Latin prose Panegyrics: tradition and discontinuity in the later Roman Empire

1. Aims and definitions of the enquiry

The development of the Latin eulogistic oratory was at first intermittent rather than continuous. So far as can be judged by the extant evidence, a period of continuity began in the late 3rd century A.D. Late Antiquity was the Golden Age of panegyrics.

The thesis of this study is that panegyric in general, but especially in late antiquity, is intelligible only as a function of a total situation. Therefore, in order to approach late antique panegyric it is necessary to examine closely the elements of continuity and discontinuity within the panegyric tradition. Also, we must study the milieu in which panegyrics were composed, and reconstruct the concrete circumstances in which they were delivered. For behind the surviving texts of Latin panegyrics there lay the formation of a specific intellectual environment, the harnessing of this environment to the needs of the court, the careful and deliberate choice of particular means of expression which had been made available by the literary tradition, and their overall orchestration to communicate a precise message at a precise time. These diverse aspects of panegyrics must be taken as a whole: and to study them is to touch upon many of the major trends in the social and cultural history of the Western Empire from the age of Diocletian to the early 5th century A.D.

* I owe much to Mr. Peter Brown, Dr. Oswyn Murray, the Rev. Gervase Mathew OP, Dr. Hadwig Hörner and Dr. Robert Markus, who have read or corrected earlier drafts of this paper, and to Dr. J. F. Matthews, who discussed some problems with me. I would also like to thank the Craven Committee for a most generous study grant which enabled me to devote more time to this paper than would otherwise have been possible.
What emerges from such a study is not a static picture. The purpose of this article is to examine why this should be so. Seen against the background of Late Antiquity as a whole, the Tetrarchy stands out as a rare moment of equilibrium. It is not (as the conventional chronoligical traditions of Late Roman history books seem to imply) the starting point for a future continuous tradition. In the history of panegyric (as in many other aspects) it is rather, an age of achievements that are not maintained in the course of the 4th century. Our starting point in the Tetrarchy reveals a situation where intimate and ceremonious relations existed between the emperor and certain towns of Gaul. The schools of these towns produced rhetors whose panegyrics are outstanding for their certainty of touch, their choice of topics, their manipulation of information, and for their discreet and skilful application of a living pagan imagery. We have here the articulation of a means of political communication which was almost unprecedented in the ancient world. The end of the 4th and the early 5th centuries reveal a very different world. If certainty of touch in political communication is still possible, it is not in prose panegyrics that we will find it: in the Greek world, two theorists of empire of religious and philosophical formation rather than of strictly literary training — Eusebius of Caesarea and Themistius — are the symptoms of a change illustrated in the West and by the tentative and ephemeral adaptation to imperial purposes of another literary genre, that of the Consolatio, in the funeral orations of St. Ambrose. The renewal of poetic eulogy in the Latin world, which is associated in the first place with Claudian, breaks with the tradition of prose panegyric. On closer inspection, for instance, the treatment of myth in the poems of Claudian differs root and branch from that of the Latin panegyrists. A strictly literary change such as this is a symptom of a drastic regrouping of the constellation of elements that had gone into the forming of Tetrarchic panegyrics. Thus, the study of what is at first sight a purely literary problem, may help us to see something of the processes that led to the decline and fall of the Roman empire in the West.

2. Greek Rhetorical Textbooks

The writers of panegyric in the age of Diocletian found themselves heirs of a long and varied tradition. They re-formed this tradition and redistributed its emphases with more originality than they have been given credit for, and they did this even though the tradition tacitly delimited their freedom of choice. However, the superficial literary resemblances, and the inevitable overlap of topics in different panegyrics which were demanded by the imperial court, should not allow us to overlook the fact that, in the Latin world of the late 3rd century, prose panegyric had become a specific political and cultural element, which can be identified and described in terms of those same definitions of their own works as were made by the panegyrist themselves. The evolution of panegyric in the 4th century and later, therefore, is to
be studied as a process in its own right.

Although Latin prose panegyrics were derived from Greek rhetorical theory as regards their arrangement of topics and rhetorical methods, in their method manner of implementing Greek theory, Latin panegyrist had been largely independent of their Greek precursors and contemporaries. They relied instead on Cicero, especially on his Caesarian speeches, his De Lege Manilia and on Pliny's panegyric. Yet six centuries of Greco-Roman writing on epideictic oratory lay behind the Latin panegyrics of the late 3rd century. It is as well to appreciate this tradition in its Greek and Latin forms in order to seize wherein Latin panegyric had shifted its emphases since Greek times. Fundamentally, as will be seen, the shift referred to made panegyrics less biographical, and thus more clearly distinct from historical writing.

Most rhetorical treatises had given instructions for the composition of epideictic speeches. Among the methods generally suggested are comparisons, amplification of particular topics, an elevated style commensurate with the importance of the theme, and careful subdivisions to make clear the overall structure of the work, whether this was biographical or analytical that is, praise or vituperation according to virtues or vices. The chief aim of an epideictic discourse, as repeated frequently in rhetorical literature, was to please the listeners by any means possible. Aristotle's Rhetoric, which, apart from the so-called rhetoric ad Alexandrum is the earliest surviving rhetorical treatise, gives instructions as to how to compose an epideictic speech, and also suggests the heroes of the mythological and historical past as fitting subjects for eulogies. In other words, Aristotle bore in mind chiefly speeches for the delection of the audience, although the example of Isocrates' Evagoras shows that such speeches could have a practical application, could serve to propound political views and ideals. Aristotle, however, treated eulogies briefly as being only a minor aspect of rhetoric, and the same was done by the author of Latin rhetorical works of the Classical period.

1. Rhet. ad Alex. 3, 1425b f.; 35, 1440b f.; Arist. Rhet. 1, 9, 1 f.; 38-41 on amplification and comparisons, which are two devices characteristic of eulogy; cf. 3, 14, 1-7; Ps. Dionysius of Halicarnassus Ars Rhetorica (ed. Usener and Radermacher) I τέχνη περὶ τῶν πανορμύρισιῶν with details on different types of speeches of praise; Ad Herenn. 3, 10 f.; 13 f.; Cicero Orator 37 f.; 42; 62 f.; 65 f.; 207 f.; Quintilian I.O. 2, 4, 20; 3, 7 ff.; surveys of the rules for the composition of epideictic discourses, R. Volkmann, Die Rhetorik der Griechen und Römer, 1885, 314-61; Kroll PW Suppl. 7, 1940, 1128-35.

2. Cicero Orator 37-8; 65 f.; cf. Arist. Rhet. 1, 3, 2, where the audience at epideictic speeches is described as θεομόι, spectators, i.e. they were present for enjoyment rather than as judges. Quint. I.O. 3, 4, 6. Cf. Hinks Tria genera Causarum, C.Q. 30, 1936, p. 172 f. Ps. Dionysius of Halicarnassus applied the term panegyrikos to speeches of praise as a whole to emphasize their festive nature.

3. Arist. Rhetoric 1, 3, 6 and 3, 16, 3 praise of Achilles; cf. 1, 9, 2; 3, 14, 3 praise of Aristides.

In the later 3rd and 4th century A.D., however, two comprehensive treatises on eulogistic discourses were composed: one of these is by the rhetor Menander, the other probably not, although both have been attributed to him. The τέχνη περὶ τῶν πανηγυρικῶν going under the name of Dionysius of Halicarnassus probably dates from the late 2nd or the 3rd century. The date of these treatises suggest that eulogistic oratory was acquiring greater importance and regard in the Late Classical period.

The principles of composition which were laid down in these treatises were the same as those in earlier works, but, particularly in the work of Menander, they were worked out in greater detail, with an abundance of examples. At times it is almost as though one hears the teacher of rhetoric addressing his class, first stating the principle in question in the abstract, then applying it in practice. The authors of the treatises attributed to Menander were certainly very aware of all the quandaries in which a panegyrist might find himself and were resourceful in suggesting solutions. The treatises are school-books, which were designed to prepare the young orator for what was in Late Antiquity one of his chief functions as a public speaker, the praise of Emperors, generals and government dignitaries. The treatises, therefore, outlined speeches for different types of official occasion, such as arrivals, departures, marriages and the presentation of wreaths — the last applicable to the aurum coronarium offered to Roman emperors. There is also a basic scheme for the basilikos logos which could be adapted, depending on the occasion. Apart from pointing out some general methods, such as comparisons and careful and clear subdivisions of the speech, so

---

5. Menander περὶ ἐπισκακτικῶν ed. Spengel in Rhetores Graeci III, 1856, 329-446 and Bursian in Abhandlungen d. kgl. bayerischen Akad. d. Wiss. philos. philol. Ch. München 16, 1882, p. 3. In his introduction Bursian demonstrates that the π. ξ. is in fact two treatises by different authors, dating, one from the later third, the other from the fourth century.


7. E.g. on birth, upbringing etc. Spengel, p. 368, 369, 370 etc.; on deeds and virtues Sp. 373, where also, for scenes of battle, Herodotus, Thucydides and others are suggested as models (cf. Lucian How to write history 15, 18-19; 25 and below n. 66, 67); Homer also is a possible source Sp. 374; on deeds of peace, 375, 376, etc.

8. E.g. Sp. 375, 5 f.

9. Sp. 377; 395; 399; 422 respectively. On the σταφανοτικός λόγος cf. Menander Sp. 422, 29 f. ἐπάξεις διὶ τοιγάρτω διὰ τοῦτο σταφανοῦ δὲ ἡ πόλις with Synesius de regno (speech accompanying the presentation of the aurum coronarium from Cyrene) 3, ed. Terzaghi, Ἐμι σοὶ πέμπει Κυρήνη, σταφανόσοντα χρυσῷ μὲν τὴν κεφαλὴν, φιλοσοφία δὲ τὴν ψυχήν...

10. Sp. 379, à propos of speeches of welcome the importance of logical division, a frequent theme, is pointed out; then praise of homecountry, deeds, etc. is suggested; similarly for the σταφανοτικός p. 422.

11. Sp. 376, comparison to predecessor.
8. Coin of Constantinus I from Syria.
9. Three Follis minted from Syria.
11. Kushana coin minted from Syria.
9. 10. Arch of Constantine, Rome. Luna with imperial « prefectio ». Sol with imperial « aduentus ».
11. Arch of Galerius, Thessalonika.
12. The Decennalia, Base in the Roman Forum: Libation Scene.
that the listener may follow more easily\textsuperscript{12}, the basic scheme outlined the order in which topics had to follow on another\textsuperscript{13}. After an introduction, where alternatives were proposed, the home country, the family, the birth and education of the subject were to be praised briefly; if any of these were likely to cause embarrassment, it was to be left out. In the main part of the speech, the deeds, divided according to the deeds of war and peace, were to be praised in detail and the author was to point out how in his deeds the subject of the panegyric practised the different virtues\textsuperscript{14}.

The elaboration of such rules excluded from consideration the juridical and deliberative speeches that had played such a large part in the oratory of the Classical world proper; and what remains vague in these handbooks is the role of panegyrics, at least potentially, in practical, political terms. In this sense, these textbooks are a product of the world of the schools, which could be, but was not always, disengaged from the world of politics and the constantly shifting aims and priorities of an imperial government. The two treatises attributed to Menander recount all the various possibilities of different types of speeches of praise without ever pointing to the contemporary significance of the time-honoured commonplace and tricks which panegyric could be made to acquire and did acquire in a specific situation.

3. The Roman contribution

The contemporary and political relevance of Latin panegyrics may be regarded as a Roman contribution to eulogistic oratory which had its roots in republican Rome, in the form of a type of eulogistic speech with a political significance which was initially developed independently of the Greek tradition and was regarded by contemporaries as a specifically Roman: this was the laudatio funebris\textsuperscript{15}. Roman tradition had it that Brutus, the first consul, was honoured with a state funeral, and a laudatio funebris was delivered by his colleague Poplicola\textsuperscript{16}. Polybius described the particular kind of funeral, when a laudatio funebris would be delivered as a thoroughly Roman occasion, untouched as yet by

\textsuperscript{12} E.g. Sp. 369; 372; 375; division of deeds of war and peace 376, 13 f.
\textsuperscript{13} E.g. Sp. 368 f.
\textsuperscript{14} E.g. Sp. 373; 373, 7 f. the four cardinal virtues; 374.
\textsuperscript{16} Dion. Hal. A.R. 5, 17, 2; Plut. Popl. 9, 6 f. Like many other traditions of early Rome, this one was remembered in late antiquity: Liber de Vir. Ill. 10, 7. The fragments of funerary laudationes were collected by Vollmer, Laudationum funebrium Romanorum historia et reliquiarum editio, Jhbb. f. Class. Phil. Suppl. 18, 1891, p. 445-528; cf. Vollmer in PW 12, 992 f.; on state funerals, Vollmer, De funere publico Romano, Jhbb. f. Class. Phil. Suppl. 19, 1892, p. 319-364; also Crawford, Class. Journal 37, 1941, p. 17-27.
Greek influence. What interests us principally, at present, however, is the fact that during the Roman republic laudationes at state funerals could provide a vehicle for political propaganda, for announcing a programme. It is this political relevance which Roman funerary eulogies have in common with the panegyrics of the later third and fourth centuries and which distinguishes both from most Greek eulogies where they are unaffected by Roman influence. However, Roman though the laudatio funebris was in origin, its layout came to be influenced by Greek rhetorical theory on the disposition of a eulogy. Delivering the laudatio of a famous — or even not so famous — ancestor, like speaking in the law courts and competing for the junior magistracies of the Roman republic, was a way in which a young candidate for a political career could catch the public eye, as Caesar did when he delivered the laudatio of his Aunt Julia. Such laudationes were treated with a certain reserve because they made false claims, and because their value as historical evidence was doubtful. Cicero, although he gave instructions as to how a laudatory speech should be handled, regarded purely laudatory composition as un — Roman. Nevertheless laudatory speeches, composed according to all the rules of the art, that is

17. Polybius 6, 53, 1 f., with F. W. Walbank A hist. Commentary on Polybius I, 1957: 737 f. The deceased was carried in reclining or seated position to the rostra, amidst persons who wore the masks of his ancestors and had with them the insignia of the offices which those ancestors had held. Then a son or close relative delivered the oration. The ceremonial was peculiarly Roman, and the republican laudatio had features which distinguished it from Greek eulogies. The ancient Roman ceremonial for state funerals was still documented by Dio Cassius, Herodian and the Historia Augusta; the laudatio funebris of Pertinax was delivered from the rostra by Septimius Severus. (See: Dio 74, 5, 1; Herodian 4, 2, 4; HA Pert. 15. The laudatio for Pertinax is the last recorded funerary laudatio to be delivered from the Rostra. Herodian who described the obseques of Septimius Severus mentioned no laudatio. Cf. laudationes by Verus and Marcus Aurelius on Antoninus Pius HA Marcus 7, 11.)

18. There was a general awareness of Greek influence in oratory noted for instance by Cicero in the Brutus, e.g. 77 f.; 114 f.; 151 f.; 325 f. and throughout the treatise; cf. A. D. Leeman, Orationis Ratio 1963, caps. 1-2. Whereas Greek schemes invariably proceeded from the praise of ancestors to that of the subject proper of the speech, the laudatio funebris, according to Polybius, began with the deceased and then proceeded to his ancestors (Polybius 6, 54, 1 f.). Another peculiarity which is to be gathered from the fragments and from historians’ renderings of laudationes, is that they addressed the deceased in the second person, e.g. Vollmer 1891, p. 482 no. 6 = Malcovati Oratorum Romanorum Fragmenta libere republicae 2nd ed., p. 465. See also, on Augustus’ laudatio of Agrippa, Koenen Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 5, 1970, 217-83, where the earlier literature on funerary laudationes and sources are also cited.


