

INTRODUCTION

The collection of imperial panegyrics known as the *Panegyrici Latini* has been well served by textual and historical commentaries. Building on the Teubner edition of Emil Bährens in 1874, the 1911 edition of his son, Wilhelm Bährens, established the text.¹ VI(7), the anonymous speech of 310 in honour of Constantine, was the subject of Brigitte Müller-Rettig's historical and philological commentary of 1990, and is also examined by the monumental historical commentary of C. E. V. Nixon and Barbara Saylor Rodgers of 1994. Much has been written on Constantine's vision as recounted in this panegyric and the scholarship on Constantine himself seems almost overwhelming.² Yet the literary aspect of the speeches and of the collection as a whole still merits attention.

The speeches in the *Panegyrici Latini* can be approached both individually and as part of a corpus. Written by different authors and for different occasions, each panegyric stands alone and can be investigated for historical information concerning the time and place of delivery, the relationship between the emperor and his people, and the imperial persona presented at that particular time. Each speech adds to our understanding of imperial ceremony, the role and requirements of oratory in late antiquity, the rhetorical skills of the speaker, and the expectations of the audience.

As a single speech, VI(7) is a valuable document. The panegyric was delivered before the emperor Constantine in Trier as part

¹ See discussion below. Further manuscript discoveries, including that of H, led to the edition of 1911. For the history of critical editions, Rees 2012b: 16–23. This commentary uses the text of Mynors, Oxford 1964.

² Monographs in English alone in the last few years include Edwards 2003, Odahl 2004, Van Dam 2007, Stephenson 2009, Barnes 2011, Bardill 2012, Potter 2013, Lenski 2106, Maranesi 2016; there are also the collections of essays of Lenski 2006a, Hartley et al. 2006.

INTRODUCTION

of the celebrations of the anniversary of the city and is conventionally dated to August 310, shortly after the uprising and death of the emperor Maximian. The panegyric illustrates not only the emperor's response to his new position, but the manner in which this response was made public. The orator, a teacher of rhetoric from Autun, had been briefed to invite the emperor to visit his own city. In addition, and perhaps in response to a formal request, he delivered previously unknown information regarding Constantine's right of descent from Claudius II and the circumstances of Maximian's revolt, and established Constantine as victorious under the patronage of Apollo rather than the Tetrarchic Hercules. His technique in all of this is masterly and often self-consciously so; his own reactions, hesitations and enthusiasms guide the response of his audience. The reciprocity of the relationship between emperor and people is made clear at the conclusion: Constantine is entreated to visit Autun and cast his divine munificence over that city. By the end of the speech, the reader has been given a very strong sense of a particular time and place and of a victorious emperor now turning his attention back to the needs of his loyal people, rebuilding their cities and honouring their gods. The manifest majesty of the emperor is honoured by his people amid the present splendours of Trier and the imagined glories of Autun.

Within a century of its delivery, however, VI(7) was intended to be read in the context of other imperial panegyrics. VI(7) appears to have formed part of an early compilation of seven panegyrics made shortly after 313, the *Panegyrici diuersorum uii*.³ Two more panegyrics on Constantine, one on Julian and one on Theodosius would be added to create the *Panegyrici Latini* corpus in the late fourth century. The orator of VI(7) had most likely intended his panegyric to be circulated locally, admired by acquaintances and used as a model by his students. As part of a collection, it became a component of a lengthy narrative

³ See pp. 9–13.

INTRODUCTION

of praise, stretching from Trajan to Theodosius. To read VI(7) as part of a macro-text runs the risk of reading too much into the speech, but the potential rewards cannot be dismissed. In defining the character of the emperor Constantine, the orator used the earlier panegyrics for models of similarity and dissimilarity: the imperial image in the speech of 310 was as much defined by what the emperor was not as by what he was. The (postulated) editor of the *Panegyrici diuersorum uii* presumably chose this speech from a considerable selection in Constantine's honour⁴ and saw it as contributing to the evolving portrayal of the emperor from VII(6) in AD 307 to V(8) in AD 311, and consonant with the speeches of 313 (XII(9)) and 321 (IV(10)).

