Call #: Hodges Library Stacks PA5000 .B9 vol.50 1980

TN: 591582

Ariel Regular

This article has been sent to you by the

University of Tennessee

TKN
TNUUTN
TU

Hodges Library
Knoxville TN
37996

Fax
865-974-2708

Lending Ariel
160.36.192.218

Email
ilslend@utk.edu

NOTICE: This material may be protected by Copyright Law (Title 17 US Code)

SO: Byzantion; revue internationale des e´tudes byzantines.

VO: 50 **NO:**

DA: 1980 **PG:** 259-278

AU/TI: Rodgers, Barbara Saylor; Constantine's pagan vision

Lending String:
*TKN,TJC,TMA,XII,VMC
In Process: 20070426 --4/27/07

Billing Category : Exempt
MaxCost : Free
Charges: No Charge

Do not pay from this workform.

TO: TXM

Middle Tennessee State University
ILL Services / Box 13
1500 Greenland Drive
Murfreesboro, TN 37132

FAX Number:
(615) 898-5551

Ariel Address:
161.45.205.82

Patron: Clark, Victor

TXM TN: 137463

IL: 30260527 OCLC

Ship Via:
Ariel

Ariel Address
161.45.205.82

Request Number
OCLC 30260527

by their father, are, among so many allusions, seldom named. Appropriately, the eastern ruler, Constantius, appears most frequently. But one recalls that the path of the Caesars had not been uneventful : the eldest, who played a crucial part in his father's final rise to supreme power, had been involved in the darkest stain on Constantine's reputation. Eusebius had already had to obliterate his memory in the *History*. Safest, then, to talk of 'the Caesars'.

There are thus religious or political explanations for the disregard shown towards some of these people, but others conversely should have been attractive to the writer, especially if he were Eusebius himself. The only explanation which suits all cases is the deliberate omission of names *wherever possible*. They must have been considered detracting from the prominence of the central figure, Constantine himself. Sometimes, as we have seen, the names have remained, particularly Licinius, and people specified in documents quoted. Apparently it was thought too troublesome or pointless to tamper with such sources, and Licinius could remain as a paradigm, suitably reviled.

This brings us back to our starting-point. The main reason why the chapter headings are intrusive is that they betray all the author's allusions and disregard his focus on Constantine. The most telling example is 1.56 : 'the chief originator of these our calamities (whoever he was)' says the *Vita*. Galerius, the editor hastens to tell us. Seldom does the heading interpolator fail : most notably with Severus and Galerius in Italy (1.26-27), the prefect's wife who suicided (1.34), the bishops condemned to death (2.2), Diocletian (2.51) and the Eusebius at Nicaea (3.11). Interestingly, Eusebius refers to two of these matters in his *History*, also without giving names. The author of the headings was indeed well-informed. Whether this means he was fairly contemporary with Constantine's era as Valesius thought, is hard to say. Most of the people concerned were well enough known to later ecclesiastical and secular sources.

Most fascinating is the link in style between the *Res Gestae* and the *Vita Constantini*. For all its innovations, Christian historiography in some respects remained true to classical models – at least in as fundamental and timeless an exercise as advertisement for the head of state.

University of Melbourne. R. T. RIDLEY.

CONSTANTINE'S PAGAN VISION

An outburst of scholarly activity followed upon Henri Grégoire's "discovery" in 1931 of a panegyrist's version of the emperor Constantine's vision in 310 (1). The anonymous orator who described the event said that Constantine, who was returning to Trier from Marseilles after Maximian's defeat and death, had turned off the road to visit a temple of Apollo, when he learned first that barbarians had been preparing to invade Gaul in his absence, and then that they had forsaken their plan at the news of his return. When Constantine approached the temple to thank the gods for his good fortune, he saw that the gods were awaiting his arrival :

> *... ipsa hoc sic ordinante Fortuna ut te ibi rerum tuarum felicitas admoneret dis immortalibus ferre quae voveras, ubi deflexisses ad templum toto orbe pulcherrimum, immo ad praesentem, ut vidisti, deum. Vidisti enim, credo, Constantine, Apollinem tuum comitante Victoria coronas tibi laureas offerentem, quae tricenum singulae ferunt omen annorum. Hic est enim humanarum numerus aetatum quae tibi utique debentur ultra Pyliam senectutem. Et – immo quid dico 'credo' ? – vidisti teque in illius specie recognovisti, cui totius mundi regna deberi vatum carmina divina cecinerunt. Quod ego nunc demum arbitror contigisse, cum tu sis, ut ille, iuvenis et laetus et salutifer et pulcherrimus, imperator. Merito igitur augustissima illa delubra tantis donariis honestasti, ut iam vetera non quaerant.* (21.3-7)

Since 1931, scholars have asked and attempted to answer many questions about this passage (2) : Is Apollo to be identified with the

(1) H. GRÉGOIRE, "La 'conversion' de Constantin", *Rev. Univ. Brux.*, 36 (1930-31), 231-272. The account of the vision, quoted below, appears in an oration delivered to Constantine in 310, number 6 (7) of the *Panegyrici Latini*. I cite the Oxford text, and numbering, of R. A. B. Mynors. All references in this paper, unless otherwise specified, are to the sixth panegyric.

(2) The bibliography on this subject is enormous. For general assessments of the *Panegyrici* as evidence for Constantine's religious development, see R. PICHON,

Graeco-Roman Apollo, with the sun-god Sol Invictus, or with a Gallic deity (3) ? What was the symbol on the laurel crowns (4) ? Did Constantine or one of his advisers or the panegyrist invent the vision, or did the emperor really believe in it ? If something happened in the temple, what was it (5) ? It is impossible to answer

Les derniers écrivains profanes (Paris, 1906), 102-107 ; J. MAURICE, "Les discours des panegyrici latini et l'évolution religieuse sous le règne de Constantin", *C. R. Acad. Inscr.* (Paris, 1909), 165-179 ; C. CASTELLO, "Il pensiero politico-religioso di Costantino alla luce dei panegirici", *Accademia Romanistica Costantiniana, Atti I° convegno internaz. ... 1973* (Perugia, 1975), 49-117 ; see also most of the works cited in nn. 3-6 below. C. JULLIAN, *Histoire de la Gaule*, 7 (Paris, 1926), 106, n. 7, realistically described the aim of the panegyric : "une manifestation politique en faveur du droit héréditaire de Constantin, ... une profession de foi apollinaire" ; cf. CASTELLO, 81-83.

