gratian's subordinates that, far from spearheading Theodosius' promotion to imperial power, Gratian had merely acquiesced to the usurpation of power by a Balkan commander whose troops declared him emperor in the chaos that followed Adrianople (a conclusion reinforced by Themistius' intriguing phrase concerning Theodosius' accession, that 'nobly [Gratian] made the vote his own, which the moment had made').²⁴

Past and Present: how panegyrics shaped history

By examining the panegyrics as the textual legacy of a primarily oral and theatrical moment, and by considering the methods and motives that shaped their composition, we have seen how their texts can be interpreted and their peculiarities used to better understand this period. Yet perhaps the most valuable insight that they have to contribute to our understanding of the fractured political world of the late Empire is that which is most direct. As has already been stated, it is a remarkable feature of the panegyrics that, across the surviving corpus, the authors of these speeches (and therefore, we can assume, the emperors who received them), evince a keen determination to talk about the delicate subjects of civil war and usurpation. Thus far, we have explored how this manifests itself in terms of narrative and of the selection of material. In the concluding section, we will explore what the panegyrists have to say about usurpers themselves, the terrible bogeymen of late Roman political discourse.

As with the more general focus on civil war, it may initially come as a surprise to discover that rival emperors are described in often lurid detail within the panegyric corpus. For the most part, the demands of the genre necessitated that all persons other than the emperor himself were reduced to indistinct collectives: the emperor's subjects acclaiming him en masse, the supplicant peoples he has conquered. Infrequent exceptions are members of the imperial family, who are occasionally mentioned in passing (and can be *expected* to get at least a sentence or two if they are themselves emperors as well), historical personages, or the occasional foreign king. Usurpers, however, are drawn in stark relief, their vices enumerated, their thoughts and emotions explored, and their characters laid bare.²⁵ This

²² Auson. *Grat. act.* 4.16.

²³ Auson. *Grat. act.* 18.80.

²⁴ Them. *Or.* 14.182c. This argument is more fully developed in Sivan 1996 and Omissi 2018, 255-63.

²⁵ This theme is explored in Roger Rees' chapter within this volume, p. 40-2.

vicious invective may, on first contact, seem like an undifferentiated stream of abuse, a seam of tar running through the golden words of praise directed toward the emperor. Like that golden praise, however, the invective is far from undifferentiated, and a careful consideration of its individual nuances can reveal much about the emperor who received the panegyric and the usurper whom it castigates.

For the purposes of illustration, let us consider the way in which three separate usurpers are handled within the panegyric corpus: the British emperor Carausius (286-93), of whom we have already had cause to speak, the Italian emperor Maxentius (306-12), overthrown by Constantine at the famous Battle of the Milvian Bridge, and the Western emperor Magnentius (350-53), who fought against Constantius II in the bloody battle at Mursa. Carausius was denounced as a pirate (*pirata*), his rebellion constituting an act of banditry (*latrocinium*), in which ships, soldiers, and resources were stolen away from the Roman people and hoarded up in the fastness of Britain.²⁶ Maxentius, however, was cast in the model of a classical tyrant (*tyrannus*), a new Sulla or Nero, who festered within the city of Rome like a disease. He filled the Tiber with murdered citizens and senate, and vaunted the reputation earned from his (apparently) false paternity in the emperor Maximian.²⁷ Magnentius, finally, was both wild barbarian (*βαρβάρος*) and terrible tyrant (*τύραννος*), his presentation self-consciously oscillating between the pretence that Magnentius' usurpation was akin to a foreign invasion and the evocation, again, of models of classical tyranny.²⁸

What it is important, firstly, to recognise here is that, though these presentations drew closely on highly formulaic language and normative moral programmes, they were nevertheless each individually modulated to the specific needs of the emperor whom they celebrated and to the character of the usurper whose downfall they commemorated. Carausius was attacked as a pirate because of the naval element to his usurpation, because he had a background in the imperial fleet, and because it suited Maximian's own presentation as Hercules to represent himself as the suppresser of pirates.²⁹ Maxentius' parentage was attacked and discredited because it was a source of embarrassment to Constantine that Maxentius' father, Maximian, was also Constantine's father-in-law, whilst the suffering of Rome was dwelt upon in order to justify why Constantine had brought such a destructive war into the Empire's heartland.³⁰ Magnentius, despite having murdered Constantius' brother, Constans, was nevertheless characterised as an invader and usurper who had brought war against *Constantius*, as the orators carefully edited away Constantius' hated younger sibling.³¹

It is also exceptionally important to see that these presentations display a commanding uniformity, usurper by usurper. Thus, across five speeches, two authors, and three years, we see Magnentius delegitimised as foreign invader crossed with murderous tyrant; across eight

²⁶ E.g. *Pan. Lat.* X(2)12.1, VIII(4)6.1, 7.3, 12.

²⁷ *Pan. Lat.* XII(9)3.5-7, 4.3-5. IV(10)27.5, 33.7.

²⁸ Jul., *Or.* 1.33c-35d, 42a, 2.56c-57b, 97c-d. Them., *Or.* 3.43a-c, 4.56d-57a.

²⁹ *Pan. Lat.* X(2)13.5.

³⁰ E.g. *Pan. Lat.* XII(9)2.3-4, IV(10)6.4.

³¹ Constans was largely airbrushed from a story of Constantius' glory: e.g. Jul., *Or.* 1.9d-10a, 18c-20a, 2.52b, 94c-d; Them., *Or.* 3.45b, 48c-d.

years and two authors we see Maxentius demonised as a cowardly warmonger whose death was a necessary liberation for the ancient city of Rome that groaned beneath his weight; and across two authors and eight years we see Carausius made into a rebellious bandit, beneath the dignity of imperial power and, above all, non-participant in the divine concord of the Tetrarchy. The significance of this lies in the fact that we know with certainty that the corpus of late Roman panegyrics that survives into the modern world, an initially impressive roster of forty eight speeches, actually constitutes merely a fraction of the thousands (if not tens of thousands) of speeches that must have been delivered to emperors during the period 284-432. Confronted with these apparently uniform and coherent presentations within the speeches that *do* survive, we can posit that the majority that have been lost to us would have approached these same topics in a similar manner.

In this we see the vital role that panegyric played in the later Empire, not only in a general context of communicating imperial power and imperial legitimacy-claims to a wide audience, but here in this specific context as a way of normalising and incorporating the challenge of civil war into the narrative of a given emperor's reign. In the wake of any given civil conflict, a great tide of panegyrics, which laid out the programme of how the fallen regime was to be understood, would break upon the Empire's political class. We have, for example, a single speech (*Pan. Lat.* VIII(4)) that commemorates the downfall of Carausius and Allectus' British Empire; yet we can infer that Constantius, whose invasion overthrew the British Empire, that Maximian, Constantius' senior Augustus, and perhaps even Diocletian and Galerius, the Eastern emperors, all received numerous speeches that commemorated this glorious occasion in which, for a brief period, the entire Roman world was united under the Tetrarchs. This observation, indeed, holds true for the aftermath of any period of civil war, after which a programme of celebrations might last for months or even years. Constantius II, for instance, celebrated an initial triumph over Magnentius in 353 at Arles, but he continued a tour of his newly acquired Western provinces throughout the years that followed, culminating in the great triumphal entry to Rome in 357, which also crowned the year of his *vicennalia* as Augustus.³² Throughout this period, he will have been bombarded by provincial embassies bearing their thanks for his liberation, and will have been received in cities at which he arrived with similar pomp.

This great mass of oratory, which presented a single, coherent message tailored to the needs and the self-presentation of the court and the emperor that it flattered, had tangible effects on the recording of history. For men and women in contact with high politics, panegyric will have supplied one of the primary conduits of information through which they developed their understanding of current affairs. Whether any member of these audiences was ever much taken in by the hyperbole, the outrageous flattery, and patent absurdities that the panegyrics presented is highly doubtful; St Augustine's assessment of his own role as a panegyrist to Valentinian II would certainly lead us to believe that they did not.³³

³² Maraval 2013, 141-9; Humphries 2015, 158-60.

³³ Aug. *Conf.* 6.6: 'How wretched I was... on the day when I was preparing to recite a panegyric to the emperor, in which I would tell many lies and would be viewed with favour by those who knew them to be such' (*quam ergo miser eram... quo cum pararem recitare imperatori laudes, quibus plura mentirer, et mentienti faveretur ab scientibus*).

Nevertheless, this vast mass of officially acceptable narrative — of invective directed against the losers of the late Empire's recurrent civil conflicts — could not fail to have an effect, particularly as what was once living memory began to transition into the realm of history. Panegyrists did what historians could not; they set the events of the contemporary world in writing. These speeches enjoyed a life that, at least sometimes, long outlived the moment of delivery, as the survival of the varied corpus it has been the business of the chapters within this volume to discuss demonstrates. Speeches were shared as models of style and as advertisements for their authors' virtuosity. Ultimately, they became the primary evidence upon which later writer would (or could) draw in order to compose true history.

The Gallic orator, Pacatus spoke frankly on the role of an orator as a communicator within Roman society, providing a conduit of information not only from the imperial centre to its provincial periphery, but between present and future time. Pacatus authored the last (chronologically) of the *Panegyrici Latini*, II(12), which was delivered at Rome to the emperor Theodosius in the late summer of 289, and he has generally been regarded as the compiler of the *Panegyrici Latini* collection. In the concluding section of his speech to an emperor newly triumphant over Magnus Maximus, a man who had held imperial power in the West for fully four years, Pacatus declared (*Pan. Lat.* II(12)47.6):

Quae reversus urbibus Galliarum dispensabo miracula! Quantis stupentium populis, quam multo circumdabor auditore, cum dixerō: 'Romam vidi, Theodosium vidi, et utrumque simul vidi; vidi illum principis patrem, vidi illum principis vindicem, vidi illum principis restitutorem!' Ad me longinquae convenient civitates, a me gestarum ordinem rerum stilus omnis accipiet, a me argumentum poetica, a me fidem sumet historia. Compensabo tibi istam, imperator, iniuriam si, cum de te ipse nil dixerim, quod legendum sit, instruam qui legantur.

What wonders I will share when I have returned to the cities of Gaul! What crowds of astounded people, how great an audience will surround me when I say: 'I have seen Rome, I have seen Theodosius, I have seen both together; I have seen the father of the ruler, the avenger of the ruler, the restorer of the ruler!' Distant cities will flock to me; every pen will receive from me the story of your deeds in order; from me poetry will get its themes; from me history will derive its credibility. Although I may have said nothing about you that is worth reading, I will make good this injury to you, emperor, if I shall give instruction to those who will be read.

For Pacatus, therefore, the delivery of his speech was the start, not the end of a process of communication in which the legacy of Theodosius' bloody civil war would be forged. Though we may suggest that Pacatus' words here ought to be discounted either as flattery to their honorand or as authorial hubris, we cannot deny their prescience. As we have already mentioned, Pacatus' panegyric constitutes unquestionably the most detailed account of the course of the campaign against Maximus, and no modern historian would consider writing on that campaign without employing Pacatus' testimony. More generally, we know that panegyric formed a primary source for historical writing and, time and again, we can point to manipulations, half-truths, and outright lies of panegyric that have made it into historical

accounts of civil wars or of a given usurper's reign, and so have become accepted as historical fact in the modern world.³⁴

It has been the aim of this chapter to show, firstly, that late Roman panegyric displayed a studied fascination with the topics of usurpation and civil war and, secondly, to critique the seeming disinterest towards this fact displayed in modern scholarship by sketching, in outline, some of the way in which we can understand and can utilise this dark seam of invective that runs its way through the panegyric corpus. Across the spread of authors, emperors, and occasions that this corpus presents us with, we see a recurrent twinning of invective and praise that tells us something fundamental not only about late Roman panegyric, but about the way in which Romans conceived of political power at the very highest level within their world. Panegyric helps shape the way that we understand emperors, and we ought to recognise that, in the late Roman world, emperors were very often to be understood through their enemies.

Bibliography

- Barnes, T. D. (1996) 'Oppressor, Persecutor, Usurper: The Meaning of 'tyrannus' in the Fourth Century', in G. Bonamente and M. Mayer (eds.), *Historia Augustae Colloquium Barcinonense (Historiae Augustae). Colloquia, nova series 4*. Bari. 55-65.
- Casey, P. J. (1994) *Carausius and Allectus: The British Usurpers*. London.
- Curta, F. (1995) 'Atticism, Homer, Neoplatonism, and Fürstenspiegel: Julian's Second Panegyric on Constantius', *Greek Roman and Byzantine Studies* 36: 177-211.
- Elbern, S. (1984) *Usurpationen im Spätromischen Reich*. Bonn.
- Galletier, E. (1949-1955) *Panegyriques Latins: texte établi et traduit par Édouard Galletier*. 3 vols. Paris.
- Grünewald, T. (2004) *Bandits in the Roman Empire: Myth and Reality* (tr. J. F. Drinkwater). London.
- Flower, H. (2006) *The Art of the Forgetting: Disgrace & Oblivion in Roman Political Culture*, Chapel Hill.
- Heather, P. J. and D. Moncur, D. (2001) *Politics, Philosophy, and Empire in the Fourth Century: Select Orations of Themistius*. Liverpool.
- Hedrick Jr., C. W. (2000) *History and Silence: Purge and Rehabilitation of Memory in Late Antiquity*. Austin, TX.
- Humphries, M. (2015) 'Emperors, usurpers, and the City of Rome: performing power from Diocletian to Theodosius', in J. Wienand (ed.), *Contested Monarchy: Integrating the Roman Empire in the Fourth Century AD*. Oxford. 151-68.

³⁴ To cite but a single example: The *Epitome* of pseudo-Aurelius Victor and the *Origo Constantini imperatoris* repeat as fact the preposterous claim that the usurping Emperor Maxentius was not, in fact, the son of the Emperor Maximian (Aur. Vic. *Epit.* 40.13; *Origo* iv.12), a claim transparently designed to distance Constantine from Maxentius, and first given voice in the panegyric of 313 (*Pan. Lat.* XII(9)4.3-5).

- Lassandro, D. (1981) 'La demonizzazione del nemico politico nei Panegyrici Latini', *CISA* 7: 237-49.
- Maraval, P. (2013) *Les Fils de Constantin*. Paris.
- Neri, V. (1997) 'Usurpatore come tiranno nel lessico politico della tarda antichità', in F. Paschoud and J. Szidat (eds.), *Usurpationen in der Spätantike; Akten des Kolloquiums 'Staatsstreich und Staatlichkeit,' 6.-10. März 1996*. Stuttgart.71-86.
- Nixon, C.E.V. and B. Saylor Rodgers. (1994) *In Praise of Later Roman Emperors: the Panegyrici Latini*. Berkeley, CA.
- Omissi, A. (2018) *Usurpers and Emperors in the Later Roman Empire: Civil war, panegyric, and the construction of legitimacy*. Oxford.
- Omissi, A. (forthcoming). 'Rhetoric and Power: How imperial panegyric allowed civilian elites to access power in the fourth century', in E. Manders and D. Slootjes (eds.), *Medial (Re)Presentations — Various Messages: Leadership, Ideology, and Crowds in the Roman Empire of the Fourth Century*. Leuven.
- Rees, R. (2002) *Layers of Loyalty in Latin Panegyric, AD 289-307*. Oxford.
- Rees, R. (2010) 'The form and function of narrative in panegyric', in D. H. Berry and A. Erskine, *Form and Function in Roman Oratory*. Cambridge. 105-121.
- Russell, D. A., and N. G. Wilson (eds. and trs.). (1981) *Menander Rhetor*. Oxford.
- Sivan, H. (1996) 'Was Theodosius I a Usurper?', *Klio* 78: 198-211.
- Sogno, C. (2006) *Q. Aurelius Symmachus: A Political Biography*. Ann Arbor, MI.
- Szidat, J. (2010) *Usurpator tanti nominis: Kaiser und Usurpator in der Spätantike, 337-476 n. Chr.* Wiesbaden.
- Varner, E. R. (ed.). (2000) *From Caligula to Constantine: Tyranny & Transformation in Roman Portraiture*. Atlanta, GA.
- Varner, E. R. (2004) *Mutilation and Transformation: Damnatio memoriae and Roman Imperial Portraiture*. Leiden.
- Wardman, A. E. (1984) 'Usurpers and Internal Conflicts in the 4th Century A.D.', *Historia* 33: 220-37.
- Wienand, J., (ed.) (2015) *Contested Monarchy. Integrating the Roman Empire in the Fourth Century AD*. Oxford.

INVITING THE ENEMY IN: ASSIMILATING BARBARIANS IN THEODOSIAN PANEGYRIC

*Robert Stone*¹

Introduction

Following the battle of Adrianople and three years of inconclusive warfare, the Emperor Theodosius made peace with the Goths in 382 and allowed them to settle inside the boundaries of the Roman empire. At the beginning of 383, to celebrate the consulship of Saturninus, Themistius delivered an address on behalf of the Senate of Constantinople to the emperor and his court (*Oration* 16). During his speech, the orator praised the settlement of the Goths within the empire and insisted that they would soon become fully integrated within the empire. This was a significant departure from earlier speeches of Themistius, which had demonised the Goths and claimed that they were incapable of change (*Orations* 14 and 15). The orator now had to convince his audience that barbarians, whose very nature had traditionally been viewed as representing the antithesis to Roman values, were capable of change.² The primary aim of this paper is to understand the techniques by which Themistius deconstructed traditional representations of barbarians in order to perform this *volte-face*. It will therefore track Themistius' changing oratorical techniques with regards to the representation of the Goths across these three speeches against the historical context of Theodosius' attempts first to destroy them before deciding to integrate them.³ A subsidiary issue is how his audience might have reacted to Themistius' change of approach: did Themistius feel the need openly to draw attention to his earlier position in order to explain or excuse his modifications; could he assume the potentially ephemeral nature of panegyrics meant that this did not matter; or did the audience simply accept that panegyrists had to adapt to changing circumstances?

While the main focus of this chapter is Themistius, comparison will also be drawn with another panegyric from later in Theodosius' reign — that of Pacatus in 389, delivered after Theodosius' suppression of the western usurper Magnus Maximus (*Pan. Lat.* II[12]). During this speech, Pacatus had occasion to comment on the Goths and their contribution to the success of Theodosius' army. This provides an additional perspective on the representation of the Goths under Theodosius, and the techniques used by another orator to persuade his audience that their incorporation into the empire had confounded traditional stereotypes.

¹ This chapter would not have been possible without the support and feedback of Alan Ross, Adrastos Omissi, Helen Lovatt, and Doug Lee.

