

## THE METAMORPHOSIS OF CONSTANTINE

Many have written of imperial qualities perceived or publicized, particularly of those attached to the emperor Constantine. Although only a tediously exhaustive volume could do justice to the whole subject, and any essay which does not embrace the whole runs the risk of being faulted for some omission or other,<sup>1</sup> one may yet justify a particular concern. The subject of the present paper is the tension between form and function, which appears nowhere so readily as in a series of similar literary exercises spanning a number of years, and the demonstration that form will always yield to practical necessity. For example, the rise, fall, and rehabilitation of Maximian through seven of the *Panegyrici Latini* clearly illustrates the many functions of a standard form. Constantine's is a more complicated case which involves two kinds of form and a certain amount of Augustan posturing.

To begin with, there is the issue of Tetrarchic 'good form' and the materials of propaganda. Early fourth-century rhetoricians were taxed to do justice to the constantly shifting forces which bore up the Roman state. As a Tetrarchy of four rulers in harmonious concord grew to six members engaged in less than cordial rivalry, shrank to a triumvirate, and at last to one emperor in the east and one in the west, the principles of newspeak infected political oratory as perhaps never before.

Constantine himself is a second factor. During these years he changed, or was perceived to do so, and the form in which he was praised changed with him. The violence done to the traditional format of a *basilikos logos* accompanied the apparent metamorphosis of the bloodthirsty son<sup>2</sup> of a renowned father into an august and

<sup>1</sup> E. Vereecke, 'Le corpus des Panégyriques latins de l'époque tardive: problèmes d'imitation', *L'Ant. classique* 44 (1975), 141–57, should be consulted for a synopsis of earlier scholarship and the drawbacks of its methodology. R. Seager, 'Some Imperial Virtues in the Latin Prose Panegyrics. The Demands of Propaganda and the Dynamics of Literary Composition', *Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar* 4, 1983 (1984), 129–65, deploring the neglect of the *Panegyrici Latini*, considers the often contradictory demands of political reality and the literary concerns of themes essential to the genre. G. Sabbah, 'De la rhétorique à la communication politique: les Panégyriques latins', *Bulletin de l'Association G. Budé* (1984), 363–88, similarly complains of the lack of multi-faceted inquiries, especially the failure of the modern investigator to unite the rhetorician and political adept in each orator. There are exceptions. Among the 'ancients', René Pichon, *Les derniers écrivains profanes* (Paris, 1906), is still worth reading. Almost everyone agrees that Edouard Galletier's introductions and notes to the Budé edition (*Les panégyriques latins* [Paris, 1949, 1952, 1955]) are exceptionally valuable, and that Sabine MacCormack has taken the *Panegyrici* out of an artificial vacuum and reunited them with political, social, and artistic reality in specific past time. See her *Art and Ceremony in Late Antiquity* (Berkeley, 1981) and works cited in the bibliography thereto. N. Baglivi, 'Paneg. IX(12),26,5: attualità ideologica e problemi interpretativi', *Orpheus* 5 (1984), 32–67, discusses the peroration of the panegyric of 313 with reference to ideological themes in other panegyrics of Constantine.

<sup>2</sup> Two qualities which I do not discuss are violence and clemency. To kill only in battle had been accounted a virtue at least since Caesar first exercised his clemency (cf. Cicero, *Marc.* 17), and when the young Caesar was found to be capable of ordering execution in cold blood disapproval exaggerated his victims' numbers. In later years he discovered that authority rendered mercy safer: R. Syme, *The Roman Revolution* (Oxford, 1939), p. 2, observes that there was but a perceived transformation of Octavian into Augustus. A panegyrist explained that conflicting capacities somehow existed simultaneously in Constantine and manifested themselves according to circumstance (*Pan. Lat.* 12[9].10.5). Foreigners, however, did not receive the consideration reserved for citizens: two orators praised Constantine both for squandering many German lives in the games and for being unable to harm a Roman who had surrendered (*Pan. Lat.* 6[7].12.3 & 14.4, 20.1; 12[9].20.4 & 23.3). Further, in Nazarius' panegyric the emperor

fatherly emperor who left his famous parent by the way as he outgrew his need for him. The third factor is inseparable from the first two: Constantine resembles Augustus in so many ways that one wonders whether the late Roman emperor made a study of that most politically astute of his predecessors.<sup>3</sup>

It is true that not every facet of every ruler's public image need be modelled consciously upon what a predecessor found useful or what a poet or an historian said about him. There are universal appeals, some of them so timeworn that even a category as broad as 'handbook material' is too narrow for them. An example is the claim that one has overthrown a tyrant or the tyranny of a faction, under the basic formula *rem publicam in libertatem vindicare*. Even in Republican times the claim neither meant what it said nor belonged to the morally superior.<sup>4</sup> It was a winner's justification for winning, usually with violence. When Constantine liberated Rome, therefore, and restored freedom and the republic, he cannot be said to have imitated what his illustrious predecessor claimed in his *Res Gestae* (1.1: 'rem publicam a dominatione factionis oppressam in libertatem vindicavi').

One may try to argue a case of *imitatio Augusti* either subjectively or objectively. The former is the more difficult, as it is impossible to prove that Constantine himself deliberately used Augustus' life as a guidebook through his own, though evocations of Augustus, not to mention Trajan, may be found and noted.<sup>5</sup> More susceptible of proof is the intent of certain literary figures to clothe Constantine's ambitions in appropriate costume. The numerous rules of panegyric change with the times, but two invariable precepts are that one must not lie in public about matters of fact and that one may employ any interpretation of policy and person which will not displease the ruler. Further, that the genre had an established form was useful to its practitioners, but utility had sometimes to give way to necessity. The form which could no longer accommodate Constantine had to change.

welcomes combat in the darkness which gives his mercy no occasion to operate (*Pan. Lat.* 4[10].23.3-4), yet those whom Constantine was eager to slaughter at Verona were Roman citizens. One must appreciate the conflict of encomiastic interests.

Praise for valour on the battlefield belongs to the genre. In extant Latin panegyric only Constantine hears himself honoured for sending countless human beings to the beasts. That both Octavian and the younger Constantine could have the unarmed killed is an interesting coincidence but neither the fact nor even the praise for it can be proven to be imitation. Clemency was another matter. Despite its being the most excellent of imperial virtues, not every emperor preferred praise to retaliation. After the taking of Rome, Constantine's *benignitas* and *clementia* were conspicuous (*Pan. Lat.* 4[10].33.2). He had done better than Octavian.

<sup>3</sup> Syme (n. 2), pp. 53-4, 317-18, presents the opinion that Augustus respected only those aspects of Caesar which he found useful: once established, Augustus found it desirable to be *divi filius* but not to be associated with the Dictator and his actions.

