1 OF/DE 3

27594

National Library
of CanadaBibliothèque nationale
du CanadaCANADIAN THESES
ON MICROFICHETHÈSES CANADIENNES
SUR MICROFICHE

NAME OF AUTHOR/NOM DE L'AUTEUR CAROLYN HAWKINS DIRKS

TITLE OF THESIS/TITRE DE LA THÈSE THE HISTORICAL VALUE OF PACATUS' PANEGYRIC
UPON THEODOSIUS I WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE
TO THE USURPATION OF MAGNUS MAXIMUS

UNIVERSITY/UNIVERSITÉ CARLETON

DEGREE FOR WHICH THESIS WAS PRESENTED/
GRADE POUR LEQUEL CETTE THÈSE FUT PRÉSENTÉE M.A.

YEAR THIS DEGREE CONFERRED/ANNÉE D'OBTENTION DE CE DEGRÉ 1973

NAME OF SUPERVISOR/NOM DU DIRECTEUR DE THÈSE PROF. ROGER C. BLOCKLEY

Permission is hereby granted to the NATIONAL LIBRARY OF
CANADA to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies
of the film.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the
thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or other-
wise reproduced without the author's written permission.

L'autorisation est, par la présente, accordée à la BIBLIOTHÈ-
QUE NATIONALE DU CANADA de microfilmer cette thèse et
de prêter ou de vendre des exemplaires du film.

L'auteur se réserve les autres droits de publication; ni la
thèse ni de longs extraits de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés
ou autrement reproduits sans l'autorisation écrite de l'auteur.

DATED/DATE 20/10/76 SIGNED/SIGNÉ Carolyn Dirks

PERMANENT ADDRESS/RÉSIDENCE PERM 205 Flora St. Apt 2
OTTAWA, ont
K1R 5E1

INFORMATION TO USERS

THIS DISSERTATION HAS BEEN
MICROFILMED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED

This copy was produced from a microfiche copy of the original document. The quality of the copy is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

PLEASE NOTE: Some pages may have indistinct print. Filmed as received.

Canadian Theses Division
Cataloguing Branch
National Library of Canada
Ottawa, Canada K1A 0N4

AVIS AUX USAGERS

LA THESE A ETE MICROFILMEE
TELLE QUE NOUS L'AVONS RECUE

Cette copie a été faite à partir d'une microfiche du document original. La qualité de la copie dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise pour le microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

NOTA BENE: La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer. Microfilmée telle que nous l'avons reçue.

Division des thèses canadiennes
Direction du catalogage
Bibliothèque nationale du Canada
Ottawa, Canada K1A 0N4

THE HISTORICAL VALUE OF PACATUS' PANEGYRIC
UPON THEODOSIUS I (WITH SPECIAL
REFERENCE TO THE USURPATION OF MAGNUS MAXIMUS)

by

Carolyn Hawkins Dirks, B.A. (Hons.)

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of
Graduate Studies in partial fulfilment
of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts

Department of Classics

Carleton University

Ottawa, Ontario

April 20, 1976

© Carolyn Hawkins Dirks 1976

The undersigned recommend to the Faculty
of Graduate Studies acceptance of the thesis

"The Historical Value of Pacatus' Panegyric
on Theodosius I (with Special Reference
to the Usurpation of Magnus Maximus)"

submitted by Carolyn Hawkins Dirks, B.A.,

in partial fulfilment of the requirements for
the degree of Master of Arts.

Thesis Supervisor

Chairman, Department of Classics

Carleton University

May 18, 1978

ABSTRACT

This study attempts to determine the value of Pacatus' Panegyric upon Theodosius I as a source for the life and career of the usurper Magnus Maximus, and his relations with the emperor addressed. An analysis of the speech reveals that the historicity of many of Pacatus' statements is questionable as a result of (a) the author's strict adherence to the conventions of eulogy, (b) the exigencies of the political situation, and (c) the influence of the author's personal interests. A comparison of the information concerning Magnus Maximus given by Pacatus with that offered by our alternative sources indicates that, despite its conventionality and prejudices Pacatus' account adds a great deal to our knowledge of this usurper and contributes invaluable contemporary insights into the politics of the period.

"What I want is Facts... Facts alone are wanted
in life."

Mr. Gradgrind

(Charles Dickens, Hard Times.)

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to thank Professor Roger Blockley for his helpful suggestions and criticisms of this thesis, and for his encouragement over the past four years. I would also like to acknowledge the work of David Dirks in the arduous job of proofreading both manuscripts and typescript, and to thank him for his comments and moral support. Thanks are also due to Sharie Saunders for her excellent typing job at very short notice.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER	
I. PACATUS AND THE TRADITIONS OF LAUDATORY RHETORIC	7
1. Topics and Arrangement	11
2. Theodosius and Maximus: Perfect Emperor and Conventional Tyrant	36
3. The Tricks of the Trade	58
II. POLITICS AND PREJUDICE IN PACATUS	75
1. Imperial Propaganda	81
i) Theodosius the Elder	82
ii) Theodosius and Valentinian II . . .	93
iii) Theodosius' Relations with Maximus	99
2. Pacatus' Prejudice	112
III. PACATUS AND HISTORY: THE USURPATION OF MAGNUS MAXIMUS	119
1. Maximus' Origin and Career Until His Usurpation	121
2. Maximus' Elevation	125
3. Maximus' Administration	136
4. The Defeat and Death of Maximus	149
5. Conclusion	169

APPENDIX	I.	THE PLAN OF PACATUS' PANEGYRIC TO	
		THEODOSIUS I	173
APPENDIX	II.	OTHER SOURCES - A SURVEY	175
APPENDIX	III.	MAP OF THE WESTERN ROMAN EMPIRE	188
SELECTED		BIBLIOGRAPHY	189

INTRODUCTION

The word πανηγυρικός was originally used in Greek rhetoric simply to designate a speech pronounced at a solemn festival or πανήγυρις, such as the Panathenaia or Olympic games, without any reference to its contents or rhetorical style.¹ The most famous example of such a speech is the Πανηγυρικός of Isocrates, written probably for the Olympic games of 380 B.C., as a plea for Greece to unite under Athenian leadership against the Persians. Among the Romans of the imperial period, the word panegyricus, although used infrequently, came to signify a speech of praise or eulogy. It is not certain exactly when the transition to panegyricus in the Latin meaning of a speech of praise was effected. It seems, however, that by the time of Quintilian, if not earlier, panegyricus could mean simply a eulogy,² and was synonymous with the words laus, laudatio and their Greek equivalent ἐγκώμιον.³ The reason for this development is

¹K. Ziegler, "Art Panegyrikos", RE, XVIII, 559; E. Galletier, Panegyriques Latins, Paris, 1949, I, vii.

²Inst. Or. III, 8, 7: cum etiam in panegyricis detatur audientium favor, ubi emolumentum non in utilitate aliqua, sed in sola laude consistit.

³Ziegler, RE, XVIII, 571; T. Burdeau, "L'Empereur d'après les Panegyriques Latins", Aspects de l'Empire Romain, Paris, 1964, 2; Galletier, Paris, 1949, I, vii; T. Payr, "Enkomion", Reallexicon für Antike und Christentum, V, 332.

not difficult to discover. Praise was always an integral part of the Greek *πανηγυρικός*. Dionysius of Halicarnassus includes praise of the king or official in charge of the festival as a specific topic in his discussion of the genre.⁴ During the course of the Roman empire, praise of the emperor became more and more the exclusive theme of speeches pronounced on festal occasions.⁵ Thus, for the Romans, the element of praise in the *πανηγυρικός* became predominant.⁶

Eulogies of rulers and other important persons were composed commonly by both the Greeks and the Romans, particularly in the imperial period, when worship and adoration of the emperor was increasingly acceptable and even obligatory. The composition of eulogies reached a peak in the third and fourth centuries A.D., by which time numerous occasions had been found on which they might be pronounced. For example, eulogies were regularly written in praise of the emperor to celebrate the anniversary of his accession or his birthday, or were delivered by a new consul to thank his emperor for the honour that he had received.

This study is concerned with the value of a eulogy of a Roman emperor as historical source material. At this point it would be relevant to ask whether, considering the

⁴Art. Rhet. I, 2ff.

⁵Ziegler, RE, XVIII, 570.

⁶For a detailed study of the development of the word "panegyric", see the whole of Ziegler's article: RE, XVIII, 559ff.

nature of this type of literature, the historian of Greco-Roman antiquity can make any use of it at all as a source. The chief aim of the eulogist is to praise and glorify the character of his hero by whatever means he considers fit for the purpose. He is not concerned with truth as such (although ancient eulogists could and often did claim to be telling the truth to add weight to the effect of their praises). The eulogist might employ such means as the exaggeration of the good qualities and deeds of the hero, and even the invention of them if necessary, to achieve his ends. On the other hand he may minimise or omit anything detrimental to his hero's glory, or, if it is possible, interpret indifferent or bad qualities in such a way that they seem to be admirable. Flattery, omission, distortion, invention - all these and more are required of the eulogist by the nature of his genre.

For the modern historian whose aim, hopefully, is to attempt to interpret the past as impartially as possible, the methods by which the eulogist achieves his purposes are strictly taboo. Although Galletier, when discussing the historical value of the collection of Panegyrici Latini, is quite right to point out in defence of the panegyrists that: ils sont les victimes du genre qu'ils ont adopté, and that, therefore, they cannot be blamed for their lack of objectivity and all the other features of their works which render them historically inaccurate,⁷ nevertheless

⁷Paris, 1949, I, xxvi.

recognising this does not alter the fact that the aims and methods of the authors seriously impair the value of their works as source material for the historian. However, when one compares eulogies with the writings of ancient historians, the situation does not appear so grim. Some believe that, since all historical judgements involve persons and their opinions, there can be no such thing as objective historical truth.⁸ Ancient historians, certainly, on the whole never achieved anything like objectivity and it is doubtful whether in most cases they even aimed at it. A great number of them approached the writing of history from a partisan standpoint, be it political or religious, and sifted and interpreted the events of the past in the light of their own, often undisguised, prejudices. The liberties taken with the truth by the eulogists of antiquity are often no more blatant than the sins of its historians in this regard.

Moreover, source material, or more accurately the lack of it, is nearly always a problem for the student of ancient history. Although panegyrists in general do not narrate but tend to assume a knowledge of the facts on the part of their audience,⁹ because of the scarcity of material available their works often provide us with valuable information that is not known from other sources. In particular there is a

⁸See E.H. Carr, What is History?, London, 1961, 7ff.

⁹T. Burgess, Epidictic Literature, Chicago, 1902, 116.

shortage of contemporary documents and reports on events. Here the extant eulogies of Roman emperors have their special value. They are for the most part more or less contemporary with the events and persons with which they are concerned. These works had to please the emperor to whom they were addressed, and thus tended to present the interpretation of events that he had or wished his subjects to have. As a result eulogies often provide invaluable first-hand insights into the policies of the emperors concerned.

In this study I propose to analyse in detail one such panegyric, that of Latinus Drepanius Pacatus upon the emperor Theodosius I, with a view to evaluating its worth as a historical source.¹⁰ Pacatus wrote his Panegyric in the year 389 A.D. to celebrate Theodosius' victory over the usurper Magnus Maximus. Our source material for the life and career of this usurper who reigned in Gaul from 383-388 A.D. is by no means abundant. Thus the evidence provided by Pacatus, who devotes approximately half of his speech to the reign of Maximus and Theodosius' successful campaign against him, is particularly important with regard to this affair. However, the statements of any panegyrist must be analysed carefully, for they are often influenced by adherence to the conventions of eulogy or by political or personal biases, and hence are of doubtful historicity. I plan in the first place, therefore, to ascertain where and to what extent Pacatus' statements are conventional or prejudiced in some

¹⁰ See below p. 112ff. for details of Pacatus' life and background.

manner. Secondly, utilising the results of these preliminary investigations, I propose to compare Pacatus' statements regarding the career and reign of Magnus Maximus and Theodosius' attitude towards him with those of our other sources, and thereby to estimate what he adds to our knowledge and understanding of this usurper.

CHAPTER ONE

PACATUS AND THE TRADITIONS OF LAUDATORY RHETORIC

Ancient rhetoric tended to be conservative and conventional. For each different type of speech there came to be stereotyped sets of rules, passed down through the schools of rhetoric, which detailed exactly how the speech should be arranged and what it should include. Laudatory rhetoric was no exception. From the time of Isocrates who, it is generally agreed, wrote the first true prose encomia, the genre was largely fixed in form, content, and methods.¹ We possess a number of ancient treatises on rhetoric which include rules for composing speeches of praise. The extant eulogies of Roman emperors all conform to their prescriptions to a greater or lesser extent. This chapter is concerned with comparing the Panegyric of Pacatus to the emperor Theodosius both with the rules set out by the rhetors and with a selection of eulogies addressed to Roman emperors by various orators, in order to establish where and to what extent Pacatus' work conforms to the conventions of the genre as illustrated by these works. For any statement in Pacatus' speech that can be shown to be commonplace in panegyrical literature or influenced by the rhetorical

¹Payr, Reallexicon für Antike und Christentum, V, 335f; Burgess, Chicago, 1902, 115.

methods of eulogy, although not necessarily untrue or even distorted, must be viewed with circumspection as regards its historical accuracy.

The majority of the extant treatises that give rules for the composition of eulogies of persons are written in Greek. The most detailed is that of Menander Rhetor composed early in the third century A.D. His handbook, Περὶ Ἐπισημησικῶν, includes schemes for several different classes of personal eulogy. The most important for our purposes is the βασιλικὸς λόγος, which, as the title indicates, gives a blueprint for eulogies of kings and in particular, considering the era in which Menander wrote, of Roman emperors.²

The only surviving work in Latin which gives rules for this type of speech is the Institutio Oratoria of Quintilian, who unfortunately deals with the subject rather summarily.³ It seems probable that other and more detailed treatises were written in Latin but have not come down to us.⁴ The outline given by Quintilian, however, brief as it is, in general

²Menander Rhetor, βασιλικὸς λόγος, L. Spengel, Rhetores Graeci, Leipzig, 1853-1856, III, 368ff. (Hereafter Spengel's work will be cited as "Sp".) The other most important rhetors that will be considered are: Anaximenes (fourth century B.C.) Sp. I, 225-228; Hermogenes (second century A.D.) Sp. II, 11-14; Aphthon (c400 A.D.) Sp. II, 35-38; Theon (uncertain date) Sp. II, 109-112. Others may be cited occasionally.

³Inst. Or. III, 7, 10ff.

⁴Galletier, Paris, 1949, I, xxx.

shows a marked similarity to those we possess in Greek. The speeches of this genre in both languages are also very similar to each other. These facts suggest that the conventions for composing eulogies were much the same in both Greek and Roman traditions.⁵

Neither Aristotle nor Cicero sets out a formal plan for composing laudatory speeches. Both of them, however, include in their works on rhetoric passages that deal with the question of praising persons in oratory, and mention the kinds of deeds that are most praiseworthy, as well as the sort of qualities that should be emphasised in the praise of a person.⁶

The authors of eulogies did not necessarily use any one scheme in particular.⁷ Nevertheless Menander Rhetor and the other rhetoricians do embody in their schemes the traditions and accepted practices of this type of rhetoric. Thus the object of comparing Pacatus' Panegyric with the plans set out in these works is not to discover which, if any, he follows,

⁵These similarities will become clear in the remainder of this chapter.

⁶Aristotle, Art. Rhet. I, 9; Cicero, De Oratore, II, 84f.

⁷Payr, Reallexicon für Antike und Christentum, V, 337; Cf. J. Mesk, "Zur Technik der lateinischen Panegyriker", Rh. Mus., 1912, 572, who seems to feel that most of the authors of the Panegyrici Latini drew specifically from Menander Rhetor, and in one case even asserts: Dieser Rhetor hat also deutlich das Schema vor Augen (Ibid. 573).

but rather to ascertain how far his speech conforms to the conventions of eulogy as illustrated in detail by Menander's work, and in outline by the treatises of the other rhetoricians.

As regards the comparison of Pacatus' speech with other examples of βασιλικὸν λόγον, the most important speeches to consider are the collection of twelve Panegyrici Latini, of which Pacatus' speech stands last in chronological order.⁸ Pliny's Panegyric to Trajan was composed c. 100 A.D. The remaining speeches of the collection represent the genre during the century from 289 A.D. to 389 A.D. Pacatus was certainly well acquainted with the other speeches in the collection and was able to draw on them for inspiration for his own speech.⁹ Also worthy of consideration are the Gratiarum Actio which Ausonius addressed to the emperor Gratian (379 A.D.) and the fragments of Symmachus' Laudationes composed in honour of Gratian (369 A.D.) and Valentinian I (369 A.D. and 370 A.D.). Pacatus seems to have been acquainted with both Ausonius and Symmachus and is thus likely

⁸The numbers assigned to the Panegyrici Latini throughout this study will follow those given by R.A.B. Mynors, XII Panegyric Latini, Oxford, 1964, rather than those which follow the chronological order of the speeches as given by Galletier in his edition.

⁹Because of the extensive "borrowings" of Pacatus from the earlier panegyrics of this collection, R. Pichon, Les Derniers Ecrivains Profanes, Paris, 1906, 270ff, has suggested plausibly that he may have been the editor of the Panegyrici Latini.

to have been familiar with their works.¹⁰ In addition, the eulogies of various emperors composed by Claudian, Libanius, and the emperor Julian are useful for comparison, for they also offer many examples of the conventional practices of the genre.¹¹

I. TOPICS AND ARRANGEMENT

As a rule the rhetoricians list the topics of praise to be dealt with when composing a eulogy of a person and the order in which they are to come. The majority in fact do little more than give the headings for each part of the speech. Menander Rhetor, however, sets forth in great detail the material to be included in each topic. As a result it seems most expedient to follow the model given by Menander for the βασιλικὸς λόγος, noting the variations which appear in the texts of the other rhetors where appropriate.¹²

There is general agreement that the eulogy should begin with an introduction (προεῖμεν). Menander suggests

¹⁰On Pacatus' relations with Ausonius and Symmachus, see below p. 113.

¹¹The following will be considered in particular: Claudian, III Cos. Hon., IV Cos. Hon., VI Cos. Hon.; Libanius, Or. XII, Or. XIII, Or. XVIII; Julian, Or. I, Or. II.

¹²As Menander's βασιλικὸς λόγος was designed primarily for composing eulogies of Roman emperors, I propose to call the recipient of praise the "emperor" in what follows. The word "emperor" is not necessarily applicable to the heroes to be praised in the schemes of the other rhetors, as they give rules for encomia of persons in general.

that in this topic the greatness of the subject and the difficulty of praising the emperor adequately should be emphasised. Alternatively the glory to be obtained from composing a successful eulogy may be mentioned, or the desirability of eulogising such a good emperor to the best of one's ability may be stressed. Because of the difficulty of the task, Homer, Orpheus, or the Muses are needed for inspiration, although even they would hardly be adequate. Finally, in the prooemium the orator ought to mention the main points with which he intends to deal in his speech.¹³ The rhetor Longinus mentions that the material for the introduction should be drawn from the subject matter of the speech as a whole.¹⁴

Before commencing the praise of the emperor himself, the eulogist must cover certain preliminary topics. For Menander these are native land ($\mu\alpha\tau\epsilon\rho\iota\varsigma$) and family ($\gamma\epsilon\iota\tau\epsilon\iota\varsigma$).¹⁵ The section immediately following the prooemium,

¹³For the contents of the prooemium, see Menander, Sp. III, 368, 6ff.

¹⁴Longinus, Sp. I, 327, 21. On the prooemium, see also Anaximenes, Sp. I, 225, 16-18; Aphthon, Sp. II, 36, 9.

¹⁵Menander, Sp. III, 369, 18ff. Cf. Anaximenes, Sp. I, 225, 27ff: no praise of country, but $\gamma\epsilon\iota\tau\epsilon\iota\varsigma$; Hermogenes, Sp. II, 12, 6-7: $\mu\alpha\tau\epsilon\rho\iota\varsigma$ and $\gamma\epsilon\iota\tau\epsilon\iota\varsigma$; Aphthon, Sp. II, 36, 10-11, entitles the whole topic $\gamma\epsilon\iota\tau\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ which is then subdivided into $\mu\alpha\tau\epsilon\rho\iota\varsigma$, $\gamma\epsilon\iota\tau\epsilon\iota\varsigma$, and $\mu\alpha\tau\epsilon\rho\iota\varsigma$; Theon, Sp. II, 110, 2-5, sections $\mu\alpha\tau\epsilon\rho\iota\varsigma$ subdivided into $\mu\alpha\tau\epsilon\rho\iota\varsigma$, $\gamma\epsilon\iota\tau\epsilon\iota\varsigma$, and $\mu\alpha\tau\epsilon\rho\iota\varsigma$, and $\gamma\epsilon\iota\tau\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ and other relations; Quintilian, Inst. Or. III, 7, 10: patria, parentes, and patres.

then, concerns the praise of the emperor's country. This should be kept brief, and centre on the emperor's own city, if it is glorious. If it is not, the orator should try and find something glorious or some noble quality in his race as a whole. Praise of the emperor is to be included. For example, he might be praised because he came from such a distinguished city or country, but he alone of all the praiseworthy members of his race was deemed worthy of being emperor. If the emperor's country is not important at all, the orator is to emphasise how different he is from the rest of his race.¹⁶ The next topic is the praise of the emperor's family. The orator is instructed once more to dwell on this topic if the family is distinguished. If not it can be glossed over or omitted altogether.¹⁷ Anaximenes adds that all the hero's ancestors should be eulogised if they are worthy, otherwise only the most praiseworthy are to be mentioned.¹⁸ On the other hand, Nicholas Sophista feels that only the hero's immediate predecessors need to be emphasised.¹⁹

The birth and early life of the emperor follow.
Concerning his birth ($\gamma\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma$), any portents or miracles

¹⁶Praise of country: Menander, Sp. III, 369, 18ff.

¹⁷Praise of family: Ibid., 370, 15ff.

¹⁸Anaximenes, Sp. I, 225, 27ff.

¹⁹Nicholas Sophista, Sp. III, 480, 16ff.

real or invented, which are said to have happened at or near the time of the event are to be quoted.²⁰ Menander then prescribes the praise of the emperor's physical qualities. He restricts himself here to suggesting the image of the beauty of the emperor vying with the most beautiful stars in heaven.²¹ Next come the topics of upbringing and education (ἐνατροφή, φύσις and ἐπιτήδευσμα). For Menander, the ἐνατροφή includes the circumstances of the emperor's youth. Praise of his φύσις comprises such qualities as his knowledge, cleverness, eagerness to learn, and quickness of comprehension. If he excels in training of the military type, this should be praised also. The ἐπιτήδευσμα seem to be moral qualities such as prudence and justice, which the orator is to say the emperor possessed when young and which increased in him as he grew to maturity.²²

²⁰Menander, Sp. III, 371, 4ff. Hermogenes, Sp. II, 12, 7-9 and Quintilian, Inst. Or. III, 7, 11 are similar.

²¹Menander, Sp. III, 371, 14-17. Many of the rhetors prescribe praise of the physical qualities of the hero. However, the position that this topic is to have in the speech varies. Theon, Sp. II, 110, 6-7, Quintilian, Inst. Or. III, 7, 12, like Menander include this topic after the praise of country and family. Anaximenes, Sp. I, 225, 21, places it immediately after the proemium; Hermogenes, Sp. II, 12, 14-15, under upbringing and education; Aphthon, Sp. II, 36, 15-16, under deeds. The consensus is that this topic should include praise of such qualities as beauty, strength, swiftness and health.

²²Menander, Sp. III, 371, 18ff. Cf. Hermogenes, Sp. II, 12, 9ff: τροφή, φύσις, ψυχή καὶ εὐμαρτία, ἐπιτήδευσμα; Aphthon, Sp. II, 36, 11-12: ἐνατροφή subdivided into ἐπιτήδευσμα, τέχνη, νόμος. There is some variation in the meaning of the term ἐπιτήδευσμα as used by the rhetors. As well as referring to moral qualities, it can, as for example in Hermogenes' treatise, mean a person's profession. See Burgess, Chicago, 1902, 122f.

The most important topic in Menander's view is the one which deals with the deeds (ἔργα) of the emperor. He includes an enormous amount of detail as to the contents of this section of the eulogy.²³ The deeds of the emperor are to be divided into two main parts, one dealing with wartime actions, the other with those of peacetime. Within each division, the deeds are to be arranged according to the virtues that they illustrate. The primary virtue to be emphasised in wartime is bravery (ἀνδρεία), but practical wisdom (φρόνησις) is also important. Peacetime deeds are to be grouped to show that the emperor possesses the remaining cardinal virtues: justice (δικαιοσύνη), temperance (σωφροσύνη), and once again wisdom (φρόνησις).²⁴ Quintilian mentions that the deeds may either be grouped according to virtues or dealt with in chronological order, whichever is the more convenient.²⁵

²³Menander, Sp. III, 372, 25ff. It is commonly agreed that praise of deeds is the chief topic. See Anaximenes, Sp. I, 227, 38ff; Hermogenes, Sp. II, 12, 19ff; Aphthon, Sp. II, 36, 12-16; Theon, Sp. II, 122, 2ff; Quintilian, Inst. Or. III, 7, 15-16.

²⁴Most of the rhetors agree in dealing with the deeds of the hero according to the virtues that they illustrate, although there is some variation in the contents prescribed for this section. (See references above n. 23).

²⁵Quintilian, Inst. Or. III, 7, 15-16:

Animi semper vera laus, sed non una per hoc opus via ducitur. Namque alias aetatis gradus gestarumque rerum ordinem sequi speciosus fuit ... alias in species virtutum dividere laudem, fortitudinis, iustitiae, continentiae, ceterarumque, ac singulis adsignare, quae secundum quamque earum gesta erunt. Utra sit autem harum via utilior cum materia deliberabimus ...

Wartime deeds should be described first if the emperor has distinguished himself in this sphere, "for courage reveals the king better".²⁶ The locations of wars and sites of battles are to be described in detail, and any ambushes laid by either side mentioned. All land and sea battles must be described, the emperor being given all the credit for the skill of the fighting. Most important, the orator must exaggerate any deeds of valour or heroic actions of the emperor himself. Scenes of battle should be described dramatically, with emphasis laid upon such points as the crowded bodies of the fallen. The emperor's victory is to be dwelt upon, and the wisdom he showed in all aspects of leadership stressed. Finally, a third virtue is to be mentioned. The orator must emphasise the clemency (φιλανθρωπία) which the emperor showed in his treatment of the conquered. He did not pursue vengeance for its own sake but struck a balance between punishment and mercy.²⁷

When the eulogy of the emperor's exploits in war has been completed, the orator is to pass on to those of peacetime, dividing them according to justice, temperance and wisdom. The emperor's justice is illustrated by his mildness to his subjects, and by the fact that those who need it may easily obtain clemency from him. His justice is also shown in his

²⁶ Menander, Sp. III, 372, 30-31: γρηγορεῖ γὰρ βασιλεὺς πλεον ἢ ἀνδρείου.

²⁷ Praise of wartime deeds, Menander, Sp. III, 373, 17ff.

appointment of virtuous magistrates who are guardians of the laws, not collectors of wealth, and in the fact that his taxes and legislation are fair. Temperance, which is linked with justice, comes next. Here the orator may say, for instance, that because of the emperor's example, marriages are temperate, children legitimate and festivals conducted with decency and restraint. The empress may be praised. Wisdom is treated last. Menander suggests that the orator point out that the emperor would not be able to endure and carry out the mass of business that his task involves if he did not surpass all others in wisdom, from which the other virtues such as lawgiving and temperance spring. His wisdom makes him able to foresee the future, to judge the opinion of others rightly and to understand both easy and difficult matters.²⁸

Menander prescribes that the good fortune (τυχη) of the emperor, which attends all his deeds and words, should be emphasised. It is through this that he is blessed with children, good friends and loyal guards.²⁹ Many of the rhetors make a distinction between the virtues which one owes to oneself and the gifts of fortune, which may include, for example, good looks, noble birth, and wealth. Very often it is noted that these gifts of fortune are not as

²⁸ Praise of peacetime deeds, Menander, Sp. III, 375, 5ff.

²⁹ The emperor's good fortune, Menander, Sp. III, 376, 24ff.

praiseworthy as the possession of virtues. Thus praise of them is to be minimised. It is rather the use made of fortune's gifts that should be the subject of praise or blame.³⁰

The orator should draw the speech to a close with an epilogue, in which all the prosperity of the empire under the present monarch should be underlined and attributed to him. Finally prayers are to be offered by all the cities for the emperor's safety, for his long rule, and for that of his descendants.³¹

The extent to which the surviving eulogies of Roman emperors make use of the conventional topics and arrangement as set out above varies a great deal from speech to speech. Some follow the traditional pattern very strictly indeed, while others have a much looser connection, and freely omit topics or introduce new ones.³² Pacatus' Panegyric upon Theodosius belongs to the former group. As will be seen, his speech conforms very closely to the rhetorical precepts

³⁰ See e.g. Anaximenes, Sp. I, 225, 18ff; Theon, Sp. II, 111, 12ff; Quintilian, Inst. Or. III, 7, 12-14; Aristotle, Art. Rhet. I, 9; Cicero, De Oratore, II, 84. Praise of the gifts of fortune is placed in various sections of the speech, usually together with physical qualities. (See references above n. 21.)

³¹ Menander, Sp. III, 377, 9ff. * See also, Athon, Sp. II, 36, 18.

³² Burgess, Chicago, 1902, 132; Payr, Reallexicon für Antike und Christentum, V, 932.

for laudatory speeches, and in particular to those for the βασιλικὸς λόγος as exemplified by Menander Rhetor.³³

Chapters 1-4, 1 of Pacatus' speech comprise his prooemium.³⁴ As suggested by the rhetors, he emphasises the greatness of his subject, and expresses his awareness that his skill as an orator is not adequate for the task he has undertaken:

Nam cum te semper ultra omnes retro principes laudari oportuerit, nunc porro ultra quam alias praedicatus es in ea urbe conveniat dicendo celebrari, cuius et libertatem armatus adservisti et auxisti dignitatem togatus, quo tandem modo consequi maiestatem utriusque vestrum oratione mea potero hoc praecipue in tempore, quo ita mutuo ambo crevistis, ut nec tu fueris adhuc maior nec illa felicior? (1,2)³⁵

Theodosius' greatness and his own inferior status as an uncultivated Gallic orator who must speak before the Roman Senate cause Pacatus to express his fear of delivering his

³³O. Kehding, De Panegyricis Latinis Capita IV, Thes. Marburg, 1899, 13ff, lists many passages in Pacatus' speech which seem to follow Menander's prescriptions. Other speeches which conform closely to the conventions are Pan. Lat. IV, VI; Julian, Or. I. As regards Claudian, L.B. Struthers, "The Rhetorical Structure of the Encomia of Claudius Claudian", HSCP, 1919, 87 remarks: "It is evident that in the arrangement of the material in his panegyric Claudian has obeyed strictly the rules which had been formulated by the great body of rhetores who had preceded him." Burgess, Chicago, 1902, 134ff, notes that Themistius and Libanius in general follow the precepts of the rhetoricians much less closely.

³⁴See Appendix I for a brief plan of Pacatus' speech.

³⁵Some apology for being inadequate for the task is commonplace. Cf. e.g. Pan. Lat. IV, 1, 1; V, 1, 5; VI, 1, 1-3; XII, 1, 3; Ausonius, Ad. Grat. 1, 2; Julian, Or. I, 1; Libanius, Or. XIII, 3; Or. XVIII, 4.

speech (1, 3-5), in much the same way as previous orators had professed to be afraid of their undertakings.³⁶ The second chapter is concerned mainly with Pacatus' reasons for pronouncing his eulogy. His admiration for Theodosius' virtues make him overcome his fear (2, 1-2). The fact that under Theodosius' rule he is not obliged to compose eulogies gives him the desire to praise the emperor (2, 2-4). Finally he hints at the event which provided the occasion for his speech, the defeat of the usurper Magnus Maximus: Libet igitur redditam postliminio securitatem loquendo experiri (2, 4).³⁷ The remainder of the prooemium sets out the theme of the speech and the method by which Pacatus proposes to deal with it. His main subject is Theodosius' reign from the time of his accession. Here again Pacatus seems to have leaned heavily on the work of a predecessor. He says: Det igitur mihi sermonis huius auspiciu[m] ille felicitatis publicae auspex dies qui te primus inauguravit imperio (3, 1) which echoes the words of the Incertus, ad Constantinum: Det igitur mihi, Caesar invicte, hodiernae gratulationis exordium divinus ille vestrae maiestatis ortus.³⁸ Pacatus, then, in

³⁶E.g. Pan. Lat. IV, 2, 8-9; VIII, 1, 1-5; IX, 1, 2. There is an expression of the inferiority of Gallic orators similar to that in Pacatus' speech in Pan. Lat. XII, 1, 2.

³⁷Reasons for speaking, cf. e.g. Pan. Lat. I, 1-2; III, 2, 1-4; VII, 1, 1-2; IX, 2, 1-2; X, 1, 4; XI, 1, 1; Ausonius, Ad Grat. 2.

³⁸Pan. Lat. VIII, 2, 2. This and many of the other "borrowings" of Pacatus from the Panegyrici Latini quoted in the following pages are listed by Pichon, Paris, 1906, 285ff.

conformity with Menander's prescriptions, goes on to give the plan for his speech. The man cui felix patria, cui domus clara, cui forma divina, cui aetas integra, cui militarium civiliumque rerum usus contigisset, is surely the one whom the Roman people would have chosen to be their emperor (3, 6). By dealing with these topics in turn Pacatus is going to show that Theodosius is this man (4, 1).³⁹

Pacatus duly passes on from the prooemium to the preliminary topics of praise (παῖσις and γένος). Theodosius' native land of Spain is eulogised in Chapter 4. (This topic comprises the felix patria of Pacatus' own scheme, 3, 6). The contents of this topic conform particularly closely to the suggestions made by Menander. Pacatus does not mention Theodosius' city but praises Spain as a whole. In relation to the entire speech, the eulogy of Spain is kept quite brief, being one chapter out of forty seven.⁴⁰ In detail Pacatus' praises of Spain are very similar to certain of the ideas put forward by Menander in his rules for a speech in praise of a country.⁴¹ Menander

³⁹Menander, Sp. III, 369, 13ff. Plans of speech, cf. e.g. Pan. lat. III, 2, 6; V, 2, 2-3; VII, 3, 1-2; IX, 3, 4; XI, 6, 1; Julian, Or. I, 4, c-d.

⁴⁰Menander, Sp. III, 369, 23-24.

⁴¹Menander, Sp. III, 344-346. See O. Kehding, Thes. Marburg, 1899, 14; E. Galletier, "L'Eloge de l'Espagne dans le Panegyrique de Théodose par Pacatus", Mélanges Paul Thomas, Bruges, 1930, 327ff. Galletier also notes Pacatus' debt in this passage to several Roman authors including Florus, Trogus Pompeius, and, in particular, Virgil, of whose praise of Italy, Georgics, II, 136-176, Pacatus' eulogy of Spain is reminiscent. (Ibid. 331-3)

recommends that the orator boast of the land's natural qualities (φύξις) and situation (θέσις). The latter should include the country's relation to the land, sea and sky, for example, whether it is inland or near the sea, an island or a peninsula, and where it lies in relation to the points of the compass.⁴² Pacatus describes Spain's situation as follows:

Quae nec austrinis obnoxia aestibus nec arctois
subiecta frigoribus media fovetur axis utriusque
temperie, quae hinc Pyrenaei montibus, illinc Oceani
aestibus, inde Tyrrheni maris litoribus coronata
naturae sollertis ingenio velut alter orbis
includitur. (4, 3)

As regards the nature of the land, Menander suggests that the orator mention whether it is mountainous or flat, dry or marshy, fertile or infertile.⁴³ Pacatus concentrates on Spain's fruitfulness in the broadest sense of the word:

Adde tot egregias civitates, adde culta incultaque
omnia vel fructibus plena vel gregibus, adde
auriferorum opes fluminum, adde radiantium metalla
gemmarum. (4, 4)

Lastly he deals with Theodosius' race (γένος). Spain is the home of the toughest soldiers, the most experienced generals, the most eloquent orators, famous prophets, judges and emperors. (4, 5)

Chapter 5 comprises the praise of Theodosius' γένος. (This is the domus clara of Pacatus' plan, 3, 6.) Pacatus does not praise the whole of the emperor's ancestry, but as

⁴²Menander, Sp. III, 344, 19ff.

⁴³Menander, Sp. III, 344, 31ff.

