

IN PRAISE OF
LATER ROMAN EMPERORS
THE PANEGYRICI LATINI

Introduction, Translation,
and Historical Commentary
with the Latin Text of R. A. B. Mynors

C. E. V. Nixon and
Barbara Saylor Rodgers

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA PRESS
Berkeley Los Angeles Oxford

The publisher gratefully acknowledges the contribution provided by the Literature in Translation Endowment Fund, which is supported by a generous gift from Joan Palevsky.

University of California Press
Berkeley and Los Angeles, California

University of California Press, Ltd.
Oxford, England

©1994 by
The Regents of the University of California

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Panegyrici Latini. English & Latin

In Praise of later Roman emperors: the Panegyrici Latini: introduction, translation, and historical commentary, with the Latin text of R. A. B. Mynors / C. E. V. Nixon and Barbara Saylor Rodgers.

p. cm. — (The Transformation of the classical heritage: 21)

Includes bibliographical references (p.) and index.

ISBN 0-520-08326-1 (alk. paper)

1. Speeches, addresses, etc., Latin—Translations into English.
2. Speeches, addresses, etc., Latin—History and criticism.
3. Rome—History—Empire, 284-476—Sources. 4. Speeches, addresses, etc., Latin. 5. Roman Emperors—Biography. I. Nixon, C. E. V. II. Rodgers, Barbara Saylor. III. Title. IV. Series.

PA6166.P36 1994

875'.0108-dc20

93-27872
CIP

Printed in the United States of America

9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

The paper used in this publication meets the minimum requirements of American National Standard for Information Sciences—Permanence of Paper for Printed Library Materials, ANSI Z39.48-1984. Ⓢ

d. m.

Paul J. Alexander

Vtriusque Magistro

CONTENTS

Preface

General Introduction

THE PANEGRYRICS: TRANSLATION AND COMMENTARY

- X. *Panegyric of Maximian*, by an Anonymous Orator (289)
Introduction
Translation and Notes *Nixon*
- XI. *Genethliacus of Maximian Augustus*, by an Anonymous Orator (291)
Introduction
Translation and Notes *Rodgers*
- VIII. *Panegyric of Constantius*, by an Anonymous Orator (297?)
Introduction
Translation and Notes *Nixon*
- IX. *Eumenius, For the Restoration of the Schools* (297/298?)
Introduction
Translation and Notes *Rodgers*

VII.	<i>Panegyric of Maximian and Constantine</i> , by an Anonymous Orator (307)	
	Introduction	178
	Translation and Notes <i>Nixon</i>	191
VI.	<i>Panegyric of Constantine</i> , by an Anonymous Orator (310)	
	Introduction	211
	Translation and Notes <i>Nixon</i>	218
V.	<i>Speech of Thanks to Constantine</i> , by an Anonymous Orator (311)	
	Introduction	254
	Translation and Notes <i>Nixon</i>	264
XII.	<i>Panegyric of Constantine Augustus</i> , by an Anonymous Orator (313)	
	Introduction	288
	Translation and Notes <i>Rodgers</i>	294
IV.	Nazarius, <i>Panegyric of Constantine</i> (321)	
	Introduction	334
	Translation and Notes <i>Rodgers</i>	343
III.	Claudius Mamertinus, <i>Speech of Thanks to Julian</i> (362)	
	Introduction	386
	Translation and Notes <i>Rodgers</i>	393
II.	Latinus Pacatus Drepanius, <i>Panegyric of Theodosius</i> (389)	
	Introduction	437
	Translation and Notes <i>Nixon</i>	448
	Appendix: The Career of Count Theodosius according to Pacatus 5.2	517
	THE PANEGYRICS: LATIN TEXT	523
	Bibliography	675
	Index of Proper Names	693
	Index of Ancient Authors	707
	Index of Greek and Latin Words and Phrases	731
	Index of Literary and Rhetorical Terms	735

PREFACE

This book has been long in the making. In 1978, while teaching an undergraduate seminar on the Tetrarchy at Macquarie University, Nixon became aware of the scantiness of the primary source material in English translation available to students and thereupon set about translating some of the Latin panegyrics for them (see *Ancient Society*, Resource Teachers, vol. 8 [Sydney, 1978]). Far away, in Berkeley, California, in the same year, Peter Brown suggested to Barbara Rodgers that she would be grateful for the first English translation of the Gallic collection of the Latin panegyrics. It was years before we learnt of each other's efforts, whereupon, at the American Philological Association convention in Toronto in December 1984, we decided to collaborate. Despite the vast distance between Sydney and Vermont, our disparate schedules, the unavailability of electronic mail for most of the period, the project was completed in March 1992, with the authors still friends.