(3) Apollo : W. SESTON, "La vision païenne de 310 et les origines du chrisme constantinien", *Mélanges F. Cumont* (Brussels, 1936), 381 ; C. LIGOTA, "Constantiniana", *Journal of The Warburg Institute*, 26 (1963), 182 ; S. G. MACCORMACK, "Roma, Constantinopolis, the Emperor and his Genius", *CQ*, 69 (1975), 139. Sol Invictus : J. MOREAU, "Sur la vision de Constantin", *Revue des Études anciennes* (*REA*), 55 (1953), 307-333 ; Apollo-Sol : P. ORGELS, "La première vision de Constantin (310) et le temple d'Apollon à Nîmes", Acad. roy. de Belgique : *Bull. de la classe des lettres et des sciences morales et politiques*, 34 (1948), 177-179. A Gallic deity : C. JULLIAN (n. 2), 107 ("l'Apollo celtique, héritier de l'antique Bélénus") ; J. J. HATT, "La vision de Constantin au sanctuaire de Grand et l'origine celtique du labarum", *Latomus*, 9 (1950), 433 and *Histoire de la Gaule* (Paris, 1955), 225 ; J. LEGALL, "Les cheveux de Constantin", in *Mélanges d'histoire ancienne offerts à William Seston* (Paris, 1974), 267-276.

(4) On the question of the *omen tricennum*, see C. JULLIAN (n. 2), 107, n. 3 ("Il s'agit des trois lettres, XXX") ; H. GRÉGOIRE, "La statue de Constantin et le signe de la croix", *L'Ant. Class.*, 1 (1932), 136 (he also believes the symbol on the crowns was XXX ; X = *vota*) ; A. ALFÖLDI, "The Helmet of Constantine with the Christian Monogram", *Journal of Roman Studies* (*JRS*), 21 (1932), 9, n. 6 ("the bestowal of Vota-wreaths on the emperors by divinities, is a typical part of the symbolism of the decennalian celebrations") ; W. SESTON (n. 3), 384, 390 (the god held a star, symbol of Apollo's favor ; the panegyrist's *omen tricennum* was a literary fiction) ; P. ORGELS (n. 3), 192 (defends X as the sign : "rien n'était plus banal, d'ailleurs, à cette époque, que la représentation de la Victoire gravant le chiffre des *vota* sur un bouclier") ; J. J. HATT, *Latomus*, 9 (1950), 427-429, 432 (a banner, the labarum, a Celtic symbol of immortality) ; J. MOREAU (n. 3), 320 (a star, *, symbol of Sol Invictus).

(5) H. Grégoire (n. 4), 135 believed that the vision was important to Constantine, and that the only officially-attested vision was the pagan one in 310 ; he later ("La vision de Constantin 'liquidée' ", *Byzantion*, 14 [1939], 348-349) observed that Constantine had a vision, or a dream, in the temple, in Gaul, or at Rome : the important point is that he wanted the panegyrist to publicize this vision and that it was a pagan vision. J. BIDEZ, "A propos d'une biographie nouvelle de l'empereur Constantin", *L'Ant. Class.*, 1 (1932), 5-6, believed that the panegyrist invented the vision ; A. ALFÖLDI, *The Conversion of Constantine and Pagan Rome* (Oxford, 1948), 18, n. 3, agreed with Bidez. J. ZEILLER, "Quelques remarques sur la 'vision' de Constantin", *Byzantion*, 14 (1939), 338-339, said that the orator represented the statue of Apollo as alive (prosopopoieia), and that there was not really a vision. P. Orgels (n. 3), 190-191 thought that there was a genuine "prodige" in the temple, but that Constantine saw actual statues of the gods (i.e. not phantoms) ; J. J. HATT, *Latomus*, 9 (1950), 432, agreed that Constantine saw himself in a group of statuary depicting Apollo and Victoria. E. GALLETIER, "La mort de Maximien d'après le panégyrique de 310 et la vision de Constantin au temple d'Apollon", *REA*, 52 (1950), 299, believed that the vision was neither a true hallucination nor an invention of the orator, but "une ingénieuse mise en scène des prêtres du temple". C. Ligota (n. 3), 182 suggested that Constantine saw a statue of himself in Apollo's dress, or a statue of Apollo with his own head substituted for Apollo's. J. LeGall and S. G. MacCormack (n. 3) have both stated that the emperor saw himself in the image of the god (a different god in each case), and, finally, R. MACMULLEN, *Constantine* (New York : Harper Torchbooks, 1971, reprint of 1969 edition), 66-67, said that Constantine saw something in the temple and that the panegyrist turned the emperor's experience to artistic account.

(6) P. Orgels (n. 3) placed the temple at Nîmes ; C. Jullian (n. 2), 107, n. 2, J. J. Hatt (n. 3) and E. Galletier (n. 5) at Grand.

any of these questions, for there is little outside evidence from which to argue ; even the location of the temple is in doubt (6). One will never know what, if anything, "really" happened ; the panegyrist's words are all that anyone knows of the events on that day. A more appropriate question, to which I address myself here, would be : What does the orator say about Constantine ? The panegyric contains a specific message, symbolized and summarized in the account of the vision, which the orator, presumably with the emperor's approval, wanted to proclaim to his audience. A brief review of the panegyric and the political circumstances therein described or ignored will place the vision in its context within the speech.

This panegyric is the first extant public oration delivered to Constantine after his father-in-law's final defeat. Herculius was dead ; it was the panegyrist's duty to justify Constantine's position, to describe Maximian's revolt as an act of madness (15.2 : *error iam desipientis aetatis*), or as a necessity imposed by unkindly fate (14.3 :

neminem hominum peccare nisi fato et ipsa scelera mortalium actus esse fortunae). But the orator exceeds the bounds of apology. He is aware that Constantine has other imperial colleagues : Galerius, Licinius, Maximin Daia in the East, and at Rome Maxentius, who in a rush of filial piety after his father's death reaffirmed his relationship with the emperor whom he had chased out of Italy two years before. The panegyrist finds a plausible reason for speaking only to Constantine on this occasion, without the praises, traditional since 286, of absent co-rulers :

> *Itaque primum illud compendium faciam quod, cum omnes vos, invictissimi principes, quorum concors est et socia maiestas, debita veneratione suspiciam, hunc tamen quantulumcumque tuo modo, Constantine, numini dicabo sermonem. Vt enim ipsos immortales deos, quamquam universos animo colamus, interdum tamen in suo quemque templo ac sede veneramur, ita mihi fas esse duco omnium principum pietate meminisse, laudibus celebrare praesentem.* (1. 4-5)

The orator has made a perfunctory allusion to the Tetrarchic ideal of peaceful coexistence and unanimity of purpose, but that is all : the emperor in Gaul enjoyed no references to his colleagues save notices of their failures (7). Constantine also had a special claim to pre-eminence. The orator ignores his promotion to Augustus at the hands of Maximian ; Constantine needed no other's support for of the co-rulers he alone is descended from two emperors : Divus Claudius now makes his first recorded appearance as ancestor of the house of Constantine (8).

