

PAUL THE SILENTIARY AND CLAUDIAN

The extent to which Latin was familiar to the inhabitants of late sixth- and early seventh-century Constantinople is a topic of current discussion and interest.¹ While there is little evidence to suggest a significant knowledge of Latin even among the educated in the seventh century,² it is clear that in the late sixth century the language was still familiar to a section of the upper classes.³ Among native easterners, the degree of this familiarity would certainly have varied considerably, from those who could recognise a few words of Latin, through the lawyers, administrators and military men who had a specialised, professional knowledge, to the small proportion who could detect the Virgilian echoes in Corippus' panegyric of Justin II.

Whether Paul the Silentiary, epigrammatist and panegyrist of the Emperor Justinian's church of S. Sophia, should be included in the small category who were acquainted with Latin literature is indeed a more far-reaching issue than that of the survival of Latin in the eastern capital, since it is an element in the larger problem of the extent to which late Greek poets knew and imitated the work of their Latin predecessors. The broad generalisations of the past⁴ no longer satisfy modern scholarship, which rightly demands rigorous scrutiny of the evidence for each individual author.⁵ Such

¹ Evidence for the sixth century is discussed by Averil Cameron, *Flavius Cresconius Corippus, In laudem Iustini Augusti minoris* (London, 1976), pp. 199f., and U. J. Stache, *Flavius Cresconius Corippus, In laudem Iustini Augusti minoris, Ein Kommentar* (Berlin, 1976), pp. 7–19. Recent discussion on the seventh century by Barry Baldwin, 'Theophylact's Knowledge of Latin', *Byzantion* 47 (1977), 357–60, with L. M. Whitby, 'Theophylact's Knowledge of Languages', *Byzantion* 52 (1982), 425–8. On an earlier period, see Elizabeth A. Fisher, 'Greek Translations of Latin Literature in the Fourth Century A.D.', *YCS* 27 (1982), 173–215, with bibliography at p. 174, n. 3.

² Whitby, loc. cit., p. 428, 'One has to conclude that there is no firm evidence for or against Theophylact's knowledge of Latin'. Likewise A. Pertusi, *Giorgio di Pisidia, Poemi* (Ettal, 1959), i. 38. n. 1, suggests that similarities between the poems of George of Pisidia and Claudian (on which see T. Nissen, 'Historisches Epos und Panegyrikos in der Spätantike', *Hermes* 75, 1940, 298–325) are more likely to be due to a common debt to rhetorical tradition than to direct influence; cf. S. Antès, *Corippe, Éloge de l'empereur Justin II* (Paris, 1981), p. lii, n. 2, on George's independence of Corippus.

³ Averil Cameron, 'A Nativus Poem of the Sixth Century A.D.', *CP* 74 (1979), 227, '... it is becoming clear that in general there was more Latin surviving in Constantinople even at the end of the sixth century than is commonly supposed...'; cf. *JRS* 71 (1981), 183–6. Much of the evidence, however, relates to the western exiles who resided in the eastern capital at this time, and to the high-ranking recipients of Pope Gregory's letters, who may have relied on interpreters. S. Antès (op. cit. in note 2, pp. xxxii–xxxv) is less sanguine, believing that Corippus' Latin poem '... était destinée à un milieu bien précis, celui du personnel politique et militaire de haut rang et des fonctionnaires de la chancellerie: ils étaient en effet les seuls, avec les universitaires, à pouvoir, dans la partie orientale de l'Empire, comprendre et utiliser le latin...' (pp. xxxivf.).

⁴ E.g. Gibbon's oft-quoted note (*Decline and Fall*, ch. II, ed. J. B. Bury, 2nd ed., London, 1909, i. 42, n. 45) 'There is not, I believe, from Dionysius to Libanius, a single Greek critic who mentions Virgil or Horace. They seem ignorant that the Romans had any good writers'; P. Maas in *BZ* 35 (1935), 385 'Einfluss lateinischer Dichtung auf griechische ist, soviel ich weiss, für die Zeit vor dem XIII. Jahrh. nirgends erwiesen'. This view is contested with equal vehemence by R. Keydell, for example in *Gnomon* 11 (1935), 605, 'Überhaupt haben wir nun für jeden spätgriechischen Dichter – zu erinnern ist besonders an Paulus Silentiarius – mit der Kenntnis lateinischer Literaturwerke zu rechnen.'

⁵ So, for example, F. Vian, *REG* 77 (1964), 370, 'Le problème concerne toute la littérature grecque d'époque impériale; mais disons tout de suite qu'on ne peut le résoudre sans tenir compte

analysis has now indicated that while Quintus of Smyrna and Triphiodorus were not directly dependent on Virgil,⁶ nor Musaeus on Ovid,⁷ Nonnus may well have used Ovid's *Metamorphoses* and perhaps the Latin works of Claudian as well.⁸ However, the question whether late epigrammatists like Paul were directly acquainted with Augustan love elegy remains unresolved: revival among Continental scholars of the 'direct imitation' thesis has generally met with scepticism in this country and reiteration of the need for exploration of possible common sources.⁹ Against the background of this continuing debate, it is perhaps worth while to stress that Paul the Silentiary certainly moved in the kind of court circles in Constantinople where Latin was most likely to be known, and was moreover a devotee of culture;¹⁰ furthermore, I believe that a passage from his panegyric *Ekphrasis* of S. Sophia¹¹ indicates that he was directly acquainted with some Latin poetry, if only that of Claudian.