Nicholas Sophista suggests, restricts himself to eulogising his father, the elder Theodosius, for his innumerable military victories and abundant virtues.⁴⁴

Next comes the eulogy of the emperor Theodosius himself. Pacatus omits the topic of his birth and begins by praising the emperor's physical beauty. (This is the divina forma of his own scheme, 3, 6.) In this Pacatus follows the order of topics as given by Menander and certain other rhetors.⁴⁵ This section is linked with the previous chapter by references to Theodosius' father. The latter was worthy to be emperor himself because of his valour, wisdom, beauty

⁴⁴Sp. III, 480, 16ff. As Nicholas Sophista did not write his treatise until the fifth century A.D., his work is on the whole too late for the purposes of this paper. It seems, however, that in this case Nicholas' work contains the earliest written statement that we possess of a tradition that was used long before his time in preference to the suggestions of earlier rhetors. Praise of ancestors is often omitted in the surviving eulogies, but where it is included the tendency is to concentrate upon recent forebears only. E.g. Pan. Lat. VIII, 3, 3-4; VI, 3ff. (the more distant ancestor Claudius Gothicus is mentioned here also but for the purposes of imperial propaganda); Julian, Or. I, 6d-10a spends an enormous amount of time on Constantius' ancestry, including distant forebears, but it is noteworthy that he spends by far the greatest time on his grandfather and father; Libanius, Or. XVIII, 7ff.; Claudian, III Cos. Hon., 51ff.; IV Cos. Hon., 18ff; VI Cos. Hon., 53ff.

⁴⁵See above p. 14 and n. 21. Physical appearance was important to the ancients. See e.g. E.C. Evans, "Roman Descriptions of Personal Appearance in History and Biography", HSCP, 1935, 43ff. Physical qualities are commonly praised in eulogies of Roman emperors, although not often as a separate topic. Cf. Pan. Lat. I, 4, 7; VII, 9, 5; 34, 3-4; VI, 17, 3-4; Ausonius, Ad Grat. 14; Claudian, IV Cos. Hon. 51f; VI Cos. Hon. 560ff. Julian, Or. I, 10b-11c, does treat praise of physical qualities as a separate topic.

and majesty. His son also has great valour and beauty. (6, 2) Pacatus remarks that according to philosophers beauty of face is a sign of divinity of soul, and hence Theodosius is worshipped like a god by his people (6, 3-4). In a similar way, one of Constantine's eulogists had stated that Constantine's beauty showed his divinity to his soldiers.⁴⁶

Chapters 7-10 of Pacatus' speech form the topic of aetas integra in his own plan (3, 6). This is the equivalent of the sections on upbringing and education in the schemes of the rhetoricians, although in detail Pacatus does not conform very closely to their prescriptions for this topic. Galletier adopts the view that Pacatus does not follow his own plan.⁴⁷ He includes Chapter 7 in the previous section, which in his view deals with the personality of Theodosius. Then, he groups Chapters 8-20 into one section which is concerned with the praise of the civil virtues of Theodosius.⁴⁸ This division, however, does not appear to be correct, as Chapters 8-20 include passages which deal specifically with wartime not civilian affairs.⁴⁹

⁴⁶Pan. Lat. VI, 17, 3-4:

Non frustra enim doctissimi viri dicunt Naturam ipsam magnis mentibus domicilia corporum digna metari, et ex vultu hominis ac decore membrorum colligi posse quantus illos caelestis spiritus intravit habitator. Itaque te cum ingredientem milites vident, admirantur et diligunt, sequuntur oculis, animo tenent, deo se obsequi putant, cuius tam pulchra forma est quam certa divinitas.

⁴⁷Paris, 1949, III, 71, n. 1.

⁴⁸Ibid. 65.

⁴⁹E.g. 8, 3-5; 10, 2-3.

It makes more sense if Pacatus is given credit for following his own scheme here, and chapters 7-10 are seen as the aetas integra, dealing particularly with Theodosius' upbringing and training before he became emperor. In this passage Pacatus seems to be concerned primarily with the advantages Theodosius enjoyed because of the age at which he came to the throne. In Chapter 7, which provides an introduction to the topic,⁵⁰ we learn that Theodosius merited the position of emperor not only because of his virtue and beauty (7, 1) but also because of the fact that he came to the throne at a mature age:

Bene igitur cuncta quadrarunt et ceteris quae innumera congruebant anni quoque suum iunxere suffragium, qui soli in homine perfecti bono duarum potiuntur aetatum, virtute iuvenum et maturitate seniorum. (7, 5)⁵¹

This thought is developed implicitly in the following chapters which deal with the experience Theodosius gained in the years before he became emperor. The military side of this training is dealt with in Chapter 8, where we see Theodosius learning

⁵⁰Cf. F. Grinda, Der Panegyrikus des Pacatus auf Kaiser Theodosius, Diss. Strasbourg, 1916, who feels that Ch. 7 alone is the topic aetas integra, and groups Chs. 18-21 together.

⁵¹Pacatus seems to have borrowed this idea from a panegyrist of Constantine, who in praising the alliance of Constantine and Maximian states: quam facile nunc omnis metus ponet Romana res publica, quae defenditur coniuncti imperii duabus aetatibus pariterque utitur virtute iuvenis et maturitate senioris. (Pan. Lat. VII, 13, 5).

military skills on campaign with his father.⁵² His retirement to Spain then gave him the opportunity to acquire experience in civil administration (9). Pacatus returns to the military in Chapter 10 where he recounts Theodosius' incessant activity in campaigns after his recall from exile, before he was offered the imperial crown.⁵³

It is difficult to decide whether Chapters 11 and 12 belong in the preceding section which deals with Theodosius' training for the position of emperor, or to the one following where Pacatus describes Theodosius' peacetime activities. As they are concerned mainly with Theodosius' elevation to the throne, and thus chronologically speaking provide a bridge between the praise of Theodosius' deeds before he was emperor and those after his accession, it is perhaps best to regard them as being transitional.⁵⁴

Pacatus devotes the majority of the remainder of his speech to praising Theodosius' deeds, thus following the precepts of the rhetoricians in treating this as the most

⁵²Cf. Menander, Sp. III, 371, 30-31. The theme of the emperor spending his youth amid wars, in lands ravaged by the enemy or hostile conditions of some sort is commonplace in eulogies. See e.g. Pan. Lat. I, 14-15; X, 2, 4; XI, 3, 9; Symmachus, In Val. I, 1; Claudian, III Cos. Hon. 10ff; IV Cos. Hon. 150ff.

⁵³Pacatus' stress upon Theodosius' maturity and experience contrasts to his allusions to the youthfulness of Valentinian II. For further discussion, see below p. 97f.

⁵⁴Menander Rhetor allots no place in his scheme for the *βασιλικὸς λόγος* to the topic of the emperor's elevation. However, this theme does occur commonly in these eulogies. See below p. 38-40.

important topic. Like Menander, he divides the eulogy of Theodosius' deeds into those of wartime and those of peacetime. Pacatus, however, reverses this order and deals with peacetime activity first, reserving until the last the eulogy of Theodosius' military exploits, which for the purposes of this speech are by far the most important, to form the climax of the speech.⁵⁵ As regards the arrangement of the deeds within each section, Pacatus utilizes both the arrangement by virtues suggested by the majority of the rhetoricians, and that by chronological order which is mentioned as an alternative by Quintilian. Pacatus deals with Theodosius' peacetime deeds according to the virtues they illustrate, while his military activities are described in chronological order.⁵⁶

Chapters 13-21 are concerned with Theodosius' deeds in the civil sphere. Here again, certain sections conform to the precepts of the rhetoricians. Pacatus begins with Theodosius' temperance.⁵⁷ He wishes his frugal way of life to be an example for his subjects. Therefore he has reduced the expenses of the palace to a minimum, and lives austere-

⁵⁵Pacatus here reverses the order of his plan: militarium civiliumque rarum usus. (3, 6).

⁵⁶See above n. 24 and n. 25. On the disposition of deeds see W. Pohlschmidt, Quaestiones Themistianae, Diss. Münster, 1908, 50-53; Galletier, Paris, 1949, I, xxxif. The practice of the orators varies on this point.

⁵⁷Cf. Menander, Sp. III, 376, 2ff.

and thriftily himself (13). Unlike luxury loving emperors of the past, he refuses to spend exorbitant sums on banquets with delicacies procured at great expense because they are out of season or from distant parts (14). This eulogy of Theodosius' temperance bears a striking resemblance to the passage of Mamertinus' panegyric to the emperor Julian, in which he praises Julian's taste for simplicity and

frugality.⁵⁸ In particular, compare the following: cum videret imperatorem parce contenteque viventem, modico et castrensi cibo ieiunia longa solantem (Pacatus, 13, 3) with: neque tempus epularum ei qui saepius statarium prandium ad necessitatem humani corporis caviat gaudens castrensi cibo (Mamertinus, 11, 4), and:

Nam delicati illi ac fluentes et quales tulit saepe res publica, parum se lautos putabant nisi luxuria vertisset annum, nisi hibernae poculis rosae innatassent, nisi aestivam in gemmis capacibus glaciem Falerna fregissent.... Namque appositae dapes non sapore, sed sumptu aestimantes, illis demum cibis adquiescebant quos extremus Oriens aut positus extra Romanum Colchus imperium aut famosa naufragiis maria misissent, quos invitae quodammodo reluctantique Naturae hominum pericla rapuissent. (Pacatus, 14, 1-2)

with:

⁵⁸Pan. Lat. III, 11.

Quin etiam prandiorum atque cenarum laboratas
magnitudines res publica sentiebat, cum quaesitissimae
dapes non gustu, sed difficulitatibus aestimarentur,
miracula avium, longinqui maris pisces, alieni
temporis poma, aestivae nives, hibernae rosae.
(Mamertinus, 11, 3)⁵⁹

Pacatus next praises the magistrates of Theodosius.
Not only is he virtuous himself but his magistrates also are
paragons of virtue (15, 1). He was fortunate in those he
inherited from the previous emperor and wise in his own
choice of men (15, 2-3).⁶⁰

After a long section in which he eulogises Theodosius
for the honours and kindnesses he bestows on his friends
(16-20), Pacatus extols him for his friendliness and
accessibility to his subjects in general. Theodosius is
praised for his frequent public appearances, and because he
allows his subjects to approach him with their petitions
(21, 2-5). Ease of access to the emperor for the people is

⁵⁹Cf. also Julian, Or. II, 101c: καὶ οὐδὲ ἐν ἑαυτοῖς
φύσειν ἐκείνων τὴν ἡμετέραν ἀπειτέ τιμήσασθαι, οὐδὲ αὐτῶν θέρος
ἔρη τοῦ κραυγαλέου μέλει. Praise of the emperor's
temperance and moderation is common in eulogies, although
not necessarily treated as a separate topic. See e.g. Pan.
Lat. I, 2, 6; 3, 2; 9, 1; 49, 5-8; 60, 5; 81, 1ff; IV, 9, 4;
34, 1 and 3; VII, 3, 4; XI, 19, 2; XII, 7, 5; Ausonius, Ad
Grat. 14; Libanius, Or. XIII, 14; Or. XVIII, 171; Or. XII,
94; Julian, Or. I, 16b.

⁶⁰Cf. Menander, Sp. III, 375, 18-21, who includes the
selection of good magistrates under justice rather than
wisdom. Cf. also Pan. Lat. III, 21; X, 3, 3; Claudian,
IV. Cos. Hon. 489f; Libanius, Or. XIII, 43.

mentioned as a subject for praise by Menander, and is also eulogised by other orators.⁶¹

The longest and most important topic in Pacatus' speech is the praise of Theodosius' military exploits, which comprises Chapters 22-46.⁶² Pacatus gives a brief account of Theodosius' relations with foreign powers (22). We hear that he conquered the barbarian tribes: Quaecumque natio barbarorum robore ferocia numero gravis umquam nobis fuit, aut boni consulit ut quiescat aut laetatur quasi amica si serviat (22, 4) which Pacatus seems to have taken directly from the panegyrist of Constantine who remarks: domita Germania aut boni consulit ut quiescat aut laetatur quasi amica si pareat.⁶³ The Persian king himself offered his submission to Theodosius (22, 5). Here again, Pacatus seems to owe a large debt to a predecessor for this description of the Persian king: ipse ille rex eius dedignatus antea

⁶¹Menander, Sp. III, 375, 8ff, where ease of access is included under justice. Cf. e.g. Pan. Lat. I, 48, 1-2; III, 2, 28-29, 30; IV, 34, 4; Ausonius, Ad Grat. 15; Libanius, Or. XVIII, 189-192; Claudian, VI Cos. Mon. 550f.,

⁶²Galletier, Paris, 1949, III, 66, would include Ch. 21 in this section which he calls les meritis publics et les exploits de Théodose. There is some justification for this division as the opening sentence of Ch. 21 seems to indicate Pacatus' transition from discussing virtues which serve the interests of a few to those that serve the many (21, 1), and both ease of access and war exploits fall into the latter category. However, since Pacatus himself divides his speech according to civil and military exploits (3, 6), it seems better to include Ch. 21 in the civil merits and regard 21, 1 as a notice of transition within this topic.

⁶³Pan. Lat. VII, 8, 5.

confiteri hominem iam fatetur timorem (22, 5), for Mamertinus in his address to Maximian states: 'rex ille Persarum, numquam se ante dignatus hominem confiteri, fratri tuo supplicat.⁶⁴

The remainder of the section (23-46) is devoted entirely to the usurpation of Magnus Maximus, and Theodosius' victorious campaign against him, which provided Pacatus with the occasion for his eulogy. Chapter 23 sets the scene: a tyrant arose in the empire who, after an apparently unimportant beginning, became a great evil. To Theodosius is due the credit for crushing this tyrant. Pacatus spends some time describing Maximus' personality and his administration (24-30). He then passes on to the outbreak of the war caused by Maximus' advance into Italy (30, 1-4). Next comes the description of the campaign against Maximus. In this section there are several passages in which Pacatus has made use of conventions for eulogising an emperor's military exploits. Chapters 32 and 33 deal with Theodosius' preparations for the war. His wisdom and careful planning are emphasised (32, 1).⁶⁵ The major battles of the campaign are recounted in Chapters 34-36. The description of the battle of the Save is brief but presented dramatically and Pacatus dwells in particular on the picture of the fallen among the enemy (34, 2-4). Especially reminiscent of the prescriptions of Menander are

⁶⁴ Pan. Lat. X, 10, 6.

⁶⁵ Cf. Menander, Sp. III, 374, 23ff.

the following passages: volvuntur impiae in sanguine suo turbae, tegit totos strages una campos continuisque funeribus cuncta late operiuntur (34, 2), and: spumat decolor cruore fluviis et cunctantes meatus vix eluctatis cadaveribus evolvit (34, 4).⁶⁶ The latter quotation also recalls Nazarius' words:

Non commemorabo his tectas continuis stragibus ripas,
non oppletum acervis corporum Tiberim et inter
congestas alte cadaverum moles aegro nisu ac vix
eluctantibus gurgitibus exeuntem.⁶⁷

As regards the battle of Poetovio (35-36) we are given more details of the actual fighting, with the bravery of Theodosius' soldiers emphasised (35),⁶⁸ and a description of the slaughter of the enemy (36, 1-2) similar to that of the battle of the Save. Maximus' army, needless to say, was defeated soundly in both battles. Theodosius marched to Italy and caught Maximus himself at Aquileia (38-42). As recommended by Menander, Pacatus praises Theodosius' clemency towards his conquered enemies.⁶⁹ He was unwilling to put Maximus to death, with the result that his soldiers had to do

⁶⁶Cf. Menander, Sp. III, 374, 9ff.

⁶⁷Pan. Lat. IV, 30, 1. In fact the battle scenes described by Nazarius, Pan. Lat. IV, 26, 29 and 30 are all quite similar to Pacatus' descriptions. Cf. also Pan. Lat. X, 11, 7: quod iam milites vestri ad Oceanum pervenere victoria, iam caesorum in illo litore hostium sanguinem reciproci fluctus sorbuerunt; Claudian, III Cos. Hon. 99ff; Julian, Or. II, 66c; Libanius, Or. XVIII, 60.

⁶⁸Cf. Menander, Sp. III, 373, 24ff.

⁶⁹Cf. Menander, Sp. III, 374, 25ff.

the job for him (43, 5-44, 3). Theodosius' generosity to those members of Maximus' army who approached him as suppliants after the battle of Poetovio is emphasised (36, 3-4). Finally, he is praised for sparing the lives, property and reputations of the majority of Maximus' allies (45, 4ff).⁷⁰

As convention requires, Pacatus concludes his speech with an epilogue (47). He apologises for not praising the remaining worthy deeds of Theodosius in both the civil and military spheres (47, 1-4). He then ends, as he began, with a personal reference. In the prooemium he spoke of his fear of delivering his speech. Now, when it was over, he expresses his joy at having had the honour of seeing Theodosius and his family, and of writing a speech which will provide inspiration for later writers (47, 5-6).⁷¹

As we have seen, Menander recommends that the orator emphasise the emperor's good fortune. Pacatus does not fail to do this. The most important passage in this respect is that which comprises Chapters 40-42, in which Pacatus points

⁷⁰ Eulogy of the emperor's clemency to be conquered: cf. e.g. Pan. Lat. III, 2, 3; IV, 6, 1; 20, 1; X, 4, 3; XII, 5, 6; 6, 1; 11, 1; 20, 2-4; Symmachus, In Val. II, 11 and 12; Claudian, IV Cos. Hon. 111ff; Julian, Or. I, 58b; Libanius, Or. XII, 85; Or. XVIII, 62.

⁷¹ The contents of the epilogue do not conform closely to Menander's suggestions except in that he ends on a note of great joy in the emperor's rule. Cf. above p. 18.

out the role that Fortuna⁷² played in Theodosius' campaign against Maximus. Fortuna was of particular help after the battles were over, because she made possible the superhuman speed of the chase after Maximus. Further it was Fortuna who prevented Maximus from committing suicide when all hope of escape had left him, and so kept him alive for Theodosius to punish suitably (40, 3ff). Pacatus also makes the distinction between the virtues one owes to oneself and the gifts of fortune.⁷³ This is made clear in the discussion of the part that Fortuna played in the war against Maximus. Theodosius' own virtue was responsible for his success during the war, but Fortuna helped him greatly afterwards (40, 1-4). So that: Nam etsi per te confeceris quae volebas, per Fortunam tamen plus adeptus es quam volebas (41, 1-2). The distinction is made even more plainly in the early chapters of the speech. After dealing with the preliminary topics of praise, native land, family, physical beauty, and having mentioned Theodosius' fortune in coming to the throne at a mature age, Pacatus remarks:

⁷²Fortuna personified as used by Pacatus signifies a power which can predestine either good or bad luck: cf. eg. 23, 4(bad); 9, 1; 40, 1; 42, 2 (good). The word fortuna can mean good or bad luck but when used of an emperor in a eulogy it generally signifies good fortune, and is more or less synonymous with the word felicitas. See H. Wagenwoort, "Felicitas Imperatoria", Mnemosyne, 7, 317; Burdeau, Aspects de l'Empire Romain, Paris, 1964, 26.

⁷³See above p. 17f

Hactenus in te praedicata sint, imperator, dona
Fatorum: nunc ad ea proferamus gradum quae tibi
debes. Neque enim illa praeterita bellicae rei gloria,
quam per tot laborum experimenta quaesisti, adscribenda
Fortunae est. (8, 1)

He then goes on to praise the military experiences of
Theodosius' youth.⁷⁴ Pacatus also praises the emperor's
felicitas. This is mentioned in the context of his triumph
when he caught Maximus at Aquileia (40, 1). His father also
enjoyed felicitas (6, 1).⁷⁵

From the preceding analysis it is evident that Pacatus
was careful to conform closely to the rhetorical conventions
for composing eulogies, and in particular to those for
laudatory addresses to Roman emperors as presented by
Menander Rhetor. His choice of topics and their disposition
follow the traditional schemes almost without swerving. In
some cases even the contents of the topic are almost wholly
conventional. This is particularly true of the eulogy of
Spain, about which Galletier concludes:

Ces lignes attestent, en effet, la tyrannie de la
tradition scolaire, et il n'est rien en elles qui
n'ait été prescrit par les faiseurs de manuel.⁷⁶

⁷⁴Theodosius' fortuna is also mentioned at 9, 1; 15, 3.

⁷⁵Praise of the emperor's fortuna or felicitas is very
common in eulogies: fortuna e.g. Pan. lat. I, 9, 4; 10, 3;
15, 1; 60, 6; 71, 5; 83, 1; III, 26, 3; 27, 2; IV, 26, 1;
29, 2; V, 2, 4; 12, 4; VII, 5, 3; 7, 4; X, 11, 1 and 7; XI,
7, 5; 10, 1; 19, 3; Ausonius, Ad Grat. 2; 8; Symmachus, In
Val. I, 7; II, 9, 15; In Grat. 11; felicitas e.g. Pan. lat.
I, 2, 8; 61, 4; 74, 1; 83, 6; III, 27, 1; IV, 11, 4; 19, 2;
27, 6; 37, 5; VI, 3, 2; 8, 2; 10, 1; VII, 10, 1; 14, 2; VIII,
7, 3; 15, 1 and 4; 16, 3; 18, 2; IX, 19, 1; X, 11, 4 and 7;
XI passim, esp. 13ff; Ausonius, Ad Grat. 2; Symmachus, In
Val. I, 1; In Grat. 10, 11.

⁷⁶Galletier, Mélanges Paul Thomas, Bruges, 1930, 333.

2. THEODOSIUS AND MAXIMUS: PERFECT EMPEROR AND CONVENTIONAL TYRANT

The aim of eulogists of Roman emperors was, of course, to praise their emperor as highly as possible. As a result they tended to depict the emperors as being the embodiment of the ideal ruler.⁷⁷ Although the ideal was modified according to the particular image of himself the emperor had or desired his subjects to have, and by any special aspects the eulogist himself wanted to emphasise, nevertheless the characteristics and functions attributed to the various emperors in eulogies all have a great deal in common with each other.

The Romans of the Republic hated the idea of monarchy, associating the name of king with the legendary tyranny of the ancient rulers of Rome. When Augustus inaugurated the Roman empire, he accordingly tried to minimise the fact that the government was now an autocracy instead of the Republic it had been. Rather than use the title imperator or dominus, he styled himself princeps - leading citizen. The absolute nature of the princeps' power was not long disguised, however, and the terms princeps, dominus and imperator came to be used

⁷⁷Burdeau, Aspects de l'Empire Romain, Paris, 1964, 6: L.K. Born, "The Perfect Prince According to the Latin Panegyrists", AJP, 1934, 21, notes the similarity of the picture of the emperor in these eulogies to the portrait of the ideal king in ancient treatises on kingship.

as synonyms and all were applied to both good and bad emperors.⁷⁸ Nevertheless, the Roman conception of the ideal emperor retained the ideas inherent in the term princeps in the Augustan sense. Although the absolute power of the emperor was recognised and accepted, the ideal sovereign conducted himself as a servant of the state rather than its master, sacrificing himself and his own personal ambitions, and using his power for the task of procuring and maintaining justice, peace, harmony and general prosperity for his people.⁷⁹ This view of the emperor is the basis of many of the portraits found in surviving βασιλικὰ λόγια.⁸⁰

The holder of imperial power was, then, required to be altruistic. The ideal ruler did not hold power for any advantages it would bring to himself but for what he could give to the state.⁸¹ This resulted in the attitude that possession of imperial power was a burden for the good emperor, a moles, labor or onus which he had to suscipere.

⁷⁸On the use of these words in the Roman empire, see J. Béranger, Recherches sur l'Aspect Idéologique du Principat, Basel, 1958, 31ff, 50ff.

⁷⁹Chester G. Starr, "The Perfect Democracy of the Roman Empire", AHR, 1952, 12.

⁸⁰However, certain writers on kingship and eulogists, notably Eusebius and Themistius, tended towards the autocratic ideal.

⁸¹Burdeau, Aspects de l'Empire Romain, Paris, 1964, 41f. Pliny says to Trajan, Pan. Lat. I, 7, 3: Adsumptus es in laborum curarumque consortium, neq te prospera et laeta stationis istius, sed aspera et dura ad capeendam eam compulerunt.

Pacatus talks of choosing the man: qui debeat tantam molem subire et nutantia Romanae rei fata suscipere (3, 5), who is Theodosius (3, 6).⁸²

A development of the idea of power being a burden is that of the refusal of power. The prospective good emperor would be hesitant to accept the position because of the altruism and self-sacrifice that it would require. Hence the theme of initial refusal to accept the throne followed by eventual acceptance under constraint became a commonplace of the elevation of an emperor.⁸³ Pacatus makes much of this idea. Dudum, ut video, dedignaris hanc gloriam (7, 1), he says to Theodosius. He stresses the authenticity of Theodosius' refusal:

Cum ad suspiciendam rem publicam vocabaris, oblatum imperium deprecatus es, nec id ad speciem tantumque ut cogi videreris, sed obnixe et diu et velut impetraturus egisti. (11, 1)

Theodosius did nothing to gain the position of emperor for himself but was compelled to take it invitus, in contrast to

⁸²Cf. eg. Pan. Lat. I, 5, 6; 7, 3; IV, 8, 2; VII, 11, 7; X, 3, 3; 4, 1; XI, 13, 4; Claudian, IV Cos. Hon. 60f. See also Béranger, Basel, 1958, 175ff, where he has collected the many references in ancient literature reflecting the idea of power as a burden, and Burdeau, Aspects de l'Empire Romain, Paris, 1964, 42ff.

⁸³Béranger, Basel, 1958, 137ff. He lists the emperors who are said to have refused power initially, and the references to the ancient sources at pp. 139-140. See also, Burdeau, Aspects de l'Empire Romain, Paris, 1964, 42ff.

the tyrants who had plotted and murdered to seize the throne (12, 1-2).⁸⁴

Although he does not seek power for himself, nevertheless the good emperor deserves his position because of his virtue: Virtus tua meruit imperium Illa praestitit ut oporteret te principem fieri (7, 1).⁸⁵ Further, the ideal emperor is the one the people wish to have at the head of the state, as opposed to the tyrant who holds the position against the will of his subjects.⁸⁶ From this concept comes the emphasis on universal consent: Être porté au pouvoir par la volonté non seulement d'une majorité, mais de tous, telle est la condition première de la légitimité impériale.⁸⁷ Thus, Pacatus argues that if a world council were held to choose an emperor, Theodosius (implied) would be chosen: omnium suffragiis hominum, tributim centuriatimque (3, 5-6). Later in the speech

⁸⁴The themes of unwillingness, refusal and constraint are dominant in Chapters 11 and 12 of Pacatus' speech. Cf. Pan. Lat. I, 5, 5; 6, 4; 9, 2-3; VI, 8, 3-6; VII, 9, 2; Symmachus, In Val. I, 10; Libanius, Or. XII, 16; Or. XIII, 34; Or. XVIII, 99.

⁸⁵Cf. eg. Pan. Lat. I, 7, 4; 21, 4; VII, 5, 3; Symmachus, In Val. I, 2.

⁸⁶See Polybius, 6, 4, 2: οὐτε γὰρ πᾶσι δόξου μοναρχίαν ἐθέλως βασίλειαν ῥήσαν, ἀλλὰ μόνον τὴν ἐξ ἀνάγκης συχωρημένην καὶ τῇ γνώμῃ τοῦ λαοῦ ἢ φόβῳ καὶ βίᾳ κυβερνωμένην

⁸⁷Burdeau, Aspects de l'Empire Romain, Paris, 1964, 35; see also H.U. Instinsky, "Consensus Universorum", Hermes, 1940, 264ff; Béranger, Basel, 1958, 153ff. .

Maximus' usurpation is contrasted with Theodosius' elevation:

Iam vero te principem in medio rei publicae sinu, omnium suffragio militum, consensu provinciarum, ipsius denique ambitu imperatoris optatum; se in ultimo terrarum recessu legionibus nesciis, adversis provinciarum studiis, nullis denique auspiciis in illud tyrannici nominis adspirasse furtum? (31, 2)⁸⁸

As regards Theodosius' personal conduct while in power, we again see many elements of the perfect ruler. The ideal emperor, although he was, as Pacatus says of Theodosius, imperatorem rerum potentem, terrarum hominumque dominum (13, 3), conducted himself as the princeps in the Augustan sense, that is as the leader of the state but still one of its citizens. Hence the emphasis placed on such qualities as the emperor not changing after his accession, but still behaving like a private citizen and obeying the laws himself, as opposed to the tyrant who desires sovereignty in order to use the impunity the position of emperor would give him to exercise his greed, lust and cruelty. Pacatus asks: Quid tua intererat te principem fieri, qui futurus eras in imperatore privatus? (12, 5).

Then he addresses Theodosius as follows:

Idem es qui fuisti et tantum tibi per te licet quantum per leges licebat. Ius summum facultate et copia commodandi, non securitate peccandi experiris.

⁸⁸Cf. eg. Pan. Lat. I, 6; VI, 8, 2.

Unum tibi praestitit principatus ut certum habeamus omnes etiam sub imperatoribus aliis vixisse te legibus tuis. Nam qui nihil facit licenter cum potest, numquam voluit. (12, 5-6)⁸⁹

Related is the idea that the possession of a virtuous character is an integral feature of the ideal ruler.⁹⁰ Thus the perfect emperor must possess the cardinal virtues of the good man. Theodosius, according to Pacatus, is temperate in his life style. He lives frugally and does not indulge himself in the pleasures of life (13-14).⁹¹ His choice of magistrates shows his sapientia (15, 3), while his war preparations show his prudentia (40, 3).⁹² He exercises ius in contrast to Maximus' iniuriam (31, 3).⁹³ He shows fortitudo in war (40, 3)⁹⁴. In addition the good emperor is endowed with virtus. This may have a variety of implications from high moral character to specifically military valour or

⁸⁹Cf. e.g. Pan. Lat. I, 65, 1; III, 26, 1; 27, 1; Symmachus, In Val. I, 7; Libanius, Or. XVIII, 184; Claudian, VI Cos. Hon. 559; Julian, Or. 45d.

⁹⁰Julian, Or. II, 79ff.

⁹¹See above p. 27-29.

⁹²Wise choice of magistrates, see above n. 60. Cf. Julian, Or. II, 90c-91d. Prudentia/Sapientia: cf. e.g. Pan. Lat. VII, 3, 4; X, 4, 1; IX, 10, 1; XI, 19, 2.

⁹³Iustitia: cf. e.g. Pan. Lat. VI, 6, 1; VII, 3, 4; X, 9, 5; II, 3; XI, 19, 2; Claudian, IV Cos. Hon. 510ff.

⁹⁴According to Julian, Or. II, 86b, the kingly man is ἀνδρῶν πρῶτος. Fortitudo, cf. e.g. Pan. Lat. III, 5, 4; 21, 4; IV, 6, 5; VI, 4, 2; 17, 1; VII, 3, 4; 4, 2; X, 4, 1 and 3; XI, 19, 2; Ausonius, Ad Grat. 8.

courage, the more frequent meaning in eulogies of Roman emperors.⁹⁵ Theodosius possesses this valour (6, 1; 22, 1; 24, 2). The use of virtus in the sentence virtus tua meruit imperium (7, 1) seems to imply his virtue in the more general sense.⁹⁶ Finally, Theodosius shows pietas by his unwillingness to listen to an account of Maximus' usurpation and his own goodness: necesse me erit vel tacentem publica incommoda vel loquentem aut ingratum virtuti aut onerosum esse pietati (24, 2). This is reminiscent of the words of Mamertinus to the emperor Maximian: Quod ego cursim praetereo; video enim te, qua pietate es, oblivionem illius victoriae malle quam gloriam.⁹⁷

The ideal emperor not only is virtuous himself, but through his character and behaviour is an example to his subjects. The emperor Julian has this to say about the perfect ruler:

⁹⁵Cf. Burdeau, Aspects de l'Empire Romain, Paris, 1964, 27ff.

⁹⁶Pliny, Pan. Lat. I, 89, 3 and Claudian, III Cos. Hon., 188, use virtus meaning virtue in general. For its use in the sense of courage or valour, cf. e.g. Pan. Lat. IV, 3, 3; 27, 6, VI, 10, 4; VII, 7, 3; 11, 4; 10, 4; 3, 3; IX, 19, 1; X, 2, 6, 5, 2; 6, 3; 7, 6; XII, 10, 3; 3, 2, 5, 2; Ausonius, Ad Grat. 2; 7; Symmachus, In Grat. 10.

⁹⁷Pliny, Pan. Lat. X, 4, 4. On piety as a characteristic of the ideal emperor, see e.g. Julian, Or. II, 86a. For citations of pietas in eulogies, cf. e.g. Pan. Lat. I, 10, 3; VI, 14, 3 and 6; VIII, 3, 3; 20, 3; VII, 1, 4; X, 1, 4; XI, passim; XII, 4, 4; Ausonius, Ad Grat. 2; 7; 8; 17; Claudian, III Cos. Hon. 85; IV Cos. Hon. 513; Symmachus, In Grat., I, 22.

And not only by exhorting, or by his readiness to praise the deserving, or by rewarding and punishing severely and inexorably, does he win them over to this [i.e. being hardy and industrious] and coerce them; far rather does he show that he is himself what he would have them be.⁹⁸

Pacatus takes up this idea in his eulogy of Theodosius:

Quin ubi primum te imperio praestitisti, non contentus ipse ultra vitia recessisse, aliorum vitiis corrigendis curam adiecisti, idque moderate, ut suadere potius honesta quam cogere videreris (13, 1).

For: exasperat homines imperata correctio, blandissime iubetur exemplo (14, 4). Thus Theodosius by his temperance and frugality: in omnes luxuriae pudor, parsimoniae cultus inolevit, et quiescentibus legum minis subiit quemque privatim sui poenitentia (14, 4), and in warfare: dux esse consilio, miles exemplo (10, 4).⁹⁹

The goodness of the emperor to his people is often emphasised. Pacatus concentrates in particular upon the benefits and honours Theodosius bestows on those eligible for

⁹⁸ Julian, Or. II, 87b-c: ἵνα δὲ οὐ παρὰ τὸν μόνον οὐδὲ ἐπὶ τῶν τοῦ ἀρχιερέως προθέμεναι καὶ χρῆζόμενος ἢ καλοῦν ἔγχα τῶν καὶ ἀσφαλείῃς συμπεῖθε καὶ βελτίονα καὶ πάλιν προτέρων αὐτῶν τοιοῦτον ἐπὶ εὐκυνῶν... (All translations of Julian's orations are by Wilmer Cave Wright from the Loeb edition.) See also: Seneca De Ira, I, 6, 3: civitatis rectorem decet, quamdiu potest, verbis et his mollioribus, ingenia curare, ut facienda suadeat. Pliny, Pan. Lat. I, 45, 6:

Nam vita principis censura est eaque perpetua: ad hanc dirigimur, ad hanc convertimur, nec tam imperio nobis opus est quam exemplo. Quippe infidelis recti magister est metus. Melius homines exemplis docentur, quae in primis hoc in se boni habent, quod adprobant quae praecipunt fieri posse.

⁹⁹ The emperor as an example to his subjects: cf. e.g. Pan. Lat. VIII, 14, 3; XII, 21, 4; Julian, Or. I, 21d; 39b.

state offices (16-20). Theodosius' amicitia is praised. Pacatus indicates that this is a new virtue for an emperor to possess. Other emperors may have been generous but did not practice friendship (16, 1). Theodosius, however, gave it a special place: Tu Amicitiam, nomen ante privatum, non solum intra aulam vocasti, sed indutam purpura, auro gemmisque redimitam solio recepisti (16, 2), much as Julian had done for philosophy according to Mamertinus:

tu Philosophiam paulo ante suspectam ac non solum spoliata~~m~~ honoribus sed accusatam ac ream non modo iudicio liberasti, sed amictam purpura, auro gemmisque redimitam in regali solio conlocasti.¹⁰⁰

Friendship was not as novel for the emperor as Pacatus would like us to believe. Pliny addressed the following words to Trajan: tu hanc (i.e. amicitiam) pulsam et errantem reduxisti; habes amicos quia amicus ipse es.¹⁰¹ Mamertinus praises the same quality in the emperor Julian: Prorsus amictias tueris privati fide, imperatoris opulentia.¹⁰² Theodosius' friendship causes him to show particular kindness to his friends. His benignitas is illustrated by the fact that he gives honours to his friends with no benefit to himself apart from the pleasure of giving (16, 4) and that he

¹⁰⁰Pan. Lat. III, 23, 4.

¹⁰¹Pan. Lat. I, 85, 2. The whole of Chs. 85-87 deal with friendship.

