

PRISCIAN'S DE LAUDE ANASTASII IMPERATORIS

By

PATRICIA COYNE, B.A., M.A.

A Dissertation

Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies

in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements

for the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy

McMaster University

April 1988

(c) Copyright by Patricia Coyne 1988.



PRISCIAN'S DE LAUDE ANASTASII IMPERATORIS

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY (1988)
(Roman Studies)

McMaster University
Hamilton, Ontario

TITLE: Priscian's De laude Anastasii imperatoris

AUTHOR: Patricia Coyne, B.A. (University of Waterloo)

M.A. (McMaster University)

SUPERVISOR: Professor Averil Cameron

NUMBER OF PAGES: vii, 290

ABSTRACT

Imperial panegyrics have often been dismissed as mere flattery of no literary merit and limited historical value. In recent years, increasing interest in the study of the history of the later Roman empire has led scholars to take a fresh look at panegyrics and to examine their role in the society of the late antique world. Detailed studies of individual works are necessary for this examination and reevaluation of imperial panegyric. This thesis, consisting of translation and commentary, provides such a study, the first in English, of the De laude Anastasii imperatoris, a verse panegyric of the emperor Anastasius (491-518) written in Constantinople by the sixth century author Priscian, best known for his works on Latin grammar.

Set in its literary context, the panegyric illustrates one stage in the Christianization of a secular literary genre. To praise his Christian emperor and justify his rule in terms of Christian political theory, the poet abandons the epic style and mythological allusions used by his predecessors in Latin verse panegyric. Instead, Priscian versifies the outline for imperial panegyric provided in rhetorical handbooks. Literary tradition, however, dictates that his language and poetic adornment be neutral, acceptable to both pagan and Christian, and as a result there are few overtly Christian elements in the poem.

In the panegyric, Priscian creates the image of an emperor chosen by God and protected by His might. The skilful development of and emphasis on such an image suggest that historically the poem should be dated to the later part of Anastasius' reign when religious controversy and armed rebellion threatened his throne. More specifically, the panegyrist's portrait of the emperor, combined with references to historical events, indicates that the poem may date to the year 513, the first year of the rebellion of Vitalian. Set in this context, the poem was probably aimed at dissident elements within Anastasius' court and administration.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I began this thesis under the direction of the late Edith Mary Wightman, and it was Edith who first aroused my interest in the history of the later Roman empire. As must all the students privileged to work with her, I remember with gratitude the depth of her scholarship and the generosity which she shared her knowledge with others: gladly did she learn and gladly teach.

I wish to extend special thanks to my supervisor, Averil Cameron, who generously took on the task of guiding this undertaking to completion. Her knowledge and insights have been of immense value in illuminating the problems of the text and the period.

Many thanks are owed to the other members of my thesis committee, Peter Kingston and J.B. Clinard, whose constructive criticism has been helpful throughout.

Finally I wish to thank those who gave me the benefit of their expertise in their various fields and without whose help and encouragement this thesis could not have been completed: Mary Ann Brazel, Michael Coyne, Melissa Clark-Jones, Marie Taylor Davis and Anne Thaler.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	1
Latin Text: <u>De laude Anastasii imperatoris</u>	48
Translation	56
Commentary	71
Appendix A: The Empress Ariadne	254
Appendix B: The Rhetorical Structure of the Panegyrics of Priscian and Procopius of Gaza	264
Bibliography	271

ABBREVIATIONS

The abbreviations used for the works of classical authors are those of the Oxford Classical Dictionary. For the abbreviations of the works of late antique authors, see The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire, vol. 2. Other abbreviations are as follows:

Claudian <u>Cons. Man.</u>	<u>Panegyric on the Consulship of Fl. Manlius Theodorus.</u>
Corippus <u>In laud. Iust.</u>	<u>In laudem Iustini Augusti minoris.</u>
Evagrius <u>Ecc. Hist.</u>	<u>Ecclesiastical History.</u>
Sidonius <u>Pan. Anth.</u>	<u>Panegyric in honour of the emperor Anthemius.</u>
<u>Pan. Maior.</u>	<u>Panegyric in honour of the emperor Maiorianus.</u>
<u>Pan. Avit.</u>	<u>Panegyric in honour of the emperor Avitus.</u>
Socrates <u>Hist. Eccl.</u>	<u>Historia Ecclesiastica.</u>
Sozomen <u>Hist. Eccl.</u>	<u>Historia Ecclesiastica.</u>
Zacharias Rhetor <u>Hist. Eccl.</u>	<u>Historia Ecclesiastica.</u>
Zonaras <u>Epit.</u>	<u>Epitome historiarum.</u>

INTRODUCTION

Sir Nathaniel: Laus Deo bone intelligo.

Holofernes: Bone? bone, for bene: Priscian a little scratched;
twill serve.

Shakespeare, Love's Labours Lost

George Orwell, whose essays on politics and literature contain many useful insights for the student of classical as well as of modern literature, remarked that "there is always a temptation to claim that any book whose tendency one disagrees with must be a bad book from a literary point of view".¹ Ancient panegyric has suffered from just this form of bias. Scholars have regarded panegyric at best as propaganda and at worst as gross flattery of undeserving despots. Michael Grant's description of Priscian the Grammarian's panegyric of the emperor Anastasius as touching the "rock bottom of groveling servility"² is a typical reflection of this attitude. Our distaste for political autocracy has prevented us from taking an objective view of the literary merits of ancient panegyric and from appreciating the function of panegyric in Greek and Roman society. Panegyrics have been viewed as inferior literary products, written to adhere to rigid rhetorical formulae of structure and content and hence as lacking originality and merit. Yet anyone reading the corpus of extant panegyrics must be surprised by the variety achieved by the writers within the conventions of the genre. Moreover, as within any type of

literature, the practitioners themselves vary in their literary accomplishments, from the virtuosity of Claudian to the solid competence of Priscian.

If political bias has led us to underestimate the literary merits of panegyric, even more serious has been the failure to perceive the importance of panegyric for understanding the society which produced it. The two features which have been regarded as most offensive, panegyric's conventional rhetorical structure and the propagandistic nature of its subject matter, are paradoxically the elements which give panegyric its value as an historical source. Working within a given framework accepted and understood by his audience, a panegyrist could adapt the framework to suit his particular situation. Studying the panegyrist's techniques provides a far deeper understanding of the historic context than any mere mining of a panegyric for references to isolated historical events. To class the message of panegyrics as propaganda is convenient but misleading. To comment on events, to create images to fit a given situation, to offer public affirmation of the values of society, to justify the contemporary power structure, to remind the audience of the civic virtues of their urban culture or of the imperial virtues of their ruler, the task of a panegyrist might be any or all of these.

— Many more panegyrics were produced than have survived. In view of their popularity and their functions, one way to consider them is as a dominant literary form expressing popular culture and widely-held views, although in the ancient world it must always be remembered

that both culture and views are those of the educated governing elite. Suggestive equivalents to panegyrics in our modern world might be such television and radio programmes as 60 Minutes, The Journal or Sunday Morning. Reaching a large audience, these programmes interpret events within a format that is understood and so is accessible. Ephemeral, in that the events on which they focus are often of no lasting historical significance, and biased in their sometimes one-sided presentation, these very qualities make such programmes indicators of contemporary values and culture. Just so does panegyric reflect similar aspects of ancient society, although its mirror can be distorted through lack of other evidence.

A rehabilitation of panegyric has been part of the growing interest of scholars in the late antique period. Fresh examinations of extant Latin and Greek panegyrics have established their value as evidence for the political and cultural life of the late empire, have increased awareness of the role of panegyrics in imperial ceremony and the place of such ceremonial performances in the society and have cast new light on the intellectual milieu of the panegyrists, the literary tradition in which they wrote and their individual uses of that tradition.³ In the light of such developments, I have undertaken an examination of Priscian's panegyric of the emperor Anastasius and have attempted to set this panegyric in its historical and literary context.

4

THE DE LAUDE ANASTASII IMPERATORIS: MANUSCRIPTS AND EDITIONS

Only one manuscript, Vindobonensis 16, folios 50-52, contains the complete text of the De laude Anastasii imperatoris. This manuscript is mostly devoted to various patristic and grammatical treatises copied probably in the eighth century at the monastery of Saint Columban at Bobbio. In the sixteenth century, the manuscript was removed to the monastery of Saint Giovanni a Carbonare in Naples. From Naples it passed in 1717 to the imperial library in Vienna where it was catalogued in 1799. After the First World War the manuscript was returned to Naples.⁴ A second manuscript, Bernensis 363, folio 195, contains the preface and the first forty-four verses of the poem. Much of this manuscript, which dates to the eighth or ninth century, is devoted to the poems of Hórace.⁵

The De laude Anastasii imperatoris was first edited with an historical commentary by Endlicher in 1828.⁶ Despite the fact that many of the non-Greek eastern sources were not available, this is still a useful edition. Endlicher explains the historical references in the panegyric and compares Priscian's version of events with those given in other sources which he often quotes extensively. Endlicher's text of the panegyric was included in the Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae.⁷ His edition was also used by E.F. Corpet, who published the Latin text with a French translation and a few historical and literary comments in 1845.⁸ Endlicher had had available to him only the manuscript in Vienna, and in 1883 Baehrens published a new edition of the panegyric for which he consulted both manuscripts.⁹ Romano used

Baehren's work as the basis for his own edition of the panegyric, which included an Italian translation and a discussion of certain literary and historical features of the poem.¹⁰ Most recently, Alain Chauvot has published with a commentary the texts and French translations of the panegyrics, one in Latin, the other in Greek, written in honour of the emperor Anastasius by Priscian and Procopius of Gaza.¹¹

THE AUTHOR

The De laude Anastasii is attributed to the Latin grammarian Priscian of Caesarea. All the editors of the panegyric, Endlicher, Corpet, Romano and Chauvot, have accepted his authorship. Yet, Maria Passalacqua in her catalogue of the manuscripts of Priscian does not mention the panegyric and states that the Periegesis is Priscian's only non-grammatical work.¹² One possible method of resolving any doubt would be to carry out a stylistic comparison of the panegyric with the grammatical works known to have been written by Priscian. In order to be both complete and objective, such a study would entail a computer analysis of all Priscian's poetical and grammatical works, together with a similar analysis of a modern author as a control. Such a project is beyond the scope of my thesis. However, there are a number of strong indications that the generally accepted attribution is correct.