The division of the orations was Nixon's, although Rodgers insists that as it had taken her years to understand Nazarius, she would not relinquish him. The results content both parties. Barbara Rodgers believes that they are a testimony to Ted Nixon's good judgment and her good fortune, as he has got most of the knotty historical problems and she has got the most challenging rhetoric. Ted Nixon concedes some interest, as he has avoided Nazarius, but is regretful about the panegyric of 313. We have each read and argued over the other's work, and have occasionally plagued colleagues for the elucidation of certain points. Needless to say, we remain responsible for all individual instances of error.

2 lives which they had given up as lost. And then you commanded them to lay down their arms to be protected much more securely by the victor's compassion; yet, that they suffer the deserts of their obstinacy, you commanded that they be seized and shackled not for punishment but to save their lives, lest they scatter because of the fears of a bad conscience and commit a greater wrong and not merit being preserved a second time, if they had not been saved.⁷⁵ But from what source were so many fetters to come which could restrain the hands of so large a number of soldiers recently armed? The soldiers who had undertaken the escort were aghast, and they refused the duty of standing guard and knew not at all what they would do; your very counselors, even the prefect himself, were perplexed, when you, advised by divine inspiration,⁷⁶ commanded that double shackles for their hands be made out of their swords, that their own swords which

was deliberately slow (he compares Constantine's strategic caution to the haste of Antonius Primus in 69). But despite the apparent support of many places, Constantine's progress across northern Italy was not as rapid as the orator pretends. Mutina, Aquileia, and the other places endured sieges before they capitulated (see *Pan.* 4.27.1 and note). Anon. Val. 4.12 also notices the victory at Verona, and Eutr. 10.4.3 says that Constantine put Maxentius' men to flight in many battles. Aur. Vict. *Caes.* 40.20 mentions a victory over Maxentius' army at Verona as an example of the tyrant's cowardice, since he did not bestir himself even then. The historian, however, places Maximian's attempt on Constantine's life between the loss at Verona and Constantine's defeat of Maxentius. Curiously, Lactant. *Mort. pers.* 44.3 reports that Maxentius' forces prevailed until Constantine marched to Rome (one wonders how, in that case, Constantine reached the city), but this makes the effect of Christ's help more worthwhile. Lactantius faced the same problem as a panegyrist, after all; see note 21 above. The contemporary oration, though it makes light of the campaign's dangers and difficulties and never reveals the length of time, is preferable. Eus. *Hist. eccl.* 9.9.3 and *VC* 1.37 say that Constantine defeated three of Maxentius' armies before he headed for Rome.

75. The orator is speaking only of the soldiers, not of the inhabitants of Verona (whom he had said at 8.2 were "besieged" by the presence of Maxentius' men) or of other cities. Constantine did not want the captured soldiers to be freed to regroup at another place, and did not wish to take a chance on incorporating them into his army in Italy.

76. The phrase *divino monitus instinctu* is similar to the later inscription on Constantine's arch in Rome: *instinctu divinitatis* (*ILS* 694).

had not defended them in their resistance might guard them in their surrender.⁷⁷

O most beautiful triumph which ought to have been exposed to the eyes of the world, the triumph of your might and clemency! For it belonged to his humanity, when it was in his power to wrest arms from the enemy, to bind those who surrendered for freedom from punishment, and to bind them in such a way that they would regret daily that iron which they had carried against you. That very sword, which a dangerous foe had drawn against you, held the hands of its master; what was designed for slaughter became a guardian for salvation. The great poet, when he describes the extent and preparations for wars springing up throughout the world, says: "And curved sickles are being melted down into hardened swords."⁷⁸ That era⁷⁹ was a sad one, when implements manufactured for the care of brutes were turned to the killing of men. But now those hardened and death-dealing swords are curved into the bonds of salvation, and do not destroy but confine disarmed men; their own beaten and blunted swords protect the surrendered enemy, since when whole and sharp they were able to do them no good.

→ Therefore the functions of all weapons serve your authority to different effect, Emperor. For you swords conquer, for you they preserve; when you fight they strike, when you forgive they protect. As that god, creator and master of the world,⁸⁰ sends messages now sad, now glad, with his same thunderbolt, so the same shafts under your divine power distinguish

77. The subsequent paragraphs on the swords and the use to which they were put breaks the narrative before the moment of greatest tension, the march on Rome and the battle of the Milvian Bridge. Of this whole tedious excursus I cannot say better than Galletier, 2: 119: "Il est impossible de rencontrer virtuosité plus vide et plus sottie, dont l'orateur finit par s'excuser en abordant un sujet plus sérieux."