20. Cic., Brut. 62; Livy 8, 40, 4; cf. 27, 27, 13.

21. Cic., Orator 42: epidictic oratory is “genus... proprium sophistarum, pompae quam pugnae aptius, gymnasis et palaestra dicatum, apretum et pulsam foro”. From this type of praise Cicero clearly distinguished laudatory autobiography by statesmen which he regarded as worth while and instructive, Brutus 112, 162.
according to Greek rules, became firmly established in Roman public life and in Latin literature in republican times. Even speeches in law courts, as witness Cicero himself, gave ample opportunity for praise, and for its rhetorical counterpart, vituperation. We need only look at Cicero’s *De Leges Manilia* and his Caesarian speeches to appreciate such methods. These speeches were carefully studied and much alluded to by Late Antique panegyrists, and in method and content were extremely influential. Indeed, just how pervasive their influence was is shown by one of the illustrations at the end of the *Notitia Dignitatum* for the East (fig. 1): this shows a number of codicilli in a rectangular framework surmounted by a shallow triangle. On the four corners are, set into medallions, and identified by inscriptions, the busts of Virtus, Scientia rei militaris, auctoritas and felicitas; these are the very virtues which Cicero praised in the *De Leges Manilia*. At the apex of the triangle in this illustration there appears the bust of Divina Providentia, a concept by means of which the military virtues of Pompey, now impersonalised, could acquire a contemporary Late Antique relevance.

With Pliny, whose panegyric on Trajan greatly influenced Late Latin panegyric, we come to the new situation which was created by the end of the Republic and by the consequent disappearance of polotical oratory. Pliny’s panegyric, or *gratiorum actio* for the suffect consulship of 100 A.D., heads the collection of the XII Panegyrici Latini. In part it also survives in the same palimpsest as the panegyrics of Pliny’s imitator Symmacus, an indication of the conscious preservation of tradition in Late Antique Rome.

The occasion and the *milieu* of Pliny’s panegyric is instructive for the future development of the tradition. The custom whereby the Consuls thanked the Emperor for their office in a speech in the Senate became established under Augustus; it originated in the Republic, when the Consuls, on entering office, had thanked the people for their election. Pliny’s *gratiorum actio*, therefore, had many antecedents of which, however, none survive. After pronouncing his speech in the Senate, Pliny expanded and improved it and recited it to a select group

22. A. vituperatio, see e.g. *Act. in Verr. 2, lib. i, 32 f., preceded by a detailed praeferentio, a...'
25. *De leges Manilia* 10, 28; II, 29; I5, 43; 16, 47.
of literary friends. It is this expended and published version that has survived. It is impossible to tell how far Pliny's panegyric differs from the many earlier consular gratiarum actiones. It owes much of its importance in the Latin eulogistic tradition to the fact that it was published and could serve as a model for later panegyrists. The Late Roman rhetor would have recognised in Pliny's work the performance of a task similar to his own because, like Cicero's De Lege Manilia, Pliny's gratiarum actio is political in content. His arrangement is basically biographical, though not in strict chronological order. The speech describes Trajan's conduct in and outside Rome and makes him an emperor such as the Senate would approve of. However, how far this would actually be the case remained to be seen at Pliny's time of speaking. In September 100 A.D., Trajan had only been in Rome for a few months, and Pliny was in no position to know what his policies would be. He could not therefore do what some of the Late Antique panegyrists did so well, that is, announce a programme and interpret Imperial policies for a local audience.

It is in the sense of a precise task that prose panegyrics differ from verse panegyrics which had, in fact, been the earliest forms of Imperial panegyric in Rome. For verse panegyrics were more or less fanciful in their setting and imagery; an example is supplied by the pastoral panegyrics which were particularly popular in the early empire. Prose panegyrics on the other hand discussed what the audience might have seen or would have liked to have seen in reality. Latin prose panegyrics treated politics directly, rather than in the imagery appropriate to poetry.

Yet though a Late Roman rhetor might have learned much from Pliny and his successors, the essential link with politics was still lacking. Pliny's audience consisted of a small literary circle of senators who were eager to appreciate and discuss each other's works. It was the literary occasion, the recitation of the revised and expanded speech to his circle of erudite friends that Pliny valued and wrote of in his letters. The panegyric was viewed firstly as a work of literature and only secondly as an instrument of politics.

---

31. Pliny did not and could not give a complete picture of Trajan, but what he wrote was sufficiently convincing, to an audience ready to be convinced, to create a legend that became accepted in historiography, Durry, op. cit., 15-21.
32. Their idiom was non-political, even if political undertones were intended in the Carmina Einsiedelnsia and the eulogistic poems of Calpurnia Siculus and Statius which are the ones to survive from genre that was much practised in the 1st century A.D. See Statius, Silvae 4, 1 on Domitian; Silvae 4, 2; 3 also Vergil, Eclogue I.
33. H. P. Büttler, Die geistige Welt des jüngeren Plinius 1970, p. 30 ff.; 129 ff.; 147; the conflict of otium-negothum, so vividly felt by Cicero, was still alive and literary activity had to be justified, ibid., p. 41 f. The recitation of the panegyric, Pliny, ep. 3, 13.
"For even though the uneducated are capable of flights of the imagina-
tion and powerful delivery, only cultivated men can devise an appro-
priate disposition and manifold figures of speech. Indeed, one must not always aspire to the elevated and the sublime. For just as in
painting light is brought to the attention by shadow, so the style of an
oration should be in part subdued and in part an elevated one."

The same limitation applied to Fronto, who, like Pliny, regarded panegy-
rics as works of literature rather than as instruments of politics. He
spent much trouble and time composing the Gratiarum Actio of Antoninus
Pius, which he pronounced in the Senate for his suffect consulship of
143 A.D., in order to save it from the oblivion which normally befell
panegyrics. His panegyric on the British victories of Antoninus Pius
was known in the late 3rd century, and, like his Gratiarum actio pro
Carthaginensisibus was probably still known in the 6th.

4. Panegyrics and historical writing

The panegyrics which Fronto mentioned in his letters are only a few among the hundreds which were delivered, but of which no trace survives. There is no mention of Latin panegyrics in prose for the third
century, but the occasions on which panegyrics were held in the second
century are likely to have been observed also in the third. The first
surviving late antique panegyric dates from 269 A.D., and apart from
Pliny's, it is the earliest oration in the Gallic corpus of the XII Panegyrici
Latini. The surviving late Roman panegyrics are a very small sample

34. Pliny, loc. cit.: nam invenire praeclare, enuntiare magnificem interdum etiam
barbari solent, disponere apte, figurare varie nisi eruditis negatum est. nec vero
affectanda sunt semper elata et excelsa. nam ut in pictura lumen non alia res
magis quam umbra commendat, ita orationem tam summittere quam attollere
decet.

35. Fronto, Letter ad Marcum Caesarem II, 1 ed. S. A. Naber, Teubner, 1868, p. 25,
where he also refers to several panegyrics he had composed on Hadrian.

36. Fronto, Letter ad Marcum Caesarem II, 1, Naber p. 25-6; cf. ad Antoninum
Pium II, Naber, p. 163; ad M. Caes. II, 3, Naber, p. 28; Fronto praised Antoninus
Pius both as consul designatus and as consul, Letter ad Antoninum Imp. II, 2,
Naber, p. 105.

37. Pan. Lat. 4, 14, 2 f.

38. E. A. Lowe, Codices Latini... I, no. 27 Fronto's Letters, written in the late
fifth century. A fragment of his grat. act. pro Carthaginensisibus survives from
a palimpsest of the 4-5 century, rewritten in the 7-8 century, ibid., no. 72.

39. Above no. 35, and Fronto, ad M. Caes. II, 6 ed. Naber, p. 37, where panegy-
rists addressing Marcus Aurelius in Southern Italy are mentioned. Another
panegyric by Fronto on an uncertain occasion, Fronto, Epist. Graece I, ed. Naber,
p. 241. His grat. act pro Carthaginensisibus (fragments ed. Naber, 261-7) was eu-
logistic. Pan. Lat 8, 312 AD, is a surviving specimen of this type of speech.

40. The most recent editions of the XII Panegyrici Latini are by E. Galletier,
with French translation, Budé, 1949-55; R. A. B. Mynors, Oxford 1964. The
latter follows the order in which the panegyrics appear in the MSS, which is not
chronological, whereas Galletier adopted a chronological order. The Panegyrici
of the discourses which were delivered throughout the empire on numerous imperial occasions. Any conclusions one draws from these panegyrics therefore must not be regarded as automatically valid for the empire at large, or even the Latin speaking part of it, but as relevant chiefly for the context from which particular panegyrics came.

The late third century panegyrists saw themselves as the continuators of the Roman republican traditions and those of the second century AD. The orator of 297 mentioned Fronto's panegyric on the victory of Antoninus in Britain, and the orator of 312 compared five years of Constantine's reign to Cato's lustrum as censor and referred to Cato's speech de lustri sui felicitate as well known; Cicero and Pliny were extensively quoted, though not mentioned by name. This consciousness of a continuity with the Roman republic and the period of the good emperors of the second century AD survived into the fifth century and later. Macrobius associated Pliny with Symmachus, for both were, as he said, representatives of the genus pingue et floridum; this association is reflected in the manuscript tradition. Symmachus' letters, in imitation of those of Pliny, were published in ten books, the tenth book in both cases consisting of official correspondence.

Although there may have existed some continuity in the composition of panegyrics between the second and late third century, for which support can be adduced from what is known of a continuity of tradition in higher education, the very long gap in the panegyric tradition — at least so far as the survival of panegyrics is concerned — must not be

Latin are here cited according to Galletier's numeration, which appears in brackets in Mynors. The collection, in the MSS, is headed by Pliny's gratiarum actio for his consulship of 100 AD, entitled panegyricus; there follows the speech by Pacatus, also entitled panegyricus. The speech by Mamertinus of Jan. rst 362 is called gratiarum actio Mamertini de consulatu suo Ituliano imperatori; gratiarum actio is the usual term for such a speech, but it was not applied to Pliny's in the collection. After Mamertinus there follow in the MSS the 'panegyricus' by Nazarius of 321, and next an overall heading incipitum panegyrici diversorum VII, to cover, in this order, the panegyrics of 312, 310, 307, 297, 298, 289, 291; of these the speech by Eumenius of 298 is not, strictly, a panegyric at all but a suasio; the speech of 291 has a sub-title, 'genethliacus', cf. below, p. 62 and n. 130. The last oration is the panegyric on Constantine of 313, entitled panegyricus in some MSS only, which appears to have been added as an afterthought to make up the number twelve. Cf. Galletier's introduction to his edition and for the use of the term 'panegyricus' Ziegler, PW 18, 3, 1949, s.v. panegyrikos, where also the genre as a whole is surveyed.

41. The delivery of a panegyric on a feast day was taken for granted, e.g. Pan Lat. 2, 1, 1; 3, 1, 1; 9, 1, 1. The corpus contains only a fraction even of the panegyrics held in Gaul.

42. Pan. Lat. 4, 14, 2.

43. Pan Lat. 8, 13, 3. For the republican tradition in the panegyrics, which survived until the Ostrogotic kingdom (below, p. 73), see also Sir Ronald Syme, Emperors and Biography, 1977, 89 ff.

44. Klotz, Rh. Mus. 66, 1911, 531 f.

45. Mack., Sat. 5, 1,7; E. A. Lowe, Cod. Lat. Ant. I, no. 29.
set aside. Developments took place in this period, the results of which can be ascertained from the late Roman panegyrics, but the actual course of which remains obscure. These developments concern the difference between panegyric and history, and the precise nature and aim of panegyric.

A letter sent by Lucius Verus to Fronto gives an idea of the content of eulogies in the second century. Verus submitted to Fronto materials which Fronto was to use to compose a history of Verus' war against the Parthians. He seems to have written only the preface. Fronto was instructed to magnify Verus' deeds as much as possible by means of a series of devices which are familiar from panegyric; for, Verus said, although the nature of his deeds would not thereby be changed, they will appear to be such as Fronto portrays them. Fronto in his reply used the term *historia* for the work: Verus wanted his deeds recorded in *historia* rather than *laudatio* for the very good reason that *laudatio* was in bad repute for disregard of truth: in short, Verus was hoping to have it both ways.

Lucian, in his "How to Write History" mocked and criticized precisely this kind of historical writing, with specific reference to devices of praise examples of which are to be found in Fronto's preface. Pliny also used some of these devices, but more discreetly. There was here, as Lucian pointed out, a confusion between the genres of panegyric and contemporary history.

In late antiquity, however, a deliberate distinction was drawn between these two, both by panegyrist and historians, and a special term was


51. Leeman, *op. cit.*, 375 f. Lucian, *How to write History*, 7, neglect of events in favour of praise of rulers and generals = Fronto princ. Hist. 8 ff.; esp. 13 f.; Lucian 8, adornment with myth = Fronto 1 f.; Lucian 8, 13; 20 exaggerations = Fronto e.g. 10-14. Lucian 14, comparison to Achilles = Fronto 1; comparison to Trajan 8 ff.; Lucian 15 imitation of Thucydides = Letter of Verus to Fronto (*ad Verum Imp. II*, 3), ed. Naber p. 130. Lucian's tract, like Fronto's preface, was occasioned by Verus' Parthian war, Lucian 2.

52. In Pliny's panegyric, neglect of the narration of events in favour of praise: e.g. considerations on adoption of Trajan, 5-9; on war, 12 ff., and similarly throughout. Note 56, 1 'propositum est... principem laudare, non principis facta'. Exaggeration, e.g. 35, 4 f.; comparison, mainly to Domitian, 26; 49-50; 54 f.; also 2; 11; 30. Lucian 31, mocking prophesies of future triumphs = Pliny 17; *Pan. Lat. 2*, 12; these also figure in Claudian and Sidonius.
applied to panegyric: it was the *stilus maior*. Pacatus stated that his panegyric would provide material for historians and artists, and that the latter should leave off illustrating the deeds of Liber and Hercules. Pacatus’ panegyric was indeed more suitable than others for supplying material for history: the war against Maximus, the theme of the central part of the work, was told in continuous narrative with the chronological and geographical framework that is needed for history but was often lacking in panegyrics. More important, however, and more decisive, was the distinction made by Eutropius and Ammianus, at the end of their works, between history and panegyric. Eutropius’ *Breviarium*, dedicated to Valens, ends with the death of Jovian:

“...But since now we have reached the period of our illustrious and revered emperors, we will for the time being end our work; for what remains should be pronounced in a higher style. This task we do not so much set aside as reserve it for a more elevated manner of composition.”

Ammianus who probably read Eutropius, ended his work in similar fashion, by exhorting any who might continue the narrative to use the *stilus maior*. Eutropius betrayed a distinct reluctance to describe the reigns of Valentinian and Valens in anything but *stilus maior*. Unlike Ammianus, he did not say that he would not attempt the task, but only that it was of a different nature. The position was that contemporary history, which began with the accession of the ruling emperor, was a subject for panegyric, past history for historical writing. Once a panegyric was out of date qua panegyric, it could be used as a source for history.

The panegyrics of late antiquity were a development of, and in some senses an improvement on the panegyric by Pliny. They were, it is true, if one is to judge them by the standards of classical Latin literature, inferior to Pliny and certainly to Cicero, from the literary and linguistic

54. Eutropius, *Breviarium* 10, 18: *quia autem ad inceptos principes venerandosque purrentum est, interim operi modum dabisim. Nam reliquia stilo maiore dicenda sunt, quae nuncii non tamen praetermittimus quam ad maiorem scribendi diligentiam reservamus.
56. As was done by Ammianus, who appears to have used Mamertinus’ panegyric on Julian; on Triptolemus *Pan. Lat.* 11, 8, 4 = Amm. 22, 2, 3; on the Palladium *Pan. Lat.* 11, 6, 3-4 = Amm. 22, 2, 4; but similarly Cicero *de lege Manilia* 41; Julian as sidus salutare *Pan. Lat.* 11, 2, 3 = Amm. 21, 10, 2; 22, 9, 15; cf. 15, 8, 21 and 24, 2, 21. See Galletier, *Panegyriques Latins III*, p. 9; Gärtner, Einige Überlegungen zur kaiserzeitlichen Panegyrik und zu Ammians Charakteristik des Kaisers Julianus, *Abhandlungen Mainz*, 1968 no. 10; also above, n. 31; below, n. 1499. Ammianus 46, 1 introductory to Julian’s deeds in Gaul, is constructed as panegyric, with the customary comment on the insufficiency of words to describe the subject in hand, profession of veracity and comparisons. Note also Julian ep. 31 (ed. Bidez) to Proairesios, offering materials for the composition of contemporary history.
point of view. Where Pliny tried to create methods of expression and literature, the fourth century panegyrists used the expressions made available to them by the authors of the past, especially Cicero. They did not aim to create literature for its own sake. Also, they were less comprehensive as a record, much shorter and less factual. However, these characteristics were in many respects an advantage. By means of them, panegyrics could be differentiated more clearly from history and were turned from pure eulogy — something pleasant for the subject of the panegyric and the general audience to listen to, duly embellished with linguistic finesses for those who could appreciate them — into an instrument of propaganda. Such panegyrics had to be concise, systematic and comprehensive, but simple. Detail of narrative, linguistic and structural complexity, yielded to clarity.