One minor but suggestive point connecting the panegyrist with the grammarian is the poet's use of the adjective musicus. This adjective is rare and its most frequent appearance is in the prologues of the playwright Terence. Priscian the grammarian wrote a short

treatise on the metres of Terence (see below). Also, in the dedication of his major grammatical work the Ars Grammatica, Priscian uses the equally rare noun musica (for the use of this adjective and noun, see commentary, note on line 249). Priscian dedicated his Ars Grammatica to a Julianus who has been identified as an official and a poet in Constantinople who had ties with members of the family of Anastasius (see commentary, note on lines 245-253). Both the fame of Priscian as a Latin scholar¹³ and the connection of his patron with the court make it very probable that he would be chosen to declaim a Latin panegyric in honour of Anastasius. A second poem firmly attributed to Priscian and accepted as such by Passalacqua is the Periegesis which appears in a number of manuscripts also containing Priscian's grammatical works and which is attributed to Priscian in these manuscripts.¹⁴ Draths Schmidt compared the imitations of earlier Latin poets, the use of rhetorical figures and the metrical practices of both the De laude Anastasii and the Periegesis and concluded that they were by the same author.¹⁵ The final and most telling argument in favour of Priscian's authorship of the panegyric is the manuscript subscript in Vindobonensis 16 which names Priscian as the author: Explicunt laudes sacratissimi imperatoris Anastasii isaurici et parthici & gothici victoris dictae a Prisciano grammatico. Thus the evidence suggests that Priscian did indeed write the panegyric and I have accepted this premise for the purposes of this thesis.

We have little information about the life of Priscian,¹⁶ although his works survive. These works include, besides his

translation and adaptation of Dionysius' Periegesis, the grammatical works for which he is best known: the comprehensive eighteen book Institutio de arte grammatica and the shorter De figuris numerorum, De metris fabularum Terentii, Praeexercitamina, Institutio de nomine et pronomine et verbo, Partitiones duodecim versuum Aeneidos principatum and the Liber de accentibus.¹⁷ From dedicatory prefaces to the works, from references in the works themselves, from manuscript subscriptions and from a few references in contemporary and near-contemporary sources come such facts as we do know. Cassiodorus tells us that Priscian was a grammarian in Constantinople: ex Prisciano grammatico qui nostro tempore doctor Constantinopoli fuit . . .¹⁸, and he may have been a professor of Latin at the university there.¹⁹ He seems to have worked in Constantinople during the reigns of Anastasius and Justin and into the reign of Justinian.²⁰ His Ars grammatica was completed before 526, for in a number of subscriptions his pupil Theodorus tells us that he edited the work in the consulships of Olybrius (526) and Mavortius (527).²¹ Priscian was, however, not a native of the capital, as the epithet Caesariensis frequently applied to him attests.²² Because of his knowledge of Latin language and literature; his pride in his Roman heritage²³ and his dedication of three of his grammatical treatises to a Symmachus who has been identified with the western aristocrat Aurelius Memmius Symmachus, consul in 485 and father-in-law of Boethius,²⁴ Priscian is usually assumed to have been from Caesarea in Mauretania,²⁵ and because of his praise of Anastasius for his treatment of immigrants from Rome (see commentary,

note on lines 242-245), to have been an exile from Vandal North Africa. These assumptions and their corollary, the view that Priscian's works were aimed at a western audience and reflect western attitudes and concerns,²⁶ have recently been convincingly challenged by Marie Taylor Davis.²⁷

Davis notes that Priscian shows no interest in Africa in his works and is not mentioned as African or western by contemporary sources. She argues that an examination of Priscian's grammatical treatises reveals him as a scholar educated equally in Latin and Greek and interested in the relationship between the two languages, whose works, based on a synthesis of Greek and Roman traditions, could have been used by native speakers of both languages.²⁸ Davis points out that there are indications that Priscian was, if not born in the east, at least brought up there from an early age. In the Ars Grammatica, Priscian several times mentions his teacher Theocistus²⁹ who is probably the eastern scholar whose book on orthography Cassiodorus recommends.³⁰ There are also a number of references in his works which show an interest in eastern languages and culture.³¹ Davis therefore suggests that Priscian should be associated with one of the eastern Caesareas, probably Caesarea in Palestine which was well known in Priscian's time as a center for rhetorical and literary studies³² and she points out that in the east the epithet Caesariensis is applied to other literary figures, notably Procopius and Eusebius, associated with this city. Although she occasionally goes too far in her efforts to counteract the accepted view, as for example, when she pictures

Priscian as out of touch with contemporary events in the west,³³ Davis does succeed in setting Priscian firmly in an eastern cultural milieu, a scholar aiming his works at an eastern audience but promulgating knowledge of both languages as an ideal, and one of a number of such thoroughly bilingual and bicultural men in Constantinople and the east³⁴ (see commentary, note on lines 245-53). It is against this background that Priscian's panegyric of Anastasius must be set.

THE DATE, OCCASION AND PURPOSE OF THE DE LAUDE ANASTASII

Since knowledge of the occasion of a panegyric often provides information about the date as well, it is unusual and unfortunate that Priscian makes no mention of the occasion for which he composed the De laude Anastasii.³⁵ The panegyric does contain certain references to securely dated events in Anastasius' reign, but they offer little help in dating the panegyric. These references consist of a description of the Isaurian war which was successfully concluded by Anastasius in 498,³⁶ and allusions to the abolition of the chrysargyron in 498 and to the banning of the venationes in the previous year.³⁷ There is mention of the part played by Anastasius' nephew Hypatius against the Persians in 503,³⁸ while praise of the empress Ariadne, who died in 515,³⁹ indicates that the poem was composed before that date.⁴⁰

In order to determine a more precise date for the De laude Anastasii, it is important to remember that a panegyrist was not a recorder of historical facts, but a creator of images, in a sense an iconographer. Imperial panegyrics promulgated, if not official propaganda, at least an image of the emperor which was officially ac-

ceptable and desirable.⁴¹ Moreover, the image could change to accord with imperial policies and necessities.⁴² Thus one way to fix the date for the De laude Anastasii is to establish the image of the emperor which the panegyrist has created and to examine the events of Anastasius' reign for a set of circumstances, a context, in which such an image would be appropriate.

The image of the emperor Anastasius which emerges from Priscian's panegyric is one of a ruler who is both divinely appointed and divinely protected.⁴³ Even in a casual reading, Priscian's emphasis on the relationship between God and His emperor is obvious and striking.⁴⁴ The constant reiteration of this theme dominates the poem.

The opening lines of the poem establish Anastasius' God-given right to rule and his divinely granted prosperity and success:

For you know, o most just Princeps of upright heart,
that God . . . is placated by song, God who granted
you sovereignty and to whom alone you owe all the good
fortune you have won equally in wars or in peace (lines
4-7).

Priscian deals first with the military success that Anastasius has achieved with the help of God. He compares the misfortunes of the Roman people under the rule of the Isaurians to the present prosperity under Anastasius, who is described as a gift from God to the empire:

At last the King of Heaven delivers the world from these
sufferings when He gives us Anastasius as our lord (lines 38-39).

When the Isaurians, intent on continuing their corrupt regime, rebel against the divinely appointed emperor, God punishes them by inflicting them with madness. This madness (furor) incites them to war, only to suffer defeat through the forces of the unconquered

princeps (lines 50-66). The fiery hand of God strikes down the Isaurians, and, because of the piety of the emperor, He causes a storm to destroy the rebel fleet (lines 89-97). In defeat the Isaurians acknowledge that God has punished them justly (lines 119-129).

The second half of the panegyric, which deals with the renewal and prosperity that Anastasius has brought the empire in peace, contains an elaborate assertion of the emperor's God-given right to rule. The emperor burns the records of the hated tax, the chrysargyron, in the Hippodrome, the very place where God had given him the sceptre and the diadem, the symbols of imperial power (lines 162-170). In the Hippodrome too Anastasius celebrates his triumph over the captured Isaurian leaders and gives thanks to God (lines 171-179). God entrusts to Anastasius the restoration of the world (lines 180-192) and the emperor, the image of the heavenly judge (lines 193-205), rules in justice. At the end of this section of the panegyric, Priscian returns to the theme of God's protection of the emperor. God turns away Anastasius' enemies and will punish all who threaten the peace and security of his empire (lines 256-260). Nor does God only protect the empire, He also intervenes to save the emperor's life (lines 270-279).