The aim of this commentary is to examine the panegyric as a work of literature, focusing on its literary and rhetorical qualities, the circumstances of performance, the orator's commission and his techniques of persuasion. In the examination of historical and political content, particular attention is given to the literary presentation of the material, such as the Caesarean intertext in Constantine's siege of Massilia or the presence of the literary Augustus in the vision of Apollo. Although textual and linguistic points will be discussed when relevant to the above, these are not a primary concern of the commentary.

This introduction to the commentary looks at the speech in the context of the corpus as a whole. Part I introduces the history of panegyric and summarises briefly the manuscript and commentary tradition of the *Panegyrici Latini* before considering the reasons for viewing the speeches as a collection. The second part of the introduction examines VI(7) and the depiction of Constantine in the context of the collection, suggesting that the imperial image presented in this panegyric is a work in progress, a persona which has evolved from the *oriens imperator*

⁴ The orator of 310 was only one of many speakers during the festivities (VI(7)1.1), the speaker of XII(9)1.1 had praised Constantine many times before.

INTRODUCTION

of 307. In 310, Constantine is seen to abandon the faults of youth, *adulescentiae error* (VI(7)8.4). Reluctantly, he accepts his divinely appointed inheritance of power and comes of age, visibly maturing in authority and moral stature over the course of the speech.

Part I: The *Panegyrici Latini*MANUSCRIPT AND COMMENTARY
TRADITION⁵

In 1433, attending the Council of Basel, Giovanni Aurispa wrote to Iacopino Tebalducci about his discovery of a codex in Mainz containing a panegyric of Pliny to Trajan, which he had read with great pleasure. The codex also contained other speeches by different authors to different emperors.⁶ This was the collection now known as the *Panegyrici Latini*. The original manuscript, Moguntius (M), was lost, but the rather careless copy which Aurispa made was brought back to Florence⁷ and before it too disappeared became the original for twenty-seven Italian manuscripts⁸ which are divided into the X₁ and X₂ families and which are important mainly for their humanist emendations.⁹ Of the X₁ family, the corrected version (w) of the codex

⁵ This is a very short summary of a vast amount of scholarship. For the manuscript tradition, Galletier 1: xxxviii–lv is excellent; the preface to Mynors' OCT edition of 1964 is also very valuable as is Lassandro 1988 and the summary of Rees 2012b: 23–8. For an overview of the scholarship on the dating and authorship of the collection up to 1994, see N–SR *passim*, more recently see Lassandro and Micunco 2000: 39–59.

⁶ 'da lu quale non lesse mai più suave cosa, et in eodem codice sunt panegyrici aliorum autorum ad diversos Caesares', Sabbadini 1931: 81–2; Paladini–Fedeli 1976: viii. Bährens 1874: viii, Mynors 1964: v. On Aurispa's findings, Galletier 1: xxxviii–xl.

⁷ *multa false descripsit, multa omisit* was the judgement of E. Bährens 1874: xiii, cf. Paladini–Fedeli 1976: viii.

⁸ Bährens 1874: vii, Mynors 1964: v. ⁹ Janson 1984: 16.

MANUSCRIPT AND COMMENTARY TRADITION

Vaticanus 1775 (W) is of particular value to editors.¹⁰ Manfredi has identified Tommaso Parentucelli, later Pope Nicholas V, as the corrector¹¹ whose emendations Mynors described as being done with ‘admirable skill’.¹² The origin of the X₂ family is thought to be the copy of Francisco Pizzolpasso, Archbishop of Milan, who had also attended the council.¹³

Another copy had been made from M before it was lost. The codex Harleianus 2480 (H) dates from the fifteenth century with corrections (h) from the same period.¹⁴ It is generally agreed that H is a direct descendant of M¹⁵ and it is considered to be the most accurate version. Two other fifteenth-century manuscripts belong in this line: from H came the codex Napocensis (N) and from N came the codex Upsaliensis C917 (A).¹⁶ A possible sibling to M was a Bertinensis (Bert), now lost, selections from which were used by Livineius in the preparation of his 1599 edition.¹⁷ Livineius also drew on the 1513 edition of Cuspinanus (Cusp)¹⁸ which itself seems also to have derived from a text which relates closely to M.¹⁹

¹⁰ This text also refers to d, the conjectures of various editions based on the corrected codex Vaticanus 1775 (Mynors: 1964: x, xii).

