Pliny's *Panegyricus* (100 CE) survives as a unique example of senatorial rhetoric from the early Roman empire. It offers an eyewitness account of the last years of Domitian's principate, the reign of Nerva and Trajan's early years, and it communicates a detailed senatorial view on the behaviour expected of an emperor. It is an important document in the development of the ideals of imperial leadership, but it also contributes greatly to our understanding of imperial political culture more generally. This volume, the first ever devoted to the *Panegyricus*, contains expert studies of its key historical and rhetorical contexts, as well as important critical approaches to the published version of the speech and its influence in antiquity. It offers scholars of Roman history, literature and rhetoric an up-to-date overview of key approaches to the speech, and students and interested readers an authoritative introduction to this vital and under-appreciated speech.
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This volume was conceived in the belief that Pliny’s *Panegyricus* deserves and will reward more concentrated scholarly attention than it has traditionally received. Neglect is a natural *topos* in scholarly prefaces, but it has genuine substance here; in fact, neglect of the speech has not infrequently sharpened into antipathy, but neither is justified. A professed cultural disdain for formal praise threatens to alienate us from a speech whose survival makes it for us a unique specimen of early imperial senatorial oratory, whose multiple agendas so easily and obviously (indeed explicitly: *Pan. 4.1*) transcend the mere delivery of praise, and whose political outlook ranks it variously as a senatorial manifesto and a classic *locus* of imperial public-image making. But this same aversion would likewise alienate us from a vital witness to an emperor who self-consciously styled himself as a kind of epitome of imperial rule, who occupies in more ways than one a crucial liminal phase between the principates of the first and second centuries, and whose early years as emperor would otherwise be almost completely occluded to us. The *Panegyricus* is a key document in the evolution of imperial leadership ideals, but it is also a key text more generally for comprehending early imperial Rome.
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