In the course of the long preface to his detailed architectural description (which begins only at line 354), Paul describes how the Emperor Justinian's church of S. Sophia, dedicated in A.D. 537, suffered a partial collapse in 558 after an earthquake (lines 186–213).¹² Amidst the general consternation, Justinian alone turns to the labour of re-building the church (lines 214–18),¹³ a task to which he is urged by a visitation from the goddess Roma (i.e. New Rome or Constantinople), who stands beside him

des époques ni des individus'; E. Schulz-Vanheyden, *Properz und das griechische Epigramm* (Diss., Münster, 1969/70), p. 159, 'Die Frage, ob Kenntnis der lateinischen Dichtung vorliegt, ist für jeden spätgriechischen Dichter gesondert zu behandeln.'

⁶ F. Vian, *Recherches sur les Posthomériques de Quintus de Smyrne* (Paris, 1959), pp. 95–101, and *Quintus de Smyrne, La suite d'Homère* (Paris, 1963), i. xxxii–xxxv, criticised by R. Keydell in *Gnomon* 33 (1961), 278–84, but followed by Malcolm Campbell, *A Commentary on Quintus Smyrnaeus Posthomérica XII*, Mnemosyne Supplement 71 (Brill, 1981), 117f. and n. 51; B. Gerlaud, *Triphiodore, La prise d'Iliou* (Paris, 1982), pp. 41–7.

⁷ G. Schott, *Hero and Leander bei Musaios und Ovid* (Diss., Köln, 1957); K. Kost, *Musaios, Hero und Leander* (Bonn, 1971), pp. 21–3; T. Gelzer and C. Whitman, *Musaeus, Hero and Leander* (Loeb, London, 1975), pp. 304–7.

⁸ J. Braune, *Nonnos und Ovid* (Greifswald, 1935), and 'Nonno e Claudiano', *Maia* 1 (1948), 176–93, with R. Keydell in *Gnomon* 11 (1935), 597–605 and P. Maas in *BZ* 35 (1935), 385–7; G. d'Ippolito, *Studi nonniani* (Palermo, 1964), with Keydell in *Gnomon* 38 (1966), 25–9 and Vian in *REG* 77 (1964), 369–71; F. Vian, *Nonnos de Panopolis, Les Dionysiaques* (Paris, 1976), i. xv and xlvif.; J. Diggle, *Euripides, Phaethon* (Cambridge, 1970), 180–200.

⁹ G. Viansino, *Paolo Silenziario, Epigrammi* (Turin, 1963), pp. xii–xv, with Averil Cameron in *JHS* 86 (1966), 210f.; E. Schulz-Vanheyden, op. cit. in note 5 above, pp. 156–69, supported by E. J. Kenney in *CR* 86 (1972), 111, but criticised by J. C. Yardley, 'Paulus Silentiarius, Ovid, and Propertius', *CQ* n.s. 30 (1980), 239–43. Cf. Alan Cameron, *Porphyrius the Charioteer* (Oxford, 1973), p. 88, n. 1, 'I am not myself at all convinced that any of the Agathian poets were familiar with Latin literature' (with bibliography).

¹⁰ For Paul's aristocratic background and devotion to culture, see Agathias, *Historiae* 5.9.7 (ed. R. Keydell, Berlin, 1967). As a silentiary he was a member of the imperial *cubiculum* and would have officiated at meetings of the imperial consistory and on ceremonial occasions; see A. H. M. Jones, *The Later Roman Empire* (Oxford, 1964), pp. 571f.; R. Guillard, *Titres et fonctions de l'empire byzantin* (Paris, 1976), XVII; J. B. Bury, *The Imperial Administrative System in the Ninth Century* (London, 1911), pp. 24f.

¹¹ Edited by Paul Friedländer, *Johannes von Gaza und Paulus Silentiarius* (Leipzig and Berlin, 1912; repr. Olms, Hildesheim and New York, 1969). Friedländer's text is reproduced, and a German translation added, by O. Veh, in appendix to *Procopius, de Aedificiis* (Munich, 1977).

¹² A detailed account of the earthquake is given by Agathias, *Hist.* 5.3–9; cf. J. Malalas, *Chronographia* (ed. L. Dindorf, Bonn, 1831), pp. 488.20–489.10 and 489.19–490.5, Theophanes, *Chronographia* (ed. C. de Boor, Leipzig, 1883), pp. 231.14–232.6 and 232.27–233.3.

¹³ Agathias, perhaps under the influence of Paul, likewise stresses the Emperor's primary concern for S. Sophia (*Hist.* 5.9.2).

in warrior guise (line 219 *σακέσπαλος*) and addresses to him an elaborate appeal (220–42) that he stretch out a healing hand to the gaping wound in her breast caused by the church's collapse (221–5). She strengthens her argument by pointing out that she has guided Justinian's programme of conquest, which has secured a peaceful world where Constantinople is a centre of trade and its inhabitants consequently prosperous (226–36). Justinian must not let his 'wondrous work' of S. Sophia sink into oblivion, since, even though all the nations of the world cower before his ordinances and he has re-built the whole of Constantinople, he will never find another more brilliant symbol of his throne (236–42). After this powerful appeal, Roma attempts to do obeisance before the Emperor and kiss his feet (243f.). But he raises her up with his right hand, smiles reassuringly and speaks words replete with joy (244–7): Roma must not be distressed, but banish grief and refuse to be weighed down by adversity, as She has in the past refused to succumb to the physical onslaught of foes. After a further appeal for fortitude, Justinian concludes with a promise to make Roma yet more glorious by restoring the collapsed dome of the church (248–54). Straightforward narrative is then resumed with an account of how Justinian hurried off to inspect the extent of the damage (255ff.).

I suggest that Paul's inspiration for the insertion of this dramatic scene is the Latin panegyric of Claudian, and perhaps also that of his imitator, Sidonius Apollinaris, both of whom several times depict personified Roma in similar scenes.¹⁴ Paul's scene is much more succinct than those of the Latin writers and represents a conflation of suitable elements from several poems rather than direct imitation of a single piece, but nevertheless the similarities bear detailed scrutiny.