From the above summary it should be clear that the main theme of the panegyric is the God-given legitimacy of Anastasius' rule. In order to present his image of Anastasius, Priscian takes certain liberties with the traditional content and format of an imperial panegyric. Topics often included, such as the birth, native city and

education of the emperor, are omitted since they do not contribute to the impression the poet wishes to convey.⁴⁵ Priscian makes no use of such epic elements as mythological allusions and personifications which are characteristic of Claudian and Sidonius, his predecessors in Latin verse panegyric.⁴⁶ In organizing his material, Priscian blurs the traditional distinction between times of war and times of peace.⁴⁷ In the second part of the panegyric, normally dedicated to times of peace, Priscian inserts a description of Anastasius' triumph over the Isaurian leaders and an allusion to the Persian war (lines 254-260), both of which are cited as examples of God's protection of the emperor.

Priscian's particular image of the emperor also affects the structure of the poem. Instead of simply moving from topic to topic in a linear progression to his peroration,⁴⁸ Priscian superimposes an arrangement of the poem around a central climactic scene. Set in the middle of the panegyric are descriptions of two events united by their common setting of the Hippodrome: first comes the burning of the tax records,⁴⁹ with Anastasius in the role of priest and intermediary presiding over an offering to God. Then the role changes. Anastasius is the victorious emperor celebrating a triumph, and, unlike earlier triumphators, he offers thanks to the true God (lines 171-179). This climactic scene, set in the place where Anastasius was proclaimed emperor, emphasizes the relationship between God and emperor, the deity and His instrument on earth in war and peace, and gives this relationship a definition and an immediacy which the conventional two-fold division into deeds of war and peace could not have achieved.

Priscian's insistence on the God-given nature of Anastasius' power and his emphasis on God's protection of the emperor against his enemies suggest that the panegyric was written at a time when the emperor badly needed support and justification for his rule. Between the years 503 and 515, when the poem must have been written, the most serious threats to Anastasius' throne occurred toward the end of the period, from 511 to 515, when religious controversy sparked riot and rebellion.

The Acacian schism had separated Rome from the eastern churches since 484. The eastern provinces themselves, especially Syria and Palestine, were divided by clashes between the supporters of the doctrines of the council of Chalcedon and the Monophysites. Despite his own Monophysite convictions, Anastasius had promised at his accession to respect the decrees of Chalcedon and, during the early part of his reign, he attempted to follow a middle course by urging adherence to the Henotikon of Zeno. By 511, however, with little hope of religious union with a Rome under the sway of the intransigent, anti-Byzantine Pope Symmachus,⁴ and with increasing religious strife in Syria and Palestine, Anastasius more and more openly supported the Monophysite cause.⁵⁰

When the emperor began to implement his pro-Monophysite policy, he faced a serious problem in the attitude of the people and clergy of Constantinople. The capital was predominantly Chalcedonian in doctrine, and the patriarch Macedonius⁵ was unsympathetic to Anastasius' Monophysite leanings. Anastasius determined to rid him-

self of the patriarch, and in August of 511 Macedonius was tried by the senate as a rebel and a heretic and was exiled.⁵¹ The following year another pro-Chalcedonian bishop, Flavius of Antioch, was deposed and replaced by Severus, one of the most influential leaders of the Monophysites.⁵² In this same year in Constantinople, the new patriarch Timotheus introduced the Monophysite version of the Trisagion into the liturgy at Hagia Sophia. The people of Constantinople rioted in protest and demanded that the general Areobindus become emperor. The riots were quelled only when the aged emperor appeared in the Hippodrome without his diadem and announced his intention of abdicating. This dramatic gesture calmed the crowds and order was restored.⁵³

Anastasius' troubles were not over. In 513, angered by the emperor's refusal to supply the federate troops, Vitalian the comes foederatorum in Thrace rebelled.⁵⁴ He won the support of the regular troops in Thrace and of many of the local peasants. Having gathered a large force, Vitalian declared his support for the Chalcedonian cause and for the deposed bishops, Macedonius and Flavius, and marched on Constantinople. The emperor negotiated a withdrawal of the rebel troops by agreeing to remedy the grievances of the Thracian army and by agreeing to submit the religious dispute to the arbitration of the pope. Once Vitalian had returned to Thrace, however, Anastasius sent an army against him under the command of Cyril, the magister militum for Thrace. When Vitalian defeated the imperial army and murdered Cyril, Anastasius had the senate in Constantinople declare Vitalian a

public enemy and sent a second army against him, this one commanded by his nephew Hypatius. After some initial success, Hypatius too was defeated, captured and held for ransom.⁵⁵

In 514 Vitalian again marched on Constantinople and again Anastasius negotiated a settlement with the rebel leader. The emperor yielded to Vitalian's demands that he be made magister militum for Thrace and that a church council, to be presided over by the pope, be held at Heraclea in 515. Anastasius entered into correspondence with Pope Hormisdas about the proposed council, but negotiations between them broke down and no council was held. For a third time, therefore, Vitalian attacked Constantinople both by land and sea. On this occasion, the imperial forces under the command of the former praetorian prefect Marinus defeated the rebel navy and army, and Vitalian fled to Thrace where he remained for the rest of Anastasius' reign.

In these turbulent years, religious controversy undermined Anastasius' prestige, and riot and rebellion threatened to remove him from his throne. In such a situation, a panegyrist might well have created the image of a God-given and divinely protected ruler in order to bolster the uncertain position of the emperor. If the De laude Anastasii is set in this context, a number of passages in the poem become clearer and in turn support the dating of the panegyric to this period.

The most important of these passages is line 299: Qui Scythicas gentes ripis depellit ab Histri. The subject of depellit, who is driving the Scythian tribes from the banks of the Hister, is

the emperor's nephew Hypatius, and the Scythian tribes are probably to be identified with Vitalian's barbarian troops. Vitalian himself is described as a Scythian in one source.⁵⁶ Hypatius' campaign against Vitalian and the success which Hypatius achieved against the rebel leader before his own final capture and defeat are dated to the autumn of 513.⁵⁷ If this interpretation of the line is correct, the panegyric too must be dated to this period.

The most quoted line from the panegyric (line 265), Utraque Roma tibi iam spero pareat uni, is also one of the most difficult to interpret.⁵⁸ The context of the line indicates that it is important and provides a clue to its meaning, especially if we understand the poem to be set against the background of Vitalian's rebellion. The line occurs toward the end of the panegyric where Priscian, in conclusion, is restating his thesis of the divinely sanctioned and protected emperor. The line follows a reference to the Persian war which includes a warning that God will deal with all Anastasius' enemies as He did with the Persians "so that the sun, when he rises from the ocean with his team and returns them there, may behold the name of Anastasius flourishing in all places" (lines 261-264). Priscian then adds the wish that both Romes may obey Anastasius alone "with the help of the almighty Father who sees all things" (lines 265-270). Finally comes an account of a disaster at sea from which Anastasius was miraculously saved because of his piety (lines 270-279). The emphasis is clearly on the favour shown by God to Anastasius coupled with a threat that God will take vengeance on the

enemies of the emperor. In Rome and Italy, both Théodoric and Pope Hormisdas favoured Vitalian, who also had other contacts in the west.⁵⁹ Priscian's wish that both Romes obey Anastasius may be an allusion to this situation,⁶⁰ albeit a vague and indefinite one because of the delicate situation between east and west, pope and emperor, and possible difficulties in Anastasius' own court (see further commentary, note on line 265).

One argument against a late date for the De laude Anastasii and in favour of a date of 503 has been the fact that Priscian makes little mention of the war against the Persians begun in 503 and concluded in 507. There are two allusions to the Persian war in the panegyric: line 300 refers to Hypatius' command against the Persians in 503, and earlier in the poem, Priscian describes how God drove back the Persians from the empire (lines 254-260):⁶¹

For these reasons the almighty Lord of the lofty heavens turned aside from your strongholds dangerous enemies who were roused unjustly by fury since it was they who violated their treaty, and who suddenly and violently erupted like bandits near the mighty streams of the vast Euphrates. But God had moved them to their own destruction and because of your plans they suffered the losses they deserved.

Priscian speaks as if the war is over, but the reference is brief and there are few details. This way of alluding to the war does not make sense if the poem is dated to 503, the first year of the campaign, but it becomes comprehensible if the poem is placed in the context of Vitalian's rebellion.

The Persian war was a struggle against a foreign enemy which took place far from Constantinople. This was a very different situa-

tion from the war against Vitalian, an internal conflict which threatened the capital itself. Nor did the Persian war pose a threat to Anastasius' popularity or the security of his throne. Thus the Persian war had little relevance to the current crisis, and there was no need to dwell on the war in detail. The brevity of the reference may also be explained by the fact that both Vitalian and his father fought in the Roman forces against the Persians,⁶² and Priscian would not wish to recall this fact to his audience. Moreover, the men who had commanded the Roman army against the Persians, Areobindus, Patricius, Hypatius and Celer, were, with the exception of Hypatius, either on friendly terms with Vitalian or had been involved in the unpopular deposition of Macedonius and the subsequent riots in 512.⁶³ The tactful panegyrist would not, therefore, dwell on the Persian war. Priscian mentions the role of Hypatius since he is now commanding the army against Vitalian. For the rest, he uses the Persian war as another example of the divine protection of Anastasius and the empire and a warning to all who threaten their safety.