78. Virg. *G.* 1.508: *et curvae rigidum falces constantur in ense*. The last three words are missing from the oldest manuscripts but supplied in many *recentiores*. I suspect that this whole excursus on the swords was occasioned by a desire to quote Virgil (he does so again at 14.2 below) and to praise something new and different.

79. Literally the time of the civil wars and immediately afterward, during the first century B.C.E. But the orator thereby implies that all other ages were happier or less violent, although he wants to make this claim only for the present time.

80. The nameless god has Jupiter's attributes: he hurls a *fulmen* and rules. But Jupiter was not considered the creator. The deity here described is a synthetic

- 3 between your enemies or petitioners by destruction or preservation.⁸¹ You snatched their swords away from your adversaries, Emperor, lest anyone fall upon his sword in a passion of grief; and you returned the same swords harmless to their hands, to satisfy both your clemency and your vengeance: you broke the weapons of those whose blood you spared.
- 4 For the life of men, long in creation,⁸² is always to be preserved, if it be permitted: iron is easy to find, variable in application. For this reason you melted down what could be repaired, you saved what could not have been
- 5 restored. What do stories tell that is its like for pleasure? Human bodies have been changed into fountains or beasts or birds: such a transformation is debased and disgusting.⁸³ A sword has been changed into manacles: this is what security is after fear, or shade after heat. The change destroyed its sheen, but blunted its point.
- 14 Our enthusiasm and your kindness, Emperor, have encouraged us to indulge our exultation thus far with our words; but now let us return to
- 2 greater things. When all Italy this side⁸⁴ of the Po had been recovered, Rome herself extended suppliant hands to you, Rome, where that monster had squatted, not daring to attempt anything in response to so many announcements of disasters suffered by his forces.⁸⁵ Rather the vile

being that a pagan would imagine, a not entirely successful attempt to avoid offending anyone.

81. The orator has not given up on comparing emperor to deity, a device that the panegyrist of 289, and others, used effectively. Causing weapons to distinguish between supplicants and active combatants is a remarkable achievement.

82. The Latin here (*vita enim hominum diu parata*) is similar to another passage from a contemporary panegyric (*Pan.* 5.10.4: *diu venturi hominis partus optatur*); the latter, however, occurs in a context of comparison: nature takes a long time to make a human being, but Constantine gives the entirety of life at once (*tu nobis vitam pariter totam dedisti*).

83. As in *Ov. Met.* passim. Besides quoting Virgil and referring to Ovid, the orator alludes to and departs from the poetic theme that iron was discovered to the sorrow of mankind.

84. He speaks now from the Gallic, not the Roman, perspective. Cf. 7.7 (with note 51) above, where he looks from the south in the traditional manner, as the area in question was actually called Transpadana.

85. Cf. *Aur. Vict. Caes.* 40.20: *adhuc pavidus et imbellis atque in desidiā foede pronus, usque eo, ut flagrante per Italiam bello fuisque apud Veronam suis nihilo segnius solita curaret.*

creature's very cowardice kept him under siege and, as the saying is, fear revealed the spirit of an ignoble man.⁸⁶

The stupid, worthless creature never dared to go outside his walls, for thus he was warned either by omens or by the forebodings of his fear. For shame, an Emperor inside the protection of his walls! He would not approach the Field of Mars, would not practice in arms, would not tolerate the dust, not he;⁸⁷ and he was clever at that, lest as he essay a man's tasks they despise him who watched him as he strode on a promenade⁸⁸ within that palace of marbled walls, for it was considered a foreign expedition to go to the estate of Sallust.⁸⁹ And in fact these pleasures shielded his disgraceful fearfulness for the whole time that he occupied the city and shut himself in. He wished to appear not unwarlike but blest, not idle but carefree. Whenever he summoned the soldiers⁹⁰ to an assembly he

86. *Virg. Aen.* 4.13: *degeneres animos timor arguit*. Some MSS change the spelling of the adjective, but none does anything with the orator's change of tense (*arguebat*).

87. Emperors were still supposed to be soldiers and generals and played the part even if they were not very good at it. Honorius was the first emperor in the West to refrain from devoting himself to military pursuits and yet avoid being deposed. Long before the fourth century the Campus Martius had been built up and was no longer used for military exercises, but the name is evocative of combat readiness, and the proximity is used for contrast with the enormous effort that it took even to visit a park (end of the sentence).