The basic schema of an impassioned appeal by Roma which is answered with reassurances occurs in Claudian, *Prob.* 73–173, *Gild.* 17–212 (including a secondary appeal by Africa), *VI Cons.* 356–493 and Sidonius, *Pan. Anth.* 387–521, *Pan. Avit.* 38–598. In *Prob.*, Roma's appeal is prompted by an initial enquiry about the reason for her visit (126ff.), as it is in Sidon. *Pan. Anth.* 438f.; in the latter case, Roma's mission is undertaken in response to a request by Tiber (387ff.). This motif is more developed in Claud. *Stil.* 2.218ff., where several personified countries of the Empire appeal to Roma to approach Stilico, while in Sidon. *Pan. Mai.* 40ff. similar appeals to Roma provoke an answering reassurance from the city herself. Elsewhere the context of Roma's appeal precludes an answering reassurance (Claud. *Eutr.* 1.371ff., *Stil.* 2.269ff.). The proportions of Paul's scene, in which a long appeal is followed by a much briefer reassurance, are similar to Claud. *Prob.* and Sidon. *Pan. Anth.* and *Pan. Mai.*, whereas Paul's emphasis on Roma's distress and supplication is closest to Claud. *Gild.* and its imitation in Sidon. *Pan. Avit.*¹⁵ But in both of these poems, Roma's

¹⁴ On Sidonius, see further below, note 32. Claudian's use of Roma was probably influenced by Symmachus *Rel.* 3.9f., where She appeals to the Emperor to allow the continuation of her cult; see Alan Cameron, *Claudian* (Oxford, 1970), p. 365. Other later Latin writers also make use of personified Roma, e.g. Prudentius *Contra Symm.* 2.80–90, 634–768 (where She champions Christianity, in answer to Symmachus' portrait of her); Rutilius Namatianus, *de reditu suo* 1.47–164; Ennodius, *Pan. Theod.* (ed. Hartel, C.S.E.L., VI, Vindob., 1882), pp. 274.11–13, 276.20f., *Libell. pro synodo*, p. 326.24 *ad fin.* (where a speech of appeal is put into her mouth). But these passages are not closely analogous to Paul's scene. The Latin writers refer to Old Roma, although New Roma is invoked by Sidonius at *Pan. Anth.* 30ff. After the mid-fourth century, New Roma is frequently depicted in the East with the same attributes as Old Roma; see J. M. C. Toynbee, 'Roma and Constantinopolis in late-antique art', *JRS* 37 (1947), 135–44 and (part II) in *Studies presented to D. M. Robinson* (Missouri, 1953), ii. 261–77.

¹⁵ The portrayal of Roma in distress goes back to Lucan 1.185ff., where She appeals to Caesar at the Rubicon in a nocturnal vision. There, and in Claud. *Gild.*, her distress is associated with old age (Lucan 1.188 *canos... crines*; cf. *Gild.* 25; Roma is old also in Symm. *Rel.* 3.9f., Prudent.

appeal is to Jupiter; for Paul's scene between goddess and Emperor, we must turn to Claud. *Prob.* (Theodosius), *Eutr.* 1, *VI Cons.* (both Honorius), or *Stil.* 2, where She seeks to persuade the general Stilico to accept the consulship.

In Paul, the epithet *σακέσπαλος* (219) alone indicates that Roma is a warrior goddess, an element which is given more extensive treatment in Claud. *Prob.* 73–99 and Sidonius *Pan. Anth.* 390–406, which describe her arming for her mission and detail the scenes on her shield, while Sidon. *Pan. Mai.* 13–39 expatiates on the appearance of the enthroned warrior goddess.¹⁶ In Claud. *Gild.* 17–25 and Sidon. *Pan. Avit.* 45–9 the goddess's unkempt arms reflect her enfeebled state, but Paul does not choose to adopt this posture of humiliation for his Roma. His curtailment of detail about the goddess's appearance and preparations contributes to the abruptness with which the dialogue between Roma and Justinian is introduced, an abruptness which is not found in the more leisured Latin writers.¹⁷ Paul's summary conclusion of the scene is, however, characteristic of Claudian and Sidonius too, Paul's transitional *ὡς φάμενος* (255)¹⁸ recalling Claud. *Prob.* 174 *dixerat et...*, *VI Cons.* 494 *dixit et...*, and less closely, Sidon. *Pan. Anth.* 522 *finierant*.¹⁹

Paul's Roma devotes several lines of her appeal (226–31) to the theme of the peaceful subjugation of the nations of east, west and south under Justinian's rule, in a manner very similar to that of Claudian's Roma in *Eutr.* 1.391–5, who likewise stresses the closeness of her relationship with the Emperor²⁰ and itemises subject nations. Indeed the theme of empire is regular in this context in the Latin poets: in Claud. *Stil.* 2.285–7 Roma's appeal to Stilico to assume the consulship is strengthened by a reminder that peace has been secured in north and south, at *Prob.* 160–3 her plea to Theodosius that Probus' sons be given the consulship is reinforced by the wish that the rivers Araxes and Rhine (symbolising east and west) be subject to Rome, at *VI Cons.* 413–16 her argument that Honorius should return to Rome from campaign is given weight by the point that previous Emperors have ruled the rivers of east and west from Rome with equal might, and so on.²¹ In view of the general similarity of situation between

Contra Symm. 2.81, Rut. 1.115f. and Ennod. *Pan. Theod.* locc. citt.). This would, however, be inappropriate for Paul's New Roma, who is considered to be the daughter of Old Roma (P. Sil. *Descr.* 151, 166f.; cf. Libanius, *Ep.* 972.5, 11.107.16f. Foerster, etc.).