<sup>4</sup> For a brief and cogent history of the phrase and its variants as a political slogan, see Ch. Wirzubski, *Libertas as a Political Idea at Rome during the Late Republic and Early Principate* (Cambridge, 1950), pp. 103-6.

<sup>5</sup> For Augustus, see, e.g. R. Delbrueck, *Spätantike Kaiserporträts von Constantinus Magnus bis zum Ende des Westreichs* (Berlin, 1933), pp. 11-12, 36-7; D. H. Wright, 'Style in the Visual Arts as Material for Social Research', *Social Research* 45 (1978), 141-8; B. Saylor Rodgers, 'Constantine's Pagan Vision', *Byzantion* 50 (1980), 259-78; and below. For Trajan, see M. R. Alföldi's chapter 'Das trajanische Bild Constantins', in *Die constantinische Goldprägung* (Mainz, 1963), pp. 57-69. Alföldi's argument for Trajan would be better without the section where she argues against Augustus (and R. Delbrueck, who does not entirely ignore the Trajanic model), primarily on the evidence of Julian's *Caesars*. Augustus the chameleon (*Caes.* 309a-c) does not come off so well as Alföldi claims, nor Trajan so badly, since the gods agree that he surpasses the other rulers in clemency (*παρότρως*) (327a-328b), which they found especially pleasing. This concession ill suits the argument that Julian blackened the best of emperors on his hated uncle's account.

Menander Rhetor has given the standard sequence of topics for a *basilikos logos*, which I reproduce here as a control:<sup>6</sup>

- (1) Exordium: amplification of topic, comparisons, aporia
- (2) Antecedents:
  - a. Fatherland (only if it is remarkable for something).
  - b. Family (only if it is distinguished, otherwise ignore or claim divine ancestry: some of the Latin panegyrists have added divinity even to a distinguished family).
  - c. Birth, nature and upbringing; comparisons with gods and heroes.
- (3) Occupations,<sup>7</sup> character.
- (4) Deeds:
  - a. War [courage]: traps and ambushes (the king's and his opponents'); descriptions of battles, especially if the king fights in person; his appearance in armour.
  - b. Peace [wisdom, temperance, justice]: government, subjects' happiness.
- (5) Fortune. Wholesale comparisons.
- (6) Peroration: prosperity, dynastic sentiments, prayers.

*Pan. Lat.* 7(6). The earliest panegyric addressed to Constantine, *Pan. Lat.* 7(6) of 307, follows this pattern, although one must allow for there being two emperors who need different sorts of praise, and for the oration's being an epithalamium in occasion but not in form. That is, the encomia of the principals (viz. the groom and the father-in-law) fill the body of the speech; the orator inserts certain civil and utilitarian, but none of the ribald, elements traditional to the genre in the exordium and peroration. Dynastic sentiments are appropriate to alliances between rulers, and the orator duly rewrites the Herculean scenario with a convenient scarcity of actors. While only one out of four earlier panegyrists had dared to hint at dynastic possibilities – and that a mention of the young Maxentius back in 289 (*Pan. Lat.* 10[2].14.1–2) – this panegyrist proclaims a new dynasty in a world where Maxentius may or may not exist. Although the orator apparently ignores the young usurper at Rome, he could defend himself against the charge on the evidence of Section 2.2 (cf. Section 2.5):

suscipiendis liberis optandisque nepotibus seriem vestri generis prorogando omnibus in futurum saeculis providetis, ut Romana res olim diversis regentium moribus fatisque iactata tandem perpetuis domus vestrae radicibus convalescat, tamque sit immortale illius imperium quam sempiterna suboles imperatorum.

Under the circumstances and with Maximian in the audience there is no other way to proceed, yet there is also room for a more natural interpretation of dynastic succession: Constantius himself gave *imperium* to his own son, whose precocious maturity prompted him to prefer to be called Caesar and to earn rather than to inherit the title Augustus.<sup>8</sup> It is difficult for the orator to disguise his interest in Constantius. Justification for saying so much about the late ruler comes from the unacknowledged apologetic argument, that Constantine is Constantius' first child, the product of his youth and vigour, a closer likeness and therefore a more fitting heir than his three

<sup>6</sup> From the second treatise, 368.3–377.30, happily available in the edition of D. A. Russell and N. G. Wilson (Oxford, 1981). For Vereecke's objections to using Greek models for Latin texts, see below n. 29.

<sup>7</sup> Russell and Wilson translate *ἐπιτηδεύματα* 'accomplishments', which I personally find confusing as it is the English word which I use to render *res gestae*.

<sup>8</sup> Section 5.3. Although Constantine was over thirty in 306, he preferred to be described as a very young man. One should beware of being deceived by his insistence: see T. D. Barnes, *The New Empire of Diocletian and Constantine* (Cambridge, MA, 1982), pp. 39–42.

half-brothers. (Not that the other part of the comparison is ever voiced.<sup>9</sup>) The primogenital rationale recurs but once, in 310. Here, in 307, it serves everyone's purpose, including the orator's:

divi, inquam, Constantii filium, in quem se prima illius iuventa transfudit, in cuius ore caelestes illius vultus Natura signavit, qui adspectum illius ad deorum concilia translati adhuc desiderantibus nobis sufficit pro duobus!<sup>10</sup>

Constantine's *res gestae* receive no more extensive coverage than his father's, although as son he occupies the traditional final half of each portion of the comparison, best by position.<sup>11</sup> He himself is said to represent his justice and *pietas* as his father's legacy, and to be gratified to hear fairness and generosity claimed as proof of paternity (Section 5.1). Constantine receives no praise as an individual, but always in comparison with or reference to Constantius or Maximian. Indeed, the orator culminates his effusive reminiscences by addressing the prayer with which he closes the oration not to either living ruler nor to the gods, but to the divine Constantius, whose immortality, peculiar to him alone, is visible in his son's person (Section 14.3–7).