¹⁰²Pan. Lat. III, 26, 1. The whole of Ch. 26 is concerned with the theme of friendship. See also, Ausonius, Ad Grat. 14.

wants to give more honours than are available (20, 1). This benignitas extends even to peoples outside the empire, for it caused Theodosius to allow barbarians to join his army (32, 3).¹⁰³ The fact that Theodosius preferred his friends to his sons to fulfil the position of consul is a mark of his benevolentia (16, 4).¹⁰⁴ The beneficia he bestowed on individuals and on the state as a whole are mentioned frequently.¹⁰⁵ Theodosius also possesses the virtue of humanitas, quae tam clara in imperatore quam rara est, which is shown by the fact that he bestowed privileges such as dinner invitations and kisses upon those for whom there was no official post available (20, 1-2).¹⁰⁶ The emperor's

¹⁰³The barbarisation of the army by Theodosius has been censured by both ancient and modern historians. For further discussion see below p. 157f. Benignitas: cf. eg. Pan. Lat. IX, 15, 5; IV, 35, 1; XII, 21, 2; Ausonius, Ad Grat. 8.

¹⁰⁴Benevolentia: cf. eg. Pan. Lat. III, 26, 1; 31, 6; 32, 2 and 3; IX, 4, 1. Sometimes bonitas is used: eg. Pan. Lat. VIII, 9, 2; VII, 26, 3; III, 18, 1. The emperor's goodness in bestowing the consulship is the main theme of gratiarum actiones, such as those of Mamertinus to Julian (Pan. Lat. III) and Ausonius to Gratian, which were, in fact, speeches of thanks for the consulship. Pliny's speech of thanks to Trajan (Pan. Lat. I) concentrates less on the aspect of thanks for the consulship.

¹⁰⁵Beneficia: Pacatus, 18, 1, 2 and 4; 19, 2; 24, 2 and 3. Cf. eg. Pan. Lat. III, 1, 1 and 2; 9, 1; 31, 3; 32, 1-2; IV, 35, 1; 38, 1; V, 1, 1 and 4; 9, 2; 10, 3; 11, 1 and 3; 13, 6; VI, 22, 4; VII, 1, 2; X, 14, 5; XII, 10, 4; 20, 3; Ausonius, Ad Grat. 1; 2; 4; 7; Symmachus, In Val. I, 11; 13; II, 1; 12, 31; Claudian, VI Cos. Hon. 386.

¹⁰⁶Humanitas: cf. eg. Pan. Lat. IX, 15, 3; 19, 4; III, 28, 2; XII, 14, 1.

kindness to the rank and file of his subjects is illustrated by the ease of access to his person that he allows them.¹⁰⁷ His mercy extends even to conquered and suppliant enemies.¹⁰⁸

A function of the good emperor is to protect the state from enemies, both internal and external. Theodosius divided his time between his citizens and the enemies of the state (22, 1). A commonplace of eulogies is the idea that the emperor inspired fear in potential enemies. Theodosius' enemies: nominis terrore percussi et velut adflati quiescant (22, 1), while:

Tua, enim, imperator, auspicia non hae tantum gentes tremunt quas ab orbe nostro silvarum intervalla vel flumina montesve distinguunt, sed quas aeternis ardoribus inaccessas aut continua hieme separatas aut interfusis aequoribus abiunctas Natura disternat (22, 2).¹⁰⁹

The emperor's continual activity on behalf of the state is emphasised frequently in laudatory speeches. Thus Pacatus remarks:

Gaudet, profecto perpetuo divina motu, et iugi agitatione se vegetat aeternitas, et quidquid homines vocamus laborem vestra natura est. Ut indefessa vertigo caelum rotat, ut maria aestibus inquietata sunt, ut stare sol nescit, ita tu, imperator, continuatis negotiis et in se quodam orbe redeuntibus semper exercitus es (10, 1).

¹⁰⁷See above p. 29f.

¹⁰⁸See above p. 32f.

¹⁰⁹Cf. eg. Pan. Lat. I, 14, 1; III, 8, 4; IV, 3, 5; VI, 11, 1; VIII, 13, 3; XI, 3, 4; 14, 1; Claudian, III Cos. Hon., 18f; Libanius, Or. XII, 73; Or. XVIII, 164, 300,

Mamertinus in his address to Maximian had already compared the emperor's tireless activity to the eternal in similar terms: Quidquid immortale est, stare nescit sempiternoque motu se servat aeternitas.¹¹⁰

The prosperity of the state under the emperor being praised is mentioned frequently in eulogies. This sometimes takes the form of a contrast between the dire situation of the empire on the eve of the emperor's accession and its present good fortune. Pacatus states:

Iacebat innumerabilibus malis aegra vel potius dixerim exanimata res publica, barbaris nationibus Romano nomini velut quodam diluvio superfusis. Sed parcam replicare causas et placatum ulcus offendere. Nam cum per se vivax sit recordatio calamitatum, tum mihi metus hanc gaudiorum praesentium lucem tristium commemoratione fuscare (3, 3-4).¹¹¹

Often the felicitas of the state under the present emperor is emphasised. Rome, Pacatus says, has never been felicior than now (1, 2). Theodosius himself caused the felicity of his empire, for the day of his accession is described as: ille felicitatis publicae auspex dies (3, 1).¹¹²

¹¹⁰ Pan. Lat. XI, 3, 2. Also very similar are Pan. Lat. XII, 22, 1: Quisnam iste est tam continuus ardor? Quae divinitas perpetuo vicens motu?; XI, 2, 3: siquidem vos dis esse genitos et nominibus quidem vestris sed multo magis virtutibus approbatis. Quarum infatigabiles motus et impetus ipsa vis divinitatis exercet. Cf. eg. Pan. Lat. III, 12, 3; VII, 14, 1; IX, 19, 2; VIII, 4, 3; X, 3, 3-4; XI, 4, 1; Libanius, Or. XVIII, 74ff; Symmachus, In Val. I, 16.

¹¹¹ Cf. eg. Pan. Lat. XI, 3; X, 4, 2; IX, 4, 1; V, 5ff; I, 5-6.

¹¹² Cf. eg. Pan. Lat. I, 46, 7; VIII, 4, 3; X, 13, 1; 14, 4; Symmachus, In Val. II, 2, 31.

Further, the emperor is often seen as the preserver or restorer of libertas. This can mean freedom in the sense of the civil and personal freedom that the people may enjoy under a good ruler, as opposed to the life of repression and curtailed liberty under a tyrant.¹¹³ Or libertas can mean freedom in the sense of security from the threat of civil war or barbarian invasion.¹¹⁴ Pacatus uses libertas in both senses. He says to Theodosius: libertatem armatus adservisti (1, 2), which would refer to the defeat of the usurper Maximus and Theodosius' victories over the barbarians.¹¹⁵ He also asserts that if Brutus, the libertatis adsertor, regii nominis osor, were to return to life, then: Romanam dignitatem ac libertatem proberet meliore in statu imperatore te esse quam consule se fuisse (20, 5-6). This is a reference to the civil freedom the people enjoyed under the just rule of Theodosius who did not behave like the tyrants who caused the name of king to be associated with severe repression. Finally, Pacatus mentions one specific civil freedom that the people enjoyed under Theodosius: Nunc per dicendi tacendique

¹¹³G. Walser, "Der Kaiser als Vindex Libertatis", Historia, 1955, 353ff; Starr, AHR, 1952, 1ff; Burdeau, Aspects de l'Empire Romain, Paris, 1964, 48ff.

¹¹⁴Walser, Historia, 1955, 363ff.

¹¹⁵See also 46, 6. Cf. eg. Pan. Lat. III, 6, 1; VIII, 19, 1; 18, 4; X, 7, 7; XII, 2, 4; Claudian, VI Cos. Hon. 121; III Cos. Hon. 105.

libertas in contrast to the obligation upon an orator under a bad emperor of composing eulogies of him (2, 2-4).¹¹⁶

Lastly, as a result of his goodness to his subjects and the blessings that his rule has brought to the empire, the good emperor wins the love and affection of his people. Thus, Pacatus remarks upon how the people love to see their emperor: Magis magisque visus expetitur, et (novum dictu) praesens desideratur (21, 5).¹¹⁷ Pacatus describes the great joy with which the people of Hemona received Theodosius when he visited their city after his defeat of Maximus (37).¹¹⁸ He is protected by the love of his subjects: remota custodia militari tutior publici amoris excubiis (47, 3). The emperors Trajan and Julian similarly had found security in their people's affections according to their eulogists.¹¹⁹

¹¹⁶Pliny also mentions freedom of speech in his address to Trajan: Pan. Lat. I, 4, 3: nec nobis munera tua praedicat sed audire tibi necesse est. Freedom in the sense of civil and personal freedom: cf. eg. Pan. Lat. I, 2, 5; 8, 1; 36, 4; 57, 3; III, 30, 3; Libanius, Or. XII, 101.

¹¹⁷Cf. Pan. Lat. X, 14, 5: adhuc praesentia tua fruimur et iam reditu desideramus. See also Claudian, VI Cos. Hon. 331ff.

¹¹⁸The descriptions of the reception of Diocletian and Maximian by the people of Milan (Pan. Lat. XI, 10, 3ff.), of Constantine likewise by the population of Milan (Pan. Lat. XII, 7, 5ff.) and of Honorius by the people of Rome (Claudian, VI Cos. Hon. 523ff.) are quite similar to this passage of Pacatus' speech.

¹¹⁹Pan. Lat. I, 49, 2: Quanto nunc tutior, quanto securior eadem domus, postquam eius /i.e. Trajan/ non crudelitatis sed amoris excubiis. Pan. Lat. III, 24, 4: Quid enim istis /i.e. gladiis atque pilis/ opus est, cum firmissimo sis muro civici amoris absaeptus? See also Julian, Or. I, 48a.
(cont. over)

Although the holding of power in its ideal aspect required the emperor to humble himself and serve the interests of his subjects, nevertheless the Romans did not regard their emperor as an ordinary citizen. He was elevated far above the rank and file of his subjects by the special relationship he had with the gods or god. As religious beliefs developed and changed during the course of the Roman empire, naturally the concept of the divinity of the emperor and his relationship to the divine altered also. Such changes are reflected in the religious attitudes of authors of laudatory addresses to the various emperors. Eulogies written in the first three centuries of the empire, such as Pliny's Panegyric to Trajan and those addressed to the tetrarchs, Diocletian, Maximian and Constantius I, were specifically pagan in tone, the gods of the Olympic pantheon being referred to frequently by name. The eulogists of Constantine the Great, however, used terminology that was much less specific and increasingly monotheistic. Eulogists of Christian emperors such as Constantine in his later years and Theodosius, although they did not use specifically Christian terminology, and, indeed, never referred to Christianity directly, remained monotheistic and vague enough in their religious expressions to be acceptable to both Christians and "

(119 cont'd) Love of the people for the emperor: cf. eg. Pan. Lat. I, 72, 3-4; IV, 7, 4; V, 14, 4; VI, 16, 2 and 6; XI, 11, 4; XI, 2, 4; 4, 1; XII, 2, 2; IX, 16, 5; Ausonius, Ad Grat. 17; Claudian, III Cos. Hon. 121; 126ff; Julian, Or. I, 8a; 49a; II, 98b.

pagans.¹²⁰ Despite these changes in religious views and attitudes certain common elements can be discerned in the expression of the emperor's divinity throughout the eulogies that have come down to us. Pacatus' speech shares many of the commonplaces concerning the emperor's divinity.

Occasionally the emperor himself is portrayed specifically as a god. According to Pacatus; deum dedit Hispania quem vidimus (4, 5), referring of course to Theodosius who is:

talem esse debere qui gentibus adoratur, cui toto orbe terrarum privata vel publica vota redduntur, a quo petit navigaturus serenum peregrinaturus reditum pugnaturus auspiciu (6, 4).¹²¹

¹²⁰ On the development of religious attitudes as expressed in eulogies of Roman emperors, see J. Béranger, "L'Expression de la Divinité dans les Panégyriques Latins", Museum Helveticum, 1970, 242ff; Pichon, Paris, 1906, 99ff; 132ff; 146ff; Burdeau, Aspects de l'Empire Romain, Paris, 1964, 13ff.

¹²¹ There is some controversy over the significance of these passages where Pacatus indicates the deity of Theodosius, since they seem to be incompatible with the latter's profession of Christianity. Galletier, Paris, 1949, III, 50f, feels that Pacatus is sincerely paying homage to Theodosius as a god, and, thus, that these passages are an indication of Pacatus' own paganism. Pichon, Paris, 1906, 148 n. 3, feels that to refer to Theodosius as a god: c'est une simple formule de politesse officielle. Burdeau, Aspects de l'Empire Romain, Paris, 1964, 16 n. 16, upholds this view, noting the rarity of referring to the emperor as a god in the Panegyrici Latini. It is certain that whatever Pacatus' own religious views were, he would say nothing in his speech that could offend Theodosius. Thus, it seems more likely that these statements of Theodosius' deity were merely accepted formulae at a time when worship of the emperor was largely an expression of his subjects' loyalty to him. (See Burdeau, op. cit. 10.) Other passages where the emperor is referred to as a god are eg. Pan. Lat. X, 2, 1; VI, 22, 1; 21, 5.

More often the emperor is depicted as being human, but in a special position with regard to the gods or god, as shown by the fact that certain aspects of his character and personality are said to be divine. Pacatus mentions Theodosius' divinus ille animus (6, 3), and his sacra mens (18, 3).¹²² He possesses a numen (21, 2; 47, 2) which was: une volonté transcendante qui échoit à un homme devenant l'Empereur.¹²³ He is associated cum deo consorte (6, 4), and with illi maiestatis tuae participi deo (18, 4), and thus enjoys divine help: tibi aliqua vis divina subservit (18, 4),¹²⁴ while he is consciis caelestis arcani (19, 2).¹²⁵ Finally, the emperor's felicitas or fortuna comes from the gods,¹²⁶ as does the superhuman celeritas, which is frequently

¹²²Cf. eg. Pan. Lat. III, 15, 1 and 2; 21, 3; 12, 1; IV, 17, 1; 32, 1; 34, 2; 29, 5; VII, 3, 3; VIII, 1, 1; 2, 2; 4, 3; 6, 2; 7, 2; 8, 1; XI, 3, 8; 4, 4; 5, 1; 6, 4; 8, 3; IX, 4, 1; 8, 2; 15, 5; XII, 11, 4; 4, 4 and 5; 10, 3; Symmachus, In Val. II, 18.

¹²³Burdeau, Aspects de l'Empire Romain, Paris, 1964, 22. On the problem of the exact meaning of the emperor's numen, see Burdeau, op. cit., 21ff. Numen: cf. eg. Pan. Lat. V, 9, 1; VI, 1, 1; 2, 5; 22, 2; VII, 8, 3; VIII, 1, 5; 4, 2; 15, 4; 5, 4; X, 1, 1 and 2; 3, 1; 9, 1; 13, 4; 6, 4; 11, 2; 14, 5; XI, 2, 3; 3, 8; 10, 4; 11, 1; 17, 4; 1, 2; XII, 2, 5; 13, 2; Claudian, III Cos. Hon. 20; VI Cos. Hon. 611; Symmachus, In Val. I, 22; II, 32.

¹²⁴Cf. eg. Pan. Lat. III, 28, 4; 27, 5; IV, 14; 27, 5; 28, 1; 7, 4; VI, 21, 4-5; XII, 2, 4; Symmachus, In Val. II, 23; Libanius, Or. XVIII, 173; Claudian, III Cos. Hon. 96.

¹²⁵Pan. Lat. III, 14, 6 is similar: consciis divini animi.

¹²⁶Burdeau, Aspects de l'Empire Romain, Paris, 1964, 26. For references to fortuna and felicitas in eulogies of emperors, see above n. 75.

attributed to emperors. Pacatus describes the extraordinarily quick march of Theodosius and his soldiers to Aquileia, the speed of the march being made possible by divine assistance (39).¹²⁷

A number of eulogists had occasion to praise the emperor for the defeat of or activities against a usurper.¹²⁸ Once again we find that the characteristics attributed to these usurpers and enemies of the emperor all tend to be much the same. The usurper is portrayed as the direct opposite of the ideal emperor. He becomes the "ideal" tyrant. Thus, whereas in the case of the emperor the orator praises as highly as possible, so the usurper is abused continually and shown in the worst possible light.¹²⁹ In Pacatus' eulogy of

¹²⁷Cf. especially Pan. Lat. XI, 8, which describes the swift journeys of Diocletian and Maximian to their meeting at Milan. Also cf. eg. Pan. Lat. IV, 36, 5; VIII, 6, 1; X, 6, 4; XI, 4, 4; XII, 5, 5; 15, 3; Ausonius, Ad Grat. 18; Claudian, IV Cos. Hon. 544ff; Libanius, Or. XVIII, 111.

¹²⁸Aside from Pacatus' treatment of Magnus Maximus, there are eg. Carausius and Allectus, Pan. Lat. X, 11-12; VIII, 6 ff; Maximian, Pan. Lat. VI, 14ff; Maxentius, Pan. Lat. XII, 2ff; IV, 6ff; Magnentius, Julian, Or. I, 30ff; Or. II, 55ff; Arbogast and Eugenius, Claudian, III Cos. Hon. 63ff; IV Cos. Hon. 71ff; Magnus Maximus, Claudian, IV Cos. Hon. 71ff.

¹²⁹The portraits of usurpers given in these speeches have many characteristics in common with the examples of bad emperors that the orators cite as a contrast to the emperor being praised. The vituperation of the usurper belongs to the rhetorical genre of ψυγος, which is the direct opposite of eulogy (Athon, Sp. II, 40, 7; Alexander, Sp. III, 3, 33; Aristides, Sp. II, 506, 21ff; Nicholas Sophista, Sp. III, 482, 1ff) and deals only with slander and vices (Aristotle, Rhet. I, 9; Athon, Sp. II, 40, 9).

Theodosius, the latter is represented as enjoying a spotless character, while Magnus Maximus is allowed no good qualities at all. The contrast is brought out well in the passage where Pacatus contrasts Theodosius' good background, legitimate elevation and virtuous character with Maximus' base origin, seizure of power, and abundant vices (31).¹³⁰

Eulogists very rarely refer to usurpers by name.¹³¹ The usual practice is to signify him by a number of abusive titles. Thus Maximus is called pestis (23, 4), carnifici (24, 1),¹³² malum publicum (24, 6), beluae furentis (24, 6),¹³³ pirata (26, 4),¹³⁴ latro (26, 3), publicus spoliator (43, 3),¹³⁵

¹³⁰Cf. Pan. Lat. XII, 4, 3-4, where Constantine and Maxentius are contrasted in a similar way.

¹³¹Pacatus does refer to Maximus by name (38, 1; 40, 3; 41, 2; 45, 1, 2, 4 and 5) but only after he has reached the point in his account where Maximus has been defeated and therefore is no longer being treated as a usurper in power.

¹³²Cf. Pan. Lat. I, 90, 5, where Domitian is referred to as carnifex.

¹³³Cf. eg. Pan. Lat. XII, 14, 3; stultam et nequam animal; I, 48, 3; illa immanissima belua.

¹³⁴Cf. eg. Pan. Lat. X, 12, 1; VIII, 12, 1 and 2.

¹³⁵Cf. eg. Pan. Lat. I, 90, 5.

and homo funebris (43, 4).¹³⁶ Most commonly, however, Maximus is referred to simply as the tyrannus.¹³⁷

Like Eugenius, Maxentius and Magnentius before him, Maximus is accused of low birth: ille quondam domus tuae neglegentissimus vernula mensularumque servilium statarius lixa (31, 1).¹³⁸ His accession is a direct contrast to that of the good emperor, for he seized the position without the support of the people (31, 2).¹³⁹ Thus his accession is a crime (sceleris, 23, 3).¹⁴⁰

The tyrant possesses none of the virtues of the good emperor. On the contrary he revels in the very opposite vices. The good emperor is generous: Itaque imperatori propriam maiestatem bene aestimanti non tamen illud videri suum debet quod abstulit quam quod dedit (27, 4). But Maximus has insatiable greed (inops avaritia, 24, 6) and:

¹³⁶Other abusive terms used are eg.: Pan. Lat. XII, 14, 2: illud portentum and vilissimi hominis; 17, 3: deforme prodigium.

¹³⁷Pacatus, 23, 2; 25, 1; 28, 3 and 5; 31, 2; 42, 2 and 3; 39, 4; 35, 1; 37, 3; 44, 3. Cf. eg. Pan. Lat. IV, 7, 4; 30; 1; 31, 4; 32, 6; Julian, Or. I, 30c; 34d; 36c; 37a and b; 38b and c; 39c; Or. II, 58c; 62a; Claudian, IV Cos. Hon. 72 and 90.

¹³⁸Eugenius; Claudian, III Cos. Hon. 67; Maxentius: Pan. Lat. XII, 4, 3; 16, 3; Magnentius: Julian, Or. I, 34a.

¹³⁹Cf. eg. Julian, Or. I, 34a.

¹⁴⁰Cf. eg. Pan. Lat. VIII, 12, 2; IV, 7, 4; Claudian, III Cos. Hon. 102; IV Cos. Hon. 72. Sometimes a usurpation is referred to as a latrocinium, eg. Pan. Lat. VIII, 12, 1; 16, 4; XII, 17, 1.

Crescebat in dies habendi fames et parandi rabiem parta irritabant (25, 6). Pacatus spends a total of almost three chapters of his speech (26-28) delving into the depths of Maximus' avarice, which he alleges is worse than that of private citizens (27, 2), of a robber (26, 3) and even of Charybdis (26, 4). His very hands are rapaces (43, 3).¹⁴¹ Theodosius is merciful, but Maximus practises great cruelty. His subjects satisfied saevitiam eius innocentium sanguine (24, 6). He caused the deaths not only of important generals (28, 4-5) but also of private citizens (28, 5) and even women (29, 1-3).¹⁴² The tyrant is impious (29, 4). His blood is referred to as impio cruore (42, 3). Theodosius tore a confession from his nefario pectore (43, 5).¹⁴³ His followers share his sinfulness. They are designated in turn as impiae turbae (34, 2), sacrilegae factionis (34, 4) and nefariae factionis (35, 1).¹⁴⁴ One of the imperial virtues is bravery, but the tyrant is a base coward. Maximus is not even brave enough to commit suicide when he no longer has any

¹⁴¹ Greed of the bad emperor: cf. eg. Pan. Lat. I, 94, 3; IV, 8, 3; 9, 3; Julian, Or. I, 35c.

¹⁴² Cruelty of the bad emperor: cf. eg. Pan. Lat. I, 48, 3; IV, 8, 3; 31, 3; XII, 4, 4; Julian, Or. I, 34a.

¹⁴³ Impiety of the bad emperor: cf. eg. Pan. Lat. IV, 6, 2; 7, 4; 12, 3; XII, 16, 2; Claudian, IV Cos. Hon. 75.

¹⁴⁴ Cf. eg. Pan. Lat. VIII, 6, 1, where Carausius' followers are termed piraticae factionis, and 15, 6, where they are nefariae factionis.

hope of escaping death at Theodosius' hands (41, 4ff).¹⁴⁵

In short, Maximus has every vice, while Theodosius has every virtue:

Postremo tecum fidem, secum perfidiam; tecum fas, secum nefas; tecum ius, secum iniuriam; tecum clementiam pudicitiam religionem, secum impietatem libidinem crudelitatem et omnium scelerum postremoque vitiorum stare collegium? (31, 3)¹⁴⁶

The good emperor brings happiness and prosperity to his subjects:

nullam maiorem esse crediderim principum felicitatem quam fecisse felicem et intercessisse inopiae et vicisse Fortunam et dedisse homini novum fatum (27, 3).

But Maximus inaugurates a reign of evil. His crimes cause rei publicae malum (23, 4). Gaul suffers especially (24, 4). His accession is a calamity (25, 1). Italy and Spain endure vulnera (24, 5). His reign is a tyranny (24, 5) which brings slavery upon the people (39, 4). Maximus' greed is appeased through publica paupertate (24, 6) and his wealth increased at the price of publica egestate (25, 7). In Chapter 25 Pacatus describes the miseries suffered by the people of Gaul in the reign of Maximus. We hear how people were deprived of their honours, wealth, rights and even lives (25, 1). He concentrates in particular upon the fact that, despite their misery, the people of Gaul had to feign happiness and contentment under Maximus' regime (25, 2ff). This forms a nice contrast to the praise of the freedom of speech enjoyed

¹⁴⁶Cf. Pan. Lat. XII, 4, 4; IV, 31, 3; Pliny, Pan. Lat. I, 47, 1, refers to Domitian as: vitiorum omnium conscius princeps.

under the emperor Theodosius (2, 2-4). According to Pacatus, Maximus' greatest pleasure, far from promoting their happiness and wellbeing, was to cause his subjects harm:

Qui praeter insitum pessimo cuivis boni exemplum
summam felicitatem habendi ac nocendi fine determinans
non solum ut quam plurimum quaereret, sed ut nihil
cuiquam reliqui faceret laborabat (28, 1).

Finally, whereas most rulers increased their revenue by exploiting mines:

illud purius splendidiusque credebat quod dedissent
dolentes, quod hominum lacrimae non amnium aquae
abluissent, nec e terrenis specubus egestum sed a
cervicibus iugulisque caesorum esset excoctum (28, 2).

Drawing extensively upon the conventions of good and bad kingship as well as upon the works of his fellow eulogists, Pacatus has shown us in Theodosius the type of the perfect emperor and in Maximus the archetypal tyrant. All is black or white. Maximus can do no right, Theodosius no wrong. These two rulers stand at opposite ends of the spectrum of virtue and vice. Pacatus clearly has produced stereotypes rather than real personalities, thereby casting serious doubts upon the accuracy of his characterisations.

3. THE TRICKS OF THE TRADE

As might be expected the authors of laudatory speeches developed a common stock of techniques and tricks by which they could heighten the effect of their praises and

flatteries or strengthen their vilification of the hero's enemies.¹⁴⁷

Certain of the fundamental tricks of eulogies are mentioned in the treatises of the rhetors. Perhaps the two most obvious techniques used in laudatory rhetoric are *παράλειψις*, or the omission of things which would damage the reputation of the hero, and *εὐφημία*, which is the presentation of unfavourable matters in the best possible light. As the emperor Julian remarked:

Orators, again, assert that the advantage of their art is that it can treat a slight theme in the grand manner, and again, by the use of mere words, strip the greatness from deeds, and, in short, marshal the power of words against that of facts.¹⁴⁸

One of the most obvious examples of omission in Pacatus' speech comes in the section where he eulogises Theodosius' father. Not surprisingly, he makes no mention of the fact that the career and life of the elder Theodosius

¹⁴⁷ Since most of these techniques are used very frequently by eulogists, just a few examples of each will be cited from the *Panegyrici Latini* for comparison with Pacatus' usages. A cursory glance over the other eulogies will provide many more examples.

¹⁴⁸ Julian, Or. I, 2c: ὅτι δὲ τῆς τέλης ἀπαλειψάσαι φέειν, ἐν τῷ δοκεῖν περὶ τῶν μικρῶν μείζονος διαλεθῆναι, καὶ τὸ μέγεθος ἐφελκύν τῶν ἔργων τῇ λόγῳ καὶ ἄλλως ἐντυπώσκειν τῇ τῶν πραγμάτων φύσει τὴν δόξαν τῶν λόγων. For *παράλειψις* see Aristides, Sp. II, 505, 10f; Theon, Sp. II, 112; 8ff; Menander Rhetor, Sp. III, 368, 3ff; Quintilian, Inst. Or. III, 7, 6. For *εὐφημία* see Aristotle, Rhet. I, 9; (Quintilian, Inst. Or. III, 7, 25, follows Aristotle); Aristides, Sp. II, 505, 11ff.

ended in disgrace and execution.¹⁴⁹ Pacatus only refers to his impressive military victories and seemingly virtuous character (5). Similarly, the orator mentions Theodosius' retirement to Spain and his activities there, but gives no hint of the reason for this exile, which was his father's disgrace.¹⁵⁰

Euphuia is a common practice in eulogies. As MacGuinness states:

And when there might seem to be nothing left to praise, the orators take indifferent, or even unpraiseworthy actions, and extract from them pretexts for eulogy.¹⁵¹

Pacatus praises, for example, the fact that Theodosius heaped honours upon men he hardly knew (17, 4). The emperor liked to precede a gift with the promise that he was going to give it. Pacatus finds this trait most laudable, for, he explains, it prevented the recipients of gifts from being overwhelmed by a sudden excess of joy and gave them the pleasure of anticipation (19)! Further, Maximus' soldiers are praised for dying: in admiratione nominis tui / i.e. Theodosius / et sui ducis / i.e. Maximus / detestatione (36, 2), whereas their disloyalty to their own master really was not at all

¹⁴⁹ Orosius, *Adv. Pag.* VII, 33, 7. For a more detailed exposition of Pacatus' treatment of Theodosius the Elder, see below p. 82ff.

¹⁵⁰ St. Ambrose, *De Ob. Theod.* 53.

¹⁵¹ W. S. MacGuinness, "Some Methods of the Latin Panegyrists", *Hermathena*, 1932, 57.

creditable.¹⁵² In these eulogies imperial gestures of formalities of court protocol are often treated as though they were unusual and praiseworthy practices.¹⁵³ Thus, Pacatus praises Theodosius because: Ille cohonestatus adfatu, ille mensa beatus, ille osculo consecratus est (20, 2). These honours, however, were customarily accorded to persons at court in accordance with their rank.¹⁵⁴

A technique that is used very frequently indeed is comparison or ἐνκρίσις. Menander Rhetor recommends the extensive use of ἐνκρίσις in the composition of a βασιλικός λόγος. According to his precepts, comparisons should be made in every section of the speech and the orator should be careful to compare only like with like, that is, for example, childhood with childhood or character with character.¹⁵⁵

As one would expect the emperor is frequently compared to his predecessors, either collectively or individually. He may be shown to be equal or superior to virtuous emperors of the past or his good qualities may be contrasted to the vices

¹⁵²Praise of indifferent or unworthy actions: cf. eg. Pan. Lat. III, 31, 4-6; IV, 31, 5; VII, 10; X, 8, 6; XI, 13, 4ff.

¹⁵³MacGuinness, Hermathena, 1932, 58.

¹⁵⁴Galletier, Paris, 1949, III, 86, n. 2. Praise of imperial gestures and formalities: cf. eg. Pan. Lat. I, 22, 1-2; 71, 1; III, 28, 4; 29, 3; 30, 2-3.

¹⁵⁵Sp. III, 372, 21ff; 376, 31ff. See also Anaximenes, Sp. I, 227, 20; Hermogenes, Sp. II, 13, 12f; Aphthon, Sp. II, 36, 17f; Cicero, De Oratore, II, 85.

of previous bad emperors.¹⁵⁶ The use of the latter type of comparison is in fact contrary to Menander's prescriptions for, he says, it is unskilful to condemn former rulers. The orator should instead admire them but show the perfection of the present emperor.¹⁵⁷ Pacatus, however, employs both types of comparison. Theodosius is compared to a number of virtuous past emperors when Pacatus puts the following words into the mouth of Roma:

quod cum me Nerva tranquillus, amor generis humani
Titus, pietate memorabilis Antonius teneret, cum
moribus Augustus ornaret, legibus Hadrianus imbueret,
finibus Traianus augeret, parum mihi videbar beata
quia non eram tua? (II, 6)¹⁵⁸

On the other hand the ease of access to his person that Theodosius allows his subjects is contrasted to the habits of those emperors who kept themselves shut up in almost solitary confinement in their palaces, and, when they did

¹⁵⁶ MacGuinness, *Hermathena*, 1932, 45ff.

¹⁵⁷ Sp. III, 376, 31ff: ἡ δὲ ἐπὶ τὴν τελειότητα σύγκρισις, ἀντιθέτως τὴν αὐτοῦ βασιλείαν πρὸς τὰς πρὸς αὐτὸν βασιλείας, ἐν καθαιρῶν ἐκείνας, ἀτεχνῶν γὰρ, ἀλλὰ θαυμάσιων μὲν ἐκείνας, τὸ δὲ τέλειον ἀποδίδους τῇ παρούσῃ.
Cf. Pliny, *Pan. Lat.* I, 53, 2: Praeterea hoc primum erga optimum imperatorem piorum civium officium est, insequi dissimiles; neque enim satis amarit bonos principes, qui malos satis non oderit. MacGuinness, *Hermathena*, 1932, 46, notes that this form of comparison is used most frequently by Pliny, and much more sparingly by later eulogists.

¹⁵⁸ Comparison to good emperors: cf. eg. *Pan. Lat.* I, 51, 2; VI, 24, 6-7; VII, 13, 4; XI, 18, 2-3.

emerge, were surrounded by a heavy guard, keeping the people, at a distance (21, 3-4).¹⁵⁹

The emperor may also be compared to figures from Greek and Roman history or mythological characters, including the gods of Olympus in their capacity as heroes of myth.¹⁶⁰ Pacatus mentions the similarity of Theodosius in his rustic life while in exile to the ancient models of Roman virtue, Curius, Coruncanus, and Fabricius (9, 5-6). The emperor made such careful preparations for the war against Maximus that with regard to his skill as a general he seemed to be vying with Perses, Pyrrhus or Hannibal (32, 1). Artists and sculptors should put aside mythological subjects such as the labours of Heracles or Bacchus' Indian triumphs, for they will find better subjects for their works in Theodosius' deeds (44, 5). Pacatus uses comparisons to increase his vituperation of Magnus Maximus. Here, of course, the aim of the comparison is reversed. In Theodosius' case comparisons serve to illuminate his greatness, whereas regarding Maximus they are intended to put his baseness in relief. Thus, his usurpation is likened to the slave revolts led by Spartacus

¹⁵⁹See also Pacatus, 14, 1-3; 12, 2 and 4-5. Contrast to bad emperors: cf. eg. *Pan. Lat.* I, 53, 3; 7, 4-5; 11, 1-2; 46, 4-5; 47, 1; 48, 3; 90, 5; 94, 3; Pliny even slanders future emperors: 59, 2; 73, 6; III, 19, 20; VIII, 14, 1-2.

¹⁶⁰Pichon, Paris, 1906, 45, 61f; MacGuinness, *Hermathena*, 1932, 48ff.

and Athenio because they were all mala summa which grew from small beginnings (23, 2-3).¹⁶¹

Akin to εὐγκριεῖς is the use of ὑπερβολή or gross exaggeration. Here the emperor is not just compared to previous emperors or figures from myth or history, but declared to be far better than they. According to Pacatus Theodosius is more praiseworthy than all his predecessors (1, 2). While his rustic life was similar to that of Curius, Coruncanus and Fabricius, these heroes of old were inferior to Theodosius. For they were obliged to farm for a living, whereas for Theodosius it was voluntary labour, and: detrahit laudem patientiae inopia: maioris exempli est labor sine necessitate (9, 7). The examples of devoted and self-sacrificing friends which mythology has to offer cannot match Theodosius' friendship, for he put his friends before his own children, whom he loved better than himself (17, 1-2). Moreover, Theodosius' army was far superior to the one that Cleopatra put into the field against Augustus (33).¹⁶²

¹⁶¹See also Pacatus, 8, 4-5; 20, 2-4; 29, 4. Comparison to figures from Greek and Roman history: cf. eg. Pan. Lat. I, 13, 4; VI, 19, 2-3; VIII, 7, 1; X, 8, 1; 14, 2; XI, 9, 4. Comparison to heroes of myth: cf. eg. Pan. Lat. IV, 11, 5; 16, 6; VII, 8, 2; IX, 15, 2; X, 9, 4-5.

¹⁶²Galletier, Paris, 1949, III, 100 n. 3, feels that the comparison here is between the enemies of Augustus and the enemies of Theodosius. Since, however, the previous chapter deals with Theodosius' own army, and the forces being compared with those of Cleopatra are said to have been drawn into the army through: amor laudis et participandae gloriae, and for the sake of the: repetita libertas of Rome, it seems that Galletier is mistaken here, and Theodosius' own troops are the subject of the comparison. Cf. Galletier, op. cit., 66, where

Maximus also is the subject of hyperbole. He is, for instance, declared to be worse even than Charybdis. Charybdis is avaricious but at least she throws back the wreckage of the boats and cargoes that she has swallowed. With Maximus, on the other hand:

Bona nostra ad aerarium una et perpetua via ibant;
nullas eorum reliquias, nulla fragmenta vel sero
victa fastidio illa communis vorago revomebat (26,
4-5).¹⁶³

Nature is often reported as being inferior to the emperor or at his service.¹⁶⁴ According to Pacatus, Theodosius had the power to remedy a fault in nature: tu promittendo praestanda invenisti tempus quod nobis Natura subtraxerat (19, 3). The river Save apparently did the emperor a special service, for: ipsum illum vexillarium sacrilegae factionis avidis gurgitibus absorbuit et, ne morti sepultura contingeret, cadaver abscondit (34, 4). The Tiber formerly had aided Constantine in a similar fashion, although that story had a different ending: nunc violentus

(162 cont'd) in his outline of the speech, Galletier rightly notes that this comparison is between the enemies of Augustus and the troops of Theodosius.