² Traditional views: Dauge 1981, 318.

³ The shift in Themistius' focus between *Oration* 14 and 16 has already been analysed by Heather (1991, 164-6; cf. Heather and Moncur 2001, 255-64) with regard to its portrayal of the relationship between the two emperors, Theodosius and Gratian, and the emphasis on clemency and governance rather than martial ability. However, there has been little in-depth analysis of the presentation of the barbarians and how Themistius manipulates this imagery across multiple orations.

Imperial panegyrics were nominally presented by the orator to the emperor and imperial court in return for favours, which has prompted some scholars to argue that panegyrists were primarily concerned to flatter the emperor or persuade him on points of policy.⁴ However, their audiences were not just the emperor and his supporters but also those elite citizens beyond the court who may have needed to be convinced to support the emperor.⁵ Because of this, and because many of the points advocated in panegyrics accorded with existing imperial policy, Heather has argued persuasively that Themistius provided the emperor with a method of garnering support for his policies amongst a politically important, wealthy and well-educated audience, with his personal wealth and long career indicative of imperial approval for his services.⁶ We also know from Socrates' *Ecclesiastical History* that a speech, such as Themistius' *Oration 5*, which was initially presented in front of the Emperor Jovian in Ancyra, was subsequently repeated before the Senate at Constantinople (Soc. 3.26.3) and could potentially have been disseminated even further in either written form or through senators communicating the central points of the speech back to other influential men in their home towns and private estates.⁷ In the hands of a skilled orator and well respected senator like Themistius, imperial policies and successes could be portrayed in a persuasive manner to those who may have doubted the credentials of a new emperor or those who might not agree with imperial decisions.⁸ The view taken in this chapter is that the flexible attitude towards barbarians across Themistius' orations are, therefore, reflective of changing imperial policies rather than a personal shift in the orator's opinions.

Traditionally, barbarians were used in panegyric as a tool to emphasise an emperor's military virtues.⁹ Late antique orators normally presented barbarians as inhuman savages

⁴ Vanderspoele 1995, 5.

⁵ As Vanderspoele (1995, 71) notes, Themistius enjoyed his greatest successes at the beginning and end of his career under Constantius II and Theodosius, but he was still the *princeps senatus* during the reigns of Jovian (Errington 2000, 874) and Valens (Lenski 2002, 376-7) and was utilised by these emperors to help secure their rule. This was due to his influence over the Senate of Constantinople stemming from his apparent choice of almost 1,700 citizens to become senators during the reign of Constantius II (*Or.* 34.13). Although this number was a clear exaggeration as the expansion was not solely undertaken by Themistius (Penella 2000, 219 n.19), it emphasised the influence he felt he had over those listening to his orations at Constantinople.

⁶ Heather and Moncur 2001, 41.

⁷ In a letter to Themistius, Libanius (*Ep.* 368) reminded the orator that he should remember to send copies of his speeches beyond their initial audience to other influential citizens, an act that would not only help establish Themistius' influence but would also spread positive imperial imagery (Cribiore 2007, 63).

⁸ Lenski (2002, 376-7) argues, for example, that when Symmachus and Themistius (*Orationes* 2 and 10 respectively) delivered speeches at around the same time in separate halves of the empire, it formed part of a pre-meditated effort by Valentinian and Valens to promote their building programmes along the frontiers. Likewise, to begin securing his rule amongst the elite, Jovian turned to the skill and influence of Themistius; Errington 2000, 874.

⁹ Menander Rhetor (II.373.7-8) suggested that orators promote the four cardinal virtues of an emperor within their speeches; courage (the most important), justice, temperance, and wisdom. Accomplishments in battle were the ideal way to display the first.

crushed under the feet of a victorious emperor, symbols of both Roman dominance and the inherent superiority of their civilisation,¹⁰ an image comparable to their presentation in other imperially authorised material.¹¹ In a panegyric to Maximian in the late third century the threat of the ‘wild and untamed nations’ across the Rhine caused ‘extreme fear’ amongst the Roman population of Gaul,¹² a fear that could only be quelled by the military intervention of the emperor, thus emphasising his courage and his importance in protecting the audience. Likewise, in a panegyric to Constantine, the ‘perpetual hatred of that race [the Franks] and their implacable fury’ is highlighted by the orator so that their eventual defeat and incorporation into the empire appeared an even greater achievement for the emperor because he overcame their negative qualities through his own virtues.¹³

This traditional portrayal of non-Romans continued into the reign of Theodosius as exemplified by the orations of Libanius. In his panegyrics to an earlier emperor, Libanius characterised undefeated barbarians as threatening the lives of citizens.¹⁴ This opinion of barbarians does not seem to change after the accession of Theodosius. Five years after the settlement of the Goths, in the spring of 387,¹⁵ the orator highlighted twice an instance of the emperor being angry after the murder of a Goth in Constantinople (*Or.* 19.22; 20.14) which implied to his audience that the emperor was excessively lenient towards barbarians.¹⁶ Libanius’ continued animosity towards the Goths indicated that it was possible for orators to

¹⁰ Quiroga Puertas 2013, 57.

¹¹ One of the most widespread images of imperial victory is found on coinage. Throughout the fourth century, coins were minted portraying the emperor standing alongside a bound barbarian captive (Hill, Kent, and Carson 1960, 42). This emphasised the accepted position of the barbarian, defeated at the hands of the emperor and emphasised the emperor’s *virtus*. Although the image was simple it could be understood by anyone seeing the coin and transported anywhere in the empire.

¹² *feras... indomitasque gentes* (*Pan. Lat.* X[2]7.6); *summus metus* (*Pan. Lat.* X[2]7.4). Translation of Pacatus’ *Panegyric of Theodosius* used in this chapter by Nixon in Nixon and Saylor Rodgers 1994.

¹³ *gentis illius odia perpetua et inexpiabiles iras* (*Pan. Lat.* VI[7]10.2). Translation of the *Panegyric of Constantine* used in this chapter by Nixon in Nixon and Saylor Rodgers 1994. On the surface, this panegyric parallels the situation of Themistius’ *Oration* 16 in which the orator praises the incorporation of a foreign tribe into the empire. As in *Oration* 16, the orator highlights the positive role that foreigners could play within the empire, (*Pan. Lat.* VI[7]6.2.). The difference between the two orations, however, is that the panegyric to Constantine represents a far more traditional situation. After Constantine defeated his enemies, he was able to separate them and integrate them into the empire on his own terms (Heather 1999, 353), compelling them ‘to put aside not only their weapons, but their ferocity as well’ through his military prowess; *non solum arma sed etiam feritatem ponere cogerentur* (*Pan. Lat.* VI[7]5.3). Theodosius did not have this military victory before his settlement with the Goths, thus forcing Themistius to depart from the traditional narrative of imperial virtue.

¹⁴ In July 362, Libanius describes the barbarians who had been sacking Gaul becoming ‘hunters hunted (διώκοντες φεύγοντες)’ through Julian’s victory (*Or.* 13.27, trans. Norman 1969). Imperial victory once again subordinated the enemy allowing them to be put to more productive tasks rebuilding the cities they had sacked (*Or.* 13.30).

¹⁵ Dating of the orations: Norman 1969, lii.

¹⁶ These orations were dedicated to the emperor but not delivered in his presence; Quiroga Puertas 2013[2015], 59. This distance between the orator and the imperial court may have allowed Libanius to present his own view on the treatment of barbarians.

continue to represent barbarians in accordance with the established oratorical traditions as a counterpoint to the changes in imperial policies. By contrast, Themistius deviated from the established presentation of the Goths over the course of Theodosius' reign in order to cast the emperor's decisions in a more positive manner.

Prior to Theodosius' reign, Themistius depicted the Goths exactly as his audience would have anticipated and in a comparable way to Libanius. In a panegyric delivered before both the Senate of Constantinople and the Emperor Valens in 370, Themistius sought to publicise and embellish the peace treaty established with the Goths the previous year.¹⁷ This treaty (*Or.* 10.135b) specified that trade between the Romans and Goths would be restricted to two cities instead of the free trade along the frontier that had previously existed.¹⁸ In order to reinforce the idea that this restriction of trade was wise, Themistius portrayed the Goths as lawless 'brigands who called theft the spoils of war',¹⁹ highlighting the barbarity of these peoples who cannot recognise the criminality of their actions and therefore should not be allowed to interact with the empire. Themistius rejected the idea that these savages could be incorporated into the empire as even Valens 'is unable to change [barbarian] nature',²⁰ emphasising that people who represent the antithesis of civilisation and refuse to submit to the rule of law deserve no place within the empire.²¹ Over the next decade, however, Themistius reversed his stance and argued instead that these same Goths deserved to be celebrated for integrating into Roman society.

This shift was not down to a change in Themistius' personal view of the empire's former enemies but instead reflected the political circumstances at the time of his speeches. The following sections analyse Themistius' three 'Gothic' orations in sequence, charting their changing depictions against their historical contexts. After the death of Valens at the battle of Adrianople in August 378, Theodosius took control of the eastern empire in January 379. *Oration* 14 was likely delivered in spring or summer of that year and was Themistius' first speech to the new emperor.²² It was not delivered immediately upon Theodosius' accession, as was customary,²³ but instead once the emperor was better established and had begun to build up a new army to replace that which was lost at Adrianople the previous year. As the Gothic conflict was still ongoing and to contrast the promise of Theodosius' rule with the incompetence of Valens' campaigns, Themistius focused on Theodosius' military

¹⁷ Heather and Matthews 1991, 14.

¹⁸ Matthews (1989, 329) suggests that this may have led to worse relations between Romans citizens and their Gothic neighbours from 369 until their integration in 382 than those which had existed prior to Valens' peace deal. As such, it would mean that Themistius' audience for *Oration* 16 would have been even less receptive to his arguments that the Goths could be successfully integrated.

¹⁹ λησταί... φώρια τὰ λάφυρα ὀνομάζοντες (*Or.* 10.136c). Translation of *Oration* 10 used in this chapter by Moncur 1991.

²⁰ τὴν φύσιν δὲ αὐτῶν ἀμείβειν οὐχ οἷός τε ὄν (*Or.* 10.135d).

²¹ Themistius directly addresses the differences between citizens and barbarians in this oration by stating that there was a barbarian within every person and, just as the empire stands against the Germans and Goths, their rejection of base desires is what made them citizens (*Or.* 10.131b-c).

²² Dating of the oration: Heather and Moncur 2001, 218.

²³ Themistius was ill during the original embassy from Constantinople to the emperor (*Or.* 14.180c) and travelled later to give this speech.

qualities; he also anticipated a grand victory which would re-establish natural Roman dominance over the barbarians, leading to a traditional depiction of the Goths as savages. By contrast *Oration 15* was delivered in January 381 when this victory was far more uncertain.²⁴ It would still have been possible for Themistius to portray an image of imperial victory over barbarians but recent developments in the war led to Themistius shifting from a military to a civic focus for this speech. Due to Theodosius' defeat in battle the previous summer and Gratian's increasing prominence in the war, Themistius limits his descriptions of the war in order to highlight the areas where Theodosius could win acclaim. The major shift in the representation of the Goths occurs, however, in *Oration 16*. After the peace settlement of October 382, this oration was delivered in honour of the consulship of Saturninus which began on 1 January 383, Theodosius' general who played a role in achieving the peace.²⁵ It offered a far more conciliatory view of the Goths and promoted the idea that, through the intervention of the emperor, barbarians could change their nature and be integrated into the empire to serve faithfully as soldiers and farmers. Themistius wanted to reassure his audience that the new citizens of the empire, settled without having been first defeated in battle, could be productive members of society. The orator therefore sought to deconstruct the image which he and other orators had cultivated up to that point and present barbarians as harmless. Pacatus takes up the same theme in 389 following the defeat of the usurper Maximus the previous year,²⁶ in a speech which highlighted the role played by the Gothic soldiers in defending the empire in direct contrast to those troops who fought against Theodosius.²⁷

Themistius, *Oration 14* (379AD)

In *Oration 14* there was no reference to this potential future role of the Goths. On the contrary, Themistius placed the Goths in their traditional role as the incorrigible barbarians who opposed the Romans in every way.²⁸ The oration admitted Roman weakness and made it clear that the Goths had the upper hand in the conflict at the time of his speech in order to emphasise the threat posed by the Goths and to instil in the audience an understanding of the

²⁴ Dating of the oration: Heather and Moncur (2001, 230) suggest that *Oration 15* was given between the 19th and 25th January during the third year of Theodosius' reign.

²⁵ Although this speech was given in honour of Saturninus, Theodosius and his policies remained the focal point of the speech and Saturninus' achievements are presented as part of the emperor's successes.

²⁶ Dating of the oration: Nixon and Saylor Rodgers (1994, 443) date the oration between 13 June and 1 September 389.

²⁷ Although there are no surviving Gallic panegyrics to Maximus, Rees (2013[2015], 43) argues that there is no credible evidence of resistance to his rule either. As such, Pacatus was eager to toe the imperial line in order to appease Theodosius and would have represented the Goths according to current imperial policy.

²⁸ As we have seen, this was a continuation of Themistius' previous attitude towards barbarians which he put forward in *Oration 10*. He argued that while Romans displayed self-control, barbarians were unable to master their desires (*Or.* 10.131b-c). It was thus the duty of the emperor to defeat these enemies and in doing so, to demonstrate the *virtus* that was expected of that rank; Dauge 1981, 319.

magnitude of the challenge which Theodosius faced. Themistius admitted at the very beginning of the speech that following Adrianople the Romans ‘were once ourselves pursued’,²⁹ reminding his audience of both the situation prior to the reign of Theodosius and the potential threat of their enemies in this war. The orator escalates this threat in the following sentence by equating the roaming barbarians with ‘the conflagration that devours all things’.³⁰ Similar metaphors had been used over the previous century by orators such as Eumenius and Libanius to express the relentless aggression and destruction of barbarians.³¹ Themistius adapted this image of a force of nature destroying the empire by replacing flooding and the ocean with fire but the effect remained the same with all the orators emphasising the scale of the threat by drawing their audiences’ attention to the extensive area that was being destroyed so that their audiences’ fear of their enemy increased.³²

The scale of the threat was also matched by the implacable nature of the enemy loose within the empire. Themistius emphasised to his audience that the Goths displayed the traditional stubbornness and ‘wilfulness’ of the barbarian in order to remind those listening that the barbarians were opposed to the Romans and what it meant to be Roman.³³ These qualities made the Goths unsuitable to serve in an empire where a willingness to submit oneself to the rule of law and the emperor was essential to being a citizen.³⁴ As mentioned above, the metaphor describing the barbarians as a ‘conflagration’ emphasised the threat posed by the Goths. However, it also served to dehumanise the barbarians.³⁵ As a wild fire, they were stripped of all human qualities and were left only with the ability to destroy.³⁶ This placed them in direct contrast to the Romans who would be hearing this speech in the court and Senate. For those citizens, the idea of incorporating these barbarians would have seemed impossible at this point as there was no possibility of redemption or indication that they could change their nature, contrary to their later presentation in *Oration 16*. Their status as irredeemable outsiders was crystallised when they were condemned as ‘guilty’ and ‘damned

²⁹ οἱ τέως καὶ διωκόμενοι (*Or.* 14.181a) Translation of *Oration 14* used in this chapter by Moncur in Heather and Moncur 2001.

³⁰ τὴν νεμομένην τὰ πάντα πυρκαϊάν (*Or.* 14.181b).

³¹ In Eumenius’ eyes the devastation caused by the Frankish soldiers of the usurpers Carausius and Allectus made Gaul appear ‘as if the river flowing about it and the sea washing against it had covered it over’; *quam si eam circumfusa flumina et mare adluens operuisset* (*Pan. Lat.* IX(4)18.3) trans. Saylor Rodgers in Nixon and Saylor Rodgers 1994. For Libanius, ‘a continuous succession of waves’ hitting the beach is comparable to the repeated attacks of the Franks; συνέχειαν ἐγείρηται κυμάτων (*Or.* 59.130).

³² This scale was also enhanced by the epic resonances of the fire metaphor (*Hom. Il.* 2.455-8), a technique Themistius also used later in the panegyric to increase the grandeur of both Theodosius and the Goths.

³³ τὴν ἀνθάδειαν (*Or.* 14.181c).

³⁴ Heather 1999, 346.

³⁵ τὴν... πυρκαϊά (*Or.* 14.181b).

³⁶ This destructive nature is immediately contrasted with the constructive work of the farmers and miners (*Or.* 14.181b) who are engaged in military preparations to defeat this enemy; Goffart 1981, 277.

villains'.³⁷ There was no prospect that their nature could be changed or that they could serve the empire in some way. Instead their destructive role had been set and the villains would be punished for their actions by the man cast in the role of hero, Theodosius.

Oration 14 was designed to present the barbarians as a potentially overwhelming threat to the security of the empire. The responsibility for stopping this menace lay solely with Theodosius, as would be expected in a speech that was presented to him. His main duty in this panegyric was to 'check the impetus of success for the Scythians' and re-establish Roman dominance over their traditional enemies.³⁸ Every reference to the Goths discussed so far was included in order to magnify the threat posed by the barbarians in the minds of the audience. In turn Theodosius appeared even greater in bringing about the victories that would surely follow in due course (*Or.* 14.181d). However, this was not the only role that Theodosius performed in the oration. As well as bringing victory, Theodosius also brought about improvements in those living in the empire. He made 'even farmers a terror to the barbarian',³⁹ raising these ordinary citizens up to the point where they could overcome those who previously posed a great threat to their lands and their lives. This provided an example of the ability of the emperor to bring about a positive change in others,⁴⁰ which was a theme Themistius would later rely heavily on to explain the integration of the Goths but in this instance explained how Theodosius would achieve victory and ensure the safety of the empire.

The final technique used by Themistius to emphasise both the scale of the barbarian threat and the significance of Theodosius' role in defeating it, was to raise the conflict to an epic level. In this instance Themistius introduced a literary comparison, with the introduction of Theodosius to the conflict being compared to the return of Achilles in Book 18 of the *Iliad* (Hom. *Il.* 18.215ff). Just as 'Achilles struck dismay into the barbarians who were victorious up to that moment',⁴¹ so too did Theodosius through his skill and ability to inspire those under his rule to achieve feats of which they would normally be incapable. The comparison reminded the audience of the ability of one man to influence a conflict and reverse the fortune of battle and linked the two men, promising the glory and fame of Achilles to the emperor as both men were destined to rescue their countrymen from being overrun. However, an unintentional by-product of this comparison was to align the Goths with the Trojan barbarians. In both cases, the barbarian side had been able to inflict serious damage on their enemies prior to the intervention of the hero — burning the Greek ships in the case of the Trojans and defeating the Roman army at Adrianople for the Goths.⁴²

³⁷ τοὺς ἀλιτηρίους... τοὺς κάκιστα ἀπολουμένους (*Or.* 14.181c).