88. There is a textual problem here, as most MSS have *deambularent tantum*. The verb ought to refer to Maxentius, not the spectators; W. Baehrens deleted *tantum* (merely) and suggested *deambularentem*, which Mynors and Paladini and Fedeli (the latter retaining *tantum*) adopt. Galletier puts a full stop after *viderent*, retains *deambulare*, making a parallel construction with the infinitives in the preceding sentence, and adds *et* before *tantum*, which then modifies *incedere*. The basic meaning remains that Maxentius was ambulatory but eschewed vigorous (military) exercise.

89. The Horti Sallustiani (between the Quirinal and, later, Aurelian's wall) included a palace; for pictures of the remains see E. Nash, *Pictorial Dictionary of Ancient Rome*, rev. ed. (London, 1968) 1: 491–99. Vespasian liked to spend time there (*Dio* 65.10.4), and Aurelian (*SHA, Aurel.* 49.1) preferred that location to the residence on the Palatine. For further examples see F. Millar, *The Emperor in the Roman World* (London, 1977) 23, who writes that these were the "best-attested, and perhaps the most used, of all the imperial gardens."

90. The soldiers of the Praetorian Guard, whom sources agree were his original supporters. See *Lactant. Mort. pers.* 26.1–3; *Aur. Vict. Caes.* 40.5; *Eutr.*

boasted that he alone ruled with them, others waged war at the borders on his behalf. "Enjoy," he used to say, "waste, squander." This was the brief and fleeting felicity of wretched men.⁹¹

5 And not even then, when he had received information of so many conflicts lost by his men, did he attempt to go to meet you to employ the boundary of the Po or the Apennine Mountains for resistance, but he suppressed letters testifying to his own disasters. Meanwhile even in public he kept wishing that an advance would be made all the way to the gates. He did not realize that the City's majesty, which had once tempted advancing armies,⁹² had gone over to support you now that it was disgraced by his crimes and driven from its seat, and that men whom so many glorious victories, over and above your generosity and their oath of allegiance, had dedicated to you could not be corrupted by any rewards.⁹³

2 What soldier, who had so often fought successfully under your command and auspices, would sell his wounds to that fellow, or concede the outcome of a war nearly won?

3 But as you had formed this impression of the eagerness inspiring the whole army, without any of indecision's delay you flew along in hasty

10.2.3; Zosimus 2.9.3. Aur. Vict. *Caes.* 39.47 reports that Diocletian had reduced the numbers of the army at Rome; Lactant. *Mort. pers.* 26.3 says that Galerius had done away with the Guard, and only a few were left. Constantine disbanded them in 312 and sent them to guard the frontiers (21.3 below; Zosimus 2.17.2).

91. The orator found this phrase (*haec erat miserorum brevis et caduca felicitas*) nearly ready-made by the panegyrist of 310, who used a similar expression of usurpers who had bribed the military to be elected (*Pan.* 6.16.5: *brevis eorum fuit et caduca popularitas*). The context in the latter instance is Maximian's attempt to overthrow Constantine, and as a deliberate allusion to the earlier oration the present phrase would be very subtle, but not perhaps too obscure.

92. E.g., the armies of Severus, which went over to Maxentius, and of Galerius, which lost many deserters to the usurper; see notes 16 and 17 above. The orator implies that Maxentius intended to use the same tactics on Constantine, and to attempt to win over his adversary's men while withstanding a siege.

93. Cf. *Pan.* 6.16.2-9. There (and at 6.17) Constantine is said to maintain the soldiers' affection for a variety of reasons, including his physical beauty, his name (the dynastic principle), and his father's accomplishments. The similarity with this passage lies in making material rewards a lesser force than loyalty. Here in particular the orator stresses Constantine's successful record as a commander. The earlier panegyrist was more concerned with evidence of Constantine's divinity, and legitimacy.

march where the shortest road is, through the Veneti,⁹⁴ and displayed for Rome then so eager for you that rapidity in action which was Scipio's⁹⁵ and Caesar's. This is the faith of an Emperor invincible and trusting 4 in the spirits of his men, not to waver in doubt nor to prolong a war, but to consider each ensuing opportunity for battle an opportunity for victory.⁹⁶ Your situation was not that of Quintus Maximus with victori- 5 ous Hannibal, to seek out a place and an opportunity after calamities,⁹⁷ but it was the right place and time for you to press your successes, to add victory to victory, and to come to the City's assistance as soon as possible. It is the mark of a wise commander to take account of a criti- 6