¹⁶³ See also Pacatus, 18, 3; 20, 5-6; 33, 3; 26, 3; 27, 2. Hyperbole: cf. eg. Pan. lat. I, 88, 6-7; 89, 1; IV, 1, 1; 15, 4-7; XII, 24, 4; X, 10, 3; 2, 5; XI, 10.

¹⁶⁴ Pichon, Paris, 1906, 62f; MacGuinness, Hermathena, 1932, 52f.

et turbidus hostem rei publicae sorbuisti, et, ne tuum lateret obsequium, eructato cadavere prodidisti.¹⁶⁵

An extreme form of hyperbole mentioned by several of the rhetors is the kind of exaggeration whereby the hero is praised for being the only one to do something or to have some quality, or for being the first or one of a few to do or to possess it. In the words of Cicero: neque enim parvae neque usitatae neque vulgares admiratione aut omnino laude dignae videri solent.¹⁶⁶ Thus, in discussing Theodosius' elevation to the throne, Pacatus addresses him as follows: solus, igitur, Auguste, solus inquam omnium qui adhuc imperaverunt ut princeps esse praestitisti (12, 1). Theodosius' refusal to accept the throne when it was offered to him is also represented as being unprecedented: quod tantis infra supraque temporibus nec invenerit aemulum nec habuerit exemplum (12, 3).¹⁶⁷

A trick used in laudatory rhetoric to imply that there is more to praise in the hero than exists in reality is to

¹⁶⁵Pan. Lat. XII, 18, 2. Cf. also eg. Pan. Lat. IV, 32, 6-7; V, 10, 4; VI, 18, 3-6; 13, 3; VIII, 2, 2-3; 7, 2-3; 4, 3; X, 12, 3-4; XI, 9, 2-3; 13, 2.

¹⁶⁶Cicero, De Oratore, II, 85. See also Aristotle, Met. I, 9; Theon. Sp. II, 110, 21ff. Cf. MacGuinness, Hermathena, 1932, 51.

¹⁶⁷See also Pacatus, 16, 1, 4 and 5. The emperor as the only one, the first or one of a few to do something or to possess a certain quality: cf. eg. Pan. Lat. I, 6, 5; 21, 3; 24, 1; III, 24, 2; VII, 7, 3; IX, 19, 2; X, 6, 2; XI, 6, 4-5; 9, 2; 13, 3; XII, 22, 2.

eulogise not only what the emperor has done but what he would have done or what would have happened, or to prophesy his future deeds or the reaction of posterity to his deeds.¹⁶⁸ Pacatus states that Theodosius would have been able to conquer the usurper Maximus singlehanded: Et te quidem, imperator Auguste, ad adserendam rem publicam usurpandamque victoriam suffecisset in bella vel solum venire (30, 5), a ridiculous hypothesis for Theodosius never did nor would attempt to defeat Maximus alone.¹⁶⁹ He prophesies that Theodosius will have a long reign to compensate for the fact that he became emperor relatively late in life: vita longiore pensandum, quod ex praeterito perdidisti. Parum interest quando coeperit quod terminum non habebit (7, 6).¹⁷⁰ On two occasions Pacatus predicts what characters who were already dead at the time he composed the speech would have said or felt if they had been still alive (16, 5; 20, 5-6). In other cases he calls upon posterity to admire Theodosius' reign:

Credetne hoc olim ventura posteritas, et praestabit nobis tam gratiosam fidem ut nostro demum saeculo adnuat factum, quod tantis infra supraque temporibus nec invenerit aemulum nec habuerit exemplum? (12, 3)¹⁷¹

¹⁶⁸Theon, Sp. II, 110, 27ff; MacGuinness, Hermathena, 1932, 58f.

¹⁶⁹See also Pacatus, 34, 4. Praise of what the emperor would have done: cf. eg. Pan. Lat. I, 40, 4.

¹⁷⁰Prophesy of the emperor's future deeds: cf. eg. Pan. Lat. I, 17; XI, 7, 4.

¹⁷¹See also Pacatus, 45, 1-4. Prediction of the reaction of posterity: cf. eg. Pan. Lat. I, 9, 2; 10, 5; 15, 4; 55, 1; III, 30, 1.

Similar tricks of a purely verbal nature are found frequently in these eulogies. They are means by which the orator can imply that he has much more to say than he actually does say. The most commonly used of such techniques is praeteritio.¹⁷² Often this involves the use of an introductory verb such as omitto, praetereo, taceo, or sileo to indicate that the orator is not going to discuss the subjects he then proceeds to mention. Pacatus makes abundant use of praeteritio. A good example is the following passage:

Summatim tuum illud attingam cum patre divino
castrense collegium, actas sub pellibus hiemes,
aestates inter bella sudatas, dies noctesque
proeliando aut vigilando consumptas, gravissimas
pugnas terra marique pugnatas (8, 3).

The orator thus manages to convey the impression of Theodosius' life of constant toil and endurance on campaign with his father without actually giving any concrete details, while implying that his account is far from complete. Again, Theodosius' campaign against Maximus is compared to that of Augustus against Antony and Cleopatra. Pacatus states: non contendam duces but immediately does compare them: nec enim principem nostrum non dicam victus Antonius sed victor Augustus aequaverit (33, 3).¹⁷³

¹⁷²W. S. MacGuinness, "Locutions and Formulae of the Latin Panegyrists", Hermathena, 1933, 131f.

¹⁷³See also Pacatus, 14, 3; 15, 2; 41, 4; Praeteritio cf. eg. Pan. Lat. III, 6, 1; 13, 2; 22, 2; 2, 6; IV, 30, 1; 27, 1 and 3; 33, 7; 17, 3; 29, 1; VIII, 2; 1; 9, 5; 5, 1-3; X, 3, 1; 6, 1; 4, 4; XI, 5, 2-4; 3, 6; XII, 4, 3.

An extension of the technique of praeteritio is the use of direct questions, normally in a series, by which the orator indicates that there is no need to say anything about a certain topic, thus implying both that its importance is self-evident and that he could say much more if he so desired.¹⁷⁴ For instance in the course of discussing Theodosius' relations with states and tribes outside the Roman empire, Pacatus asks:

Dicamne ego receptos servitum Gothos castris tuis militem, terris sufficere cultorem? Dicam a rebellibus Sarracenis poenas polluti foederis expetitas? Dicam interdictum Scythis Tanain et imbelles arcus etiam fugientis Albani? (22, 3)¹⁷⁵

Akin to praeteritio is the use of the commonplace statement in which the orator mentions the abundance of the material with which he has to work, implying that he cannot possibly include everything because of lack of time.¹⁷⁶ Thus, Pacatus complains: novam quandam patior ex copia difficultatem (5, 1) in eulogising the exploits of Theodosius' father. He proceeds to mention briefly each of his accomplishments, hinting that further discussion would take too much time, and finishes the development with the statement:

¹⁷⁴MacGuinness, Hermathena, 1933, 131.

¹⁷⁵See also Pacatus, 25, 1; 28, 5. Use of direct questions to imply that there is more to say than is actually said: cf. eg. Pan. Lat. III, 1; 24, 5; IV, 18, 1; 8, 3-4; VI, 6, 1-4; 5, 4; XII, 20, 1; V, 7, 1; X, 2, 6.

¹⁷⁶MacGuinness, Hermathena, 1933, 124ff.

Cum igitur impediatur turba dilectum, ad hoc tanti viri gesta praestet in summam referre quam enumerando tenuare dixisse sufficiat unum illum divinitus exstitisse, in quo virtutes simul omnes vigerent quae singulae in omnibus praedicantur (5, 3).¹⁷⁷

An ingenious method used to praise two things at once is what is termed by MacGuinness the formula of the Unresolved Alternative. Here the orator states two possibilities between which he cannot decide and thus implies that both are equally acceptable.¹⁷⁸ Regarding Theodosius' physical merits Pacatus declares: ut plane in ambiguo sit utrumne te magis nostris mentibus virtus an obtutibus vultus insinuet (6, 2). What he really wants to convey is that Theodosius is both very virtuous and good looking. Similarly, when Pacatus remarks of Theodosius' magistrates: ergo cum duplex fuerit iste dilectus, unus ex iudicio alter ex fato, incertum meliores viros sapientia tua an fortuna quaesiverit (15, 3), he is not really saying that one group of magistrates was better than the other, but that Theodosius both had good fortune in the officials he inherited and showed wisdom in his own choice of men.¹⁷⁹

Two tricks used by eulogists to increase the credibility of their praises are the Untenable Hypothesis, where the

¹⁷⁷ Abundance of material: cf. eg. Pan. Lat. I, 56, 2-3; IV, 19, 1; VI, 7, 1; VIII, 4, 4; X, 2, 7.

¹⁷⁸ MacGuinness, Hermathena, 1933, 124ff.

¹⁷⁹ See also Pacatus, 18, 4; Unresolved Alternative: of. eg. Pan. Lat. I, 14, 4; 56, 4; 58, 5; 71, 2; 60, 7; 91, 4; 84, 1; 64, 4; 89, 2; III, 1, 2; IV, 4, 3; 33, 3; V, 11, 2; X, 4, 3; 8, 3.

orator mentions a possible objection to his statement in such a way that the objection seems absurd, and the Contemptuous Acquiescence, where the orator agrees with some proposition but again does it in such a way that he implies that his own story is much more worthwhile.¹⁸⁰ Examples of each of these techniques can be found in Pacatus' speech. The orator asks what difference becoming emperor would make to Theodosius since he would remain the simple citizen he had been. He adds: nisi forte in te hodie aut pudicitiae remissior cultus aut minor sanguinis humani metus aut alienae rei maior est appetitus (12, 5). The phrase nisi forte at the beginning of the sentence immediately suggests that the reader/hearer cannot possibly believe what follows. This impression is reinforced by the orator's next statement: Idem es qui fuisti et tantum tibi per te licet quantum per leges licebat (12, 5), which dismisses in no uncertain terms the idea that Theodosius may have changed or become less virtuous on attaining sovereignty.¹⁸¹ The use of Contemptuous Acquiescence can be illustrated by the passage where Pacatus wishes to emphasise Theodosius' fidelity to his friends. Here the orator defies antiquity to bring forth the examples of faithful friends she has to offer: Eat nunc sui ostentatrix vetustas et illa innumeris litterarum vulgata

¹⁸⁰ MacGuinness, Hermathena, 1933, 134ff.

¹⁸¹ See also Pacatus, 39, 4; 41, 5. Untenable Hypothesis: cf. eg. Pan. lat. I, 3; 6, 3; 28, 1; III, 5, 4; IV, 11, 4; IX, 16, 2; 18, 3; X, 12, 2.

monimentis iactet exempla, immediately prejudicing the audience against the credibility of vetustas by labelling her ostentatrix - a boaster. Pacatus goes on to say that even if we do believe these tales: quae mendaciis vatū in plausus aptata cavearum fidem tempori debent (Pacatus again emphasises their lack of veracity) they could not match Theodosius' example (17, 1-3).¹⁸²

A variation from the more direct methods of eulogy is the substitution of pretended criticism for praise.¹⁸³ Pacatus uses Rome as a mouthpiece to rebuke Theodosius for being unwilling to accept the throne (II, 4), although, in fact, his refusal was actually grounds for great praise.¹⁸⁴ It is not always the emperor to whom the orator addresses his feigned criticism. The people of Hemona are rebuked for their excessive enthusiasm on the occasion of Theodosius' visit to their city, because blandam tibi faciebat iniuriam contumacia gaudiorum (37, 3). Pacatus really wishes to stress the laudable abundance of love these people had for their emperor.¹⁸⁵

¹⁸²See also Pacatus, 4, 4. Contemptuous Acquiescence: cf. eg. Pan. Lat. IV, 15, 5-6; XI, 9, 4.

¹⁸³Pichon, Paris, 1906, 64f; MacGuinness, Hermathena, 1933, 126ff.

¹⁸⁴See above p. 38f.

¹⁸⁵See also Pacatus, 23, 1; 8, 2. Pretended censure as a substitute for praise: cf. eg. Pan. Lat. IV, 4, 5; V, 14, 4; XI, 11, 2.

Such are the most striking methods used by Pacatus and his fellow eulogists to render their flatteries the more effective. It is perhaps ironic to note one final commonplace of their speeches. The orators persistently refuse to acknowledge that they are flattering their heroes and staunchly profess or at the least imply that they are telling the truth.¹⁸⁶ This is of course yet another trick designed to enhance the credibility of their statements. Pacatus implies that he is not going to flatter Theodosius. He contrasts previous regimes under which the composition of eulogies of the emperor was obligatory with the present when one could speak or keep silence as one pleased, remarking: Fuerit abieritque tristis illa facundiae ancillantibus necessitas (2, 2-4).¹⁸⁷ Pacatus was indeed a master of the tricks and techniques a eulogist could use to add to the effect of his flatteries.

Pichon described Pacatus as: un virtuose habile à jouer du lieu commun,¹⁸⁸ and it is impossible to disagree with his conclusion. Pacatus was the eulogist par excellence. He clearly was imbued with the precepts of the rhetors, whose suggestions regarding the form and content of a personal eulogy he followed very closely indeed. He also

¹⁸⁶MacGuinness, Hermathena, 1932, 59.

¹⁸⁷Denial of flattery: cf. eg. Pan. Lat. I, 1-3 passim; 62; III, 21, 3; V, 3, 1.

¹⁸⁸Pichon, Paris, 1906, 137.

draw extensively upon the works of previous eulogists, particularly those in the collection of Panegyrici Latini, from which he freely adopted ideas and sometimes even the words to express them. His speech abounds in commonplaces concerning the character and actions of the ideal emperor and the typical tyrant, with full use made of the rhetorical devices at his disposal to render his praises the more effective. However, because Pacatus' account of the emperors Theodosius and Maximus and their regimes is so conventional and commonplace it lacks credibility by itself. His statements must be compared carefully with those of our other authorities before any conclusions as to their truth or falsity can be reached.

CHAPTER TWO

POLITICS AND PREJUDICE IN PACATUS

Although the extant eulogies of Roman emperors do have many similarities, a glance over them will show that the differences between them are nevertheless very great. Obviously, therefore, while rules did exist for composing speeches of this genre, the orators were not obliged to follow them slavishly.¹ The rules provided general guidelines but the extent to which the individual orator obeyed them, the emphases he put upon the various parts of his speech, and the additions or subtractions he made to the conventional topics would depend on the one hand upon the emperor addressed and the specific circumstances in which the speech was delivered,² and on the other upon the background and particular purposes of the orator himself. Each of these factors produced biases and emphases which moulded the final form of any given eulogy.

One of the most important functions of a panegyric to a Roman emperor was the part it played in a ceremonial occasion. Thus the execution of the speech was to some

¹Mesk, Rh. Mus., 1912, 511f.

²Burgess, Chicago, 1902, 131.

extent more important than its contents.³ Nevertheless eulogies could be used for other purposes. In the absence of the mass media which present day governments have at their disposal, Roman emperors were obliged to find other means to inform the public of their policies. The best-known of these is the use they made of coins as a vehicle for propaganda.⁴ It seems likely that Roman emperors also made use of eulogies of themselves to inform their subjects of the view they were to take of their ruler and of various aspects of his policies. We do not know whether the authors of such speeches were ever actually briefed as to the view they were to present of certain issues. Some scholars have suggested that the speeches may at least have been required to be submitted for official approval before they were delivered.⁵ What is certain, however, whether or not emperors actively employed eulogies for propaganda, is that these speeches had to please the emperor concerned. They were addressed to the emperor and very often, although not invariably, delivered in his presence. Therefore the orators were obliged to take his point of view as regards events,

³A. Cameron, Claudian: Poetry and Propaganda at the Court of Honorius, Oxford, 1970, 37.

⁴For an introduction to the use of coins by Roman emperors for the purposes of propaganda, see M. Grant, Roman History from Coins, Cambridge, 1968.

⁵Calletier, Paris, 1949, I, xxv; Burdeau, Aspects de l'Empire Romain, Paris, 1964, 5.

policies and actions. As the panegyrist Nazarius remarked: Existimare quidem de principibus nemini fas est.⁶ Thus such speeches may be termed "official" in the sense that they reflect the imperial policy of the day.⁷ Consequently eulogies of Roman emperors are often very informative as regards imperial policies and their development under certain emperors.⁸

Moreover, the author of a eulogy could make use of his opportunity to further his own ambitions and/or those of his nation, class or profession. It seems to be assumed generally that since a eulogy of an emperor had to conform to his wishes the orator composing a speech of this type

⁶Pan. Lat. IV, 5, 1.

⁷On panegyrics and imperial policy, see eg. C. Jullian, Histoire de la Gaule, Paris, 1926, VII, 260; T. Maarhoff, Schools of Gaul in the Last Century of the Western Empire, Johannesburg, 1958, 140f. T. R. Glover, Life and Letters in the Fourth Century, Cambridge, 1901, 120. Pichon, Paris, 1906, 67, 87ff; Burdeau, Aspects de l'Empire Romain, Paris, 1964, 5f; G. Boissier, "Les Rhéteurs Gaulois au IV^e Siècle", Journal des Savants, 1884, 17; J. Straub, Vom Herrscherideal in der Spätantike, Stuttgart, 1964, 153ff. Cf. Cameron, Oxford, 1970, 41f, who feels that, Claudian excepted, the authors of panegyrics "normally confined themselves to the conventional commonplaces of the genre and steered well clear of controversial issues. It was safer to avoid politics and stick to harmless eulogy." It seems to me that Cameron is wrong on this point. Pichon, op. cit. 87ff cites a number of examples from the Panegyrici Latini in which it is clear that the orators were putting forward official policies. See also my discussion on imperial propaganda in Pacatus' speech, below p. 81ff.

⁸For examples see in particular, Pichon, loc. cit.

would therefore entirely subordinate his own desires and views to those of the emperor. This was not necessarily so. Most, if not all, writers reflect their own prejudices to a greater or lesser extent in their works, even if they claim to be writing objectively. The prejudices of an author which govern certain biases and emphases of his work may appear without his being conscious of them. Alternatively a writer who wishes to impress some idea or set of ideas upon his audience will deliberately slant his account so as to achieve his ends. Romano has begun the exploration of the use that the authors of the Panegyrici Latini made of eulogy for their own purposes.⁹ Aristotle asserted that:

Laudatory and deliberative speaking have a topic in common; since those things which, in debate, one would suggest, become, when differently expressed, encomia.... So when you wish to praise, think what you would advise; and, when you wish to advise, think what you would praise.¹⁰

Basing his observations upon this text of Aristotle Romano emphasises the link between praise and exhortation:

Si infatti si loda una persona perché è giusta, nella loda è implicita l'esortazione a continuare ad esserlo: tu sei giusto = sii, giusto.¹¹

⁹D. Romano, "Per Una Nuova Interpretazione del Panegirico Latino in Onore dell' Imperatore". Annali del Liceo Classico "Caribaldi" di Palermo, 1965, 327ff.

¹⁰Aristotle, Rhet. I, 9, 35f: ἔχει δὲ κοινὸν ἔδος ὁ ἐπαινεὶς καὶ ὁ συμβουλεύων, ὅτι γὰρ ἐν τῷ συμβουλεύειν ὑποθαίρει, ταῦτα μετὰ τὸ εὐεργετῆσαι τῇ λέξει ἐγκώμια γίνονται. ὡστε ὅταν ἐπαινῇ βούληται, ὅταν δὲ ἐν ὑπόθεσιν καὶ ὅταν ὑπὸ θέσει, ὅταν δὲ ἐν ἐπαινεύσει. Translation by R.C. Jebb, The Rhetoric of Aristotle, Cambridge, 1909.

¹¹Annali del Liceo Classico, 1965, 330; see also, L.K. Born, "The Perfect Prince According to the Latin Panegyrists", AJP, 1934, 35.

He goes on to relate this concept to the methods of eulogists. In particular he demonstrates the way in which Pliny, as the representative of the Roman Senate, used the vehicle of praise in his panegyric to the emperor Trajan to point out to him the sort of emperor the Senate desired him to be:

Lodare il principe, e consigliarlo lodandolo, non è pericoloso: è questa la via scelta appunto dal senato per mezzo del suo fedele ed abile interprete.¹²

This chapter is concerned with analysing Pacatus' Panegyric to ascertain where it contains reflections of imperial propaganda and of Pacatus' own prejudices and ambitions. Such reflections are important for gaining insight into the politics of Theodosius' reign and into certain aspects of society under his rule. To know the interpretation that a government or an individual wished to put upon an event is valuable in itself for understanding that government or that individual. The interpretation, however, also produces a distorted impression of the event. To reach a deeper understanding of the event itself the bias of the interpretation must be recognised and taken into account. Thus, to acquire a more accurate knowledge of the issues with which Pacatus had occasion to deal in his speech, it is necessary to establish if possible where his account is distorted by the exigencies of official policy or personal prejudice.

¹² Annali del Liceo Classico, 1965, 332f.

The question of how to recognise passages of a eulogy which reflect political or personal bias does present some difficulties. Nevertheless there are certain techniques which may indicate that a passage or statement of a eulogy is prejudiced in some way. Since there were detailed rules for composing eulogies, passages which deviate from the specified pattern are of prime importance in this regard, particularly in the case of an orator such as Pacatus who, as we have seen, in general followed the conventional scheme very closely. He is likely, then, to have had a good reason for adding a new topic or omitting a standard one. Strong repetition of a particular point or great emphasis upon any topic indicates that the author is particularly anxious to bring home the point he is making. Lastly, the omission of important facts known from other sources may be deliberate and indicate that the orator wishes to slant his account in a certain way. Of course, there could be many reasons other than political or personal bias for an orator to stress a particular point or omit certain facts from his account.

Pacatus, for example stresses heavily the fact that Theodosius was unwilling to become emperor.¹³ The reason for this could be simply that, as this type of hesitation was a characteristic that was very frequently attributed to Roman emperors and had become a meaningless convention, Pacatus felt it necessary to stress that in Theodosius' case it was

¹³Pacatus, 7, 1; II, 1-12, 3.

not merely a traditional gesture but genuine.¹⁴ The omission of certain facts may be the result of ignorance or a genuine adherence to one version of a particular story. Thus, often it is impossible to state absolutely that a given passage of a eulogy is an instance of imperial propaganda or personal prejudice, especially since in many cases we know very little about the policies of Roman emperors or the backgrounds of their eulogists. Particularly difficult to recognise are passages in which the orator is putting forward his own views or ambitions. His first concern had to be the pleasure of the emperor. He could not afford to offend him by what he had to say. Therefore, he would have to be circumspect in putting forward his own views and veil the points he wished to make with his extravagant praises. It is possible, however, to reach more definite conclusions about the political or personal bias affecting any passage in which one or more of the "pointers" are present when one's suspicions are supported by evidence from other sources.

1. IMPERIAL PROPAGANDA

There are several passages in Pacatus' Panegyric which seem to me to reflect aspects of Theodosius' policies in the year 389 A.D. The most important are the following:

¹⁴MacGuinness, Hermathena, 1932, 56.

- i) The way in which he wished his father, the elder Theodosius, to be remembered.
- ii) His justification of his assumption of the position of senior Augustus and controller of Valentinian II.
- iii) What he wished his subjects to believe concerning his relations with the usurper Magnus Maximus both before and during the latter's reign.

i) Theodosius the Elder.

The father of the emperor Theodosius had been a distinguished general under Valentinian I. In 368-369 A.D. he reconquered Britain which was suffering from invasions by the Picts and Scots, and restored Roman rule in that island. He went on to win victories over the Saxons and the Franks. In late 369 or early 370 A.D. he was promoted to the rank of magister equitum praesentalis. In this office he enjoyed successes against the Alemanni and led a protracted but ultimately successful campaign against the usurper Firmus in Africa (373-375 A.D.).¹⁵

In the early months of 376 A.D. the career of the elder Theodosius was brought to an untimely conclusion by his death in circumstances which are veiled in mystery for us now. We know that he was condemned to death and executed, but the precise reasons for this, the emperor responsible, and whether or not Theodosius was guilty of the charges

¹⁵On the campaigns of the elder Theodosius see A. Demandt, "Die Feldzüge des Älteren Theodosius", Hermes, 1972, 81ff.

brought against him, are questions which cannot be answered with any certainty. Indeed the problems surrounding the fall and death of this famous general have provoked an enormous amount of controversy.¹⁶ Although many answers have been put forward, none can be definitive. The reason for this lies in the state of the evidence, for the sources we have are almost unanimously silent concerning the death of the elder Theodosius. St. Jerome, St. Ambrose and Paulus Orosius briefly mention his fate.¹⁷ The other major sources

¹⁶ Among the most important works dealing with the subject are: R. Egger, "Der Erste Theodosius", Byzantion, 1929-30, 9ff; A. Solari, "Il Magister Equitum Teodosio", Byzantion, 1931, 469ff; W. Ensslin, "Theodosius (9)", RE, VA2, 1937ff; A. Hoepffner, "La Mort du Magister Militum Théodose", REL, 1936, 119ff; A. Demandt, "Der Tod des Älteren Theodosius", Historia, 1969, 598ff; A. Lippold, "Kaiser Theodosius d. Gr. und sein Vater", Rivista Storica dell' Antichita, Bologna, 1972, 195ff; E.A. Thompson, The Historical Work of Ammianus Marcellinus, Cambridge, 1947, 87ff. For a more complete bibliography see Demandt, Historia, 1969, 625f.

¹⁷ Jerome, Chron., (ed. Fotheringham), 330: Theodosius, Theodosii postea imperatoris pater et plurimi nobilium occisi. A gloss on Jerome's text which appears in certain MSS adds some information concerning the death of the elder Theodosius. It reads: Theodosius, Theodosii postea imperatoris pater, multorum per orbem bellorum victoriis nobilis, in Africa factione eorum periit, qui et ipsi mox caesi sunt; id est Maximinus ex praefecto et ceteri. The authenticity of this gloss has been questioned - see R. Helm, Chronik des Hieronymus, Berlin, 1956, xviii. It is defended convincingly by Demandt, Historia, 1969, 617. Ambrose, De Obit. Theod., 53: portavit iugum grave Theodosius / the emperor / a iuventute, quando insidiabantur eius saluti, qui patrem eius triumphatorem occiderant. Orosius, Adv. Pag. VII, 33, 7:

Post, cum experientissima providentia totam cum Mauretania Africam meliorem pristinis reddidisset, instimulante et obrepente invidia iussus interfici, apud Carthaginem baptizari in remissionem peccatorum praeoptavit ac postquam sacramentum Christi, quod quaesierat, adsecutus est, post gloriosam saeculi vitam etiam de vitae aeternitate securus percussori iugulum ultro prae-buit.

for the period, including Ammianus Marcellinus, the Epitome de Caesaribus, Zosimus, Symmachus, Libanius, Themistius and Claudian, give no account of his death, and barely any hints concerning the matter. Pacatus also is totally silent. The death of the elder Theodosius is neither mentioned directly nor alluded to in the course of his speech.¹⁸

It has long been acknowledged that this silence must have been deliberate and political in origin:

La rareté et le laconisme des témoignages contemporains doivent s'expliquer par une sorte de conspiration du silence qui se fit, de très bonne heure, autour de ce triste événement.¹⁹

All of the above mentioned authors wrote either under the rule of the emperor Theodosius himself or during the reigns of his sons, or they drew their material from writers of this period. It seems that Theodosius desired to suppress the facts concerning his father's death. The reasons for this wish, however, are not clearly understood. Thompson feels that it must mean that the elder Theodosius was guilty of the charges laid against him, for otherwise his son would have proclaimed his innocence loudly. If he was guilty and had

¹⁸ A number of suggestions have been put forward as to the grounds for the condemnation of the elder Theodosius. The most plausible, in my view, is that he was accused of conspiring to usurp the throne. (See Demandt, Historia, 1969, 605ff) The words of Pacatus: O digna imperatore nobilitas eius esse filium principem qui princeps esse debuerit, qui hunc Romani fastigii apicem non solum fortitudine atque sapientia sed decore etiam corporis et dignitate potuerit aequare. (6, 2) are perhaps a veiled reference to his aspirations.

¹⁹ Hoepffner, REL, 1936, 120. See also Thompson, Cambridge, 1947, 94ff; Demandt, Historia, 1969, 599.

been condemned justly, it would have brought discredit on the ruling family to allow these facts to be published.²⁰ The evidence of St. Ambrose suggests that the emperor Theodosius may himself have been implicated, or at least suspected of being so, in his father's crime.²¹ If he had been involved, his desire for silence on this matter would be perfectly understandable. There may, however, have been other reasons. It has been argued convincingly that Gratian was the emperor responsible for the execution of the elder Theodosius.²² If Theodosius insisted upon his father's innocence and claimed that his execution had been unjust, this would indicate that he had a cause for resentment against Gratian. There were rumours, which it can be argued were well-founded, that Theodosius had conspired with Magnus Maximus to overthrow Gratian.²³ Theodosius wished to discredit these rumours.²⁴ In these circumstances he may well have felt it politic to remain silent concerning the affair of his father's death, rather than show openly that he had a reason for hostility towards Gratian. Nevertheless, we can only speculate as to the precise reasons for Theodosius' wish to have the

²⁰ Cambridge, 1947, 94ff: cf. Demandt, Historia, 1969, 613ff.

²¹ De Obit. Theod., 53, quoted above at n. 17.

²² See especially Hoepffner, REL, 1936, 122ff; Demandt, Historia, 1969, 601ff.

²³ See below p. 99ff.

²⁴ See below p. 110ff.

circumstances of his father's death forgotten. All that can be said with confidence is that Theodosius desired to conceal the matter because to have the truth about it made public would in some way reflect badly upon himself. Pacatus' silence concerning the death of the elder Theodosius reflects his emperor's policy of suppressing the facts surrounding his father's death.

Theodosius' policy did not stop at a negative desire to suppress adverse facts. There is ample evidence indicating positive attempts by himself and his family to rehabilitate the memory of his father and to have him remembered as a superb general and glorious hero. Ensslin cites a number of statues erected in various parts of the empire by Theodosius to honour the memory of his father's victories.²⁵ Ammianus Marcellinus, the major source for the career of the elder Theodosius, provides good literary evidence of the emperor Theodosius' desire to have his father glorified for posterity. He gives a picture of the elder Theodosius that is frankly eulogistic, particularly in what concerns his military prowess. For example, he is called: officiis Martiis felicissime cognitus,²⁶ dux efficacissimus,²⁷

²⁵Ensslin, RE, VA2, 1944. See also Hoepffner, REL, 1936, 129.

²⁶Amm. Marc. XXVI, 8, 3.

²⁷Ibid. XXVII, 8, 6.

dux nominis inclyti,²⁸ praeclarus dux,²⁹ dux alacrior ad
audendum,³⁰ ductor exercitum ille magnificus,³¹ spectatissimus
dux,³² dux consultissimus,³³ pugnator ille cautus et prudens³⁴
and intrepidus, dux suopte ingenio pertinax.³⁵ He is
 compared to some of the heroes of Rome's past.³⁶ We hear
 how he expected nothing of his soldiers which he would not do
 himself,³⁷ that he surpassed his contemporaries in military
 knowledge,³⁸ that he was blessed with unfailing fortune,³⁹
 that his very face inspired fear,⁴⁰ and of his popularity with

²⁸Ibid. XXVIII, 3, 1.

²⁹Ibid. XXVIII, 3, 2.

³⁰Ibid. XXVIII, 3, 6.

³¹Ibid. XXVIII, 6, 26.

³²Ibid. XXIX, 5, 8.

³³Ibid. XXIX, 5, 35.

³⁴Ibid. XXIX, 5, 39.

³⁵Ibid. XXIX, 5, 32.

³⁶Ibid. eg. XXVIII, 3, 9; XXIX, 5, 4, 22, 32, 33.

³⁷Ibid. XXVIII, 3, 1.

³⁸Ibid. XXVIII, 3, 6; XXIX, 5, 4.

³⁹Ibid. XXVIII, 3, 7.

⁴⁰Ibid. XXIX, 5, 15.

2 3
OF/DE

the people of Britain and Africa⁴¹ and with the emperor.⁴² On the other hand, there is almost no direct criticism of Theodosius' conduct of his campaigns and Ammianus takes care to make some justification of actions of Theodosius that were criticised by his contemporaries, as in the case of the ferocious punishments meted out to his men in the name of discipline.⁴³

Ammianus certainly did have his favourite personalities, the most notorious being the emperor Julian. On the whole, however, his assessment of the characters in his history is more balanced and critical.⁴⁴ Ammianus was not usually free with his praises.⁴⁵ In particular the abundance of superlatives employed to describe the elder Theodosius is not at all characteristic of Ammianus' work. Most of the traits attributed to this general are commonplaces of eulogy. Furthermore Thompson has shown that Ammianus was well aware that the elder Theodosius was not quite the superb general that a superficial reading of his text would lead

⁴¹Ibid. XXIX, 3, 9; 5, 56.

⁴²Ibid. XXVIII, 3, 7 and 9.

⁴³Ibid. XXIX, 5, 23: Sed obtractatores malevoli vetus factum laudantes hoc et durum vituperant et asperrium ... hos vero subsignatos milites debuisse lenius corrigit, ad unum prolapsos errorem, quos nescientes forsitan admonemus, hanc cohortem et facto fuisse et exemplo adversam.

⁴⁴Demandt, Historia, 1969, 617f.

⁴⁵Thompson, Cambridge, 1947, 92.

one to believe. A closer reading of his narrative of Theodosius' campaigns reveals that the latter was incompetent and remiss in matters of strategy, unnecessarily cruel, and unable to inspire loyalty in his troops.⁴⁶ On the other hand enemies of the elder Theodosius such as the prefect Maximinus and Count Romanus of Africa are blackened unduly by Ammianus.⁴⁷ The reason for this uncharacteristic and insincere eulogy of Theodosius and vituperation of his opponents may well have been that Ammianus felt compelled to give this view for fear of offending the emperor if he did otherwise.⁴⁸

Lippold has expressed doubt that Ammianus' eulogy of the elder Theodosius was the result of political pressure.⁴⁹ Nevertheless there is ample evidence to indicate that freedom of speech was quite restricted in the late Roman empire.⁵⁰ Ammianus himself was aware that a writer had to be circumspect when dealing with contemporary events. For instance, he originally intended to finish his work at the year 364 A.D.,

⁴⁶ Ibid. 89ff. See also Demandt, Zeiteritik und Geschichtsbild im Werk Ammians, Bonn, 1965, 64f.

⁴⁷ Eg. Amm. Marc. XXVII, 9, 1-2; XXVIII, 1; XXVIII, 6; XXIX, 2, 22ff; 3, 1; 6, 3; XXX, 2, 11; Thompson, Cambridge, 1947, 97ff; cf. Demandt, Historia, 1969, 607ff.

⁴⁸ Thompson, Cambridge, 1947, 92, 101.

⁴⁹ Rivista Storica dell'Antichita, Bologna, 1972, 199.

⁵⁰ See Thompson, Cambridge, 1947, 109.

one of the reasons for this decision being that he felt it would be dangerous to tell the truth about events nearer his own time.⁵¹ Pacatus, following the conventions of his genre, praised the freedom of speech enjoyed under the emperor Theodosius (2, 2-4). Nevertheless, although we know that the latter was interested in history, the remark of the author of the Epitome de Caesaribus that he: simplicia ingenia aequae diligere, erudita mirari, sed innoxia,⁵² may be taken to indicate that he enjoyed literary works but only when the views expressed were acceptable to him.⁵³ Ammianus gives no reason for extending his history beyond 364 A.D., but it seems most probable that when he was dealing with events of nearer the time at which he was writing and particularly with those which concerned the ruling emperor or his family, he felt obliged to adhere to the official version.⁵⁴

⁵¹ Ann. Marc. XXVI, 1, 1: ut et pericula declinentur veritati saepe contigua. For further examples see Thompson, Cambridge, 1947, 109f.

⁵² Epit. de Caes., 48, 9.

⁵³ Thompson, Cambridge, 1947, 110.

⁵⁴ It may be objected that Eunapius did not feel any qualms about presenting a very unfavourable picture of the reigns of Theodosius and his sons although he probably wrote his History in the reign of Arcadius. Eunapius however, a resident of Sardis, was out of the mainstream of the life of the empire and thus out of the public eye. He could perhaps afford to be less scrupulous about the views he put forward than Ammianus whose work was well known. (See Thompson, Cambridge, 1947, 110f.)