¹¹ Manfredi 1995, on the style of his corrections, 1319–21.

¹² Mynors 1964: x, E. Bährens 1874: vii, ix also singles w out for praise.

¹³ Mynors 1964: vi; Aurispa’s copy is referred to as X, being the consensus of the X₁ and X₂ groups.

¹⁴ Mynors 1964: vi–vii.

¹⁵ Mynors 1964: vi, Paladini–Fedeli 1976: ix, Janson 1984: 16, following Las-sandro 1967.

¹⁶ Writing before his discovery of H, E. Bährens argued for A as a copy of M and more accurate than Aurispa’s text. That A actually derives from N, itself a copy of H, is the work of Mynors 1964: vii and confirmed by Las-sandro 1967.

¹⁷ E. Bährens 1874: xix, W. Bährens 1911: xvi–xix. Mynors 1964: viii describes this as one of the less certain texts. On the background, Galletier I: xlix–xl, on useful conjectures from Bert see also Paladini–Fedeli 1976: xxx–xxxii.

¹⁸ Galletier I: I, lviii.

¹⁹ Mynors 1964: viii. On the textual variations in Cusp, Paladini–Fedeli 1976: xxxii–xxxvi.

INTRODUCTION

The following editions and commentaries are of relevance to this commentary: ²⁰

- Puteolanus 1482: The earliest edition is that of Francesco Puteolano of Milan. The date is uncertain: Patarol refers to an edition of *Panegyrici ueteres* in 1476, which was revised as *Panegyricae Veterum orationes* in 1482.²¹
- Cuspinianus 1513: *Panegyrici variorum auctorum* by Johannes Cuspinien of Vienna. Paladini–Fedeli xxxii–xxxvi discuss the scholarship on this MS.
- Rhenanus 1520: *Panegyrici ueteres*, published by Johannes Frobenius (Johann Froben) at Basel, based on a text which had been corrected and emended by Beatus Rhenanus (Beatus Bild) for private use.²²
- Livineius 1599: *XII Panegyrici ueteres* by Johannes Livineius (Jean Liévens, canon at Liège and d’Anvers²³). This is the first critical edition, with text and commentary, published in Antwerp.
- Gruter 1607: *XII Panegyrici ueteres* by Janus Gruter (Jean Gruytère), which used Livineius and incorporated conjectures by Valens Acidalius (Valtin Havekenthal²⁴) and Conradus Ritterhusius (Conrad Ritterhausen).²⁵

Later commentaries include the work of Christian Gottlieb Schwarz and Wolfgang Jaeger (1779), Henricus Joannes Arntzen (Arntzen *Junior*, 1790–7), Schwarz and Arntzen, *pater et filius* (1828) (= *PanVet* 1828).²⁶

The first modern edition of the *Panegyrici Latini* was the Teubner text of Emil Bährens in 1874. He had identified M as the archetype and argued that two copies were made, A and

²⁰ For the history of critical editions, Rees 2012b: 16–23.

²¹ Patarol in Antonelli 1842: 1013–14. ²² Brown et al. 2011: 99–100.

²³ Galletier I: lviii.

²⁴ Matrikelportal, University of Rostock (<http://matrikel.uni-rostock.de/id/100038611>).

²⁵ Galletier I: lviii.

²⁶ These works include references to the conjectures of Bongarsius (Jacques Bongars, 1554–1612) and Langius (Karel Delanghe, 1521–73).