These principles do not exclude the rules of Menander, but in many ways they modified what had been said about amplification\textsuperscript{56a}. The late Roman panegyrists observed Menander’s rules, but they did so very selectively\textsuperscript{57}. Among the omissions are not only those parts of eulogistic speeches which had to be passed over because, as Menander himself said, they could not always apply, or would strain the credulity of the audience\textsuperscript{58}, but also matters which could perfectly well have been said but were nonetheless left out. The late Roman panegyrists were deliberately not writing history, and most of them did not aim at completeness, even as regards the emperor’s good qualities. Rather, they interpreted a particular situation for a particular purpose, place and time. In short, they wrote in what historians, without attaching either praise or blame, could call \textit{stilus maior}. Panegyric was an acceptable genre of literature in late antiquity.

5. \textbf{Occasions for \textit{panegyrics} in late antiquity; ceremonial-imagery.}

By the fourth century AD, a pattern of occasions had emerged on which panegyrics were customarily held, but the better part of this pattern was already established by the second century\textsuperscript{59}.

---

\textsuperscript{56a} E.g. Spengel III, 368, 8 ff.; 372, 19 f.

\textsuperscript{57} The application of Menander’s rules in panegyrics in studied in detail for the oration by the consul Mamertinus by H. Gutzwiller, \textit{Die Neujahrrede des Konsuls Claudius Mamertinus vor dem Kaiser Julian}, 1942, 92-9.

\textsuperscript{58} Menander Spengel III, 369, 27 f.; 370, 30 f.; but note 371, 11 it is permissible to expand on matters incapable of proof or disproof, such as divine descent.

\textsuperscript{59} The earliest kind of imperial panegyric to be regularly delivered was probably the \textit{grat iatum actio} by the consuls. In Pliny’s \textit{grat iarum actio}, the actual thanksgiving at the end of the work is almost totally submerged by the laudatory part of the speech. Mamertinus’ \textit{grat iarum actio} of 362 AD, on the other hand, falls into two almost even parts, which is perhaps the more usual form that such a speech would have taken. Imperial consulships were another occasion for praise, which was utilized by Statius, who wrote a laudatory poem on Domitian as Consul (\textit{Silvae} 4, 1); for the fourth century, there are Symmachus’ panegyric on Valentinian
But to treat panegyrics merely in terms of the individual occasions of each surviving text is superficial; panegyrics in late antiquity formed an integral part of the ceremonial of various imperial occasions. They can therefore be seen as one of the accompaniments of legitimate rule, one form of consent among many other forms of consent. As will be seen, this is a striking feature of their revival in the Ostrogothic kingdom. As part of imperial ceremonial, they needed a setting, an architectural framework: the extensive imperial building programme of the later Roman empire, which was emulated in 6th century Italy by the Ostrogothic kings, can be viewed in the context of imperial ceremonies that stood in need of a back-cloth. At Trier, Aquileia, Milan, and the other capitals of the empire, the palace and its accompanying buildings formed a nucleus of imperial activity and propaganda, as well as of local pride. The panegyrist of 310 referred to the buildings of Trier as rivalling those of Rome:

"I see the great circus, resembling, I believe, the circus of Rome. I see the basilicas and the forum — kingly works — and the seat of justice, being raised to such a height that they promise to be worthy of the stars and the sky to which they come so close.""

The "sedes iustitiae" probably is the extant basilica at Trier and is to be identified with the building where Ambrose was received by the tyrant

I (Symmachus or. 2, ed. O. Seeck, 1883, p. 324 ff.), and Claudian’s three consular panegyrics on Honorius. Consulships of private individuals could be similarly praised. The anniversary of the emperor’s accession was marked by special religious observances, and Latin panegyrics survive from Constantine’s quinquennalia and quindecennalia (quinquennalia, Pan. Lat. 8, cf. Galletier II, 77 f.; quindecennalia, Pan. Lat. 10). Imperial accessions provided another occasion for panegyrics, e.g. Symmachus’ or. 3 (Seeck, p. 330 ff.) on Gratian. On earlier accessions, see Fink, Hoey, Snyder The Feriale Duranum, Yale Class. Stud. 7, 1940, 85 f., the proclamation of Alexander Severus by the troops; 89 f., his recognition by the Senate. The accession of some past emperors continued being celebrated after their death. In the Fer. Dur. such celebrations, mostly for the Antonines, express the dynastic claims of the Severi (cf. Snyder, Public Anniversaries in the Roman Empire, Yale Class. Stud. 7, 1940, 230 ff. passim.). The time to celebrate imperial victories could be adjusted to coincide with such anniversaries (Fink, Hoey, Snyder, op. cit., 77 ff., celebration of Severus’ capture of Ctesiphon timed to coincide with Trajan’s dies imperii); thus Pan. Lat. 4, 297 AD, was occasioned by Constantius’ quinquennalia and praised his reconquest of Britain. Victories in themselves were also used as occasions for the Emperor to take up the consulship. An example is Honorius’ sixth consulship, celebrated by Claudian, after the defeat of the Goths in 403. Finally, a victory in its own right could provide the occasion for a panegyric. Instances are Constantine’s capture of Rome, and Theodosius’ defeat of the usurper Maximus (Pan. Lat. 9, 313 AD; Pan. Lat. 12, 389 AD; cf. Pan. Lat. 3, 5, 1).

60. Pan. Lat. 7, 22, 5: video circum maximum, aemulum, credo, Romano, video basilicas et forum, opera regia, sedemque iustitiae in tament altitudinem suscitarit ut se sideribus et caelo digna et vicina promittant.
Maximus and where earlier, Ausonius delivered his *gratiarum actio*\(^{61}\). According to him, it was an awe-inspiring and holy place.

"And I will not only give thanks in the shrine of the imperial oracle, a place of quiet worship and reverend awe, where the face can only seldom express what is in the soul, but I will give thanks everywhere, now silently, and now with words...\(^{62}\)."

In such a place the emperor could be seen enthroned under a ciborium in the apse, ready to receive the homage of those who were so privileged as to be admitted: as Mamertinus said of Diocletian and Maximian in 291:

"What a spectacle was vouchsafed by your Piety in the palace of Milan, when you were both seen by those who were admitted to adore your sacred countenances, men who, being accustomed to revering only one emperor, were troubled by a twofold majesty\(^{63}\)!

Late antique people had a very highly developed sense for the appropriate architectural setting of various imperial activities. In art, the emperor was often represented in an architectural framework which was in keeping with the function he was represented as performing. Thus Theodosius on the Missorium in Madrid\(^{64}\) is seated in his palace between Valentinian II and Arcadius, giving the codicilli of his office to a dignitary. This consciousness of the imperial architectural setting survived unbroken in the West until the Ostrogothic kingdom. It is probable that in the original version of the mosaic of the Palatium in S. Apollinaire Nuovo in Ravenna, Theodoric was to be seen in the gate of his palace, flanked on either side by dignitaries of his court (fig. 2). Iconographically, the mosaic and the missorium are related: both show a schematized symmetrical structure\(^{64}\). The ruler occupies the central part of a tripartite entrance, while those subordinate to him are show in the parts of the building which are subsidiary to the main, central structure.

One of the ceremonies where the architectural setting emerges very clearly is that of imperial *adventus*. In art, the ceremony was often

---


62. Ausonius, *grat. act. i*: atque non in sacrario modo imperialis oraculi, qui locus horrore tranquillo et pavore venerabili raro eundem animum praestat et vultum, sed usquequaque gratias ago, tum tacens, tum loquens...

63. *Pan. Lat. 3, 11, 1* quale pietas vestra spectaculum dedit, cum in Mediolanensi palatio admissis qui sacros vultus adoraturi erant conspecti esti ambo et consuetudinem simplicitis venerationis geminato numine repente turbatis! See also Galletier's note ad loc. Cf. *Pan. Lat. 10, 5, 1.*


64. E. Dyggve, *Ravennatum Sacrum Palatium, La Basilica Ipetrale per Ceremonie*, Copenhagen 1941, 34 f.
depicted against the background of a city gate from which citizens or a personification emerged to greet the emperor. The panegyrist of 312 expressed the relevance of the architectural setting particularly well when he said, a propos of Constantine’s arrival at Autun in 310:

“Immortal gods, what a day shone upon us... when you, bringing us the first token of our salvation, entered the gates of this city, which, being shaped in a hollow curve, with projecting towers at either side, seemed to receive you in a kind of embrace.”

Such a gateway, with towers protruding at either side, appears on a Constantinian gold multiple from Trier (fig. 3). Adventus was a frequent and important theme in panegyric, and could be adapted for different contexts: instances are the meting of Diocletian and Maximian in Milan in 290, Constantius’ entry into London in 296, Constantine’s accession and his entry into Rome after the defeat of Maxentius, Julian’s progress to Constantinople and Theodosius’ entry into Haemona in 389 on route for Italy. The theme of adventus still appears in Cassiodorus’ panegyric on the consulship of Eutharich delivered in 518 or 519, where, as in numerous earlier panegyrics, the joy bestowed by the ruler’s presence was described. The typology of adventus was used in panegyric to cover any ordinary imperial arrival as well as special occasions like accession and victory. It is the context, different for each occasion, that determined the particular colours and shades of meaning that the orator would put into the tableau in which the scene was generally described in panegyric.

The ceremony of adventus was one of the occasions on which panegyrics were customarily delivered, and the treatise attributed to Menander as well as the τέχνη περὶ τῶν πανηγυρικῶν of Ps. Dionysius of Halicarnassus gave instructions regarding panegyrics for arrivals. The treatise by Ps. Dionysius also suggests that the panegyric could be delivered by

65. Pan. Lat. 8, 7, 6: di immortales, quisnam ille tum nobis illuxit dies... cum tu, quod primum nobis signum salutis fuit, portas istius urbis intrasti, quae te habitu illo in sinum reducto et procurrentibus utrimque turribus amplexi quodam videbantur accipere! E. Baldwin-Smith, Architectural Symbolism of Imperial Rome and the Middle Ages, 1956, 19 ff. reviews the buildings that figured in ceremonies of arrival and triumph.

66. Roman Imperial Coinage, ed. C. H. V. Sutherland (hereafter RIC) VII, p. 162, no. 1 = pl. 3, r, AugG Gloria, city gate of Trier, outside it, two seated captives, above statue of emperor.

67. Pan. Lat. 3, 8 ff.; 4, 19, 1 f.; 7, 9, 4-5; 8, 7, 6-8, 5; 9, 7; 3 f.; 19, 1 f.; 10, 30, 4 f.; 31, 1 f.; 12, 37, 1 f.; Cassiodorus or. 1, ed. Traube (in MGH Auct. Ant. 12, reprint 1962), p. 470.

68. In both cases the technical term for a formal welcome was used; Ps. Dionysius Ars Rhetorica ed. Usener and Rademacher, Teubner 1904-29, p. 272 l. 7; Menander Spengel III, p. 378 l. 30, see Peterson, Die Einholung des Kyrios, Zeitschr. f. systematische Theologie 7, 1930, 682-702; cf. S. G. MacCormack Change and continuity in late antiquity: the ceremony of Adventus, Historia 1972, p. 721 ff.
one of the dignitaries who were to meet the arriving ruler outside the city walls, before the welcoming crowd together with the ruler and his train entered the city⁶⁹. The practice in the West, however, was that the panegyric was delivered after the formal arrival was accomplished, in the Curia: if it was in Rome, or in the local curia or palatium if it was elsewhere.

The delivery of a panegyric necessitated a well-ordered formal setting, which was provided by the fixed ceremonial for the various imperial occasions. The panegyrics themselves, when describing imperial actions, described them as orderly and planned, and often as having splendour and beauty⁷⁰. This also was a sign of legitimate rule. Chaos and disorder, on the other hand, were accompaniments to the rule of a usurper. This emerges very well in Ammianus’ description of the usurpation of Procopius in 365⁷¹. Procopius was acclaimed by a disorderly group of soldiers — and not very many of them — he was hustled to the palace, and the whole scene bears the imprint of hasty, ill-prepared and surreptitious action. The acclamation of Julian as Augustus on the other hand, in fact probably no less chaotic, was described by Ammianus in such a way as to convey the divine and human consent which were betokened by ceremonies carried out with dignity and in the prescribed order⁷².

It was generally thought that a large audience should be present to hear the panegyric: the orator of 312 actually stated that he did not speak on an earlier — not strictly official — occasion because at that time not many people were present⁷³. Most panegyrists addressed not only the emperor, but also the audience: the Senate of Rome was always specifically addressed, and a number of panegyrists made a point of selecting their topics so as to interest and involve the local audience. This could be done very specifically, with reference to contemporary political issues⁷⁴. The delivery of a panegyric on an imperial occasion and in a formal ceremonial setting was not merely a method of making propaganda, but also a token of legitimate rule, and a form of popular consent which was demonstrated by the presence of the audience. A panegyric by Cassiodorus, probably delivered on the occasion of the marriage of Vitigis and Matasuntha, Theodoric’s granddaughter, in 536 AD, illustrates the element of consent particularly well. Having

⁷⁰. E. g. Pan. Lat. 3, 8 ff.; cf. below, p. 50.
⁷¹. Ammianus 26, 6, 11-19.
⁷². Ammianus 20, 4-5: the acclamation, 20, 4, 14, the soldiers ‘Augustum appellavere (Iuliamum) consensione ffirmissima’ (cf. 17); the refusal of power 20, 4, 16; the donative, 20, 4, 18; and the imperial adlocutio 20, 5, 1 — these were the prescribed ingredients of the imperial accession ceremony.
⁷³. Pan. Lat. 8, 1, 5.
⁷⁴. Instances are Ambrose’s appeal for the loyalty of the soldiers in his Consolatio on the death of Theodosius, below, p. 66, and the description of Maximian’s assumption of the consulship Pan. Lat. 2, 6, below, p. 49.
praised Vitigis’ deeds in war, Cassiodorus paused for the army to acclaim the king, and to attest the truth of his statements. The order and beauty attributed by panegyrics to imperial actions, and implied by the very delivery of panegyrics, was also conveyed in the formalized and carefully structured iconographic schemes which were employed by late antique imperial art. On the largitio and adlocutio panels of the arch of Constantine (fig. 4), on the base of the obelisc in the hippodrome of Constantinople and on the column base of Arcadius, emperors were shown receiving, in various forms, the homage of subjects and barbarians, and appearing as the central figures in a structured and rigidly ordered composition.

It is against this ceremonially-delineated visual background that we should place and explain a specifically literary feature of the panegyric. The language of late antiquity was rich in images, and this was particularly so in the case of panegyrics. Certain parts of panegyrics describe an imperial tableau, rather than events in historical narrative, and they describes facts as symbols, rather than facts merely in themselves. Their words could be translated into images. For the panegyrics bring us to one aspect of the classical perception of a basic harmony between the different arts: visual and verbal expression were meant to go hand in hand. Earlier, Pliny, preceded by Cicero, among others, had explained the characteristics of literary styles in terms of light and shade as used by painters, and Quintilian matched the achievements and characteristics of particular orators with those of particular painters and sculptors. Viewing the question from the angle of the visual arts, Philostratus said:

"Whosoever scorns painting is unjust to truth; and he is also unjust to all the wisdom that has been bestowed upon poets — for poets and painters make equal contribution to our knowledge of the deeds and the looks of heroes — and he withholds his praise from symmetry and proportion, whereby art partakes of reason."

The way in which some panegyrists made a contribution to such knowledge of "the deeds of the heroes" consisted in their ability to expound imperial actions in terms that would evoke images, like the tableaux that have been referred to above. Panegyrists often described rather than narrated, and in their descriptions of actions used the methods of ekphrasis, as employed, for instance, by Philostratus in the 3rd century.