The orator Claudian in his panegyrics to the emperor Honorius eulogises the elder Theodosius, Honorius' grandfather. As a panegyrist Claudian would have been required to reflect the official view of the emperor's grandfather. His praises are quite similar to those of Ammianus. He concentrates on Theodosius' military prowess. The latter is represented as being a fierce and dauntless general whose advance no adverse conditions could stop and who struck terror into his enemies.⁵⁵

Pacatus' treatment of the character and career of Theodosius the elder accords nicely with the evidence cited concerning the emperor Theodosius' desire to rehabilitate the memory of his father. Praise of the emperor's relatives and particularly of his close family was, as has been seen, a conventional topic of eulogy. But the rules specified omission of the topic if the family was discreditable.⁵⁶ Therefore, Pacatus would have been justified in omitting to mention Theodosius' father because of the dubious nature of his death. He chose, however, to praise the elder Theodosius alone of the emperor's family. Presumably this was because the emperor wished it. Like Ammianus and Claudian, Pacatus concentrates almost exclusively upon the military renown of the elder Theodosius. He mentions his major campaigns (5, 2).

⁵⁵Claudian, III Cos. Hon., 52ff; IV Cos. Hon., 24ff.

⁵⁶See above p. 13.

His glorious deeds were so numerous that they cannot be told in full (5; 3). If the practice of giving generals honorific titles still persisted Theodosius would have earned several (5, 4). He has summa virtus and summa felicitas, the greatest attributes of a general (6, 1). Ammianus stresses his preeminence in virtue: Theodosius cuius virtutes ut impetrabilis ea tempestate prae ceteris enitebant.⁵⁷ In a similar vein Pacatus had remarked that in him: virtutes simul omnes vigerent quae singulae in omnibus praedicantur (5, 3). Pacatus honours the elder Theodosius as divus (8, 3; 16, 5), an epithet attributed to him by Claudian also,⁵⁸ and which is found on certain inscriptions referring to him.⁵⁹

In conclusion, it is evident that under the rule of the emperor Theodosius and his sons writers had to be circumspect when dealing with the events of the elder Theodosius' career and death. For reasons not fully understood, Theodosius wished the circumstances of his father's demise to be forgotten, and that he be remembered only as a glorious and intrepid general. Pacatus echoes and furthers this propaganda by emphasising the military victories of the elder Theodosius and entirely omitting to mention the events surrounding his downfall and death.

⁵⁷XXIX, 5, 4.

⁵⁸Claudian, IV Cos. Hon., 190; Bell. Gild. I, 215; the elder Theodosius is referred to as a god in Cos. Stil. II, 421.

⁵⁹Eg. CIL VI, 7730 = Dessau 1277; see Egger, Byzantion, 1929-30, 28; Ensslin, RE, VA2, 1944.

ii) Theodosius and Valentinian II

When Valens was killed at the battle of Adrianople (August, 378 A.D.), the Roman empire was left under the leadership of two young emperors. Gratian, then nineteen, held court at Treves. Valentinian II, who was only eight years old, had been emperor in name over Italy and Illyricum since the death of his father, Valentinian I, in 375 A.D. Valentinian II in fact possessed no independence as a ruler. His territory was administered effectively from the court of Gratian.⁶⁰ On Valens' death the eastern portion of the empire was left without a ruler, at a time when it was being threatened seriously by hordes of barbarian invaders. In these circumstances Gratian recalled the younger Theodosius, who had already shown himself to be a capable general, from his retirement in Spain. He was first put in charge of troops in Thrace, and then, in January 379 A.D., he was coopted by Gratian to be his imperial colleague, and to administer the eastern empire. At this point Theodosius was in theory the most junior of the three emperors. Gratian, however, seems to have been concerned about Theodosius' aspirations, and took care to show him that he, Gratian, was

⁶⁰J. R. Palanque, "Collégialité et Partages dans l'Empire Romain aux I^{er} et VI^{es} Siècles", *REA*, 1944, 59f.

the senior Augustus by imposing a uniform coinage in both the west and the east.⁶¹

The balance of power was upset in 383 A.D. by the usurpation of Magnus Maximus and the consequent murder of Gratian. Maximus assumed Gratian's position as emperor of Gaul, Spain and Britain. Now that Gratian was dead, Valentinian II, who was still only twelve years old, was in theory senior Augustus. Both Maximus and Theodosius, however, now wished to claim the protectorate over the boy which had been possessed up to this time by Gratian. Maximus seems to have desired to rule the whole of the western empire as Gratian had done.⁶² In 383 A.D. he sent an embassy to Milan entreating Valentinian to come to him like a son to his father.⁶³ Maximus' designs were thwarted by Valentinian's ambassador, St. Ambrose, and for the first time the young emperor, under the guardianship of his mother Justina,

⁶¹J.W.E. Pearce, Roman Imperial Coinage, IX, London, 1951, xviii. Themistius addressed a eulogy to Theodosius in the year of his elevation (Or. XIV). In it he remarks that Gratian need not mistrust Theodosius' maturity because of his virtue (183a). This denial of any threat posed by Theodosius suggests, perhaps, that Gratian may have feared that his position as senior Augustus was in jeopardy when he elected Theodosius, an older man with military experience, to the throne of the east.

⁶²J.R. Palanque, "Sur l'Usurpation de Maxime", REA, 1929, 34ff.

⁶³Ambrose, Ep. xxiv, 10, 7: cum diceres quod Valentinianus ad te quasi filius ad patrem venire deberet.

enjoyed independence in ruling his own domains.⁶⁴ Maximus did not give up his ambitions, however, and did not recognise Valentinian II on his coinage.⁶⁵ Although Valentinian was left largely unmolested in his own territory during this period, Theodosius attempted to assume for himself certain of the privileges of the senior Augustus, which by rights should have fallen to Valentinian on the demise of Gratian. For example, he appropriated the right of appointing the consuls.⁶⁶

In 387 A.D., under the pretext of sending military aid to Valentinian, Maximus invaded Italy. Valentinian fled to Thessalonica with his family and put himself under the protection of Theodosius.⁶⁷ Theodosius' defeat of Maximus, and the assassination of the latter (28th August, 388 A.D.),

⁶⁴On the negotiations between Valentinian and Maximus through the mediation of St. Ambrose, see especially, J.R. Palanque, St. Ambrose et l'Empire Romain, Paris, 1933, 122ff and 168ff. On Valentinian's independence in Italy, see Palanque, REA, 1944, 61f.

⁶⁵Pearce, London, 1951, xxi; V. Grumel, "Numismatique et Histoire: l'Époque Valentinienne", Rev. Ét. Byz., 1954, 20.

⁶⁶Theodosius appointed two of his own men to the consulship of 384 A.D. (Richomer and Clearchus). After this a compromise seems to have been reached by the three emperors, for in 385 A.D. Praetextatus, Prefect of Italy, (i.e. a man from Valentinian's court) was made consul, while in 386 A.D. Evodius, Prefect of Gaul, (i.e. Maximus' man) enjoyed this honour. See Seeck, Geschichte des Untergangs der Antike Welt, Stuttgart, 1926, V, 183f.

⁶⁷Zosimus, IV, 42, 3-43, 2; Pacatus, 30, 2; Socrates, HE, V, 11; Sozomen, HE, VII, 13.

clinched Theodosius' position. Valentinian of his own accord had submitted to the protection of Theodosius. He was now finally completely subordinate to his older colleague. He was sent to Gaul where Arbogastes, a tool of Theodosius, was directing affairs. This marks the end of Valentinian's short period of independent rule. Although from this time until his death he was nominal ruler of the whole western portion of the empire (it would have been extremely difficult for Theodosius to remove him entirely), he was under the direction of Theodosius and his counsellors. By his defeat of Maximus and subsequent visit to Rome in triumph, Theodosius had made it quite clear to the west where the real leadership of the empire lay, and was now effectively ruler of the entire Roman world.⁶⁸

It was at this point, when, following the overthrow of Maximus, Theodosius was able to assume complete superiority over Valentinian II, that Pacatus delivered his eulogy. Theodosius was not a member of the ruling dynasty. As Pacatus says to him: eras a familia imperatoris alienus (12, 1). Since, however, he had been chosen as a colleague by a ruling Augustus, his position as emperor was perfectly legitimate. But the position he ultimately adopted after the defeat of Maximus, that is senior Augustus and de facto ruler of the whole empire, was not strictly constitutional. Since the death of Gratian, Valentinian had been entitled theoretically

⁶⁸Cf. Palanque, REA, 1944, 62ff.

to the rights and duties of senior Augustus. Theodosius, therefore, needed to justify his assumption of this position. Such justification would have been particularly necessary in Rome, which not only remained the emotional and symbolic capital of the Roman empire, although it was no longer its administrative centre, but also had been in Valentinian's portion of the empire. In his speech Pacatus can be shown to have promoted Theodosius' propaganda on this point.

Throughout Pacatus' Panegyric Theodosius is addressed as if he were the sole ruler. The rights of Valentinian II are totally ignored. This silence concerning Valentinian may well have had a political purpose. Since his speech was pronounced in Rome, which, as noted previously, had been in Valentinian's territory, to ignore Valentinian and eulogise Theodosius alone would imply that Theodosius and not Valentinian was now the chief authority in this part of the Roman world.

Valentinian is only alluded to twice in the course of Pacatus' speech. On both occasions the orator emphasises his minority. In the speech put into the mouth of Rome, begging Theodosius to accept the throne, Valentinian is referred to as parvus (11, 5). Furthermore, earlier in the eulogy Pacatus stated that Theodosius had been chosen as the man: qui imperatoris unius [i.e. Valentinian] tueretur aetatem, alterius [i.e. Gratian] iuvaret laborem (3, 5). This statement quite clearly carries the implication that Valentinian had

always been in a junior position to Theodosius and under his protection.

That Pacatus is echoing the official view of Theodosius' relationship to Valentinian is supported by the evidence of Theodosius' coinage. The obverse legend of a coin of a Roman emperor could be continuous or broken according to whether or not the laurel-wreath of the portrait interfered with it. By the late fourth century this distinction had come to have political implications. Many emperors at this time succeeded to the throne at a very early age. Such an emperor was often given the unbroken form of legend to indicate his minority and to suggest that he was not mature enough to rule independently. After the death of Gratian, Theodosius used the unbroken style for Valentinian II, although the latter was technically the senior Augustus, to denote his youth and support his claim that Valentinian was under his protection.⁶⁹ Valentinian himself used the broken style of legend right up until the invasion of Italy by Maximus became imminent and he was finally prepared to submit to Theodosius' protection.⁷⁰

Pacatus goes further and explains why Theodosius should have superiority over Valentinian. We have seen that he spends some time on the topic of aetas integra (7-10) and that, although this corresponds to the section on upbringing

⁶⁹Pearce, London, 1951, xxxvii.

⁷⁰Ibid., xxf.

and education in the schemes of the rhetoricians, Pacatus' approach to the topic is somewhat unusual.⁷¹ In it he stresses essentially the maturity and experience that Theodosius possessed when he came to the throne. Theodosius was a fitting person for the imperial throne because he came to rule at a mature age and equipped with experience in both civil and military affairs. The implication is that Valentinian, because of his youth, was not fit to rule. This hint could not have been missed by a contemporary audience.

Thus, Theodosius had usurped the position of senior Augustus and controller of Valentinian II. His justification of this action was that he was mature and experienced while Valentinian was a mere boy and therefore unable to rule independently. Pacatus, delivering his speech in Rome, which formerly owed its first allegiance to Valentinian, helped promote Theodosius' propaganda regarding his relationship with his young colleague by stressing the maturity of the former and the youth of the latter.

iii) Theodosius' relations with Maximus

The attitude that Theodosius adopted towards the usurpation of Magnus Maximus is ambiguous. The traditional view of his usurpation given by Pacatus and our other ancient authorities, and accepted by the majority of modern scholars,

⁷¹ See above, p. 24-26.

is that Maximus' usurpation occurred without the knowledge of Theodosius, and that the latter, hostile to the usurper from the beginning, eagerly awaited an opportunity to overthrow him and avenge Gratian. Zosimus, for example, states that Maximus' revolt was motivated by his jealousy of the position attained by Theodosius, his former companion-at-arms.⁷² Most modern scholars either accept this motive,⁷³ or invent one that similarly does not involve any collusion between Maximus and Theodosius.⁷⁴ Pacatus explicitly denies any amity or good relations between Theodosius and Maximus. He scorns the latter's (probably justified)⁷⁵ claim to kinship with Theodosius (24, 1) and reinforces his scorn by

⁷²Zosimus, IV, 35, 4: αὐτὸς δὲ αὐτομαχέτων ὅτι Θεοδοσίος ἦν βασιλεὺς, αὐτὸς δὲ οὐδὲ ἀρχὴν ἔχοντα ἐπὶ προελθόντι ἀνήγειρε. πάλιν εἰς τὸ κατὰ τοῦ βασιλέως ἔχοντος τοὺς στρατιώτας. This motive is also reported by John of Antioch, Frg. 186.

⁷³Eg. Gibbon, London, 1791, V, 7; Jullian, Paris, 1926, VII, 291.

⁷⁴Palanque, "L'Empereur Maxime", Les Empereurs Romains d'Espagne, Paris, 1965, 256, suggests that Maximus was anti-barbarian, and that his revolt was directed against Gratian, who strongly favoured barbarians in his army. Matthews, Western Aristocracies and the Imperial Court, A.D. 364-425, Oxford, 1975, 175, rejects this motive as being unlikely since Maximus himself boasted of his own barbarian support (Ambrose, Ep. 24, 4). More plausible is Matthew's own suggestion (loc. cit.): Maximus wished to restore a strong regime to the west instead of the reigns of a "dilettante youth and child". However, such a motive would rather strengthen the argument of collusion between Maximus and Theodosius than otherwise, since Theodosius also seems to have resented the authority of the weak Gratian. (See below, p. 101f.)

⁷⁵See below p. 121-123.

accusing Maximus of having been a mere slave in Theodosius' household (31, 1). He demolishes the usurper's assertion that he enjoyed the favour of Theodosius by reporting that Maximus confessed to boasting of such approval in order to win the support of the soldiery (43, 6).⁷⁶ Pacatus, however, also allows us a glimpse of another side to the story. For he mentions the fact that there were rumours of collusion between Maximus and Theodosius to depose Gratian and install Maximus in his place, based on the latter's boast of having Theodosius' support (42, 1; 43, 4-6). Despite the fact that Pacatus strongly denies the truth of such rumours, his statements have led certain scholars to argue, and not without compelling reasons on their side, that Theodosius did indeed support Maximus' usurpation, or at the least acquiesced willingly in the accomplished fact.⁷⁷

Our evidence suggests that relations between Theodosius and Gratian were far from good. They were at odds over religious matters. Gratian incurred the hostility of Theodosius for his opposition to the choice of Nectarius and Flavian for bishoprics.⁷⁸ Perhaps more important y,

⁷⁶The other major sources all indicate that Theodosius was hostile to Maximus, although he tolerated his rule for some time. See especially, Socrates, HE, V, 12.

⁷⁷The strongest statement of this view is that of Solari, "L'Alibi di Teodosio nella Opposizione Anti-dynastica", Klio, 1934, 165-168. Seeck, Stuttgart, 1921, V, 168f also believes in some complicity. Noepffner, REL, 1936, 128f, admits the possibility of collusion.

⁷⁸Seeck, Stuttgart, 1921, V, 187.

Theodosius does not appear to have respected Gratian's rule. Themistius, in an oration addressed to Theodosius in the winter of 384/385 A.D., remarks that to be a good shot does not constitute the honour of an emperor.⁷⁹ Seeck very plausibly takes this to be a slighting reference to Gratian's devotion to sport, and concludes that if Themistius was free to make such a remark before Theodosius so soon after the murder of Gratian, then the latter could not have been held in very high esteem by the emperor of the east.⁸⁰ Moreover, it seems probable that Theodosius, an experienced soldier of mature years, would have resented the seniority of a young and weak emperor such as Gratian. Certainly the evidence points to the conclusion that Gratian feared that his imperial colleague might attempt to usurp his authority as senior Augustus.⁸¹ Furthermore, Theodosius was concerned to establish his own dynasty. In January 383 A.D., just a few months before the assassination of Gratian, he elevated his young son Arcadius to the rank of Augustus. His ambitions in this regard may have brought him into conflict with Gratian, who, of course, would have been primarily concerned with the succession of his own house. At any rate it appears that Gratian did not recognise

⁷⁹Or. XVIII, 219a: οὐδὲ μὲν Διὶ τοξότῳ ἐνίκῃ καὶ ἀκοντίζειν.

⁸⁰Stuttgart, 1921, V, 185 and note ~~33~~ line 34.

⁸¹See above p. 93f.

Arcadius on his coinage.⁸² If, as many believe, Gratian was responsible for the execution of the elder Theodosius,⁸³ then the emperor Theodosius would have had personal reasons for animosity towards him. Maximus, who had served with the elder Theodosius and may have been related to him, would likely have shared such hostility. The fact that Theodosius had various reasons for desiring the removal of Gratian does not, of course, by any means prove that he conspired with Maximus to this end. It does, however, add weight to the possibility that he did so.

Theodosius apparently made no attempt to oppose Maximus' revolt. Rather, he quickly recognised him as his colleague. Pacatus mentions an agreement between them (foedus) which Maximus broke when he invaded Italy (30, 1). Zosimus remarks: "Theodosius the emperor accepted Maximus as co-emperor, conceding that he was worthy of sharing the imperial title with himself."⁸⁴ He also mentions a statue of Maximus that Theodosius had erected at Alexandria.⁸⁵ To support the literary

⁸²Piganiol, L'Empire Chrétien (325-395), Paris, 1947, 240.

⁸³See above p. 85 and n. 22.

⁸⁴IV, 37, 5: Θεοδόσιος δὲ ὁ βασιλεὺς ἐδεδίκατο τὴν βασιλείαν Πάξιμον εἰμῇ, καὶ εἰκόνας αὐτῷ κοινῶν εἶναι καὶ βασιλεὺς προσηγόρευε ἡ πόλις....

⁸⁵Ibid.: Ὡστε καὶ Κυνηγῶ.... τὴν Πάξιμον εἰκόνα δεῖξαι τοῖς Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ ἐπέταξεν ἀποθεῖναι τὴν δημοσίᾳ, ταύτην καὶ ὅτι συμβασιλεύσειν ἔαχεν αὐτῷ προφωνήσαι τῇ δήμῳ.

evidence of Pacatus and Zosimus concerning the recognition of Maximus, there are the facts that Theodosius issued coins in the name of Maximus,⁸⁶ and that Maximus' praetorian prefect Evodius was recognised in the east as consul in 386 A.D.⁸⁷ The proponents of the traditional view argue that Theodosius recognised Maximus as his colleague only with great reluctance. Zosimus reports the recognition but qualifies it by stating that Theodosius was secretly preparing to make war on Maximus all the time.⁸⁸ It is argued that Theodosius had no choice at the time but to accept Maximus as emperor. The overthrow of Gratian happened suddenly and contrary to expectation.⁸⁹ The treaty with the Goths which had been concluded in 382 A.D. was still fresh and the loyalty of these new barbarian allies as yet unknown.⁹⁰ For this reason Theodosius would have been unwilling to risk the withdrawal of troops from this area.⁹¹ While it is true that the settlement of these barbarians as

⁸⁶ Grumel, Rev. Ét. Byz., 1954, 21.

⁸⁷ Sulp. Sev., Vit. Mart. 20, 4.

⁸⁸ IV, 37, 5: ... λάβει μὲν τὸν ἐπὶ αὐτοῦ πραγματοποιήσαντος πόλεμον παντὶ δὲ θωπείας εἶδει καὶ θεραπείας αὐτὸν κατὰ στρατηγῶν.

⁸⁹ A. Lippold, Theodosius der Grosse und Seine Zeit, Stuttgart, 1968, 29.

⁹⁰ Matthews, Oxford, 1975, 178.

⁹¹ Seeck, Stuttgart, 1921, V, 182. David Jones, "The Emperor Theodosius", History Today, 1971, 625, also feels that Theodosius had little other choice than to recognise Maximus.

foederati would have required careful watching, it can equally well be argued that these new Gothic allies provided Theodosius with a huge number of new troops for a war against the usurper and an excellent opportunity to put his recently acquired allies to the test was afforded by Maximus' revolt.

The date of the recognition of Maximus is disputed. We have no direct evidence of such a recognition before 386 A.D., and this has led some to believe that the recognition did not take place before this year.⁹² Obviously it would serve better the thesis of those who believe that Theodosius recognised Maximus only reluctantly if it could be shown that the recognition was delayed until 386 A.D. But the argumentum e silentio bears little weight. Our evidence for the recognition is scanty, and it may well be due to chance that no definite proof of its existence prior to 386 A.D. has survived. A further argument for a late date has been put forward by Castagnol. He maintains that the recognition of Maximus could not have taken place until February 385 A.D. since his name does not appear in the Relationes of Symmachus, which span the period from June/July 384 A.D. to January/February 385 A.D. Castagnol argues that, as it was customary to address relationes to all the reigning emperors, the fact that Maximus is not mentioned must mean that he was not acknowledged as a legitimate emperor at the time that Symmachus

⁹²Matthews, Oxford, 1975, 176ff. He suggests that the invasion of the Greuthungi in 386 A.D. may have impelled Theodosius finally to recognise Maximus.

wrote his Relationes.⁹³ However, the absence of Maximus' name on these official addresses is easily explicable. After his downfall, Maximus' name would have been struck off such documents as these since he was no longer regarded as having been a legitimate emperor.

Themistius mentions that Theodosius undertook an expedition to the Rhine in 384 A.D., the alleged purpose of which was to avenge Gratian's death and recover his remains.⁹⁴ This evidence has led Matthews to believe that Theodosius was not as uncommitted to opposing Maximus as he otherwise appears.⁹⁵ Nevertheless, Themistius also remarks that although the intentions behind the expedition were great, its outcome was not. It achieved neither of its purported ends. Matthews himself admits that the expedition may not even have been intended to go to the Rhine in the first place.⁹⁶ It is possible, however, that this expedition of 384 A.D. was the occasion of the recognition of Maximus as emperor. Theodosius had reason to be angry with him at this time, whether or not he had been involved in the downfall of Gratian. As we have seen, after Gratian's death, Theodosius

⁹³Chastagnol, note on the article of Palanque, "L'Empereur Maxime", in Les Empereurs Romains d'Espagne, Paris, 1965, 264.

⁹⁴Or. XVIII, 220d-221a.

⁹⁵Oxford, 1975, 178.

⁹⁶Ibid.

wished to assume the senior position that his colleague had held, and together with it the protectorate over the young Valentinian.⁹⁷ If he had conspired with Maximus to overthrow Gratian, presumably it was to attain this position. But Maximus in the winter of 383/384 A.D. had begun to bargain with Valentinian to claim the protectorate for himself.⁹⁸ If, as is likely, these negotiations displeased Theodosius, the events of the summer of 384 A.D. are easy to understand. Theodosius went to the west not to depose Maximus but rather to bargain with him.⁹⁹ He was prepared to acknowledge his position as ruler of Gratian's lands, and may even have been instrumental in his attainment of it. However, he refused to recognise him if he were to persist in claiming authority over Valentinian.¹⁰⁰ Pacatus mentions that Maximus broke the agreement with Theodosius by invading Italy (30, 1-2). This suggests that this agreement involved Maximus in giving up his ambitions to rule Italy, probably in return for his recognition as a legitimate emperor. There is evidence which

⁹⁷See above p. 94ff.

⁹⁸See above *ibid.*

⁹⁹Zosimus, IV, 37, 4, mentions an embassy of Maximus to Theodosius.

¹⁰⁰Palanque, Les Empereurs Romains d'Espagne, Paris, 1965, 259. See also Gibbon, London, 1791, V, 12f; Stein, Histoire du Bas-Empire, Paris, 1959, I, 202; and Lippold, Stuttgart, 1968, 30, who agree that Maximus was excluded from ruling Italy by the terms of the agreement.

indicates that Theodosius was in north Italy in the summer of 384 A.D.¹⁰¹ I would suggest that after coming to terms with Maximus, Theodosius proceeded to Italy to persuade Valentinian to accept the agreement.¹⁰² It would have been difficult for the latter to recognise his brother's murderer as his colleague. On the other hand, he did not wish to be dominated by either Maximus or Theodosius, and may have been prepared to accept Maximus as emperor in Gaul in return for his own independence in Italy, which the terms of the treaty apparently offered him.

That Theodosius made no attempt to put up any opposition to Maximus' usurpation, but was indeed quite ready to accept him as a legitimate colleague, is not proof of any conspiracy between himself and the usurper against Gratian. Nevertheless, it does suggest that Theodosius was at the least content with his removal, and, as in the case of the bad relations between Theodosius and Gratian, lends more credibility to the idea that there may have been collusion.

After his usurpation, Maximus asserted that he had been compelled to become emperor by his soldiers against his will.¹⁰³ Those who believe in Theodosius' innocence of

¹⁰¹ CTh. xii, 1, 107.

¹⁰² Matthews, Oxford, 1975, 178, feels that a conference with Valentinian may have been the outcome of the expedition to the west in 384 A.D. mentioned by Themistius, Or. XVIII. 220d-221a.

¹⁰³ Orosius, Adv. Pag. VII, 34, 9; Sulp. Sev., Vit. Mart. 20, 3.

complicity in the usurpation argue that for Maximus to make such an assertion would be nonsense if there had been a conspiracy.¹⁰⁴ But the fact that Maximus later wished to argue that he had become emperor only reluctantly proves nothing as regards his relationship with Theodosius at the time of his elevation. To be sure, if the truth was that Maximus had been forced against his will to assume the responsibilities of the crown, then he could not have prearranged his elevation with Theodosius. As we have seen, however, at this time reluctance to assume sovereignty was considered the proper attitude for a legitimate emperor to assume.¹⁰⁵ Thus, Maximus, like many other emperors, may well have made a pretence of reluctance in order to demonstrate the legitimacy of his power.

It is impossible with the evidence at our disposal to prove categorically that Theodosius was party to Maximus' usurpation. He had reasons to desire the removal of Gratian and certainly seems to have made very little, if any, effort to oppose Maximus' elevation. He may have felt that he would be able to control Maximus, a former military companion of his, whereas he could exercise no authority over Gratian. The only positive evidence of any conspiracy is the rumours reported by Pacatus. That Maximus claimed to have the support

¹⁰⁴ Ensslin, *RE*, XIV, 2548.

¹⁰⁵ See above p. 38f.

of Theodosius is no proof in itself of collusion, for it is possible that he did merely pretend to this to win support for his revolt.¹⁰⁶ Nevertheless, it is clear that the possibility that Theodosius was involved in some way in Maximus' revolt certainly should not be dismissed out of hand.

Furthermore, it would be erroneous to accept without question the view given by our sources of the relations between Theodosius and Maximus, that is hostility on Theodosius' part towards the upstart in the west from the beginning, as an accurate representation of the true situation. All the surviving accounts of Maximus' revolt were written after his downfall, when Theodosius obviously had assumed a pose of utter hostility towards this man and the memory of him, and certainly would not have been prepared to acknowledge any involvement in his revolt, whatever his original part in the affair may have been. Indeed, even before Maximus' deposition it seems unlikely that Theodosius would have admitted openly to conspiring against his senior colleague Gratian, to whom he was indebted for his own elevated rank. Political pressure would have prevented contemporary writers from alluding to such a touchy issue in any way that might offend Theodosius. The majority of later authors were Christians, and favoured Theodosius. Such writers would have been unlikely to report any collusion

¹⁰⁶Piganiol, Paris, 1947, 242. See also Palanque, Les Empereurs Romains d'Espagne, Paris, 1965, 257.

between Maximus and Theodosius even if they knew of it. Zosimus' case is different. His hostility to Theodosius is overt. He certainly would not wittingly have put forward a view that was favourable to Theodosius if he had known of an alternative. We must assume that Zosimus knew of no rumours that Theodosius had lent his support to Maximus' rebellion.

It is in Pacatus' speech in particular that one would expect to find some statement of the official attitude towards Maximus' revolt. For he wrote his Panegyric in order to praise Theodosius for his defeat of Maximus. At this point when Theodosius was quite definitely hostile to the usurper, Pacatus would have been obliged to deny absolutely any implication in his usurpation on the part of the emperor, whether or not he had been involved. Therefore, although it is not possible to prove that Pacatus' denial that Theodosius took any part in Maximus' elevation is false, we must regard it with circumspection on the grounds that the orator clearly had no choice but to advance the official attitude adopted towards Maximus' revolt and Theodosius' part in it after the downfall of the usurper.

There is enough evidence to suggest strongly that Theodosius supported the usurpation of Magnus Maximus in some way. The fact that Pacatus denies this, and our other sources make no mention of it, only presenting the view that Theodosius was opposed to Maximus from the start, in no way rules out the possibility of collusion since these authors,

and Pacatus in particular, may simply reflect the official attitude towards this matter. The fact that Zosimus appears to know nothing of the rumours of a conspiracy against Gratian perhaps bears witness to the effectiveness of Theodosius' propaganda.

2. PACATUS' PREJUDICE

It is obviously necessary to know the background of the author as fully as possible in order to be able to recognise passages and statements in which his own prejudices and ambitions may be influencing his words. In the case of Pacatus, the information at our disposal is not abundant, but what is known is very important for assessing his Panegyric from this point of view. Pacatus makes it quite clear in his speech that his home is Gaul,¹⁰⁷ although the exact location is not certain. Sidonius Apollinaris indicates Agen or Perigueux.¹⁰⁸ Pacatus' own description, however: ab ultimo Galliarum recessu, qua litus Oceani cadentem excipit solem et deficientibus terris sociale miscetur elementum (2, 1), seems to indicate that his residence at any rate was a place

¹⁰⁷1, 3; 2, 1; 23, 1; 24, 4; 47, 5.

¹⁰⁸Ep. VIII, 11: Quid agunt Nitiobroges, quid Vesunnici tui Tu vero utrisque praesentiam tuam disposite vicissimque partitus nunc Drepanium illis, modo istis restituis Anthedum. It is not clear from this text from which of the two places mentioned Pacatus came.

near the coast. Bordeaux is a plausible suggestion.¹⁰⁹ as well as being an orator Pacatus was, according to the testimony of Ausonius, a poet.¹¹⁰ He must have enjoyed a high social position, for he was friendly with some of the most prominent Gauls of his time. Ausonius dedicated a number of works to Pacatus, addressing him with affection and an apparently high regard for his abilities.¹¹¹ We also possess letters of Symmachus that were addressed to Pacatus.¹¹² Moreover, he held important positions in the administration of the empire. In 390 A.D. he was proconsul of Africa,¹¹³ and in 393 A.D. occupied the post of comes rerum privatarum at the court of Theodosius.¹¹⁴

Pichon has pointed out some areas of Pacatus' Panegyric in which his attitudes seem to have been affected by his own background. In particular he cites Pacatus' bitter condemnation of Magnus Maximus, whose allegedly

¹⁰⁹W. Baehrens, "Pacatus", Hermes, 1921, 445; R. Hanslik, "Pacatus (2)", RE, XVIII, 2058; Galletier, Paris, 1949, III, 48f.

¹¹⁰Ausonius, Eclogues, I, 10-12.

¹¹¹Eclogues, I; Technopaegnon, I; Ludus Septem Sapientium, I.

¹¹²Ep. VIII, 12; IX, 61 and 64.

¹¹³CTh., ix, 2, 4.

¹¹⁴CTh. ix, 4, 2, 13f; xi, 67, 1. Cf. A. Lippold, "Herrscherideal und Traditionsverbundtheit im Panegyrikus des Pacatus", Historia, 1968, 238.

extortionate fiscal exactions would have affected men of Pacatus' class the most, and the excuses that the orator makes for the Gauls who gave their allegiance to Maximus. He concludes:

Dans son indulgence pour les complices de Maxime comme dans sa haine contre Maxime lui-même, quoique ces deux sentiments paraissent contradictoires, Pacatus a toujours en vue les intérêts de la classe très élevée à laquelle il appartient: il maudit le tyran, parceque la noblesse gauloise a été maltraitée par lui, mais il excuse les nobles qui l'ont servi, parcequ'il est du même monde qu'eux.¹¹⁵

Further, Pichon mentions the aristocratic attitude that Pacatus reflects in his enthusiastic praise of Theodosius' generosity in giving the consulship to his friends and those who deserved it rather than reserving it for himself and his family.¹¹⁶ While Pichon is correct as far as he goes in observing that the preoccupations of Pacatus in these passages are the result of his background among the Gallo-Roman aristocracy, it seems to me that the point can be taken further. How and by whom Pacatus' eulogy was commissioned is not known. It is probable, however that he was chosen to thank Theodosius on behalf of the Gauls for delivering them from the usurper Maximus, who now, if not before, was regarded as a tyrant.¹¹⁷ As Pliny formerly had used his eulogy of Trajan in order to promote the interests of the Senate, so it

¹¹⁵Pichon, Paris, 1906, 139ff.

¹¹⁶Ibid. 143f.

¹¹⁷Galletier, Paris, 1949, III, 48.

seems from the evidence of the passage cited by Pichon, that Pacatus used his Panegyric as a vehicle to further the interests and ambitions of the Gallo-Roman aristocracy of which he was a member.

Firstly, Pacatus takes great care to deny that the Gauls have any real allegiance to Maximus. Their apparent allegiance to him, he pleads, was all a pretence. They were forced, for fear of informers, to suppress their misery under Maximus' rule and to feign happiness (25, 2-5). The implication is, of course, that they had never really supported Maximus at all. It would have been dangerous under the new regime of Theodosius to admit to having paid homage to the usurper. Symmachus is known to have written a Panegyric upon Maximus, as a result of which he was impeached for high treason. He fled to a church for sanctuary, until he was pardoned through the intercession of bishop Leontius.¹¹⁸ In the passage cited Pacatus seems to be making a deliberate attempt to excuse the apparent devotion of the Gallic nobles to Maximus, and thereby to ingratiate himself and his class with their new ruler.

The passage of Pacatus' eulogy which deals with Theodosius' friendship and generosity in bestowing honours (16ff) can also be related to Pacatus' own ambitions. Of particular interest is his emphatic praise of Theodosius for the liberality that he showed by not reserving consulships

¹¹⁸ Socrates, HE, V, 14. J.P. Matthews, "The Gallic Supporters of Theodosius", Antonius, 1971, 1079.

and other high offices for his sons and relatives (16, 4-5; 17, 2-4). Theodosius' sons had in fact received consulships already, although they were still very young. Arcadius was consul in 385 A.D. when he was only seven or eight years old, and Honorius in 386 A.D. at the age of two years! Moreover, Chastagnol has shown that Theodosius did seem to favour his fellow Spaniards, if not his own relations exclusively, for offices in his administration.¹¹⁹ Pacatus seems here to be using praise as a means of exhortation, and in praising 'Theodosius' generosity, asking him to be generous. He appears to be requesting that favours similar to those shown to Spaniards be given to members of the Gallo-Roman aristocracy. His question:

Enimvero cum leviter cognitos aut etiam semel visos
his honoribus ditas, quibus et amici possent esse
contenti, nonne omnibus vis probare amicum tibi
esse qui bonus sit? (17, 4)

can perhaps be interpreted in this way. The leviter cognitos aut semel visos could well be a reference to Pacatus and his Gallic compatriots.. This was Theodosius' first visit to the west in the capacity of its ruler. The important men of Gaul would indeed have been only slightly known to him at this time. It was probably also the first occasion on which he had met Pacatus himself. Matthews points out that Gauls had been prominent at the imperial court under Julian but had been

¹¹⁹ "Les Espagnols dans l'Aristocratie Gouvernementale à l'Époque de Théodose", Les Empereurs Romains d'Espagne, Paris, 1965, 269ff.

virtually eliminated by the time of Valens. Moreover, he goes on to show that to the time when Theodosius was visiting the west after his defeat of Maximus can be attributed the rise to high office of three Gauls, including Pacatus himself,¹²⁰ whose appointment to the office of proconsul of Africa was possibly a reward for his Panegyric upon Theodosius.¹²¹

The witness of Pacatus' own preoccupations and statements in these passages seems to indicate that one of his purposes, and possibly his main purpose, in pronouncing his eulogy of Theodosius was to be the advocate of the Gallo-Roman aristocracy with its new emperor. He wished to ingratiate his class with Theodosius and to plead for its members to be included in high positions in his government. The evidence cited by Matthews would seem to show that Pacatus' pleas did not fall upon deaf ears.