(7) The only living ruler to receive a favorable notice is Diocletian (15.4 : *divinum illum virum*), happy in his retirement, with whom the panegyrist compares Maximian who has an insatiable thirst for power. One may compare *Pan. Lat.*, 12 (9).3.4 and 4.3. : *Duxerat magnum Severus exercitum, et hostem suum perfidia desertus armaverat ; maiores postea copias Maximianus [Galerius] admoverat, et ipse transfugis circumcisus videbatur prospere refugisse. Ipse denique qui pater illius credebatur discissam ab umeris purpuram detrahere conatus senserat in illud dedecus sua fata transisse ... erat ille Maximiani suppositus.* These are the only examples in any panegyric addressed to Constantine in which an orator names other emperors, besides Constantius I or Claudius Gothicus, and even in these instances the emperors, who show up at a disadvantage, were all dead at the time that the speech was delivered (313).

(8) *Inter omnes, inquam, participes maiestatis tuae hoc habes, Constantine, praecipuum, quod imperator es <natus>, tantaque est nobilitas originis tuae ut nihil tibi addiderit honoris imperium* (2.5). There is no consensus of opinion on the question of Claudius as Constantine's ancestor, although most scholars dismiss the relationship as apocryphal. C. Jullian (n. 2), 101, n. 6, 228, n. 3, and E. Galletier (Budé edition of the *Panegyrici*, II.42) accept the story. Those who do not include R. Pichon (n. 2), 93-96 ; A. Piganiol, *L'Empereur Constantin* (Paris, 1932), 47-48 ; A. H. M. Jones, *Constantine and the Conversion of Europe* (New York, 1949), 65-66 ; J. J. Hatt, *Histoire de la Gaule*, 273 ; H. Dörries, *Konstantin der Grosse* (Stuttgart, 1958), 24 ; R. Syme, *Ammianus and the Historia Augusta* (Oxford, 1968), 115-116, 134 ; J. H. Smith, *Constantine the Great* (London, 1971), 2-3. Pichon sets forth the best argument : he observes that the evidence is hopelessly contradictory. Eutropius 9.22.1 makes Claudius the maternal grandfather of Constantius ; some inscriptions (e.g. *CIL*, 9.9 : *abnepos*) have the same relationship as in Eutropius, while some (*CIL*, 2.4844, 3.3705) call Constantine's sons *Claudii pronepotes* : in other words, Constantius is Claudius' son ; the sixth panegyric uses the inexact expression *avita cognatio* (2.2) ; and in *SHA* (*Claud.*), 25.13.2 Constantius is Claudius' great-nephew on his mother's side.

The orator describes another aspect of the emperor's extraordinary fitness for his position when he delivers what is, compared to similar passages in other panegyrics, one of the most vigorous expressions of belief in an emperor's apotheosis. The panegyrist maintains that Britain is an especially blessed place because Constantine became Caesar there, as he wonders how it happens that the ends of the earth always produce new divinities :

> *Di boni, quid hoc est quod semper ex aliquo supremo fine mundi nova deum numina universo orbi colenda descendunt ? Sic Mercurius a Nilo, cuius fluminis origo nescitur, sic Liber ab Indis prope consciis solis orientis deos se gentibus ostendere praesentes. Sacratiora sunt profecto mediterraneis loca vicina caelo, et inde propius a dis mittitur imperator ubi terra finitur.* (9.4-5)

Constantine has not only been sent by the gods, he is a god himself, a *dei numen*. Even his physical beauty betrays his divine nature :

> *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 intrarit 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.* (17.3-4)

The vision of Apollo comes almost at the end of the speech ; it is the culmination of the panegyrist's claims for his emperor. The orator's general intention has escaped no one : Constantine has repudiated Maximian and has set forth dynastic claims of his own ; he is not unwilling to hear himself described as the man fated to take over the entire earth. As an indication, and integral part, of his new political policy, he rejects his former patron Hercules, adopted perforce because of his and his father's relationship with Maximian, and promotes a new divine protector, Apollo.

As Henri Grégoire and others have stressed repeatedly (9), the most important aspect, not only of the vision but of the entire panegyric, is Constantine's rejection of his former political stance. In 306 he had been willing to receive recognition, as Caesar, from Galerius, although the evidence of Panegyric 7 (6) (delivered in 307) suggests that neither he nor Maximian wanted to be too closely associated with the eastern rulers (10). In 307 he married Maximian's daughter, a step which further strengthened his position in the West by assuring him of the friendship of the rulers at Rome. But when Maximian returned to Italy to face Galerius' invasion, Constantine remained neutral. After the meeting at Carnuntum in 308 and Maximian's second retirement (11), Constantine received his father-

(9) Sometimes to no avail : B. H. WARMINGTON, "Aspects of Constantinian Propaganda in the Panegyrici Latini", *TAPA*, 104 (1974), 377, believes that "the message of the panegyrist of 310 is therefore one of reassurance in a difficult moment rather than the proclamation of an extensive new claim", that the new dynastic claim is not really very important, and that the vision has been overrated.

(10) The author of Panegyric 7 (6) ignores the Eastern rulers, who were at odds with Maximian and Maxentius if not with Constantine, and he defends as well the principle of dynastic succession and rejoices that the empire will finally be reunited under the rule of one family, the Herculii (*Pan. Lat.*, 7 [6].2.2-5). In addition, as one may expect given the date (307) and circumstances of the oration, the panegyrist argues at length that Maximian's retirement in 304 was improper, unjust, and nearly the cause of disaster for the empire (*Pan. Lat.*, 7 [6].9.1-12.8).

(11) LACTANTIUS, *De mort. pers.*, 29 and the panegyrist of 310 (16.1) both say that Maximian retired twice, once with Diocletian and again after his falling-out with Maxentius. E. A. SYDENHAM, "The Vicissitudes of Maximian after his Abdication", *Num. Chron.*, 14 (1934), 141-167, notes that there was a new series of abdication coins issued shortly after the meeting in Carnuntum in November 308, when Licinius was elected to replace Severus, and he believes that Maximian's second abdication took place at this time. C. H. V. SUTHERLAND, *The*

in-law as an honored guest, but not as co-ruler. The old man's rebellion was an embarrassment not only because any usurpation created an uncomfortable situation for emperors and panegyrists alike, but also because of the family connection between the two men.