THE SPEECHES

Aurispa's copy, A being superior. Subsequent to publication, Bährens found H and recognised its value, but did not have time to publish a revised edition. Instead, the text was revised by Bährens' son Wilhelm in 1911, his revisions based on the study of H, and discussed in his doctoral dissertation.²⁷ Marcel Durry's commentary on Pliny's *Panegyricus* (1938) and Edouard Galletier's edition of the *Panegyrici Latini* (1949, 1952, 1955) are indebted to this scholarship.²⁸

In his 1964 OCT edition, R. A. B. Mynors created a simplified stemma, based on his conclusion that N and A derived from H and so were of less significance in establishing the text. The stemma was further pared down by the classification of the various Italian manuscripts under the headings of X₁ and X₂.²⁹ Mynors' findings were supported by the commentaries of Paladini–Fedeli 1976 and Lassandro 1992.³⁰

This commentary uses the text of Mynors with a shortened and emended apparatus criticus.

THE SPEECHES

With the exception of Pliny's *Panegyricus*, the speeches are generally in reverse chronological order.³¹ The numbering below indicates the original position of the speech in the manuscript with the chronological number in parentheses.

²⁷ In his dissertation, W. Bährens describes the importance of prose rhythm to many of his emendations, although at least one reviewer (*CPh* 7 (1912) 135) had reservations about this 'science' of *clausulae*.

²⁸ Rees 2012b: 17–18.

²⁹ On Mynors' critical apparatus, Mynors 1964: v–xi, summarised by Rees 2012b: 19–20.

³⁰ Note also the emendations of Janson 1984.

³¹ There are the following exceptions: X(2) is earlier than XI(3) and VIII(5) may predate IX(4). In order to correct the dating of the second pair, Galletier refers to VIII(5) as VIII(4) and IX(4) as IX(5). I am following the numbering in the editions of Bährens, Mynors, Paladini–Fedeli and Lassandro.

INTRODUCTION

- I(1) Pliny's *gratiarum actio* to Trajan (AD 100).
- II(12) Chronologically the final speech (AD 389). The author is Pacatus Drepanius and the speech was delivered shortly after Theodosius' arrival in Rome to celebrate his victory over Maximus.³²
- III(11) A *gratiarum actio* (AD 362) for his consulship from Claudius Mamertinus to Julian in Constantinople.³³
- IV(10) This is the final panegyric to Constantine. The author is Nazarius and the speech celebrates the *quinquennalia* of the young Caesars, Crispus and Constantinus (AD 321). It is thought to have been delivered at Rome.³⁴
- V(8) This speech is a response to the request of VI(7)22 that Constantine visit Autun. It celebrates Constantine's visit to the city and his *quinquennalia* (AD 311). The unnamed orator is a native of Autun.³⁵
- VI(7) The anonymous orator speaks at Trier on the occasion of the anniversary of the city's foundation. 310 is the suggested date.³⁶
- VII(6) Addressed jointly to Constantine and Maximian at Trier, the speech celebrates the marriage of Constantine to Maximian's daughter Fausta and Constantine's elevation to Augustus. The date is a matter of argument, but September 307 is plausible.³⁷ The orator is unknown.
- VIII(5) In honour of Constantius, this speech is thought to have been recited in the spring of 297 or 298. The unknown orator praises Constantius' recovery of Britain but the specific occasion for the panegyric is not known: the anniversary of Constantius' accession has been suggested.³⁸

³² N-SR 443.

³³ N-SR 386–9. On the historical context of this speech, García Ruiz 2006: 19–24.

³⁴ N-SR 338. ³⁵ N-SR 255–6. ³⁶ N-SR 212–14.

³⁷ Because it concerns the marriage and elevation of Constantine, the dating of this speech has attracted considerable attention with dates of March and December suggested; see N-SR 179–85.

³⁸ Barnes 1982: 59–60, cf. N-SR 105–6.