³⁸ τὸν δρόμον τῆς εὐπραγίας ἐφέξειν... Σκύθαις (*Or.* 14.181b). Themistius consistently refers to the Goths as Scythians in his orations, using the name for these barbarians that had a classical pedigree dating back to Herodotus (4.1.1) and demonstrated his knowledge of the pre-existing literary tradition.

³⁹ καὶ τοὺς γεωργοὺς φοβεροὺς τοῖς βαρβάροις (*Or.* 14.181b).

⁴⁰ Chauvot 1998, 294.

⁴¹ τάρραχον ἐμβαλεῖν τὸν Ἀχιλλέα... τοῖς βαρβάροις τέως νικῶσιν (*Or.* 14.181c).

⁴² Although here linked with the Goths, the Trojans were also traditionally connected to the Romans through the mythological foundation of Rome, civilised lifestyle within cities and geographical link with some of Themistius' audience. However, any unwitting alignment between Goths and citizens was clearly outweighed by the recognisable epic example in the mind of the orator as he returned to

Oration 14 carried a simple message regarding the enemy loose on Roman soil. In accordance with oratorical traditions, Themistius asserted that barbarians were a threat to Roman society that could only be controlled by the emperor. They could and would be defeated but at this point there was no prospect of them playing any beneficial role in Roman society. This speech would have been exactly what the Senatorial audience and elite throughout the East would have expected to hear upon the accession of a new emperor, a promise to secure the borders and re-establish Roman dominance over those they naturally considered less civilised.⁴³

Themistius, *Oration* 15 (381 AD)

By the beginning of 381 and *Oration* 15, however, circumstances had changed. Theodosius' setbacks in the war, with both the defeat the previous summer and Gratian's overall command of the war, led to a change in Themistius' focus for the oration and his depiction of the barbarians. The focus of this speech is on Valens' mismanagement of the East and the partnership between Gratian and Theodosius,⁴⁴ with the Goths presented in a much less threatening manner. They were still considered to be the antithesis of the citizens of the empire, as indicated by the direct comparison between Romans, barbarians and the values they represent,⁴⁵ but the immediate danger they posed in *Oration* 14 was replaced by new concerns for both orator and emperor.

Despite their reduced role, the Goths were still presented as less than human to the Roman audience. Both emperors were charged with working together to seek out and heal the wounds which the state received from the 'lawless tribe' that remains within the empire's borders,⁴⁶ and to remove 'an infection which still endures, is deep-seated and dies hard'.⁴⁷ Just as in *Oration* 14, the barbarians were dehumanised by a comparison to a purely destructive force. In this case they were likened to a medical condition, stripping them of any potential human qualities and reducing them to a damaging force of nature. Likewise, the Goths were compared to 'wild beasts' seeking to snatch livestock from shepherds and cowherds.⁴⁸ Although they were an omnipresent concern and could have caused some

the comparison at the start of *Oration* 15 (184b), where he compared his praising of Theodosius' virtues to, amongst other pairings, Homer singing about Achilles, and in *Oration* 16 (209b-c), where he compared Theodosius and Saturninus with Achilles and Patroclus.

⁴³ Errington (2000, 893) argues that this oration was an attempt by Themistius and the elite of Constantinople to ingratiate themselves with a new imperial court but this may be overestimating the political strength of Theodosius in 379.

⁴⁴ Heather and Moncur 2001, 232-3.

⁴⁵ Themistius contrasts order with disorder, system with chaos, valour with credulity and discipline with insubordination (*Or.* 15.197b) in order to argue that Roman victory is inevitable.

⁴⁶ ἀθεμίτου φύλου (*Or.* 15.197a) Translation of *Oration* 15 used in this chapter by Moncur in Heather and Moncur 2001.

⁴⁷ τὴν λήμην... ὅση ὑποβέβηκεν ἔτι καὶ ἐγκάθηται δυσθανατώσα (*Or.* 15.198c).

⁴⁸ τὰ θηρία (*Or.* 15.186c).

damage through their hunger-fuelled attacks, they were not presented by Themistius as being as significant a concern as effective management of the herds.⁴⁹

The more limited focus on barbarians was reflected by Themistius' use of Homer in the speech. Once again, the oration ended with the Goths and Romans being presented to the audience as the Trojans and Greeks. The Goths are likened to “the Trojans coming against our cities, they who once were like fleeing harts”,⁵⁰ while Themistius appeals to Theodosius: “Son of Atreus... lead the Argives in doughty battles”.⁵¹ Again, this was a ploy by the orator to raise the conflict to an epic level in the minds of his audience by depicting the emperors as Greek heroes.⁵² At the same time, he used Homer to de-emphasise the military role of the emperor by highlighting Agamemnon's qualities as ‘a good king’,⁵³ thereby increasing the importance of other imperial virtues besides courage (*Or.* 15.187b-188c). These references to Homer added weight to Themistius' change in focus but it would also have encouraged his audience to reflect on the use of Homer to heighten the military scale of the conflict both in this and the previous oration, indicating that the war was a continued concern for the emperor despite the focus on improving his rule.

Theodosius' efforts to become a better ruler did, however, start to bring about some changes for the Goths. An emperor who was less committed to destroying the enemy opened up the possibility of accommodation without the need for defeating the enemy in the field. Themistius certainly put forward this option with his description of Athanaric being welcomed into Constantinople.⁵⁴ Athanaric became a willing suppliant not due to Roman military strength but ‘through faith in you [Theodosius]’.⁵⁵ While this passage celebrated the political coup of the surrender of a figure who had fought against Theodosius' predecessor and indicated that some victories could be won without the need for battles, it can be seen as anticipating the positive presentation of integration that Themistius would follow in *Oration* 16, even if at this point he was not indicating that Athanaric would be of use to Roman society, nor advocating the use of this policy on a wide scale.⁵⁶

⁴⁹ This comparison does associate Roman citizens with cattle but it is not meant in a negative manner, instead it implies the relationship between the emperor and his subjects is one of care and duty.

⁵⁰ Τρῶας ἐφ' ἡμετέρας ἰέναι πόλεις, οἱ τὸ πάρος περ φυζακίνοϊς ἐλάφοισιν ἐφέκεσαν (*Or.* 15.198c-d). Themistius quotes Hom. *Il.* 18.99ff. but substitutes references to the Greek ships for cities to make the quotation resonate more strongly with his audience.

⁵¹ Ἀτρείδη... ἄρχεν Ἀργείοισι κατὰ κρατερὰς ὑσμίνας (*Or.* 15.198d). Hom. *Il.* 2.344ff.

⁵² Themistius also attempted to make the Gothic war appear more impressive by drawing upon examples from other conflicts in history. He compares Theodosius with Lucullus against Tigranes, Pompey against Mithridates and Caesar against the Galatians (i.e. the Gauls) amongst others (*Or.* 15.198a).

⁵³ βασιλεύς... ἀγαθός (Hom. *Il.* 3.179).

⁵⁴ Athanaric was the former leader of the Tervingi and had fought against Valens in the war of 367-9. He entered Constantinople on the 11 January 381 and died a fortnight later.

⁵⁵ τῇ σῇ πίστει (*Or.* 15.190d).

⁵⁶ Heather and Moncur (2001, 235) suggest this passage indicates that Theodosius was already considering the possibility of a compromise with the Goths. However, the Homeric references at the end of this oration indicate that at this point continuing the theme of eventual imperial victory from *Oration* 14 was more pressing for Theodosius and Themistius than considering the idea of

Themistius, *Oration 16* (383 AD)

After the peace settlement of 382, Themistius portrayed the Goths in a very different manner than in his earlier orations. Now the Goths were being settled within the empire, Themistius set about deconstructing the stereotypes that he himself had helped to reinforce over the previous years. Initially, all hint of a Gothic threat was removed, as it would only have served to highlight the folly of inviting an uncontrollable threat to reside within the empire, before the qualities that separated citizens from barbarians were transformed by the emperor. After this, he needed to indicate to his audience how they could benefit from this new integration of their former enemies.

In *Oration 16*, rather than talk of how Theodosius stopped the flood of barbarians, as the orator promised he would do in earlier orations, Themistius instead offered nothing but silence on the potential threat that Theodosius had overcome. Indeed, the only talk of the challenge involved in this conflict was a brief word on how Saturninus ‘needed no time at all to achieve this victory’,⁵⁷ implying that not only had it been easy to reassert Roman dominance over their inferior foes but that the settlement could be treated the same as a military conquest. While we might have expected Themistius to have exaggerated the threat so that the subjects of his panegyric, Theodosius and his general Saturninus, seemed even more impressive in overcoming their foes, he instead removed all trace of the threat to reassure his audience that no problems would result from the integration of these non-Romans into the empire. Reminding the audience of the potential threat posed by those who were now farming the land or being trusted with the defence of the empire might have prompted doubts about the wisdom of the emperor’s decision. Instead, the absence of imagery such as the fire metaphor used in *Oration 14* helped to avoid provoking thoughts of the Gothic threat in the minds of the audience.

As part of Themistius’ efforts to persuade his audience that the settlement of the Goths was a wise decision, he emphasised that those qualities which had previously marked the barbarians out as ‘damned villains’ could be transformed into qualities associated with model citizens.⁵⁸ In *Oration 14*, the emperor had been presented as able to improve the nature of citizens to allow them to overcome their enemies. This theme not only continues here but is developed further as Themistius uses it to introduce the idea of changing the nature of barbarians. In this oration, the emperor ‘subdues all nations, turns all savagery [to]

accommodation. Therefore, the last-minute inclusion of this passage, in the eight days between Athanaric’s arrival and the likely date of the speech, was an attempt to capitalise on the situation rather than an indication of a change in policy.

⁵⁷ οὐκοῦν οὐδὲ ἐδέησεν αὐτῷ χρόνου πρὸς ταύτην τὴν νίκην (*Or.* 16.209a). Translation of *Oration 16* used in this chapter by Moncur in Heather and Moncur 2001. Themistius’ emphasis on Saturninus’ role in ending the war can be attributed to the general’s earlier patronage of the orator (*Or.* 16.200b). However, Theodosius remains the overarching subject of the oration and can claim even more acclamation for his role (*Or.* 16.200c).

⁵⁸ τοὺς κάκιστα ἀπολουμένους (*Or.* 14.181c).

mildness'.⁵⁹ Theodosius could even calm the traditional barbaric aggression of his enemies, a quality that if left uncontrolled would have made them unsuitable to live in the empire. These barbaric qualities — 'the intransigence of the Scythians, the boldness of the Alans, [and] the madness of the Massagetai'⁶⁰ — were all named as qualities that Theodosius could tame without relying on weaponry. In doing so, Theodosius turned his enemies, even the Alans and Massagetai who were outside the borders of the empire, into potential citizens; 'their boldness [is] to be cut short, their spirit humbled' as they submit to the emperor and in turn to Roman law.⁶¹ This universal psychological submission to Roman rule was made physical through the acts of the Goths, as 'they are now turning the metal of their swords and breastplates into hoes and pruning hooks',⁶² transforming the symbols of their warlike instincts and opposition to the empire into peaceful tools that allowed them to contribute to Roman society. Similarly, he claims that their love of war had begun to fade, and already they showed little more than 'distant respect to Ares' and instead they offered 'prayers to Demeter and Dionysius',⁶³ reflecting their new, more agriculturally-orientated role and an implicit rejection of the imagery which the senators had seen in the previous two orations.⁶⁴

Through this transformation and the absence of a barbarian threat, Themistius attempted to reassure his audience that the Goths could play a positive role in the empire. As well as manipulating the reputation of those who used to be Roman enemies, the orator also pointed to the success of the policy over the past year by proclaiming that the 'most hated name of Scythia is now beloved' and celebrated by the general population.⁶⁵ This would have been highly unlikely as many of those in the East would have had fresh memories of the horrors of the previous six years. Nonetheless, by claiming that other citizens of the empire had accepted the Goths, Themistius encouraged those amongst his senatorial audience who may have maintained some reservations about these new Romans to accept imperial policy by deploying an element of peer pressure. To support this argument, he also offered evidence of how well the integration had progressed over the last year. Already, the Goths were showing a willingness to adapt and become Romans by taking part in the traditional customs of their new home. As Themistius noted, 'they join together with us... and partake of the feasts that celebrate the triumph over themselves' as they were now part of the empire rather than barbarians living beyond its boundaries.⁶⁶ This public celebration parallels the beginning of the oration depicting the surrender of the Goths (*Or.* 16.199c). An image of the submissive

⁵⁹ πάντα μὲν ἔθνη χειροῦται πάντα δὲ ἡμέρα καθίστησιν ἐξ ἀγρίων (*Or.* 16.207c).

⁶⁰ καὶ αὐθάδεια Σκυθικὴ καὶ τόλμα Ἀλανῶν καὶ ἀπόνοια Μασσαγετῶν (*Or.* 16.207c).

⁶¹ ἐξεκόπτετο δὲ ἡ τόλμα, συνεστέλλετο δὲ ὁ θυμός (*Or.* 16.209a).

⁶² μεταποιοῦσι τὸν σίδηρον ἐκ τῶν ξιφῶν καὶ τῶν θωράκων εἰς δικέλλας νῦν καὶ δρεπάνας (*Or.* 16.211b).

⁶³ τὸν Ἄρην πόρρωθεν ἀσπαζόμενοι προσεύχονται Δήμητρι καὶ Διονύσῳ (*Or.* 16.211b).

⁶⁴ As Heather and Moncur (2001, 280 n.253) note, although two other gods have overtaken him, Ares has not yet completely faded from the minds of the former barbarians, implying that utilised correctly they could still play an important military role for the empire if required but Themistius wants his audience to avoid feeling threatened by the Goths and avoids overt references to the Goths as soldiers.

⁶⁵ τὸ ἔχθιστον ὄνομα Σκύθαι ὅπως νῦν ἀγαπητόν (*Or.* 16.210d).

⁶⁶ συμπαναγυρίζουσιν ἡμῖν τὴν τοῦ στρατηγοῦ πανήγυριν... καὶ συνεορτάζουσι τὰ καθ' ἑαυτῶν ἐπινίκια (*Or.* 16.210d).

barbarian previously seen on coinage or imperial monuments was now enjoyed by the entire population.⁶⁷ The later celebration explicitly including the Goths as part of the celebration emphasised the visibility of the integration.

In order to demonstrate emphatically how positive this integration had been for the empire, Themistius contrasted the situation with what could have happened had Theodosius not suppressed the base nature of the barbarians. In section 211a-b, Themistius compared the positive outcome of the Goths farming and cultivating the land with the grim alternative of a wilderness inhabited only by the tombs of the dead. In the light of this stark description, Theodosius' policy of assimilating rather than destroying his enemies is presented as the right one, especially as there was the promise of further benefits to come. 'We shall soon receive them to share our offerings, our tables, our military ventures, and public duties'.⁶⁸ Themistius claimed earlier in his oration that the first two parts, shared offerings and tables, were already occurring but soon the Goths would be fully integrated by providing both troops and assuming some public duties. The latter was most likely a reference to paying taxes, which would have been particularly welcome news for senators as it meant that there would have been a wider tax base to collect from.

To convince his audience that welcoming their former enemies into the empire was the right decision, Themistius used a number of different tactics. He avoided any suggestion of the barbarians posing a threat to inhabitants of the empire and described Theodosius as quelling their natural instincts. These were replaced by Roman customs and traditions, beginning the process of transforming the Goths from barbarians to citizens. After this he gave examples of the practical benefits of integration and promised more to follow in the future. However, to truly persuade his audience, Themistius once again raised the issue to a higher plane by bringing in a mythological comparison. In this case, Themistius invoked a myth involving the taming of wild beasts — that of Orpheus. By attributing Orpheus' ability to charm wild animals to Theodosius, Themistius is able to elevate his achievements. But whereas Orpheus' power had had its limits, in that 'he could not charm the harsh nature of men',⁶⁹ Theodosius was not constrained by these limitations and even his subordinate Saturninus, acting as an 'interpreter and disciple of the celestial Orpheus',⁷⁰ could charm the Goths and change their very nature.⁷¹ Rather than merely equalling the feats of the mythological past, Theodosius and Saturninus were surpassing all those who had come before, leaving no doubt that their policy of integration would be vindicated.⁷²

⁶⁷ Heather and Moncur 2001, 265 n.189.

⁶⁸ ληψόμεθα δ' οὖν οὐκ εἰς μακρὰν ὁμοσπόνδους, ὁμοτραπέζους, ὁμοῦ στρατευομένους, ὁμοῦ λειτουργοῦντας (*Or.* 16.211d).

⁶⁹ ἀνθρώπων δὲ χαλεπότητα θέλγειν οὐκ εἶχεν (*Or.* 16.209c).

⁷⁰ οὐρανόθεν Ὀρφείως ὑποφήτης καὶ θεραπευτῆς (*Or.* 16.209d).

⁷¹ Surpassing the mythological precedent was necessary as Themistius wanted his audience to ignore the violent fate of Orpheus and the potential threat posed by those Goths now in a parallel position to the Thracian women.

⁷² They not only surpassed Orpheus but Achilles and Patroclus as well through having 'better auspices' than the doomed pair of heroes; ἀμείνοσιν οἰωνοῖς (*Or.* 16.208c).

More proof was offered in the form of the historical precedent of the integration of the Galatians into the empire during the early Principate.⁷³ ‘Galatians’ was a potentially ambiguous ethnic designation in a Greek text since it could refer either to the Celts who had settled in central Anatolia or to the Celts of Gaul in the west. Both groups had undergone integration during the early Principate, and given the fame of Caesar’s conquest of Gaul (which Themistius had already referred to in *Or.* 15.198a), one might have expected the western Galatians to be Themistius’ point of reference. However, he is explicit that he is referring to those in Anatolia – ‘the ones on the Pontus...[who] crossed over into Asia’⁷⁴ – which is consistent with Themistius’ ‘easternizing’ perspective. Indeed, Themistius himself was most likely born in Paphlagonia, a region just north of Galatia.⁷⁵ These barbarians gave up their traditions, just as the Goths had begun to do, and ‘now no one would ever refer to the Galatians as barbarian but as thoroughly Roman... their way of life is now akin to our own’.⁷⁶ Through this allusion, Themistius sought to reassure his audience not only that Theodosius was acting in a manner befitting an emperor by continuing a Roman tradition that dated back to the time of Augustus but also that full integration had been successful in the past and would work again with the Goths. It also offered an example that may have held particular significance for members of the eastern Senate, who may have had Galatian heritage. Given Themistius’ likely Paphlagonian origin his claim that the Galatians were now model citizens would have gained even greater credence from his audience.