Were the panegyric an isolated piece of evidence it would be easy to explain away the prominence given a dead person as nothing more than political realism. Civil war lurked in the future, Maximian and Constantine were both usurpers, Constantine's legalized position as Caesar was being threatened by his promotion, and Maximian may have been out of office for three years but was presumably an authoritative figure in Gaul.<sup>12</sup> The older emperor, to whom half the panegyric is directed, was better known but less legitimate, while the younger was nearly untried, although he had begun to get himself a military reputation. The connection with Constantius, who was genuinely popular in Gaul, conferred a stability on the situation which neither living man could offer. But there is more. The orator clearly welcomed an opportunity to praise the dead man. Constantius was remembered favourably for a long time after he died in 306. Eutropius' brief and pragmatic encomium on his reign illustrates both the lasting good impression which Constantius left of himself and some reasons for it:

Constantius tamen contentus dignitate Augusti Italiae atque Africae administrandae sollicitudinem recusavit, vir egregius et praestantissimae civilitatis, divitiis provincialium ac privatorum studens, fisci commoda non admodum adfectans, dicensque melius publicas opes a privatis haberi quam intra unum claustrum reservari, adeo autem cultus modici, ut festis diebus, si amicis numerosioribus esset epulandum, privatorum ei argento ostiatim petito triclinia sternerentur. Hic non modo amabilis, sed etiam venerabilis Gallis fuit, praecipue quod

<sup>9</sup> The children were in any case too young to rule on their own and at some time were subject to a kind of exile in Toulouse: Ausonius, *Prof.* 16.9–12.

<sup>10</sup> Section 3.3; cf. 14.4: *talem hunc filium tuum, qui te primus patrem fecit.*

<sup>11</sup> Section 4.2–3; the sections on Britain and barbarians other than Franks are especially weak. Constantius had thirteen years against Constantine's one. Seager (n. 1), 143 remarks upon the noteworthy distinction between the *venia* associated with Constantius' *victoria* and the *terror* which Constantine inspires but which robs him of opportunities for victory. Constantius' *venia* is significant, but Constantine's *terror* is the commonplace refuge taken by those who have nothing to praise.

<sup>12</sup> The best evidence that he continued to have some power is that Constantine accepted an alliance and promotion in rank from him. Some would claim that Maximian was much more influential, even in Gaul, not only in 307 but when he tried to take control in 310. For the strongest argument, see B. H. Warmington, 'Aspects of Constantinian Propaganda in the Panegyrici Latini', *TAPA* 104 (1974), 371–7. Cf. A. Piganiol, *L'Empereur Constantin* (Paris, 1932), pp. 47–8. For a balanced and relatively recent narrative, see T. D. Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius* (Cambridge, MA, 1981), pp. 34–6.

Diocletiani suspectam prudentiam et Maximiani sanguinariam temeritatem imperio eius evaserant. (10.2–3)

Constantius' tenure in Gaul was a happy one, and his qualities fulfilled the principal hopes that his subjects cherished of their ruler: military ability, good-natured kindness, generosity, and no inclination to settle elsewhere.<sup>13</sup> Thus Constantius serves not only as means but as an end: he can be used both to legitimate the living Herculians and as a role-model for his oldest son.

Although the orator has alluded clearly to several sources of embarrassment, he never openly admits what he does not wish to discuss. Thus he says that Constantine is the first and best son, but not that he has brothers. He mentions Constantine's satisfaction with the title Caesar, but does not say who gave it to him. He recognizes Maximian's precarious situation,<sup>14</sup> but does not reveal the source of the storms which may be building up far away.<sup>15</sup> The common element of the conspicuous omissions is the absence of colleagues. The Tetrarchic system had required that an etiquette of harmonious accord be observed. It must have been well done, for there are echoes in contemporary and later literature.<sup>16</sup> To abandon the imperial college needed an apology, and some years before the panegyrist of Constantius had had one ready: brevity was essential, *Caesare stante dum loquimur* (*Pan. Lat.* 8[5].4.4), a ruler's deeds are better praised in his presence (8[5].5.1–3), and everyone prefers to hear about things which affect himself (8[5].5.4).

The author of the epithalamium must have decided wisely that any sort of recognition of colleagues was more embarrassing than none at all, and would conflict, moreover, with the dynastic theme as he presented it. There was no room there for Jovians. Galerius and his colleague(s) were far away and either uninteresting or threatening, and Constantine's unmentioned brother-in-law at Rome was Galerius' son-in-law. There were offspring, too. Clearly, it was best to say nothing.

*Pan. Lat.* 6(7). In contrast, the panegyrist of 310 is politely correct. After the obligatory invocation of brevity (*Pan. Lat.* 6[7].1.3), the orator pronounces the Tetrarchic catechism, present reality intruding:

cum omnes vos, invictissimi principes, quorum concors est et socia maiestas, debita veneratione suspiciam, hunc tamen quantulumcumque tuo modo, Constantine, numini dicabo sermonem. ut enim ipsos immortales deos, quamquam universos animo colamus, interdum tamen in suo quemque templo ac sede veneramur, ita mihi fas esse duco omnium principum pietate meminisse, laudibus celebrare praesentem. (Section 1.4–5)

This disclaimer notwithstanding, the colleagues do not disappear immediately. It would be pointless for Constantine to develop a distinguished new lineage without having someone to be better than (Sections 2.1–4.1). The question of whether or not

<sup>13</sup> Eusebius, *VC* 1.14 says that there are many stories about Constantius which illustrate his good qualities, and as an example he relates the incident of Constantius' empty treasury and his method of freeing himself from his senior colleagues' criticism.

<sup>14</sup> But not Maxentius'. At Section 12.3 the orator compares Maximian to Apollo [Helios] taking back the reins wrongly entrusted [to Phaethon]. The incompetent *rector* is not named. Although it is rather early to look for criticism of Maxentius, the myth fits too well to be dismissed as coincidence. It is possible that Maximian would not have noticed and probable that Constantine (and Maximian as well) would not have minded.

<sup>15</sup> Section 12.7–8: 'statim igitur ut praecipitantem rem publicam refrenasti et gubernacula fluitantia recepisti, omnibus spes salutis inluxit. Posuere venti, fugere nubes, fluctus resederunt, et sicubi adhuc in longinquiorebus terris aliqua obversatur obscuritas aut residuus undarum pulsus immurmurat, necesse est tamen ad tuos nutus diluescat et sileat'. One may understand that Galerius and associates had not acquiesced.

<sup>16</sup> Lactantius, *Mort.* 8.1; Julian, *Caes.* 315a–b, *Or.* I 7a–b; Aurelius Victor, *Caes.* 39.28–9; Orosius, *Adv. pag.* 7.26.5–6.

Claudius II was actually related to Constantine was settled in the negative long ago and need detain no one.<sup>17</sup> The idea itself, of course, is clever as well as traditional: the princeps is *primus inter pares* with emperors, not senators, now the ostensible equals. In Section 3.1 the orator reverses the *promeritum* theory of 307 (cf. *Pan. Lat.* 7[6].5.3). Constantine, one must know, was deserving on account of both birth and abilities (Section 3.3), yet birth, being his claim alone, was the greater distinction.