Constantine practised a certain economy in his propaganda. Claudius Gothicus appears in the panegyrics of 310 and 312, but not again in Constantinian propaganda, after Maxentius was removed, until 317 when Constantine was on the point of marching against Licinius. There is little point in claiming that one's ancestors are better than anyone's else unless one actually has a rival in mind. Constantine's association with a new divinity was part of his new political statement and, as such, the claim to a vision must have originated with Constantine himself. If the priests at the temple of Apollo set up something without consulting the emperor, they were either very lucky or very shrewd.

The evidence of Constantine's coinage, on which the sun-god figures prominently after 310 (12), suggests that the emperor had chosen Sol Invictus as his new deity. The orator himself, however, seems to identify the god with the Graeco-Roman Apollo. The god's identity apart, the vision presents a greater problem. One assumption common to all the discussions which I have read is that the orator intended to identify Constantine with Apollo, and he represented Constantine as recognizing himself in the god. The late

Roman Imperial Coinage (*RIC*), 6.158 notes on the coinage of Trier, "The consequences of the Carnuntum conference of November 308 are seen in the appearance of Licinius and in the disappearance of Herculius". For a recent analysis of the relationships of the multiple emperors after 306, see the works of P. Bruun cited in note 12.

(12) SUTHERLAND, *RIC*, 6.32, 161 : "Mars and Sol now emerge on the *aes* of Trier as Constantine's 'popular' projection of his imperial personality, though he shares SOLI INVICTO COMITI in one rare courtesy issue with Maximinus. Date, c. 310-13". Many of Constantine's coins show the sun-god during the years 310 and following, with legends SOLI INVICTO COMITI (*RIC*, 6.227), SOLI COMITI AVG N, SOLI COMITI CONSTANTINI AVG, SOLI INVICT COM DN, SOLI INVICTO COMITI, etc. (*RIC*, 7.752-753). See also P. BRUUN, "Constantine's Change of Dies Imperii", *Arctos*, 9 (1975), 19, and "Portrait of a Conspirator", *Arctos*, 10 (1976), 5 ; G. H. HALSBERGHE, *The Cult of Sol Invictus* (Leiden, 1972), 167-169 ; H. P. L'ORANGE, "Sol Invictus Imperator. Ein Beitrag zur Apotheose", *Symbolae Osloenses*, 14 (1935), 101.

Professor Paul Alexander, however, once asked me to consider whether the panegyrist's depiction of the encounter were not more ambiguous. It is time to examine the details which the orator provides.

The panegyrist of 310 began his description of Constantine's vision by mentioning two familiar attributes of successful emperors : *felicitas* (= fortune in war) and, by implication, *pietas*, the paying of one's just debts to the gods, who will continue to aid the ruler who honors them (13). The orator has carefully designed the vision as a further means of recommending the emperor to his subjects.

The first intimation of a vision is simply phrased : *deflexisses ad templum ... immo ad praesentem, ut vidisti, deum*. Here Apollo is a *praesens deus*. When the panegyrist had first spoken of Constantine as a god, he likened him to Liber and Mercury, *deos se gentibus ostendere praesentes* (9.4 ; cf. 22.1 *praesentissimus hic deus* [Constantine]). The Latin expression *praesens deus*, corresponding to the Greek *θεὸς ἐπιφανής*, is used of a god, or an emperor, who manifests himself in his divinity to men (14). It is an act of power, and of revelation : Constantine is a *praesens deus* to the rest of mankind, and Apollo is a *praesens deus* to Constantine. The orator emphasizes Constantine's actual physical perception of Apollo, physically present : *Et – immo quid dico 'credo' ? – vidisti*. It cannot be a question merely of statues ! The orator speaks of a manifestation, he says that the god himself actually appeared to Constantine.

Apollo was accompanied by Victoria (15), who has already appeared once before in this speech. It was she who brought on her wings the *maiestas* which Jupiter had sent to Constantine in 306 when the Roman army in Britain first elected him emperor immediately after his father's death (8.5). Her appearance in the vision of 310 reaffirms Constantine's right to rule. Apollo offers him laurel crowns, symbol of victory ; there are at least three crowns (16), possibly more, each bearing a symbol for thirty years (17). Thirty years was, of course, a generation, as the orator explains (*Hic est enim humanarum numerus aetatum*) ; he believes that Constantine will live longer than Nestor, who ruled over three generations of men (18). The wish for a long – if not infinite – rule is traditional in the context of panegyric ; compare the words of another orator in 313 (19) :

> *Quamobrem te, summe rerum sator, ... oramus et quaesumus ut hunc in omnia saecula principem serves. Parum est enim optare tantae virtuti tantaeque pietati quem longissimum habet vita processum ... Fac igitur ut, quod optimum humano generi dedisti, permaneat aeternum, omnesque Constantinus in terris degat aetates.* (*Pan. Lat.*, 12[9].26.1, 2, 4)

When a *praesens deus* appears, it is to do something or to prove that he has done something for the beholder. Apollo reveals to Constantine that he, the emperor, is the one who has been foretold as the ruler of the entire world : *teque in illius specie recognovisti, cui*

(13) M. P. CHARLESWORTH, "*Pietas* and *Victoria* : The Emperor and the Citizen", *JRS*, 33 (1943), 1-10, has discussed the emperors' *pietas* and its ultimate aim : the gods' favor, indicated by their gift of *felicitas*, the most important aspect of which is military success.

(14) See A. D. NOCK, "Notes on the Ruler Cult, I-IV", *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 48 (1928), 40 : "A god or a divine king is *ἐπιφανής* when he by his *ἐπιφανεία* produces some striking result. A king may show his superhuman powers in healing or again in controlling the weather, but his normal field is war".

(15) Some scholars have offered other explanations for her presence in this scene. P. Orgels (n. 3), 191 says that Apollo was often confused with Sol Invictus, who was habitually accompanied by Victoria ; J. LeGall (n. 3), 273 believes that Victoria became associated with a female divinity, part of the traditional Gallic divine couple.

(16) The word *singulae* itself shows that the number is greater than two, which would have been indicated by the adjective *utraque*.

(17) Those who believe that the symbol was a star have a down-to-earth explanation of its use. W. Seston (n. 3), 390 observes, "Chaque fois qu'il veut manifester son droit à l'empire du monde, il l'inscrit sur ses monnaies", J. Moreau (n. 3), 326 agrees that the sign appears each time that Constantine "affirme ou précise ses prétentions à l'empire universel".

(18) Nestor's age (*Il.*, 1.250-252 ; *Od.*, 3.245) was proverbial ; cf. CICERO, *Sen.*, 10.31 (*tertiam iam enim aetatem hominum videbat*) ; MARTIAL, 2.64.3 (*Nestoris aetas*), 4.1.3. (*Pylium aevum*), 8.2.7 & 10.38.14 (*Pylia senecta*), 9.29.1 & 13.117.1 (*Nestorea senecta*) ; JUVENAL, 12.128 (*Vivat Pacuvius, quaeso, vel Nestorea totum*). The orator probably found the inspiration for his phrase in a handbook.