75. Or. 2, ed. Traube, p. 475.
75b. See A. Grabar, L'empereur dans l'art byzantin, 1936 (1971, pl. xiii-xv).
75bis. See A. Grabar, L'empereur dans l'art byzantin, 1936 (1971, pl. xiii-xv).
76. Cicero, Brut. 63 ff.; cf. 131; 274 and Or. 149; Or. 3 f.; 7 f.; 36 f.; 65 f.; 73-4; de Or. 3, 101; Quint. I. O. 12, 10, 1-12 (cf. Austin, Quintilian on painting and statuary, CQ 38, 1944, 17). A variety of points are made in these passages, showing a certain preoccupation with parallels in rhetoric and visual art, although no strict theory is worked out. Cf. the authors quoted by Lee, Ut pictura Poesis, Art Bull. 22, 1940, 197 f.
77. Imagines I, preface (tr. Fairbanks, Loeb).
and by Procopius of Gaza in the 6th century, in descriptions of works of art. Such descriptions, though initially perceived through the sense of hearing, in fact appealed to all the senses, but particularly to the eyes. This is also the case in those panegyrics which evoke images.

On the one hand, panegyrics bring to mind specific and simple images in imperial art and slogans on the coinage; on the other, they express themselves in such a way as to evoke mental pictures which can be matched with existing works of imperial art or an iconographic scheme which is familiar. This is the tableau, the scene in panegyric which is in fact a picture. Thus, Pliny's account of the deeds of Trajan, where division into "scenes", so pronounced in later panegyrics, is incipient, can be paralleled in the iconographic schemes used on the coinage of the second century and in the attic of the arch of Beneventum, Iuppiter appears handing his fulmen to Trajan, thereby leaving to the emperor the dominion of the earth, just as stated by Pliny.

In late antiquity, imperial iconography, like panegyrics, became simpler, the images it used became fewer, and they were used more frequently, but often with great effectiveness. The message of imperial art, like the message of panegyrics, became more concise and compact. This factor in itself contributed to the more frequent correspondence of ideas in art and panegyric. Phrases in panegyric bring to mind images.

This is the case particularly in those panegyrics which above were found to announce imperial programmes and policies in terms of symbols and pageants or tableaux, and which, at the same time, used a pagan idiom. Constantius, according to the panegyrist of 297, gained control of Gaul by his mere arrival, "Gallias tuas veniendo fecisti", and is to be seen on medallions greeted by a kneeling province — to be identified as Britain — whom he is about to raise (fig. 4). The coinage showed the emperor crowned by Victoria: the panegyrist of 310, in a passage quoted below, visualized Constantine similarly crowned in a Gallic temple of Apollo. He also praised Constantine's beauty, resembling the beauty of Apollo, who in late antiquity was often identified with Sol. Thus the Ticinium medallion of 313 (fig. 8) shows jugate busts of Sol and Constantine, and on the reverse is depicted a FELIX ADVENTUS AUGG NN, where the mounted emperor is preceded by Victoria holding

78. See P. Friedländer, Johannes von Gaza und Paulus Silentiarius, 1912, esp., p. 83 f.
79. E.g. congiarium, Pliny 25 f. = RIC II, pl. 10, 177; buildings Pliny 51 f. = ibid., pl. 9, 150 BASILICA ULPIA; pl. 9, 153 FORUM TRAIAN; pl. 8, 146 and 11, 203 VIA TRAJANA... Cf. J. M. C. TOYNBEE, Roman Medallions, 1944, 110-111; G. HAMBERG, Studies in Roman Imperial Art 1945, 32 ff.
80. Pliny, panegyric 80, 4-5, but see Hamberg op. cit., 64-7.
81. Pan. Lat. 4, 6, 1; Toynbee, op. cit., pl. 8, 5; 6 (cf. pl. 6, 2) and, p. 174; 183; 193; the reverse legend of these medallions is PIETAS AUGG; cf. Pan. Lat. 3, 6 ff., above, p. 000. On the Arras medallion (Toynbee, pl. 8, 4) and panegyric; cf. MacCormack Historia, 1972, p. 729 f.
high a wreath. The emperor depicted on the coinage in the act of victory, crushing a barbarian with his foot (fig. 7), has a verbal parallel in Mamertinus' gratiarum actio, and another phrase of Mamertinus is matched by a set of fourth century coins showing the emperor standing in the prow of a ship (fig. 8).

Whether the coinage was deliberately used as an instrument of imperial propaganda is disputed. What the parallels between coinage and panegyrics do make clear, is that the former was used with a measure of planning to express ideas which were current at the time and to which, because of their appearance in both media, one can attribute some validity as expressions of imperial policy. Eusebius, characteristically, was aware of the possibilities of the coinage as a means of imperial advertising. The late third and earlier fourth century stands out as a generation in which coinage and panegyric presented a uniform and coherent imperial programme.

So far, only simple images in art and panegyric have been mentioned. The tableau of the panegyric, like some works of imperial art, is, however, a complex image with many strands. The method of narrative in the relevant panegyric passages resembles the literary genre of ekphrasis: these passages are descriptive of a scene, a prospect, in the same way that Philostratus, John of Gaza and Paulus Silentiarius were descriptive. They appeal to sight as much as to hearing, and the appeal to the sense of vision is often explicit in the wording of the panegyric, as it is for instance in the speech of Mamertinus in 289, where he described Maximian's entry on his consulship of 287:

---

82. Pan. Lat. 7, 21, 4-6, cf. above, p. 44. On the coinage e.g. RIC VII, p. 368, Ticinum 316 AD, RECTOR TOTUS ORBIS, Constantine seated, holding zodiac, crowned by Victoria; RIC VII, p. 474, Sirmium, 324 AD, VICTORIA CONSTANTINI AUG, Victoria standing, crowned standing emperor. The Ticinum medallion, Toynbee, op. cit., pl. 17, 11, p. 108-9.

83. Pan. Lat. 11, 6, 2, quoted above p. 57, cf. Symmachus or. 2, i. H. Cohen, Description historique des Monnaies 8, 1892, p. 51, no. 67 (Julian), VIRTUS AUG N, Julian in military dress, holding standard and laurel branch, placing foot on seated captive (cf. nos. 68-70); also no. 75 VIRTUS EXERC GALL, Julian in military dress holding captive by hair (cf. nos 76-82); for Valentinian I, e.g. RIC IX, pl. 12, 2 = p. 218, 32; pl. 3, 6 = p. 14, 5.

84. Pan. Lat. 11, 9, 4.

85. K. Kraft, Die Taten der Kaiser Constans und Constantius II, Jhb. f. Numismatik und Geldgeschichte, 9, 1958, 141 f.; 170 f.; 179-81, issues for Constans and Constantius II, AVG TEMP REPARATIO, pl. 12, 3; 9. The ship of state, e.g. Pan. Lat. 2, 4, 2. The origin of this type had been the third century ADVENTUS AUGUSTOR and TRIÆCTUS AUG, and in the fourth century, legends were more general and the ship of state should not be excluded from the frame of reference of these issues.


87. VC 3, 47; 4, 15; 73; see also H. v. SCHÖNEBECK, Religionspolitik d. Maxentius und Constantin, Elio Belth. 43, 1939, p. 46.
"We have seen you, Caesar, taking up and fulfilling the vows for the state on the same day. For what you had desired for the future, that you performed yourself in the present, so that you were seen to anticipate the very aid of the gods for which you had prayed, and you achieved in advance what the gods had promised. We have seen you, Caesar, on the same day both in the most honoured attire of peace and in the most noble apparel of virtue."

The link between imperial art and panegyric could be an explicit one. The panegyric of 307 even contains as part of the laudes, the ekphrasis of a wall painting in the palace of Aquileia, which represented Fausta presenting a ceremonial helmet to Constantine as a betrothal gift.

More effective, however, are those passages which evoke themes such as adventus, which are commonly illustrated in imperial art and which were appropriate for various contexts. Here, the orator could begin with a particular event or fact which, on the one hand, he could use to support a generalisation, and on the other, he could make it into an image, a tableau, or several images. Generalisation and image frequently coincided, for in late antiquity imperial art came to represent, like some panegyrics, less the historical identifiable event, than general aspects of the emperor’s rule and character. Thus the panegyric of 297 generalised and universalised nature. The rule of the four Tetrarchs was described as being matched symbolically in the order of nature by the four lights of the sky and other quaternities. The symbol of the four lights, like other Tetrarchic ideas, was still used in the early reign of Constantine. On the arch of Constantine, the representations of imperial deeds are framed by two medallions, showing, the one, Luna with Vesper (fig. 9), and the other, Sol with Lucifer (fig. 10). Thus, the imperial deeds were set into a cosmic context, as was still done in imperial and then in Christian art after the fourth century, for instance on the column base of Arcadius, which will be discussed below. The particular value of the panegyric of 297 consisted in making the very widely used and very general formulae of cosmic imperial dominion specifically relevant to the Tetrarchy by emphasizing the number four. In Constantinian and later imperial propaganda, on the other hand, the application of this symbol to reality had to be more general.

The panegyric of 289 discussed the rise to power of Diocletian and

88. Pan. Lat. 2, 6, 3; Vidimus te, Caesar, eodem die pro re publica et vote suscepere et coniunctim debere, quod enim optoveras in futurum, fecisti continuo transactum, ut mihi ipsa deorum auxilia quae precatus eras praevenisse vidarit et quidquid illi promiserant ante fecisset. Vidimus te, Caesar, eodem die et in clarissimo pacis habitu et in pulcherrimo virtutis ornatu. The emphasis on sight also in e.g. Pan. Lat. 4, 9, 1 ‘quía... deus... persuadere potuisset quod nunc vidimus et videmus, totis porticibus civitatim sedere captiva agmina... (cf. above n. 66) Pan. Lat. 11, 6, 3.
89. Pan. Lat. 6, 6, 2 f.; cf. Pan. Lat. 12, 44, 5; Symmachus or. 3, 5.
90. J. Kollwitz, Oströmische Plastik der theodosianischen Zeit, 1941, 58-62.
Maximian. Characteristically, here also, historical and datable events were only referred to by implication, but were used as the starting point for imagery and generalisation.

“Your triumphal robes of state, your consular fasces, and your curule chairs, the glorious display of your subjects’ allegiance, and that light which surrounds your divine head with a shining halo: these are the ornaments of your merits...; but much greater are the benefits which you in turn have imparted on the empire which has been bestowed on you: your concern is the care of so great a commonwealth, and the destinies of the whole world are your responsibility... You live for the nations and stand in that most exalted pinnacle of human affairs whence, as it were, you look down on all lands and seas... You receive messengers without number from all parts of the earth and send out as many orders, and countless cities, nations and provinces are the subjects of your consideration... All these tasks, which have been laid on you by your brother, you perform them with fortitude and he with wisdom.”

The image here painted conveys the emperors enthroned high above all, surveying the world. Their role is not identical, however, for Diocletian, whose pares is Iuppiter, acts sapienter, and Maximian, whose pares is Hercules, acts fortiter. This contrast was worked out throughout the Tetrarchic panegyrics. The image of the emperor enthroned above all recurs in the panegyric of 307, where an attempt was made to preserve the ideology of the Tetrarchy for new circumstances. It is now, to use the vocabulary of 289, Maximian who acts sapienter, and Constantine, in the role of a Tetrarchic Caesar, who acts fortiter.

“Your role it is, Father (Maximian), to look out into the world which you both rule from the very summit of empire, and to decree the outcome of human undertakings by your celestial volition, to grant the auspices for wars which have to be undertaken, and to impose the terms when peace is to be concluded. And your role, young (Constantine), it is to traverse continuously the boundaries whereby the Roman empire is defended against barbarian nations, to send many laurels of victories to your father in law, to seek his instructions and to report to him when they have been performed. So it will come about that you both will work according to the counsels of one mind, yet you will each have the strength of two.”

92. Pan. Lat. 2, 3, 2 ff.: trabeae vestrae triumphales et fasces consulares et sellae curules et haec obsequiorum stipatfo et fulgor et illa lux divinum verticem clare orbe compactens vestrorum sunt ornamenta meritorum...; sed longe illa maiora sunt quae tu impartito tibi imperio vice gratiae retullisti: admittere in animum tantae republicae curam et totius orbis fata suscipere et... gentibus vivere et in tam arduo humanarum rerum stare fastigio, ex quo veluti terras omnes et maria despicias... accipere innumerables undique nuttios, totidem mandata dimittere, de tot uribus et nationibus et provinciis cogitare... haec omnia cum a fratre optimo oblata susceperis, tu fecisti fortiter ille sapienter.  

93. Pan. Lat. 6, 14, 1 te pater ex ipso imperii vertice decet orbum prospicere communem caelestieque nutu rebus humanis fata decernere, auspicia bellis gerendis dare, componendis pacibus leges imponere; te iuvenis indefesum ire per limites qua Romanum barbaris gentibus instat imperium, frequentes ad socerum victoria- rum laureas mittere, praecpta petere, effecta rescribere. ita eveniet ut et ambo
Such passages echo visual art where the emperors enthroned "in vertice imperii", "in tam arduo humanarum rerum fastigio", appear on the arch of Galerius (fig. 11). Diocletian and Maximian are enthroned over the figures of earth and sky, presiding over the other parts of the tableau, acting sapienter. On either side of them, the Caesars Galerius and Constantius, acting fortiter, introduce conquered provinces to the enthroned emperors. The scene is framed by the Dioscuri, Oceanus and Tellus and other divinities, represented to convey the world-wide and eternal nature of Tetrarchic rule, which was also propagated in the panegyrics.

An explicit interpretation of a historical even as a symbol, suitably introduced by a praeteritio — "transeo innumerabiles tuas tota Gallia pugnas et victorias" — occurs in the panegyric of 289. The matter under discussion was Maximian's consulship of 287, referred to above, which he entered upon in Trier. On the day of the celebrations occurred a comparatively minor barbarian attack on Trier not recorded elsewhere, which Maximian repulsed. In itself the event was of little significance, but it made an impression on the townspeople and it matched a common theme in imperial art and panegyric, the interrelationship between imperial consulships and victory. Thus, Mamertinus made of it a symbol, an ekphrasis, something to be seen with the eyes, as he repeated himself. The themes of the episode are a correlation of Maximian's roles in peace and war, expressed by his wearing the consular toga praetexta and armour on the same day. His role in peace was fulfilled by his sacrifice to Iuppiter with the vows appropriate for imperial consulships, and his role in war by the engagement with the enemy. Similar themes, victory and a religious observance, are joined together on the Decennalia base in the Roman Forum, which is part of a monument that was erected in 303 on the occasion of the Vicennalia of Diocletian and Maximian and the Decennalia of Galerius and Constantius. One

consilium pectoris unius habeatis et uterque vires duorum. Cf. 9, 2 f.; 13, 3 f.;
Pan. Lat. 3, 3; 7, 6; Pan. Lat. 5, 10, 2.

94. According to Seston, Diocletien et la Tétrarchie, p. 251, the emperors are enthroned over Pluto and Hecate, on the ground of their Mithraic devotion. I am doubtful of this interpretation, as it has no parallels in imperial art, whereas the emperor enthroned over the sky does, e.g. Euseb. VC 4, 69. The motif was adopted in Christian art, e.g. on the sarcophagus of Junius Bassus, where the figure under the billowing veil can only be Cēlūs. See now H. P. Laubscher, Der Reliefschmuck des Galeriusbogens in Thessaloniki (Archäol. Forsch. Band 1), 1975, p. 75 f.

95. Cf. Seston, op. cit., 252-3; Pan. Lat. 3, 5-6; 14; 16; Pan. Lat. 4, 4; 20; 5, 20, 2 ff.

96. P. 49; Pan. Lat. 2, 6, 1 f.

97. Cf. Alföldi, Insignien und Tracht der römischen Kaiser, Röm. Mitt. 50, 1935, 32 f.; the themes of victory and imperial consulship are particularly clearly related to each other in Claudian's panegyrics on Honorius.

side of the base, showing two victories holding a shield inscribed CAESARUM DECIANNALIA FELICITER over two crouching captives, the whole composition framed by two trophies, is devoted to imperial victoriousness, while the other three sides show the sacrifice of the suovetaurilia in the presence of Mars, Roma and Sol, a civil ceremony, performed by a togate emperor (fig. 12). The performance of this sacrifice, one of the most ancient Roman religious rites, by the emperor, has an antiquarian touch which also found expression in the panegyric of 289, where the legendary origins of Rome were recalled.