If Priscian refers only briefly to the Persian war, he devotes the first half of the panegyric to the Isaurian war. Since this war took place in the early years of Anastasius' reign, its prominence in the poem has been used to suggest an early date for the panegyric.⁶⁴ In fact, Priscian gives few concrete details of the war, as he might be expected to do if he were describing recent events. Rather, he uses the war as an opportunity to embellish his poem with picturesque details, similes and exempla. More importantly, his account of the

Isaurian war gives a military atmosphere to the poem which is appropriate to the crisis of the year 513. Like Vitalian and his troops, the Isaurians were rebels,⁶⁵ engaging in a civil war against their rightful ruler. The civil aspect of the conflict is underlined by Priscian's imitations of Virgil and Lucan.⁶⁶ In addition, Priscian explicitly attributes the success of the imperial army to bravery (robor) not bribery (pretium). The financial measures taken by Anastasius to reduce supplies to the federate troops in Thrace were a factor in inciting Vitalian to rebel,⁶⁷ and Priscian may be making an oblique allusion to this problem and its outcome. Thus Priscian uses the Isaurian war to comment on contemporary events, and his emphasis on the vengeance taken by God against the Isaurians and His punishment of their crimes suggests the desired outcome of the war against Vitalian.

There are three other passages which may point to a late date for the panegyric. Lines 192-194 are possibly a reference to the institution of the vindices which is usually understood to have taken place after 510. The praise of Anastasius' brother, nephews and the empress Ariadne who chose Anastasius as emperor may indicate an interest in the succession which would be more appropriate in the closing years of the reign. The references to Anastasius' family may also be intended to demonstrate the strong support the emperor had in his family. Finally, the panegyric ends with the wish that the barbarians be conquered and that the prayers of the people and holy senate be confirmed. The barbarians are probably the troops of

Vitalian; the prayers may be an allusion to the religious service which celebrated the victory of Hypatius against the rebels.⁶⁸

There can be no certainty that the De laude Anastasii was composed in the autumn of 513, since no one reference gives clear and specific evidence for this date. Yet the cumulative effect of the allusions which suggest a late date for the poem, combined with the overall impression made by the panegyric, the development of the image of Anastasius as a divinely appointed and protected emperor, and the departure from the style and content of earlier panegyrics necessary to create that image, all strongly suggest that the poem belongs in the context of the rebellion of Vitalian and the religious crisis of the years 511-515. If the date of 513 is accepted, then a suitable occasion for the delivery of the panegyric may well have been the celebrations with which Anastasius greeted the news of Hypatius' initial success against the rebel forces.

A panegyric delivered on such an occasion would have been part of a propaganda campaign mounted against Vitalian.⁶⁹ In response to Vitalian's championship of Chalcedon, Priscian demonstrates divine sanction for Anastasius' power. The military threat is countered by accounts of God's vengeance on Anastasius' enemies, the Persians and Isaurians. Above all, Priscian portrays Anastasius as the embodiment of imperial virtue, the image of God, and guarantor of peace, prosperity and justice for his subjects. This image of the emperor is the message of the panegyric. Hence the oblique, and to the modern reader confusing; references to actual events.

The message of the panegyric may well have been aimed at members of Anastasius' court, army officers and nobility. The emperor may have had cause to suspect disloyalty and to feel the need of a justificatory panegyric. A number of officials and nobles seem to have been supporters of Chalcedon, unsympathetic to the direction of the emperor's religious policy. Celer, Juliana Anicia, the wife of Areobindus, the emperor's nephew Pompeius and his wife, even the empress Ariadne, were Chalcedonians. Theophanes (AM 6004) tells us that Ariadne and many of the court were upset at the deposition of Macedonius. We know that John and Patricius refused to command the army against Vitalian in 515 because, if they were defeated, their friendship with Vitalian would expose them to a charge of treason.⁷⁰ Among Anastasius' officials there were also westerners and those who had contacts with the west. Priscian emphasizes Anastasius' generosity to those whom Rome has sent to the east and goes on to praise the emperor for entrusting the conduct of affairs to men of literary culture.⁷¹ Like Priscian himself, these men would have had friends and contacts in the west. One way to protect against possible disloyalty was to commission a panegyric from a member of these circles. There is, of course, no way to judge the efficacy of the poem, but Anastasius did stay in power and the potentially serious internal divisions remained under control.

PRISCIAN AND THE PANEGRIC TRADITION

Poetry seems to have been the medium for the earliest imperial panegyrics⁷² but, since little of what must have been a large corpus

of verse panegyric has survived, it is difficult to trace the development of this literary genre. Extant verse panegyrics in Latin fall into two basic categories: the pastoral panegyric favoured by the poets of the first century A.D.⁷³ and the epic panegyrics produced during a revival of interest in verse panegyric during the late empire. In the context of late imperial panegyric, a comparison of the De laude Anastasii with the laudatory poems of Claudian, Sidonius and Corippus suggests that, in the form and content of verse panegyric, there was a growing divergence between east and west. It is also possible to see in Priscian's poem the tentative beginnings of a process of Christianization of the secular genre of panegyric, a process which in turn has implications for the ways in which verse panegyric could be written.

The basic topics and structure of imperial panegyrics, the deeds of the emperor in war and peace organized around his display of the cardinal virtues, had long been established, and orators could consult rules set out in rhetorical handbooks, like that of Menander Rhetor. The panegyrists of the late fourth and the fifth centuries, Claudian and Sidonius, combined these rhetorical elements with epic features which included epic similes, personifications, speeches, elaborate descriptions of people, places and objects, and frequent mythological and historical allusions. Indeed, it is often difficult to draw a clear line between epic and panegyric in their works.⁷⁴

Corippus, writing a hundred years after Sidonius, abandoned the traditional topical structure for his panegyric of the emperor

Justin II. His poem is a narrative of Justin's first days as emperor and includes such events as the coronation of Justin, his reception of a barbarian embassy and his inauguration as consul. Accompanying the narrative are elaborate descriptions of ceremonies and ceremonial objects which emphasize their symbolic importance. Although Corippus includes such epic elements as speeches and similes, he employs no mythological and few historical allusions. His poem is neither panegyric nor epic as these are traditionally defined.⁷⁵

Priscian falls chronologically between Claudian and Sidonius on the one hand and Corippus on the other, and his panegyric bears little resemblance to either the earlier or the later panegyrics. The structure and content of the De laude Anastasii are strongly influenced by the rhetorical tradition, although it is going too far to say, with Previale, that his is a true verse panegyric perfectly adhering to the scheme of Menander.⁷⁶ Yet the rhetorical structure of the De laude Anastasii is far more obvious than in the panegyrics of Claudian and Sidonius because the epic elements incorporated by those poets are largely absent; Priscian includes no personifications, speeches, divine machinery or mythological allusions; his similes are fewer and less elaborate. Priscian abandons the epic format of his predecessors in verse panegyric because, for a poet writing in the east, in Constantinople, this style could no longer serve the purpose for which imperial panegyric was intended, the demonstration of the emperor's right to rule. Although they were writing in praise of Christian emperors, Claudian and Sidonius provide a framework of pagan

mythology for their versions of contemporary events and illuminate the present with references to Rome's glorious past. Both poets were writing for an audience of cultured western aristocrats, educated in the pagan literary and rhetorical tradition and proud of Rome's great achievements. By their use of myth, allegorical figures and historical exempla, Claudian and Sidonius demonstrated the continuity between past and present and, by surrounding the subjects of their panegyrics with the trappings of epic, hoped to make them acceptable to the Roman or Gallic nobility. Sidonius' panegyric on Anthemius provides a good example of this technique. Anthemius was chosen by Leo I to govern the west as its emperor, and the Greekling (Graeculus) Anthemius was unpopular because of his eastern origins. Sidonius has personifications of Italy, the Tiber and Rome claim Anthemius for the west, and he places the new emperor in a gallery of Rome's past heroes. Such devices would help present Anthemius in a favourable light to Sidonius' audience in Rome.

Neither Claudian and Sidonius nor the later panegyrists of the Ostrogothic Kings, Ennodius and Cassiodorus, include the theme of the divine election of the ruler in their panegyrics. In the east, however, religious and political thought had established that the chief sanction for imperial power was the will of God. Thus Priscian, who, as I have demonstrated above, was probably writing his panegyric to support Anastasius in a time of crisis, makes the emperor's divine right to rule his major theme. As a result, Priscian faced the problem of writing a secular poem in which the main theme had to be

Christian in expression. Mythological allusions, personifications and pagan divine machinery would have been out of place, and he omits them, along with most of the epic elements which dominate the poetry of Claudian and Sidonius. Priscian is aware that he is breaking with this tradition of verse panegyric, and he informs his audience of the fact in his preface.⁷⁷

Priscian does not replace the epic elements with specifically Christian motifs and language; Christian writers had long since adopted the vocabulary used of Jupiter for the Christian God so references to the deity posed no problem.⁷⁸ As well as one Biblical allusion to the patriarch Joseph, there are a few echoes of Biblical language and ideas.⁷⁹ Apart from these features, the major Christian aspect of the poem is the theme of the God-given and divinely protected emperor. Corippus who includes prayers, a vision of the Virgin and a paraphrase of the creed in which he uses the language of Christian poets goes further than Priscian in Christianizing panegyric. Corippus, however, does not achieve a complete synthesis of secular and Christian thought and language and, as with Priscian's poem, the most Christian element is his emphasis on the theme of the emperor's divinely ordained right to rule.⁸⁰

Since his Christian theme made pastoral and epic incompatible as models, Priscian had to find another method of constructing a poem in praise of Anastasius. His solution to the problem was simple: he took the topics and organizational framework provided by the rhetorical handbooks, adapted them to suit his vision of the emperor, and

then adorned this basic structure with poetic diction and figures of speech. A similar technique was followed by the authors of the Panegyricus Messallae and the Laus Pisonis, and, in form and concept, these three panegyrics, two from the early empire and one from the late empire, are closely related.⁸¹ Priscian's language and poetic ornament, however, are without the overtly pagan overtones and imagery of the earlier works.