(19) Even Theodosius is supposed to be eternal : *Parum interest quando coeperit quod terminum non habebit* (*Pan. Lat.*, 2 [12].7.6).

totius mundi regna deberi vatum carmina divina cecinerunt. Quod ego nunc demum arbitror contigisse, cum tu sis, ut ille, iuvenis et laetus et salutifer et pulcherrimus, imperator. The *te* is recognizable *in illius specie* ; *illius* is the antecendent of *cui* : Constantine is the one who is fated to rule. The orator reiterates the identity of *tu* and *ille* in the following sentence. Who is the person referred to in the relative clause ? Must he necessarily be Apollo ? The orator does not say so explicitly, nor should he : emperors, not the gods of the pantheon, rule the earth. The very addition of the relative clause betrays the orator's intention : had he wanted to equate Constantine with Apollo, he would have stopped after *recognovisti*, and the message Apollo = *ille* = Constantine would have been clear. Up to this point, the *illius* would appear to refer to what has come before, but the panegyrist upsets this easy assumption when he commences the clause in which he explains who this famous person is.

Much of the difficulty of interpretation is due to two causes : (1) the orator's deliberate ambiguity and (2) the interruption in the description. The words *immo quid dico 'credo' ? – vidisti* comprise an editorial comment : "delete the *credo* in the sentence above". The object of this second *vidisti* is the same as the object of the first, the entire phrase *Apollinem tuum comitante Victoria coronas tibi laureas offerentem* ; the *-que* in *teque* signals the resumption of his next statement, first begun by *Et* and then interrupted : *teque* [or *Et te*] *in illius specie recognovisti, cui totius mundi regna deberi*. The pronoun *illius* is anticipatory, and a new figure enters the picture, a world-ruler. The orator's message is not mere flattery, that is, a description of yet another aspect of Constantine's divine nature, but a statement of political ambition.

The orator has already said that Constantine himself is a new god created for men. But apotheosis does not necessarily bring with it the notion of unity between emperor and an established deity such as Apollo. The panegyrist believes that Constantius I was Constantine's physical father (14.4), and that the emperor was also one of the *nova deum numina*. The orator is not a theologian ; he explains neither the process of apotheosis nor its meaning. Constantine may have become a god only by becoming emperor (which, according to this speaker, he already was from birth), or, like Mercury and Liber, he was born divine but only later revealed his true nature. The question here, however, is not whether divinity

is connected to the office or to the man, but whether Constantine is the same as Apollo. The panegyrist does not say that Constantine *is* Apollo, he calls the god *Apollo tuus*, "your Apollo", not "you, Apollo". He continues, in the sentences which immediately follow the description of the vision, to maintain the distinction :

> *Iam omnia te vocare ad se templa videantur praecipueque Apollo noster, ... Di immortales, quando illum dabitis diem, quo praesentissimus hic deus omni pace composita illos quoque Apollinis lucos ... circumeat ? ... Miraberis profecto illam quoque numinis tui sedem ...* (21.7-22.2)

The last clause may contain another ambiguity, for the word *numen* sometimes meant emperor, sometimes god. If it means "god" here it is equivalent in function to *comes*, the special protecting divinity represented as particularly attached to a specific emperor.

Even the author of Panegyric 11 (3), who addressed Maximian in 291 and whose effusive assertions of his emperor's divinity rival those of the orator of 310, was not unaware of the difference between the emperors Diocletian and Maximian and their tutelary deities, although in the following context the distinction affords the opportunity for additional flattery : *non opinione traditus sed conspicuus et praesens Iuppiter cominus invocari, non advena sed imperator Hercules adorari* (*Pan. Lat.*, 11[3].10.5). A late antique man may have explained, if pressed, that Constantine or any other emperor was divine because he was associated with a certain divinity who worked through him or in him, that the emperor was the physical manifestation of one god – or of a divine force – just as the sun is of another. But such a definition stops short of equation, a revelation in effect, in this case, that Constantine never existed, that the emperor called Constantine was Apollo all the time. Constantine was a new deity ; Apollo was not.

One possible description, not yet advanced by anyone, of the conception which the orator may have formed of the vision is that Constantine saw three figures – Apollo, Victoria, and himself – and he recognized that he was the long-awaited ruler. It is useless to speculate on the actuality of the vision, let alone the problem of whether or not it is possible to see one's own face in a dream/hallucination, or whether the orator was aware of all the psychological niceties involved in the depiction and interpretation of such phenomena. The vision may well have been an invention the

sole purpose of which was to introduce a specific claim on Constantine's behalf. Before I discuss this claim, I offer here a translation of the entire passage (21.3-7) quoted at the beginning of this paper :

> ... Fortune herself thus arranged it that the successful outcome of your affairs advised you to offer to the immortal gods what you had vowed, in the place where you had turned aside to the most beautiful temple in the whole world, or rather, to the god manifest in person, as you saw. You saw, I believe, Constantine, your Apollo, accompanied by Victoria, offering you laurel wreaths, each of which bears a sign of thirty years. Now this is the reckoning of human generations, which assuredly are due to you, beyond the long years of Nestor. And – but why do I say "I believe ?" – you saw [your Apollo, accompanied by Victoria, offering you laurel crowns,] and you recognized yourself in the figure of that (famous) person to whom was owed the rule of the entire world, as the divine songs of the poets prophesied. And now, at last, I think that their prophecy has been fulfilled, since you, like him, are young and joyous and health-bringing and most beautiful, emperor. Fittingly, therefore, you graced that venerable shrine with such lavish offerings that it does not miss its former riches.

I have said that a new figure enters the picture, someone whom the panegyrist describes as *iuvenis et laetus et salutifer et pulcherrimus*. He has in mind a definite personage, of whom the *vatum carmina divina* have sung. The author of Panegyric 6 is a literary man (20), and it would be a mistake to ignore the obvious literary allusion in this passage (21). Virgil comes instantly to mind (22), and

(20) At the end of his oration (23.1-2) he recommends to the emperor not only his five sons but his many students ; he was probably a teacher of rhetoric at the schools of Autun, although he had been a functionary in the imperial administration as well. He prefaces his commendation with a disparaging account of his speaking ability : *hanc meam qualemcumque vocem diversis otii et palatii officiis exercitam*.

(21) C. Ligota (n. 3), 181-182 has warned against such a neglect of the mise-en-scène and literary context ; see further n. 23.