This rapid shift in attitude towards the Goths between *Orations* 14, 15, and 16 was not solely due to the cessation of hostilities between the Romans and Goths. Instead, it was prompted by a shift in imperial policy and a need to convince the senatorial and elite audience that the emperor’s decision to integrate the former barbarians into the empire was the best policy.⁷⁷ An absence of the barbarian threat, praise for the positive steps already taken by the Goths, and the replacement of the Homeric military references with comparisons to the transformation of the Galatians and to Orpheus encouraged the audience not to dwell on the representation of the Goths in previous orations and accept their new position within the empire.

Pacatus, *Pan. Lat.* II(12) (389 AD)

Another panegyric which highlighted Roman interaction with the Goths was that of Pacatus in 389, which was delivered at Rome six years after Themistius’ *Oration* 16, in the aftermath

⁷³ Chauvot 1998, 292.

⁷⁴ τουτουσι Γαλάτας τοὺς ἐπὶ Πόντῳ... διαβάντες εἰς τὴν Ἀσίαν (*Or.* 16.211c).

⁷⁵ As Heather (2001, 1) and Penella (2000, 1) note, Themistius freely acknowledged that he was not native to Constantinople and most likely shared the same birthplace as his father.

⁷⁶ καὶ νῦν οὐκέτι βαρβάρους Γαλάτας ἄν τις προσείποι, ἀλλὰ καὶ πάνυ Ῥωμαίους... ὁ βίος δὲ σύμφυλος ἤδη (*Or.* 16.211c-d).

⁷⁷ Ziche (2011, 210-12) notes that the transformation of undefeated barbarians into Roman citizens may have sat uncomfortably with both Themistius and his audience, due to the lack of the military victory that was customary before integration.

of the defeat of the usurper Maximus at the hands of Theodosius.⁷⁸ In the aftermath of civil war, rather than a war against a foreign enemy, those same barbarians whom Themistius claimed could contribute to society were amongst those praised for their discipline and service whilst the usurper's troops were stripped of their Roman status.

This panegyric offered the audience, which now included the western elite,⁷⁹ confirmation of what Themistius had claimed and again sought to assure the audience: that those settled within the empire's borders were acting on their behalf, this time in direct contrast with the soldiers of Maximus.⁸⁰ Their willingness to 'supply soldiers for [Roman] camps, and farmers for [Roman] land' was offered as evidence of the wisdom of Theodosius in allowing them permanent residence,⁸¹ whilst his power was demonstrated in making enemies of the empire either avoid conflict, if living outside the empire, or rejoice if they were subservient to the emperor (*Pan. Lat.* II[12]22.4). According to Pacatus, therefore, the policy of integrating the Goths had only strengthened the empire and was working well. Certainly, he described the former barbarians as willing to enter into closer ties with the empire. According to the orator one of the final parts of Theodosius' preparation for his campaign against Maximus was to grant 'the privileged status of fellow soldiers to the barbarian peoples who promised to give you voluntary service' to ensure their loyalty and build his army.⁸² The opportunity to serve Theodosius was apparently widely welcomed by the Goths who 'flocked to [him] in such great numbers that [he] seemed to have imposed a levy upon [the] barbarians'.⁸³ This meant that the emperor did not need to call upon his other subjects.⁸⁴ Just as Themistius had implied six years before, the Goths were fulfilling Roman roles which in turn not only secured the state but lifted the burdens from other citizens.

The willingness of these barbarians to control their base desires for the good of the empire also helped Pacatus to reassure his audience about the reliability of these new soldiers. 'There was no disorder, no confusion, and no looting, as is usual among the barbarian'.⁸⁵ Instead there was caution and discipline even in the face of food shortages out

⁷⁸ This left Theodosius as sole emperor and allowed western orators, such as Pacatus, to make speeches in his honour.

⁷⁹ For the western elite, any usurper would have posed a far greater threat than an invasion by the Goths which may provide another explanation for the absence of barbarian threat in this panegyric; McCormick 1986, 82.

⁸⁰ As criticism of Gratian had included the favour he showed for the Alans, Pacatus may have been using this oration to try to deflect any such criticism being levelled at Theodosius for his failure to be strict on the Goths; Nixon and Saylor Rodgers 1994, 447.

⁸¹ *castris tuis militem, terris sufficere cultorem* (*Pan. Lat.* II[12]22.3).

⁸² *populis barbarorum ultroneam tibi operam ferre voventibus commilitum munus* (*Pan. Lat.* II[12]32.3).

⁸³ *omnes Scythicae nationes tantis examinibus confluebant... barbaris videreris imperasse dilectum* (*Pan. Lat.* II[12]32.3).

⁸⁴ Following Adrianople, the military reserves of the East were still relatively limited. Theodosius had no choice but to rely upon barbarians to strengthen his army in order to fight Maximus; Liebeschuetz 1990, 30.

⁸⁵ *nullus tumultus, nulla confusio, nulla direptio ut a barbaro erat* (*Pan. Lat.* II[12]32.5).

of a desire to ‘be spoken of as yours [Theodosius]’.⁸⁶ Once again the emperor is presented as the catalyst for the transformation of barbarian soldiers into true Roman soldiers who were able to maintain their discipline and resist their base desires. Later in the oration, Pacatus no longer even differentiates between the soldiers of foreign origin and their Roman counterparts, implying that through respect for the emperor and by extension the empire, the army was considered one single, unified body that had helped Theodosius to secure his reign. All the soldiers acted in a way that was ‘mindful of their ancient valour, their Roman name, and last but not least their emperors, [to support] the cause of the State by engaging hand to hand’ with their enemies.⁸⁷ This was a long distance from the start of the campaign where the Goths merely held ‘dubious loyalty’ to Rome before being transformed by the emperor into soldiers and marching ‘under Roman leaders and banners’.⁸⁸ Even those who were not previously integrated into society were now recognised as Roman and had a claim on the heritage that resulted from being in the Roman army.

In reality, the barbarian soldiers did not prove to be as disciplined as Pacatus described and Theodosius struggled to maintain control over the Goths settled within the empire throughout his reign.⁸⁹ However, this does not change the techniques that Pacatus used to attempt to convince his audience that the barbarians were playing a productive role in society. Nor does it alter the fact that the emperor was presented as being responsible for the integration of a productive and loyal group who were already proving to be beneficial to society.⁹⁰

Conclusion

In both Pacatus’ oration and Themistius’ *Oration* 16, the Goths no longer offered a threat to the empire and were presented as highly successful in suppressing their nature through the power of Theodosius. To avoid inciting any fear of the Goths amongst his audience, the

⁸⁶ *tuus diceretur* (*Pan. Lat.* II[12]32.5). Chauvot (1981, 297) notes that the formerly barbarian soldiers display none of the traits associated with non-Romans but argues that there is no notion of assimilation in Pacatus’ oration. On the contrary, as we shall see, the integration occurs during the battle when the soldiers show complete respect for Roman traditions and the emperors.

⁸⁷ *milites pristinae virtutis, Romani nominis, imperatorum denique memores causam publicam manu agere* (*Pan. Lat.* II[12]35.4).

⁸⁸ *suspectus* (*Pan. Lat.* II[12]32.3); *sub ducibus vexillisque... Romanis* (*Pan. Lat.* II[12]32.4).

⁸⁹ While some soldiers integrated into Roman culture and willingly served as *foederati*, a large number of those settled after 382 remained hostile to Theodosius and were still not called upon to serve even during the war with Maximus (Thompson 1982, 41-42). These Goths would go on to cause trouble in the following decade and Heather (1991, 184) argues may already have begun to do so, leading Pacatus emphatically to proclaim the loyalty of the auxiliaries in service to Theodosius as a counterexample.

⁹⁰ Lippold (2012, 378) argues that the circumstances surrounding Pacatus’ oration may have added to the appearance of the emperor’s success; the triumph over the Goths in Constantinople in 386, the victory over Maximus, and the lack of barbarian attacks in the West that year may have encouraged acceptance of the imperial policy of integrating a supposedly submissive people.

techniques Themistius had relied on to heighten the threat posed by the Goths in *Orations* 14 and 15 were quietly dispensed with in the final two orations examined in this chapter. Neither the metaphors that had been used to dehumanise the empire's enemies and reinforce traditional stereotypes nor the military references to Homer that heightened the scale of the conflicts at the end of *Orations* 14 and 15 were present in the latter orations. Instead, Pacatus and Themistius referred to visible examples of the Goths integrating into Roman society through their military service and involvement in communal celebrations in order to reinforce the wisdom of imperial policy.

This omission of traditional tropes could indicate that the orations were ephemeral in nature, with audiences viewing the speeches and the Goths in isolation. On the other hand, there was consistency in the use of certain techniques despite the changing representation of the Goths, which would have been more effective if those listening to the speeches were alert to what they had heard previously. In *Oration* 16, Themistius continued to use a mythological reference to enhance the importance of his subject and aggrandise the honorands of his oration but in this instance, it referred to changing barbaric nature rather than achieving military success and was supported by the historical example of the successful integration of the Galatians. The idea of an emperor being able to transform people's natures also recurs throughout these orations. Theodosius was depicted initially as being able to prepare his own subjects for effective military service and later as being able to suppress and change barbarian nature to the point where they contribute usefully to society. The continued reference to this theme, and its development over the course of Themistius' orations, may have aided the audience to accept the idea of barbarian settlement and integration despite the lack of a definitive military victory — and despite Themistius having presented a rather different view previously.

Bibliography

- Chauvot, A. (1998) *Opinions romaines face aux Barbares au IVe siècle ap. J.-C.* Paris.
- Cribiore, R. (2007) *The School of Libanius in Late Antique Antioch.* Princeton, NJ.
- Dauge, Y.A. (1981) *Le Barbare. Recherches sur la conception romaine de la barbarie et de la civilisation.* Brussels.
- Errington, R.M. (2000) 'Themistius and his Emperors', *Chiron* 30: 861-904.
- Goffart, W. (1981) 'Rome, Constantinople and the Barbarians', *The American Historical Review* 86: 275-306.
- Heather, P.J. (1991) *Goths and Romans 332-489.* Oxford.
- Heather, P.J. (1999) 'The Barbarian in Late Antiquity: Image, Reality and Transformation', in R. Miles (ed.) *Constructing Identities in Late Antiquity.* London. 343-86.
- Heather, P.J. and J.F. Matthews (1991) *The Goths in the Fourth Century.* Liverpool.
- Heather, P.J. and D. Moncur (2001) *Politics, Philosophy, and Empire in the Fourth Century, Select Orations of Themistius.* Liverpool.
- Hill, P.V., J.P.C. Kent and R.A.G Carson (1960) *Late Roman Bronze Coinage A.D. 324-498.* London.
- Lattimore, R. (tr.) (1951) *Homer: The Iliad.* Chicago.

- Lenski, N. (2002) *Failure of Empire: Valens and the Roman State in the Fourth Century AD*. Berkeley, CA.
- Liebeschuetz, J.H.W.G. (1990) *Barbarians and Bishops: Army, Church and State in the Age of Arcadius and Chrysostom*. Oxford.
- Lippold, A. (2012) 'The Ideal of the Ruler and Attachment to Tradition in Pacatus' Panegyric', in R. Rees (ed.), *Oxford Readings in Classical Studies: Latin Panegyric*, Oxford. 360-86.
- Matthews, J.F. (1989) *The Roman Empire of Ammianus*. Baltimore, MD.
- McCormick, M. (1986) *Eternal Victory*. Cambridge.
- Nixon, C.E.V. and B. Saylor Rodgers (1994) *In Praise of the Later Roman Emperors*. Berkeley, CA.
- Norman, A.F. (1969) *Libanius: Selected Orations, Volume 1*. Cambridge, MA.
- Penella, R.J. (2000) *The Private Orations of Themistius*. Berkeley, CA.
- Quiroga Puertas, A.J. (2013[2015]) 'The Others: Cultural Monotheism and the Rhetorical Construction of "Cultural Alterity" in Libanius' Panegyrics' *Talanta* 45: 55-66.
- Rees, R. (2013[2015]) 'From Alterity to Unity in Pacatus Drepanius' *Panegyric to Theodosius*', *Talanta* 45: 41-53.
- Thompson E.A. (1982) *Romans and Barbarians: The Decline of the Western Empire*. Madison, WI.
- Vanderspoel, J. (1995) *Themistius and the Imperial Court: Oratory, Civic Duty, and Paideia from Constantius to Theodosius*. Ann Arbor, MI.
- Ziche, H. (2011) 'Barbarian Raiders and Barbarian Peasants: Models of Ideological and Economic Integration', in R.W. Mathisen and D. Shanzer (eds.), *Romans, Barbarians, and the Transformation of the Roman World*. Farnham. 199-219.

THE AUDIENCE IN IMPERIAL PANEGYRIC

Alan J. Ross

Introduction

In 330BC the political reputation of the Athenian statesman and orator Demosthenes hung in the balance. Challenged by his erstwhile opponent Aeschines, he responded before the Athenian law court with a defence of his career that also included a blistering attack upon his opponent for being a lackey of the now-dominant Macedonian regime (*Or.* 18.52):

ἀλλὰ μισθωτὸν ἐγὼ σε Φιλίππου πρότερον καὶ νῦν Ἀλεξάνδρου καλῶ, καὶ οὗτοι πάντες. εἰ δ' ἀπιστεῖς, ἐρώτησον αὐτούς, μᾶλλον δ' ἐγὼ τοῦθ' ὑπὲρ σοῦ ποιήσω. πρότερον ὑμῖν, ὧ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, δοκεῖ μισθωτὸς Αἰσχίνης ἢ ξένος εἶναι Ἀλεξάνδρου; ἀκούεις ἃ λέγουσιν.

But I do call you [Aeschines] a hireling, formerly of Philip, now of Alexander, and all these men call you the same. If you don't believe me, ask them yourself or, rather, I'll do it for you. Do you think, Athenians, that Aeschines is Alexander's hired hand or his guest? You hear what they say.¹

This is a confident moment of showmanship, in which Demosthenes elicits a seemingly spontaneous interjection from the audience in support of his argument. Scholars ancient and modern have pondered how risky this move might have been: how could Demosthenes be sure that the audience would give the right response and agree that Aeschines was a 'hired hand'; was this dramatic interjection staged, choreographed beforehand with some loyal supporters; or did he write it into the speech only for its published form?² Whatever the precise mechanism of this exchange, it demonstrates the importance for Athenian orators of engaging their audiences directly, and their ability to swivel between different addressees to do so: Demosthenes first attacks his opponent directly using the second person singular ('I call you a hireling...'), before turning out the wider audience in the second person plural to ask his question ('Do you think, Athenians...').³ Demosthenes thus constructs a three-way relationship between opponent, audience, and himself, in which he forces the audience to align publicly (and audibly) with his position against that of Aeschines. Perhaps these dynamics are not surprising: Demosthenes' audience was also his judge, in whose power lay his political survival. But they raise questions about the ways in which any ancient orator might envision a relationship with his audience or audiences, what rhetorical methods he

¹ Trans. Yunis 2005.

² Yunis 2001, 140.

³ For the importance of interaction with the audience in Athenian oratory, see Hansen 1987, 70-2; Wolpert 2003; Serafim 2017, 68-74; Worthington 2017.

might use to construct such a relationship within his speech, and what purpose that relationship served.

Demosthenes' assembly speech may seem far removed from our late-antique panegyrics. Six centuries stand between them and they belong to two different subspecies of rhetoric, judicial and epideictic respectively, that theorise contrasting relationships between orator and audience. According to Aristotle, judicial oratory had an imperative to convince its audience, whereas epideictic was a display piece designed to delight its hearers.⁴ Recent scholarship has, however, posited a more important communicative purpose for late-antique panegyric that implicitly grants a greater role to a wider audience beyond the formal, single addressee of the emperor. Rather than mere static display of the emperor's praise, panegyric is now recognised as a dynamic means to disseminate information and shape opinion, not just of (or by) the emperor but also the wider audience before whom a speech was performed. Sabbah's pioneering model of two-fold 'upward' and 'downward' communication⁵ may have given way to more complex models in which the orator in varying degrees acts simultaneously as mediator, adviser, or propagandist within a single speech,⁶ but such observations still mean imperial panegyric was a dialogue between honorand and audience that was controlled by the orator.⁷

Such trends in recent scholarship may have implicitly raised the importance of the (non-imperial) audience by arguing for complex communicative agendas of panegyric, but in comparison to studies of earlier judicial and forensic oratory, the relationship between epideictic orator and audience remains relatively unexplored for late antiquity.⁸ The role of the audience has often been assumed, and the audience itself merely defined as a rather nebulous group of passive, anonymous hearers of a speech.⁹ Perhaps this is not surprising when one considers that often the only source to study audiences are the speeches themselves, and even then they offer meagre pickings. Within the usual structure of an imperial panegyric the orator might openly define his position vis-à-vis the emperor, especially in terms of benefactions received or imperial positions held,¹⁰ but the dominating

⁴ Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 1.3.3, and Introduction.

⁵ Sabbah 1984. See Rees 2012, 40-1 for developments in the study of Latin Panegyric as communicative discourse.

⁶ Paraphrasing Whitby 1998, 1.

⁷ *Pace* Rees 2002, 15: 'Panegyric was not a dialogue but a drama and the mute characters [the wider audience] had vital roles to play.' Rees acknowledges the important function allotted to the audience, however. As I show here, the wider audience was not entirely mute.

⁸ Unlike for Athenian and Roman Republican oratory, e.g. Aldrete 1999, Bablitz 2007, Serafim 2017. Quiroga's recent study of the dynamics of rhetorical performances in the fourth-century east focusses more on the actions and deportment of the orator than his interactions with the audience, Quiroga 2019.

⁹ Rees 2002, 10 even imagines a situation where there was scarcely any room for an audience beyond imperial officials at the performance of an imperial panegyric. Throughout this chapter, by 'audience' I mean the wider audience beyond just the emperor, unless otherwise qualified with a more specific definition.