Another tableau, where adventus and victory are intermingled, occurs in Mamertinus' gratiarum actio of 362. Some aspects of it have already been discussed in connection with the avoidance of issues not suitable for panegyrics, and in connection with parallels between individual phrases in panegyrics and iconographical schemes on the coinage. After stating, as has been seen, Julian's proclamation as Augustus by implication rather than expressly, Mamertinus went on to describe his welcome by the rejoicing populace of the Danubian provinces in the current idiom of imperial advents. He then contrasted the rejoicing of the Romans on one side of the river and the abject submission of the barbarians on the other:

"How glorious was our progress during that voyage, when the right bank of the river was lined with an endless array of citizens of all ranks of society, men and women, soldiers and civilians, while on the left bank barbarians were to be seen sunken to their knees and uttering abject entreaties! The emperor visited every city on the Danube, heard the requests of all, raised their condition and restored their prosperity, and granted pardon and the gift of peace to countless barbarians."

The "genu nixa barbaria" is a common place of imperial art. It is more important that the image presented by the passage as a whole appears on the column base of Arcadius. On the south side Arcadius and Honorius were represented with a following of court dignitaries, while in the register below provinces wearing mural crowns made their offerings. On the west side, the emperors, attended by soldiers,
received the submission of barbarians, shown in the register below with Victories and a trophy.

The occasion of the erection of the column base was the expulsion of Gainas and the consulship of Arcadius and Honorius in 402. Accordingly, on the east side, the emperors were shown togate as consuls, attenned by lictors, and, in the register below, by the Senators of Rome and Constantinople. In the bottom register were mourning barbarians and piles of captured armour. This was an interpretation in art of the themes of consulship and victory as described in the panegyric of 289. However, on the column base these themes were placed into a Christian, not a pagan or neutral context: the figurations of all three sides of the column base were dominated by the cross or Chi Rho, supported by angels or Victories, and framed by the old symbol of Sol and Luna.

In this example we can see how, by the later fourth century, imperial art achieved the fusion of Roman imperial traditions and Christian concepts of empire which panegyric failed to achieve. Imperial art became Christian, and continued to express itself in stylisations and universalisations, tableaux in other words, rather than in the conventions of narrative art, whereas panegyrics remained pagan or neutral and ceased employing tableaux as a means of expression. The panegyrics of Nazarius, Symmachus and Pacatus contain few images, and none that can be matched in imperial art, and they can have no tableaux. This lessened their effectiveness as propaganda and as announcements of imperial programmes, quite apart from their content.

The most successful surviving panegyrics of late antiquity arose out of an interchange between court and schools in Gaul and out of imperial patronage. As a result, in the fourth century, Gaul was one of the centres of oratory in the West. The Gallic orators of the late third century developed techniques which made their panegyrics particularly effective: they spoke by allusion, implication, symbol, and they presented facts and events as images and tableaux. It is here than one can trace connections between imperial panegyrics and imperial art.

From the point of view of imperial politics and propaganda, these connexions and parallels show that the emperors were able to present a consistent, stable and continuous programme, which, because of its continuity, could be stylized and universalized and could be made to acquire symbolic meanings in art and rhetoric. The changes that occurred in the fourth century, especially after Julian, made it more difficult for panegyrist to use symbols and universalisations, partly because they—or at least those whose works survive—were too distant from the court, both physically and in outlook, and partly because imperial policies were too changeable for any fusion of art and panegyric to

take place. From the point of view of the cultural history of the later empire, on the other hand, the parallels between art and panegyric illustrate a special sensitivity and skill on the part of the orators, for they succeeded in applying to the exposition of res gestae methods of description which had formerly been applied mainly to objects, in particular works of art. To achieve this, the orators utilized the genre of ekphrasis, description. Description, rather than narrative in the historical manner was particularly suitable for panegyrics, the more so if it could evoke not only a visual experience in the imagination, but could also bring to mind actual works of imperial art and serve as a kind of commentary on them. However, the orators of the later fourth century returned to narrative in the historical manner: they spoke about facts and events, rather than states of affairs and tableaux.

In verse panegyrics, on the other hand, images, personifications and divinities who also figures in late Roman and Byzantine art continued living a vigorous and picturesque existence: but verse panegyric was a different genre from prose panegyric, with different rules and conventions. Prose panegyrists under the Tetrarchy had created a specifically political and imperial imagery, which differed from the imagery of verse panegyric. Their expertise, the involvement of sight and hearing concurrently, was largely lost in the later fourth century. There occurred a change of awareness and ways of perception on the part of panegyrists, and perhaps their audiences. In the later fourth century, orators were not able, or, perhaps, willing, to convey emperor and empire as the theme that would absorb eyes and ears.

6. Late Roman panegyrics as expressions of imperial policies.

We have referred to the formal features which differentiate late Roman panegyrics from history; these panegyrics were selective and composed for a particular purpose, while, according to Lucian, among others, historical writings ought to be written so as to be appreciated by posterity. Late antique panegyrics, had a certain inbuilt and quite deliberate obsolescence, for they addressed themselves to contemporaries, and then mainly to a particular group of contemporaries, that is to those locals who were present to listen. It is thus important to realize the potential and the limitations of panegyrics. On the one hand, a panegyric could crystallize in considerable detail and depth one specific moment in a specific place, but on the other hand, in its particularity lay its limitations. Panegyrics are not a good basis upon which to generalize. It is a mistake to extract from them singly or collectively an amalgam of qualities attributable to the late antique 'ideal emperor'. Parti-

---

103. How to write History, 38-42; 61-3.
104. E.g. Born, The perfect prince according to the Latin Panegyrist, AJPh 55, 1934, 20-33; also Lippold, Herrscherideal und Traditions-verbundenheit im Panegyricus des Facatus, Historia 17, 1968, 228 ff. Charlesworth, The virtues of a
cular imperial qualities found expression in relation to particular circumstances, places and groups of people. Thus Constantine in Trier in 310 was portrayed as the merciless conqueror of barbarians, but in 313 in Trier and in 321 in Rome, his generosity towards the enemy was emphasized. Similarly the Theodosinus of Pacatus’ panegyric is barely recognizable as the subject of Ambrose’s Consolatio.

The temporary and relative validity of panegyrics, the way in which they were circumscribed by a particular context, also becomes apparent when one examines them as sources for historical facts. The historian who disentangles facts from panegyrics has a frustrating task, not only because of the conventions of the genre, according to which, for instance, an enemy was often not referred to by name, and placenames and chronology could be avoided, but also because the aim of most late Roman panegyrics was suggestion and allusion rather than demonstration and proof. In this, late Roman panegyrist differ greatly from Pliny, who was more thorough and therefore more neutral and impartial in his treatment of facts.

In late Roman panegyrics, events were not necessarily narrated in detail, but could be explicitly or implicitly passed over to make room for descriptions of states of affairs and of imperial actions in terms of pageants and ceremonies. Instead of hearing of historical facts, the audience heard of facts as symbols and as tokens of imperial majesty. These characteristics are especially pronounced in some panegyrics of the late third and early fourth century and in Mamertinus’ gratiarum actio of 362. These panegyrics were all used as a medium to announce imperial programmes and policies in such a way as to embrace both political and religious matters, while avoiding any details that would detract from the central themes. This will be illustrated by some examples.

Roman Emperor PBA 23, 1937, 105-35 emphasized the continuities of imperial virtues but also pointed to the changes. A good study of the ideological content of the Panegyrici Latinis is P. Burdeau, L’Empereur d’après les Panégyriques Latins, in Aspects de l’Empire romain, 1964 see esp. 6-9; the attempt to define the religious aspects of empire (10 ff.) is less successful, for the reasons here stated.

105. Pan. Lat. 7, 10-11; 9, 6, 1; 9, 11-12; 10, 8 and 21; for the connexions between events and what Claudian in his role as propagandist said about them see A. Cameron Claudian, Pauly and Propaganda at the Court of Honorius, 1970.

106. Particularly if he was a rival emperor, thus Alectus is not named in Pan. Lat. 4, nor Maximian in Pan. Lat. 7, nor Maelentius in Pan. Lat. 9 and 10;Procopius in Symmachus or. 1, 17 is rebellis exsul. Pacatus, however, mentioned Maximus by name, Pan. Lat. 12, 24; 38, 1; 40, 3; 41, 2 etc.; this fits with the historical nature of the narrative dealing with the war against Maximus. For Mamertinus the consul of 362 see below at nn. 114-116. For the historical material to be found in the XII Panegyrici Latini, see Galletier’s introductions to the several panegyrics.

107. This is the case particularly when praise is arranged according to virtues, as in Pan. Lat. 3; see also Pan. Lat. 11; in Symmachus’ panegyrics most placenames occur in exempla, and are therefore of no use historically.
It was a panegyric common place to say that the emperor’s achievements were too great and too numerous to be narrated in detail. The audience was more likely to be convinced by this if the orator did not actually go into the detail he had promised to avoid, if he could make his message clear, concise, and relevant to the local situation. Thus Mamertinus in 289 very appropriately merely reminded his hearers of imperial victories in the East\textsuperscript{108}, and concentrated on the situation in Gaul which was of more immediate concern to the people of Trier whom he addressed. Similarly in 291, rather than going through the four cardinal virtues, he only praised the emperors’ \textit{pietas} and \textit{felicitas}\textsuperscript{109}. They had \textit{pietas} towards the gods and towards each other. The latter was very skilfully illustrated by an account of the meeting of Diocletian and Maximian in Milan in 290, described as a victorious \textit{adventus}\textsuperscript{110}, where fact and symbol flow into each other, and are juxtaposed one to expound the other without the tedium of actual explanation and definition. The hardships of the journey, the rejoicing of the population at the approach of the emperors, their reception in Milan and residence in the palace there, were all described in some detail as illustrating the emperors’ affection and devotion for each other, their endurance and their command even over the elements. But the subject of the deliberations in Milan was not mentioned with one single word. The historical event did not matter as much as the event which could be made into a symbol. In the second part of the panegyric, the empire’s prosperity, the fertility of the fields and imperial victory were used to demonstrate the emperors’ \textit{felicitas}. This speech was very skilfully composed, for while imperial virtues were expressed by the well-being of the subjects, they were also expressed — in the description of the \textit{adventus} scene — in the majesty, the exalted position of the emperors. In this way imperial virtues created a link between ruler and ruled, which, characteristically, was not stated directly, but emerged from the panegyric as a whole.

Even in a more factual panegyric, like that on the \textit{quinquennalia} of Constantius, celebrating his victory over Allectus and re-conquest of Britain in 296, the narration of imperial deeds was prefaced by an introduction on the worldwide victories of the Tetrarchs\textsuperscript{111} and an exposition of Tetrarchic rule in terms of symbols. The fourfold division of the Tetrarchic empire was not explained so much with regard to frontiers needing defence and provinces requiring the presence of an emperor to provide a local focus of interest and to retain the loyalty of the provincials. Such an explanation would belong to the realms of historical

\begin{footnotes}
\item \textsuperscript{108} \textit{Pan. Lat.} 2, 9, 2; \textit{Arist. Rhet.} I, 9, 30 pointed out that a panegyrist should praise what would interest his audience; cf. Menander, Spengel III, 368, 21 f.
\item \textsuperscript{109} \textit{Pan. Lat.} 3, 5, 1-6, \textit{divisio}; 6, 2 ff. \textit{pietas}; 13, 1 ff. \textit{felicitas}.
\item \textsuperscript{110} \textit{Pan. Lat.} 3, 8 ff.
\item \textsuperscript{111} \textit{Pan. Lat.} 4, 3, 2 f.; 5, 1-3.
\end{footnotes}
writing. Rather, the panegyrist compared the four emperors to the four elements, the four seasons, the four cardinal points and the four luminaries of the sky, Sol and Luna, Vesper and Lucifer\textsuperscript{112}, and thereby integrated imperial dominion into the eternal order of nature (cf. figs. 9 and 10). The narration of Constantius’ campaign against Allectus, although sufficiently factual for the events of the war to be reconstructed in outline, yet emphasized the world-wide ans supernatural aspects of the victory as much as its practical importance. The victory was used to illustrate the felicitas and divine protection which the emperors enjoyed\textsuperscript{113}. It was understood as a symbol for imperial felicitas as well as extolled in its own right.

Events which a panegyrist did not want to develop could be alluded to or passed over explicitly in a praeteritio\textsuperscript{114}, or they could be ignored. Mamertinus in his gratiarum actio of 362 to Julian gave an example of both praeteritio and omission which is distinguished by the superb confidence of a real master in this art of saying the unsaid. After mentioning Julian’s activities in Gaul, Mamertinus said:

“
I pass over the whole barbarian world rising up in arms against the defender of Roman liberty; I pass over the nations recently conquered but still rebellious under the yoke newly imposed on their inscrutable or mystical necks, nations which were aroused to renewed uproar by nefarious schemes: all these troubles at last conquered the steadfast and unmoved patience of our emperor. Thus it was that he who with his victorious army had traversed regions, rivers and mountains whose names were heretofore unknown, hastening through the remotest kingdoms of uncivilized peoples, and trampling over the heads of kings (cf. fig. 7), appeared unexpectedly in the heart of Illyricum. We, the blessed companions of that journey, beheld the astonished populace of cities suspending belief in what they saw with their own eyes\textsuperscript{115}.
"

The narrative of the occurrences here referred to occupied lengthy sections in Ammianus; the events in question were the battle of Strassburg, and the rebellion of the Alamanni, which, according to Ammianus\textsuperscript{116},

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{112} Pan. Lat. 4, 4.
\item \textsuperscript{113} Pan. Lat. 4, 15 and 17.
\item \textsuperscript{114} E.g. Pan. Lat. 3, 5, 1; 4, 2, 1, cf. 4, 23, 3; 7, 7, 1, 45; 7, 7, 1; Symmachus or. 2, 3.
\item \textsuperscript{115} Pan. Lat. 11, 6, 1 f., mitto cunctam barbariam adversus vindicem Romanae libertatis in arma commotam gentesque recens victas et adversum ingem nuper impositum cervia duobus contumaces in redivivum furorem nefandis stimulis excitatas — quae omnia obstinatam et immobilem principis maximi tandem vicere patientiam. itaque cum in ipso molimine oppressisset Alamanniam rebellantem, qui paulo anter inaudita regionum, fluviorum, montium ostina exercitu victore peragrawerat, per ultima ferarum gentium regna, calcata regium capita supervolans, in medio Illyrici sinu improvisus apparuit. vidimus, felicis istius viae comites stupentes urbium populos dubitasse credere quae videbant. See the commentary by H. Gutzwiller, \textit{Die Neujahrsvorles...}, p. 125 ff., for the events alluded to.
\item \textsuperscript{116} Ammianus 18, 3, 4 ff., see also K. P. Stroheker, Alamannen im Reichsdienst, in \textit{Germanen und Spätantike}, 1965, 48 ff.
\end{itemize}
Constantius had incited against Julian. One is left to think whatever one likes of the sentence beginning " itaque... ". It may refer to Julian's action against the barbarians, where Constantius is also implied, or to Julian's usurpation, or to both, for by the end of the next sentence, Julian had arrived in Illyricum and was on his way to Constantinople. He was heading for armed conflict with Constantius, although Mamertinus suggested without actually saying it, that Julian's inroad into Illyricum was just part of his campaign against the barbarians. Mamertinus then led his narrative into the terminology of a victorious adventus, and that was all he said about Julian's becoming sole emperor. Julian's proclamation as Augustus in Gaul, the reasons for it, the events leading up to it and the events following after were all ignored. Mamertinus never allowed himself to betray the cause by giving any details or any explanation of any matter at all that was likely to lead him into difficulties or to require apologies. It was a superb performance which left potential objectors in Constantinople with little chance to reply. Mamertinus, while giving his listeners a good and thorough picture of Julian in general, really told them no facts. That is, he deprived them of the opportunity of any rejoinder, there being nothing in what he said that they could deny. There is little narrative of events in the historical manner in this panegyric. All is evaluation, allusion, argument. The listener was definitely not left to make up his own mind.

Late Roman panegyrists explained and propagated past imperial actions, as is illustrated by the above example. But this was only one of their possible tasks. They could also elucidate for their listeners imperial policies for the future. Such panegyrics, for instance that of 362, could prepare the scene for action: a number of them were delivered on the occasion of an arrival, a time of potential uncertainty, when a definition of past events could be used to lay down attitudes for the future. In particular this was the case during the aftermath of a war against a rival emperor or usurper; the panegyric would make sure that the point of the war was understood properly\(^{117}\), and considerable liberty could be taken with the facts. Here again the approach was non-historical\(^{118}\).