94. *Venetos* is Livineius' conjecture for M's *eos*; it makes the best sense if Constantine marched east from Verona, as he might well have done (see Galletier, "Notes complémentaires," to 2: 135 [n. 3]). Nazarius (*Pan.* 4.27.1) includes Aquileia and Mutina among the places that were besieged and then surrendered. Constantine may, for example, have headed for the *via Flaminia* either by way of Ravenna (if he had gone to Aquileia) or Mutina. His choice of road would depend upon his last stopping place in northern Italy. Arntzen believes that Constantine did not march to Aquileia, and suggests *per Veios*, citing Aur. Vict. *Caes.* 40.23 (Maxentius advanced to Saxa Rubra), since Saxa Rubra is between Veii and the Tiber. But Maxentius advanced only to the bridge (see note 103), and it seems odd to say that the shortest journey is through a place very near its terminus. See *Pan.* 4.27.1 and note.

95. The phrase *celeritatem illam in re gerenda Scipionis* derives from Cicero *Verr.* 2.5.25 *illius superioris Africani in re gerenda celeritatem*.

96. Nazarius upgrades the claim in a passage of similar content, namely, the soldiers' ability and loyalty. See *Pan.* 4.19.4 (*cum dico proelia, significo victorias*).

97. See Livy, esp. 22.12-18, 23-30. Fabius not only saved Rome by delaying but became such a fixture in handbooks that he is one of the few Republican heroes to appear in a Tetrarchic or Constantinian panegyric. Another is Scipio Africanus. Although not a few Republican names appear in these orations, they very often occur in groups (e.g., *Pan.* 10.14.2: prominent Romans; *Pan.* 12.18.1-2: people saved from or helped by the Tiber), not singled out for individual accomplishments or problems. Here, and occasionally elsewhere (e.g., the reference to Scipio's invasion of Africa at *Pan.* 10.8.1), the exemplum actually tells an incident of Roman history, although in this case the exemplum is negative, and somewhat intrusive. It may be that Hannibal, the ultimate enemy, is the critical feature, and that this orator, who seems rather fond of history (see the Introduction, p. 289), was moved to insert Fabius at the point where he was about to paraphrase Livy's Scipio.

cal situation by delaying, but under favorable conditions not to neglect Fortune.⁹⁸

- 16 There was still this one fear, that in absolute terror, gravely smitten by your power and backed into a corner, he might consult his best interests and put off by enduring a siege the penalty owed the republic, since, after all of Africa, which he had decided to destroy,⁹⁹ had been exhausted, and all the islands had been emptied, he had amassed provisions for an unlimited length of time.¹⁰⁰ But the divine spirit and the eternal majesty of the City itself robbed the accursed man of good sense, and made him suddenly rush out, after his inveterate sloth and shameful hiding, and after the passing of six indolent years to mark the very day of his accession by his final destruction, that he not violate the sacred and holy number seven¹⁰¹ even by commencing upon it.¹⁰²

98. Cf. Livy 28.44.8: *id est viri et ducis, non deesse fortunae praebenti se et oblata casu flectere ad consilium*. The words come from Scipio's speech urging an attack on Carthage and rebutting Fabius' cautious advice. Even if it comes through an intermediate source, the reminiscence of Livy nicely rounds out the comparison of Scipio and Fabius.

99. Aur. Vict. *Caes.* 40.17 says that [L. Domitius] Alexander stupidly assumed power in Africa, whereas Zosimus 2.12.1-3 connects the rebellion with the soldiers' loyalty to Galerius and Maxentius' attempt to secure the support of Alexander, the *vicarius*, by demanding his son as a hostage. The rebellion lasted probably from 308 to 309 (see Barnes, *New Empire*, 14 with nn. 17 and 18). Maxentius sent C. Ceionius Rufius Volusianus to suppress the revolt. (For the interesting career of the latter, see *PLRE* I, Volusianus 4. He continued to serve the state under Constantine.) After he regained control of Africa, Maxentius exacted severe reprisals (Aur. Vict. *Caes.* 40.18-19; Zosimus 2.14.2-4).

100. Maxentius had evidently anticipated a long siege, but circumstances changed his mind (see below).

101. The ancients regarded seven as a perfect number for several reasons, including the multiples of seven that were thought to make up the ages of a man's life: sixty-three, for example, being the grand climacteric. See Macrobius *Sonn. Scip.* 1.6 for discussion of the number seven.