¹⁰ Although the *Panegyrici Latini* provide little information, as the series of short, lacunose biographies of their authors pieced together in the Introductions to each speech in Nixon and Saylor

figure within the text is the emperor himself, both as formal addressee, often in the second person (even when he is not physically present), and as the subject of deeds and virtues praised.¹¹ There is little room left for anyone else, and the sort of explicit dialogue with the wider audience that we find in Demosthenes is extremely rare among our extant imperial panegyrics.

This is not to say, however, that the panegyrists do not provide us with several clues about how they envision an audience beyond just the emperor himself. The aim of this chapter, then, is to assess the rhetorical role that is allotted to the audience by orators of imperial panegyric. First, with reference to a Greek panegyric for which exceptionally we do have external evidence for its delivery, I suggest that there was a significant mismatch between the theory and practice of engaging an audience. If audience-interaction was an ‘undertheorized’ aspect of epideictic oratory, how did it operate in practice, and did late-antique orators create or make use of their own precedents? Turning to Latin panegyrics I argue that a discernible pattern emerges across the *Panegyrici Latini* which later Latin orators, speaking in atypical circumstances (especially before potentially hostile or unsympathetic audiences), could exploit to support of their particular agendas.

The audience in theory and practice: Libanius’ Consular speech for Julian (*Oration 12*)

Expanding on earlier ideas of Aristotle, the first-century rhetorical theorist Quintilian envisioned an important role for the epideictic audience in conditioning the way that an orator should construct his praise of an individual. Epideictic works best when one praises characteristics in the honorand that the audience already accept as potentially praiseworthy: if speaking before Spartans, for example, better to praise the honorand’s martial qualities than his literary endeavours. ‘In this way, there will be no doubt about their [the audience’s] judgement, because it will have preceded the speech’ (*Instit. Or.*3.7.23).¹² Quintilian’s model sets a role for the audience that is not so dissimilar from that of the Athenian law court: both are treated as a collective that acts as judge of the speech, albeit in an epideictic setting judgment is confined to the audience’s opinion about the honorand rather than a legal decision that affects the orator or his client.¹³ Nonetheless, other than preconditioning the content of orator’s speech, Quintilian posits no active role for the audience during the performance of an epideictic oration, or any more complex a relationship between orator and audience than that the former must be sympathetic to the latter.

Rodgers 1994 shows. Greek authors are scarcely more revelatory about themselves within their imperial panegyrics, but at least for Libanius, Themistius and Julian we have large corpora of their works that provide external biographical data.

¹¹ For the second person address used of emperors, even when absent, see Rees 2003.

¹² *ita non dubium erit iudicium, quod orationem praecesserit*. Quintilian repeats a point made by Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 1.1367b7[9.30]. See also Maxwell 2010, 30-32; Pernot 2015, 77-78.

¹³ There is also a difference in timeframe for such judgements: ‘while judicial and deliberative speeches are oriented toward judgments of past and future events, epideictic reflects present appreciations, understandings, and judgments.’ Oravec 1976, 172.

Quintilian theorized about panegyric addressed to any individual, not necessarily to a Roman emperor. Our principal theorist of imperial encomium in Late Antiquity has even less to say about the audience.¹⁴ Menander Rhetor’s advice is largely confined to the content and structure of a speech, rather than methods of its delivery. He seems aware of Aristotle’s and Quintilian’s precept that the orator should take account of his audience’s preconceptions — he says one should only include ‘commonly agreed good things’,¹⁵ although he does not spell out between whom there should be agreement — and, like Quintilian, he provides no further advice for how to manage the audience in a live performance.

Any external evidence for the delivery of epideictic is rare, but we have a detailed (if somewhat exceptional) example from the fourth century. In his autobiographical first oration, Libanius recalls the delivery of a speech eleven years earlier that celebrated the Emperor Julian’s assumption of the consulship in Antioch on 1 January 363.¹⁶ Libanius was just one of several orators to speak during the day’s festivities (*Or.* 1.128):

ὁ δὲ αὐτὸν μὲν ἔνδον οὐδενὸς ἐπαινοῦντος ἐπήνει, δευτέρῳ τούτῳ παρέχων ἀφορμὴν γέλῳτι, τοὺς δὲ ἐπ’ αὐτῷ γελᾶσαντας οὐκ ἀνίει λοιδορῶν, οἱ δ’ [ἄν] αὐθις ἐγέλων.

The previous speaker [before Libanius], since there was none in the company to praise him, spoke in praise of himself, and so provided another cause for ridicule, and he did not cease abusing those who ridiculed him, whereupon they laughed all the more.¹⁷

It appears that this orator’s lacklustre performance resulted in an unenthusiastic response from the audience, so he commended his own speech provoking more voluble reaction.¹⁸ Perhaps he had failed to heed Aristotle and Quintilian’s advice to compose a speech that was preconditioned to be commendable to the audience. Libanius, by contrast, presents himself as the most successful of the group, thanks not a little to the honorand’s support (*Or.* 1.129):

ὡς δὲ ἀπέδυν ὕστατος αὐτοῦ τοῦ βασιλέως, ὅπως ὅτι πλεῖστοι συνέλθοιεν, φροντίσαντος, τὸν Ἑρμῆν ἔφησαν τοῦ θεράποντος κηδόμενον τῇ ράβδῳ κινεῖν τῶν ἀκροωμένων ἕκαστον, ὅπως μὴδ’ ὀτιοῦν ὄνομα θαύματος ἄμοιρον ἀπέλθῃ. βασιλεὺς δὲ τὰ πρῶτα μὲν τῇ διὰ τῆς μορφῆς ἡδονῇ μνηυομένη συνετέλει, ἔπειτα τῷ μέλλειν ἀναπηδᾶν, ἔπειτα, οὐ γὰρ δὴ κατεῖχεν αὐτὸν καὶ σφόδρα πειρώμενος, ἤλατο μὲν ἐκ τοῦ θρόνου, τῆς χλαμύδος δὲ ὀπόσον ἐξῆν, ταῖν χεροῖν ἀνεπέτασεν, ὡς μὲν ἂν εἴποι τις τουτωνὶ τῶν ἀγγάρων, ἐκφερόμενος τοῦ σχήματος, ὡς δ’ ἂν ἀνὴρ εὖ εἰδῶς, οἷς ἂν σεμνὴ βασιλεία γένοιτο, ἄρα ἐν τοῖς προσήκουσι μένων· τί γὰρ δὴ βασιλικώτερον τοῦ βασιλέως ψυχὴν πρὸς κάλλη λόγων ἀνίστασθαι;

¹⁴ For the status of Menander Rhetor as a witness to third-century practices, see Introduction.

¹⁵ ἐφ’ ὁμολογουμένοις ἀγαθοῖς, II.368.7.

¹⁶ For the date of the first section of *Oration* 1 (up to 1.155) see Norman 1965, xiii; Martin and Petit 1979, 3.

¹⁷ Trans. Norman. The passage is difficult and lacunose. This orator’s problems may have been compounded by speaking in Latin (Libanius did so in Greek).

¹⁸ An orator’s self-praise was considered a grave solecism, Quiroga 2019, 135.

I was the last to take part, for the emperor himself had so devised it that there should be the fullest possible audience, and people insisted that Hermes, in his care for his servant, stirred every member of the audience with his wand, so that no single word of mine should pass without its share of admiration. The emperor contributed to this, first by the pleasure which he expressed at my style, then by his tendency to rise to his feet in applause, until finally when he could no longer restrain himself, despite his best efforts, he leapt up from his seat and, with outstretched arms, spread wide his cloak. Some of our boors would assert that in his excitement he forgot the dignity of his position, but anyone who is aware of what it is that makes kingship an object of reverence would maintain that he stayed within the bounds of what is proper. For what is more royal than that an emperor should be uplifted to the glory of eloquence?

It suited Libanius' self-promoting agenda in the *Autobiography* to present himself as favoured by Julian, and thus he seeks here to defend Julian's clearly abnormal behaviour, and revel in a competitor's failure.¹⁹ Nonetheless, Libanius indicates that audiences could respond audibly and visibly during the delivery of a speech, and speakers could alter their performance to heed their critiques.²⁰ The failed first speaker even seems to have extemporized in response to the audience's ridicule, albeit with disastrous results. Julian was criticised not because he responded to Libanius' speech but because he did so excessively, especially for an emperor.²¹ We may detect an underlying norm that listeners, including both honorand and wider audience, could get up and sit down, applaud, wave their clothing, or otherwise respond critically to a panegyric as it was being delivered.²²

We are fortunate to possess the speech that Libanius delivered in January 363, and comparison of its content with Libanius' later account reveals how an epideictic orator might cope with the pressurised circumstances of delivery, in which both honorand and audience

¹⁹ For Libanius' careful crafting of his career in *Oration* 1, see Van Hoof 2014; and for his proximity to Julian Wiemer 1995, 32-69.

²⁰ A comparison may be drawn with another form of late-antique ceremonial that involved audience participation: imperial acclamations. See Van Hoof and Van Nuffelen 2011, 170-1 for the argument that, far from being staged displays of loyalty, acclamations 'could be improvised expressions of popular approval as well as dissent' (171).

²¹ A more acceptable interjection by the honorand was a silent nod: when discussing Maximian before Constantine in 310 (the former had committed suicide a few months previously after rebelling against Constantine; Barnes 1981, 34-5), the orator of *Pan. Lat.* VI(7) notes 'I am still very hesitant as to how I am to speak about this man [Maximian], and I am awaiting for your divinity [Constantine] to advise me with a nod' (*De quo ego quemadmodum dicam adhuc ferme dubito et de nutu numinis tui exspecto consilium*, 14.1). No doubt this was prearranged with the emperor, and served to dispel any awkwardness amongst the rest of the audience that the orator was unwittingly straying onto a potentially dangerous topic.

²² Audiences for late-antique imperial panegyric reacted in much the same way as for earlier forms of epideictic (Pernot 1993, 462-3) and other genres of speeches during the second sophistic (Korenjak 1999, 105-114 and 130-50).

could erupt with approval or censure at any moment. Remarkably, he addresses the audience in the very opening of the speech (*Or.* 12.2-3):

...ὅτι με μὴ τοῖς πολλοῖς ἐν ἴσῳ θεωρὸν ἄφωνον ἔστησεν ἡ Τύχη τὴν μετὰ R 367σιγῆς ἡδονὴν | ἡδόμενον, ἀλλὰ καὶ λόγῳ μνηῦσαι ταύτην ἔδωκε τοῖς τε παροῦσιν ὑμῖν τοῖς τε ὕστερον ἐντευξομένοις. ὑμεῖς δὲ ὅτι μὲν χαίρετε τοῖς ὀρωμένοις, καὶ ταῖς εὐχαῖς δι' ὧν αἰτεῖτε ταῦτα πολλάκις ὀφθῆναι καὶ τοῖς προσώποις γέμουσιν εὐθυμίας δηλοῦτε· πολὺ δ' ἂν δείξατε κάλλιον, εἰ συνεξορμήσαιτε¹ τοῖς λόγοις καὶ γένοιτο τῆ τοῦ λέγοντος ἐφάμιλλος ἢ τῶν ἀκροωμένων βακχεία.

...Fortune has not set me here, like the average person, a dumb spectator expressing myself with silent feelings of pleasure, but she has granted me the ability to proclaim them both to you, my present audience, and to future readers. Your pleasure at the sight is manifested by the prayers which you offer for its frequent recurrence, and by the joy radiant upon your faces. A demonstration still more eloquent would be your active support of my speech, and for the enthusiasm of the audience to rival that of the speaker.

Unlike most other imperial panegyrists, Libanius uses the second person both here at the opening and throughout the rest of the speech to address not the emperor but the wider Antiochene audience. Julian is only mentioned in the third person. Formally, then, the speech is orientated towards the Antiochene crowd as its main addressee, whereas Julian a mere witness to his praise. This unusual pose allows Libanius to solicit directly the sort of active and positive response to his speech that had not been forthcoming for the previous speaker (as we learn from *Or.*1). The requested ‘demonstration of active support’ surely means applause and assent that he ultimately received also from Julian himself. Maybe this was a cue for a prearranged outburst of clapping; but the previous sentence suggests Libanius carefully curates his audience’s response via his speech itself. His claim to know that the audience are already and discernibly full of joy at Julian’s consulship locks them into a positive response to his speech.²³ Libanius also uses the audience as a prop here by directing attention to their physical reactions, and we might surmise how this reference worked in practice: Libanius’ remark about the Antiochenes’ facial expressions suddenly directed the emperor’s gaze to check that his audience were indeed so full of joy. We can imagine the Antiochenes swiftly beamed with happiness lest they invite the displeasure of the emperor. In other words, the orator’s statements about the audience are not so much descriptive as prescriptive: they are an incentive to act enthusiastically, disguised as the description of existing enthusiasm. Libanius, then, constructs an ideal image and identity for the audience that serves an important rhetorical role within the speech, and projects onto the real audience a uniformity and relationship with the honorand that presumably smoothed over the variation of personal opinions among a large and diverse crowd at the moment of delivery. After all,

²³ At the moment of performance in 363, the reference to ‘future readers’ would suggest the unending interest in the praise of Julian in years to come, and may even invoke the ‘metaphysical presence’ of future generations who continue to celebrate Julian’s inauguration.

Quintilian had suggested that audiences were supposed to judge epideictic speeches, and Libanius' *Oration* 1 shows us that a positive response to panegyric on this occasion was far from guaranteed.²⁴

Libanius' identity-construction extends also to his role as orator: he has the authority to talk about the audience because, he makes clear, he is one of them. Only chance has singled him out from among them to make this speech; before he ever got up to speak, he shared their 'feelings of pleasure'. Again, this pose enables him to claim that the praise he expresses is genuine (not just a rhetorical need) and that such sentiments are uniformly held amongst the whole of audience whom he represents. He projects a positive and enthusiastic persona onto the audience, which it might be dangerous for the 'real' audience to undermine by not acting the part scripted for them by Libanius' speech.

Libanius' *Oration* 1 offers a valuable commentary on his earlier performance of *Oration* 12 that is unparalleled for other late-antique panegyrics. That comparison points to a degree of mismatch between the live audience of the speech as presented retrospectively in *Oration* 1 (judgemental, rowdy, and willing to criticise bad panegyrists) and the audience depicted within *Oration* 12 itself (uniformly enthusiastic in their praise for Julian, and whose representative is the equally joyful Libanius). Here we should note the difference between 'real' audience on the one hand (who are the subject of our historical reconstructions via *Oration* 1) and the 'constructed' audience within the panegyric itself, on the other.²⁵ Speaking of Athenian judicial oratory, Serafim defines the latter as the sum of 'all the strategies used by the speaker to alert the judge and the onlookers to the role(s) he wants them to play.'²⁶ Exchange Serafim's 'judge' for our 'emperor' and the model of constructed audience is as applicable to Libanius as it is for Demosthenes.

In the absence of such specific contextualizing information for other late-antique panegyrics, the rest of this chapter will investigate how imperial panegyrists internally represent the relationship between honorand, orator, and audience, in the understanding that such relationships are first and foremost a rhetorical construct that may serve an important protreptic purpose for the 'real' audience, but should not be mistaken as straightforward description of historical audiences. Furthermore, our earlier discussion of Quintilian and Menander Rhetor shows that the orator's relationship with the audience was an 'undertheorized' aspect of imperial encomium, at least according to our surviving theorists. Orators had no formula to adopt or adapt in the way they did for the content and structure of their speech. We may legitimately ask, then, to what extent Libanius' practice in *Oration* 12 was typical or exceptional. Turning now to a distinct group of Latin panegyrics, I suggest that a pattern of practice was built up across Latin panegyric, that could be recognised and adapted by 'unusual' exponents of the genre, such as orators speaking away from their

²⁴ A portion of the Antiochene population became so disgruntled with Julian that within three months of the Consular inauguration, the emperor would pen a satirical invective against a population that he depicted as effeminate, indolent and Christian (*Misopogon*). cf. Van Hoof and Van Nuffelen 2011.

²⁵ This is not to suggest that *Oration* 1 necessarily allows a clearer window on the events of 1 January 363: as already noted, Libanius uses the narrative of this episode in January 363 to pursue various agendas in *Oration* 1, such as defence of both Julian and himself.

²⁶ Serafim 2017, 20.

‘home’ audiences, or indeed within a sub-genre of panegyric, the speech of thanks, that necessarily drew attention more to the individual orator than to his audience.

The audience in the *Panegyrici Latini*: passive beneficiaries of imperial action

Libanius’ sustained second-person address to the Antiochenes is an anomaly among extant imperial panegyrics, but other orators found ways to represent their wider audience within their speeches. The earliest of our late-antique panegyrics was likely delivered in Trier in 289 by a local orator.²⁷ It celebrates both Maximian and Diocletian as Dyarchs, although the patterning of forms of address make clear that only Maximian was present at the speech’s delivery. In spite of the physical separation of the emperors, the orator reinforces the idea of harmony between the two Augusti by deftly oscillating between the second-person singular to refer to the present Maximian, and the second-person plural to refer to both emperors together and thus to create what Rees termed the ‘metaphysical presence’ of the absent Diocletian.²⁸ This is an orator, then, who was attuned to the power of such little words as personal pronouns, and pronouns not just applied to the emperors, but also to himself and his audience (*Pan. Lat.* X[2]6.1-3):

transeo innumerabiles **tuas** tota Gallia pugnans atque victorias. Quae enim tot tantisque rebus sufficiat oratio? Illum tamen primum consulatus tui auspicalem diem tacitus praeterire nullo modo **possum**, ... **vidimus te**, Caesar, eodem die pro re publica et vota suscipere et convicta debere. Quod enim **optaveras** in futurum, **fecisti** continuo transactum, ut **mihi** ipsa deorum auxilia quae **precatus eras** praevenisse **videaris** et, quidquid illi promiserant, ante fecisse. **Vidimus te**, Caesar, eodem die et in clarissimo pacis habitu et in pulcherrimo virtutis ornatu.

I pass over your countless battles and victories all over Gaul. For what speech could do justice to so many great exploits? **I can** in no way, however, pass over in silence the day which inaugurated **your** consulship... **We saw you**, Caesar, on the very same day taking up vows on behalf of the State and incurring the debt of them being answered. For what **you wished** for the future **you** immediately **accomplished**, so that **you seem to me** to have anticipated the very help of the gods **you implored**, and to have done

²⁷ Some mss. name the orator as Mamertinus, the same as for XI(3). For doubts over this attribution, see Nixon and Saylor Rodgers 1994, 41-2.