The panegyrist's frank prejudice is mildly shocking, although safe enough, but soon he returns to a mode with which the reader feels more familiar. It is the brothers' turn to be made aware of their inferiority: the oldest son is not only still the best, he is more emphatically the best than he was three years before (Section 4.2–6), while his half-brothers are again invisible opponents. Yet this magical power of Constantius' youth to produce a virtual clone of the parent serves not only to keep the brothers in their places. The orator says that he misses Constantius and that Constantine, his father's double, is the only suitable replacement for him (Section 4.5–6). He presents, moreover, such detailed *res gestae* for the honorand's father (Sections 5.1–7.2) that historians have reason to be grateful. This panegyrist, alone among those practising the genre, equates *divus* and *deus* (*tantus ille et imperator in terris et in caelo deus*: Section 4.2): high praise for a dead emperor. The excess may belong to his peculiar notion of rulership. He calls Claudius II a *numen* (Section 2.1) and Constantine a *deus* (Section 22.1; cf. 9.4–5 and 17.4). He is one of three speakers to use the latter term of a living person.<sup>18</sup>

The rest of the panegyric falls into the usual pattern as neatly as the first part. The orator describes Constantine's election, by army and gods, complete with *recusatio* and revelation of divinity (Sections 8.1–9.5). There follow military and other accomplishments, comparisons, and at last the traps and ambushes of the enemy, this being the extended narrative of Maximian's second usurpation. Other elements are interspersed, indispensable ingredients of Constantinian panegyric: there is a prominent place for the emperor's extreme youth and eximious beauty (Section 17.1–4).<sup>19</sup> Not only do these same physical attributes appear in some mode in every

<sup>17</sup> The frequent allusions in the *Historia Augusta* are worthless. Pichon (n. 1), 93–6, gave an excellent reason decades ago for rejecting the claim: the evidence, even on inscriptions, is contradictory. Some inscriptions (e.g. *CIL* 9.9: *abnepos*, with Eutropius 9.22.1) contradict others (*CIL* 2.48.44; 3.3705); the *Historia Augusta* (e.g. *Claud.* 25.13.2) has yet a third affiliation. Julian *Or.* 1.6d (cf. *Caes.* 131d) does not say what the relationship was. The panegyrist uses the vague expression *avita cognatio* and leaves the specifics to others. See also R. Syme, *Historia Augusta Papers* (1983), pp. 63–79 (= *Bonner Historia Augusta Colloquium* 1971 [1974], 237ff.). On the other side of the question, A. Lippold, 'Constantius Caesar, Sieger über die Germanen – Nachfahre des Claudius Gothicus?', *Chiron* 11 (1981), 347–69 (especially 357–69), discusses the possibility that a life of Claudius was written between 297 and 305 and dedicated to Constantius, and that this biography was later incorporated into the *Historia Augusta*. It is an intriguing possibility that the propaganda has such an early date, but Lippold's arguments are not irrefutable. He does not cite Syme. I have difficulty with the theory because of (1) the contradictions of the evidence, (2) the orator's introduction of the information (if very few knew about it, Constantius must have suppressed publication of the life to maintain his standing as a good Tetrarch with no extra pretensions), (3) an awareness that borrowing can go two ways.

<sup>18</sup> The other two instances are at *Pan. Lat.* 10(2).2.1 and 2(12).4.5. For recent discussion of the ruler-cult in this oration, see B. Saylor Rodgers, 'Divine Insinuation in the *Panegyrici Latini*', *Historia* 35 (1986), 83–5; there is no mention given there to the word *deus* used of Constantius, and no category *deus* in the Appendix.

<sup>19</sup> These are also essential elements of Constantine's early coin portraiture: see Wright (n. 5), 141–8; G. G. Belloni, 'La bellezza divinizzante nei Panegirici e nei retratti monetali di Costantino', *CISA* 7 (1981), 213–22.

panegyric of Constantine save the *gratiarum actio* of 311,<sup>20</sup> but they are essential to the image of the beautiful young creature who will, according to the *vates*, rule the whole world. The vision of Apollo (Section 21.4–6) is the single best device found in any panegyric for arguing divine election.<sup>21</sup>

Here Constantine is a new Augustus, the prophecy of whose coming may be found at *Aeneid* 6.791ff., beginning *hic vir, hic est, tibi quem promitti saepius audis, / Augustus Caesar, divi genus, aurea condet saecula*. Augustus once fostered a connection with Apollo;<sup>22</sup> Constantine's vision of Apollo is part of the same scheme. Constantine should not be confused with the god any more than Augustus was: i.e. somewhat. Emperor and god are somehow akin yet clearly distinct. The nature of a colour may more easily be expounded than this theology, which adds the quality of a colour to the image of a ruler, yet cannot be separated or quantified.

Apollo rules on earth no more than Jupiter or any other traditional god; mundane government is for the emperor, whose quasi-divine status may be ambiguous but clearly has much to do with humankind and the mortality of a human frame. One may find the principle of spheres of rulership enunciated in Augustus' time by both Horace (*C.* 1.12.51–8, 3.5.1–4) and Ovid (*Met.* 15.858–60). The operative portion of the panegyrist's vision contains the assertion that Constantine has been foretold as the ruler of the whole world. Those unequal colleagues from the oration's beginning are either forgotten or threatened; the monarchy has no place for them. Whether Constantine be Augustus, Apollo, or some combination thereof, he is no longer a Tetrarch, and his fate is foretold in Virgilian terms.

*Pan. Lat.* 5(8). The *gratiarum actio* addressed to Constantine in the following year (*Pan. Lat.* 5[8]) removes itself by its topic from the presentation of familiar themes. The orator has travelled to Trier to thank the emperor for a personal visit to Autun which was culminated with both a remission of arrears on taxes and a reduction of the city's future liabilities. The celebration is of civic virtues, humanity and generosity. There are a number of elements missing, the absence of which cannot be attributed to preference any more than to the demand of the genre and theme. Constantine has no antecedent section, although there is one for the city, as in a *laus urbis*.<sup>23</sup> It is not therefore strange that there seem not to be any imperial colleagues, although one may suspect deliberate omission from the one Section (4.4) where the orator speaks of Constantius:

ob haec igitur merita et <recentia et> prisca divus pater tuus civitatem Aeduorum voluit iacentem erigere perditamque recreare, ... ut esset illa civitas provinciarum velut una mater, quae reliquas urbes quodammodo Romanas prima fecisset.

The intent is to put the son under the obligation to fulfil his father's intentions; the method is to make the aim of restoring Autun and the work already accomplished

<sup>20</sup> Cf. *Pan. Lat.* 7(6).6.2. In 321, after nearly half a century of life and fifteen years as emperor, with a grown-up son, Constantine could no longer pretend to be little more than a teenager, yet Nazarius dusts off the myth as part of his retrospection to the emperor's earliest accomplishments (*Pan. Lat.* 4[10].16.4–6, beginning 'tu, imperator optime, inito principatu, adhuc aevi immaturus sed iam maturus imperio').