(22) This panegyric contains frequent verbal allusions to and borrowings from all Virgil's works ; most of these, however, are commonplaces. For examples, see A. Klotz, "Studien zu den Panegyrici Latini", *Rheinisches Museum*, 66 (1911), 555. The only other poet whom Klotz mentions for this orator is Statius. One

more than one scholar has already seen a connection between this passage and the Fourth *Eclogue* (23). He who decides, before examining the literary implications of the vision, that Constantine is Apollo, will find exactly what he seeks : *tuus iam regnat Apollo* (*Ecl.*, 4.10), an obvious allusion based on the orator's *Apollinem tuum*. I have no quarrel ; but the orator has not yet mentioned the *carmina divina*, and Virgil's inclusion of Apollo's rule in the Fourth *Eclogue* is an introduction of a variant expression for "golden age" (cf. *Saturnia regna* in line 5 and *gens aurea* in line 9), not a prophecy that Apollo will rule personally. When the panegyrist introduces a poet's prophecy of a ruler for the earth, he might well have in mind the first Augustus, whose advent is thrice foretold in the *Aeneid*, rather than the child, whoever he may have been, of the Fourth *Eclogue*, or the god spoken of there.

In the first book of the *Aeneid*, Jupiter consoles Venus with a short history of the Roman people, culminating in the accession of Caesar Augustus (24) ; Anchises also describes the great ruler to his son, in more detail and in a way more pertinent to the panegyrist's prophecy :

> *hic vir, hic est, tibi quem promitti saepius audis,*
> *Augustus Caesar, divi genus, aurea condet*
> *saecula qui rursus Latio regnata per arva*

must assume that as a school teacher the panegyrist knew his Virgil well, but other Augustan poets perhaps less well. The plural *vatum* may be loosely applied ; in conjunction with *carmina divina* the name Virgil must have been uppermost in the orator's mind. One must not forget the circumstances and the audience : in fourth-century Trier, few listeners, including the emperor, may be expected to have read any of the Augustan poets except Virgil, if their education extended even to that.

(23) C. Ligota (n. 21) cites the Fourth *Eclogue* as the poem to which the orator alludes, and notes that A. Alföldi (n. 4) had already seen the connection. Ligota and P. Orgels (n. 3), 178, n. 2 both equate Constantine's identification with Apollo as an imitation of Augustus, who, according to Servius (*ad Aen.*, 8.681), wore a star on his helmet. Servius also advises in the context of *Ecl.*, 4.10 : *et tangit Augustum cui simulacrum factum est cum Apollinis cunctis insignibus*.

(24) *Aen.*, 1.286-291 : *nascetur pulchra Troianus origine Caesar, / imperium Oceano, famam qui terminet astris, / Iulius, a magno demissum nomen Iulo. / hunc tu olim caelo spoliis Orientis onustum / accipies secura ; vocabitur hic quoque votis. / aspera tum positis mitescent saecula bellis.*

Saturno quondam, super et Garamantas et Indos
proferet imperium ; iacet extra sidera tellus,
extra anni solisque vias, ubi caelifer Atlas
axem umero torquet stellis ardentibus aptum.
huius in adventum iam nunc et Caspia regna
responsis horrent divum et Maeotia tellus,
et septemgemini turbant trepida ostia Nili.
nec vero Alcides tantum telluris obivit,
fixerit aeripedem cervam licet, aut Erymanthi
pacarit nemora et Lernam tremefecerit arcu ;
nec qui pampineis victor iuga flectit habenis
Liber, agens celso Nysae de vertice tigris (*Aen.*, 6.791-805)

Augustus is Virgil's long-awaited ruler, and it is to Augustus, I suggest, that the panegyrist alludes. He has already described Britain, in the context of Constantine's accession, in terms which poets and panegyrists usually reserve for the golden age [25] ; he has already compared Constantine favorably to Julius Caesar in the ease with which he captured Marseilles, a town which once before had preferred a *dux senior* (Pompeius) to the ultimate victor (19.3). In the description of Augustus' domain in *Aeneid* 6 Anchises says that Augustus will rule over more lands than Hercules has visited : this convenient slight of Maximian's patron divinity may even have been in the orator's mind.

A third reference to Augustus occurs in the description of Aeneas' shield in Book 8. At Actium, Virgil's Augustus represents traditional Roman values : *hinc Augustus agens Italos in proelia Caesar / cum patribus populoque, penatibus et magnis dis* (*Aen.*, 8.678-679) [26]. Constantine, the panegyrist says, is also a traditionalist : *Renovasti, imperator, veterem illam Romani imperii fiduciam, quae de captis*

(25) 9.1-2 : *O fortunata et nunc omnibus beatior terris Britannia, quae Constantinum Caesarem prima vidisti ! Merito te omnibus caeli ac soli bonis Natura donavit, in qua nec rigor est nimius hiemis nec ardor aestatis, in qua segetum tanta fecunditas ut muneribus utrisque sufficiat et Ceceris et Liberi, in qua nemora sine immanibus bestiis, terra sine serpentibus noxiis, contra pecorum mitium innumerabilis multitudo lacte distenta et onusta velleribus.* One may also compare Virgil's praise of Italy in *Georgics*, 2, especially lines 149-154.

(26) Note the emphatic position of *Italos* in 8.678, and especially the "Roman" tone in the following verse, with its consciously archaic ring : alliteration and the echo of Ennius (201, V).

hostium ducibus vindictam morte sumebat (10.5). Actian Apollo took part in the battle of 31 B.C. (*Aen.*, 8.704-705) ; afterwards Augustus sat in the threshold of Apollo's temple at Rome, receiving gifts and hanging them up as offerings in the temple (*Aen.*, 8.720-722). Augustus himself was specially attached to Apollo, to whom he built a temple after the battle at Actium ; he was also a zealous restorer of the temples and rites of the gods. Constantine's panegyrist attributes this same *pietas* to his emperor : after his victory, and the vision granted by Apollo, he so generously enriched the shrine that all temples, especially the temple of Apollo in the orator's native city of Autun, wanted the emperor to come and do the same for them (21.7). Flowers may grow where Jupiter and Juno have lain, but in Constantine's footprints rise up cities and temples (22.7).