²⁸ A procedure announced in the opening sentence: ‘Since on all festival days, most sacred emperor [singular – Maximian], your honour ought to be equated with divine affairs, then on this most celebrated day which is most joyful for you who are our emperors [plural – both Maximian and Diocletian], worship of your [s.] godhead must be joined with the annual respect paid to the sacred city.’ *Cum omnibus festis diebus, sacratissime imperator, debeat honos vester divinis rebus aequari, tum praecipue celeberrimo isto et imperantibus vobis laetissimo die veneratio numinis tui cum sollempni sacrae urbis religione iungenda est.* *Pan. Lat.* X[2]1.1. Rees 2002, 38; 2003, 449.

beforehand what they promised. **We saw you**, Caesar, on the same day both in the most splendid garb of peace and in the magnificent accoutrements of war.²⁹

The addressee in the second person singular is Maximian, whose inauguration as consul a little over a year earlier is celebrated in this section of the speech.³⁰ The orator uses the first person singular to present himself as a reflective organiser of his material, ostentatiously deciding (or claiming to decide) what material to include or exclude (in textbook *praeteritio*), and introducing personal judgement on what he does relate ('you seem *to me* to have anticipated...'). The procedure gives the orator an air of thoughtful extemporisation, that suggests the genuine nature of his praise: this is not overly-planned or premeditated flattery. The sudden intrusion the first-person plural on two occasions ('we saw you'), however, cannot then be accidental nor a variant of the first person singular to refer to the orator exclusively.³¹ Here the orator uses the first-person plural ('we') to refer the actions of the audience in order to testify to the glory Maximian's consular inauguration in both literal and metaphorical terms: they physically saw him make vows to the Senate and they perceived the symbolic references to Maximian's military and civil authority.³² The juxtaposition of the two first-person terms in this section aligns the orator with the audience and identifies him as their representative: he *and* the audience alike saw Maximian.³³ Unlike in Libanius (or Demosthenes), there may be no direct address to the audience here, but the Latin orator's subtle variation of 'I' and 'we' serves the same purpose of constructing a relationship between audience and orator that sets the latter as the representative of the former, and as a representative who can authoritatively speak of the audience's positive interpretation of the emperor(s).³⁴

The use of 'we' forms to represent (and construct) the role of the audience vis-à-vis the emperor is a technique that recurs throughout the *Panegyrici Latini*, especially among the seven Gallic orators who address emperors in their 'home turf' in Gaul.³⁵ A distinct pattern emerges from their relatively infrequent use of 'we' forms. 'We' are commonly presented as the beneficiaries of the emperor(s)'s actions. In response to an account of Maximian's defeat of nearby Burgundians and Alamanni, the orator of X(2) could exclaim 'What god would

²⁹ Trans. Nixon and Saylor Rodgers 1994 (revised).

³⁰ For the date of consulship (287) and speech (289), see Galletier 1949, 9; Barnes 1982, 57; Nixon and Saylor Rodgers 1994, 42-3.

³¹ Such as the 'we' form that historiographical narrators often use to refer to themselves as narrators, e.g. Amm. 14.1.8, 14.7.7, 16.6.2, 20.1.1, 21.8.1, 23.6.50, 29.6.1.

³² For the importance of visibility leading to judgement in late-antique panegyric, see Rees 2013.

³³ The technique is repeated at the conclusion of the speech, when the orator uses a string of 'we' forms to express the emotions of the audience 'we still enjoy your presence; we already long for your return' (*adhuc praesentia tua fruimur, et iam reditum desideramus*), *Pan. Lat.* X(2)14.5.

³⁴ A technique frequently deployed also in Greek epideictic. Pernot 1993: 614.

³⁵ I.e. *Pan. Lat.* X(2), XI(3), VIII(4), VII(6), VI(7), V(8) and XII(9). This list excludes Eumenius' plea for restoration of the schools of Autun delivered to a provincial governor (*Pan. Lat.* IX[5]), Nazarius' speech in Rome (*Pan. Lat.* IV[10]), Mamertinus' *gratiarum actio* for his consulship delivered in Constantinople (*Pan. Lat.* XI[3]), and Pacatus' speech in Rome to Theodosius (*Pan. Lat.* II[12]); for discussion of Pacatus and Mamertinus, see below.

have brought us such un hoped-for salvation had you not been present?’³⁶ In the wake of Constantine’s defeat of the Franks in 306/7, the orator of VI(7) observes ‘we are protected now not by the boiling waters of the Rhine, but by the terror aroused by your name.’³⁷ In 311, a senator of Autun expresses that ‘we give thanks’ to Constantine for visiting Trier and alleviating the effects of a poor harvest.³⁸ These audiences are not just the beneficiaries of imperial assistance, both in terms of the emperor’s military and organisational skills, but they are especially passive beneficiaries, helpless had not the emperor intervened. In response, audiences perform two connected actions: perceiving the emperor’s actions and subsequently being amazed at them. We have already encountered the refrain of ‘we saw you’ (*te vidimus*) in the speech to Maximian of 289;³⁹ ‘we’ the audience in Trier in 297 are presented as unable to believe what we see — a captive barbarian held within their city thanks to Constantius I’s victories (VIII[4]9.1); and in 310 ‘we gaze’ upon Constantine’s face and recognise in him his recently-deceased father (*in te colimus*, VI[7]4.4). Response to perception of the emperor’s actions is also typically uniform: in the speech of 297 just mentioned, the implied reaction to those captives was one of amazed disbelief (VIII[4]9.1); in 307 ‘we marvelled (*mirabamur*)’ at Maximian’s peaceful retirement from the throne (VII[6]12.1).⁴⁰ The orator of 291 even seems to play with these tropes of viewing and marvelling: ‘while we are marvelling at your [Diocletian and Maximian’s] footprints and think that you are still in our sight, we suddenly hear of your distant miracles.’⁴¹ The expected pattern of viewing leading to marvelling is given a twist in order to praise the emperors’ speed and omnipresence: unknowingly we marvel at signs of emperors’ absence.

All these examples serve distinct and immediate purposes — Constantine was keen to stress a dynastic line via his father, and hence the need to recognise a physical similarity between father and son; speed and mobility were recurring themes of tetrarchic propaganda, which supported an image of the Tetrarchs’ military competency and control⁴² — but even if the services into which the invocation of ‘we’ the audience was pressed may change from case to case, they all subscribe the same rhetorical grammar of implied perception and reaction by the audience. Invoking the audience as spectators adds an evidential quality to the orator’s speech,⁴³ perhaps borrowed from historiography, which privileged autopsy as the

³⁶ *quis deus tam insperatam salutem nobis attulisset, nisi tu adfuisses?* (5.1).

³⁷ *Neque enim iam Rheni gurgitibus, sed nominis tui terrore munimur* (11.1).

³⁸ *gratias agimus*, *Pan. Lat.* V(8)7.4.

³⁹ A refrain that appears elsewhere in the speech (2.1).

⁴⁰ As we had done earlier in the speech, VII(6)9.5.

⁴¹ *dum vestigia vestra miramur dumque vos adhuc esse in conspectu putamus, iam de vobis audiamus longinqua miracula*. *Pan. Lat.* XI(3)4.3.

⁴² See Nixon and Rodgers 1994, 215 for Constantine’s forging of a dynasty in counterpoint to the conventions of the Tetrarchy via *Pan. Lat.* VI(7); and MacCormack 1981, 74-5 for Tetrarchic speed and mobility.

⁴³ Even though, as Rees notes, panegyric tended to rely a rather feeble standard of evidence in comparison to other genres (2010, 112).

best source of information and interpretation.⁴⁴ In these panegyrics, collective autopsy adds greater force to each of these points: it is not just the orator who witnesses the emperor, but the entirety of the audience including the orator too. The orator can then claim (and project) a sense of collective celebration onto his ‘real’ audience.

Speaking away from home — Pacatus in Rome

We might expect that this rhetorical relationship constructed between audience, orator, and emperor best fitted a provincial agenda, in which the inhabitants of Trier and other Gallic cities needed to emphasise their dependence upon and support of the emperor (via what I have called the ‘passive beneficiary’ pose) to exhort the emperor to maintain such support in the future, as much as it suited the communicative aims of the emperor to disseminate ‘propaganda’ via the mouthpiece of a local orator who repeatedly reminded his audience that he was one of them. What might happen when an orator’s historical persona was demonstrably out-of-kilter with the festive surroundings in which he spoke? In 389 the emperor Theodosius celebrated his defeat a year earlier of the usurper Magnus Maximus. Despite killing Gratian in 383, Maximus had been tolerated and at times recognised by Valentinian II and Theodosius during the five years before Theodosius marched against him in 388. Moreover, during his power-sharing, Maximus controlled *Galliae* — Gaul, Britain and Spain — with his seat in Trier.⁴⁵ This was the very area from which the orator Pacatus Drepanius travelled to Rome to deliver a panegyric to Theodosius before the Roman Senate (*Pan. Lat.* II[12]). Pacatus celebrates Theodosius’ career in the first half of a speech that comprises the standard topics of homeland, family, and virtues illustrated by deeds (§§1-22); he then offers a narrative of the suppression of Magnus Maximus culminating in the celebration of Theodosius’ clemency in the second (§§23-47). Pacatus, then, spoke as a representative of the territory that (at best) might be suspected of collusion with the figure that both he and Theodosius now branded a usurper. Rather than dodging this potentially awkward detail, he openly draws attention to his homeland in his introduction: ‘I hastened from the farthest recesses of Gaul,’⁴⁶ confirming his out-of-place identity by claiming to speak Latin with a dissonant Gallic accent (1.3). At the outset, Gaul is represented as a remote ‘other’ place, but as the speech continues Gaul gradually changes to one of a comprehensible and Romanized place, in a move, as Rees has argued, that seeks to raise then dispel the suspicion of its collusion with the ‘tyrant’, emphasising instead Gaul’s loyalty to Theodosius.⁴⁷ I suggest Pacatus’ representations of audiences play a significant part in his agenda of incorporating Gaul back into the imperial fold. Constructed audiences are multiple

⁴⁴ Methodological statements that promote autopsy are more numerous in Greek historiography (e.g. Hdt. 2.29.1, 34.1; 3.115.2; 4.116.1; Thucy. 1.22.1) than Latin, but it seems likely the Roman historians equally prized eyewitness testimony (e.g. Amm. 15.1.1). Marincola 1997, 76-79.

⁴⁵ See now Omissi 2018, 263-90 for a narrative of Maximus’ reign. For ancient historiographical responses to Maximus, see Lunn-Rockcliffe 2010, 320-1.

⁴⁶ *ab ultimo Galliarum recessu...properassem.* (2.1)

⁴⁷ Rees 2013[2015].

and overlapping in this speech, yet they share some characteristics with those of the earlier *Panegyrici Latini*. One of those audiences is constructed as especially troublesome for Pacatus during the opening of the speech. In a typical move to gain the goodwill of the audience (*captatio benevolentiae*), Pacatus claims that he is not qualified to speak of the magnificence of both Rome and Theodosius, and furthermore (1.3):

huc accedit auditor senatus, cui cum difficile sit pro amore quo in te praeditus est de te satis fieri, tum difficilius pro ingenita atque hereditaria orandi facultate non esse fastidio rudem hunc et incultum Transalpini sermonis horrorem...

An additional challenge is that the audience is the Senate. Not only is it difficult to satisfy it with regard to you because of the love it has for you, it is even more difficult, because of its inborn and hereditary gift of eloquence not to induce in it a feeling of distaste for the crude and uncultivated roughness of this, my Transalpine mode of speech...

Pacatus' 'challenge' also allows him to flatter the senators (they are loyal and eloquent), but it is noticeable that in comparison to other panegyrists Pacatus uses a direct reference to an audience to distinguish himself from them (linguistically they are relegated to the third person; Pacatus uses the first person singular of himself in 1.1). Yet throughout the first half of the speech we nonetheless find the typical pose of 'we' the passive beneficiary who see and celebrate Theodosius: at 4.5, under the rubric of the honorand's homeland, 'Spain has given us a god [the emperor] whom we can actually see';⁴⁸ at 7.2, 'we see' Theodosius and are surprised by his youth at the moment of his appointment as Augustus in 379; at 18.2 'each day we enquire about your [Theodosius'] benefactions and combine our memories, and lest forgetfulness ensnare individuals, each of us compares notes with each other.'⁴⁹ Who exactly are 'we' here? Does Pacatus now include the senatorial audience whom he had singled out in his introduction? Or does he mean the Gauls, from whom he has travelled, and whom he had already implied he represents (2.1)? Certainly, there seems to be no geographical location implied for 'our' actions, although the chronological indicators place all these events before Maximus' usurpation or in the present of the speech. The lack of specificity instead allows Pacatus to claim he speaks on behalf of an entire Roman population, including both 'Roman' Romans and Gauls, that was unified despite Maximus' usurpation in 383. He even adds a historical dimension to this claim when he invokes the example *maiores nostri* 'our ancestors', by which he means Republican magistrates who had to be a certain age to hold office, to emphasise Theodosius' remarkable youth at his appointment as Augustus, breaking the republican precedent (7.2).⁵⁰ This depiction of a unified, traditional, and universal Roman population, whose collective actions Pacatus can

⁴⁸ *deum dedit Hispania quem videmus*. Thus the trope of the *deus praesens*. MacCormack 1981, 22-32.

⁴⁹ *cotidie in beneficia tua quaerimus et memoriam convenimus et, ne singulis insidietur oblivio, cum altero quisque conferimus*. Similarly 17.2 and 17.4.

⁵⁰ Pacatus here asserts 'his membership of a common identity', Rees 2013[2015], 50.

represent, comes to a head halfway through the speech, just before the transition to the section on Maximus' rebellion. Here Pacatus uses the standard tropes of visibility and amazement to create a dichotomy between 'us' (i.e. Romans) and the 'barbarians' (22.1):

miremur in urbibus tuis et a tuis populis te videri, quem fere nulla in solo suo natio externa non vidit, idque ita crebro ut paene tam notus sit barbaris vultus iste quam nobis?

Should we wonder at your being viewed in your cities and by your peoples, you whom almost every country has seen on its soil and that so frequently that your countenance is almost as well known to the barbarians as it is to us?

It suits Pacatus' agenda to present himself as a representative of the entire Roman population at this stage because it normalises his position as a typical, representative, and loyal subject of the emperor. In the second half of the speech he shifts his pose to make it clear that he can also speak as the representative of the Gauls specifically when he describes Maximus' rebellion. He announces this shift via what at first seems a brash attack on the emperor: 'Do not think, however, that everything I am about to say will be pleasing to your ears, O emperor: we Gauls — you may well be astonished — are angry at your triumphs'.⁵¹ He goes on to explain that Theodosius' absence in the East had allowed Maximus the opportunity to rebel. As Rees notes, 'what the charge enables [Pacatus] to do is to develop an argument by which Gaul is seen to be victim of and not accomplice in Maximus' reign.'⁵² The explicit definition of who 'we' are here, allows Pacatus to suggest that the Gauls are identifiable a distinct subgroup of the empire's population only because of Maximus' actions. Furthermore, the actions that were typical of the constructed 'we' audience in other Latin panegyrics are invoked in the remainder of the speech to stress that the Gauls were an unwilling audience of Maximus' actions. For example, the trope of the passive beneficiaries of the good emperor is inverted so that they become the passive victims of the tyrant Maximus; communal joy was replaced with misery and faked happiness (25.1-2):

quis se nobis calamitate contulerit? Tyrannum et cum aliis tulimus et soli. Quid ego referam vacuatas municipibus suis civitates, impletas fugitivis nobilibus solitudines? ... cum interim miseri vetabamur agere miseros, immo etiam cogebamur mentiri beatos

Who could compare himself to us for disaster? We suffered the tyrant [Maximus] both with others and alone. Why should I recall towns emptied of their citizens, the

⁵¹ *Nec tamen, imperator, existimes cuncta me ad aurium gratiam locuturum: triumphis tuis Galli (stupeas licebit) irascimur.* 23.1. This is the inversion of the 'amazement trope': the emperor is amazed at 'we' the audience rather than vice versa (albeit Pacatus uses a different verb — *stupeo* rather than the more typical *miror*).

⁵² Rees 2013[2015], 50.

wilderness filled with noble fugitives?...We wretches were forbidden to display our wretchedness, indeed we were compelled to feign happiness.⁵³

Furthermore, if it was possible to identify the use of the second-person plural in tetrarchic speeches to invoke the ‘metaphysical presence’ of an absent emperor, then here the use of the first-person plural creates the metaphysical presence of the absent Gauls, of whom Pacatus is a single representative. Their invocation implies their participation in the communal celebrations taking place in Rome (especially in the first half of the speech), overcoming the suspicion that may still hang around them. And to ram home his point Pacatus concludes with a rousing depiction of how this metaphysical audience will become a real audience when he returns home and reiterates his praise of both Rome and Theodosius (47.5):

quae reversus urbibus Galliarum dispensabo miracula! Quantis stupentium populis, quam multo circumdabor auditore, cum dixerō: ‘Romam vidi, Theodosium vidi, et utrumque simul vidi...’

What marvellous tales shall I have to tell to the cities of Gaul upon my return! What crowds of admiring people, how great an audience (*multo... auditore*) shall surround me when I say: ‘I have seen Rome; I have seen Theodosius; and I have seen both together...’⁵⁴

Pacatus provides us with a far more complex use of a constructed audience than the other orators of the *Panegyrici Latini*, but is notable that he is discernibly acting on their lead. Despite the shifting identity of the wider group with whom Pacatus associates himself, their actions are the same as elsewhere: viewing, judging, and benefitting from the emperor (or the opposite in the case of a tyrant). Pacatus was likely responsible for the compilation of the *Panegyrici Latini* corpus, and in other aspects we can identify his awareness and development of the practices of his predecessors.⁵⁵ Here too, then, practice (not theory) has created a standard set of tropes for the role of the ‘constructed’ audience, that, 100 years after the first speech in the collection, Pacatus could redeploy in novel ways (inverting the emperor-audience relationship to present the absent Gauls’ relation with the tyrant Maximus) to serve the immediate political context.

Speeches of thanks and the orator’s separation from the audience

⁵³ The first-person plural is used to similar effect at 28.3.

⁵⁴ ‘The speech thus draws to its conclusion on an emphatically self-referential note, whereby Gaul will replicate in unanimous wonderment the very practice Pacatus Drepanius is undertaking. Again, and with more intensity, Gaul is seen to enact and parade its *Romanitas* through a combination of political loyalty and cultural display.’ Rees 2013[2015], 52.

⁵⁵ Pichon 1906.