¹⁶ Claud. *Stil.* 2.270–77 has a briefer reference to Roma's arms. In Corippus, *Laud. Just.* 1.288–90 (written a few years after Paul's poem) Old Roma is depicted in a traditional pose on Justinian's funeral pall; see Averil Cameron *ad loc.* for bibliography of this characteristic depiction.

¹⁷ The closest parallel is Sidon. *Pan. Mai.* 13ff., where the scene with Roma follows immediately upon a prefatory celebration of Maiorianus' consulship.

¹⁸ Cf. *Il.* 5.290, Nonn. *D.* 4.307, al.

¹⁹ Cf. also Claud. *Stil.* 2.407 *haec dum Roma refert, iam Fama loquacibus alis...* and *Gild.* 213, where the theme is abruptly changed, but without a verb of saying.

²⁰ P. Sil. *Descr.* 226f. *πάντα κυβερνητῆρι τεῶν διέπουσα χαλινῶ|ὑμετέροις ὑπέθηκα τροπαιοφόροις θριάμβοις*; Claud. *Eutr.* 1.391f. *quantum te principe possim, non longinqua docent*; cf. 384f., on Roma's maternal emotions at the sight of Honorius negotiating with the Germans.

²¹ Cf. also Claud. *Gild.* 31ff. and Sid. *Pan. Avit.* 72ff. (Roma details her previous conquests by contrast with her present plight); Sid. *Pan. Anth.* 440ff. (Roma reassures Aurora that She has not come to reclaim her eastern conquests); also Symm. *Rel.* 3.9 (the cult of Roma gave her world empire), Rut. 1.55ff. (eulogy, addressed to Roma, of her peaceful world empire). Paul's Roma mentions specifically Medes and Celts (228 *ἡρεμέει καὶ Μῆδος ἀναξ καὶ Κελτὶς ὁμοκλή*), India (229f. *καὶ ξίφος ὑμετέροις φιλοτήσιον ὥπασε θώκοις* | *Ἰνδὸς ἀνὴρ...*) and Carthage (231), in phrases reminiscent of Claud. *Stil.* 2.286 *cecidit Maurus, Germania cessit* or *VI Cons.* 415f. *...cum foedera Medus et Indus|hinc peteret pacemque mea speraret ab arce*. The linguistic similarity cannot, however, be pressed. Paul's account of Justinian's peaceful world empire (cf. also *Descr.* 11–16, 135–60, 922f., 935–7) is the characteristically rosy view of panegyrists of the

Paul's scene and that of Claud. *Gild.*, it may be significant that Paul's Roma concludes her survey of the peace of Justinian's reign with a reference (232–5) to Constantinople's importance as a trading-centre and the consequent prosperity²² which Roma is able to extend to her inhabitants. The supply of corn for bread was as important to Constantinople as it was to Rome: the chronographers record that a bread shortage lay behind unrest in Constantinople in A.D. 556,²³ for example, and there was serious concern in November 562 about the strong north winds which prevented the grain ships from passing through the Hellespont.²⁴ However, Paul's introduction of this theme in this context may have been partly inspired by Claudian's *Gild.*, where Roma is starving as a result of Gildo's blockade of the corn supply.²⁵

A final point of comparison illustrates how Paul has adapted a motif from the Latin writers to accord with sixth-century practice. In Claud. *Gild.* and Sid. *Pan. Avit.*, Roma adopts a standard suppliant posture before addressing her appeal to Jupiter,²⁶ and ends in tears (*Gild.* 127f., *Pan. Avit.* 118), while in *Pan. Mai.* Africa supplicates and weeps together at the outset (53f. *flens*... | *procubuit*). Paul's Roma, however, at the end of her speech, attempts to fasten her lips upon the Emperor's feet (243f.). By the sixth century, it had long been the practice to perform an act of *adoratio* upon entering the Emperor's presence,²⁷ but according to Procopius (*Arc.* 30.23) the touching with the lips of the feet of the Emperor (and Empress) was a modification of the practice introduced by Justinian and Theodora.²⁸ Justinian responds to Roma's obeisance by stretching out his gracious right hand and raising her up, as Jupiter in Claud. *Gild.* uses a similar gesture at the conclusion of Roma's appeal, so as to calm her weeping and that of the other gods present.²⁹ This graciousness (ἱλαον 244) of Paul's Justinian

560s; cf. *A.P.* 4.3B.1–100, 9.641 (both Agath.), 16.72 (Anon.), *Cor. Laud. Just.* praef. 1–36, with Averil Cameron's note, pp. 118f.

²² Roma uses the word ὄλβον (234), thereby neatly returning to the theme from which her survey of Justinian's empire began, a reference to the hand of the Emperor as ῥυτφενέος τροφόν ὄλβον (225).

²³ Malalas p. 488.6–14, Theophanes p. 230.17–25.

²⁴ Malalas p. 492.11–16, Theophanes p. 237.7–12. Cf. Proc. *Aed.* 5.1.7–16 on the need for a favourable south wind for the grain ships to pass through the Hellespont. Paul's poem was delivered in January 563, so the subject was topical.

²⁵ Other passages in Paul's poem celebrate Justinian's world empire (see note 21 above), but make no mention of the theme of Constantinople as a centre of trade, which is elsewhere only obliquely suggested in a description of how sailors steer towards Constantinople by the lights of S. Sophia (906–20).

²⁶ *Gild.* 26f. *attigit ut tandem caelum genibusque Tonantis | procubuit*; Sidon. *Pan. Avit.* 50 *utque pii genibus primum est adfusa Tonantis*.