The panegyrist describes the one fated to inherit the earth with the adjectives *iuvenis*, *laetus*, *salutifer*, *pulcherrimus* : one cannot help thinking of Apollo, who was surely thought to have been all of those things. But he was not the only one. All Roman emperors were supposed to be *laetus* and *salutifer* ; Constantine himself was a *iuvenis* and exceptionally good-looking as well, if one may believe his flatterers (17.1 : *Pulchrum enim, di boni, et caeleste miraculum imperator adulescens*) [27]. Statues of Augustus show a *iuvenis pulcher* (Constantine was not so fortunate in his artists) ; he was very young when he came to power and he often figured as a *iuvenis* in Augustan poetry (e.g. VIRGIL, *Ecl.*, 1.42), especially in passages of prophetic content (VIRGIL, *Georg.*, 1.500 ; HORACE, *C.*, 1.2.41, *Serm.*, 2.5.62). Virgil says that Augustus' *origo* is *pulchra* (*Aen.*, 1.286) and that the temples of his head are *laeta* [28] ; as the ruler of a

(27) Compare 17.4 (*cuius tam pulchra forma est quam certa divinitas*) and 16.9 (*tua aetatis gratia, tua denique ista venerabilis forma*) ; also three other panegyrists : 4 (10).34.4 ; 7 (6).6.4-5 ; 12 (9).4.3. Flattery of this sort would appear to be more of a commonplace if it were regularly addressed to other emperors, but it is not. In the case of Maximian, one can understand the reason : Eutropius (9.27.1) describes him vividly as a man whom one would not care to look upon (*Herculius autem ... asperitatem suam etiam vultus horrore significans*). Constantine either was *pulcher* or wanted people to say that he was.

(28) They pour forth flames (*Aen.*, 8.680-681) ; cf. *laetitia* at 8.717 and see below on Horace *C.*, 1.2.46 (*laetus intersis populo Quirini*).

golden age (*Aen.*, 6.792-793) he should be considered *salutifer* [29]. There is no reason then to reject Augustus as the person alluded to in the panegyrist's description, and he figures more prominently than Apollo in Virgil's prophecies.

Constantine himself suggested, on some of his coin types, his similarity with the first emperor [30]. In a recent article [31], David Wright has studied numismatic portraits of Constantine and he has observed important changes which occurred in conjunction with important dates in that emperor's history. He notes (pp. 143-145) that beginning in 306 there was a youthful type, similar to those issued by emperors in honor of their sons when the latter had attained the rank of Caesar ; in 310 (pp. 145-146) Constantine issued a fleshy-faced, naturalistic image reminiscent of a much earlier Roman style and quite different from Tetrarchic portraiture. Finally (pp. 146-148), after his defeat of Maxentius in 312, Constantine began to use another idealized type with longer hair than in the preceding portrait, and this type remained standard until after the removal of Licinius in 324. Professor Wright observes :

> This arrangement of Constantine's hair must therefore be associated with the youthful idealized image rather than the fleshy-faced image. The point is not trivial, for the heroic type shown in Fig. 7 [= *RIC*, 7.385, no. 192] is generally recognized as specifically based on the portraits of Augustus, especially the slightly more idealized posthumous portraits which were well known in Constantine's time, and this hair style is similar to that of Augustus. It seems to me that Constantine must have intended some reference to Augustus even as his first portrait type developed, but the reference becomes a specific part of his propaganda after the conquest of Rome. (p. 148)

(29) This word is not found in Virgil but it had become a commonplace epithet for all emperors by the fourth century.

(30) The prominence of Sol in itself suggests a parallel with Augustus : "The 'vision' of 310 was immediately followed by fundamental change in Constantine's *aes* types, which thereafter laid immense emphasis on Sol ... Apollo, for Constantine as for Augustus long ago, was the god of bright and warm regeneration as well as the god of fiery destruction ; ..." (C. H. V. SUTHERLAND, *RIC*, 6.111).

(31) D. H. WRIGHT, "Style in the Visual Arts as Material for Social Research", *Social Research*, 45 (1978), 141-152.

Constantine's panegyrist may be allowed to have followed his emperor's lead, for the resemblances between the first and present emperors, including the real or imagined physical ones, were there. Constantine eventually achieved universal domination and internal peace for the empire. One cannot say whether the orator believed that his prediction would be fulfilled as it was in every respect. Constantine soon attacked and overcame his western rival Maxentius ; his later dealings with Licinius are remarkably similar to Octavian's with Antonius. It is too much, however, to insist that Constantine or his panegyrist had his strategy for the next fourteen years planned out in 310.

Constantine like Augustus was the son of a *divus* and would receive deification in his own right ; the only difference was that in the fourth century an emperor could be called a god while he was still alive. Perhaps I should add, "in prose". Augustan poets were ambiguous on the subject of Augustus' nature. Virgil has Tityrus say that Octavian is a god *to him* (*Ecl.*, 1.7) and that his trip to Rome had been necessary for a powerful reason : *neque servitio me exire licebat / nec tam praesentis alibi cognoscere divos* (*Ecl.*, 1.40-41). Horace imagines Mercury taking on the form of a *iuvenis*/young Caesar (*C.* 1.2.41-52), in a way which is at least syntactically enigmatic, and prays, *serus in caelum redeas, diuque / laetus intersis populo Quirini* (*C.*, 1.2.45-46) [32]. Horace also distinguishes between Jupiter who rules and Caesar who attends to the actual business of ruling on earth : *tu secundo / Caesare regnes. ... te minor laetum reget aequus orbem : / tu gravi curru quaties Olympum* (*C.* 1.12.51-52, 57-58). Finally, Horace slights Jupiter in favor of a more present power in words more ambivalent but similar in tone to the passage from Panegyric 11 (3) cited above :

> *Caelo tonantem credidimus Iovem*
> *regnare : praesens divus habebitur*
> *Augustus adiectis Britannis*
> *imperio gravibusque Persis.* (*C.*, 3.5.1-4)

(32) Nisbet and Hubbard note *ad loc.* : "the epithet [*laetus*] suggests the gracious pleasure of a visiting deity ; ... *intersit* is used naturally of a *praesens deus*".

When the poets (33) of Augustus' time could suggest that a living emperor was divine, it is small wonder if a fourth-century panegyrist is equally ambiguous (34) about his own emperor and the first Augustus as well. It is hard to untangle the evidence relating to the ruler-cult, a theological phenomenon never sufficiently explicated by the ancients themselves, to arrive at a definition which will fit every case. There is every indication that certain emperors called themselves divine or were so called by their well-wishers, but no instance of anyone's asserting that an emperor was actually the same being as any of the long-established gods. Horace (*C.*, 1.2) nearly makes the equation ; the orator of 310 refrains.