The political situation of 389 complicated Pacatus' relationship with his immediate audience, but other factors could have a similar effect for other speeches. The Speech of Thanks (*gratiarum actio* or *χαριστήριος λόγος*) is a clear subset of imperial panegyric that had a more specific agenda than just praise of the emperor.⁵⁶ A decade before Pacatus addressed Theodosius, Ausonius composed a speech to thank his former tutee, the emperor Gratian, for appointing him consul in 379.⁵⁷ Naturally a speech which renders thanks for a particular imperial action, such as the gift of the consulship to an individual, singles out the recipient-orator from the rest of the audience in front of whom it was delivered: both the benefaction and the thanks are personal not collective. Ausonius appears particularly aware of this situation in the opening of his speech (1.2):

usquequaque gratias ago, tum tacitus, tum loquens, tum in coetu hominum, tum ipse mecum...

At all times and in all places that I express my thanks, now silently in my own heart, now with my tongue, now in company with others, now by myself...⁵⁸

Startlingly, then, Ausonius' thanksgiving does not necessarily require an audience to be either genuine or effective. This opening pose resembles Libanius' in *Oration 12*, examined earlier in this chapter. There Libanius also claimed that his praise for Julian preceded his actual speech; but whereas Libanius had claimed that as either 'dumb spectator' or orator, he shared his feelings with the rest of the audience, Ausonius sets himself apart. Indeed in the first two-thirds of the speech (§§1-12), Ausonius outlines the benefactions that he has received from the emperor, even to the imagined incredulity of his audience, to whom he gives a brief role as an interrogatory interlocutor: 'Someone will interpose: "It is true you have received all these benefits, but, tell me, how have you deserved them?"'⁵⁹ This rhetorical trick allows Ausonius to talk about further about himself and extol Gratian's generosity,⁶⁰ but it creates an adversarial stance between orator and audience that is unparalleled in other types

⁵⁶ Examples include Pliny's consular speech to Trajan in 100, which heads the *Panegyrici Latini* collection; Mamertinus' for his consulship of 362, *Pan. Lat.* III(11); Ausonius for his consulship of 379, *Gratiarum Actio*; Symmachus' *Oration 4* (albeit an odd example — for his father's intended consulship, before holding which the elder Symmachus died); Themistius' *Oration 2* for his adlection to the Constantinopolitan senate in 355; Julian *Oration 3* to Eusebia for the empress' patronage (c. 356/7).

⁵⁷ Ausonius' inauguration occurred on 1 January 369. The speech was delivered in Trier, but it is not entirely clear whether Gratian was present: Matthews 1975, 72; Green 1991, 537-45; Sivan 1997, 199.

⁵⁸ Translations of Ausonius are taken from Evelyn White 1921.

⁵⁹ *subiciet aliquis: 'ista equidem adeptus es, sed effare quo merito'*. 5.21.

⁶⁰ The technique becomes a litany of imagined interjections, repeated also for the topic of Ausonius' position as Gratian's tutor, 7.30 and 7.33. E.g. 'But again someone will comment freely in speech, yet more freely in thought: "Were there not in the past and even in ancient times many such tutors? Or are you the only man who has had an emperor for his pupil?" (*et rursum aliquis adiciet aut sermone libere aut cogitatione liberius: 'nonne olim et apud veteres multi eiusdem modi doctores fuerunt? an tu solus praeceptor Augusti?' 7.30).*

of imperial panegyric. But is *gratiarum actio* even true imperial encomium? Ausonius suggests not, and uses the reaction of the imagined audience to reinforce the distinction at the transition, two-thirds of the way through his speech, when he introduces a concluding section of more typical praise of the emperor's deeds (§§13-18), (13.61):

exspectare nunc aures praesentium scio et eminere in omnium vultu intellego, quod desiderio concipiatur animorum. existimant enim, cum ea quae ad grates agendas pertinebant summam... aliqua me etiam de maiestatis tuae laudibus debere perstringere. quamquam me istam dixerim seposuisse materiam et in tempus aliud reservare, nihilominus tamen, ut nunc aliqua contingam, nutu et prope murmure cohortantur.

I know that the ears of my audience are now eagerly waiting, I can read on every face the thought which springs from the longing of each heart. They think that now that I have touched on every topic which has reference to my Thanksgiving... I am bound to touch upon the praises of your Majesty. Although I have said that I have put that subject on one side and am keeping it for another occasion, nevertheless they all urge with nods, nay, almost with protests, to make some reference to it now.

On a theoretical level here, if thanksgiving was personal, then praise is communal; the audience may tolerate the former, but they are eager for the latter. More practically, we may detect the same rhetorical ploy as in Libanius' *Oration 12* to effect a positive, physical reaction in the 'real' audience in Trier, as they were suddenly compelled to nod in assent. In what follows, some familiar tropes appear ('we' marvel at and view Gratian's actions, 14.65), allowing Ausonius to assume the more usual role as his audience's representative.⁶¹ Thus we see a return to the more 'normal' relationship between orator and audience.

The political context of 379 saw Valens killed the previous year and the 20-year old Gratian elevate an outsider from the Valentinian dynasty, Theodosius, to deal with the Gothic crisis.⁶² Gibson has recently argued that Ausonius' focus on his personal relationship with Gratian was a way to avoid speaking about the difficult situation that he found himself, and instead promote his self-importance.⁶³ We might then think that his distancing from the audience and alignment as the emperor's intimate is part of this agenda, and thus atypical for *gratiarum actio*; but Claudius Mamertinus' speech of thanks to Julian for his consulship in 362 exhibits the same tropes. Mamertinus spoke not just as the new consul, but as Julian's right-hand man from his years as Caesar in Gaul.⁶⁴ Now both men were in Constantinople, suddenly in control of the entire empire after the unexpected death of Julian's cousin and opponent Constantius less than two months earlier. Mamertinus' speech not only expresses

⁶¹ Although he maintains a pose of the emperor's intimate: 'I have spoken of matters known to me and to all who share the inner life of the Court' (*atque ut ista dixi de cognitio mihi atque intra aulam familiaribus*, 15.71).

⁶² Matthews 1975, 91-6; Sivan 1993, 120-2. For Theodosius' panegyrists, see Stone in this volume.

⁶³ Gibson 2018.

⁶⁴ Lieu 1989, 4-6.

his thanks to Julian but also justifies the latter's legitimacy in the wake of his sudden seizure of the throne before a recently-expanded senate, many of whose new senators owed their position to Constantius.⁶⁵ Nonetheless, Mamertinus too deftly presents himself both as part of an audience of Julian's beneficiaries ('but our most revered emperor takes infinite pains that we should have suitable homes, that we should enjoy an abundance of goods, that we should lead virtuous, certainly, but also cheerful lives,'⁶⁶ and yet uses the 'marvelling' trope to distinguish himself from them (31.1):

sed sint, sanctissime imperator, ea quae tu iuste moderate civiliter facis aliis forte miraculo; mihi esse non possunt.

It may be, revered emperor, that your acts of justice, moderation and kindness are a source of profound astonishment to some; they are not so to me.

The standard audience response is not shared by the speaker. The context of these two examples at 12.2 and 31.1 is Julian's recent actions towards the Constantinopolitans, whereas earlier in the speech Mamertinus had singled himself out as Julian's thankful beneficiary (1.1-5) before giving a summary of Julian's activities in Gaul as Constantius' Caesar. Here the audience is set up as potential adversaries to Mamertinus' presentation of events: Mamertinus notes that Julian's victories in the late 350s incensed Constantius' envy, and turns directly to his audience (5.2):

sed quid, oro vos, principem nostrum facere debuisse censetis? Romanas urbes hostibus dederet, ne animum fratris offenderet?

But what, I ask you [i.e. the audience], in your opinion should our prince have done? Should he have handed over Roman cities to the enemy, for fear of offending his brotherly pride?

So far only Julian had been addressed in the second person. Here the sudden address to the audience highlights a potential area for disagreement between orator and audience (did the audience have doubts about Julian's actions in Gaul?), and invokes a deliberative mode. Unlike Demosthenes (with whom we started) Mamertinus seems not to have waited for a spontaneous or choreographed response from his audience (though who knows what might have happened on the day) — instead he answers his own question to defend Julian in the following sentence. Mamertinus, like Ausonius, uses the natural distinction between thanksgiving-honorand and audience to reinforce the agenda of his speech, sometimes

⁶⁵ Blockley 1972. Rees 2012b, 212-215 for Mamertinus' threatening pose against the Constantinopolitan audience.

⁶⁶ *at sanctissimus imperator impense studet ut nos pro dignitate habitemus, ut commodis adfluamus, ut castam quidem sed hilarem ducamus aetatem* (12.2).

maintaining his distance, but ultimately bringing all together to reinforce a message of Julian's positive reign (27.2 and 31.1).

Conclusion

Our few glimpses of 'historical' audiences for late-antique panegyric suggest that they played a vital role in the performance and success of any speech. Their positive reactions were not guaranteed, despite the dominating presence of an imperial honorand, and so orators sought to control that role by scripting a part for their audience within their speeches through a variety of direct addresses or claims to represent them, prompting or controlling interjections and conditioning certain responses. Equally, the construction of the audience's persona could communicate to the emperor their loyalty, gratefulness, and a continued need for benefaction. The absence of any practical advice from our few theorists suggests that the uniformity both of the techniques used by orators, and the types of relationships created between honorand and audience, owes more to imitation of practice than following of established rules. A normalised depiction of the audience as a single, static, and passive beneficiary, whose representative was the orator before a mobile emperor was established in the early *Panegyrici Latini*. This was sufficiently well known that it could then be manipulated to serve specific agendas of less typical speeches — when orators were not drawn from their immediate audience, or when their agenda included personal thanks as well as communal praise.

Bibliography

- Aldrete, G.S. (1999) *Gestures and Acclamations in Ancient Rome*. Baltimore, MD.
- Bablitz, L. (2007) *Actors and Audience in the Roman Courtroom*. London.
- Barnes, T.D. (1982) *The New Empire of Diocletian and Constantine*. Cambridge, MA.
- Blockley, R.C. (1972) 'Constantius Gallus and Julian as Caesars of Constantius II', *Latomus* 31: 433-68.
- Evelyn-White, H. (1921) *Ausonius Volume II*. Cambridge, MA.
- Galletier, É. (1949) *Les Panégyriques latins, tome II*. Paris.
- Gibson, B. (2018) 'Gratitude to Gratian: Ausonius' "Thanksgiving for his Consulship"', in D. Burgersdijk and A.J. Ross (eds.), *Imagining Emperors in the Later Roman Empire*. Leiden. 270-88.
- Green, R.P.H. (1991) *The Works of Ausonius*. Oxford.
- Hansen, M.H. (1987) *The Athenian Assembly in the Age of Demosthenes*. Oxford.
- Korenjak, M. (1999) *Publikum und Redner: ihre Interaktion in der sophistischen Rhetorik der Kaiserzeit*. Munich.
- Lieu, S. (1989) *The Emperor Julian*. Liverpool.
- Lunn-Rockliffe, S. (2010) 'Commemorating the Usurper Magnus Maximus: Ekphrasis, Poetry, and History in Pacatus' Panegyric of Theodosius', *Journal of Late Antiquity* 3: 316-36.
- MacCormack, S. (1981) *Art and Ceremony in Late Antiquity*. Berkeley, CA.

- Marincola, J. (1997) *Authority and Tradition in Ancient Historiography*. Cambridge.
- Martin, J and P. Petit (1979) *Libanios: Discours*. Tome I: *Autobiographie (Discours I)*. Paris.
- Matthews, J. (1975) *Western Aristocracies and Imperial Court AD 364-425*. Oxford.
- Maxwell, K.R. (2010) *Hearing between the Lines: The Audience as Fellow-Worker in Luke-Acts and its Literary Milieu*. London.
- Nixon, C.E.V. and B. Saylor Rodgers (1994) *In Praise of Later Roman Emperors. The Panegyrici Latini*. Berkeley, CA.
- Norman, A.F. (1965) *Libanius' Autobiography (Oration 1)*. Oxford.
- Omissi, A. (2018) *Emperors and Usurpers: Civil war, Panegyric, and the Construction of Legitimacy in the Later Roman Empire*. Oxford.
- Oravec, C. (1976) "Observation" in Aristotle's Theory of Epideictic', *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 9: 162-174.
- Pernot, L. (1993) *La rhétorique de l'éloge dans le monde Gréco-Romain*. Paris.
- Pernot, L. (2015) *Epideictic Rhetoric: Questioning the Stakes of Ancient Praise*. Austin, TX.
- Pichon, R. (1906) 'L'Origine du recueil des *Panegyrici Latini*' *REA* 8: 229-49.
- Quiroga Puertas, A. (2019) *The Dynamics of Rhetorical Performances in Late Antiquity*. Abingdon.
- Rees, R.D. (2002) *Layers of Loyalty in Latin Panegyric: AD 289-307*. Oxford.
- Rees, R.D. (2003) 'Talking to the Tetrarchs; the Dynamics of Vocative Address', in C. Deroux (ed.), *Studies in Latin Literature Roman History XI*. Brussels. 447-92.
- Rees, R.D. (2012a) *Latin Panegyric*. Oxford.
- Rees, R.D. (2012b) 'Bright Lights, Big City', in L. Grig and G. Kelly (eds.), *Two Romes: Rome and Constantinople in Late Antiquity*. Oxford. 203-22.
- Rees, R.D. (2013) 'The Look of the Late Antique Emperor and the Art of Praise', in H. Lovatt and C. Vout (eds.) *Epic Visions: Visuality in Greek and Latin Epic and its Reception*. Cambridge. 99-121.
- Rees, R.D. (2013[2015]) 'From Alterity to Unity in Pacatus Drepanius' *Panegyric to Theodosius*', *Talanta* 45: 31-53.
- Sabbah, G. (1984) 'De la Rhétorique à la communication politique: les Panégyriques latins', *Bulletin de l'Association Guillaume Budé* 43: 363-388.
- Serafim, A. (2017) *Attic Oratory and Performance*. London.
- Sivan, H. (1993) *Ausonius of Bordeaux. Genesis of a Gallic Aristocracy*. London.
- Tacon, J. (2001) 'Ecclesiastic *Thorubos*: Interventions, Interruptions, and Popular Involvement in the Athenian Assembly', *Greece and Rome* 48: 173-192.
- Yunis, H. (2001) *Demosthenes: On the Crown*. Cambridge.
- Yunis, H. (2005) *Demosthenes, Speeches 18 and 19*. Austin, TX.
- Van Hoof, L. and P. Van Nuffelen (2011) 'Monarchy and Mass Communication: Antioch AD 362/3 Revisited' *JRS* 101: 166-84.
- Whitby, M. (1998) 'Introduction', in Mary Whitby (ed.) *Propaganda of Power: the Role of Panegyric in Late Antiquity*. Leiden. 1-16.
- Wiemer, H.-U. (1995) *Libanios und Julian*. Munich.
- Wolpert, A.O. (2003) 'Addresses to the Jury in Attic Orators', *AJP* 124: 537-55.
- Worthington, I. (2017) 'Audience Reaction, Performance and the Exploitation of Delivery in the Courts and Assembly', in S. Papaioannou, A. Serafim, and B. de Vela (eds.), *The*

Theatre of Justice: Aspects of Performance in Greco-Roman Oratory and Rhetoric.
Leiden. 13-25.

Appendix: Editions, Translations and Commentaries of Imperial Panegyrics

Below is a list of imperial panegyrics from the period years 284-423 with which this volume is concerned, both surviving speeches and *testimonia* of speeches that were delivered which do not survive.¹ Whilst the former list can claim to be comprehensive, it would be overly bold to claim likewise of the latter, nonetheless it is felt that even a potentially incomplete list of *testimonia* will be valuable resource. Surviving speeches are grouped by author, with authors listed alphabetically and their speeches chronologically. Titles are given for each speech, derived from the MSS, and an indication of its date of delivery.² Appended to each author's list are the key editions, translations, and commentaries of the texts concerned.³ The *testimonia* are listed at the end.

Key to translations: [EN]=English, [FR]=French, [GE]=German, [IT]=Italian, [RU]=Russian, [SP]=Spanish.

Ausonius

1. *Speech of Thanks to the Emperor Gratian for the Consulship*, 379

Editions: Pastorino 1971; Prete 1978; Green 1991; Green 1999

Translations: Evelyn White 1921 [EN]; Jasinski 1934-5 [FR]; Pastorino 1971 [IT]; Alvar Ezquerra 1990 [SP]; Gasparov 1993 [RU]

Commentaries: Alvar Ezquerra 1990; Green 1991

Claudian

1. *Panegyric on the Third Consulship of Honorius Augustus*, 396
2. *Panegyric on the Fourth Consulship of Honorius Augustus*, 396
3. *Panegyric of Serena (Carmina Minora 30)*, before 398
4. *Panegyric on the Sixth Consulship of Honorius Augustus*, 404

Editions: Hall 1985; Charlet 1991-2000

Translations: Plautner 1922 [EN]; Barr 1981 (4 Cos. Hon) [EN]; Consolino 1986 [IT];

Charlet 1991-2000 [FR]; Dewar 1996 (6 Cos. Hon) [EN]; Ricci 2001 (*Laus Serenae*) 2000 [IT]

¹ This list draws upon the appendices of Murray 2018 and Omissi 2018. Here we include all speeches addressed to an emperor that include a substantial amount of praise. This is a slightly broader definition than employed in the Introduction and throughout the volume, but our aim in this appendix is to provide as comprehensible a guide as possible to imperial panegyric literature in the period.

² Dates are not always easy to establish with certainty, and we have erred here on the side of caution, generally omitting specificity where dating is insecure. Where Murray and Omissi differ, we have tended to follow Omissi. In general for dating, however, it is always recommended that readers consult the forewords to specific editions and translations and, indeed, relevant secondary literature.

³ Note that 'editions' refers to texts that are editions *only*. Many of the translations also contain an edition of the text.