²⁷ See A. Alföldi, 'Die Ausgestaltung des monarchischen Zeremoniells am römischen Kaiserhofe', *Mitt. deutsch. arch. Inst.*, röm. abt. 49 (1934), 3–118, repr. in Alföldi, *Die monarchische Repräsentation im römischen Kaiserreiche* (Darmstadt, 1970), with comment and criticism by W. T. Avery, 'The *Adoratio Purpureae* and the Importance of the Imperial Purple', *Mem. Amer. Acad. Rome* 17 (1940), 66–80; also R. Guiland, *Recherches sur les institutions byzantines* (Berliner byz. Arbeiten, 35, Berlin, 1967), i. 144–50. The prostration of Roma is a mark of the greatest extremity, since Alföldi notes (p. 43) that in allegorical representations, Roma alone among divine personifications retained throughout the empire the exceptional privilege of remaining seated in the Emperor's presence.

²⁸ The practice is also alluded to at Proc. *Arc.* 15.15, *Cor. Laud. Just.* 1.157f., 3.235f., Const. Porph. *de Caer.* 1. 84 (p. 387.8, 13f., Bonn), 1. 89 (p. 406.12; cf. p. 407.17f.), 2. 51 (p. 700.12, 16, al.), etc. (These chapters of the *de Caer.* all date from the sixth century; the first is certainly, the second probably and the third possibly from the *περί πολιτικῆς καταστάσεως* of Peter the Patrician; see J. B. Bury, 'The Ceremonial Book of Constantine Porphyrogenetos', *EHR* 22, 1907, 212f., 216f.)

²⁹ P. Sil. *Descr.* 244f. ὁ δ' ἱλαον ἠθάδι 'Ρώμη | δεξιτερὴν ὥρεξεν ὑποκλάζουσας ἐγείρων; Claud. *Gild.* 132f. *genitor iam corde remitti | coeperit et sacrum dextra sedare tumultum*.

and the Emperor's soft smile (ἦκα δὲ μειδήσας 246) in the face of Roma's passion are manifestations of the calm (*serenitas*, γαλήνη) befitting an emperor;³⁰ so Claudian stresses the calm of Theodosius even amidst the sweat of battle (*Prob.* 117f.) and Sidonius mentions the tranquillity of Jupiter as he takes his place upon his throne (*Pan. Avit.* 38f.); both of these allusions, however, precede Roma's appeal. The motif of imperial or divine serenity is, moreover, common (see note 30), and although it is noteworthy that the Latin poets sometimes include it in the context of an appeal by Roma, Paul did not necessarily rely upon them for this idea. His account of Justinian's response is, for example, not unlike Themistius' description (*Or.* 4, 1.80.10–13 Downey) of the Emperor Constantius' reassurance of Constantinople in her panic at the conspiracy of Vetranio and Magnentius, ὁ βασιλεὺς ὁ μέγας... ἦκε τε εὐμενὴς παρ' αὐτῇ καὶ χεῖρα ὥρεξε κραδαινομένη καὶ προὔτρεψατο εὐψυχον εἶναι, where the last phrase is replaced in Paul by Justinian's direct speech (248–54).³¹

The thesis that Paul's inspiration for the scene between Roma and Justinian came from Claudian³² does not require that he should owe every detail to the Latin poet. It is sufficient that Claudian's influence is to be detected in the insertion into a panegyric context of a dramatic scene between Roma and Emperor, in which an impassioned appeal by the one is answered by the other with reassurance. The detailed similarities in content to which I have pointed are merely corroborative. Those sceptical of direct use of Latin sources by Greek writers have stressed the need to prove linguistic imitation, which is notoriously difficult where translation is involved. I have quoted passages where there may be a possibility of linguistic reminiscence, but I would not claim that any is more than a possibility. Paul's language is influenced by the exigencies of composition dictated by Nonnus' stringent metrical rules, and his phraseology is generally modelled on Greek sources.³³ But I know of no extant Greek source which affords a parallel for Paul's Roma-Justinian scene nearly as close as that of Claudian: personified Roma does appear in Greek writers, but not in scenes of extended dialogue.

Closest perhaps to Paul is Themistius' anthropomorphic description of Constantinople's panic at the conspiracy of Vetranio and Magnentius, *Or.* 4 (1.80.6–10 Downey) ἡ πόλις δὲ ἐνδεινότερον ἐξεπέπληκτο ὑπὸ δέϊματος, καὶ ἔπαλλε μὲν αὐτῆς ἡ καρδία, ἐβάμβαινε δὲ ἡ φωνή κτλ., where the city is comforted and reassured by Constantius;³⁴ the passage does not, however, use any direct speech. Occasional

³⁰ By the sixth century, γαλήνη and cognate terms are regularly used in connection with the Emperor: an early example is Themistius, *Or.* 19 (1.330.18 Downey); for other instances, see G. W. H. Lampe, *A Patristic Greek Lexicon* (Oxford, 1968), s.vv. γαληναῖος 2, γαλήνη 4, γαληνότης 2; E. A. Sophocles, *Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine Periods* (Camb. Mass., London and Oxford, 1914), s.vv. γαλήνη, γαληνός, γαληνότης 2; C. du Cange, *Glossarium ad scriptores mediae et infimae Graecitatis* (Lugdunum, 1688), s.v. γαληνότης; R. C. McCail in *JHS* 98 (1978), 51.

³¹ There are other similarities between this passage of Themistius and Paul; see below.

³² Paul may or may not have been familiar with Sidonius' imitations of Claudian: Sidonius has no scene between Roma and the Emperor and there is nothing in Paul which could derive from Sidonius alone, except the possible parallel for his abrupt opening in *Pan. Mai.* (see n. 17 above), which may simply be a sign that both writers are lifting material from elsewhere.