<sup>21</sup> For bibliography and discussion of the vision as a political statement connected with a reminder of the emperor Augustus, see Rodgers (n. 5), 270–7. In what follows, I borrow from this the references and some of the argument. See also Baglivi (n. 1), 24–5 on the content of the vision. For Belloni (n. 19), 217 (cf. 215) the vision is meant to equate ruler and Apollo.

<sup>22</sup> See Rodgers (n. 5), 271 with n. 23.

<sup>23</sup> Menander Rhetor, the first treatise 353.5ff. Although this oration fits exactly no category found in either treatise, it has much in common with the *presbeutikos* (423.7–424.32), the case being argued after the event.

belong to Constantius alone. This may well have been true, but it is not what Eumenius had said when there was a Tetrarchy (*Pan. Lat.* 9[4] *passim*). The panegyrist also speaks of Claudius II (Section 4.2–3). Among the cities of Gaul, north of Aquitania anyhow, Autun suddenly had a unique claim on Constantine's proper feelings: when Claudius II was emperor, the city had declared for him and invited him to regain Gaul. Claudius was busy battling Goths and could not come when the city shut its gates against the pretender. After a seven months' siege the city of Autun was sacked by the usurper's army and what was left of it was made to rejoin the Imperium Galliarum.<sup>24</sup> I wonder whether it was a citizen of Autun who first suggested to Constantine that Claudius Gothicus, rather than some other, would be suitable for adoption.

There is one section where the orator mentions other princes; these may be taken as then living, or they may be 'Roman emperors as a rule' (no one specific intended), fitting in with the generalizing present tense. The inhabitants of Autun are said to wish that Constantine outlive them all (Section 8.1), a desire explained thus:

quod enim ad propagandos <annos> aliorum principum sollemni verborum more iuratur, tibi, Constantine, soli ultra omnium nostrum fata victuro securi vovemus, cui tam longa aetas propria debetur. (Section 8.2)

Since Constantine is so much more deserving of an expanded lifetime the identity of the other princes is immaterial. It is worth noting one source of this formula for wishing the emperor a long life. Ovid had once made the same prayer: *tarda sit illa dies et nostro senior aevo, / qua caput Augustum, quem temperat, orbe relicto / accedat caelo faveatque precantibus absens!* (*Met.* 15.868–70).<sup>25</sup>

Of course, Augustus had for decades been enjoying the admirable and enviable position of sole ruler. Ovid's imitator envisaged his emperor in the same state (*imperatorem totius orbis*: Section 9.3). When he finishes off his thanksgiving, the orator requests a return visit, perhaps even a taking up of residence (Section 14.4): Autun has changed its name to Flavia in anticipation, to make the city uniquely Constantine's own.<sup>26</sup> Otherwise the emperor's choice would presumably be harder, since he is master of all cities and all nations (Section 14.5). Plainly, the omission of colleagues is deliberate.

*Pan. Lat.* 12(9). The panegyrist of 313 discovers another way to dispose of awkward partners. He mentions them early on with no particular respect and later silently assigns them the fate reserved for incompetents, to cease to exist. The orator also disregards other topics. The arguments against the absent half-brothers disappear, as they need no longer be bettered. One section after another of a traditional *basilikos logos* disappears too. Constantine required no introduction and welcomed neither the recommendation of his family nor the reminder that the Gauls missed Constantius. Coins tell the same story: Constantius did not appear on them after about this time excepting one issue which he shares with the divi Claudius and Maximian when Constantine first went to war against Licinius.<sup>27</sup>

<sup>24</sup> Section 4.2–3 contains the narrative. For a recent modern reconstruction with a survey of the evidence and bibliography see I. König, *Die gallischen Usurpatoren von Postumus bis Tetricus* (Munich, 1981), 148–57.

<sup>25</sup> For a different emphasis, see Cicero *Mil.* 16.

<sup>26</sup> C. Jullian, *Histoire de la Gaule* (Paris 1926, repr. Brussels 1964) 7.92 with n. 3, theorizes that the renaming may rather have been done earlier in Constantius' honour.

<sup>27</sup> See *RIC* 7: Constantius appears on no coin later than 317/318. Note that he does not appear for the second conflict with Licinius. Nazarius mentions him only as the leader of the heavenly army (see below). Maximian puts in an appearance in this oration but not in Nazarius'.



One cannot fault the panegyrist's teachers for failure to teach him proper form.<sup>28</sup> His exordium is entirely correct, his oration from the deeds to the peroration proceeds in an orderly fashion from one topic to the next exactly as the Greek source recommends.<sup>29</sup> But the orator heads straight from the exordium to the subject announced there (*Pan. Lat.* 12[9].1.3), by-passing the usual circuitous route. What normally comprised the first several parts of the body of the speech – where the king came from, who he is and what he is like – is not there. The emperor's youth is among the casualties, with his career prior to 312 and the image of him leaping, as it were, from cradle to throne. But the orator does not sacrifice the value of beauty, which both recommends for its own sake (Sections 4.3, 19.6) and adorns the emperor's moral rectitude (Section 7.5).

There is even a place for Constantius, who has been put into a rhetorician's handbook, whence the orator releases him for brief appearances along with the likes of Alexander, Julius Caesar, Fabius Maximus and other figures from remote antiquity. He is said to have died long before the date of the speech (Section 25.1). In the comparison between Constantine and Maxentius Constantius appears once by name (*erat ille Maximiani suppositus tu Constantii Pii filius*: Section 4.3),<sup>30</sup> twice in an adjective (*paterna gravitas* and *pietas*: Sections 4.1, 4.4). He reappears near the end as an exemplum, inadequate but the best that the orator could find (Sections 24.4–25.3). In this panegyric his *res gestae* are as nothing compared to his son's, although the orator must cheat on the recovery of Britain, and he asks Constantius' forgiveness, not for the cheating but for the conclusion drawn from it:

purgavit ille Bataviam advena hoste depulso, tibi se ex ultima barbaria indigenae populi dedidere. Ille Oceanum classe transmisit, tu et Alpes gradu et classibus portus Italicos occupasti. recuperavit ille Britanniam, tu nobilissimas Africi maris insulas, quae populi Romani fuere provinciae. ignoscat, inquam, divus ipse Constantius: quid habeo quod comparem Italiae Africae Romae? (Section 25.2–3)

The proud father is said not to mind, especially since his son's accomplishments enhance his heavenly status.