Constantine was a new divinity created for the purpose of governing the Roman empire, a new Augustus fulfilling an old prophecy. He is like Augustus in his physical and moral aspects ; like Augustus, he favors Apollo in particular and all the old Roman gods in general :

> *at Caesar, triplici invectus Romana triumpho*
> *moenia, dis Italis votum immortale sacrabat*
> *maxima ter centum totam delubra per urbem.*
> ...
> *ipse sedens niveo candentis limine Phoebi*
> *dona recognoscit populorum aptatque superbis*
> *postibus ; ...* (*Aen.*, 8.714-716, 720-722)
>
> *Merito igitur augustissima* (35) *illa delubra tantis donariis honestasti, ut iam vetera non quaerant. Iam omnia te vocare ad se templa videantur praecipueque Apollo noster, ... Miraberis profecto illam quoque numinis tui sedem et calentes aquas* ... (21.7, 22.2)

(33) And other people : there is some evidence that the inhabitants even of Italy worshipped Augustus while he was still alive. See L. R. Taylor, "The Worship of Augustus in Italy during His Lifetime", *TAPA*, 51 (1920), 116-133 ; note Servius' observations (n. 23) on the relationship between Augustus and Apollo. Suetonius (*Aug.*, 94.4) says that many believed Augustus to be the son of Apollo. There was no doubt in Tacitus' mind as to what Augustus wanted : *nihil deorum honoribus relictum cum se templis et effigie numinum per flamines et sacerdotes coli vellet* (*Ann.*, 1.10).

(34) The ambiguity is most pronounced in the phrase *illam quoque numinis tui sedem* (22.2).

(35) The adjective is evocative both of the traditional Roman deities and of a traditionalist emperor who revived their cults.

My point is perhaps merely a quibble : the panegyrist was probably influenced more by the prophecies in the *Aeneid* than by the tenth line of the Fourth *Eclogue*, and he linked Constantine to Apollo by conceiving of his emperor as a latter-day Augustus, not as Apollo himself. The connection to the god was something which Constantine and Augustus had in common and was secondary to the important political statement which the panegyrist wished to proclaim.

The orator did have a motive, beside that of saying what his emperor liked to hear, in making Constantine the new Augustus. Augustus had established Autun's original circuit and had its walls built ; the panegyrist of 310 hoped that Constantine would also take an interest in the city :

> *Di immortales, quando illum dabitis diem, quo praesentissimus hic deus omni pace composita illos quoque Apollinis lucos et sacras aedes et anhela fontium ora circumeat ? ... Dabis et illic munera, constitues privilegia, ipsam denique patriam meam ipsius loci veneratione restitues. Cuius civitatis antiqua nobilitas et quondam fraterno populi Romani nomine gloriata opem tuae maiestatis exspectat, ut illic quoque loca publica et templa pulcherrima tua liberalitate reparentur* ... (22.1, 3-4)

The orator's prayers were answered. When Constantine visited Autun a year later he was so moved by the city's condition that he granted a remission of five years' arrears of taxes and lowered the *caput* by 7,000, over a fifth of the earlier assessment (*Pan. Lat.*, 5[8].11-13) (36). Constantine fulfilled part at least of the prophecy, for he had proved himself to be genuinely *salutifer* (37) to the citizens of Autun, who renamed their city Flavia Aeduorum in his honor, according to the author of Panegyric 5 (8).

(36) For discussion of the census, units of taxation, and revisions thereof, see two works by Edgar Faure, "Notes sur le panégyrique VIII". *Byzantion*, 31 (1961), 34-41 and, in greater detail, "Étude de la capitation de Dioclétien d'après le Panégyrique VIII", *Varia, Études de droit romain*, Institut de droit romain de l'Université de Paris, 4 (1961), 43-153.

(37) *Pan. Lat.*, 5 (8).11.3 & 5 : *Remissione ista septem milium capitum viginti quinque milibus dedisti vires, dedisti opem, dedisti salutem, ... O divinam, imperator, tuam in sananda civitate medicinam !*

The orator of 310 had done well by his emperor. In return, he hoped that Constantine would restore Autun (38), the city which the first Augustus had founded : it was all in the best tradition (*).

University of Vermont.. Barbara SAYLOR RODGERS.

(38) *Ideoque hoc votis meis sufficit ut patriam meam videas ducente pietate, quia statim erit restituta si videris* (22.7).

(*) I would like to express my gratitude to Professors W. S. Anderson and C. E. Murgia, who provided valuable criticisms of preliminary drafts of this paper.

MÉMOIRES ET DOCUMENTS

L'*HISTOIRE* DE CANTACUZÈNE EN TANT QU'ŒUVRE LITTÉRAIRE

On a beaucoup écrit sur Cantacuzène (1295-1383 env.) (1) ; son œuvre historique est unanimement reconnue comme l'une des sources les plus importantes de la première moitié et du milieu du XIV^e siècle. Il est vrai que tous ceux qui l'ont étudiée considèrent, à juste titre il faut l'avouer, que l'*Histoire* de Cantacuzène est une œuvre partiale qui déforme le tableau d'ensemble et la suite des événements (2). L'*Histoire* a été, néanmoins, fréquemment utilisée comme source, aussi bien pour reconstituer le cours des événements politiques (3) que pour étudier la structure de la société byzantine (4), ou l'histoire des querelles ecclésiastiques (5).

(1) En dehors de la monographie ancienne de T. D. FLORINSKIJ, *Andronik Mladšij i Ioann Kantakuzin*, *Žurnal Ministerstva Narodnogo Prosveščenija*, 204-205, 1879 ; 208, 1880) on peut citer deux ouvrages récents : Lj. MAKSIMOVIČ, *Politička uloga Jovana Kantakuzina posle abdikacije (1354-1383)*, in *ZRVI*, 9 (1966), 19-193, et D. M. NICOL, *The Byzantine Family of Kantakouzenos (Cantacuzenus), ca. 1100-1460*, Washington, 1968, pp. 35-103.

(2) La subversion de la structure du récit chez Cantacuzène peut être partiellement expliquée par des confusions du copiste : v. R. J. LOENERTZ, *Ordre et désordre dans les mémoires de Jean Cantacuzène*, in *REB*, 22 (1964), 222-237 = R. J. LOENERTZ, *Byzantina et Franco-Graeca*, Roma, 1970, pp. 113-130. R. Loenertz suppose même que Cantacuzène n'avait pas, après les avoir achevés, relu ses mémoires.

(3) Nombre d'ouvrages pourraient être cités ; nous nous limitons à ceux-ci : P. LEMERLE, *L'émirat d'Aydin. Byzance et l'Orient*, Paris, 1957 ; U. V. BOSCH, *Kaiser Andronikos III Palaiologos*, Amsterdam, 1965 ; E. FRANCES, *Quelques aspects de la politique de Jean Cantacuzène*, in *RivSBN*, 5 (15), (1968), 167-176 ; C. P. KYRRIS, *John Cantacuzène, The Genoese, the Venetians and the Catalans (1348-1354)*, in