This becomes especially clear where panegyrics are close together in time and where changes of policy had to be explained. The type of problem that arose is illustrated in the panegyrics that document the ascendancy of Constantine. The panegyrics of 289, 291, 297 and 298 praised the institutions and emperors of the Tetrarchy with great skill.

\(^{117}\) The relevant panegyrics are cited in n. 106, above.

\(^{118}\) The 'tyrant' endowed with numerous vices, was, in some panegyrics contrasted to the emperor, his opposite: *Pan. Lat.* 7, 14 f. on Maximian is cautious in comparison to *Pan. Lat.* 9, 3, 4 f.; 10, 1 f. and *Pan. Lat.* 10, 12 on Maxentius, where there is much distortion (a reconstruction of Maximian's policies, H. v. Schoenebeck *Beitr. zur Religionspolitik d. Maxentius und Konstantin Kılıç*, 43, 1939); also *Pan. Lat.* 12, 23 f. on Maximus.
and conviction, and gave the impression that the Tetrarchic system had been worked out to last for ever — as indeed it was intended to do. With the panegyrics that follow, however, the reader is in for a shock — but it cannot be anything like as big as the shock of those who witnessed the events after 305 and listened to the panegyrics. The panegyric of 307 praised what amounted to the collapse of the Tetrarchy. Constantine, having emerged from Britain in what looked like a usurpation, made a makeshift alliance with Maximian who had returned to a semblance of power after his retirement, by means of a dynastic marriage between himself and Maximian's daughter Fausta. The panegyrist's task was to publicize these facts in a manner and a setting which would convince people that the arrangements in question were valid and final. He had to back up the emperor's military effort of preventing further usurpations. Facts were duly selected and tailored to suit that programme. But the orator did not choose themes that might suit the occasion at random by leafing through his copy of Menander or equivalent, as one might suppose if one studies only the way in which panegyrics repeat commonplaces and observe the textbook rules. The orator did introduce and point to themes which turned out to be of great importance in Constantine's later policy.

The themes which emerge in the panegyric of 307 are the dynastic aims of Constantine and the collapse of the Tetrarchic religious programme. These were two features which were to make an essential difference between the regime of Constantine and that of the Tetrarchs. The dynastic theme is of course an obvious ingredient in a panegyric for a marriage: this panegyric, however, is not the traditional epîthalamîum, for the bride is hardly mentioned at all, but a political speech. The omission of any religious programme, of a religious interpretation of empire, which distinguishes this panegyric from the Tetrarchic ones, was deliberate. The panegyric of 307 was an attempt at interpreting recent events. When compared with the earlier panegyrics, this one gives an impression of slight unease and uncertainty which is expressed in the indistinct divisions of the speech and its lack of unity and coherence.

The panegyric of 307 was only an introduction to the changes in the empire which were made by Constantine. Further rhetorical convolutions had to be gone through to take account of the situation three years later, when Maximian was dead and Constantine sole ruler of the tres Galliae. In the panegyric of 310, Maximian figured as the tyrant who had abused Constantine's generosity, while Constantine was the
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119. Mesk, Zur Technik der Lateinischen Panegyriker, Rh. Mus. 67, 1912, 569-90, analysed, most informatively, the rhetorical structure of panegyrics and literary influences on them; from this, however, results a picture of uniformity which the panegyrics do not have. Similarly in Magniness, Some Methods of the Latin Panegyrists, Hermathena 47, 1932, 42-61; Locutions and Formule of the Latin Panegyrists, Hermathena 48, 1933, 117-38.
legitimate emperor who ruled by virtue of his descent from Claudius Gothicus and Constantius, and by virtue of the consent of the gods and mankind. The Tetrarchic religious programme had gone but it was now replaced by something new and positive, the personal relationship between Constantine and his god, Apollo — or, according to the coinage, Sol (cf. fig. 6). The panegyrist, using the late antique identification of Sol and Apollo, adapted the empire-wide numismatic slogan of ‘Sol invictus comes Augusti’ to the personal interests of his Gallic listeners by recounting a vision of Constantine’s in a Gallic temple of Apollo:

"...when you turned aside to visit the most beautiful temple on earth, and came into the very presence, as you saw, of the god. For I believe, Constantine, that you saw your own Apollo, attended by Victory, who offered you wreaths of laurel. But indeed, why do I say ‘I believe’? You did see him, and recognized yourself under the aspect of him to whom, as the songs of poets have told, belong all the kingdoms of the world. I now hold that his rule has at last come to pass, for you, our emperor, like he, are young and gay, a healer and most beautiful."

The panegyrists who used the medium of praise most successfully for propaganda and the announcement of imperial programmes in clear imaginative language, were men who had some close connection with the emperor or the court. They were the Tetrarchic panegyrist, the panegyrist of 310, and Mamertinus the consul of 362. They were all pagans who were able to use the familiar idiom of paganism and adapt it as required. The possibilities ranged from the Tetrarchic concept of Iuppiter and Hercules as the parelines and models of the emperors, to Constantine’s Apollo — Sol, to Julian’s more impersonal ideal of philosophy as expounded by himself and Mamertinus.

7. The impact of Christianity

Some panegyrist did not give a clear and positive impression of imperial actions and programmes. One of the explanations of the change in the nature of panegyrics, I would suggest, is to be sought in the religious changes introduced by Constantine, which resulted in his conversion to Christianity. These changes obliged panegyrists to be less open and explicit in their statement of imperial policies. Among the panegyrist in question are the orator of 307, already referred to,

120. Pan. Lat. 7, 2, 1 f.; 7, 7, 4; 7, 8, 2.
121. Pan. Lat. 7, 21, 3 f.: ... ubi deflexisses ad templum toto orbe pulcherrimum, immo ad praezentem, ut vidisti, deum. vidisti enim, credo, Constantine, Apollinem tuum comitante Victoria coronas laureas tibi offerentem... et immo, quid dico ‘credó’? vidisti, teque in illius specie recognovisti, cui totius mundi regna debet vatum carmina cecinerant. quod ego nunc demum arbitror contigisse, cum tu sis, ut ille, invenis et laetus et salutifer et pulcherrimus, imperator.
122. Pan. Lat. 11, 23, 4.
Nazarius and Pacatus. The orator of 307 and Pacatus have one feature in common: they spoke very shortly after fundamental changes in government. All three were unknown men who came forward to comment — or rather, so far as possible, avoid comment — on a new situation. Having such a panegyrist, enabled the emperor not to commit himself as to the ultimate aims of his policies.

The content of the panegyric of 307 indicates the overthrow of the Tetrarchy, but much of the ideology of the panegyric is still drawn from the Tetrarchy. Constantine filled the role of a Tetrarchic Caesar, Maximian that of an Augustus. The passage describing this aspect of the arrangement in terms of a pageant of empire, evoking a visual experience, is among the most convincing in the panegyric. The author here used the vocabulary of the past to adapt the Tetrarchic system without its religious foundations to hereditary monarchy. Like Mamertinus in his panegyric on Julian, he divulged as few facts as possible. One can detect in the panegyric a certain distance from the emperors as the orator works out the relationship between them. He gives the impression of being an outsider to the court, chosen to make what he could of policies hanging in the air.

Nazarius, delivering the panegyric for the quindecennalia of Constantine in Rome in the emperor’s absence, was in a similar position, for in 321, he had to resort to the events of 312 as his central theme. He treated it, however, without the use of imagery, in which consisted much of the appeal of the panegyric of 307. He was not in sufficiently close contact with the emperor to say anything about the — admittedly complex and obscure — events between 312 and 321. He was the first of the Gallic orators represented in the corpus of the XII Panegyrici to come, not from Autun, but from Bordeaux, like later Pacarius, as well as Ansonius. The school of Autun had been rebuilt and patronized under the Tetrarchs, and its teachers composed most of the panegyrics on the Tetrarchs and the young Constantine which survive in the corpus of the XII Panegyrici Latini. The choice of Nazarius may indicate a dissociation on the part of Constantine from the school of Autun and thereby from Tetrarchic policies. Nazarius’ daughter was a Christian, and it is possible that he himself, figuring as he does in Jerome’s Chronicle, was a least a Christian sympathizer. Relations between Constantine and the Senate of Rome, whom Nazarius addressed, were strained at
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123. *Pan. Lat.* 6, 14, r f., see also above, at n. 93.
124. *Pan. Lat.* 6, 3, r f.; 8, r f.; 13, r f.
125. For the rebuilding see the oration of Ennenius, *Pan. Lat.* 5; T. Haarhoff *Schools of Gaul*, 1920, 136-90 in imperial patronage (with adverse judgement on panegyrics); cf. Galletier ed. *XII Pan. Lat.* 1, xi-xiv.
this period, and in 325, the first Christian praefectus urbi — a Spaniard, of equestrian origin into the bargain — was appointed to an office generally held by Senators of Rome. Nazarius’ panegyric, entirely unrevealing about the contemporary situation in any direct sense, by its very silence illustrates the complexities of the time, for which no satisfactory official explanation could be made available. Pacatus’ oration is structurally the most complex of the surviving Latin panegyrics, and, apart from Pliny’s, the longest. Both the virtues and the deeds of Theodosius were praised; among the latter was the victory over Maximus, which provided the occasion for the panegyric, and which was related with some historical detail. No personal picture of the emperor and his policies emerges, however, and it is impossible to tell from the panegyric anything about either the emperor’s or the author’s religion.

On matters of religion and empire, the panegyrics of the Tetrarchy had provided a clear guideline, by presenting the religious foundations of the Tetrarchy as an integral part of imperial rule. After the accession of Constantine, and particularly after his conversion to Christianity, this incorporation of religion into imperial policy ceased to be possible in Latin panegyrics. Nazarius said nothing of it, and even Mamertinus was cautious, if definite, in referring to restorations at Eleusis and mentioning that philosophy was now again enthroned side by side with the emperor. Pacatus picked up this image and changed the person of philosophy into the more neutral figure of amicitia, while saying nothing of Christianity.

Religion as treated in panegyrics was a public matter, involving the emperor, his representatives and subjects in an official capacity. The adoption of Trajan in the temple of Iuppiter, the relationship between the Tetrarchs and Iuppiter and Hercules, even Constantine’s vision of Apollo in 310, relate to the role of the gods as protectors of emperors in their capacity of emperors. This did not, however, exclude the possibility of a personal religion of the emperor coalescing with the official one, like the devotion to Mithras by the Tetrarchs. In this context

128. A. Chastagnol, La Préfecture Urbaine à Rome, 1960, 400; 401 ff.; Stroieker, Spanische Senatoren... in Germanenland und Spätantik, p. 58.
129. Cf. above, n. 106.
131. Pan. Lat. XI, 9, 4; 11, 23, 4 with Pan. Lat. XII, 16, 2.
132. Pliny Panegyricus 8, 1.
133. Inscription of Carnuntum CIL III, 4413 = M. J. Vermaseren, Corpus Insor. et Mon. Rel. Méthraïcas II, 1960 no. 1698, ‘DSIM fatorii imperi sui Iovii et Herculi... sacrarium restituerunt’. Seston, Dioclétien..., p. 225 interprets this inscription as an official expression of imperial religion; the light imagery of Pan. Lat. 3, 9-10; 15 is taken as an expression of this imperial Mithraism. But Mithras is not mentioned in any panegyric, and the Tetrarchic panegyrics, like the coinage show
it is significant that Eusebius in his *Life of Constantine* tried to give to Christianity an official relevance, whereby the religion of the emperor affects the whole empire: Constantine's religion was not merely a personal matter, but the instrument of his victory. The personal religion of emperors was not usually a subject for panegyrics, which had a certain official value. Thus Mamertinus very properly left the topic out, apart from his references to philosophy and to Elenis, and a very discreet passage on divination: this was because both philosophy and divination could, and under Julian did, have a public role affecting the empire officially. Julian's conversion to paganism in general, however, like conversion to Christianity, before it became the religion of the empire, and often thereafter even, was a personal matter, which was as such not suitable for panegyric. But there were methods whereby to make conversion officially effective, and Constantine's building programme was one of them, duly utilized by Eusebius in the Life of Constantine. He also recorded that the bishops who came to Nicaea did so on the *cursus publicus*, like any imperial official. The role of the council itself, timed to coincide with Constantine's *Vicennalia*, was official and imperial, and the unity of religion was to support the unity of the empire.

Notwithstanding the religious developments of the fourth century, the Senate of Rome still regarded paganism as the official religion of the empire, the gauge of victory and security. Thus it is quite explicable that Pacatus, even if he himself was a Christian, (which, however, is uncertain), speaking about a Christian emperor, omitted that aspect when addressing the Roman Senate in his panegyric. The pagan members
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134. *Euseb.*, *VC* 1, 1-6; 37-8; 2, 3-14; 16-17.
136. Note the emphasis on philosophy in Julian's panegyric on Constantius, *or. 2* (Bidez); reception of Maximus, Ammianus 22, 7, 3; divination, Ammianus 22, 1, 1; 12, 6-8; 23, 3, 3; 24, 6, 17; 25, 4, 17.
138. Churches: Jerusalem *VC* 3, 25-39; 4, 40; 43-7; church of the Apostles *VC* 3, 41 ff., *passim*; 4, 39, 58-60; bishops on cursus publicus *VC* 3, 6; 4, 48.
139. *Vicennalia* at Nicaea *VC* 3, 15; also 4, 40; 47 on the dedication of the church of the Sepulchre on Constantine's *tricennalia*; on the unity of faith and empire, Constantine's letter to Arius *VC* 2, 64 ff., esp. 65. Note also Eusebius' emphasis on the presence of bishops from all parts of the empire at councils, to signify universal consent, *VC* 3, 7; 8; 4, 43. In view of the prestige accruing to emperors from Persian embassies (*Pan. Lat.* 2, 10, 5 f.; 4, 10, 4; 10, 38, 3; 12, 22, 4 f.; *VC* 4, 57), the presence of Persian bishops noted by Eusebius is perhaps significant.
of the Senate, probably still in the majority in 389\textsuperscript{141}, would dispute the official role of Christianity, and in the circumstances it was undiplomatic to raise the point. Therewith, the religion was excluded altogether, for Christianity, if it could only figure as the personal religion of the emperor, was irrelevant. The method of avoiding the whole question was to follow very carefully as Pacatus did, the rules for composing panegyrics, which the Tetrarchic panegyrists, being freer in their choice of topic, were able to use much more selectively.

Pacatus' method, which was also used by Libanius in his panegyric on Constantius and Constans — easily the most boring panegyric extant — was one solution to the problem of composing the official address to a Christian emperor on an official occasion. Another was found by Ausonius in his gratiarum actio for his consulship to Gratian, held at the end of his term at Trier, in the presence of the emperor, who had come specially to hear him\textsuperscript{142}. Ausonius explicitly avoided producing the usual gratiarum actio in the form of a panegyric, and delivered instead a personal thanksgiving which did not follow the rules of panegyric. It is in some senses comparable to Pliny's personal gratiarum actio at the end of his panegyric, and to Mamertinus' second section, where the personal position of the author of the panegyric and his relationship to the emperor were discussed. Ausonius spoke as a Christian to a Christian emperor, and in order to do so avoided the traditional literary form of panegyric.

Not only was Christianity both as official and as personal religion unsuited to panegyric, but also, Christians had qualms about the genre in itself. The reason is to be sought partly in the content of panegyrics, even leaving religion aside, and partly in the historical background.

One of the chief topics of panegyric was imperial success in war and the practice, by the emperor, of the warlike virtues. Christians, even in official orations, as will be seen attempted to pass over and deny the importance of this aspect of imperial activity. In this, they were in accord with the argument of Orosius' Historia, according to which war was an evil which Christian emperors had laudably sought to minimize, so far as was possible. According to Orosius, as well as Augustine in the City of God, war in itself was not glorious, and not a subject for praise.

As for the historical background of panegyrics, the Tetrarchy had been militantly pagan, and the panegyrics emphasized this feature, particularly Mamertinus in his Genethliacus of 291, in which he expounded the adoption of the names Iovius and Herculius by the emperors. Seven years later, the centurion Marcellus was provoked into martyrdom

\textsuperscript{141} Chastagnol, La Préfecture Urbaine, 454 f.
\textsuperscript{142} Ausonius, grat. act. 18.
during the celebration of the anniversary of this occasion in Africa\textsuperscript{143}—quite possibly a panegyric here also formed a part of the official proceedings. Imperial celebrations of the kind where panegyrics were customary could produce strong Christian reactions: they provided an opportunity for both sides to assert themselves, and may have produced in Christians an innate distaste for speeches of imperial propaganda\textsuperscript{144}.