Commentaries: Barr 1981 (4 Cos. Hon); Heuss 1982 (*Laus Serenae*); Lehner 1984 (4 Cos. Hon); Dewar 1996 (6 Cos. Hon)

Eusebius of Caesarea

1. *In Praise of Constantine*, 25 July 336
2. *Life of Constantine*, 337

Editions: Heikel 1902

Translations: Drake 1976 (*LC*) [EN]; Cameron and Hall 1999 (*VC*) [EN]; Amerise 2005 (*LC*) [IT]

Commentaries: Cameron and Hall 1999 (*VC*)

Himerius

1. Fr. 1 ?*To Constantius*
2. Or. 41: [*An Oration*] *Given in Constantinople for the City Itself, for the Emperor Julian, and for the Mithraic Initiation*

Editions: Colonna 1951

Translations: Völker 2003 [GE]; Penella 2007 [EN]

Commentaries: Völker 2003

Julian

1. Or. 1: *Panegyric to Constantius*, 355-56
2. Or. 3: *To Eusebia*, 355-56
3. Or. 2: *Constantius, or On Kingship*, 357-59

Editions: Hertlein 1875-76; Bidez 1932

Translations: Wright 1913-23 [EN]; Bidez 1932 [FR]; García Blanco 1982 [SP]; Tantillo 1997 (*Or.* 1) [IT]; Angiolani 2008 (*Or.* 3) [IT]; Ponzzone 2012 [IT]; Filippo & Ugenti 2016 (*Or.* 3) [IT]

Commentaries: Tantillo 1997 (*Or.* 1); Angiolani 2008 (*Or.* 3); Filippo & Ugenti 2016 (*Or.* 3)

Libanius

1. Or. 59: *Panegyric on Constantius and Constans*, 344-49
2. Or. 13: *Address to Julian*, 362
3. Or. 14: *For Aristophanes*, 362
4. Or. 12: *To the Emperor Julian as Consul*, 1 Jan 363
5. Or. 15: *Embassy to Julian*, 363
6. Or. 16: *To the Antiochenes, on the Emperor's Anger*, 363
7. Or. 24: *On Avenging Julian*, 378/9
8. Or. 45: *To the Emperor, on the Prisoners*, 386
9. Or. 33: *To the Emperor Theodosius, against Tisamenus*, 386

10. *Or. 30: To the Emperor Theodosius, on the Temples*, 386
11. *Or. 19: To the Emperor Theodosius, on the Riots*, post 387
12. *Or. 20: To the Emperor Theodosius, after the Reconciliation*, post 387
13. *Or. 49: To the Emperor, for the City Councils*, 388
14. *Or. 51: To the Emperor, Against those who Besiege the Governors*, 388
15. *Or. 52: To the Emperor, Proposal of a Law against those who Visit the Headquarters of Officials*, 388

Editions: Foerster 1903-27

Translations: Pack 1935 (*Or. 45*) [EN]; Norman 1969-77 (*Ors. 12-16, 19-20, 24, 33, 45, 49*) [EN]; Stern 1980 (*Ors. 13-16, and 30*) [EN]; Romano 1982 (*Or. 30*) [IT]; Criscuolo 1994 (*Or. 24*) [IT]; Criscuolo 1996 (*Or. 13*) [IT]; Dodgeon 1996 (*Or. 59*) [EN]; González Gálvez 2001 (*Ors. 12-16, 19, 30, 45*) [SP]; Fatouros, Krischer, and Portmann 2002 (*Or. 17, 18, 24, 59*) [GE]; Malosse 2003 (*Or. 59*) [FR]; Kauffmann 2006 (*Or. 45, 51, 52*) [FR]; Criatore 2015 (*Or. 51-2*) [EN]

Panegyrici Latini

1. *Pan. Lat. X(2): Panegyric of Maximian*, 21 April 289
2. *Pan. Lat. XI(3): Genethliacus of Maximian Augustus*, 291
3. *Pan. Lat. VIII(4): Panegyric of Constantius*, 297
4. *Pan. Lat. IX(5): Eumenius, for the Restoration of the Schools*, 297/8
5. *Pan. Lat. VII(6): Panegyric of Maximian and Constantine*, 307
6. *Pan. Lat. VI(7): Panegyric of Constantine*, 310
7. *Pan. Lat. V(8): Speech of thanks to Constantine*, 311
8. *Pan. Lat. XII(9): Panegyric of Constantine Augustus*, 313
9. *Pan. Lat. IV(10): Nazarius, Panegyric of Constantine*, 1 March 321
10. *Pan. Lat. III(11): Claudius Mamertinus, Speech of thanks to Julian*, 1 January 362
11. *Pan. Lat. II(12): Pacatus, Panegyric of Theodosius*, summer 389

Editions: Baehrens 1874; Baehrens 1911; Galletier 1949-55; Mynors 1964; Paladini and Fedeli 1976; Lassandro 1992

Translations: Galletier 1949-55 [FR]; Barbarino 1965 (III[11]) [IT]; Marsili 1965 (IX[5]) [IT]; Sang 1979 (VII[6] & VI[7]) [EN]; Lieu 1986 (*Pan. Lat. III[11]*) [EN]; Nixon 1987 (II[12]) [EN]; Müller-Rettig 1990 (VI[7]) [GE]; Nixon and Saylor Rodgers 1994 [EN]; García Ruiz 2006 (III[11]) [SP]; Müller-Rettig 2008-15 [GE]

Commentaries: Gutzwiller 1942 (III[11]); Sang 1979 (VII[6] & VI[7]) [EN]; Müller-Rettig 1990 (VI[7]); García Ruiz 2006 (III[11])

Symmachus

1. *Or. 1: Panegyric to Valentinian Augustus*, 367/8
2. *Or. 3: Panegyric to Gratian Augustus*, 367/8
3. *Or. 2: Panegyric to Valentinian Augustus*, 1 January 370

Editions: Seeck 1883; Callu 2009.

Translations: Hall 1977 (*Ors.* 1 and 2) [EN]; del Chicca 1984 (*Or.* 1) [IT]; Pabst 1989 [GE]; Callu 2009 [FR]; Saylor Rodgers [online resource] [EN]

Commentaries: Hall 1977 (*Ors.* 1 and 2)

Synesius of Cyrene

1. *To the Emperor, or On Empire*

Editions: Lamoureux and Aujoulat 2008

Translations: Fitzgerald 1930 [EN]; Garzya 1973 [IT] Lamoureux and Aujoulat 2008 [EN]

Themistius

1. *Or.* 1: *On The Love of Mankind, or Constantius*, 342-51
2. *Or.* 2: *To the Emperor Constantius, that the Ruler be a Philosopher, or Thanksgiving*, 355
3. *Or.* 3: *Embassy Speech for Constantinople delivered in Rome*, 357
4. *Or.* 4: *To the Emperor Constantius*, 1 January 357
5. *Or.* 5: *Consular Speech to the Emperor Jovian*, 1 January 364
6. *Or.* 6: *On Brotherly Love, or on the Love of Mankind*, 364
7. *Or.* 7: *On the Unfortunates, before Valens*, 366/7
8. *Or.* 8: *Quinquennial Oration*, 368 or 369
9. *Or.* 9: *Exhortation to the Younger Valentinian*, 1 January 369
10. *Or.* 10: *On the Peace of Valens*, 369/70
11. *Or.* 11: *Decennial Oration, or on the Words Suitable to the Emperor*, 373 or 374
12. *Or.* 13: *Erotikos, or on Imperial Beauty*, 376
13. *Or.* 14: *Embassy to the Emperor Theodosius*, 379
14. *Or.* 15: *To Theodosius, or the Most Royal of the Virtues*, 19 January 381
15. *Or.* 16: *Speech of Thanksgiving for the Peace and the Consulship of the General Saturninus*, 1 January 383
16. *Or.* 17: *On the appointment to the Prefecture*, 383/4
17. *Or.* 18: *On the Indulgence of the Emperor*, 384/5
18. *Or.* 19: *On the Love of Mankind of the Emperor Theodosius*, 384/5

Editions: Schenkl et al. (1965-74)

Translations:⁴ Heather and Moncur 1991 (a partial translation of *Or.* 8 and 10) [EN];

Maisano 1995; Leppin and Portmann 1998; Heather and Moncur 2001 (*Or.* 1, 3, 5-6, 14-17) [EN]; Sugars 1997 (*Or.* 7) [EN]; Swain forthcoming (*Or.* 6-11 and 13) [EN]

⁴ A complete English translation of Themistius' political orations was completed by G. Downey but was never published. After Downey's death it was deposited with Prof. W.E. Kaegi of Chicago (MacBain 1983; Vanderspoel 1995: viii), although its whereabouts are now unknown to Prof. Kaegi (pers. comm. Sept. 2018).

Commentaries: Sugars 1997 (*Or.* 7)

Testimonia

1. Soterichus, to Diocletian (*Suda* Σ877)
2. Author of *Pan. Lat.* VIII(4) to Maximian (*Pan. Lat.* VIII(4).1.5-6)
3. Libanius to Gallus Caesar (*Lib., Or.* 1.97)
4. Faltonia Betitia Proba to Constantius (Matthews 1992).
5. Himerius to Julian (*Or.* 52 [Colonna])
6. Latinus Alcimus Alethius to Julian (Ausonius *Prof.* III.23)
7. Themistius to Julian (*Lib., Ep.* 818.3; 1430)
8. Libanius to Procopius? (*Lib., Or.* 1.163-5)
9. Libanius to Valens (*Lib., Or.* 1.144)
10. Themistius to Valens (*Soc., HE* 4.32)
11. Augustine to Valentinian II (*Aug., Conf.* 6.6)
12. Symmachus to Magnus Maximus (*Symm., Ep.* 2.31; *Soc., HE* 5.14)
13. Symmachus to Theodosius (*Soc., HE* 5.14)
14. Eusebius of Antioch to Theodosius and Arcadius (*Lib. Or.* 1.258)
15. Paulinus of Nola to Theodosius (Paulinus, *Ep.* 28.6; Jer. *Ep.* 58; Gennad. *de vir. inlustr.* 49).
16. Priscio to Theodosius (*Lib. Ep.* 1053)

Bibliography

- Alvar Ezquerro (1990) *Decio Maximo Ausonio*. Madrid.
- Amerise, M. (2005) *Elogio di Costantino: Discorso per il trentennale, Discorso regale*. Milan.
- Angiolani, S. (2008) *Elogio dell'Imperatrice Eusebia*. Naples.
- Baehrens, E. (1874) *XII panegyrici latini*. Leipzig.
- Baehrens, W. (1911) *XII panegyrici latini*. Leipzig.
- Barr, W. (1981) *Claudian's Panegyric on the Fourth Consulate of Honorius. Introduction, Text, Translation and Commentary*. Liverpool.
- Bidez, J. (1932-64) *L'Empereur Julien: Oeuvres Complètes*. 2 vols. Paris.
- Callu, J.-P. (2009) *Symmaque. Tome v: Discours*. Paris.
- Cameron, A.M. and S.G. Hall (1999) *Eusebius' Life of Constantine. Introduction, translation and commentary*. Oxford.
- Charlet, J.-L. (1991-2000) *Claudien. Oeuvres*. Paris.
- Colonna, A. (1951) *Himerii Declamationes et orationes cum deperditarum fragmentis*. Rome.
- Consolino, F.E. (1986) *Elogio di Serena*. Venice.
- Criore, R. (2015) *Between City and School: Selected Orations of Libanius*. Liverpool.
- Criscuolo, U. (1994) *Sulla vendetta di Giuliano: or. 24*. Naples
- Criscuolo, U. (1996) *Allocuzione a Giuliano per l'arrivo in Antiochia: or. 13*. Naples.

- del Chicca, F. (1984) *Q. Aurelii Symmachi V.C. Laudatio in Valentinianum seniore*
Augustum prior. Rome.
- Dewar, M. (1996) *Panegyricus de sexto consulatu Honorii Augusti*. Oxford.
- Dodgeon, M. H. (1996) 'Libanius, *Oratio LIX*', in S. Lieu and D. Montserrat (eds.), *From Constantine to Julian: Pagan and Byzantine Views: A Source History*. London. 164-209.
- Drake, H. (1976) *In Praise of Constantine: A Historical Study and New Translation of Eusebius' Tricennial Orations*. Berkeley, CA.
- Evelyn-White, H.G. (1922) *Ausonius*. Cambridge, Mass.
- Fatouros, G., T. Krischer, and W. Portmann (2002) *Libanios: Kaiserreden*. Stuttgart.
- Filippo, A. & M. Ugenti (2016) *Giuliano Imperatore, Elogio dell'imperatrice Eusebia*. Pisa.
- Fitzgerald, A. (1930) *The Essays and Hymns of Synesius of Cyrene, Including the Address to Arcadius and the Political Speeches*. Oxford.
- Foerster, R. (1903-27) *Libanii opera*. 12 vols. Leipzig.
- Galletier, E. (1949-1955) *Panegyriques Latins: texte établi et traduit par Édouard Galletier*. 3 vols. Paris.
- García Blanco, J. (1982), *Juliano. Discursos I-V*, Madrid.
- García Ruiz, M.P. (2006) *Panegírico (Gratiarum actio) al emperador Juliano*. Pamplona.
- Garzya, A. (1973) *Sinesio, Sul regno*. Naples.
- Gasparov, M.L. (1993) *Stikhotvoreniia. Avsonii*. Moscow.
- González Gálvez, A. (2001) *Discursos II & III*. Madrid.
- Green, R.P.H. (1991) *The Works of Ausonius*. Oxford.
- Green, R.P.H. (1999) *Decimi Magni Ausonii Opera*. Oxford.
- Hall, J.B. (1985) *Claudii Claudiani carmina*. Leipzig.
- Hall, R.G. (1977) *Two Panegyrics in Honor of Valentinian I by Q. Aurelius Symmachus: a Translation and Commentary*. Diss: North Carolina.
- Heather, P.J. and J. Matthews (1991) *The Goths in the Fourth Century*. Liverpool.
- Heather, P.J. and D. Moncur (2001) *Politics, Philosophy, and Empire in the Fourth Century: Select Orations of Themistius*. Liverpool.
- Heikel, I.A. et al. (1902) *Eusebius Werke*. 9 vols. Leipzig.
- Hertlein, F.C. (1875-76) *Iuliani imperatoris quae supersunt praeter reliquias apud Cyrillum omnia*. 2 vols. Leipzig.
- Jasinski, M. (1934-5) *Ausone. Oeuvres en vers et en prose*. Paris.
- Kauffmann, S. (2006) *Discours 45, 50, 51 et 52 de Libnios: Édition, traduction et commentaire*. PhD, Paris.
- Lamoureux, J. and N. Aujoulat (2008) *Synésios de Cyrène, Opuscules III*. Paris.
- Lehner, J. (1984) *Poesie und Politik in Claudians Panegyrikus auf das vierte Konsulat des Kaisers Honorius: ein Kommentar*. Königstein.
- Leppin, H. and W. Portmann (1998) *Staatsreden: Themistios, Übersetzung, Einführung und Erläuterungen*. Stuttgart.
- Lieu, S.N.C. (1986) *The Emperor Julian: Panegyric and Polemic*. Liverpool.
- MacBain, B. 1983. 'An Annotated Bibliography of Sources for Late Antiquity in English Translation', *Byzantine studies. Études byzantines* 10: 88-109 and 223-47.

- Maisano, R. (1995) *Discorsi di Temistio*. Turin.
- Malosse, P.-L., (2003) *Libanios: Discours*. Tome IV. *Discours LIX*. Paris.
- Matthews, J. (1992) 'The Poetess Proba', in M. Christol, S. Demogin, Y. Duval, C. Lepelley, and L. Pietri (eds.), *Institutions, société et vie politique dans l'empire romain au IVe siècle ap. J.-C.: actes de la table ronde autour de l'œuvre d'André Chastagnol (Paris, 20-21 Janvier 1989)*. Rome. 277-304.
- Müller-Rettig, B. (1990) *Der Panegyricus des Jahres 310 auf Konstantin den Grossen: Übersetzung und historisch-philologischer Kommentar*. Stuttgart.
- Müller-Rettig, B. (2008-15) *Panegyrici Latini: Lobreden auf römische Kaiser*. 2 vols. Darmstadt.
- Murray, O. (2018) 'The Classical Traditions of Panegyric and Advice to Princes', in G. Roskam and S. Schorn (eds.) *Concepts of Ideal Rulership from Antiquity to the Renaissance*. Turnhout. 217-54.
- Mynors, R.A.B. (1964) *XII panegyrici latini*. Oxford.
- Nixon, C.E.V. (1987) *Panegyric to the Emperor Theodosius*. Liverpool.
- Nixon, C.E.V. and B. Saylor Rodgers (1994) *In Praise of Later Roman Emperors: the Panegyrici Latini*. Berkeley, CA.
- Norman, A.F. (1969-77) *Libanius: Selected Orations*. 2 vols. Cambridge, MA.
- Omissi, A. (2018) *Emperors and Usurpers: Civil war, Panegyric, and the Construction of Legitimacy in the Later Roman Empire*. Oxford.
- Pabst, A. (1989) *Quintus Aurelius Symmachus: Reden*. Darmstadt.
- Pack, R.A. (1935) *Studies in Libanius and Antiochene society under Theodosius*. Menasha, WI.
- Paladini, V., and P. Fedeli (1974) *Panegyrici Latini*. Rome.
- Pastorino, A. (1971) *Opere di Decimo Magno Ausonio*. Turin
- Penella, R.J. (2007) *Man and the Word: The Orations of Himerius*. Berkeley, CA.
- Plautnauer, M. (1922) *Claudian*. 2 vols. Cambridge, MA.
- Ponzzone, S. (2012) *Giuliano Imperatore, Encomi e lettere*. Varese.
- Prete, S. (1978), *Decimi Magni Ausonii Burdigalensis opuscula*. Leipzig.
- Ricci, M. L. (2001) *Claudiani Opera Minora*. Bari.
- Ritoré Ponce, J. (2000) *Temistio: Discursos Políticos*. Madrid.
- Romano, R. (1982) *In difesa dei templi*. Naples.
- Sang, J.C. (1976) *Panegyrici Latini VI & VII: Translated with Introductions and Commentary*. Diss: Univ. of Cape Town.
- Saylor Rodgers, B. [online resource] translation of Symmachus' *Orationes*: <https://www.uvm.edu/~bsaylor/> (retrieved 28 March 2019).
- Schenkl, H. (1965-74) *Themistii Orationes quae supersunt*. 3 vols. Leipzig.
- Seeck, O. (1883) *Q. Aurelii Symmachi quae supersunt*. Berlin.
- Stern, M. (1980) *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism, Vol. 2*. Jerusalem.
- Swain, S. (forthcoming), *Themistius, Speeches to Valens and his Family (Orr 6-13)*. Provisional title. Liverpool.
- Sugars, J.M. (1977) *Themistius' Seventh Oration: Text, Translation, Commentary*. Diss: UC Irvine.

Völker, H. (2003) *Himerios, Reden und Fragmente : Einführung, Übersetzung und Kommentar*. Wiesbaden.

Wright, W.C. (1913-23) *The Works of the Emperor Julian*. 3 vols. Cambridge, MA.