Pacatus' Panegyric upon Theodosius offers good examples both of how such speeches could be used to promote the emperor's policies, and of how an orator could further his own interests using the medium of praise. Most obviously Pacatus reflects Theodosius' views concerning the recently defeated usurper Magnus Maximus, but he also sheds interesting light upon his policies with respect to the

¹²⁰ Iatonus, 1971, 1073ff. The other two were: i) Cl. Iachanius (Ibid. 1082f.) He was consularis Turiae in 389 A.D., and later comes sacrarum largitionum, quaestor sacri palatii, and finally praefectus, perhaps of Constantinople; ii) Marcellus 'Empiricus', author of De Medicamentis (Ibid. 1983ff.) He was Magister Officiorum from 394-395 A.D.

¹²¹ Hanslik, RE, XVIII, 2058.

memory of his father and towards the young emperor Valentinian II. While being careful to adhere to the official view of Theodosius' policies, however, Pacatus also made good use of his opportunity to advance the ambitions of himself and his fellow members of the Gallo-Roman aristocracy.

CHAPTER THREE

PACATUS AND HISTORY: THE USURPATION OF MAGNUS MAXIMUS

In the preceding chapters we have examined to what extent Pacatus' Panegyric upon Theodosius was moulded by the conventions of eulogy on the one hand and by political and social prejudices on the other. Both these factors affect the historicity of the orator's statements. In the light of our findings we may now compare Pacatus' account of Magnus Maximus and his usurpation with the evidence given by alternative authorities, and assess the value of his speech for the career of this usurper.

It is important to bear in mind that our other sources also are each influenced by their own prejudices and biases, according to the nature and purpose of the works. The attitude of St. Ambrose, for instance, towards Maximus is governed by the fact that he represented the interests of Valentinian II at the court of the usurper, and by the fact that he disapproved of the latter's actions with regard to the Priscillianists. The panegyrics of Claudian were controlled by similar conventions as that of Pacatus, and by the fact that he composed them at the court of Honorius, the son of Theodosius. The period of the late Roman empire is particularly interesting from the point of view of its

historiography. After the acceptance of Christianity as the official religion of the empire by Constantine the Great, many writers of history took a definite party standpoint according to their religious views. Christians began to interpret history from the Christian point of view, concentrating on apologetic rather than true history, or on the vicissitudes of the church rather than on political or military history. They tended to attack pagans while eulogising Christian saints and emperors. This approach naturally put the pagans on the defensive, and by the end of the fourth century a pagan reaction to the Christian apologetic was beginning to develop, such as may be found in the pro-pagan and anti-Christian prejudices of Eunapius' History and, later, that of Zosimus.¹ Historians of this kind are inclined to produce very schematic interpretations and characterisations, with little in the way of critical assessment. Such pronounced biases must be considered carefully in any estimate of the reliability of the evidence of these historians.²

¹On the conflict between pagan and Christian historical writing in the late Roman empire, see the chapter: "Pagan and Christian Historiography in the Fourth Century A.D.", by A. Momigliano, in Paganism and Christianity in the Fourth Century, ed. A. Momigliano, Oxford, 1963, 79ff.

²It is not possible in this study to present a detailed analysis of the alternative sources which provide information on the career of Magnus Maximus. Nevertheless, a brief survey of the relevant characteristics of the most important sources may provide a useful background to the discussion which follows, and will be found in Appendix II.

Our information concerning the history of Magnus Maximus is not plentiful. Many authors make only very brief comments about this man, so that as regards many areas of his career we know little or nothing. It will be seen that on many points the evidence that we possess from alternative sources is incompatible with Pacatus' version. Thus it is important to weigh Pacatus' view ~~against~~ those of our other authorities, keeping in mind the prejudices which influenced each writer, in order to establish as far as possible whether or not the orator's information reflects the truth, and to ascertain what he adds to the corpus of knowledge furnished from other sources.

I. MAXIMUS' ORIGIN AND CAREER UNTIL HIS USURPATION

The origins of Magnus Maximus are obscure. Pacatus, however, does shed some light on this problem. He mentions that Maximus boasted of being related to Theodosius by marriage (21, 4: adfinitate). As we have seen, the orator scorned this assertion on the part of Maximus, for at the time when he delivered his speech it was Theodosius' policy to deny any connections with the usurper whom he had just put to death.³ Thus, Pacatus' attitude reflects the official view on this point. It does not rule out the possibility that Maximus had some connection with Theodosius' family.

³See above p. 110f.

What little other evidence we possess concerning Maximus' origin supports the inference that, contrary to Pacatus' denial of any relationship, Theodosius and Maximus may indeed have been related in some way. Zosimus records that Maximus was a Spaniard by birth.⁴ Under his administration the Spanish province of Galicia was governed by a consular instead of a praeses.⁵ This favour shown to Galicia has been taken with some justification as evidence that it was Maximus' home province.⁶ Galicia was also the homeland of Theodosius. For his part, Theodosius seems to have had a special concern for Maximus' family. After his defeat and death, the emperor cared for the upbringing of his children and allowed his mother a pension.⁷ Most persuasive of all is the fact that Pacatus himself indicates that Maximus was attached to the household of Theodosius:

ille quondam domus tuae neglegentissimus vernula
mensularumque servilium statarius lixa ... te
heredem nobilissimae familiae, se clientem; (31, 1).

Pacatus attributes to Maximus a very low station in the household. He even implies that he was a bastard (31, 1;

⁴IV, 35, 5: *ἰσχυρὸς τῶν γένους*. Cf. Cedrenos, I, 551, 3, who describes him as *ἡγεμονικὸς τῆς ἀρχῆς*, and Ausonius, Ord. Urb. Nob., XIX, 7, 7 v. 72, who refers to him as Rutupinus Iatro. Such errors concerning Maximus' origin could easily arise from his strong connections with Britain before his usurpation.

⁵CIL, II, 4911.

⁶Ensslin, "Maximus (33) (Usurpator)", RE, XIV, 2546.

⁷Ambrose, Ep. 40, 32; Ensslin, RE, XIV, 2546.

patris incertum). As it was conventional in eulogy to accuse usurpers of low birth,⁸ Pacatus' assertion of Maximus' bastardy and humble station is of doubtful veracity. Nevertheless he would have had no reason to fabricate the fact that Maximus was attached in some way to Theodosius' household. For such an attachment belies his denial of the existence of any connection between the two men. It is from Pacatus' Panegyric alone that we learn that Maximus had connections of some kind with Theodosius' family, and may have been related to him by marriage.⁹

Pacatus tells us nothing of Maximus' career prior to his usurpation. We do know that he served with Theodosius and his father in Britain,¹⁰ and probably with the latter in Africa.¹¹ Maximus' military connections with the elder Theodosius have led to the suggestion that Pacatus' references to the usurper as: orbis extorrem patriaeque fugitivum (31, 1)

⁸See above p. 55.

⁹Most modern scholars accept that Maximus and Theodosius were related in some way, although it is not possible to make any reasonable conjecture as to the exact nature of the relationship. See eg. Ensslin, RE, XIV, 2546; Seeck, Stuttgart, 1926, V, 167; Stein, Paris, 1959, I, 201; Solari, Klio, 1934, 168; Hoepfner, RRL, 1936, 128.

¹⁰Zosimus, IV, 35, 5: Θεοδοσίῳ τῷ βασιλεῖ κατὰ τὴν βρετανίαν ἐοστρατεύσαντι.

¹¹The Maximus mentioned by Ammianus (XXIX, 5, 6 and 21) in his description of Theodosius' campaign in Africa is often equated with the later usurper. (Eg. Seeck, Stuttgart, 1921, V, 167; Ensslin, RE, XIV, 2546.) The identification is not certain.

and exulem (23, 3) indicate his involvement in the fall of that general. It is argued that at the time of the execution of the elder Theodosius, Maximus was banished to Britain for his part in his commander's alleged crime.¹² There is no need, however, to read any such interpretation into Pacatus' words. In the reign of Gratian, Maximus enjoyed the command of the troops stationed in Britain.¹³ Pacatus' allusions to

¹²Ensslin, RE, XIV, 2546.

¹³Either as dux Britanniae or comes Britanniarum. The hypothesis of C.E. Stevens, "Magnus Maximus in British History", Études Celtiques, 1938, 86ff, that Maximus was the governor of Wales, rather than commander of the troops in Britain, is probably incorrect. Stevens contends that Maximus held the office of consularis Valentiae (Not. Dig. Occ. XXI, ii). However, although the precise location of the province Valentia is not certain, it is more likely to have been north west England than Wales. (See S.S. Frere, Britannia: A History of Roman Britain, London, 1967, 215.) Further, Stevens denies that Maximus could have held the command of the British troops on the grounds that Zosimus, IV, 35, 6, followed by John of Antioch, Frsg. 186, states that Maximus enjoyed no "honourable" office. However, Zosimus' actual words are ἀξιωματικὸν, which should be translated in this case as "prized" rather than "honourable". For the assertion is made in the context of Maximus' envy of Theodosius who had attained the rank of Augustus. The command of the troops in a remote corner of the empire would not have been a "prized office", especially when compared with that of emperor of the east. Finally, the office of consularis Valentiae was a civilian post, and it would have been an unusual one for a man such as Maximus who was following a military career to hold. (See Chastagnol, Les Empereurs Romains d'Espagne, Paris, 1965, 264; Matthews, Oxford, 1975, 175 n. 6). The fact that Maximus is well remembered in Welsh legend can easily be explained if legend is right in depicting him as married to a Welsh princess. (Mabinogion, I, 135-150. Maximus also appears in the genealogies of the Welsh kings. See Stevens, Études Celtiques, 1938, 86ff.) Wales was a part of Maximus' sphere of authority but not the whole of it. It seems that he was able to draw troops from a broader area than Wales alone for his attack on Gratian in 383 A.D. (Frere, London, 1967, 234f.)

his "banishment" and "exile" are probably derogatory references to this office. He also scorns his troops as exules and insulani (23, 3). Britain itself is described as: ultimo terrarum recessu (31, 2). It was, after all, a remote outpost of the Roman empire, out of the mainstream of its life. It would have been appropriate in Roman terms to put down a commander stationed in Britain by referring to his banishment and exile. It is not justified to conclude from Pacatus' mocking references to Maximus' position in Britain that he was in any way involved in the downfall of count Theodosius.

2. MAXIMUS' ELEVATION

Pacatus does not narrate the events of Maximus' elevation in Britain, and subsequent invasion of Gaul. This would have been neither expected nor necessary. The story would have been well known to a contemporary audience. Mere allusions to whatever aspects to which he wished to draw attention would have been sufficient for Pacatus' audience to understand his point. From Pacatus' speech alone we could not even be sure that Maximus' elevation took place in Britain. He alludes to the event as occurring in ultimo terrarum recessu (31, 1). His first supporters are termed insulani (23, 1). We hear that he had British satellites (28, 4) and connections with Britain (38, 2). These hints would be sufficient for us to conjecture that his revolt had its

beginning in Britain, but not for absolute certainty if it were not for the confirmation given by other sources.¹⁴

Pacatus supplies certain information concerning the overthrow of Gratian. We know that following his elevation in Spring 383 A.D. Maximus crossed over to Gaul with a large body of troops to challenge Gratian.¹⁵ The two armies met at Paris,¹⁶ where light skirmishes occurred for a period of five days.¹⁷ Pacatus notes that Maximus' revolt gathered strength: præcipue cum perfidia ducum, defectione legionum contra rem publicam foret verum quidquid pro re publica fuerat armatum! (23, 4) The fact that Gratian was deserted by his troops is corroborated by other sources. Zosimus, in particular, gives a number of details not found in Pacatus' speech. From his History we learn that the Moorish cavalry deserted their emperor first, followed gradually by the majority of the remainder of the army, leaving Gratian with

¹⁴Sulp. Sev. Chron. II, 49, 5; Rufinus, HE, II, 14; Socrates, HE, V, 11; Sozomen, HE, VII, 13; Orosius, Adv. Pag. VII, 34, 9; Zosimus, IV, 35, 4-5; Epit. de Caes., 47, 7; Claudian, IV Cos. Hon. 73; Prosper Tiro, a.384.

¹⁵See references in n.14 above. For the date of Maximus' usurpation see Seeck, Stuttgart, 1921, V, 167. Cf. Grumel, Rev. Et. Byz., 1954, 19, who gives the date as 382 A.D. but without any evidence. Prosper Tiro mistakenly mentions Maximus' usurpation under the year 384 A.D.

¹⁶Prosper Tiro, Chron. a.384.

¹⁷Zosimus, IV, 35, 9.

a bodyguard of a mere three hundred cavalry, with which he took flight towards Italy.¹⁸

One phrase in Pacatus' speech which concerns this question has caused some difficulty. He alludes to the perfidia ducum (23, 4), but does not mention the names of any of the generals who allegedly betrayed Gratian. We know that one such man was Andragathius, who had been a dux under Gratian, but, during Maximus' revolt, assassinated his former master.¹⁹ Prosper Tiro names Merobaudes, Gratian's magister militum, as a traitor.²⁰ This statement, however, conflicts with Pacatus' account of Merobaudes death. For he states that Merobaudes: vita sese abdicare compulsus est steterat enim in acie Gratiani et Gratianus dilexerat (28, 4-5). This indicates that, far from being a traitor, Merobaudes met his death because of his loyalty to Gratian. The opinion of modern scholars is divided on this question. Seeck, on the one hand, accepts the evidence of Prosper Tiro that Merobaudes did in fact join the rebel's camp. He argues

¹⁸ Ibid.:

ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς διὰ τὴν ἀντιπαράθεσιν, ἡρώδην μὲν τῆς μαρτυρίας
ἀνακρίψας ἐν τῇ ἀπολογία, καὶ μαρτυροῦν ἀναγκάσας
ἀβυστρον, εἰς τὴν καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους κατὰ ἀρχὴν τῆς ἀπορίας
ἀπελθὼν, ἀπερὶ τῆς ἐκείνου προδοτικῆς ἐνέργειας ἀνέδειξε,
ὡς αὐτὸς ἐπὶ τῇ προδοτικῇ ἐνέργειᾳ τὸν βασιλέα.

See also Ambrose, Ep. 24, 10; In Psalm. 6, 17; Jerome, Ep. 60, 15; Pseud-Jerome, Ep. 18, 4; Rufinus, HE, II, 14; Epit. de Caes. 47, 7.

¹⁹ On the career of Andragathius see Seeck, "Andragathius", RE, I, 2132; Jones, Martindale and Morris, The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire, Cambridge, 1971, 62f.

²⁰ Chron. a. 384: Gratiano Parisio Merobaudio magistro militum prodicione sueratus.

that Pacatus' story is fictitious, being designed merely to add weight to the charge of cruelty that he lays upon Maximus.²¹ Jullian, on the other hand, feeling that such treason would have been out of character for Merobaudes, accepts Pacatus' account of his death.²² It seems most unlikely that Pacatus' version is wholly fiction. Merobaudes was designated for the consulship of 388 A.D.²³ and thus was still alive in 387 A.D. Had he defected to Maximus and thus, presumably, served him since 383 A.D., the statement that Maximus caused his death on account of his attachment to Gratian would have been too obvious a lie. Moreover, if Merobaudes had betrayed Gratian, Pacatus would not have missed the opportunity to denounce him as a traitor, particularly since Theodosius seems to have had no great liking for this man.²⁴ We need not doubt Pacatus' word that Merobaudes met his death by suicide. There seems to be no reason for him to have invented this. However, to burden Maximus with the responsibility for his death because of his loyalty to Gratian four years after the murder of this emperor is puzzling. Why did he wait so long? Why did he compel him to suicide rather than use a more direct method?

²¹ Stuttgart, 1921, V, 167 and note to line 25. See also Ensslin, *RE*, XIV, 2547; Matthews, Oxford, 1975, 173.

²² Paris, 1926, VII, 292, n. 1.

²³ De Rossi, *Inscriptiones Christianae Urbis Romae Septimo Saeculo Antiquiores*, Rome, 1857, I, 370.

²⁴ Hoepffner, *REL*, 1936, 128.

A possible explanation is as follows. In 383 A.D. Merobaudes did not betray Gratian, but rather fled with him towards Italy. Gratian was caught and killed at Lyons. Merobaudes managed to escape and reached the court of Valentinian II, where nothing more is heard of him until his designation for the consulship of 388 A.D. When Maximus invaded Italy in 387 A.D. and forced Valentinian to flee, Merobaudes finally gave up hope and took his own life. In this case, Maximus could be said to have been responsible for his suicide in a sense. Pacatus, naturally, has exaggerated his part in Merobaudes' death in order to add substance to his accusation of cruelty against Maximus. If the above hypothesis is correct, we must assume that Prosper Tiro erred in naming Merobaudes a traitor. He perhaps mistook him for Andragathius.²⁵ Nevertheless, it must be emphasised that this reconstruction is by no means certain. We are indebted to Pacatus for the fact that Merobaudes found death by his own hand. The circumstances must remain a matter of conjecture.

Pacatus makes only vague allusions to the murder of Gratian.²⁶ Nevertheless, he does imply that Maximus was responsible for his death. For he states that when Maximus invaded Italy, the: extinctus aperto dominus parriocidio poenas ab eo debitas expetebat (30, 3). Maximus himself,

²⁵Jullian, Paris, 1926, VII, 292, n. 1.

²⁶24; 4: interitum Gratiani.

however, denied desiring the murder of Gratian.²⁷ Although Pacatus, who wished to blacken Maximus' character as much as possible, may be expected to implicate Maximus in the murder of Gratian whether he was guilty of it or not, he is probably justified in this instance.

A number of sources put the blame for Gratian's death upon the treachery of Maximus,²⁸ although it is clear that the actual murder was carried out by Andragathius.²⁹ That Maximus wished to extricate himself from responsibility for the assassination is easy to understand. He wanted to be recognised as a legitimate emperor. Therefore, he would hardly confess openly to having come to the throne by murder. He could easily claim that Andragathius had exceeded the bounds of his competence and killed Gratian against his orders. Yet Andragathius was not punished for this offence.³⁰ This suggests that Maximus was at least ready to accept the fait accompli even if he had not ordered Gratian's death. It

²⁷ Ambrose, Ep. 24, 10: quomodo allegabas, quod eum non mandaveris occidi, quem prohibes sepeliri? poterit igitur credi, quod ei non invideris vitam, cui etiam sepultum invides? In Psalm. 61, 25: nec defuit qui manus lavaret dicens: innocens sum a sanguine iusti istius.

²⁸ Socrates, HE. V, 11; Orosius, Adv. Pag. VII, 34, 10; Epit. de Caes. 47, 7; Philostorgius, X, 5; Rufinus, HE. II, 14; Claudian, IV Cos. Mon. 75f; Marcellinus Comes, Chron. a.383; Jordanes, Romana. 316.

²⁹ Rufinus, HE. II, 14; Socrates, HE. V, 11; Sozomen, HE. VII, 13; Zosimus, IV, 35, 10-12.

³⁰ Seeck, Stuttgart, 1921, V, 185.

was obviously better for Maximus to have Gratian right out of the way. As Zosimus points out, it made his position the more secure.³¹ In all probability Maximus intended from the beginning that Gratian should be murdered,³² although there was no general purge of his supporters.³³

When he contrasts Maximus' elevation with that of Theodosius, Pacatus indicates that Maximus did not enjoy the support of the people. Theodosius' accession occurred consensu provinciarum while Maximus came to the throne adversis provinciarum studiis (31, 2). As we have seen, the perfect emperor was the one whom his subjects desired to be their ruler. Hence, Maximus, whom Pacatus wished to portray as the archetypal tyrant, would have to be denied popular support.³⁴ However, although we have little information concerning the support enjoyed by Maximus, the evidence would seem to suggest that the replacement of Gratian by Maximus would not, in fact, have been unwelcome to a large number of his subjects, and that, therefore, in this case Pacatus' words are purely conventional.

³¹IV, 35, 12: ὅτω τε βέλαιότερον παύσῃ τὴν βασιλείαν πεποιήκειν.

³²Modern opinions vary on this point. For example, Seeck, Stuttgart, 1921, V, 168, believes in Maximus' innocence. Ensslin, RE, XIV, 2547, feels that his innocence is improbable. Palanque, Les Empereurs Romains d'Espagne, Paris, 1965, 256, is uncertain which side to take. Jullian, Paris, 1926, VII, 292, is non-committal.

³³Matthews, Oxford, 1975, 174.

³⁴See above p. 55.

In the course of his short reign Gratian managed to alienate several important groups in the population. His army, discontented with his rule largely because of the excessive favour that he showed to a regiment of Alans, was ripe for revolution.³⁵ Gratian's religious policies offended pagans and Christians alike. In his Christian zeal, he refused to bear the title of Pontifex Maximus which had been held by all previous emperors, both pagan and Christian, and was esteemed by the pagans as a necessary component of rule.³⁶ Thus the pagans could view his murder as punishment from heaven.³⁷ Further measures directed against the pagans increased their hostility towards Gratian. In 382 A.D. he ordered the removal of the Altar of Victory from the senate house at Rome. Moreover, he deprived pagan priests of their inherited property, and withdrew tax exemptions and state

³⁵ Epit. de Caes. 47, 6:

Nam dum exercitum negligerat et paucos ex Alanis quos ingenti auro ad se transulerat, anteferebat veteri ac Romano militi, adeoque barbarorum comitatu et prope amicitia capi, ut nonnumquam eodem habitu iter faceret, odia contra se militum excitavit.

Zosimus, IV, 35, 3-4:

Ἀλάνους τινὰς αὐτομόλους δεξιόμενος καὶ στρατῶν ἐγκαταλείψας ὡρεῖται τὰ ἀπορίαις ἔτιμα, καὶ θάρσυν ἡίου τὰ πάντων ἀναγκαιοτέρα, στρατιωτῶν λόγῳ οὐδένα ποιοῦμενος. τούτῳ τοῖς στρατιώταις κατὰ τοῦ βασιλέως ἔτεκε μῖσος. ὅπερ ὑπὸ τυφλόμενον ἐκταβράχῳ καὶ ὑπερβόρῳ, εἰς νεώτερον τραγμάτων ἐκίνησε τοὺς στρατιώτας ἐπιθυμῶν....

³⁶ Zosimus, IV, 36.

³⁷ Seeck, Stuttgart, 1921, V, 186.

grants from the priestly colleges. The pagan senators requested that these measures be repealed. Their request was refused.³⁸ In addition, Gratian lost the support of orthodox Christians by tolerating and even encouraging the Priscillianist heresy, which had been condemned by the orthodox clergy. Gratian's magister officiorum, Macedonius, not only was a convert of Priscillian, but also had great influence with the emperor. He managed to persuade Gratian to allow Priscillian and his companions to be reinstated in their ecclesiastical offices.³⁹ And so, in the words of Seeck: fast alle religiosen Parteien, Heiden wie Christen, scheinen darin einig gewesen zu sein, dass er sein Schicksal verdient habe.⁴⁰

Of course, the evidence just quoted is purely negative as regards the support of Maximus. It shows that Gratian was unpopular, but by no means proves that the accession of Maximus was favoured. Nevertheless, it seems likely that many of those who were discontented with Gratian would welcome the change. The latter was in many ways a weak emperor: an intellectual and a pleasure seeker, who was unfitted for the responsibilities of government a qua prope alienus non modo voluntate, sed

³⁸Symmachus, Rel. 3; Ambrose, Ep. 17, 10.

³⁹Sulp. Sev. Chron. II, 48, 5; 49, 3. For a more detailed treatment of Gratian's unpopular religious policies see Seeck, Stuttgart, 1921, V, 186ff; Stein, Paris, 1959, I, 200f. See also Matthews, Oxford, 1975, 160ff, on the treatment of the Priscillianist heresy.

⁴⁰Stuttgart, 1921, V, 186.

etiam exercitis fuit.⁴¹ In times of frequent wars and invasions such as the end of the fourth century A.D., the empire needed a strong, warlike emperor, not a weak youth who was more concerned with his own pleasures than the troubles of the state. Maximus was a soldier of proven ability, and popular with his troops in Britain. Certainly the fact that Gratian's army defected to him so swiftly indicates that it was more than ready to give the usurper its support. Furthermore, Maximus was a strictly orthodox Christian, and soon showed himself active in denouncing heresy, which probably won him the initial support of orthodox Christians, although he lost favour with the orthodox clergy later through his treatment of the Priscillianists. Only the pagans had little hope of any gain from the accession of Maximus. Pacatus himself indicates that the people of Gaul actually favoured Maximus, when he explains that under his rule they had to feign happiness (25, 2ff). Naturally, after the downfall of the usurper, the Gauls had to deny any favour they may have shown to Maximus in order to please their new master.⁴² That Pacatus felt it necessary to emphasise so strongly the fact that his countrymen's support of the usurper was just a

⁴¹On the character of Gratian see Epit. de Caes. 47, 4f. Cf. Amm. Marc. XXVII, 6, 12; XXXI, 10, 18-21. Ammianus, XXXI, 9-10 indicates that Gratian had some initial successes in the military sphere.

⁴²See above p. 115.

pretence which bore no relation to their real sentiments suggests that the Gauls were indeed quite favourably disposed towards Maximus. Thus, although we have little direct proof except in the case of the soldiery that Maximus' usurpation was popular, it is likely that, despite Pacatus' assertion to the contrary, his future subjects were far from adverse to him.

The question of whether or not Theodosius supported Maximus' usurpation has been discussed in detail above.⁴³ Although the information at our disposal does not permit definite conclusions to be reached on this matter, there is a strong possibility that Theodosius was involved in some way in this revolt, notwithstanding the fact that our sources give little indication of it. The evidence of Pacatus is very important as regards the problem of Theodosius' collusion. For his speech is the only source which mentions the rumours of the emperor's complicity in the affair that were in the air at the time of Maximus' usurpation. Thus, it is only as a result of Pacatus' testimony that the question of a conspiracy has been raised at all, and that it is possible to present a plausible alternative reconstruction of Theodosius' attitude to Maximus' revolt to the traditional one that is given by the sources and the majority of modern scholars.

⁴³See above p. 99ff.

3. MAXIMUS' ADMINISTRATION

Pacatus does not discuss Maximus' administration *per se*. Rather he concentrates on condemning two aspects of Maximus' character, his greed and his cruelty, each of which is illustrated by examples drawn from his administration. We must attempt to ascertain just what Pacatus means by these charges of greed and cruelty, and to what extent they were justified with regard to Maximus' reign.

The orator describes dramatically and at great length what he terms Maximus' inops avaritia (24, 6). He speaks of his subjects, in particular those of high standing in society, nobilibus, men who had exercised summīs honoribus and consulares, being despoiled of their wealth. Such men, Pacatus alleges, had their property confiscated by Maximus, and even lost their lives so that the usurper might increase his wealth (25, 1ff). As noted above, avarice was one of the conventional attributes of the tyrant.⁴⁴ Pacatus has exploited this commonplace trait to the fullest extent. We are told that Maximus collected wealth purely for the sake of it, enjoying nothing more than seeing the suffering of his victims (26, 4; 28, 1). A vivid mental image of the vicious and voracious tyrant is conjured up by the words: stabat ipse purpuratus ad lanceas et momenta ponderum nutusque

⁴⁴See above p. 55f.

trutinarum pallens atque inhians exigebat (26, 1). Such lurid descriptions are obviously grossly exaggerated and designed to evoke the emotional response of revulsion in his audience.

In these chapters Pacatus is condemning Maximus' methods of increasing the imperial revenue. While good princes obtained their revenue from exploiting mines, Maximus preferred to impoverish his subjects (28, 1). There is evidence to corroborate Pacatus' accusation that Maximus' fiscal exactions were harsh. Sulpicius Severus notes that Maximus was prone to pursue capital charges with an eye to acquiring the property of those condemned.⁴⁵ We know that a number of Priscillianist heretics were punished by confiscation of their goods.⁴⁶

Nevertheless, in his eagerness to blacken the character of Maximus, Pacatus has not told the whole story. Sulpicius Severus excuses Maximus' alleged avarice with the following words:

Fertur enim ille vir multis bonisque actibus praeditus adversus avaritiam parum consuluisse, nisi regni necessitate, quippe exhausto a superioribus principibus reipublicae aerario, paene semper in expectatione procinctu bellorum civilium constitutus facile excusabitur quibuslibet occasionibus subsidia imperio paruisse.⁴⁷

At the end of the fourth century, as indeed throughout the later Roman empire, it was increasingly difficult for an

⁴⁵Dial. III, 11, 11.

⁴⁶Sulp. Sev. Chron. II, 51.

⁴⁷Dial. III, 11, 11.

emperor to acquire the necessary funds for the administration of his domains. On the one hand the population and productivity of the empire were declining, while on the other the bureaucracy was growing in size, and the constant threat of barbarian invasions required a very large number of troops who needed to be fed and paid. Oppressive taxation was the rule rather than the exception.⁴⁸ Maximus, like every other emperor in this period, must have found it difficult to make ends meet.

Furthermore, there is ample evidence that Theodosius' portion of the empire was also burdened by oppressive taxation. Eunapius and Zosimus both condemn his economic policy.⁴⁹ No doubt the severity of the oppression has been exaggerated by these authors, but the basic fact that taxation was a severe burden under his rule cannot be doubted. It is true that Theodosius reduced taxation in Thrace because of the ravages of the barbarians in that area.⁵⁰ Yet he compensated for this by imposing higher taxes elsewhere.⁵¹ The enormous levies of barbarians into the

⁴⁸On the general economic conditions of the late empire see eg. M. Rostovtzeff, The Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire, Oxford, 1926, I, 514ff; P. Vinogradoff, "Social and Economic Conditions of the Roman Empire in the Fourth Century", CMH, I, 54ff; P. Walbank, The Awful Revolution, Liverpool, 1969, 81ff.

⁴⁹Eg. Eunapius, Frsg. 48; 56; Zosimus, IV, 27, 2ff; 29; 32, 2ff; 41.

⁵⁰CTH. VI, 11, 14, 384; CJ XI, iii, 1.

⁵¹Stein, Paris, 1959, I, 195.

army and the number of military campaigns carried out during his reign point to high military expenditure.⁵² The evidence concerning Theodosius' personal expenditure is contradictory. Pacatus praises his great frugality (13-14), while Eunapius and Zosimus condemn his love of luxury and loose living.⁵³ All of these accounts, written as they are from highly prejudiced viewpoints, are likely to be exaggerated. Nevertheless, the other evidence that we possess points to the conclusion that Theodosius was in fact lavish rather than otherwise. The epitomator of Aurelius Victor notes his generous gifts of money as well as honours to his friends.⁵⁴ Libanius bears witness to a great expansion of the imperial bureaucracy in his reign.⁵⁵ The burden of the extraordinary tax imposed upon Antioch in 387 A.D. to help pay for the celebration of Theodosius' decennalia resulted in a full

⁵²A.H.M. Jones, The later Roman Empire, Oxford, 1964, I, 162; Jullian, Paris, 1926, VII, 290.

⁵³Eunapius, eg. Frg. 48; Zosimus, eg. IV, 28, 1f; 33, 5ff; 41, 1; 50, 4f.

⁵⁴Epit. de Caes. 48, 9: largiri magno animo magna; amare cives vel privato contubernio cognitos eosque honoribus pecunia beneficiis ceteris munere, praesertim quorum erga se vel patrem aspero casu officia probaverat. Zosimus, IV, 28, 4, states that Theodosius poured out money to unworthy persons: ἐνδίδῃ γὰρ οὗς ἄνθρωποι, καὶ πρὸς τοὺς ἀναξίους, τὰ χρηματικά ἐμπάσαντες ... Pacatus, 16f, praises his generosity in distributing offices but does not mention money gifts.

⁵⁵Or. II, 58. Zosimus, IV, 27, 2ff, mentions an increase in army officials.

scale riot in that city.⁵⁶ Although this incident occurred just two years before he delivered his Panegyric, Pacatus does not mention it. The fact that Theodosius' fiscal policy was so burdensome would not reflect well upon the emperor whom he wished to depict as perfect. In fact Pacatus does not remark upon Theodosius' economic policy at all. As praise of the emperor's fair taxation was a commonplace topic of eulogy,⁵⁷ Pacatus' omission of it, particularly since he made extensive use of the traditional material, suggests that Theodosius' taxation policy was perhaps not entirely praiseworthy.

Pacatus' accusation that Maximus' exactions from his subjects were harsh and oppressive is probably founded on fact. No doubt he did use any means that came his way to increase his revenue. Pacatus, however, is not justified in implying that fiscal oppression was confined to Maximus' territory. The circumstances of the times in which he lived required Maximus to be somewhat ruthless in raising money to administer his portion of the empire. What Pacatus fails to point out is that conditions apparently were no better in the east under the regime of his hero Theodosius.

⁵⁶Libanius, *Ors.* XIX-XXIII; Joh. Chrys. *Hom. ad Pop. Ant.*; Sozomen, *HE*, VII, 23; Theodoret, *HE*, V, 20; Zosimus, IV, 41. The exact nature of the tax involved is not certain. See in particular, P. Petit, *Libanius et la Vie Municipale à Antioche au IV^e Siècle après J.C.*, Paris, 1955, 145f; 238ff; R. Browning, "The Riot of Antioch", *JRS*, 1952, 14f.

⁵⁷See above p. 17.

Pacatus also condemns Maximus for cruelty with reference to two distinct examples. First of all he brings forth as evidence the deaths of Vallio and Merobaudes, who had been two of Gratian's generals (28, 4). The circumstances of Merobaudes' death have been discussed above.⁵⁸ If, as postulated, he committed suicide of his own accord, his death can hardly be used as evidence for Maximus' cruelty. Vallio may have been a victim of Maximus' revolution. However, it seems unlikely that anyone would have thought Maximus particularly cruel for putting to death one of Gratian's generals. We should be more impressed by the fact that his usurpation was accompanied by very little bloodshed. There was no general purge of Gratian's supporters. Two such men, Leucadius, a praeses, and Narses, a comes, apparently were endangered because of their loyalty to Gratian, but their lives were spared owing to the intervention of Martin of Tours.⁵⁹ Otherwise we know of no supporter of Gratian who was endangered or actually executed at the instigation of Maximus.

Secondly, Pacatus cites the execution of certain adherents of the Priscillianist heresy. He does not actually name the sect or the victims. There was no need for him to do so. It would be clear to his audience to whom he was

⁵⁸See above p. 127-129.

⁵⁹Sulp. Sev. Dial. III, 8. See also Matthews, Oxford, 1975, 174.

referring. The account of Sulpicius Severus enables us to clarify the allusions made by Pacatus.⁶⁰ One victim in particular is singled out, the vidua of a clari vatis (29, 2). This lady was Euchrotia, the widow of the rhetorician and poet Attius Delphidius Tiro.⁶¹ Pacatus emphasises her execution in order to add weight to his charge of cruelty against Maximus: De mortibus virorum loquor. cum descensum recorder ad sanguinem feminarum et in sexum cui bella parant pace saevitum ? (29, 1). He may also have felt a genuine revulsion towards Maximus on account of the death of Euchrotia. For she came from Bordeaux, and, as the wife of Delphidius, was probably of the same social circle as Pacatus himself.⁶²

The Priscillianist sect arose in Spain, from where it spread to southern Gaul, soon finding a wide following particularly among women.⁶³ Priscillian himself was appointed bishop of Avila. Although the heresy had been condemned in

⁶⁰Chron. II, 46ff.

⁶¹Ibid. 48, 2.

⁶²For Pacatus' social background, see above p. 112f. Ausonius has left us a brief biography of Attius Delphidius Tiro (Prof. Burd. V). Delphidius began his career as a poet and teacher of rhetoric. Later he became a lawyer, and conducted the prosecution of Numerian, governor of Gallia Narbonensis, before Julian (Amm. Marc. XVIII, 1). He held an administrative post under a tyrant, probably Magnentius (Jones, Martindale and Morris, Cambridge, 1971, 264). After the fall of Magnentius, he went back to teaching rhetoric in Aquitaine, where he died in middle age, before the execution of his wife.

⁶³Sulp. Sev. Chron. II, 46.