Nearly a hundred years later, in 385, Augustine in Milan experienced such a distaste. He was required, as the rhetor of Milan\textsuperscript{145}, to deliver the official panegyric on the consulship of the Frankish magister militum Bauto, which was to include the praises of the emperor\textsuperscript{146}. On his way to the palace, tormented by anxiety about the occasion, Augustine was struck by a poignant preception regarding the worth of temporal felicity: he saw a drunken beggar in a side street who had achieved that *laetitia temporalis felicitatis*, questionable as it was, which, in spite and because of prolonged labour, Augustine himself had failed to attain. The memory of that experience, that brief venture into public life, led Augustine to reflect on the falsity of the panegyric he had delivered, and threw him back to recall his longing for God, his friends and his home.

Meanwhile, however, other Christians were hoping to create a Christian variety of panegyric. After Theodosius' defeat of Eugenius, the Christian poet Endelechius encouraged Paulinus of Nola to compose a panegyric on the emperor. Paulinus sent a copy of this—now lost—panegyric to Jerome, who praised the sub-divisions, *sententiae* and arrangement of the work—merits which the pagan authors discussed here also aspired to—in terms that vividly recall Pliny's views on what a good panegyric should be in literary terms\textsuperscript{147}. But in the panegyric, Paulinus praised Theodosius, as he wrote to Sulpicius Severus, "not so much as an emperor than as the servant of Christ, powerful not by the pride of dominion but by the humility of service, an emperor not because of his imperial

\textsuperscript{143.} Seston, *Jovius et Herculus ou l'épiphanie des Tétrarques*, *Historia* 1, 1950, 257-66; see also the critique of this work by E. Wistrand, *opera selecta* 1972, p. 427-41.

\textsuperscript{144.} The Christian mentality that was provoked into martyrdom by the institutions and ceremonies of the empire was particularly pronounced in Africa, cf. W. Freud, *Martyrdom and Persecution in the Early Church*, 1965, 361 f.; note the incident narrated by Tertullian *de corona* 1 f.

\textsuperscript{145.} He obtained the appointment through a recommendation by Symmachius, then *praedectus urbi*, *Conf.* 5, 13, 23.

\textsuperscript{146.} Augustine, *Conf.* 6, 6, 9 f.; *c. lit. Petil.* 3, 25, 30; according to A. Salignac in *Bibliothèque Augustiniennes, les Confessions*, vol. I, 1962, p. 204 two different panegyrics on different occasions were delivered by Augustine.

\textsuperscript{147.} Jerome, *ep.* 58 cf. above, n. 34. The rules of traditional imperial panegyric were also followed in eulogies of saints, H. Delehaye, *Les Passions des Martyrs et les genres littéraires*, 1966, 133 ff.
authority but because of his faith. According to Gennadius, Paulinus composed a panegyric in prose, addressed to Theodosius, about the victory he gained over the tyrants, because he conquered by faith and prayer rather than by arms. And from Jerome's reply it emerges that Paulinus also praised Theodosius' legislation, meaning, possibly, the laws against Arians and pagans. As may be seen from these reports, the content of the panegyric was such that it could only apply to a Christian emperor, for the emphasis on faith and humility amounted to a denial of the traditional imperial and pagan military virtues which were customarily praised in panegyrics.

Specimens of this Christian form of praise survive in Ambrose's Consolationes on Valentinian II and Theodosius, where similar disclaimers regarding the primary importance of the successful conduct of war were made. These orations follow the classical rules for the disposition of Consolationes, but the content is uncompromisingly Christian. In Valentinian's Consolatio, the spectacle of victory and empire, which is so prominent in a number of pagan panegyrics, is almost entirely lacking. The Consolatio on Theodosius does, however, display a tableau of magnificent proportions, where the rule of Theodosius is set against the background of Old Testament kingship and the principes Christiani of the fourth century, and where the virtues with which Ambrose endowed Theodosius — fides, misericordia, humilitas and love of God — were integrated into the teaching of the Church.

Indicative of the method employed by Ambrose is the complex and beautifully modelled passage where he appealed for the loyalty of the soldiers — some of whom were present in the cathedral of Milan where the oration was delivered — to Theodosius' young sons. He started with the idea of the fides mili tum, formerly a slogan of the coinage, and ascended from there to an exposition of Theodosius' fides which had brought him victory on the Frigidus, and faith as the substance of

148. Paulinus of Nola, ep. 28. 6: non tamen imperatorum quam Christi servum, non dominandi superbia sed humilitate famulandi potentem, nec regno sed fide principem.

149. Gennadius, de vir ill. 49: composuit ad Theodosium imperatorem prosa panegyricum super victoria tyrannorum eo maxime quod fide et oratione plus quam armis vicerit.

149a. See Augustine CD 5, 26; the picture drawn here of Theodosius is very similar to what may be gathered of the content of Paulinus' panegyric and to the Consolatio of Ambrose; see also Orosius Hist. adv. pag. 7, 34-5. The similarity suggests that Augustine and Orosius may have been influenced by the panegyric and the Consolatio, and that Christian panegyric could act on Christian history as pagan panegyric did on pagan history, cf. above, n. 56. See also, Duval. L'éloge de Théodose..., Rech. Aug. 4, 1960, p. 135-79.


151. De ob. Theod., 6 f.
things hoped for, faith by which the righteous — Abraham, Isaac and Jacob — had lived. That is, on one level: on another, faith as the substance of things hoped for meant the coming of age of Honorius and the future of the empire. In this oration, every traditional topic of the imperial laudes was either denied or turned to a different purpose. The pre-Christian empire was not mentioned with one single word: history progressed directly from the Old and New Testaments to the fourth century. This amounted to a breach of tradition such as not even the Christian court was prepared for — as shown by the career of Claudian, whose first panegyric on Honorius, phrased in traditional and comfortably pagan terms, was pronounced two years after Theodosius’ death.

The content of these Christian imperial laudes was too radical to be found acceptable, and also, Christians did not show any sustained interest in imperial panegyrics. Jerome in his letter to Paulinus\(^{152}\) sketched the development of Christian eloquence, past and future. Although Paulinus’ panegyric was the starting point of his considerations, Jerome rapidly turned to questions which were of more immediate concern to him, the exposition of the Scriptures and of Christian teaching. Late antique Christian programmes of education concentrated on the instruction of the faithful and of preachers, not of political orators, and the secular schools could therefore survive untouched until after the barbarian conquests\(^{153}\). No tradition of Christian panegyric developed and in the panegyrics of the early sixth century, as will be seen, a few Christian comments were simply added to the existing pagan framework\(^{154}\).

On the other hand, as has already been seen, and as will be elaborated in the sequel, the Christianisation of the empire was one of the factors which disrupted the equilibrium that had made the Gallic panegyrics of the late third and early fourth centuries possible. Panegyrists after that date never succeeded in recapturing the confidence and concision, and the grasp of imperial policies which had distinguished their Gallic predecessors.

8. The relationship between court and schools in Gaul and its collapse; symmachus.

The Gallic panegyrics of the late third and early fourth century illustrate a situation of co-operation and contact between the court and the
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152. Jerome, ep. 58.
schools — a stable situation, — which enabled the panegrists, especially those of the Tetrarchy, to phrase imperial policies so as to make them comprehensible and relevant to the local townsfolk, especially the people of Trier, where most of the extant panegyrics were held. The panegyrist, the court orator, is a figure who emerges particularly clearly in fourth century Gaul. Pronouncing the imperial laudes was a task which a rhetor at a Gallic university was expected to be able to perform himself and to teach to his pupils, for it was one of the chief functions of oratory. The orator’s role as panegyrist was stated particularly emphatically during the Tetrarchy and the early reign of Constantine, and again during the Ostrogothic kingdom. These were periods when rulers unlike for instance Constantine in his later years and Julian, were not very vocal themselves in propagating their policies and selected orators to perform this task for them.\(^155\)

The gratiarum actio of Ausonius is one of the indications that the arrangement between schools and court which had worked so well during the Tetrarchy, was no longer functioning. Julian’s edict prohibiting Christians from teaching in an official capacity may have contributed towards upsetting the balance between court and schools by creating and defining divisions and borderlines which could have remained fluid.\(^156\) Julian himself seems to have been aware of that problem: the edict deprived of his post Julian’s former teacher at Athens, the same Proairesios, to whom Julian had written in the preceding year offering to send materials for a description of his expedition from Gaul to the East. Julian wanted to exempt Proairesios, but the latter did not accept.\(^157\)

Maximian, Constantius, Constantine and Julian, who are the subjects of ten out of the eleven Gallic panegyrics, all had strong connections with Gaul and resided there during important periods of their reigns. But most of the panegyrics date from 289-313, precisely the period when an emperor was continuously resident in Gaul and when the atmosphere of co-operation and mutual confidence that is required for the production of convincing panegyrics could be maintained. After 313, a number of factors converged to destroy this atmosphere of confidence. Constantine was in Gaul only in 316 and 328\(^158\) and until Julian, Gaul had no legitimate, permanently resident emperor.\(^159\) By the mid-fourth century, Christianity had effected changes in the intellectual climate of the

\(^{155}\) Panm. Lat. 3, 3, f., esp. 2 ; 4, 1, 2-3 ; 5, 8, 9-9, 4 ; 5, 21, 1-3 ; 7, 23, 1 ; 9, 1, 1 ; Eunodius, *panegyric of Theoderic* 74, quoting Symmachus or. 2, 30 ; cf. Cassiodorus or. 1 (ed. Traube), p. 466 ; 470 ; 472.

\(^{156}\) Cf. Marrou, *op. cit.*, 463-5.

\(^{157}\) Cf. above, n. 56 ; PW 189, 1957, 30-2, Ensslin.


\(^{159}\) Cf. Ammianus 15, 8, 21 ; on the role of Trier as an imperial capital until c. 395, when it was replaced by Milan, F. Ewig, *Trier im Merowingerreich*, 1954, 21 ff., esp. 25-7, and Wightman, *Trier and the Treveri*, 52-70.
court which Mamertinus in his *gratiarum actio* could ignore, but which were expressed in the *gratiarum actio* of Ausonius. In 389, after Theodosius' victory over the usurper Maximus, Pacatus, a friend of Ausonius, was sent from Bordeaux as the emissary to assure Theodosius of Gallic loyalty, and, perhaps, to contribute towards recreating that atmosphere of co-operation and confidence which had been lost. An imperial acknowledgement of the approach that had been made followed in 390, when Pacatus became proconsul of Africa. However, Pacatus was, so far as the available information goes, the last Gallic university teacher to deliver an imperial panegyric, and he was unable to handle the medium with the freedom and confidence of his predecessors of the early fourth century.

The gradual disintegration of the Gallic rapport between court and schools after 313 left a vacuum in the communication of imperial programmes, which, especially in the East, was filled by ecclesiastical propagandists, chief of them Eusebius. They did not, however, employ the traditional medium of panegyric, apart from the ephemeral adaptation of it which had been practised by Paulinus and Ambrose. This left a gap in the production of imperial propaganda which had not existed in the late third and earlier fourth centuries. Among pagans, Symmachus was one of the few to realize that an opportunity had arisen and could be made use of, and he was equipped by his education to do so. Gaul, in the fourth century, was the home of Latin oratory and panegyric, and Symmachus, after careful consideration by his father, was taught by a Gallic rhetor. But learning rhetoric was one thing; pronouncing panegyrics on the emperor was quite another. The fact that Symmachus, as one of the leading senators of Rome should condescend to employ a genre of literature generally practised only by teachers, is significant.

He used the medium as a means of communication between Senate and court, cautiously in 369, when as the emissary of the Senate he delivered a panegyric on the occasion of Valentinian's *quinquennalia* and another on Gratian's accession, and more boldly in the following year in the panegyric on Valentinian's third consulship, and particularly in 376, in his speech *Pro Pater*161. Of all these orations substantial fragments survive.
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160. The elder Symmachus had originally thought of sending his son to Libanius, Libanius *ep.* 1004, 8, but then chose a Gallic rhetor: Symmachus *ep.* 9, 88; Symmachus in his turn sent his own son Memmius to a Gallic rhetor: *ep.* 6, 34. Cf. D. Romano, *Simmaco*, 1955, 14 ff.

161. *or.* 1, 3, 2 and 4, respectively, ed. O. Seeck, *MGH AA* 61, 1883, p. 318 ff.; for the dates *ibid.*, p. 228. Symmachus also delivered a panegyric on the usurper Maximus, for which he later had to apologize: Seeck p. 228 and n. 228. The reason for this political *faux pas* is hard to understand, but see now J. F. Matthews, The Letters of Symmachus, in *Latin Literature of the Fourth Century*, 1974, p. 77 and p. 89.
The panegyric of 369 on Valentinian is composed strictly according to the textbook rules, with comparisons and sententiae, and the topics are arranged in chronological order, beginning with Valentinian's home-country and birth. It seems that there was also a subdivision of deeds of war and of peace, but the main part of the latter section is lost. The speech was somewhat hampered by ignorance, and little was said that would not have been generally known. It is not so much the exposition of an imperial programme as a record of res gestae in the idiom of panegyric. The oration of 370 concentrates on recent events and is more circumstantial, but there are still no tableaux, no symbolism, and no pageantry of victory, although victory was Symmachus' main theme. Instead, he adhered closely to the rhetorical structure in the panegyric of 369, and to the facts in 370. The method he followed consisted of narration rather than of allusion, exposition and the painting of a picture. In this, the method resembles that of Pacatus and Nazarius. On the other hand, one can detect in the panegyrics of 369 and 370 undertones—clothed in rhetorical commonplaces—which may be regarded as Senatorial suggestions: propaganda would be too strong a word. Symmachus balanced Valentinian's warlike achievements with civic activities, the practice of eloquence and the involvement of the nobles in imperial affairs. In the consular panegyric, he spoke as though the consulship were bestowed by the Senate on behalf of the res publica, and as though it were a Senatorial reward for imperial victory.

Symmachus treated these themes at greater length and more explicitly in the oration of 376, delivered before the Senate. This was in effect a gratiarum actio for his father's consulship, which had been granted at the request of the Senate. The message of the oration, however, is, that the Senators acted as electors to the consulship together with the principes, thus constituting 'unum corpus reipublicae,' in which' quisquis bonus est, iam designatus est.' Elsewhere in the speech, Symmachus condemned in no uncertain terms the abuses of the past—referring by name to Maximinus, Valentinian's praefectus annonae, vicar of Rome and pretorian prefect—and used the topic to reassert the link existing between Senate and emperor.

These panegyrics document the growing concreteness of Senatorial aspirations, at least as understood by Symmachus. But these aspirations remained a matter of nuance: the issues were flexible and open to inter-

162. Or. 2, 30 and particularly or. 1, 23.
163. Or. 2, 27.
164. See Seeck ed. Symmachus p. xix f. A gratiarum actio before the consulship was taken up was not entirely unusual, for Fronto see above, n. 36.
165. Or. 4, 2; 6; 7.
166. Especially or. 4, 12. Romano, Simmaco, p. 19 ff. also points out Symmachus' emphasis, in the panegyrics, on Senatorial hopes and ideals. On the rhetorical methods of Symmachus, ibid. 113 ff.
pretation. This was not the case with the conflict between the court and the pagan Senators regarding the restoration of the altar of Victoria in which Symmachus played so prominent a part. Here, as in Julian's edict against the Christian teachers, a hard line was drawn which forced people to take sides. It appears that in his gratiarum actio to Theodosius for his consulship of 391, Symmachus firmly placed himself on the pagan side by using the occasion to request, once more, the restoration of the altar. The request merely served to emphasize divisions between the court and the pagan Senators, which became explicit during the usurpation of Eugenius.

Rome, more than any other city, had the setting, the buildings, from which the emperor or his panegyrist might address the world (cf. fig. 4). But since the Tetrarchy, Rome had ceased to be the effective capital of the empire, for, as the Gallic usurpations of the third century demonstrated, it was far removed from the focal points of power in the empire, one of which was Gaul: panegyrics, like army units, were in evidence in those places where they were most needed. The panegyrics of Symmachus may be regarded as an attempt to put Rome on the map, to make it a place of importance. But success was of short duration. During the fourth century, Rome became a self-contained unit of government under the control of the Senators, who in this way isolated themselves from the problems of the empire at large. The isolation of Rome from Italy and the empire was also, as will be seen, a feature of the Ostrogothic kingdom.