Unfortunately this concept of verse panegyric is by its very nature an unsatisfactory one. The combination of poetic ornament with a rhetorical structure developed originally for prose can be as unhappy and as incongruous as Rococo decoration on a Romanesque building. Verse panegyric works best when it is conceived within a specific genre of poetry, so that the characteristic features of the genre dominate or conceal the rhetorical framework and unify the literary edifice. Such poetic panegyric was produced in the fourth century when Claudian developed the new order of epic panegyric. Why, when epic proved incompatible with his image of the emperor, Priscian fell back on the technique of a rhetorical framework ornamented with poetic devices, instead of moving verse panegyric in a new direction, as Corippus did when he substituted narrative for the topical arrangement of the rhetorical tradition, is a question which should be asked but to which there can be no certain answer. It is probable that the overwhelming authority of the classical literary tradition in which he had been educated, and in which he himself worked, made innovation impossible for Priscian.

PRISCIAN'S POETIC TECHNIQUES

For one person to combine the occupations of poet and grammarian was common in the late empire,⁸² and Priscian's De laude Anastasii is a competent, professional production. Although his combination of rhetorical structure and poetic adornment is ultimately unsatisfactory because the components are incompatible, Priscian is a skilled craftsman who is thoroughly familiar with his rhetorical and poetic tools and who often employs them with considerable effect.

Priscian's favourite figures of speech are anaphora and alliteration. He uses anaphora, especially in the first half of the poem, to signal transitions or to underline contrasts. After the preface, the beginning of the poem proper is marked by anaphora:

Accipe Romanum clementi pectore carmen,
Accipe, quod soleo caelesti reddere regi.

At line 37 (Vexabant vinclis, vexabant stipite duro), the repetition of vexabant makes the verse an emphatic climax to Priscian's description of the crimes of the Isaurians. In order to make Anastasius' achievement in surpassing the feats of his ancestor Pompey the more remarkable, anaphora is used to underline the magnitude of Pompey's triumphs. The repetition of negatives at the beginnings of lines 87 to 89 underscores the futility of the Isaurian rebellion.

Alliteration appears throughout the poem and varies from the simple repetition of a single initial letter, Qui dubio quondam peiora pericula ponto (line 187), to elaborate interlocking patterns of sound, Atque sui casus se causam scire fuisse (line 129). The more complex patterns, in particular, are used to unify and emphasize pas-

ages which are important either for their message or for the colour which they add to the poem. Note, for example, the variety of alliterative combinations and the uses made of them in the lines which describe the triumph celebrated by Anastasius in the Hippodrome:

Ipse locus vobis ostendit iure tropaea,
 Obtulit et vinctos oculis domitosque tyrannos
 Ante pedes vestros mediis circensibus actos.
 Aemilius quondam Paulus fortissimus ille
 Sic regem Persen populo spectante latino
 Curribus invectus Tarpeiam traxit ad arcem
 Placavitque Iovem Capitolia templa tenentem;
 Omnipotens sed te superum conspexit ab arce
 Numina placantem caelestia templa tenentis (lines 171-179).

The setting of the passage is emphasized by the repeated o's, v's and t's of the first two lines, while the device of beginning the first and last words of the third line with the same letter suggests the position of the prisoners under the feet of the emperor. Paulus and his captive Perses are united by the repetition of p and r, and an abba pattern combined with the word order of line 175 places Perses in the midst of the watching throng. The final four lines of the passage end with a pattern of t's and a's which contributes to the contrast between Paulus and Anastasius, Jupiter and the Christian God.

Similar analyses could be made of any number of passages in the De laude Anastasii. One of the most successful manipulations of sound effects in the poem is Priscian's description of the venationes outlawed by Anastasius:

Atque voluptates prohibes a sanguine sumi,
 Corporis et causa pascendi perdere vitam,
 Humanos arcens lacerari dentibus artus,
 Dentibus, armatur rabies quibus atra ferarum (lines 224-227).

Although the alliteration and the assonance of the repeated r sounds in the final two lines underscore the cruelty of the games, one senses that Priscian was enjoying himself.

Priscian sustains only two major patterns of imagery throughout the poem, but these two, the image of the sun and the image of the dextera Dei, are carefully chosen to underline the theme of the panegyric and Priscian's vision of Anastasius. The images are precisely distributed and placed in significant contexts. The first appearance of the solar imagery occurs near the beginning of the panegyric in the passage describing Pompey's triumphs:

Quos vidit Titan linquens repetensque profundum,
Quos medio veniens steterat miratus Olympe (lines 13-14).

In the central scene of the panegyric, the sun beholds the burning of the tax records in the Hippodrome:

Munera suscipiens flammis aeterna beatis,
Ad quas accessit placidus magis omnibus aris.
Aspexit vestros radiis sol aureus ignes,
Et placuere diem violantia lumina fumo,
Quae pura fulgens accendis mente serenus (lines 166-170).

Finally in the peroration of the panegyric, Priscian explains that God will punish and drive away all Anastasius' enemies:

Haec eadem cunctus bello quicumque lacessunt
Imperii columen vestri pacemque, manebunt,
Ut sol oceano tollens mergensque iugales
Cernat Anastasii florere per omnia nomen (lines 261-264).

Priscian invests his solar imagery with two levels of meaning. In the first and third passages, the descriptions of the sun's physical journey across the heavens from east to west reflect the ideal of a united empire under Anastasius' rule, and indeed the second

reference is followed by a wish that both Romes may obey Anastasius. More significantly, in Christian thought Christ was identified with the sun, and, although this identification is not made explicit in the poem, Priscian could expect that his contemporaries would see in the sol aureus of line 168, who looks down at and is pleased by the sacrifice of the tax records with their burden of misery, the Biblical Christ, the Sol Iustitiae and Sol Salutis. Moreover, Priscian describes Anastasius as fulgens, that is, as a reflection of the sun himself the representative of God on earth. The image of the sun in the last passage could equally readily have been interpreted with a Christian connotation by Priscian's audience. Here Christ appears as Sol invictus in the quadriga of the sun, as He is pictured, for example, in the well-known mosaic from the Vatican cemetery. Thus the solar imagery is used to reinforce Priscian's image of Anastasius as a divinely elected ruler.⁸³

The image of the hand of God also appears three times in the panegyric and, as with the solar imagery, is chosen to underline the theme of Anastasius' God-given right to rule, and indeed, because of its physical immediacy, provides an even more explicit statement of the theme than the image of the sun. In the first half of the poem, the image of the hand of God is a symbol of divine vengeance and justice. The Father who sustains all things with His right hand and who wields the scales of justice punishes the Isaurians for their crimes by inflicting a madness upon them which drives them to war against the emperor (lines 55-60). Once the war has begun, the blazing hand of

the supreme Father (summi genitoris dextera flagrans line 101), strikes down the Isaurians on land and sea. In contrast, the third reference which occurs in the second half of the poem evokes the hand of God as a symbol of salvation. It is the hand of God which saves Anastasius from harm as it has saved pious men throughout the ages (line 283).⁸⁴

Priscian's use of imagery shows him at his best both as a poet and as a panegyrist. His images are not original but they would have had considerable reassuring authority and appeal for his audience. The image of the sun as a divine prototype of imperial power and that of the hand of God supporting and protecting the emperor were familiar in both pagan literature and art and in Christian art and political and religious theory (see commentary, notes on lines 55 and 168). By his use of these images, Priscian the poet is able to recognize the classical literary tradition which he inherited from the past and contemporary Christian thought. Priscian the panegyrist summons doubly powerful and accepted images to support Anastasius' rule.

If Priscian's use of imagery shows him at his best, his similes reveal the problems inherent in the type of verse panegyric he is writing. There are two major similes describing Anastasius, one in each half of the poem. In order to elaborate his description of Anastasius' deeds in war, Priscian naturally draws extensively from the epic poets to supply the proper military atmosphere, and under their influence he adds to the long line of literary lions. The Anastasius who conquers the Isaurians is compared to a lion who, when

provoked, destroys his attackers. But however appropriate to an epic hero, the simile is out of place in the De laude Anastasii. In the first place, as Priscian's audience knew and as the rest of the poem makes evident, Anastasius did not lead the imperial armies against the Isaurians. Moreover, the image of a ferocious lion does not suit the picture of Anastasius presented elsewhere in the panegyric, where it is suggested that God's justice and vengeance prevailed over Anastasius' merciful instincts.⁸⁵ In fact the simile applied to Anastasius detracts from the image of God the avenger which Priscian has built up in the rest of the section on war. Finally, the simile is too long, eleven lines out of some one hundred and thirty-five devoted to the Isaurian war. The disproportionate length and the elaborate detail make this simile an excellent example of poetic ornament applied to an unsuitable structure. Admirable in itself, such a simile needs an epic context and it is this context which Priscian has deliberately rejected.