380 A.D. by the orthodox clergy, its adherents managed to procure an edict of toleration from the emperor Gratian in 382 A.D., through the influence of the magister officiorum, Macedonius. Gratian's successor Maximus, however, was staunchly orthodox. Thus the chief opponents of Priscillian, the bishops Hydatius and Ithacius, looked to him to take measures against the heresy. As a result the sect was condemned once more at the Council of Bordeaux in 384 A.D., and Priscillian and others were relieved of their ecclesiastical offices. Priscillian, however, being unwilling to accept this verdict, demanded to be heard by the emperor himself. The case was heard initially by the prefect Evodius, with Ithacius as accuser, and then referred to a purely secular tribunal. The death penalty was recommended. Priscillian, Euchrotia and five more were executed. Several others were banished.⁶⁴

Pacatus was concerned chiefly with those who were condemned to death, whom the accusers: non contenti miseros avitis evolvisse patrimoniis calumniabantur in sanguinem et vitas premebant reorum iam pauperum (29, 3). According to the orator, the reason for their execution was excessive piety: nimia religio et diligentius culta divinitas (29, 2). Were he correct in stating that Priscillian and his followers were condemned for their religious beliefs, he would perhaps be

⁶⁴ The events of the Priscillianist affair are narrated by Sulp. Sev. Chron. II, 47ff.

justified in accusing Maximus of saevitia, for although it was common for orthodox Christian emperors to take measures against heretics, so far none had been put to death.⁶⁵ It appears, however, that Pacatus deliberately misrepresented the grounds for their condemnation in order to put Maximus in a bad light. The account of Sulpicius Severus makes it sufficiently clear that the charge brought against Priscillian was really the practice of magical arts, of which he had apparently been suspected since boyhood.⁶⁶ He states:

[Evodius] Priscillianum gemino iudicio auditum, convictumque maleficii, nec dissitentem obscaenis se studuisse doctrinis, nocturnos etiam turpium feminarum egisse conventus, nudumque orare solitum nocentem pronuntiavit.⁶⁷

Suys has shown convincingly that maleficium here refers to the practice of magic, and that the other charges, which are all related to sorcery, are subsidiary and intended to reinforce the primary charge.⁶⁸ Evodius was apparently convinced that Priscillian and the others who were executed were guilty of practising magic. Those who were sent into exile must have

⁶⁵Seeck, Stuttgart, 1921, V, 193. See also Gibbon, London, 1791, V, 34, who states that Maximus was: "the first among the Christian princes, who shed the blood of his Christian subjects, on account of their religious opinions."

⁶⁶Sulp. Sev. Chron. II, 46, 5: magicas artes ab adolescentia eum exercuisse creditum est.

⁶⁷Ibid. 50, 3.

⁶⁸E. Suys, "La Sentence Portée Contre Priscillien", Rev. d'Hist. Eccl., 1925, 530ff.

been convicted of heresy alone. Banishment was the regular penalty for heresy.⁶⁹

If it is correct that Priscillian and his followers died because they were believed to be guilty of practising magic, then Maximus cannot be accused of excessive cruelty according to the standards of his day. As MacMullen remarks:

There was thus no period in the history of the Empire in which the magician was not considered an enemy of society, subject at the least to exile, more often to death in its least pleasant forms.⁷⁰

Many laws were passed against magic in the fourth century A.D., and conviction regularly carried the death penalty.⁷¹ It is true that this treatment of Priscillian and his followers were condemned by many of the orthodox clergy, especially St. Ambrose and Martin of Tours. But the reason for their condemnation was not so much that they judged the penalty to be excessively harsh as that they were angry at the intervention of the secular arm in what they considered to be an affair which concerned the church alone. For the clergy, the conviction of Priscillian by Maximus' tribunal represented an inroad into their authority which they were not prepared to

⁶⁹Seeck, Stuttgart, 1921, V, 193.

⁷⁰R. MacMullen, Enemies of the Roman Order: Treason, Unrest and Alienation in the Empire, Cambridge, Mass., 1966, 125f. See *ibid.* 95ff, on the development of the attitude of the Romans towards magic and magicians.

⁷¹In the reign of Valentinian I, just a few years before Maximus' reign, a number of aristocrats had been put to death for practising magic. See *Amm. Marc.* XXVIII, 1.

tolerate submissively.⁷² Sulpicius Severus' hostility towards Maximus' actions in the Priscillianist affair, although he felt him to be in other respects a good emperor, is explained by his devoted allegiance to Martin of Tours, whose attitudes he reflected in his writings.

Thus, as in the question of avarice, there was a grain of truth in Pacatus' accusations of cruelty on the part of Maximus. He may well have instigated the death of Vallio, and possibly indirectly that of Merobaudes. Euchrotia and other Priscillianists certainly were condemned to death under his administration. Pacatus, however, has grossly overstated his case. The deaths of Gratian's leading generals at the hands of Maximus probably would not have seemed exceptionally harsh to most of his contemporaries, particularly since he seems to have been sparing of bloodshed on the whole. Furthermore, Pacatus deliberately misrepresented the charge against the executed Priscillianists to make it appear that Maximus acted unjustly and with exceptional severity in condemning them, whereas, on the contrary, they were convicted of practising magic for which capital punishment was legal

⁷²Sulp. Sev. Chron. II, 50, 5: Saevum esse et inauditum nefas ut causam ecclesiae iudex saeculi iudicaret; 49, 9:

Priscillianus, vero, ne ab episcopis audiretur, ad principem provocavit, permissumque id nostrorum inconstantia, qui aut sententiam vel in refragentem ferre debuerant aut, si ipsi suspecti habebantur, aliis episcopis audientiam reservare, non causam imperatori de tam manifestis criminibus permittere. See also Seeck, Stuttgart, 1921, V, 193f; Ensslin, RE, XIV, 2250; Matthews, Oxford, 1975, 166f.

and usual. Pacatus clearly has prejudiced his account of Maximus' administration. If the cases cited were all that he could find to support his contention that Maximus was a monster of cruelty, then we must conclude that Maximus in fact was not particularly bloodthirsty by the standards of his day.

As regards increasing our knowledge of Maximus' administration, Pacatus' Panegyric contributes little. The most important information is that which concerns the deaths of Vallio and Merobaudes. The end of Vallio, about whose career we possess but scanty information, is not recorded elsewhere. If it were not for Pacatus' statements concerning the death of Merobaudes and the implication that he remained loyal to Gratian, there would be no reason to reject the evidence of Prosper Tiro that he betrayed Gratian. In the light of Pacatus' words, this appears to have been an error on the part of the chronicler. Pacatus' allusions to the Priscillianist affair do not add to our understanding of the matter at all. His references to it are vague, and his interpretation distorted to strengthen his allegations of cruelty against Maximus. Similarly, his statements regarding Maximus' financial policy are unspecific and too highly prejudiced against the usurper to be of much value, particularly when compared with alternative sources which indicate that the situation was by no means as bad as Pacatus tries to make out.

Naturally enough, the orator makes no reference to any positive aspects of Maximus' reign. Although our evidence is not abundant, it appears that he was successful in checking barbarian invasions in his part of the empire. Orosius implies this when he describes Maximus as: trucem et ab immanissimis quoque Germanorum gentibus tributa ac stipendia sola terrore nominis exigentem.⁷³ Certainly we hear of no barbarian invasions into Maximus' territory until after his invasion of Italy, when the barbarians appear to have taken advantage of his absence to cross the Rhine in 388 A.D.⁷⁴

If our view of the emperor Maximus had to rest solely upon the evidence of Pacatus we would have no choice but to see him as a vicious, unscrupulous and avaricious tyrant. Indeed some scholars have been too ready to accept Pacatus' description more or less at face value. Wightman, for example, remarks:

Maximus was an unattractive enough character even if we allow for exaggeration on the part of Drepanius Pacatus, panegyrist to Theodosius, who depicts in lurid detail a greedy tyrant revelling in the blood and spoliation of his subjects.⁷⁵

As we have seen, Pacatus' description is highly exaggerated and totally one-sided. Furthermore, both Orosius and Sulpicius Severus estimate Maximus as, on the whole, a good

⁷³ Adv. Pag. VII, 35, 4. See also Seeck, Stuttgart, 1921, V, 209; Ensslin, RE, XIV, 2550.

⁷⁴ Sulpicius Alexander, in Greg. Tur. Hist. Franc. II, 9.

⁷⁵ E.M. Wightman, Roman Trier and the Treveri, London, 1970, 67. Also, Jullian, Paris, 1926, VII, 293.

ruler. Orosius is particularly favourable to Maximus. He states that Maximus was: vir quidem strenuus et probus atque Augusto dignus nisi contra sacramenti fidem per tyrannidem emerisset.⁷⁶ Like Pacatus, both Severus and Orosius came from countries (Gaul and Spain respectively) which had been ruled by Maximus. Thus they both had first-hand knowledge of the nature of Maximus' rule. However, unlike Pacatus, neither Severus nor Orosius had any compelling reason to present an unduly harsh or, for that matter, favourable portrait of the usurper. These facts make their evidence particularly good. Their moderate praise of Maximus is likely to be much closer to the truth than Pacatus' fierce condemnation.

4. THE DEFEAT AND DEATH OF MAXIMUS

In the Spring of 387 A.D. Maximus crossed the Alps into Italy in order to gain control of the territory of Valentinian II.⁷⁷ Pacatus mentions this event: superatis Alpibus Cottiae Iulia quoque claustra laxaret (30, 2), but he gives no reason for the invasion. It seems clear that Maximus' prime motive was personal ambition. Not satisfied with ruling Gratian's former territory, he wished to control

⁷⁶ Adv. Pag. VII, 35, 9. See also Sulp. Sev. Dial. III, 11, 2 and 11.

⁷⁷ For the date of the invasion, see Seeck, Stuttgart, 1921, V, note to p. 209, 2.

Valentinian's also. As we have seen, he had begun negotiations to this end as early as 383 A.D.⁷⁸ According to the agreement of 384 A.D. he was to content himself with Gratian's domains, but Maximus never gave up his designs upon Valentinian's portion of the empire. St. Ambrose, in his report to Valentinian concerning the results of his second embassy to Maximus, indicates that there was already a possibility of war with the usurper: haec est expositio legationis meae. Vale, imperator, et est tutior adversus hominem pacis involucro bellum tegentem.⁷⁹ Maximus was opposed to Valentinian on religious grounds. The latter had espoused the Arian heresy, and also tolerated paganism. At Easter 386 A.D. Maximus sent a letter to him in which he threatened war if the young emperor did not abandon his hostility to orthodoxy.⁸⁰ Certain ecclesiastical historians regard this religious antagonism as the reason for Maximus' invasion.⁸¹ Sozomen, however, recognises that it was just a pretext. Maximus used his support of the orthodox church as a means of justifying his

⁷⁸See above p. 94.

⁷⁹Ed. 24, 12.

⁸⁰Theodoret, HE, V, 12: πᾶσιμος . . . ἐπέστειλε δὲ τῷ βαλεντινιανῷ τοῦ κατὰ τῆς εὐσεβείας πόλεμον καταλύσαι παρεγγυῶν καὶ παραινῶν μὴ προέσθαι τὴν πατρίαν εὐεξέειν προέσθαι δὲ καὶ τοῦ πολέμου.

⁸¹Theodoret, HE, V, 14; Rufinus, HE, II, 16.

invasion of Valentinian's territory.⁸² Zosimus also indicates that ambition was the prime moving force behind Maximus' actions.⁸³

Opportunity of bringing his ambitions to fruition came to Maximus in 387 A.D. Valentinian needed military aid against the barbarians who were threatening Pannonia. Maximus granted it and sent a contingent of troops to Italy with Valentinian's envoy, Domnosus. Maximus himself, however, followed with additional troops, crossed the Alps, which he found unguarded, and marched to Aquileia where he established his headquarters.⁸⁴ Although it appears that Maximus did not plan to take Valentinian's life, but only to enforce his guardianship upon the boy,⁸⁵ Valentinian and his family fled to Thessalonica.⁸⁶

According to Pacatus, since Maximus had broken the treaty between himself and Theodosius by invading Italy, the latter now had no choice but to conquer him. He states that this invasion: imponeret servanti adhuc veniae fidem vincendi

⁸² HE, VII, 13: πρόφασιν μὲν ὡς οὐκ ἀγόμενος νεώτερόν τι γενέσθαι περὶ τὴν πατρίον, πίστιν καὶ τὴν ἐκκλησιαστικὴν τάξιν, τὸ δὲ ἀληθὲς τυραννίου δοξῆς ἐνυτὸν καθάρων, πρὸς δὲ τὴν βασιλείαν βλέπων καὶ πραγματευόμενος, ἐπὶ πῇ ἔρα δύναίτο δοῦναι νόμον οὐ βίαι, τὴν ἀρχὴν Ῥωμαίων ἐν αὐτῇ περιποιῶν.

⁸³ IV, 42, 1: Μάξιμος, ὃς κατὰ τὴν εἰρὴν αἰόμενος αὐτῶν τὰ πράγματα φέρεσθαι μόνων ἀρχόντι τῶν ὑπὸ στρατιῶν πρότερον τυταγμένων ἐθνῶν, διενοεῖτο παραλῦσαι τὸν νέον βαλεντινιανὸν τῆς βασιλείας, εἰ μὲν δύναίτο πάσης.

⁸⁴ The story is narrated by Zosimus, IV, 42.

⁸⁵ Ensslin, RE, XIV, 2552.

⁸⁶ See references above, Ch. 2 n. 67.

necessitatem (30, 2). This statement implies that there was no hesitation in Theodosius' mind. The moment that Maximus invaded Italy, Theodosius felt compelled to take steps to depose him. Our alternative evidence, however, suggests that this was not the case at all. It seems that, on the contrary, Theodosius was very reluctant to go to war with Maximus even now. Almost a year passed between Maximus' invasion of Italy and the commencement of war between himself and Theodosius.⁸⁷ The latter does not seem to have made any move to help Valentinian, who was in exile in Thessalonica. Indeed, he even wrote to him, saying that he deserved his fate for having espoused the Arian heresy.⁸⁸ It has been suggested that Theodosius delayed taking up arms against Maximus because he needed time to settle the eastern frontier.⁸⁹ But when war finally did come, it found Theodosius' army unprepared. It was badly provisioned, as Pacatus himself mentions (32, 5).⁹⁰ This would suggest that

⁸⁷Sulpicius Severus, Vit. Mart. 20, 9, states that Maximus ruled in Italy for almost a year. The narrative of Zosimus, IV, 44, also suggests a considerable delay.

⁸⁸Theodoret, HE, V, 15: Θεοδοσίος... ἔγραψε τῷ πτεφυγόντι νέῳ μὴ χρῆναι θαυμάζειν, ἐξ τῷ μὲν βασιλεὺς τὸ δέος, τῷ δὲ τυράννῳ τὸ κράτος συνεξέωκται, γὰρ εὐδιόβεια πεπαισμήκε. μὲν δὲ βασιλεὺς δὲ τυράννος ἐπεκουρῆσαι.

⁸⁹Piganiol, Paris, 1947, 253; Palanque, Les Empereurs Romains d'Espagne, Paris, 1965, 262f.

⁹⁰This is confirmed by Ambrose Ep. 40, 22: Frumentum non habebas ad exercitus alimoniam.

the outbreak of war came suddenly, and that Theodosius had not been planning on war ever since Maximus entered Italy.⁹¹

Theodosius was vacillating, uncertain which direction to take. Maximus sent an embassy to him at this time, demanding recognition of his new position as ruler of Valentinian's territory. Theodosius was undecided as to whether he should accept or reject Maximus' proposals.⁹² This uncertainty is understandable when considered in the light of his own ambitions. It seems clear that, although Theodosius may have been content for Maximus to rule Gratian's territory, and may even have actually encouraged his usurpation, he would not allow him to adopt the position of Valentinian's guardian, which he coveted for himself, without resistance.⁹³

According to Zosimus, Theodosius was, in fact, anxious to avoid war with Maximus. He would have been satisfied if Maximus "would restore his kingdom to Valentinian and keep the peace, then the empire would be divided among them all as before".⁹⁴ This would be acceptable since it would mean a return to the situation before Maximus' invasion of Italy,

⁹¹Ensslin, RE, XIV, 2553.

⁹²Socrates, HE, V, 12; Sozomen, HE, VII, 14.

⁹³See above p. 94f.

⁹⁴IV, 44, 2: καὶ εἰ μὲν ἔλοιτο Βαλεντινιανῶν
 Πάξιμος ἀποδοῦναι τὴν βασιλείαν καὶ ἄγειν τὴν φρουράν,
 κατὰ τὸ πρότερον εἶημα τὴν ἀρχὴν εἰς ἀπάτας εὐχρησθῆναι.

with which Theodosius was content, for the time being at least.⁹⁵ It was not worth his while to make war upon Maximus for the sake of restoring Valentinian to his throne, unless he could thereby procure some advantage for himself. He was probably not prepared to assist Valentinian unless the latter agreed to accept his domination.⁹⁶

Zosimus records the following anecdote. Justina, the mother and guardian of Valentinian, knowing that Theodosius was prone to lust, presented her beautiful daughter Galla to him. The emperor fell desperately in love with her. Justina cunningly promised him her daughter's hand in marriage only on condition that he agreed to make war on Maximus. Burning with passion for the girl, Theodosius finally decided upon war.⁹⁷ This story is naive and simplistic, and narrated in such a way as to show Theodosius in a bad light.⁹⁸ Nevertheless, there may be a germ of truth in it. It is possible that

⁹⁵ Even Pacatus acknowledges that Theodosius would have been willing to pardon Maximus had he not undertaken the invasion of Italy (30, 2).

⁹⁶ As Seeck, Stuttgart, 1921, V, 208, remarks: Wir dürfen vermuten, dass Maximus und Theodosius beide bereit waren, den Schutz des Junglings zu übernehmen jeder aber wohl unter der Bedingung dass der sechzehnjährige seine Vormunschaft anerkenne.

⁹⁷ IV, 44, 2ff.

⁹⁸ Some scholars, however, have accepted this story at its face value and believe Galla's beauty was the force which determined Theodosius to go to war with Maximus. See eg. Gibbon, London, 1791, V, 51; Seeck, Stuttgart, 1921, V, 210; Piganiol, Paris, 1947, 253.

Valentinian, who was in dire straits because of Maximus' aggression on the one hand and Theodosius' unwillingness to help him on the other, in the end agreed to accept the protection of Theodosius. The new alliance was cemented by the marriage of Theodosius to Valentinian's sister, Galla. This marriage would not only unite Theodosius' family and interests with those of the ruling dynasty, but would also strengthen his claim to the position of senior Augustus. Theodosius would now be ready to overthrow Maximus, whose ambitions obviously conflicted with his own at this point, and to reinstall Valentinian in the west but under his own domination, making himself the virtual ruler of the whole empire, despite Valentinian's theoretical seniority.⁹⁹

Thus, Pacatus omitted to mention the fact that Theodosius was reluctant to go to war with Maximus until it would bring distinct advantages to himself. This omission affords an easy explanation. Pacatus was obliged to present the official view, and Theodosius, after his defeat of Maximus, was unwilling to admit that he had ever been anything but opposed to the usurper. Pacatus' interpretation is, therefore, influenced by political considerations. The invasion of Italy by Maximus did, it is true, eventually lead to war with Theodosius. But the cause and effect relationship

⁹⁹See above p. 93ff on Theodosius relationship with Valentinian II. See also Solari, *Klio*, 1934, 167. Cf. Palanque, *Les Empereurs Romains d'Espagne*, Paris, 1965, 262f.

between the invasion and the war was not as clear cut as Pacatus would have us believe. The attack on Italy did not compel Theodosius to make war upon Maximus, as Pacatus asserts. Only the chance of promoting his own personal ambitions did that.

Pacatus eulogises Theodosius' preparations for the war against Maximus. First, he assured the security of the eastern frontier (32, 2). Pacatus is probably referring here to the settlement of Armenia. A treaty concerning the partition of Armenia was concluded in 387 A.D. between the Persians and Romans. The terms of the treaty, by which the Persians took four-fifths of Armenia and Theodosius the remaining one-fifth, were disadvantageous to the Romans. However, as Pacatus remarks, if Theodosius thought civil war a possibility, he needed to be assured of security on his frontiers. Secondly we are told that the emperor divided his troops into three parts in order to terrify his enemies the more, and cut them off from the possibility of flight (32, 3). Pacatus is probably correct here also. The threefold division that he mentions can be explained as follows. One contingent would be the fleet which set sail with Valentinian for Italy in order to attack Maximus' territory from the rear. Secondly, there was the land army led by Theodosius himself, which set out from Thessalonica in July 388 A.D. Seeck feels that the third section was additional troops coming from Constantinople to reinforce

Theodosius' contingent.¹⁰⁰ A more plausible suggestion, however, is that the third section was the force, led probably by Gildo, which was to set out from Egypt to wrest Africa from Maximus.¹⁰¹

Pacatus praises at length the quality of the barbarian troops in the army which fought against Maximus. Theodosius greatly increased the number of his troops by granting to barbarians the privilege of fighting in his ranks (32, 3).¹⁰² Pacatus mentions the Goths, Huns and Alans (32, 4). According to the orator these new recruits were eager to serve: Gothus ille et Churus et Halanus respondebat ad nomen et alternabat excubias et notari infrequens verebatur ... pro omni praemio omnique mercede id unum reposcens ut tuus diceretur (32, 4-5). They were also well disciplined: nullus tumultus, nulla confusio, nulla direptio ut a barbaro erat (32, 5). Moreover, these barbarian troops of Theodosius, who compared most favourably to the army of Cleopatra, were brave, loyal, and dedicated to the service of the empire (33). The fact that Theodosius enrolled in his army a huge number of barbarian foederati is well known. According to Themistius, at this time the number of troops serving the empire attained previously unreach heights.¹⁰³ Pacatus, as a eulogist of

¹⁰⁰ Stuttgart, 1921, V, 212.

¹⁰¹ S.I. Oost, "Count Gildo and Theodosius the Great", CP, 1962, 27ff.

¹⁰² See also Ambrose, Ep. 40, 22.

¹⁰³ Ox. XVIII, 222a.

the emperor, was required to praise his policy. Nevertheless the wholesale barbarisation of the army has been criticised severely both by ancient authorities, such as Zosimus, for whom the barbarisation of the empire was one of the major causes of its ruin,¹⁰⁴ and by many modern scholars. The settlement of barbarians within the empire as foederati was only a temporary solution to the problem of the invasions. These "allies" were settled in large blocks under the leadership of their own chieftains. Consequently their Romanisation proved impossible. The presence of large contingents of barbarians in the army had a detrimental effect on its discipline, and their loyalty was never certain.¹⁰⁵ We have evidence that not all of those barbarians levied by Theodosius for the war against Maximus were as faithful and eager to serve as Pacatus pretends. Zosimus recounts how Maximus was able to seduce a party of Theodosius' barbarian allies away from their master, although their defection was soon discovered, and they fled into the mountains and marshes of Macedonia.¹⁰⁶

Maximus' preparations are not discussed at all by Pacatus. Rather he implies that he had no hope of success

¹⁰⁴EG. IV, 30; 40, 59, 3.

¹⁰⁵Stein, Paris, 1959, I, 193f. See also, eg. CMH, I, 254ff; Jones, I, 156ff; Piganiol, Paris, 1947, 232f.

¹⁰⁶IV, 45, 3.

against Theodosius (30, 5). Such an attitude is to be expected from a flatterer of Theodosius and does not necessarily bear much relation to the truth. Evidence exists which casts grave doubts upon the idea that Maximus was a weak opponent. Orosius states that the usurper was, on the contrary, much better prepared than was Theodosius, for the latter: posuit in Deo spem suam seseque adversus Maximum tyrannum sola fide maior - nam longe minor universa apparatus bellici comparatione proripuit.¹⁰⁷ Orosius' view, however, also carries a strong bias. He wished to make Theodosius appear incompetent in this war so as to demonstrate the power of great faith in God, who would bring victory even to a very weak party.¹⁰⁸ It is unlikely that Maximus had any great advantage over Theodosius, for if this had been the case one would expect Pacatus to praise Theodosius for achieving victory against all odds - a commonplace of eulogy.¹⁰⁹ Numerically the army of Theodosius was probably stronger than that of Maximus. The eastern military establishment was always larger than that of the west, and Theodosius had recently made substantial additions to his forces by recruiting large numbers of barbarians. Nevertheless, Maximus was well

¹⁰⁷ Adv. Pag. VII, 35, 2.

¹⁰⁸ See also Orosius' account of the battle of the river Frigidus (Adv. Pag. VII, 35, 12ff) where Theodosius is made to appear utterly incompetent.

¹⁰⁹ Seeck, Stuttgart, 1921, VI, 211.

prepared. He had advanced into Illyricum, where, as we learn from Pacatus, he besieged Hemona (32, 2), and had also occupied Siscia on the Save (34, 1). He was careful to deposit magazines to provision his troops, that Theodosius' army which had been poorly provided for (a weakness which Pacatus makes light of) was able to draw upon after its victory at Siscia.¹¹⁰ Maximus had won the support of Africa, probably at the time of his invasion of Italy, and no doubt was amply provided with supplies from this quarter.¹¹¹ Maximus himself seems to have been confident of victory since he remained in Aquileia, leaving his general Andragathius to conduct the war.¹¹²

Hence, once again we find that Pacatus' account is heavily prejudiced in favour of Theodosius, and by no means wholly accurate. He seems to be correct in his assertion that Theodosius was careful to settle the problems of the eastern frontier before embarking upon the war with Maximus, and that he divided his army into three parts in order to press the attack on three fronts simultaneously. On the other hand he exaggerates the trustworthiness of the barbarian

¹¹⁰Pacatus, 32, 5; 40, 2; Ambrose, Ep. 40, 22.

¹¹¹CIL, VIII, 23968; 11025. Pacatus, 38, 2, describes how Maximus rejected the idea of fleeing to Africa after his defeat: peto Africanam quam exhausti? This implies that he had enjoyed the support of Africa. See also Oost, CP, 1962, 27ff.

¹¹²Orosius, Adv. Pag. VII, 35, 3. On the preparations of Maximus see also Piganiol, Paris, 1947, 253f.

contingents in Theodosius' army and minimises the fact that he failed to provide properly for his troops. Moreover he fails to acknowledge that Maximus had made careful and thorough preparations for the war, and was indeed a force with which to be reckoned.

The most complete account of the course of the fighting between Maximus and Theodosius that we possess is that found in the Panegyric of Pacatus.¹¹³ His narrative is particularly important for the land engagements between the two armies. Our other sources have only very scanty material concerning these battles. Christian sources especially fail to report the engagements. It was not thought fitting for a Christian emperor to shed blood. Orosius elaborates on this point at length, even going so far as to deny that any battles took place in this war at all:

Theodosius incruentam victoriam Deo procurante suscepit nullus dolos struxit, nullus aciem disposuit, postremo nullus, si dici licet, gladium de vagina extulit. Formidulosissimum bellum sine sanguine usque ad victoriam et in victoria duorum morte confectum est.¹¹⁴

It is clear that Orosius falsified the facts in order to prove his point that with the help of God, the Christian emperor could win wars without spilling blood, even when the odds were against him.¹¹⁵ St. Ambrose records that battles took

¹¹³See Appendix III for a map showing the locations of the most important places in this war.

¹¹⁴Adv. Pag. 35, 5ff.

¹¹⁵See also Socrates, HE, V, 14, who denies that any actual fighting occurred.

place.¹¹⁶ Pacatus alone, however, offers some description of them.

The initial clash of the two armies occurred at Siscia which controlled the crossing of the Save (34). The location given by Pacatus is corroborated by St. Ambrose.¹¹⁷ Pacatus' description of the progress of the battle is, on the whole, very conventional.¹¹⁸ Nevertheless his assertion that the engagement ended in a swift victory for Theodosius' forces may well be correct. Seeck plausibly suggests that a quick success could have been brought about by the unexpected daring of Theodosius' Hunnish cavalry, for, as he points out, the Huns would be objects of terror to the western barbarians of Maximus' army.¹¹⁹ An additional factor may have been that Maximus' army had to fight with reduced numbers on this occasion. On hearing of the contingent which set out by sea under Valentinian, Andragathius assembled a fleet to pursue it, thus detaching troops from the army.¹²⁰ The absence of Maximus from Gaul led to an invasion of

¹¹⁶Ep. 40, 23: Maximus in Sicilia, Sisciae. Petavione victus est.

¹¹⁷Ibid.

¹¹⁸See above p. 31f.

¹¹⁹Stuttgart, 1921, V, 214. On the Roman conception of the nature of the Huns see also the evidence of Amm. Marc. XXXI, 2, 1-12; Sidonius Apollinaris, Carm. II, 235ff; Zosimus, IV, 20.

¹²⁰Orosius, Adv. Pag. VII, 35, 3; Zosimus, IV, 46, 1.

barbarians across the Rhine in 388 A.D.¹²¹ Maximus may well have been forced to send reinforcements to the troops that he had left in Gaul to protect it in his absence. St. Ambrose mentions the part played by the Franks and Saxons in the defeat of Maximus. It seems probable that he is referring to the indirect help given to Theodosius' cause by these barbarians whose invasion forced Maximus to divide his forces and weaken the army which was to fight Theodosius.¹²² And so Theodosius' surprisingly swift success can perhaps be attributed to the startling effect of his Hunnish cavalry, combined with the fact that Maximus had had to reduce the size of the army that he put into the field against Theodosius because of the exigencies of campaigns elsewhere.

Pacatus mentions that a vexillarius of Maximus was drowned in the river Save during this battle (34, 4). This event is not mentioned elsewhere. Socrates and Sozomen, however, mention that Andragathius, on hearing of Maximus' death, committed suicide by leaping into a nearby river.¹²³

¹²¹Sulp. Alex. in Greg. Tur. Hist. Franc. II, 9.

¹²²Ep. 40, 23: Ille [Maximus] igitur statim a Francis, a Saxonum gente . . . victus est. Cf. Piganiol, Paris, 1947, 254, who feels that this refers to the decisive roles of the Franks and Saxons in Theodosius' army. However, it is almost impossible that Theodosius would have had Franks and Saxons in the army of the eastern empire. Pacatus certainly does not mention them among the barbarian contingents.

¹²³Socrates, HE, V, 14; Sozomen, HE, VII, 14. They are followed by John of Antioch, Frg. 186.

These authors seem to have confused the deaths of two men. For Andragathius, who was in command of the fleet, drowned himself in the sea not a river.¹²⁴ The standard-bearer who lost his life in the river Save certainly cannot be identified as Andragathius. But it is impossible to determine the identity of the drowned officer.

According to Pacatus, the remnants of Maximus' army were regrouped by his brother Marcellinus, who led his army in the second clash with Theodosius (35, 1). He does not name the site of the battle, which we learn from St. Ambrose was Poetovio, which is situated on the river Drave at the border between Pannonia and Noricum.¹²⁵ Once again Pacatus' description of the battle is largely conventional and drawn picturesquely for dramatic effect.¹²⁶ Nevertheless some useful facts emerge from Pacatus' account. In this battle it seems that Theodosius' opponents offered much stronger resistance. The battle was hard fought and lasted a full day (36, 5) before Maximus' troops were finally routed. A large part of his army surrendered to the victorious Theodosius (36, 3-4).¹²⁷

¹²⁴Orosius, Adv. Pag. VII, 35, 5; Zosimus, IV, 47, 2.

¹²⁵See above n. 116.

¹²⁶See above p. 32.

¹²⁷See also Socrates, HE, V, 14.

Although Pacatus' speech provides the best account of the major engagements of the war, it is clear that there was much that he chose to omit. He makes no mention of the expedition which set out from Egypt to win back Africa from the usurper, nor of the naval expedition sent to regain Italy under the leadership of Valentinian II, and the pursuit of it by Andragathius. The evidence of St. Ambrose indicates that Valentinian in fact won a victory over Maximus' forces near Sicily.¹²⁸ The reason for these omissions is obvious. Pacatus was eager to give Theodosius all the credit for the defeat of Maximus. Thus he would only mention those engagements in which his hero was personally involved. In particular he would be careful not to acknowledge any victory achieved by Valentinian, whom Theodosius wished to represent as incapable of ruling without his guardianship.¹²⁹

From Pacatus we learn that after his victory at Poetovio, Theodosius began his march towards Italy to confront Maximus. He narrates the emperor's triumphal entry into Hemona, which had been besieged by Maximus (37). The details of Theodosius' visit to Hemona as given by the orator are highly conventional and reminiscent of other descriptions of enthusiastic receptions given to visiting emperors.¹³⁰

¹²⁸See above n. 116.

¹²⁹See above p. 97f.

¹³⁰See above p. 49 and n. 118.

Meanwhile, according to the orator, Maximus was panic-stricken. He did not know which way to turn (38, 1ff), and although he could not hope for mercy, he was too cowardly to take his own life (41ff). Such details concerning Maximus' psychological state are unhistorical and designed to strengthen the repulsion which Pacatus intended his audience to feel towards the usurper. Not only was he cruel and greedy, Maximus was a base coward as well. However, we do learn from Pacatus that Maximus decided not to resist Theodosius but to await his arrival in Aquileia (38, 4), apparently hoping for mercy.

After leaving Hemona, Theodosius and his army marched towards Aquileia. According to Pacatus, they covered the distance spatio lucis unius (39, 2). As we have seen, superhuman swiftness was a conventional attribute of the hero of a eulogy,¹³¹ and Pacatus certainly exaggerated the speed with which Theodosius arrived at Aquileia. Seeck has pointed out that it would be impossible for an army to cover the sixty (approx.) miles of mountainous country between Hemona and Aquileia in one day.¹³²

The story now draws to a close. Maximus, hoping for mercy, came forth from Aquileia to meet Theodosius (43, 1). He was stripped of his imperial regalia by the emperor's soldiers (43, 2). Theodosius granted the usurper an

¹³¹See above p. 52f.

¹³²Stuttgart, 1921, V, 215.

interview (43, 4).¹³³ We are told that Maximus was made to confess that he had claimed to have the support of Theodosius merely to win over the soldiery to his side (43, 5). It is possible that this incident is historical. Theodosius, embarrassed by his initial support of Maximus' revolt, or by the rumours of it, may have promised Maximus his life in return for a confession which would clear his own name.¹³⁴ Pacatus stresses the emperor's clemency towards Maximus at the end (43, 4; 44, 1). Mercy was a conventional trait of an emperor in victory,¹³⁵ and it would not have reflected well upon Theodosius if Pacatus had shown Maximus begging for mercy and Theodosius denying it.¹³⁶ Thus, Pacatus states that Theodosius could not bring himself to put Maximus to death. His soldiers had to take the law into their own hands and effect the deed for him (44, 2). It seems more likely, however, that Theodosius himself ordered his death. None of our other sources mention any reluctance on his part to execute Maximus.¹³⁷

¹³³Zosimus, IV, 46, 3, also describes an interview.

¹³⁴Seeck, Stuttgart, 1921, V, 215.

¹³⁵See above p. 16 and p. 32f.

¹³⁶Seeck, Stuttgart, 1921, V, 215.

¹³⁷Cf. Ensslin, RE, XIV, 2554. On the death of Maximus see Claudian, IV Cos. Hon. 85; Socrates, HE, V, 14; Sozomen, HE, VII, 14; Theodoret, HE, V, 15; Philostorgius, X, 8; Zosimus, IV, 46, 3; Orosius, Adv. Pag. VII, 35, 4; Marcellinus Comes, Chron. a.388; Cons. Const. a.388. On the date of Maximus' death, see Seeck, Stuttgart, 1921, V, 215.

Pacatus also stresses Theodosius' clemency to the followers of Maximus. Only a few of his closest supporters were put to death, in particular his Moorish bodyguard (45, 5), and nobody was executed after Maximus himself. Nobody had his goods confiscated or suffered in any way for having supported the usurper (45, 6f). In making these statements, the orator was probably prejudiced by personal considerations. He came from Gaul, which had, outwardly at least, supported Maximus, and through praise was asking Theodosius to be lenient towards himself and his countrymen.¹³⁸ Nevertheless, Maximus' son, Victor, was put to death by Arbogastes who was sent to Gaul to destroy the remnants of Maximus' support there.¹³⁹ We know that Symmachus' life was endangered because he had written a panegyric upon Maximus.¹⁴⁰ Confiscations were ordered at Treves on June 14th, 388 A.D.¹⁴¹ All this suggests that Theodosius was not as unvengeful as Pacatus may have hoped.

Although Pacatus' Panegyric provides the fullest account that we possess of the fighting and the events immediately

¹³⁸See above p. 173ff.

¹³⁹Zosimus, IV, 47, 1; Orosius, Adv. Pag. VII, 35, 10; Sulp. Alex. in Greg. Tur. Hist. Franc. II, 9; Epit. de Caes. 48, 6; Cons. Const. a.388; Hydatius, Chron. a.388; Marcellinus Comes, Chron. a.388; Prosper Tiro, Chron. a.388.

¹⁴⁰Socrates, HE, V, 14; John of Antioch, Frg. 186.

¹⁴¹See Galletier, Paris, 1949, III, 112.

following the war between Maximus and Theodosius, his account is designed to highlight the part played by Theodosius. He is presented as the sole victor, the important roles of Valentinian and Gildo being ignored completely. Moreover, Theodosius is pictured as being the perfect emperor in victory, dealing mercifully with his conquered enemies, whereas in actual fact he did take steps to avenge himself upon the usurper and those who had supported him.