³³ E.g. *Descr.* 246 ἦκα δὲ μειδήσας, ἵνα μυρίον ἄλγος ἐλάσση; cf. A. R. 2.61 ἦκα δὲ μειδήσας, *simil.* 3.107, Hes. *Th.* 547, all in *eadem sede*; *Il.* 1.2 μυρί'... ἄλγε', 18.88 πένθος... μυρίον, A. R. 1.259 ἄλγεα μυρία θέϊη, *A.P.* 11.401.3 (Luc.), *Opp. H.* 2.503f.; Nonn. *D.* 32.111 λύσσαν ἐλάσσαι (at line-end); etc.

³⁴ On Themistius' treatment of the relationship between Constantinople and Emperor, see further E. Fenster, *Laudes Constantinopolitanae* (Misc. Byz. Monacensia 9, Munich, 1968), pp. 28–35.

anthropomorphic references to Constantinople occur elsewhere, for example, that of the fourth-century anonymous *Laudatio professoris*... *Beryti recto* 82–97,³⁵ where the city mourns the dead professor from Berytus and at 94 ἡ πόλις αἰὲν ἄδακρυς ἐδάκρυσεν τότε 'Ρώμῃ. In the early sixth-century anonymous treatise *de polit. scientia* 5.3,³⁶ the speaker, alluding to faction rioting, relates how he saw standing around Constantinople (line 4f. ὡς ἐν πίνακι κύκλῳ περὶ τὴν μητέρα καὶ βασιλίδα ἐστώσας) cities which had been maltreated by their nurselings and were detailing their suffering. This picture is similar to that of Choricus, *Laudatio Arati et Stephani* 52 (misprinted 51) – 56 (62.16–63.21 Foerster), where the orator envisages various cities standing about him in a circle (p. 62. 17 ἐντεῦθεν δοκῶ τὰς πόλεις ὁρᾶν κύκλῳ περιεστώσας), each asking him to detail the benefits she has received from Stephanus; but Gaza, his home city, smiles triumphant because she produced Stephanus, saying, εἰ γὰρ μὴ τοῦτον ἐγὼ... ἐθρεψάμην, πῶς ἂν ὑμῖν ὑπήρχε σωθῆναι;. Choricus then puts into her mouth (54f.) an account of Stephanus' benefits to her so far and her hopes for his future building achievements. These last two passages both emphasise the author's visual picture of the scene, and may well be influenced by artistic presentations of personified cities (as the phraseology of the *de pol. sci.* passage explicitly suggests). Such personifications, notably that of Roma, appear on coins, consular diptychs and elsewhere in the period of the fourth to the sixth centuries,³⁷ and their similarity to Claudian's literary Roma has long been recognised.³⁸

Artistic influence cannot, however, account for Paul's attribution to Roma of direct speech, for which there is very little precedent in Greek writers. Apart from the Choricus passage, where Gaza speaks, the only parallel appears to be a fragmentary anonymous fifth-century *Encomium ducis Romani*³⁹ in which Egyptian Thebes is first described as prostrating herself before the feet of the general in supplication (2.18f., cf. 3.7) and subsequently (4.9ff.) the general's native land appeals to his present distant abode for his return and then addresses him directly. The situation of supplication and appeal by the city clearly has resemblances to Paul's scene, but Claudian still affords a far closer analogy for the use of Roma and the dialogue of appeal and response between city and Emperor. Moreover it seems unlikely that the ephemeral Egyptian poem could have reached Paul in Constantinople.⁴⁰ On the other hand, although Paul may well have been familiar with the epigram of his contemporary Theaetetus Scholasticus (*A.P.* 16.32b) in which a three-word statement (πάντα φύσις δύναται) is put into the mouths of Roma and Beroe, this can hardly have inspired his dramatic

³⁵ Ed. E. Heitsch, *Die griechischen Dichterfragmente der römischen Kaiserzeit* (2nd ed., Göttingen, 1963), i. 97.

³⁶ Ed. A. Mai, *Scriptorum veterum nova collectio* (Rome, 1827), ii. 598. Aspects of the work are discussed by A. S. Fotiou in *JÖB* 27 (1978), 1–10 (including reference to this passage, p. 3) and in *Byzantion* 51 (1981), 533–47, and by C. Behr in *AJP* 95 (1974), 141–9.

³⁷ See J. M. C. Toynbee, locc. cit. in note 14 above.

³⁸ See Alan Cameron, *Claudian*, pp. 273–6 and 363–6. Cf. Friedländer's note on P. Sil. *Descr.* 145 (p. 271).

³⁹ Ed. Heitsch, op. cit. in note 35 above, pp. 120–4. The parallel is noted by Alan Cameron, *Claudian*, p. 255.

⁴⁰ It is more likely that the Egyptian panegyrist knew the works of his fellow-countryman Claudian; cf. Alan Cameron, 'Wandering Poets: a Literary Movement in Byzantine Egypt', *Historia* 14 (1965) at pp. 494–7, on knowledge of Latin among Egyptian poets. It is noteworthy that Keydell's supplement of the *Encomium* 4.8 ἀπορρίψαντες ἀνίην gives the same line-end as P. Sil. *Descr.* 169. Beazley, however, supplemented ἀπ' οἴκων τρέψας ἀνίην. Even if Keydell is right, Paul did not necessarily derive his verse-end from the papyrus *Encomium*; cf. A. R. 2.884 ἀπορρίψαντες ἀνίας in eadem sede.

Roma scene.⁴¹ Nor did Paul's scene influence his successor in the field of imperial panegyric, the seventh-century iambic poet George of Pisidia, who, when he apostrophises Roma in the opening lines of Book 2 of his *Heraclias* (1–4), gives her only a few words of direct speech (line 4).⁴²

These meagre parallels among Greek poets do not offer a serious challenge to the thesis that Paul was directly influenced by Claudian. The only alternative is to postulate that an intervening Greek panegyric, inspired by Claudian, might have served as Paul's model – Christodorus of Coptus' poem on Anastasius' Isaurian wars or his twelve-book epic *Patria* of Constantinople,⁴³ for example, or one of the lost panegyrics of the Latinist John Lydus (*de Mag.* 3.27f.). However, since there is no evidence for the content of such works, this can be no more than a possibility to be recognised. Paul is so much closer to Claudian than to anything which survives in Greek that the case for direct imitation remains persuasive.