Symmachus was one of the most prominent pagan literary figures of his day. Like Pliny, he was a member of a literary circle, and his speeches, among them panegyrics, carefully edited before publication, had not only political and practical aims, but also literary ones. The latter in particular were intended to be appreciated by those of Symmachus' friends and acquaintances who received copies of his works.

---


168. As is illustrated by Symmachus' letters. For the Senate's disinterest in issues affecting the empire see J. A. McGeechy, Q. Aurelius Symmachus and the Senatorial Aristocracy of the West, Diss. Chicago, 1942, p. 44 ff. (but somewhat biased). The urban prefecture of Rome was administered almost exclusively by Roman senators in the fourth century, Chastagnol, La Préfecture Urbaine, p. 391 ff., a trend which continued thereafter, Chastagnol, Le Sénat Romain sous le règne d'Odoacre, Recherches sur l'Epigraphie du Colisée au Ve Siècle, Antiquités 3, 1966 p. 46 ff. The prosopography (p. 79 ff.) shows that a senatorial career which comprised non-Roman offices was an exception. This illustrates the isolation of the Senate from the rest of the empire. Cf. Fuhrmann Die lateinische Literatur der Spätantike, Antike und Abendland 13, 1967, p. 72 ff., on the dissociation of court and the schools of Gaul after the Tetrarchy.

169. The literary circle, Romano, Simmaceo, p. 74 ff.; edition of speeches Seeck
These literary aims of Symmachus' speeches are in accord with the Senatorial programme which he expressed in his panegyrics. The practice of literature and of politics by Senators was to constitute a return to the golden days of the republic and the second century AD. That these hopes were not to be realized was shown by the usurpation of Eugenius and is illustrated by the subsequent history of panegyrics. The literary circle of which Symmachus was a member still stirred the imagination of Macrobius in the 430's, but as an author of prose panegyrics on emperors, Symmachus had no immediate successor either in Senatorial circles or among the rhetors of Gaul.\textsuperscript{170}

After 394, the regular basis of co-operation and mutual adjustment between court and Senate, which could produce Senatorial panegyrics, disappeared. Claudian praised Honorius and Stilicho from the point of view of the court, whereas Symmachus and the Gallic rhetors had, in their various ways, spoken as representatives and on behalf of groups of people other than the court, whose interests and enthusiasms they conveyed.


The epilogue of this study can also serve as its summing-up. For nothing illustrates more vividly the dependence of the panegyric form on a precise constellation of circumstances than the content and circumstances of its transient revival in 6th century Italy. The panegyrics of the Ostrogothic period serve as a fitting conclusion to the themes we have been discussing. In the first place, their revival was an aspect of the renewed awareness, in Ostrogothic Ravenna, of the need for a suitable ceremonial and architectural setting for royal activities, of which the formal delivery of panegyrics formed a part.\textsuperscript{171}

Politically, the revival illustrates an attempt at achieving something similar to the social and political cohesion of which the panegyrics of the early fourth century had been an expression. In Cassiodorus' view, as expressed in the \textit{Variae}, panegyrics served to commend the ruler to his subjects, and were a token of lawful, rather than tyrannical

---


The work shows knowledge of the rhetorical rules for panegyric, but as in Ennodius (below at n. 183), the division of deeds of war and peace, although hinted at, is not properly carried out.

\textsuperscript{171} Cf. above at, n. 59 ff.; at, n. 67; at, n. 75.
dominion, a voluntary offering to rulers who were also patrons of letters172. Like the Variae, the panegyrics of Cassiodorus were a genuine attempt to mediate between the Gothic king and his Italian subjects, as well as the Senate of Rome, with which Cassiodorus had peripheral connexions173. Cassiodorus, like Ennodius, presented Gothic kingship in the idiom of the Roman panegyrics of the past, with the traditional comparisons to the heroes of myth and history, especially those of the Roman republic174.

The old techniques of writing panegyrics, and the old repertoire of themes still held good. After 200 years of establishment and even in the hands of a Christian clergyman, Christianity was only peripherally incorporated into this structure of propaganda. Characteristically, the method of incorporation was that of the comparison, a much used device of panegyric. In Cassiodorus, Theodoric was found superior to the great men of the republic because he did not worship mindless images175, and Ennodius' Theodoric excelled Alexander, among other reasons, because he was a Christian176. There is one passage which goes beyond the sterility of this somewhat laboured comparison, because it conjures up a fertile theme of Byzantine imperial theology and an aspect of Frankish kingship which was to emerge in the eighth century:

172. Var. praef., p. 4. 27 (Mommsen); Var. 9, 25.
173. A panegyric on Theodoric marked the beginning of Cassiodorus' public career. The date was in or after 500 A. D.: see H. Usener, Anecdota Holderi, Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte Roms in ostgothischer Zeit, 1877, p. 4.; 68 (Anecdota also edited by Mommsen in Cassiodorus Variae, MGH AA 12, p. v-vii). Usener's date of this panegyric was accepted by Courcelle, Histoire Littéraire des grandes Invasions Germaniques, 3 ed., 1964, p. 207, n. 5, but cf. Mommsen ed. Variae, p. x. It is possible that this was the oration which the king later asked to be published: Usener op. cit., p. 68, and n. 11; Cassiodorus or. i, ed. Traube MGH AA vol. 12 p. 470. Among Cassiodorus' numerous subsequent panegyrics (for which, cf. above, n. 172) which are no longer extant, were a speech on Eutharic's consulsip of 519, addressed to the Senate in Rome, and another on an Ostrogothic king and queen, probably Vitigis and Matasuntha on the occasion of their marriage in 536, of both of which fragments survive (ed. Traube, in Mommsen's edition of the Variae, p. 465-84; cf. p. 462-3). The oration of 536 is the last recorded late antique Latin prose panegyric. For Cassiodorus' position in a wider sense see Momigliano, Cassiodorus and Italian Culture of his Time, P.B.A. 41, 1955, p. 207-45 = Secondo Contributo, 1960, p. 191-229. Boethius was consul in 510, but no panegyric for the occasion is recorded; for the consulship of his sons in 522, however, he praised Theodoric in the Senate, as is stated in the Anecdota Holderi and in Boethius' De cons. phil. 2. 3. I cannot find the evidence for the panegyric on the occasion of Theodoric's visit to Rome in 500 AD, mentioned by J. Sundwall, Abhandlungen zur Geschichte des ausgehenden Römertums 1919, p. 102; 204. Only one Ostrogothic panegyric survives complete, that by Ennodius, then deacon of Milan, addressed to the king in Ravenna in Spring, 507 A. D.: Sundwall op. cit., p. 41 f.; Courcelle op. cit., p. 206 attributes the panegyric to the year 506 AD.
174. Ennodius, panegyric 17 f.; 29; 85; cf. 78 f. (Alexander); Cassiodorus, or. i, p. 467; 468; cf. or. 2 p. 473 (Achilles); p. 483 (Semiramis; Cyris).
175. Or. i, p. 468.
176. Panegyric 80.
Your administration of affairs is such that our prosperity is to be ascribed to your virtues, yet you prefer to attribute everything to your creator. Your power, vigilance and success give you the aspect of an emperor, your mildness that of a priest. Yet tied as he was to the device of comparison Ennodius did not explain, his meaning any further, but rather by criticising the divi and pontifices of antiquity, made one of the traditional sallies against the maiores, whose achievements, according to panegyrics, were always being excelled in the present.

The pressure put on the consensual function of the panegyric had, if anything, increased because the Ostrogothic king had to a certain extent lost the position that the 4th century Emperor had still enjoyed as the focus of the public ceremonial life in which panegyrics played such an important role. In the absence of an emperor in Rome, the Senatorial families had gradually taken it on themselves to satisfy the Roman taste for ceremonial and magnificence in the emperor's stead. Thus Boethius visualized the consulship of his sons in almost imperial terms:

When you watched both your sons, consuls at the same time, proceeding from your house accompanied by a crowd of Senators and the rejoicing populace; when you yourself, delivering the panegyric of the king in the Curia, in the presence of your sons seated on their curule chairs, reaped the glory of wit and eloquence; and when, seated between the two consuls in the circus, you stifled the expectant multitude with your triumphal largesse (fig. 13).

All the glory was concentrated on the actors of this scene, and the glory of the absent Theoderic vanished behind that of his orator. Such an outlook contradicted the role — resembling that of an emperor — which Ennodius and Cassiodorus were attempting to attribute to Theoderic, and could well have affected the tenor of Boethius' lost panegyric for his own consulship in 522. It probably did affect Theoderic's reaction to the allegedly treasourable letter of Albinus, the discovery of which


179. *De cons. phil.* 2, 3. cum duos pariter consules liberos tuos domo provehi sub frequentia patrum, sub plebis alacritate vidisti, cum esdem in curia curules insidentibus tu regiae laudis orator ingenii gloriam facundiaeque meruisti, cum in circu duorum medius consulum circumfusa multitudinis expectationem triumphali largitione satiasti.
led to Boethius' death\textsuperscript{180}.

There is, if anything, a return to the sheltered literary world of Pliny. For culturally, the revival of the literary genre of prose panegyric in the early sixth century was a manifestation of the Senate's concern for the preservation of learning, of the classical texts and of Roman traditions, which were visualized chiefly as republican and urban ones\textsuperscript{181}. Ennodius used republican exempla, and quoted, apart from Virgil, the panegyrics of Symmachus, thereby reflecting the literary tastes of the Senators.

The surviving Ostrogothic panegyrics display considerable erudition, but this was not, as in many earlier panegyrics, subordinated to the political function that panegyrics could have. The Ostrogothic panegyrics were a homage to contemporary notions of eloquence as much as to the king. Much of what the panegyrists said could not have been appreciated except by a very small group of men of letters, a literary circle reminiscent of the circle of Symmachus. Such an evolution confirms the conclusions reached above about the decline of panegyrics during the later fourth century. Panegyrics became less important when their primary aim was no longer the propagation of imperial programmes and policies.

Alongside the decline in function, we must set a decline in those rhetorical skills which had enabled earlier panegyrists to communicate their message so effortlessly in the first place. Late Latin rhetorical textbooks with their mechanical repetition of earlier views and controversies have little to recommend them, what is lacking in the resulting panegyrics is the economy imposed by firm rules, properly understood by their practitioners, concerning the choice and disposition of themes\textsuperscript{182}. The

\textsuperscript{180} Cf. \textit{de cons. phil.} i, 4 where Theoderic is indirectly referred to as a tyrant, with M. A. Wes, \textit{Das Ende des Kaisertums im Westen des römischen Reiches}, 1967, 176 f. Under both Odovacar and Theoderic, Senatorial cooperation was at best conditional, Wes 162-7; Sundwall \textit{Abhandlungen} 187 ff., \textit{passim}; p. 202 etc. on Senatorial involvement with the papacy, which was another factor separating Rome and the Senate from the court. E. Stein, \textit{Histoire du Bas-Empire}, II, 1949, 130 f.; 254 f.


\textsuperscript{182} Even a somewhat unusual passage, like Emporius' explanation of how the same information could be used for either praise or blame, where Julius Caesar's life was used as an object lesson (ed. C. Halm in \textit{Rhetores Latini Minores}, 1863, p. 567 f. with details on order of topics), is static, theoretical and dry, a far cry from the lively adaptability displayed in the two treatises attributed to Menander and in several late Roman panegyrics. The authors were still aware of the type of topic that was to be discussed in panegyrics, but instructions for the order in which topics were to be arranged were at best cursory. On the three \textit{genera}, see Chirius Fortunatianus \textit{Ars Rhetorica}, ed. Halm 81, 15 f.; Marius Victorinus on \textit{Cicero de Inventione}, Halm 174, 39 ff.; cf. 182; 300; 304; Martianus Capella, Halm 456, 15 f. (463, 7 f. on laus and vituperatio); Cassiodorus \textit{Inst.} Halm, p. 495 = ed. R. A. B. Mynors 1937, p. 98; Priscian, \textit{Prae exercitamenta ex Hermogene versa},
arrangement of the surviving Ostrogothic panegyrics is imprecise. In Ennodius' panegyric, the disposition, considered so important earlier, was omitted, and topics follow one another loosely and without proper introductions. Ennodius' arrangement of topics is chronological up to the death of Odovacar. There follow three further sections, two on deeds of peace and one on war, relating to the capture of Sirmium in 505. There is no chronological reason why the deeds of peace in the first section should be thus divided from those in the last, and the arrangement is best explained by reference to the rhetorical scheme according to which deeds could be divided into deeds of peace and of war regardless of chronology. Ennodius' manner of combining different patterns of panegyric, however, defeated the purpose for which the rhetorical rules were devised, because it led to obscurity rather than clarity. The obscurity is the more pronounced because Ennodius also used an abstruse vocabulary, complex sentences and erudite comparisons which all served to complicate, rather than elucidate, the issues in question. Also, Ennodius displayed more emphatically the narrative methods that have been noted above for Nazarius, Symmachus and Pacatus, and which differentiate these orators from the earlier panegyrist. That is, Ennodius used narrative of events, rather than description, and he wrote partisan history rather than panegyric technically defined. There are no tableaux: the oration adheres too closely to the course of events and to facts for tableaux, the type of generalisation which they imply and the treatment of events as symbolic to become possible. These failures of Ennodius are a measure of the unobtrusive discipline that had regulated earlier panegyrics.

Cassiodorus, on the other hand, did produce a tableau, an ekphrasis, not of actions, however, as is the case with the pageants and tableaux of the Tetrarchy, but of objects and persons. In his panegyric on Vitiges and Matasuntha, the Virtues appear attending the queen as personifications, endowed with poetic epithets, and Matasuntha herself is greeted as more beautiful and radiant than any of her jewels. Cassiodorus' description of the jewelled royal throne and the palace adorned with marbles, painting and mosaic, evoke a picture of majesty clothed in all the ornaments of imagery and art that the age could provide. This same picture is also conveyed by the art and architecture of Ostrogothic Ravenna. The throne of Christ in the Arian Baptistery is encrusted with jewels, and Theodoric's palace in S. Apollinare Nuovo (fig. 2) shines with gold, mosaic work and precious marbles. Cassiodorus, a better panegyrist than Ennodius, if one may judge by the fragments, was at

---

Halm p. 556-7, on laus and vituperatio, with indications on order of topics. This was one of the works which Priscian dedicated to Symmachus.

183. Ennodius panegyric 1-55; 56-9; 60-70; 71-93.
185. Cassiodorus, or. 2, p. 480 f.
his best when portraying a still-life, a motionless picture of bejewelled kingship. What captured the imagination of the orator in Ostrogothic Ravenna was what he himself saw. It had been the same during the Tetrarchy and in the fourth century. Throughout, panegyrist appealed to the spectacle before their eyes: 'haec magis diligo quae probavi' said Symmachus, a sentiment many times expressed by other panegyrists.

Cassiodorus' interest is the still-life, the tableau of the metropolis, which he had seen with his own eyes. This, in itself, is deeply revealing. For from the later part of the fourth century, imperial doings on the frontiers and in the provinces ceased being of sufficient interest and concern to stimulate an orator's imagination as much as they had done earlier, even if, like Symmachus, he had been a witness of them. One might relate this failure of the imagination regarding the secular res gestae of emperors and kings to the character of later Christian eulogies in the West, in which such topics were absent or transformed into something new and different. Topics like military success which, in various guises, had formed one of the chief themes of panegyrics, came to be, as it had not been earlier, spiritually as well as geographically remote from the capital, be it Symmachus' Rome or Cassiodorus' Ravenna.

Seen altogether, in the corruption of the formal elements and in the decline of rhetorical skills in formulating imperial actions, we find that the panegyrics in their late flowering in Ostrogothic Italy were silent witnesses not only to a decline of secular letters after the end of the 4th century, but, by their nature, they can be treated as exceptionally sensitive pointers to the deep-seated causes of the disintegration of the political framework of the Roman Empire in the West.

Sabine Mac Cormack

---

186. Symmachus, or. 2, 3.
187. For the intensity of the propaganda conducted in Ostrogothic Ravenna by means of works of art, see O. G. von Simson, Sacred Fortress Byzantine Art and Statecraft in Ravenna, 1948.