102. Cf. *Pan.* 4.27.6. Zosimus 2.16.1 has Maxentius consult the haruspices and Sibylline books and discover a prophecy that an enemy of Rome would die. Lactant. *Mort. pers.* 44.4 says that Maxentius was finishing his fifth year (*sic*) and that he sent out his army without him (44.6). The people in the city became unruly and cried out at the games that Constantine could not be conquered (44.7). It was then that Maxentius consulted the Sibylline books and found the prophecy, which he interpreted to his own advantage (44.8-9). Lactantius does

But how did he arrange his battle line, that little slave who dressed himself in purple for so many years? Precisely in such a way that no one could escape, that no one driven from his position could withdraw and fight anew, as usually happens, since he would be restrained in front by weapons and in the rear by the river Tiber.¹⁰³ In this he did not by

not doubt the accuracy of the pagan oracle, which, like many another, derives its success from its ambiguity.

103. Ancient versions of the battle vary considerably, even in the year (when one is given). Lactant. *Mort. pers.* 44.4 says that Constantine waited in the region of the Milvian Bridge, that after Maxentius finally went out to the battle the bridge was cut (44.9); when he fled back toward the bridge he was pushed into the Tiber by the crowd of those fleeing (44.9). Eus. *Hist. eccl.* 9.9.4-7 has Constantine approach very near Rome, and Maxentius advance some distance from the city; on his retreat Maxentius and his men broke the bridge of boats that they had built. Eutr. 10.4.3 briefly notes that Constantine in the fifth year of his reign overcame Maxentius at the Milvian Bridge. Aur. Vict. *Caes.* 40.23 relates that Maxentius advanced (in the sixth year of his reign) reluctantly to Saxa Rubra, 9 miles from the city, where he was defeated. As he fled to the city he was caught in the trap that he had set for his enemy at the Milvian Bridge. J. Moreau, "Pont Milvius ou Saxa Rubra?" in *Scripta minora* (Heidelberg, 1964) 72-75 (= *La nouvelle Clío* 4 [1952] 369-73), discusses Victor's information about Saxa Rubra. The historian appears to have confused the site of a confrontation in 193 (between Didius Julianus and Septimius Severus) with events of 312. There is no reason to believe that Maxentius progressed any farther than the opposite bank of the Tiber. In *Epit.* 40.7 Maxentius falls from his horse while attacking in battle, at the bridge built of boats a little above the Milvian Bridge. Zosimus 2.16.2-4 gives many details: Maxentius built a bridge across the Tiber; as he crossed it a flock of owls covered the walls; Constantine's cavalry advanced first and engaged the enemy cavalry and won; then the infantry advanced, the Romans and Italians fought Constantine reluctantly, and the rest of the opposition struggled valiantly (and were killed in great numbers); as Maxentius and others fled over the bridge the wood broke beneath their weight, and Maxentius was plunged into the river with the rest. These details have exercised many minds. The present orator, the source closest to the event, says that the Tiber was to Maxentius' rear, too close to allow regrouping (cf. *Pan.* 4.28.4). He also mentions the Milvian Bridge (17.1). Lactantius believes that the bridge was cut on the day of the battle; Eusebius has this done some time before and a bridge of boats in its stead (cf. *Epit.*, and the wood in Zosimus' narrative). This orator and Nazarius (*Pan.* 4.28) are amazed both at Maxentius' abrupt decision to give battle and at his inept generalship (although they attribute these to the workings of the divine will), so it is most likely that Maxentius had planned on withstanding a siege and had cut off access

Hercules ponder the necessity of resistance but the proximity of refuge, unless perhaps he sensed already that his fatal day had come and wished to drag as many as possible with him as consolation for his own death, to have
 5 as companions in his end all who had been partners in his crimes. For what else ought one to believe he expected, since he had already moved out of the palace two days before and had voluntarily withdrawn with wife and son¹⁰⁴ to a private house, driven in fact by terrifying dreams and expelled by nocturnal Avengers, so that you the long-expected occupant might succeed to that sacred edifice after it had been aired out and purified?
 6 He had foreseen the truth and yielded to you who were to come, since by leaving the palace he had already renounced his command, although he advanced armed into battle.
 17 Then at the first sight of your majesty and at the first attack of your army so often victorious, the enemy was terrified, routed, hindered by the narrowness of the Milvian Bridge,¹⁰⁵ and with the exception of the first instigators¹⁰⁶ of that usurpation who in despair of pardon covered with their bodies the place which they had chosen for combat,¹⁰⁷ all the rest went headlong into the river, so that there was at last some abridgment
 2 of the slaughter for the weary right hands of your men. After the Tiber had swallowed the impious, the same Tiber also snatched up their leader

to the city, but that he was compelled either by a dream or premonition (16.5 below) or the prophecy or insurrection within the city, to give battle (see Stein and Palanque, *Histoire du Bas-Empire*, 1: 91). The bridge of boats may or may not have been intended as a trap; anyway it was a passage out of the city if the other bridges were down. See F. Paschoud, *Zosime* (Paris, 1971) 1: 205 n. 26; Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius*, 42-43 and n. 144.