The orator finds another inadequate model in Augustus, who comes off even worse than Constantius (Section 10.1: *Augustus aliud agens vicit apud Actium*). Disparagement of Augustus' role at Actium had become for some reason a rhetorical commonplace; there are two other instances of the same theme in the *Panegyrici Latini*.<sup>31</sup> Yet the first emperor may be more subtly applied: an Augustan model can be used to illuminate Constantius' sudden lack of prominence.

<sup>28</sup> He might, however, have exercised more restraint in his employment of rhetorical devices. *Inter alia*, he overuses apostrophe. See Galletier II.118–19.

<sup>29</sup> Vereecke (n. 1), 144–51 objects to the judging of Latin rhetoric by Greek handbooks, as if the western practitioners actually had Menander Rhetor or his like, in Greek, and no other, before them. Yet one cannot dismiss the likeness between the Greek *basilikos logos* of Menander Rhetor and most of the *Panegyrici Latini*. The form books, like grammar books, were compiled from practice and influenced by the products as much as they influenced them.

<sup>30</sup> Cf. Sections 4.4 and 3.4, where there is the same claim of bastardy.

<sup>31</sup> *Pan. Lat.* 7(6).13.4 ('si pro divo Augusto Actiacam victoriam tantummodo gener Agrippa confecit') and 2(12).33.3, in a long passage comparing the battle of Actium to Theodosius' march on Italy in 389 ('non contendam duces – nec enim principem nostrum non dicam victus Antonius, sed victor Augustus aequaverit'). Alföldi (n. 5), pp. 60–1 cites the passage about Actium in Panegyric 12 as evidence that Constantine would not wish to be identified with Augustus. Use of what is clearly a handbook *exemplum* cannot be made to demonstrate something so specific.

It may be overly subtle to observe a silent indication that Constantine would do what Augustus had done. At Section 21.5 the panegyrist predicts that Constantine will extend the empire from

The young Octavian would have had no opportunity even to try to attain influence in public affairs had he not been Caesar's heir.<sup>32</sup> The name and the avenging were at first both means and end. After he had obtained the army and had fought the wars, Octavian began to make himself different from his adoptive father when he had become wiser or sought a way to be safer. Political and physical survival depended on the compromise of sharing and the use of fair names. Even in his old age, however, he could not avoid hearing about his father, although he did not need to be reminded that Caesar had been a revolutionary.

Ovid put Caesar into the *Metamorphoses* as the ultimate transformation in more than one sense: now a god, he was no longer so concerned with his *dignitas* that he minded being outdone. For students of Ovid, the question of poetic intent, malicious or otherwise, is critical, and far from settled.<sup>33</sup> But the use of Ovid in the third and fourth centuries A.D. is another matter. The rhetoricians who consulted the Augustan poets found all manner of praise and example useful; trustworthiness or the genuineness of their emotions would not come into question. Ovid's Caesar has become a foreign conqueror with the domestic battles that could not be so disguised forgotten;<sup>34</sup> his greatest achievement, however, was having become Augustus' father.<sup>35</sup> It was to this that he owed his divinity;

Caesar in urbe sua deus est; quem Marte togaque  
praecipuum non bella magis finita triumphis  
resque domi gestae properataque gloria rerum  
in sidus vertere novum stellamque comantem,  
quam sua progenies; neque enim de Caesaris actis  
ullum maius opus, quam quod pater exstitit huius:  
scilicet aequoreos plus est domuisse Britannos  
perque papyriferi septemflua flumina Nili  
victrices egisse rates Numidasque rebelles  
Cinyphiumque Iubam Mithridateisque tumentem  
nominibus Pontum populo adiecisse Quirini  
et multos meruisse, aliquos egisse triumphos,  
quam tantum genuisse virum, quo praeside rerum  
humano generi, superi, favistis abunde!

Tuscan Albula (Virgil, *Aen.* 8.332) to German Alba (Elbe: see J. Straub, 'Alba = Elbe oder Alb?', in *Regeneratio Imperii* [Darmstadt, 1972], pp. 425–6): cf. Suetonius, *Aug.* 21.2. This orator, incidentally, is fond of allusions to and echoes of Virgil, the more the nearer he approaches Rome: at Sections 4.2 (*Aen.* 9.185), 12.3 (*G.* 1.508), 17.3 (*Aen.* 8.538–40), 18.1 (*Aen.* 8.31–65), 21.5 (above), 24.2 (*Aen.* 1.33), 26.1 (*Aen.* 6.724ff.).

<sup>32</sup> Cicero, *Phil.* 13.24, quoting Antonius to Octavian, 'Qui omnia nomini debes', cited by Syme (n. 2), 113.

<sup>33</sup> There is an enormous literature on the subject of Ovid's intentions and the extent to which the use of Caesar in the *Metamorphoses* is meant as insult or parody. For a smattering of scholarly opinions from the past two decades, see G. K. Galinsky, 'The Cipus Episode in Ovid's *Metamorphoses* (15.565–621)', *TAPA* 98 (1967), 181–91 and *Ovid's Metamorphoses* (Berkeley, 1975), pp. 259–60; C. P. Segal, 'Myth and Philosophy in the *Metamorphoses*. Ovid's Augustanism and the Augustan Conclusio of Book XV', *AJP* 90 (1969), 257–92; C. Moulton, 'Ovid as Anti-Augustan: *Met.* 15.843–879', *CW* 67 (1973), 4–7; D. A. Little, 'Ovid's Eulogy of Augustus. *Metamorphoses* 15.851–70', *Prudentia* 8 (1976), 19–35, and bibliography in 'Politics in Augustan Poetry', *ANRW* 2.30:1 (1982), 368–70; R. Syme, *History in Ovid* (Oxford, 1978), pp. 190–1; S. Lundström, *Ovids Metamorphosen und die Politik des Kaisers* (Uppsala, 1980), pp. 90–104. Consultation of any of these titles, especially the more recent ones, will reveal further bibliography.

<sup>34</sup> So the passage appears at first blush to the assiduous reader of encomiastic orations. Lundström (n. 33) 93–6 has entertaining analyses of the humorous intent of Ovid's descriptions of these campaigns.

<sup>35</sup> See Lundström 97–9 on the topics of, *inter alia*, adoption, begetting, and Caesarion.

ne foret hic igitur mortali semine cretus,  
ille deus faciendus erat.

(*Met.* 15.746–61)

The panegyrist of 313, who alludes in one place to the *Metamorphoses* in their entirety (Section 13.5), makes a fair likeness, *mutatis mutandis*, of Ovid's original. It is cited above (Section 25.2–3). The Augustan poet and Constantinian orator also try to make amends for their rulers' presumably outraged piety by insisting that the parent is not insulted but pleased:

stella micat natique videns bene facta fatetur  
esse suis maiora et vinci gaudet ab illo.  
hic sua praeferri quamquam vetat acta paternis,  
libera fama tamen nullisque obnoxia iussis  
invitum praeferet unaque in parte repugnat.