In the second half of the poem, Anastasius the ruler of the empire in peace, is compared to the Biblical patriarch Joseph (lines 210-217). Although the virtues of the wise administrator of Egypt make him an appropriate parallel for the emperor, the overtly Christian nature of the allusion is out of place in a poem in which elsewhere Priscian has been at pains to use language and imagery with both classical and Christian connotations. In addition, with no classical models to imitate, the simile plods along prosaically, set apart from the rest of the panegyric by style as well as content.

Between these two pictures of Anastasius, ferocious lion and provident patriarch, stands Priscian himself mediating uneasily between classical past and Christian present. In his introduction to the section on the emperor in times of peace, Priscian compares himself, with his knowledge of Anastasius' achievements and his inability to express them, to the priestess of Apollo, who knows all things but cannot reveal them (lines 140-144). The image of the poet as a bard inspired by Apollo has an impeccable lineage in classical literature, yet the comparison is not really suitable for a poet who sings the praises of so Christian an emperor as Anastasius. Priscian here has opted for tradition and, to be fair, a comparison of himself to an appropriate Biblical figure, David for example, would have been equally out of place. Perhaps this simile does more than anything else in the poem to sum up Priscian's problem of impossible reconciliation.

Much of the poetic quality of the panegyric stems from Priscian's imitations of Latin epic writers, especially Virgil and Lucan, and of Claudian and Ovid. These imitations fall into three main categories. The first group consists of phrases which have not been deliberately borrowed from any one author. Such expressions as Tonans (line 126), semina belli (line 18), noctesque diesque (line 247) and rector Olympi (line 162) were part of the common currency of epic vocabulary⁸⁶ and the use of such phrases is to be expected of any poet writing in the classical tradition.

The second group consists of the deliberate borrowings from classical authors by which a writer demonstrated his knowledge and

virtuosity.⁸⁷ In a panegyric, such imitations serve as a presentation of the credentials of the writer as a man of letters, worthy to praise the emperor, despite the modest denials demanded by the conventions of the genre. Most of Priscian's imitations of earlier writers are of this type. Notable is his use of Lucan and Ovid at the beginning of the poem to prepare for the mention of Pompey as an ancestor of Anastasius. The audience would recognize the quotations, but would only appreciate their appropriateness at the reference to Pompey. Later in the poem, the lion simile and the description of the battlefield after the defeat of the Isaurians combine imitations of Latin epic poets with original elements.⁸⁸

The third group of imitations consists of those which Priscian uses to underline the message and meaning of the panegyric. The sources of Priscian's borrowings become significant here. Lucan, Virgil and Claudian are by far the most important. Echoes from the last six books of the Aeneid and from Lucan recall the horrors of war, especially civil war, and help Priscian to suggest that the Isaurian war, and by implication Vitalian's rebellion, are also civil wars. The analogies are never stressed, but the implications of the imitations of the Aeneid and the Pharsalia are there for the attentive listener and must have been obvious to the well-informed contemporary. Such imitations are confined to the section of the panegyric dealing with the Isaurian war. A similar use of imitations from Claudian occurs in passages at the end of the poem, but they are more tentative and less specific. The echoes of Claudian recall the wars of Stilicho

against the barbarians and may have been intended to evoke the menace of Vitalian and his barbarian troops, even though the imitations themselves do not occur in passages dealing with war.⁸⁹

As Priscian imitates the vocabulary and imagery of earlier Latin poets, so also he conforms to the standards established by these poets in his prosody and versification. By these standards Priscian's prosody is correct and his dactylic hexameter is regular and uniform; for example, he consistently places a strong caesura in the third foot. Only three lines do not follow this pattern for the caesura. Two lines (121 and 278) have no third foot caesura, but have instead an elision before this foot. Line 268 has a weak caesura in the third foot combined with strong caesuras in the second and fourth feet. Since Draths Schmidt has studied these and other metrical practices of Priscian in both the De laude Anastasii and the Periegesis in some detail, I do not propose to repeat his findings here.⁹⁰ Instead, in order to discover which Latin epic poets Priscian has followed in his use of the hexameter, I have examined the metre of the poem using the information and statistics on verse patterns in Latin hexameter to be found in the studies by George Duckworth.⁹¹ In his choice of verse patterns, Priscian closely follows Virgil and Lucan. Of the eight patterns of dactyls and spondees most used by Priscian, seven are among the eight favourite patterns of Virgil, six among those of Lucan. The two patterns which most often occur in the De laude Anastasii (dsss and ddss) are the same two employed most frequently by Virgil. In the frequency of his repetition of these eight patterns,

Priscian is closer to Lucan. The first eight patterns account for 79.5 percent of the total lines of the poem as compared with 78.6 percent for the favoured eight patterns in Lucan, and 72.8 percent in Virgil. The proportion of dactyls to spondees is very similar in the three poets, with 19 spondees to 13 dactyls in Priscian, 20 spondees to 12 dactyls in Virgil and 18 spondees to 14 dactyls in Lucan. Like the earlier epic poets, Priscian provides reasonable variety in his selection of patterns, with an average of 9.3 patterns to every sixteen line unit, as compared an average of 9.4 in the Aeneid. Only in his use of elision does Priscian differ from Vergilian metrical practice. Elision is infrequent in the De laude Anastasii and in this Priscian is closer to the practices of Lucan and Claudian. It is evident, then, that Priscian follows closely in metrical usage the authors whom he imitates most frequently.

Priscian's vocabulary is drawn from classical Latin, although where necessary he is careful to choose words which have both pagan and Christian connotations (lines 126, 128, 162, 168, 179). The one word he uses which seems to have been more common in Christian than in pagan writers is dominator (line 254). In a comparatively short poem it is difficult to detect any significant preferences in word usage, but Priscian does show a fondness for the word sensus (lines 21, 208, 305) and for teneo used as a present participle (lines 26, 177, 179, 188). He is capable of producing unusual and even striking phrases and images, for example, ductorum . . . vallo (line 100), vivendi ponere fructum (line 134), undarum et tractibus altis (line 185) and sudor musicus (line 249).

Non-classical grammatical usages are rare in the poem except for the use of the indicative in indirect questions (lines 271 and 278) and the use of the pluperfect for the perfect tense (lines 49 and 302). There are also a number of awkward constructions, which seem to occur when Priscian has no classical model for the incident he wishes to describe and must himself supply the necessary poetic quality. Such passages are thus more frequent in the second half of the poem which deals with the achievements of Anastasius in times of peace. For examples, see the Joseph simile, especially line 208, and the description of God's rescue of Anastasius from a disaster at sea, especially line 275.

Priscian exhibits two idiosyncrasies of style which deserve mention. The first is his marked liking for the present participle. There are fifty-six present participles in the poem as compared with, for example, forty-three in the first 312 lines of Claudian's panegyric on the fourth consulship of Honorius. These participles are used descriptively to expand upon or add to ideas already expressed. For examples, see line 4 of the preface and lines 102, 165, 166, 238, and 268. The use of the participle with its indefiniteness and variety of connotations is appropriate in a panegyric, where image and allusion are more important than facts.⁹² Priscian also has the ability to use only one word to suggest a whole context of related images. This allusive technique, admirable in its brevity and subtlety, is best seen in Priscian's use of fulgens (line 170) to evoke the splendour of the imperial regalia and costume, of pascens (line

253) to recall the Christian image of the good shepherd, and of florere (line 264) to sum up the theme of renovatio.

I must conclude that Priscian's skilful exploitation of accepted poetic language and imagery and his awareness of the political exigencies of the emperor make him a successful panegyrist, but that his refusal to be innovative in a poetic medium which he obviously found sympathetic and his own academic restraints, prevented true poetic accomplishment.

ENDNOTES

¹George Orwell, "Notes on Nationalism," in The Collected Essays, Journalism and Letters of George Orwell, eds. Sonia Orwell and Ian Angus, vol. 3, As I Please 1943-1945 (London, 1968), p. 414.

²Michael Grant, Greek and Latin Authors 800 B.C. - 1000 A.D. (New York, 1980), p. 360.

³See, for example, Alan Cameron, Claudian, Poetry and Propaganda at the Court of Honorius (Oxford, 1970); Averil Cameron, Flavius Crescens Corippus, In laudem Iustini Augusti minoris (London, 1976); F.M. Clover, Flavius Merobaudes. A translation and historical commentary, Transactions of the American Philosophical Society 61, 1 (1971). H.A. Drake, In Praise of Constantine: A Historical Study and New Translation of Eusebius' Tricennial Oration (Berkeley, 1976); Sabine MacCormack, Art and Ceremony in Late Antiquity (Berkeley, 1981).

⁴For the history and a description of the manuscript, see E.A. Lowe, Codices Latini antiquiores. A Paleographical Guide to Latin Manuscripts prior to the Ninth Century (Oxford, 1933-34), 3:36-38. The manuscript was catalogued by Michel Denis, Codices manuscripti theologici Bibliothecae Palatinae Vindobobensis latini, vol. 2, part 1 (Vienna, 1799), col. 634-638.

⁵H. Hagen, Catalogus codicum Bernensium (Bern, 1875), 1: 347-348.

⁶S.L. Endlicher, Prisciani Grammatici de laude imperatoris Anastasii et de ponderibus et mensuris carmina (Vienna, 1828).

⁷B.G. Niebuhr and Imm. Bekker, eds., Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae (Bonn, 1829), 10:517-526.

⁸E.F. Corpet, Poesies de Priscien: La Periégese. Les poids et mesures. Eloge de l'empereur Anastase (Paris, 1845), pp. 112-139.

⁹E. Baehrens, Poetae Latini Minores (Leipzig, 1883), 5: 263-274.