104. His wife was Galerius' daughter Valeria Maximilla; the name of this (second) son is not known. His son Romulus was already dead (see below, 18.1 with note).

105. The orator refers to the original bridge, whether through carelessness or ignorance or the fact that the bridge was still standing. He does not have Eusebius' story of a trap, which would have made a rhetorically useful addition. There is no narrative to speak of concerning the tactics and action of the battle itself, which other sources also pass over briefly. It seems not to have lasted very long.

106. Instigators: the Praetorian Guard, or at least some of them, and their officers (Zosimus 2.9.3).

107. Sall. *Cat.* 6.12 had so described the deaths of Catiline and most of his supporters in battle: "Almost every man dead covered with his body the place which he had taken up for battle."

himself in its whirlpool and devoured him, when he attempted in vain to escape with his horse and distinctive armor by ascending the opposite bank, lest such a misshapen monster should leave behind this fame for his death, that he had fallen by the sword or shaft of some brave man.¹⁰⁸ The swirling river rolled along the bodies and arms¹⁰⁹ of other enemies and carried them away; that one, however, it held in the same place where it had killed him, lest the Roman people should long be in doubt whether it was to be believed that the man, the confirmation of whose death was sought, had actually escaped.¹¹⁰

Sacred Tiber, once adviser of your guest Aeneas,¹¹¹ next savior of the exposed Romulus,¹¹² you allowed neither the false Romulus¹¹³ to live for long nor the City's murderer to swim away. You who nourished Rome by conveying provisions, you who protected her by encircling the walls, rightly wished to partake of Constantine's victory, to have him drive the enemy to you, and you slay him. You are not always rapid and turbulent but moderate if the occasion demands it. You were calm when you carried

108. All sources agree that Maxentius was drowned.

109. Cf. Virg. *Aen.* 8.538-40: *quam multa sub undas / scuta virum galeasque et fortia corpora volves, / Thybri pater!*

110. Zosimus 2.17.1 says that the Romans were afraid to rejoice until Maxentius' head was displayed on a spear. What is more, if the body had not been found, someone might later have impersonated Maxentius. Such masquerades were not unusual in the ancient world. See, for example, Tac. *Ann.* 2.39-40 (the false Agrippa Postumus).

111. The episode related at *Aen.* 8.31-65, esp. 8.57: *ipse ego te ripis et recto flumine ducam.*

112. See Livy 1.4.4-5 for justification of the claim.

113. Valerius Romulus, perhaps named for his great-grandmother Romula, Galerius' mother, is known from coins and inscriptions (see *PLRE* I, Romulus 6). He died before Constantine's invasion of Italy, probably in 309. How the Tiber achieved his death is a mystery, unless the child drowned. Galletier ("Notes complémentaires," to 2: 138 [n. 2]) believes that the false Romulus is Maxentius himself, not his son. The orator's language does not support that interpretation: (1) *nec diu vivere* describes a child even better than a person in the water, and (2) the second *nec* with a second noun signals a change of subject. Nor does anything explain why Maxentius would be the false Romulus, and since he was the "City's murderer," the false Romulus must be someone else.

Cocles in armor,¹¹⁴ the maiden Cloelia entrusted herself to your stillness,¹¹⁵ but now violent and turbid you sucked in the enemy of the State and, lest your service go unnoticed, you revealed it by disgorging his corpse.

3 Then, after the body had been found and hacked up, the entire populace of Rome broke out in vengeful rejoicing, and throughout the whole City where it was carried affixed to a spear that sinful head did not cease to suffer disfiguration, and meanwhile, in the customary jests of a triumph, it was mocked by insulting its bearer, since he suffered the deserts of another's head.¹¹⁶

19 But why do I dwell so long upon drolleries? The houses themselves, I hear, seemed to move!¹⁷ and the rooftops seemed to rise higher, wherever the chariot conveyed your deity with slow effort: so numerous a throng of the people, so numerous an entourage of senators carried you along and at the same time detained you. Those who stood at a distance pronounced fortunate those who had a closer look at you; those whom you passed by repented of the place which they had occupied.¹⁸ Everyone in turn approached from this side, followed from that; the countless multitude struggled and surged back and forth with varying pressure, and they remarked to themselves that there were so many souls left over after that 3 six years' slaughter. Some even dared to ask you to tarry and to complain

114. Livy 2.10.2–11 tells the story. Horatius and Cloelia (the subject of the following exemplum), of course, were to be found in the most elementary of handbooks.