(*Met.* 15.850–4)

invitus hoc forte accipis, imperator, sed ille dum dicimus gaudet e caelo, et iam pridem vocatus ad sidera adhuc crescit in filio et gloriarum tuarum gradibus adscendit. (Section 25.1)

It is hard to believe that the orator did not have Ovid before him as he composed, although to be fair one must admit that many an earlier speaker must have consulted the same passage, excerpted or in situ, when about to face an emperor's son.<sup>36</sup>

Ridding oneself of colleagues, on the other hand, is easier than shedding paternity, although in this oration the price turns out to be an admission of aggression and temerity, admirable though the latter quality be:

tene, imperator, tantum animo potuisse praesumere, ut bellum tantis opibus, tanto consensu avaritiae, tanta scelerum contagione, tanta veniae desperatione conflatum quiescentibus cunctantibusque tunc imperii tui socii primus invaderes! (Section 2.3)

The Tetrarchic system makes a number of unsuccessful rivals available for comparison, and if they are dead this panegyrist will even name them.<sup>37</sup> The living colleagues whom he does not name may be assumed, first, to belong in the same category as unmentionable opponents, and, second, to be those who have effete oriental armies whom it is no distinction to defeat (Section 24.1). To continue the Augustan analogy, if Licinius has defeated Maximinus it was merely a victory of one Antonius over another.<sup>38</sup>

After the long narrative of Constantine's successful invasion of Italy, capped by a campaign against the Franks on his return to Gaul, the orator commences the peroration. He ignores Constantine's stopover in Milan and its purpose, but it goes beyond the demands of duty actually to lie. The panegyrist stays just this side of deliberate falsification when he implies that Constantine marched straight from Rome to the Rhine (Section 21.5 with 22.1–3). Unsuccessful colleagues, living or dead, are long forgotten by this time, their failure to defeat Maxentius having consigned them to a place where memory will never find them again, despite Licinius' marriage to Constantine's sister. What a disquisition on concord was lost in that. Constantine and his offspring both existent and expected are sufficient for the orator's contemplation. The panegyrist asks the supreme being<sup>39</sup> to make Constantine live, on earth, forever: *te, inquam, oramus et quaesumus ut hunc in omnia saecula principem serves. ... fac igitur*

<sup>36</sup> Pacatus employed one facet of Ovid's treatment (*Pan. Lat.* 2[12].6.1): 'scire obvium est qua praeditus fuerit felicitate: te genuit!' (Cf. also Julian, *Or.* 1 9a.)

<sup>37</sup> Severus and Maximianus [Galerius] in Section 3.4; Maximian's name occurs at Section 4.3.

<sup>38</sup> Cf. Baglivi (n. 1), 44–6. Section 5.3 of the panegyric contains a nearly identical theme, there to Alexander's detriment (and quite unfairly).

<sup>39</sup> Whoever or whatever that is. This paper does not deal with the question of Constantine's religious affiliation before or after 312.

*ut, quod optimum humano generi dedisti, permaneat aeternum, omnesque Constantinus in terris degat aetates* (Section 26.1, 4). Constantine is now the greatest and best, and presumably the only ruler into the bargain. There can be no looking back.

*Pan. Lat.* 4(10). Nazarius saves the panegyrist of 313 from suspicion that his revision of form is idiosyncratic. The rhetor from Bordeaux is fortunate in a subject which allows him to manipulate the parts of an oration to be what he wishes. The official occasion was the quinquennalia of the Caesars Crispus and Constantinus in A.D. 321, and Nazarius therefore begins and ends with the necessary formality of recognizing them. The body of the oration may thus be characterized in one of two ways: either it is a panegyric of Constantine which omits the sections on antecedents, or it is a panegyric of the children in which the cancerous growth of the antecedents (back one generation only) virtually annihilates everything else. Such a deformity is not much different from the Homeric hymn to Ares which never gets past the salutation. But with his opening words Nazarius settles the question in favour of the former possibility: *Dicturus Constantini augustissimas laudes* (*Pan. Lat.* 4[10].1.1). The occasion is merely an excuse to praise the emperor.

Since Nazarius must say something about the children, he can use them to replace the ancestors. The principle that the son resembles the father is made to perform a new function. It is not Constantine who equals or surpasses his father, but his children who win his affection because they are like him (Section 3.7). The analogy cannot be complete, though, for the children must never actually outdo this parent. The panegyrist of 313 had affirmed that Constantine would always be superior,<sup>40</sup> but Nazarius the Gaul comes close not to saying it, and closer to regarding Crispus, the Caesar in residence, as his countrymen had regarded his grandfather Constantius (Section 37.4). It may be that reality intrudes, since Crispus had been left as ruler in Gaul and the Romans do not want to hear the Gauls ask for what they themselves do not have, the emperor's (Constantine's) presence. At any rate, I suspect that Constantius would not have been able to appear in the oration at all, since he does not come in under the antecedents, if there were no heavenly army for him to lead in his son's honour.<sup>41</sup> The panegyrist has no other place to insert him.

There is in the section on the children's upbringing a comparison which states that they are more fortunate in their role-model than Constantine had been in his (Section 4.2: *sub eodem magistro discendi fortuna felicior*). Nazarius implies that as an innocent child Constantine had witnessed wicked things at the eastern courts of Diocletian and Galerius.<sup>42</sup> Eusebius was later to compare the young Constantine to Moses (*VC* 1.12). This unfortunate childhood is a new element in Constantine's story, and although there is no later panegyric to be searched for evidence of its continued application, there are historians and biographers who have it as well, Lactantius earlier than Nazarius.<sup>43</sup> This is not, of course, criticism of Constantius; it is another sort of praise for Constantine.

Although Nazarius imitates and reinterprets many parts of the panegyric of 313,

<sup>40</sup> *Pan. Lat.* 9(12).26.5; 'quamvis enim, imperator invicte, iam divina suboles tua ad rei publicae vota successerit et adhuc speretur futura numerosior, illa tamen erit vere beata posteritas ut, cum liberos tuos gubernaculis orbis admoveris, tu sis omnium maximus imperator'.

<sup>41</sup> Note that the army got more honour than it gave: Section 14.5.

<sup>42</sup> Section 4.5: 'iam tibi quidem in erudiendo, imperator optime, non omnia proponebantur quae sequi velles, nisi quod recte factorum contemplator accerrimus, si quid secus fieret, a spectandi cura prudentes oculos abstrahebas'.