¹⁰D. Romano, "Prisciano a Bisanzio," Atti della Accademia di Scienze, Lettere e Arti di Palermo series 4, vol. 25, part 2 (1966): 305-355.

¹¹Alain Chauvot, Procopé de Gaza, Priscien de Césarée, Panegyriques de l'empereur Anastase Ier (Bonn, 1986).

¹² Maria Passalacqua, I Codici di Prisciano (Rome, 1978), p. vii.

¹³ The grammarian Eutyches who was a student of Priscian praises his former master in terms which suggest that he was well known: de quibus omnibus terminationibus et traductionibus quia Romanae lumen facundiae, meus, immo communis omnium hominum praeceptor, in quarto de nomine libro summa cum subtilitate copiosissime grammaticus Priscianus diseruisse cognoscitur. Eutyches' surviving works are to be found in H. Keil, Grammatici Latini (Leipzig, 1868), 5:447-489. For his remarks on Priscian, see p. 456.

¹⁴ For a description of these manuscripts, see Passalacqua, Codici, pp. 67, 127, 128-129, 163-164, 221-222, 324-325, 340, 382-385. Priscian's Periegesis is conveniently included with the original Greek work by Dionysius and the Latin version by Avienus in C. Muller, Geographi Graeci Minores, vol. 3 (Paris, 1882). For a recent edition of the poem, see P. Van De Woestijne, La Periegesis de Priscien (Brussels, 1953).

¹⁵ R. Drathschmidt, De Prisciani grammatici Caesariensis carminibus (Breslau, 1907).

¹⁶ His cognomen may have been Octavius. See L.G. Whitbread, "A Note on Priscian the Grammarian," Latomus 36 (1977): 811-812.

¹⁷ The grammatical works are collected in Keil, Grammatici Latini, vols. 2 and 3 (Leipzig, 1859).

¹⁸ Cassiodorus, De Orthographia 1.13, in Keil, Grammatici Latini, 7:207.

¹⁹ For the establishment and structure of the university, see the Codex Theodosianus 14.9.3.

²⁰ Paul the Deacon, Historia Langobardorum 1.25, in writing of the reign of Justinian mentions Priscian as well as other writers of the period: Tunc quoque apud Constantinopolim Priscianus Caesariensis grammaticae artis, ut ita dixerim, profunda rimatus est.

²¹ Keil, Grammatici Latini, 2:191-192, 451, 597; 3:208-209.

²² The epithet is used in the subscripts by his pupil Theodorus (see note 21) and also by Paul the Deacon (see note 20).

²³ In the Ars grammatica, Priscian identifies his work as being in the Latin tradition and speaks of nos Romani or Latini and nostris auctores. For examples, see M. Gluck, Priscians Partitiones und ihre Stellung in der spatantiken Schule (Hildesheim, 1967), pp. 58-59.

²⁴ J. Sundwall, Abhandlungen zur Geschichte des ausgehenden Romertums (Helsinki, 1919), p. 160.

²⁵ For this view see, for example, the standard accounts of Priscian's life in Martin Schanz, Carl Hosius, and Gustav Krueger, Geschichte der romischen Literatur, vol. 4.2 (Munich, 1920), p. 221 and in R. Helm, "Priscianus," in Real-Encyclopaedie der klassischen Alterumswissenschaft, vol. 22.2, eds. A. Pauly, G. Wissowa, W. Kroll et. al. (1954), col. 2328. See also A. Momigliano, "Gli Anicii e la storiografia latina del vi secolo d.c.," in his Secondo contributo alla storia degli studi classici (Rome, 1960), p. 240 and Romano, "Prisciano," p. 307.

²⁶ See P. Courcelle, Late Latin Writers and their Greek Sources, trans. H.E. Wedeck (Cambridge, Mass., 1969), pp. 325-330, and Romano, "Prisciano," pp. 324-327. For Priscian as an exile from Africa, see J.B. Bury, History of the Later Roman Empire (London, 1923), 1:467, M. Salamon, "Priscianus und sein Schulerkreis in Konstantinopel," Philologus 123 (1979): 96, and Romano "Prisciano," p. 307.

²⁷ Marie Taylor Davis, "Priscian and the West," paper presented at the Byzantine Studies Conference, Chicago, 1982.

²⁸ The Partitiones, which uses a grammatical and metrical analysis of the first twelve lines of the Aeneid as the basis for teaching the fundamentals of Latin grammar, could well have been used by Greek students beginning their study of the language (see Courcelle, Late Latin Writers, p. 329, n. 49. For the text of the Partitiones, see Keil, Grammatici Latini, 3:459-515. For an analysis of the place of the Partitiones in the ancient educational system and Priscian's use of Greek, see Glück, Priscians Partitiones. Priscian's knowledge of Greek is discussed by A. Luscher, De Prisciani studiis Graecis (Breslau, 1912).

²⁹ Priscian says of Theocistus: noster praeceptor Theocistus, omnis eloquentiae decus, cui quicquid in me sit doctrinae post deum imputo (Keil, Grammatici Latini, 2:238).

³⁰ Cassiodorus, Institutiones Divinarum Litterarum 30.2.

³¹ Priscian includes brief comments on Syrian and Hebrew in the Ars Grammatica; for examples, see Keil, Grammatici Latini, 2:147, 148, 214, 321. For Priscian's mention of a Biblical figure popular in Egypt and the east, see commentary, note on lines 208-217.

³² For the school at Caesarea, see G. Downey, "The Christian Schools of Palestine: A Chapter in Literary History," Harvard Literary Bulletin 12 (1958): 301-304, L.I. Levine, Caesarea under Roman Rule (Leiden, 1975), pp. 58-60, 119-128, 135-136, and P. Collinet, Histoire de l'école de droit de Beyrouth (Paris, 1935), pp. 81-83.

³³ Davis bases this opinion on the limited knowledge of activities in the west which Priscian displays in the De laude Anastasii. A panegyrist, however, was not writing history. His composition was geared for a specific occasion and audience and his task was to interpret the occasion for that audience. It is understandable that Priscian would not include references to events in Italy in a poem delivered in Constantinople before an eastern audience. Nor are Priscian's grammatical works suitable for discussion of contemporary events. Moreover, Priscian's interest in promulgating the knowledge of both languages and cultures, which Davis so ably demonstrates in her analysis of the grammatical works, implies that Priscian would have had contact with those of similar interests in the west. We know that westerners with scholarly interests did visit the east. One such visitor was Marcius Novatus Renuus who owned a copy of Boethius corrected by Priscian's pupil Theodorus (Schanz-Hosius, 4.2:152) and who, when in Constantinople in 510, discussed theology with Severus of Antioch, as Severus mentions in his Liber contra impium grammaticum, Oratio 3, pars posterior, trans. J. Lebon, Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium (Scriptores Syri), series 4, vol. 6 (Paris, 1933), p. 72.

³⁴ For the use of Latin in the east and in Constantinople, see L. Hahn, "Zum Sprachenkampf in romischen Reich bis auf die Zeit Justinians," Philologus 10 (1907): 675-718, B. Hemmerdinger, "Les lettres latines à Constantinople jusqu'à Justinien," Byzantinische Forschungen 1 (1966): 173-179, and G. Dagron, "Aux origines de la civilisation byzantine: langue de culture et langue d'état," Revue Historique 241 (1969): 23-56. The extent to which Latin was still a viable language in sixth century Constantinople is a matter of debate. Dagron's view, that Greek was the predominant cultural language, while knowledge of Latin was restricted to officials of the imperial administration and Latin was not normally used by the emperor's entourage, has been questioned by Salamon. Salamon ("Priscianus und sein Schülerkreis," p. 96) argues that Latin was not restricted to administrators and to a small Italian and African colony in Constantinople, and that interest in Latin culture was still strong. He demonstrates that a circle of aristocrats and officials, interested equally in Greek and Latin studies and in contact with intellectuals in the west, was grouped around Priscian. He notes also that interest in Latin as a cultural language continued well into the sixth century.

³⁵ Panegyrics formed one element of the increasingly elaborate ceremonial surrounding the emperor and were recited as part of the celebrations which marked imperial consulships, anniversaries, weddings and victories. Panegyrists often draw attention to the occasion for which the panegyric has been composed. Procopius of Gaza, Priscian's contemporary who wrote a prose panegyric of the emperor Anastasius in Greek, tells us (Pan. 1) that his panegyric was delivered to celebrate the reception of an image of the emperor which was probably erected to thank the emperor for some benefaction to the city of Gaza.

³⁶For the Isaurians and the Isaurian war, see commentary, notes on lines 16-17, 19-37, 50-51 and 58-60.

³⁷For the chrysargyron, see commentary, note on lines 149-161, and for the venationes, note on lines 223-227.

³⁸For the date and for Hypatius' role in the campaign against the Persians, see commentary, note on line 300.

³⁹The reference to the empress Ariadne appears at the end of the poem, lines 301-308. For the career of Ariadne, see Appendix A.

⁴⁰Various dates between the years 503 and 515 have been suggested for the panegyric. Most recently Alan Cameron, "The Date of Priscian's De laude Anastasii," Greek Roman and Byzantine Studies 15 (1974): 313-316, has put forward 503 as the probable date, while A. Chauvot, "Observations sur la date de l'eloge d'Anastase de Priscien de Cesaree," Latomus 36 (1977): 539-550, favours a date of 513.