The Roma-figure developed by Claudian was ideally suited to Paul's needs in the long panegyric section (*Descr.* 1–353) which precedes his architectural *ekphrasis* of S. Sophia. His purpose in this section was primarily that of celebrating the church of S. Sophia as the climactic achievement of Justinian's reign,⁴⁴ an objective which demanded tactful presentation since the church had been dedicated twenty-five years previously (in A.D. 537) and had recently (in 558) suffered a major collapse. The dramatic Roma-scene is inserted into the middle of the account of the collapse, where the celebration by Roma of Justinian's achievements, which culminates in a plea for the restoration of S. Sophia as the crowning achievement, recalls positive accomplishments: this has a vital function in creating an atmosphere of optimism and stressing Justinian's control of the situation at a point where the Emperor might otherwise appear to have failed. The masterly stroke, inspired by Claudian, of using the figure of Roma as the vehicle for these sentiments has several advantages. Roma was closely linked with the Emperor as his divine counterpart⁴⁵ and hence was the most likely of deities to appear at a moment of crisis, since an appeal to him put into her mouth would carry the greatest possible weight.⁴⁶ Moreover, her appearance has to some extent been foreshadowed by Paul's earlier invocation of Roma to come and celebrate S. Sophia (*Descr.* 145ff.),⁴⁷ to which is added (164ff.) an invocation of Old Roma too, to celebrate the surpassing achievement of her daughter.⁴⁸ But above all the figure of

⁴¹ Averil and Alan Cameron, 'The Cycle of Agathias', *JHS* 86 (1966), at p. 14, suggest a Constantinopolitan provenance and a date of c. A.D. 555 for this epigram.

⁴² Pertusi (*ad loc.*) compares Claud. *Stil.* 3.1ff., but see note 2 above on George of Pisidia and Claudian.

⁴³ Suidas s.v. *Χριστόδωρος*; cf. Cameron, 'Wandering Poets', p. 489.

⁴⁴ Justinian's public image was probably in need of support by the time Paul wrote in A.D. 562–3, when the great military achievements of the earlier years of the reign were beginning to seem remote, and administrative, economic and financial problems loomed; cf. Proc. *Arc.* 24, Cor. *Laud. Just.* 2.260f. (with Cameron's note), Agath. *Hist.* 5.13.5–14.4. (It should, however, be observed that all three sources are prejudiced against Justinian.) See also Jones, *Later Roman Empire*, pp. 298–302, E. Stein, *Histoire du Bas-Empire* (Paris, 1949, repr. 1968), ii. 777–80, P. Lamma, *Ricerche sulla storia e la cultura del VI° secolo* (Brescia, 1950), pp. 47–52 and *passim*.

⁴⁵ See S. MacCormack, 'Roma, Constantinopolis, the Emperor, and his Genius', *CQ* n.s. 25 (1975), 131–50, esp. 139ff.

⁴⁶ Cf. Cameron, *Claudian*, p. 364 'She [Roma] appears so frequently in Claudian, ... because she was dramatically the most appropriate figure to exhort Stilico to save the East from Eutropius or Africa from Gildo or (above all) to officiate in a consular panegyric'.

⁴⁷ Cf. Friedländer's note on *Descr.* 145 (p. 271).

⁴⁸ The notion of Old Roma's rejuvenation which is found in Latin poets (e.g. Claud. *Gild.* 208–12) is replaced in eastern writers by the idea that the New Roma is the daughter of the Old; cf. note 15 above, and see F. Dölger, 'Rom in der Gedankenwelt der Byzantiner', repr.

Roma was perfectly appropriate to Paul's aspiration to compose his poem in the classical manner, and hence to avoid as far as possible any explicitly Christian allusions which would detract from a pure classical atmosphere,⁴⁹ an aspiration by no means easy to sustain for one required to celebrate the inauguration of a Christian church.⁵⁰ Although the goddess Roma was older than the Christian era, she was always in a separate category from the explicitly pagan Olympian deities, preserving a more neutral character which allowed her to slip readily across the border between pagan and Christian.⁵¹ This neutral character made her an ideal deity for a Christian poet like Paul who did not wish to speak in unequivocally Christian terms.⁵²

There is no difficulty in the assumption that the works of Claudian were available in sixth-century Constantinople. The suggestion⁵³ that Claudian's patron Stilico organised the dissemination of Claudian's works in the eastern capital for propaganda purposes remains plausible, even if it is unlikely that Synesius directly imitated Claudian in his *περὶ βασιλείας*, delivered at Constantinople in A.D. 399.⁵⁴ Moreover, there is evidence that Claudian was read in the first half of the sixth century by the Latin writers Priscian and Marcellinus Comes, both of whom worked in Constantinople, and by the antiquarian and Latinist John Lydus, who mentions Claudian (in terms not altogether complimentary) as a source of information for his *de magistratibus* (1.47, p. 49.21f. Wuensch).⁵⁵ Corippus' encomium of Justin II, written at the beginning of the reign, betrays a clear debt to Claudian, but echoes in his earlier epic *Iohannis*, which was written for a Carthaginian audience, confirm that the African Corippus was already familiar with Claudian before he came to Constantinople.⁵⁶

in *Byzanz und die europäische Staatenwelt* (Darmstadt, 1964), at pp. 93–8, on the ideology of *renovatio*, in which the young and vital New Roma is contrasted with the ageing Roma of the West; Paul provides an early example.