<sup>43</sup> Lactantius, *Mort.* 18.10, 24.3–5; Anon. Val. 2.2; Eusebius, *VC* 1.12.2, 19; *Epitome* 41.2.

his reiteration of the proper usage of Constantius is worth contemplation for its overall adherence to the model:<sup>44</sup>

ducebat hos, credo, Constantius pater, qui terrarum triumphis altiori tibi cesserat, divinas expeditiones iam divus agitabat. Magnus hic quoque pietatis tuae fructus: quamvis particeps caeli, ampliozem se fieri gratia tua sensit, et cuius munera in alios influere iam possint, in eum ipsum tua munera redundarunt. (Section 14.6–7)

Not obvious in the context is the assertion, fifteen years after his death, that Constantius had made a lasting contribution to his subjects' welfare ('cuius munera in alios influere iam possint'). This idea was not part of *Pan. Lat.* 12(9); although it amplifies the comparison, it faintly echoes the sentiments of panegyrics spoken before Constantine had so firmly established himself.

By 321 the Tetrarchy had long since been no more, the patched up Dyarchy, which had nearly gone out of existence three years earlier, was not to last much longer, a dynasty was about to be founded by a monarch.<sup>45</sup> Nazarius ignores Licinius and his son, Constantine's nephew; he reveals not even that there is a *socius*, however unsatisfactory (cf. *Pan. Lat.* 12[9].2.3); he imagines the rulers of all foreign nations, the Persians not excepted, suing for Constantine's friendship (Section 38.3). Although it was Licinius still in 321 who should rather have been in contact with the Persians, the claim is along the Augustan model:

super et Garamantas et Indos  
proferet imperium; ...  
huius in adventum iam nunc et Caspia regna  
responsis horrent divum et Maecotia tellus,  
et septem gemini turbant trepida ostia Nili.<sup>46</sup>

There are not even any obvious omissions or absences to draw attention to what is not there. But there is one commission. The heavenly army of Section 14 appears in Gaul to boost Constantine's reputation and reappears only at the battle of the Milvian Bridge (Section 29.1), having reserved its immeasurable weight for the decisive conflict. It is obvious that without saying as much Nazarius must answer Licinius' vision of the angel (Lactantius, *Mort.* 46.3–6), a story which had had nearly a decade to circulate.<sup>47</sup> Incidentally, the celestial commander Constantius is absent from Section 29, that he not be thought to have won the big battle.

It is only in this last panegyric that Constantine's beauty gives way to an agreeable attractiveness: result and proof of the internal quality of moral superiority. The reality that Constantine was almost fifty is probably not the cause for the change. It may be due to Christianization of imperial iconography, word-pictures included, but divorce from Tetrarchic brilliance and display is an equally compelling motive, and the location cannot be discounted. In the presence of the Roman senate it was polite to pretend that the autocrat was a prince.

As there is no more evidence from the Latin west, Nazarius' remains the final image of Constantine: prince and kindly father-figure not only to his children but to

<sup>44</sup> The source is *Pan. Lat.* 12(9).25.1.

<sup>45</sup> Eusebius, *LC* 3.5–6 justifies and glorifies monarchy as the best form of government, earthly parallel to the celestial scheme. For the difference between Eusebius' and the Gallic viewpoint, see McCormack (n. 1), p. 181. The Gauls had better experience of the Tetrarchs than the Christian writer had.

<sup>46</sup> *Aen.* 6.794–5, 798–800. Cf. Suetonius, *Aug.* 21.3.

<sup>47</sup> Henri Grégoire was right all those years ago ('La vision de Constantin "liquidée"', *Byzantion* 14 [1939], 348–9) when he observed that the importance of any imperial vision was political: 'Licinius et Constantin ont pris soin de faire répandre par des écrivains et par des orateurs à leur dévotion ces histoires merveilleuses'.

all citizens (Sections 5.1–4, 34.3–4), approachable as no predecessor had been. Transformed not quite beyond recognition by age and the security of greatly improved circumstances, Constantine left his mark even on literary form. The form, of course, reverted to the usual. Panegyrics addressed to Crispus or to his other sons would have had extensive sections devoted to the father's deeds.<sup>48</sup> It was rare for a Roman not to hear about a distinguished ancestor.

It is hard to find a political or pragmatic reason to account for the treatment of Constantius in later panegyrics of Constantine. When a ruler had a problematic parent, one may understand that he would prefer not to hear the whole truth about him. It may be true that Augustus wanted to dissociate himself from Caesar to avoid certain political liabilities, but there were ways other than silence to deal with potentially embarrassing ancestors. One could pretend to face the issue squarely, as when Pacatus with admirable boldness claimed that the elder Theodosius ought to have been emperor (*Pan. Lat.* 2[12].6.2). The mysterious execution which no ancient source adequately explains must have been on a charge, true or false, of treason. Alternatively, one could exaggerate or diminish. Ausonius and Symmachus spoke less than honestly about Valentinian for Gratian's hearing. Ausonius was the author of the more blatant abuses of verity (*Gratiarum actio*, Section 16 init.), while Symmachus employed an apology which nearly revealed the whole truth (*Or.* 4.9), yet both had the decency to speak of Valentinian as he was during his time on earth.

Out of known examples of conspicuously absent parents, only Julius Constantius disappears more completely than his own father. Claudius Mamertinus found no place in his *gratiarum actio* for a man who was murdered two years after holding the consulship. It was not a case which Julian preferred to have hushed up,<sup>49</sup> but on the specific occasion past sorrow would have spoilt present rejoicing. Constantius I was a source neither of grief nor of embarrassment except the kind occasioned by an excess of something desirable. There is no compelling pragmatic reason to explain why Constantine had his father relegated to the stars, once he himself was secure enough to need his progenitor neither to acquire nor to maintain his position, and the explanation for this curiosity may therefore be found in some personal desire or prejudice of the emperor himself.

The metamorphosis, at any rate, was complete. Constantine Caesar had become the only Augustus, fatherly and kind. During the process, his panegyrists modified the form of imperial encomium to suit the needs both of the occasion and of the emperor. Finally, the orators utilized and successively transformed Tetrarchic models until in 321, shortly before these were no longer necessary, they no longer existed. It is a good point at which to leave Constantine, his paternal benevolence intact and the changes which he had caused to be made to the literary models and to the ideals of collegiality very likely to remain in effect only until the end of his reign.

University of Vermont

BARBARA SAYLOR RODGERS

<sup>48</sup> Cf. Julian on Constantius' ancestors, *Or.* I 6d–8d.

<sup>49</sup> On the contrary: see, e.g., Julian, *ad Ath.* 270c–d.