5. CONCLUSION

De tous les Panégyriques, celui de Drepanius Pacatus en l'honneur de Théodose est peut-être celui dont on peut extraire le moins de réalité historique. C'est le plus considérable par les dimensions matérielles Mais sa valeur intrinsèque n'est pas en rapport avec son étendue: il contient beaucoup de délayage et de banalité.. En particulier, la façon dont sont tracées, au début, les louanges de l'empereur, révèle l'amplificateur à outrance et malheureusement le reste du discours confirme trop souvent cette première impression. Assurément les auteurs précédents n'ignoraient pas cette vaine rhétorique, mais Pacatus les dépasse tous; plus qu'eux tous il est riche de mots et pauvre d'idées et de faits.¹⁴²

It cannot be denied that Pacatus' work is a rhetorical tour de force. The orator obviously had a thorough knowledge of the conventions of eulogy. His speech abounds in the commonplaces traditionally associated with the praise of an emperor or the abuse of his enemies, in hackneyed phrases and thoughts already much overworked by his predecessors.

¹⁴²Pichon, Paris, 1906, 136f.

Nevertheless, although he does allow that Pacatus' account of the usurpation of Magnus Maximus is: un peu plus précise,¹⁴³ Pichon has clearly underestimated the historical value of this speech.

In the first place, Pacatus' Panegyric offers the historian invaluable contemporary views of Maximus' revolt in the aftermath of his defeat. We see that Theodosius, who may originally have supported the usurpation, now wished his subjects to believe that Maximus was nothing but a wicked tyrant, to whom he had always been opposed, and who had been tolerated for a time only out of necessity. We are shown the attitude of the Gallo-Roman aristocracy in the face of a new regime. The nobles of Gaul, using Pacatus as their mouthpiece, in an attempt to avoid recriminations and to curry favour with their new emperor wished him to understand that they had never given their allegiance to the usurper but endured only misery in the years of his rule.

Secondly Pacatus' speech teaches a number of facts concerning the life and reign of Maximus which have not been recorded elsewhere. For example, we learn of the usurper's early attachment to Theodosius' family, and of his possible relationship to the emperor, perhaps by marriage. It is through the evidence of Pacatus that we can establish the probability that Merobaudes remained loyal to Gratian and the nature of his death. Pacatus' mention of the rumours of

¹⁴³ Ibid. 139.

Theodosius' complicity in Maximus' revolt allows a quite different interpretation of the politics of the period to the one that has been traditionally accepted. Pacatus' speech is particularly useful as regards the war between Theodosius and Maximus, for the only details that we possess about the battles which occurred are those provided in his speech.

Nevertheless, although Pacatus' account of the usurpation of Magnus Maximus is one of the most detailed that we possess, we must guard against accepting his statements as embodying historical truth if no corroborating evidence exists to support them. This is especially true in the case of Pacatus' description of Maximus' character and administration. Apart from the words of Pacatus, very little evidence exists as regards these subjects. As a result some scholars have been too ready to accept Pacatus' portrait of the greedy and cruel tyrant, without considering that the orator had little choice but to present Maximus in this way. On the one hand, the emperor wished the memory of Maximus to be damned, on the other Pacatus needed to paint a particularly black picture of the usurper in order to add substance to the idea that the Gauls could not possibly have supported his rule. When Pacatus' statements are examined more closely and compared with the other evidence at our disposal, slight though it is, it appears that his presentation of Maximus as a bloodthirsty and unscrupulous ogre bears little relation to the truth. This fact illustrates clearly that although Pacatus'

Panegyric does contain much information that is useful to the historian of the reign of Magnus Maximus, caution is necessary in estimating the historicity of his statements. Pacatus had strong political and personal reasons to prejudice his account in certain ways, and before accepting his viewpoint the historian must consider whether he had any special reason for his particular interpretation. Similarly the value of Pacatus' speech as a source is limited by the fact that he fails to give a balanced view of events. He sins by omission. For instance, in the case of the war between Theodosius and Maximus, the orator magnifies the role of Theodosius beyond all proportion and we are told nothing of the other contingents that contributed to his success.

Pacatus was not a historian but a eulogist. His account of the usurpation of Magnus Maximus is undeniably strongly influenced by the fact that he had to reflect Theodosius' opinion of the usurper and, thereby, win his favour. Yet, because the other information available concerning the reign of Maximus is so scanty, when due consideration is given to the prejudices which moulded Pacatus' statements, many facts emerge from his Panegyric that we would otherwise not know. Moreover the insight into the politics behind Maximus' usurpation, reign and downfall given by Pacatus in a speech written so soon after the events themselves is invaluable. It is perhaps here that Pacatus makes his greatest contribution to history.

APPENDIX I

THE PLAN OF PACATUS' PANEGYRIC TO THEODOSIUS I¹

1. Chapters 1-4, 1: Prooemium. Pacatus stresses his inability to eulogise such a great subject as Theodosius, states his reasons for speaking, and gives an outline of his speech. He will cover the topics of Theodosius' felix patria, domus clara, forma divina, aetas integra, militarium civiliumque usus.
2. Chapters 4, 2-6: Preliminary topics of praise. Pacatus here includes a eulogy of Theodosius' native land (felix patria, 4), his father (domus clara, 5) and of Theodosius' physical beauty (divina forma, 6).
3. Chapters 7-10: Upbringing and education. This section is mainly concerned with the training and experience that Theodosius received before he became emperor at a mature age (aetas integra).
4. Chapters 11-12: Form a bridge between section 3, Theodosius' life before he became emperor, and section 5, his deeds as emperor. They deal with his elevation to the throne.

¹The outline given below may be compared with those given by Grinda, Strasbourg, 1916, 9ff, and Galletier, Paris, 1949, III, 59.

5. Chapters 13-46: Deeds. These are divided into two groups, civil (13-21) and military (22-46). Under deeds in the civil sphere Pacatus praises Theodosius' frugality (13-14), his choice of magistrates (15, 1-3), his generosity to his friends (16-20), and to his subjects in general (21). Praise of Theodosius' military exploits begins with a brief report of his relations with foreign powers (22) but is dominated by a description of the usurpation of Magnus Maximus (23-30) and Theodosius' campaign against him (31-46).

6. Chapter 47: Epilogue. Pacatus apologises for not eulogising Theodosius' other exploits and expresses his joy at having the honour of seeing Theodosius and his family, and at having the opportunity to pronounce his eulogy.

APPENDIX II

OTHER SOURCES - A SURVEY

1. CONTEMPORARY OR NEAR CONTEMPORARY DOCUMENTS

i. St. Ambrose.

Ambrose was bishop of Milan in the reign of Valentinian II. He was staunchly orthodox and strenuously opposed any stance adopted by an emperor which jeopardised the position or conflicted with the views of the orthodox church. This attitude brought him into opposition in turn with Maximus, Valentinian, and Theodosius. Valentinian chose Ambrose as his ambassador to Maximus after the latter's usurpation. His correspondence with Valentinian on the results of his embassies provides important information on the relations between the two courts which is not provided elsewhere.¹ Furthermore, the allusions that he makes in a letter to Theodosius concerning the war between Theodosius and Maximus are valuable for corroboration of Pacatus' account of these hostilities.²

¹Ep. 24.

²Ep. 40, 22f.

ii. Claudian.

The poet Claudian lived in Rome at the court of Honorius from 395-404 A.D. The most important of his works for our purposes are the panegyrics which he addressed to this emperor on the occasions of his third, fourth and sixth consulships. Since they are eulogies of an emperor, as historical value these poems are subject to similar limitations to that of Pacatus. Claudian was not writing history, and we cannot expect balanced or accurate judgements from him. His purpose was to praise Honorius, and, like Pacatus, Claudian was a master of exaggeration, of political omission, and of all the conventional weapons in the eulogist's arsenal.³ His eulogies are of more importance for the reign and achievements of Theodosius. His treatment of the latter is highly eulogistic and full of commonplaces similar to those found in Pacatus' speech.⁵

³For an analysis of the conventional structure of Claudian's poems, see Struthers, HSCPh, 1919, 49ff.

⁴In particular: III Cos. Hon. 22ff; IV Cos. Hon. 41ff; VI Cos. Hon. 53ff.

⁵Eg. Theodosius did not seek power for himself but he alone was worthy of it: IV Cos. Hon. 45-48 (cf. Pacatus, 7, 1; 12, 1-2); power as a burden: IV Cos. Hon. 59-62 (cf. Pacatus, 3, 5); Theodosius' clemency to the conquered: IV Cos. Hon. 111-117 (cf. Pacatus, 43, 5-44, 3; 36, 3-4; 45, 4ff); his accessibility to his people: IV Cos. Hon. 60-62 (cf. Pacatus, 21, 2-5); love of his subjects for him: VI Cos. Hon. 63-64 (cf. Pacatus, 21, 5; 37; 47, 3); Theodosius lived like a private citizen: VI Cos. Hon. 58-59 (cf. Pacatus, 12, 5).

Claudian, as a panegyrist, was required to present the official view of events and personalities. Thus, not surprisingly, his brief account of the usurpation of Magnus Maximus is hostile and similar in attitude to that presented by Pacatus. Maximus again appears as the conventional wicked tyrant.⁶

iii. Themistius.

The orator Themistius lived in Constantinople during the reign of Theodosius, and held distinguished administrative posts including that of prefect of Constantinople. He addressed a number of eulogistic orations to Theodosius in the early years of his reign. Like Pacatus and Claudian, Themistius was concerned to produce an idealised portrait of his emperor, endowing him with all the qualities of the perfect ruler.⁷ Themistius was mostly interested in the affairs of the eastern empire, and makes few references to the west. Neither Maximus nor his administration are mentioned directly in his speeches. Nevertheless, he does make an important allusion to Theodosius' expedition to the west in 384 A.D., the purpose of which, he alleges, was aggression against Maximus.⁸

⁶IV Cos. Hon. 72ff.

⁷See eg. G. Downey, "Philanthropia in Religion and Statecraft in the Fourth Century after Christ", Historia, 1955, 199ff; V. Valdenberg, "Discours Politique de Themistius dans leur Rapport avec l'Antiquité", Byzantion, 1924, 557ff.

⁸Or. XVIII, 220d-221a.

2. PAGAN HISTORIES

i. Zosimus

By far the most important narrative of the usurpation of Magnus Maximus that we possess from pagan writers is that of Zosimus, who composed his history probably in the early years of the sixth century A.D.⁹ Zosimus was a convinced pagan, and aimed to show in his work how Rome fell because of the neglect of the pagan cults. Zosimus' History is a valuable source for the history of the late Roman empire not only because it provides the sole evidence for many events, but because it is: le seul ouvrage historique de Bas-Empire tendancieusement païen qui nous soit parvenu complètement.¹⁰ As such it furnishes a rejoinder to the many Christian interpretations of the period that have come down to us.¹¹ Like Eunapius, his major source for books II-V, 28,¹² Zosimus is severely critical of Christian emperors.

⁹On the date of Zosimus' History see François Paschoud Zosime, Histoire Nouvelle, Paris, 1971, xiiff.

¹⁰Ibid. lxvii.

¹¹Ibid.; R.T. Ridley, "Zosimus the Historian", Byz.Z., 1972, 287.

¹²To what extent Zosimus relied upon Eunapius is the subject of a great deal of controversy. For a summary of the major arguments see Paschoud, Paris, 1971, xxxivff. See also R.T. Ridley, "Eunapius and Zosimus", Helikon, 1969-70, 582ff; D.C. Scavone, "Zosimus and his Historical Models", GRBS, 1970, 57ff.

Theodosius is reproached for sloth, intemperance and extravagance.¹³ In a number of instances the characteristics attributed to Theodosius by Zosimus directly contradict Pacatus' praises of the emperor.¹⁴ Because of his strong anti-Christian bias, Zosimus' reproaches against Theodosius are no more reliable without corroborating evidence than are the effusive praises of Pacatus. As regards Magnus Maximus, Zosimus is rather more sober, although, as Maximus too was a Christian, he had no reason to be particularly well-disposed towards him. The usurper is portrayed by Zosimus as an ambitious and cunning man,¹⁵ but there is no hint of the enormous greed and cruelty so harshly censured by Pacatus. Zosimus contributes some important information concerning the usurpation of Maximus. For instance, his work is the only literary source which records that Maximus was recognised as emperor by Theodosius.¹⁶ Further, it provides the fullest surviving account of the usurper's invasion of Italy.¹⁷

¹³Sloth, eg. IV, 33; 44, 1 and 4; 50; intemperance and extravagance, eg. IV, 28, 1; 50.

¹⁴Eg. Pacatus, 14, praises Theodosius for his frugality in his eating habits. Zosimus, IV, 28, 1, condemns his excesses: τοσαύτην δὲ ἐπιετήρως τῇ βασιλικῇ τροφῇ δαπάνην, ὥστε διὰ πλεονεξίας τῶν ἐδεσμάτων καὶ τῆς περὶ ταῦτα πολυτελείας, γέγονεν πολυάνθρωπος καταστροφή, μαγείρων τε καὶ οἰνοχόων καὶ τῶν ἄλλων οὐδ' εἰ τις ἐξαρτηθῆσθαι βούληθε, συγγραφῆς ὑπὸ πολυετήριον δεήσει.

¹⁵Eg. IV, 35, 5-6; 42.

¹⁶IV, 37, 3.

¹⁷IV, 42.

ii. Epitome de Caesaribus.

The author of the Epitome de Caesaribus offers a very different view of the emperor Theodosius from that found in Zosimus' work. For the epitomist, who was possibly a contemporary of Theodosius,¹⁸ judges this emperor very favourably indeed. In many respects the presentation of Theodosius in this work reads like a eulogy.¹⁹ Unfortunately the epitomist makes only very brief remarks as regards Magnus Maximus, giving only the barest outline of his rebellion against Gratian and his defeat at the hands of Theodosius.²⁰

iii. Sulpicius Alexander.

Two fragments of this otherwise unknown fifth century historian have been preserved in the History of the Franks of Gregory of Tours. One of the fragments is important for our purposes since it deals with an invasion of Gaul by the Franks while Maximus was engaged in invading Italy.²¹

¹⁸Fr. Pichlmayr, ed. Sexti Aurelii Victoris Liber de Caesaribus, Leipzig, 1966, xif.

¹⁹Eg. Theodosius is praised for continence: 48, 10 (cf. Pacatus, 14); personal accessibility: 48, 9 (cf. Pacatus, 21, 2-3); the fact that his elevation occurred cunctis faventibus: 47, 3 (cf. Pacatus, 3, 5-6; 31, 2).

²⁰47, 7; 48, 6.

²¹Hist. Franc. II, 9.

3. CHRISTIAN HISTORIES

i. Ecclesiastic historians.

Many Christian historians of the fourth and fifth centuries chose to write histories of the church, concentrating upon its development, its struggles against persecutors and heretics, and upon doctrinal controversies.²² They wished to show that the course of events was guided by the providence of God.²³ Secular history was of secondary importance to ecclesiastic historians, and was introduced only as a framework within which to set the history of the church, and to illustrate the interdependence of church and state.²⁴ Because of their preoccupation with ecclesiastical matters, the accounts of secular affairs given by these authors tend to be brief and quite superficial.

A number of fifth century church historians provide some information concerning Maximus' usurpation. Almost all of them looked upon Theodosius as a saint because of his vigorous upholding of orthodox Catholic Christianity. Rufinus added to his translation of Eusebius an account of the events from 325-395 A.D., concentrating particularly upon

²²Momigliano, Oxford, 1963, 90f.

²³G. Downey, "The Perspective of the Early Church Historians", GRBS, 1965, 57.

²⁴Socrates in his introduction of book V of his History felt it necessary to apologise for including a narrative of secular events with his account of ecclesiastical affairs.

the eastern empire. He judged emperors according to whether their reigns were good or bad for the church. Thus, for Rufinus, Constantine and Theodosius were model emperors with all the endowments of the perfect Christian ruler.²⁵ Rufinus kept his account of secular affairs very brief and tended to introduce religious motives wherever possible. Thus, he attributed Maximus' invasion of Italy to a desire to oppose the Arianism of Valentinian II and his mother, an explanation which was followed by certain later ecclesiastical historians.²⁶

Socrates, Sozomen and Theodoret all knew and used the work of their predecessor Rufinus. Socrates' History covered the years 323-439 A.D. Although often inaccurate and too credulous of miracles, Socrates was in general a careful historian, paying attention to chronology, and eager to seek out primary sources and eyewitness accounts wherever possible.²⁷ This account of Maximus' usurpation is telescoped and prejudiced towards Theodosius. He makes no mention of Theodosius' recognition of Maximus but represents him as being opposed to the usurper from the beginning. Sozomen's History

²⁵F. Thélamon, "L'Empereur Idéal d'après l'Histoire Ecclesiastique de Rufin d'Aquilée", Studia Patristica, X, 310f.

²⁶HE, II, 16: cf. Sozomen, HE, VII, 13; Theodoret, HE, V, 15.

²⁷On the character of Socrates' History see A.C. Zenos, A Select Library of Nicene and Post Nicene Fathers, New York, 1890, II, xiff.

is also marred by his extreme credulity. Furthermore he fails to give accurate chronological data and to acknowledge his major sources. Sozomen certainly owes a great debt to the work of Socrates which he used directly.²⁸ As regards the usurpation of Magnus Maximus, Sozomen's account follows that of Socrates very closely. At times, however, he does add material not recorded by Socrates or he presents a conflicting account of events.²⁹ Theodoret intended his History to be a supplement to those of Socrates and Sozomen. Aside from his strong religious bias, the most serious defect in Theodoret's work is his total lack of chronology. Theodoret includes in his History certain information not recorded by his predecessors. An example is the threatening letter which he says Maximus wrote to Valentinian, chastising him for his heresy.³⁰ As is common with Christian historians, religious motives pervade the work of Theodoret. He not only records that Maximus was fighting for the sake of religion,

²⁸Chester D. Hartranft, A Select Library of Nicene and Post Nicene Fathers, New York, 1890, II, 221f.

²⁹For example, compare the following:

Socrates V, 14:

τοῦ δὲ βασιλέως ἐπεβύτης τῆς
τύραννός, τινοὺς ὄντας τὴν
παράσκευὴν αὐτῷ ὑπὸ Μάξιμου
ταπτομένα, ὅτε τὴν ἐκ τῆς
φύλης προέβλην, ἀνέκλειν
ἐκ τῆς φύλης, ἀλλὰ καταπύσαντες
δεδούλω αὐτῷ τὴν τύραννον
ἐνεχέριον ὅς ἀνηρίθ...

Sozomen VII, 14:

τῷ δὲ βασιλεὶ τὰ περὶ τοῦ
πόλεμον κατὰ γνώμην ἀπέλθῃ.
οἱ γὰρ ὑπὸ Μάξιμου στρατῶνται
ἡ πόλις τῆς ἐν αὐτοῖς παρασκευῆς,
τύραννον ἀνείλον.

³⁰HE V, 14.

but also that Theodosius would only take up arms against Maximus to aid Valentinian after the latter had renounced his Arianism.³¹

Philostorgius, whose work covers the years 300-425 A.D. gives an interesting twist to church history, for he was not an orthodox Christian but an Arian. He hated orthodox Christianity as much as he hated paganism.³² Thus, although he praised Theodosius for his zeal against pagans, he disliked him for his orthodoxy and was critical of his character and lifestyle.³³ Philostorgius' statements with regard to Magnus Maximus are few and record nothing that is not found elsewhere.

ii. Paulus Orosius.

At the request of St. Augustine, Paulus Orosius, a Spanish priest, wrote a history directed against the pagans. His work was a counter-reaction to the pagan interpretation of history which claimed that the ills of Rome in the late empire were due to the fact that the Romans had turned away from paganism. Orosius' main purpose was to show that the pagan view was false by demonstrating that earlier civilisations had been overwhelmed by just as great disasters as the Roman

³¹Ibid. V, 15.

³²On Philostorgius and his History see J. Bidez, "L'Historien Philostorge" in Mélanges d'Histoire Offerts à Henri Pirenne, Bruxelles, 1926, I, 23ff.

³³Eg. XI, 2.

3 3

OF/DE

3 3

OF/DE

empire.³⁴ Being interested primarily in proving his thesis, Orosius selected and recorded only material that would support it.³⁵ As regards Theodosius, Orosius' account is eulogistic.³⁶ The most important reason for this is, of course, that Theodosius was staunchly orthodox. However, the fact that he was a fellow countryman of Orosius may have played some part in forming Orosius' favourable attitude towards him. The account of Maximus' usurpation in Orosius' History is very valuable since it is fuller than those of his fellow Christians, although he too leaves many gaps. Perhaps the most important feature of Orosius' account for our purposes is his sympathetic characterisation of Maximus, which contradicts the extremely black portrayal of the usurper given by Pacatus.³⁷ Unlike the latter, Orosius had no reason to condemn Maximus unduly. The usurper was an orthodox Christian and a Spaniard like Theodosius. As he wrote his History after the reign of Theodosius, Orosius was not obliged to present the official view of Maximus' revolt. Several other points in Orosius' narrative give a different picture of Maximus' usurpation to that found in

³⁴Orosius, Adv. Pag. I, prologue.

³⁵M.L. Laistner, "Some Reflections on Latin Historical Writing in the Fifth Century", CP, 1940, 250f; I.W. Raymond, Seven Books of History Against the Pagans: the Apology of Paulus Orosius, New York, 1936, 9ff.

³⁶See eg. Adv. Pag. VII, 34, 3; 34, 7.

³⁷Orosius, Adv. Pag. VII, 34, 9. Cf. Pacatus, 23ff.

Pacatus' speech. He records that Maximus was constrained to accept the purple by his soldiers.³⁸ According to Orosius, Maximus not Theodosius was the better prepared for the war which erupted between them.³⁹ Finally, Orosius denies that there was any bloodshed in the course of this war.⁴⁰

iii. Sulpicius Severus.

Sulpicius Severus, a priest from Aquitaine, was a contemporary of Orosius. His works contain a number of references which are relevant to Maximus and his usurpation. Severus' History is a brief chronicle of the world from the creation to 400 A.D. He used both Christian and pagan sources, attempted to be accurate in chronological matters and desired to examine all possible evidence, with the result that this work has been judged: "the best piece of historical narrative written during the century that we are considering [*i.e.* the fifth]".⁴¹ For our purposes, the most valuable portion of his History is the section devoted to the Priscillianist heresy, and the persecution of its adherents by the usurper Maximus.⁴² This is the only

³⁸ Adv. Pag. VII, 34, 9.

³⁹ Ibid. 35, 2.

⁴⁰ Ibid. 35, 5ff.

⁴¹ Laistner, op. cit. 1940, 247ff.

⁴² Chron. II, 46ff.

contemporary account of the Priscillianist affair that survives, and it illuminates the obscure allusions made to the persecution by Pacatus. Severus seems to have attempted to judge men's characters without prejudice. He disliked Priscillian for the views for which he stood, but nevertheless allowed him to have a great many good qualities.⁴³ He found the same balanced judgement in the comments which he makes concerning the character of Maximus. He opposed his treatment of the Priscillianists but found him in other ways a good man.⁴⁴ He criticised his avarice but pointed out that the military needs of his portion of the empire may have rendered this necessary.⁴⁵ It is particularly interesting to compare Severus' remarks concerning Maximus with those of Pacatus, because the former, like Pacatus, lived in Gaul under the rule of the usurper, and therefore he also had first-hand experience as regards his administration. However, unlike Pacatus, Severus had no particular reason to blacken Maximus' character.

⁴³Ibid. 46.

⁴⁴Dial. II, 11, 2.

⁴⁵Ibid. II, 11, 11.

APPENDIX III

MAP OF THE WESTERN ROMAN EMPIRE¹

ERN ROMAN EMPIRE¹

THE ROMAN EMPIRE

A.D.—1-300

Scale 1:2,500,000

Scale (60-1")

Miles Per Inch (1:2,500,000)

Miles Per Inch (60-1")

3 OF

REFERENCE TO
COLORS

1000 Ft. to 5000 Ft.
500 Ft. to 1000 Ft.
Sea Level to 500 Ft.

Legend:
— Imperial
--- Boundary
--- Frontier
--- The Sea

ROMAN EMPIRE

REFERENCE TO COLOURING

0000 Ft. to 0000 Ft.
000 Ft. to 0000 Ft.
Sea Level to 000 Ft.

...the ... of Augustus ... after Augustus ... to ...

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. GENERAL HISTORIES AND REFERENCE WORKS.

GIBBON, Edward. The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire. A New Edition. London: A. Strahan and T. Cadell, 1791, vol. 5.

JONES, A.H.M. The Later Roman Empire, 284-602; a Social Economic and Administrative Survey. 3 vols. Oxford: Blackwell, 1964.

JONES, A.H.M., MARTINDALE, J.R., MORRIS, J. The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971.

JULLIAN, Camille. Histoire de la Gaule. Paris: Hachette, 1926, vol. VII.

SEECK, Otto. Geschichte des Untergangs der Antiken Welt. Stuttgart: J.B. Metzler, 1921, vol. V.

STEIN, Ernst. Histoire du Bas-Empire. Édition française par Jean-Remy Palanque. Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1959, vol. 1.

2. BOOKS AND DISSERTATIONS.

BERANGER, Jean. Recherches sur l'Aspect Idéologique du Principat. Basel: F. Reinhardt, 1953.

BURGESS, Th. C. Epidictic Literature. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1902.

CAMERON, Alan. Claudian: Poetry and Propaganda at the Court of Honorius. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1970.

CREES, J.H.E. Claudian as an Historical Authority. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1908.

DILL, Sir Samuel. Roman Society in the Last Century of the Western Empire. 2d. ed. rev. London: MacMillan, 1899.

FRERE, S.S. Britannia: a History of Roman Britain. London: Routledge and K. Paul, 1967.

- GALLETIER, E. Panegyriques Latins. 3 vols. Budé. Paris: Société d'Édition "Les Belles Lettres", 1949.
- GLOVER, T.R. Life and Letters in the Fourth Century. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1901.
- GRANT, Michael. Roman History from Coins; Some Uses of the Imperial Coinage to the Historian. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968.
- GRINDA, F. Der Panegyrikus des Pacatus auf Kaiser Theodosius. Diss. Strasbourg, 1916.
- HAARHOFF, T.J. Schools of Gaul; A Study of Pagan and Christian Education in the Last Century of the Western Empire. 2d. ed. Johannesburg: Witwatersrand University Press, 1958.
- KEHDING, O. De Panegyricis Latinis Capita IV. Thes. Marburg, 1899.
- LIPPOLD, Adolph. Theodosius der Grosse und Seine Zeit. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1968.
- MACMULLEN, Ramsay. Enemies of the Roman Order: Treason, Unrest and Alienation of the Empire. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1966.
- MATTHEWS, J.F. Western Aristocracies and Imperial Court, A.D. 364-425. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975.
- MOMIGLIANO, Arnaldo, ed. The Conflict Between Paganism and Christianity in the Fourth Century: Essays. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963.
- PALANQUE, Jean-Remy. Saint Ambrose et l'Empire Romain. Paris: E. de Boccard, 1933.
- PASCHOUD, Francois. Zosime: Histoire Nouvelle. Text établi et traduit par Francois Paschoud. Budé. Paris: Société d'Édition "Les Belles Lettres", 1971, Vol. I.
- PEARCE, J.W.E. Roman Imperial Coinage, Vol. IX. London: Spink, 1951.
- PETIT, Paul. Libanius et la Vie Municipale à Antioche au IVe Siècle après J.C. Paris: P. Geuthner, 1955.
- PICHON, Rene. Les Derniers Écrivains Profanes: Les Panegyristes - Ausone - la Querolus - Rutilius Namatianus. Paris: Leroux, 1906.

- PIGANIOL, André. L'Empire Chrétien, 325-395. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1947.
- POHLSCHMIDT, W. Quaestiones Themistianae. Diss. Munster, 1908.
- RAYMOND, Irving Woodsworth, ed., trans. and introd. Seven Books of History Against the Pagans; the Apology of Paulus Orosius. New York: Columbia University Press, 1936.
- ROSTOVITZ, M. The Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1926.
- SCHAFF, Philip and WACE, Henry, ed. A Select Library of Nicene and Post Nicene Fathers. Second Series. New York: Christian Literature Co., 1890.
- STRAUB, Johannes A. Vom Herrscherideal in der Spätantike. Stuttgart: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1964.
- THOMPSON, E.A. The Historical Work of Ammianus Marcellinus. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1947.
- WALBANK, F.W. The Awful Revolution; the Decline of the Roman Empire in the West. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1969.
- WIGHTMAN, Edith M. Roman Trier and the Treveri. London: Hart-Davis, 1970.

3. ARTICLES.

- BAEHRENS, W. "Pacatus." Hermes 56 (1921): 443-445.
- BERANGER, Jean. "L'Expression de la Divinité dans les Panégyriques Latins." Museum Helveticum 27 (1970): 242-254.
- BIDEZ, J. "L'Historien Philostorge." In Mélanges d'Histoire Offerts à Henri Pirenne par ses Anciens Elèves et ses Amis à l'Occasion de sa Quarantième Année d'Enseignement à l'Université de Gand 1886-1926. Bruxelles: Vromant & Co., 1926, vol. I, 23-30.
- GALLETIER, E. "L'Eloge de l'Espagne dans le Panégyrique de Théodose par Pacatus." In Mélanges Paul Thomas: Recueil de Mémoires Concernant la Philologie Classique Dédié à Paul Thomas. Bruges: Impr. Sainte-Catherine, 1930.

- BOISSIER, G. "Les Rhéteurs Gaulois au IV^e Siècle." Journal des Savants (1884): 5-18; 125-140.
- BORN, Lester K. "The Perfect Prince According to the Latin Panegyrists." American Journal of Philology 55 (1934): 20-35.
- BROWNING, R. "The Riot of Antioch." Journal of Roman Studies 42 (1952): 14-15.
- CAMERON, A.M. and A.D.E. "Christianity and Tradition in the Historiography of the Later Empire." Classical Quarterly 58 (1964): 316-326.
- BURDEAU, Francois. "L'Empereur d'Après les Panégyriques Latins." In Aspects de l'Empire Romain. Par Francois Burdeau, Nicole Charbonnel and Michel Humbert. Préf. de Jean Gaudemet. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1964.
- CHASTAGNOL, André. "Les Espagnols dans l'Aristocratie Gouvernementale à l'Epoque de Théodose." In Les Empereurs Romains d'Espagne. Organise par A. Piganiol et H. Terrasse. Paris: Editions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1965.
- DEMANDT, A. "Die Feldzüge des Älteren Theodosius." Hermes 100 (1972): 81-113.
- _____. "Der Tod des Älteren Theodosius." Historia 18 (1969): 598-626.
- DOWNEY, G. "The Perspective of the Early Church Historians." Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies 6 (1965): 57-70.
- _____. "Philanthropia in Religion and Statecraft in the Fourth Century after Christ." Historia 4 (1955): 199-208.
- EGGER, R. "Der Erste Theodosius." Byzantion 5 (1929-1930): 9-32.
- ENSSLIN, W. "Maximus (33) (Usurpator)." Paulys Realencyclopädie der Classischen Altertumswissenschaft. XIV: 2546-2555.
- _____. "Theodosius (9)." Paulys Realencyclopädie der Classischen Altertumswissenschaft. VA2: 1937-1945.
- EVANS, Elizabeth Cornelia. "Roman Descriptions of Personal Appearance in History and Biography." Harvard Studies in Classical Philology 46 (1935): 43-84.

- FOCKE, F. "Synkrisis." Hermes 58 (1935): 327-368.
- GALDI, M. "La Figura de Panegyrista Antico." Atti della R. Accademia di Archeologica, Lettere e bella Arti di Napoli 13 (1933-1934): 275-292.
- GRUMEL, V. "Numismatique et Histoire: l'Époch Valentinienne." Revue des Études Byzantines 12 (1954): 7-31.
- HANSLIK, Rudolph. "Pacatus (2)." Paulys Realencyclopädie der Classischen Altertumswissenschaft. XVIII: 2058-2060.
- HOEPPFNER, A. "La Mort du Magister Militum Théodose." Revue des Études Latines 14 (1936): 119-129.
- INSTINSKY, H.U. "Consensus Universorum." Hermes 75 (1940): 264-278.
- JONES, David. "The Emperor Theodosius." History Today 21 (1971): 619-627.
- _____. "Magnus Maximus at Trier." History Today 18 (1968): 109-115.
- LAISTNER, M.L.W. "Some Reflections on Latin Historical Writing in the Fifth Century." Classical Philology 35 (1940): 241-258.
- LECLERCQ, H. "Panégyrique." Dictionnaire d'Archéologie Chrétienne et de Liturgie 18 pt. 1: 1016-1045.
- LIPPOLD, Adolph. "Herrscherideal und Traditionsverbundheit im Panegyricus des Pacatus." Historia 17 (1968): 228-250.
- _____. "Kaiser Theodosius d.Gr. und sein Vater." Rivista Storica dell'Antichità, Bologna 2 (1972): 195-200.
- MACGUINNESS, W.S. "Locutions and Formulae of the Latin Panegyrists." Hermathena 48 (1933): 117-138.
- _____. "Some Methods of the Latin Panegyrists." Hermathena 47 (1932): 42-61.
- MATTHEWS, J.F. "The Gallic Supporters of Theodosius." Latomus 30 (1971): 1073-1099.
- MESK, J. "Zur Technik der Lateinischen Panegyriker." Rheinisches Museum für Philologie N.F. 67 (1912): 569-590.

- COOST, S.I. "Count Gildo and Theodosius the Great." Classical Philology 57 (1962): 27-30.
- PALANQUE, Jean-Remy. "Collégialité et Partage dans l'Empire Romain au IVe et Ve Siècles." Revue des Études Anciennes 46 (1944): 47-64.
- _____. "L'Empereur Maxime." In Les Empereurs Romains d'Espagne. Organisé par A. Piganiol et H. Terrasse. Paris: Éditions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1965, 255-267.
- _____. "Sur l'Usurpation de Maxime." Revue des Études Anciennes 30 (1929): 33-36.
- PAYR, Th. "Enkomion." Reallexicon für Antike und Christentum V (1962): 331-343.
- RADICE, B. "Pliny and the Panegyricus." Greece and Rome Ser. 2, 15 (1968): 166-172.
- RIDLEY, R.T. "Eunapius and Zosimus." Helikon 9-10 (1969-1970): 574-592.
- _____. "Zosimus the Historian." Byzantinische Zeitschrift 65 (1972): 277-302.
- ROMANO, D. "Per Una Nuova Interpretazione del Panegirico Latino in Onore dell'Imperatore." Annali del Liceo Classico "Garibaldi" di Palermo 11 (1965): 327-338.
- SCAVONE, D.C. "Zosimus and his Historical Models." Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies 11 (1970): 57-67.
- SOLARI, A. "Il Magister Equitum Teodosio." Byzantion 6 (1931): 469-476.
- _____. "L'Alibi di Teodosio nella Opposizione Antidinastica." Klio 9 (1934): 165-168.
- STARR, Chester G. "The Perfect Democracy of the Roman Empire." American Historical Review 58 (1952): 1-16.
- STEVENS, C.E. "Magnus Maximus in British History." Études Celtiques 3 (1938): 86-94.
- STRAUB, Johannes A. "Christliche Geschichtsapologetik in der Krisis des Romanischen Reiches." Historia 1 (1950): 52-81.
- STRUTHERS, Lester B. "The Rhetorical Structure of the Encomia of Claudius Claudian." Harvard Studies in Classical Philology 30 (1919): 49-87.

SUTHERLAND, C.H.V. "The Historical Evidence of Greek and Roman Coins." Greece and Rome Ser. 1, 9 (1940): 65-80.

SUYS, E. "La Sentence Portée contre Priscillien (Treves 385)." Revue d'Histoire Ecclesiastique 21 (1925): 530-538.

THÉLANON, F. "L'Empereur Idéal d'après l'Histoire Ecclesiastique de Rufin d'Aquilée." Studia Patristica 10: 310-314.

VALDENBERG, V. "Discours Politique de Themistius dans leur Rapport avec l'Antiquité." Byzantion 1 (1924): 557-580.

VINOGRADOFF, Paul. "Social and Economic Conditions of the Roman Empire in the Fourth Century." Cambridge Medieval History. New York: MacMillan, 1911. Vol. I: 542-567.

WAGENVOORT, H. "Felicitas Imperatoria." Mnemosyne Ser. 4, 4 (1954): 300-322.

WALSER, G. "Der Kaiser als Vindex Libertatis." Historia 4 (1955): 353-367.

ZIEGLER, K. "Art Panegyrikos." Paulys Realencyclopädie der Classischen Altertumswissenschaft. XVIII: 559-570.

END

3

7

FIN