115. Livy 2.13.6–11.

116. Two of the many prerequisites for a triumphal procession were distinguished captives, who were usually slain after having adorned the parade, and the *triumphator* with his army. The soldiers sang apotropaic verses that were ribald or insulting, and the slave who rode on the chariot with the victorious general spoke words to the same effect, so that no harm come to the commander because of the adulation and that the praise not go to his head. The conquered, clearly, could be directly reviled, as Maxentius' head, or rather the man who carried it, is here.

117. Cf. *Pan.* 11.11.3 for nearly the same phrase used of Diocletian and Maximian's joint public appearance in Milan: *lecta ipsa se, ut audio, paene commoverunt*.

118. The depiction of the populace confronted with an emperor is fairly standard, the essential element being that no one's eyes could achieve satiety: cf. *Pan.* 11.11.3–5. But here the orator also seizes the opportunity (in the next sentence) to observe that Rome had a fair number of inhabitants left even after six years of a tyrant's slaughter.

that you approached the palace so quickly¹¹⁹ and, after you had entered,

119. J. Straub, *Regeneratio imperii*, 100–118 (= "Konstantins Verzicht auf den Gang zum Kapitol," *Historia* 4 [1955] 297–313), and "Constantine as ΚΟΙΝΟΣ ΕΠΙΣΚΟΠΙΟΣ," *DOP* 21 (1967) 39–55, discusses the changes that Constantine brought to the traditional ceremonial surrounding an emperor at Rome. He argues (*Regeneratio imperii*, 104–5) that in this description of Constantine's triumphal procession there is no word of his approaching the Capitol to do sacrifice to Jupiter Optimus Maximus or to any other deity on this or any other day. Of the procession as here described he writes (*Regeneratio imperii*, 114–15): "Konstantin hat demnach auf einen Triumphzug im alten Sinne verzichtet: er nahm den Weg zum Forum und von dort unmittelbar zum Palatium." Cf. id., "Constantine as ΚΟΙΝΟΣ ΕΠΙΣΚΟΠΙΟΣ," 41–42: the "officially commissioned" pagan orator "reported every detail of the ceremonial entrance, but this panegyric report does not make even a vague allusion to a sacrifice on the Capitol." Thus Straub argues that during the course of his triumph Constantine dispensed with the hitherto obligatory sacrifice to the pagan god; he discusses as well other instances of what he describes as mutual accommodation between Constantine and the Senate.

Straub cites this panegyrist's predecessors for corroboration. The author of the panegyric of 289 (*Pan.* 10.13.2) had described an imaginary joint triumph of Diocletian and Maximian in which a visit to the Capitol figured: "These rulers, as soon as they return to you in triumph, wish to be conveyed in the one chariot, to ascend the Capitol together, to dwell on the Palatine together." The author of the panegyric of 307 (*Pan.* 7.8.7) also mentions the Capitol: "Upon your first entry the Roman people greeted you with such joy, and in such great numbers, that when they conceived a passion to convey you to the lap of Capitoline Jupiter, if only with their eyes, they scarcely allowed you through the gates of the city, such was the press." Straub observes that the panegyric of 307 was known to this orator (see note 122), who nevertheless copied only selected details to describe Constantine's entrance in 312. It is fair, up to a point, to argue from silence, for when a traditional feature is missing from a narrative it is right to ask why. But this passage cannot support so much weight. Two arguments can be used against it. First, it is unlikely that the orator was officially briefed, and he was not with Constantine in Rome and does not know all the details of what occurred (see the last sentence of 20.2 below). It is rather to be expected that he has chosen out for comment the beginning and the end of what often seemed an interminable procession (cf. Suet. *Vesp.* 12), and has other things to talk about. It may even be the case that he feels uncomfortable mentioning pagan deities by name (see the Introduction, pp. 292–93) and would not mention Jupiter even if he knew that Constantine had visited the temple. Second, one cannot argue successfully from gaps in a panegyrist's description of what he has not seen, for by the same logic one would assume that the orator of 289 believes that Diocletian and Maximian