THE SPEECHES

- IX(4) This speech by Eumenius (AD 297–9) concerns the financing of schools at Autun where the speech may have been delivered. The dedicatee is unknown, but there is considerable praise of Constantius' generosity to Gaul (6–9) and an extract from a letter he wrote to the orator (14).
- X(2) Maximian is honoured at Trier on the occasion of Rome's birthday (21 April 289³⁹). Some manuscripts give the author of this speech and XI(3) as Mamertinus.⁴⁰
- XI(3) The panegyric celebrates Maximian's birthday and is thought to have been delivered at Trier; the date cannot be fixed beyond 291.⁴¹ Variations of *Eiusdem Magistri ꝛ Memet Genethliacus Maximiani Augusti* appear in different manuscripts.⁴²
- XII(9) This oration was delivered at Trier by an anonymous author in 313 to celebrate Constantine's victory over the Franks.⁴³

The authorship of the anonymous speeches has given rise to considerable discussion. The attribution of X(2) and XI(3) to Mamertinus is open to question, but the evidence remains inconclusive⁴⁴ and the opinion of Galletier, that the style of the speeches indicates different sources, is now generally accepted.⁴⁵ However, despite the subheading of V(8), *incipiunt Panegyrici diuersorum uii*, there has been a sustained effort to attribute more than one speech to an orator. Livineius attributed VIII(5), VI(7) and V(8) to Eumenius, and Seeck's study of 1888 made Eumenius the author of all the anonymous speeches.⁴⁶ With clarity and common sense, Pichon redirected the reader to the evidence of the speeches themselves and the reference to

³⁹ N–SR 42–3. ⁴⁰ On the attribution of this speech, Galletier i: 6.

⁴¹ N–SR 76–9.

⁴² This is the version of A, (H) gives *eiusdem magistri Mamertini Genethliacus Maximiani Augusti*.

⁴³ N–SR 289–90. ⁴⁴ N–SR 9–10, 41–2, 76, Rees 2012b: 25–6.

⁴⁵ Galletier i: xvi–xxv.

⁴⁶ Pichon 1906: 270–91 is still an excellent summary of this scholarship.

INTRODUCTION

diuersorum, pointing out that to make a collection of the work of a single author and attribute it to ‘Various Authors’ would be ‘vraiment une anomalie un peu bizarre’.⁴⁷

THE COLLECTION

Panegyrici diuersorum uii

Although the words of Aurispa, *et in eodem codice sunt panegyrici aliorum autorum ad diuersos Caesares*, do not imply that Aurispa considered that he had found a collection, the notation and numbering of the panegyrics in the manuscripts suggest that some of the speeches had been gathered at an early date.⁴⁸ Several manuscripts give a subheading before V(8), *incipiunt Panegyrici diuersorum uii*, and it is thought that the speeches V(8) to XI(3) were collected in 311–12, with XII(9) being added shortly afterwards.⁴⁹ Barnes argues that XII(9) and IV(10) were added by Nazarius to form a second collection with Nazarius’ own speech, IV(10), placed at the front and XII(9) at the end, the position of next importance.⁵⁰ In support of this, Laudani suggests that after the tumultuous history attested in the earlier speeches, Nazarius may have desired to replace the ancient capital at the centre of power again.⁵¹ His own speech was written in 321, a time when Constantine was preparing for war with

⁴⁷ Pichon 1906: 284. The question was dropped for a while, but Enenkel 2000: 93 and De Beer 2005: 314–16 have suggested that VI(7) and V(8) are by the same author.

⁴⁸ Barnes 2011: 182–3.

⁴⁹ Galletier I: xi following Brandt argues that a compilation of the anonymous speeches was put together in Autun in or around AD 312, then the two earlier speeches on Maximian were added and finally the speech of 313. For Seck’s attempts to include XII(9) in the early collection and Pichon’s objections, Pichon 1906: 284–5, 289–90. On early copyists’ attempts to impose an *octauus*, Galletier I: xxi–xxiii.

⁵⁰ Barnes 2011: 183. ⁵¹ Laudani 2014: 14.