⁴⁹ This classicising ideal as practised by the historians Procopius and Agathias has been expounded by Averil Cameron, 'The "scepticism" of Procopius', *Historia* 15 (1966), 466–82, 'Procopius and the Church of St. Sophia', *Harvard Theological Review* 58 (1965), 161–3, and *Agathias* (Oxford, 1970), pp. 75–88.

⁵⁰ Paul does permit himself to name Christ directly (e.g. *Descr.* 193), for which he had precedent in Nonnus, *Paraphrasis S. Evangelii Ioannei* (e.g. 1.68 and *passim*) and ps. Apollinaris of Laodicea, *Metaphrasis Psalmorum* (e.g. *proth.* 65).

⁵¹ Old Roma already champions Christianity in Prudentius, *Contra Symm.* 2.634ff., and is portrayed in the fifth-century mosaics on the triumphal arch of Santa Maria Maggiore in Rome. Cf. Cameron, *Claudian*, pp. 365f., Toynbee in *JRS* 37 (1947), 135f.

⁵² Paul likewise attributes the collapse of the dome of S. Sophia not to the Devil, but to the Telchines (*Descr.* 195), Baskania and Megaera (221), whose affiliations, like Roma's, are ambiguous. At the end of the poem, when he turns towards the explicitly Christian subject of the Patriarch Eutychius, Paul is less fastidious, mentioning Christ as Justinian's guide in similar terms to Roma (*Descr.* 960, cf. 226) and referring more explicitly to the Devil (975).

⁵³ Alan Cameron, 'Wandering Poets', p. 503, and *Claudian*, p. 244.

⁵⁴ Argued for by C. Lacombrade, 'Notes sur deux panégyriques', *Pallas* 4 (1956), 15–26; accepted by Cameron, 'Wandering Poets', p. 503, but argued against in *Claudian*, pp. 321–3.

⁵⁵ Th. Birt, *Claudii Claudiani carmina* (Mon. Germ. Hist., Auct. Ant. X, Berlin, 1892), pp. iii, lxxviii f., esp. lxxix *Quodsi Sedulius in Achaia Claudianum legebat, etiam Constantinopoli saeculo VI apographa eius fuisse non mirum; quibus usum esse credo Priscianum (...) usus esse potest etiam Laurentius Lydus*; Alan Cameron, *Claudian*, pp. 243–5, 419, and p. 3 on John Lydus' reference to Claudian as ὁ Παφλαγών.

⁵⁶ S. Antès (op. cit. in note 2 above, pp. lxxivf.) puts Claudian third, after Virgil and Ovid, among Corippus' sources for linguistic imitation in the *Laud. Just.* (collected pp. 151f.); Averil Cameron (op. cit. in note 1 above, pp. 7f.) emphasises their thematic affiliation; cf., for example, her note on *Laud. Just.* 1.288–9, on the similarity to Claudian of Corippus' picture of Roma, and 'Corippus' *Iohannis*: Epic of Byzantine Africa', *ARCA* 11, *Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar Vol. IV*, 1983, ed. F. Cairns (Liverpool, 1984), p. 172 with n. 45, for parallels in Claudian (and elsewhere) for Corippus' *adventus* scene. For *loci similes* between Claudian and both poems

Among these figures, Paul the Silentiary is unique in being neither a native Latin speaker nor, like Lydus, a student of Latin and things Roman, but in view of Paul's extraordinary passion for culture and his certain acquaintance with the Greek mythological poetry written by Egyptians in the fourth and fifth centuries,⁵⁷ it is not hard to believe that he extended his reading to Claudian's Latin panegyrics. The suggestion that he adopted from Claudian a motif which exactly suited the requirements of his own panegyric preamble contributes to the problem of the relationship between Paul's epigrams and Augustan love elegy only indirectly, by indicating that Paul knew some, albeit late, Latin poetry. It has more positive value as a rebuttal of the old theory that no Greek writer ever uses a Latin one,⁵⁸ and as an item of evidence for the survival of Latin among easterners in Constantinople, although I would not wish to suggest that the eastern capital held many as learned as Paul the Silentiary.*

Oxford

MARY WHITBY

of Corippus, see R. Amann, *de Corippo priorum poetarum Latinorum imitatore* (Diss., Oldenburg, 1885), pp. 33–7.

⁵⁷ See note 10 above for Agathias' reference to Paul's παιδεία. On the school of Egyptian poets in the fourth and fifth centuries, with whom Claudian is to be associated, see Alan Cameron, 'Wandering Poets': mythological poets like Nonnus are exceptions to the general preference of the school for contemporary subjects (pp. 470f.). Paul's debt to Nonnus needs no illustration; for a clear echo of Triph. 41 Ἴλιος ἀκλινέεσσιν ἐπεμβεβαυία θεμέθλοισι, cf. *Descr.* 186 ἦδη μὲν σθεναροῖσιν ἐπεμβεβαυία θεμίλοισι; with Colluthus' repetition of εἴξατε at 171 εἴξατέ μοι πολέμοιο, συνήθεος εἴξατε νίκης, cf. *Descr.* 152 εἴξατέ μοι, 'Ρώμης Καπετωλίδες, εἴξατε, φῆμαι; and with Musaeus 33 σοοφροσύνη τε καὶ αἰδοῖ (v. l. δὲ), cf. *Descr.* 995 σοοφροσύνη τε καὶ αἰδῶς in eadem sede (striking examples; J. Merian-Genast, *de Paulo Silentiario byzantino*, Diss., Leipzig, 1889, pp. 101–4, collects others).

⁵⁸ See note 4 above.

* I am grateful to Dr Michael Whitby for reading and commenting on this paper.