⁴¹For panegyric as propaganda, see Alan Cameron, Claudian and Sabine MacCormack, "Latin Prose Panegyrics: Tradition and Discontinuity in the Later Roman Empire," Revue des études augustiniennes 32 (1976): 21-77. See also the remarks of Drake, In Praise of Constantine, pp. 46-46.

⁴²In his early poems, for example, Claudian stresses the regency of Stilicho, but this theme disappears from his last two panegyrics. See Alan Cameron, Claudian, pp. 49-51.

⁴³For the concept of the divine election of the emperor see A.D. Nock, "A Diis Electa," Harvard Theological Review 23 (1930): 251-274, and J. Rufus Fears, Princeps a diis electus. The Divine Election of the Emperor as a Political Concept at Rome, American Academy at Rome, Papers and Monographs 26 (1971). On divine protection of the emperor, see W.E. Kaegi, Byzantium and the Decline of Rome (Princeton, New Jersey, 1968), pp. 176-223. Both ideas are pervasive in Byzantine political and religious thought. They appear, for example, in the acclamations which greeted emperors at their accession. Anastasius was hailed as follows: "God gave you, God will preserve you" (Constantine Porphyrogenitus De Cer. 1.92). For the divine election of Anastasius, see also John of Nikiu, Chronicle 98.9, trans. R.H. Charles (London, 1916), p. 122.

⁴⁴The themes of divine election and divine protection of the emperor are not always stressed in imperial panegyrics. Procopius of Gaza (Pan. 5) lists the persons and institutions involved in the selection of Anastasius as inspired by God in their choice: "In truth some divine decree caused your election. As with one voice all the people acclaimed you, the great senate agreed with them and the empress consented": all translations of passages from Procopius'

panegyric are my own. The concept of divine election is not stressed nor does the idea appear elsewhere in Procopius' panegyric. Procopius concentrates on the actual historical event of the emperor's accession, although briefly and without detail.

⁴⁵ Menander Rhetor (370) advises orators to include these topics only if they add to the emperor's prestige. Procopius of Gaza omits birth and education but includes praise of Anastasius' native city Dyrrachium, as this gives him the opportunity to claim Herakles and Zeus as ancestors of the emperor (see further, note on the preface, lines 10-11).

⁴⁶ Priscian alludes to the changes in content he has made. See commentary on the preface, page 73.

⁴⁷ Menander Rhetor (372) suggests that times of war should precede times of peace and, with the exceptions noted, Priscian follows his advice.

⁴⁸ Procopius of Gaza moves from topic to topic almost exactly in the order recommended by Menander Rhetor. See Appendix B for a comparison of the topics and order suggested by Menander and those used by Procopius and Priscian.

⁴⁹ See further commentary, note on lines 164-170.

⁵⁰ For a discussion of the religious controversy as it affected Anastasius' policies, see P. Charanis, Church and State in the Later Roman Empire: The religious policy of Anastasius the First, 491-518 (Madison, Wisconsin, 1939) and C. Capizzi, L'imperatore Anastasio I (491-519), Orientalia Analecta 184 (Rome, 1969), pp. 100-137. More generally see W.H.C. Frend, The Rise of the Monophysite Movement (Cambridge, 1972). The text of Zeno's Henotikon, which attempted to avoid the difficulties by accepting the creeds of Nicea and Constantinople and condemning the heresies of Nestorius and Eutyches, but made no mention of the one or the two natures of Christ, can be found in Evagrius' Ecclesiastical History 3.1.

⁵¹ For a contemporary account of the proceedings against Macedonius and the reaction in Constantinople, see Zacharias of Mitylene Chronicle 7.8.

⁵² Evagrius Ecclesiastical History 3.32 and Theophanes AM 6004.

⁵³ Evagrius Ecclesiastical History 3.44; Theophanes AM 6005; Marcellinus comes s.a. 512.

⁵⁴ The main source for the rebellion of Vitalian is John of Antioch fr. 214e. See also Theophanes AM 6006 and Evagrius, Ecclesiastical History 3.43. For the date of the rebellion, see E.W.

Brooks, "The Eastern Provinces from Arcadius to Anastasius," in The Cambridge Medieval History eds. H.M. Gwatkin and J.P. Whitney (Cambridge, 1924), 1:485.

⁵⁵ For the details, see commentary, note on line 299.

⁵⁶ For the sources, further discussion, and Alan Cameron's different interpretation of this passage, see commentary, note on line 299.

⁵⁷ Chauvot, "Observations sur la date," p. 549.

⁵⁸ For the various interpretations of the passage, see commentary, note on line 265.

⁵⁹ John of Antioch 214e; Theophanes AM 6006.

⁶⁰ Certainly the reference to the west does not fit in with a date of 503, when Anastasius had just become embroiled with the Persians and the campaign had not gone well.

⁶¹ Cameron, "Date," makes no mention of these lines.

⁶² Joshua the Stylite Chronicle 60; Procopius De bello Persico 18.3.

⁶³ For Areobindus as one of the commanders against the Persians, see Joshua the Stylite, Chronicle 54. He was called on to be emperor by the rioters in 512 (Marcellinus comes s.a. 512 and John of Nikiu Chronicle 89.9.8). For Patricius' role in the Persian war, see Joshua the Stylite Chronicle 54. He attempted to pacify the rioters in 512 (Marcellinus comes s.a. 512). He was a benefactor of Vitalian (John of Antioch fr. 214e) and refused to command the army against him in 515 lest this friendship lead to a charge of treason (John Malalas 404). Celer took over as commander-in-chief against the Persians in 504 (Joshua the Stylite Chronicle 66). He was involved in the efforts to depose Macedonius and was sent with Patricius to pacify the rioters in 512 (Marcellinus comes s.a. 512).

⁶⁴ Cameron, "Date," 315.

⁶⁵ For the Isaurians as rebels, see commentary, note on lines 52-53.

⁶⁶ See, for example, the note on lines 115-118.

⁶⁷ John of Antioch fr. 214e.

⁶⁸ John of Antioch fr. 214e.

Anastasius had bronze crosses set up over the gates of Constantinople stating the causes of the rebellion (John of Antioch fr. 214e). The designation of Vitalian as a barbarian, Gothicus vir, (Zacharias Ecclesiastical History 7.13.82) and Vitalianus Scythā, (Marcellinus comes s.a. 514 and 519) may be a reflection of imperial propaganda designed to reduce Vitalian to the level of his troops (Chauvot, "Observations sur la date," p. 547, and see also E. Stein, Histoire de Bas-Empire (Paris, 1949), 2:178-179).

70 See note 53 above.

71 See commentary, note on lines 245-253.

72 Suetonius (Aug., 89.3) mentions Augustus' displeasure at being the object of inferior verse panegyrics.

73 The Einsiedeln Eclogues, the first, fourth and seventh Eclogues of Calpurnius Siculus, and Statius' Silvae 4.1 and 2 all eulogize the emperor in a pastoral setting.

74 For an analysis of the epic features in Claudian's poetry, see Alan Cameron, Claudian, pp. 260-266.

75 For an analysis of the literary features of the In laudem Iustini, see Averil Cameron, Corippus, pp. 7-8.

76 L. Previale, "Teoria e prassi del panegirico bizantino," Emerita 17 (1949): 77. See Appendix B for a comparison of Menander's scheme with the structure of the De laude Anastasii.

77 See commentary, note on preface pages 72-73.

78 See commentary, note on line 126.

79 For Joseph, see commentary, note on lines 208-217 and for the Biblical echoes, see notes on lines 198, 231, 253.

80 For the In laude Iustini as a Christian poem, see Averil Cameron, Corippus, pp. 8-10.

81 The Panegyricus Messallae, included in the Tibullan corpus, is the earliest extant Latin verse panegyric, while the Laus Pisonis dates from the reign of Nero. Both poems are comparable to the De laude Anastasii in length, 212 and 261 lines respectively, and in both the influence of rhetoric is clear.

82 Alan Cameron, "Wandering Poets: A Literary Movement in Byzantine Egypt," Historia 14 (1965): 491-497.

⁸³For the development of solar monotheism, see Gaston H. Halsberghe, The Cult of Sol Invictus (Leiden, 1972). For the eastern origins of solar symbolism, see H.P. L'Orange, Studies on the Iconography of Cosmic Kingship in the Ancient World (Oslo, 1953). For solar imagery in Christian art and literature, see E. Kantorowicz, "Oriens Augusti: Lever du Roi," Dumbarton Oaks Papers 17 (1963): 119-177, and F. Dölger, Sol Salutis, Gebet und Gesang im christlichen Altertum, Liturgiegeschichtliche Forschungen, vols. 4-5 (Münster, 1920). A description of the Vatican mosaic can be found in Kantorowicz, "Oriens Augusti," pp. 44-45. On the use of solar imagery by individual authors, see Averil Cameron, Corippus, pp. 160-163, and Drake, In Praise of Constantine, pp. 73-74.

⁸⁴For a further discussion of the image of the dextera Dei, see commentary, note on line 55.

⁸⁵See lines 50-66 and 130-132, for the mercy shown by Anastasius towards the Isaurians.

⁸⁶See, for example, commentary, note on line 162.

⁸⁷On the use of imitatio in Latin literature, see D.A. Russell, "De Imitatione," in Creative Imitation and Latin Literature, eds. David West and Tony Woodman (Cambridge, 1979), pp. 1-16.

⁸⁸For analyses, see commentary notes on lines 67-78 and 115-118.

⁸⁹For these echoes of Claudian, see lines 282, 283 and 302.

⁹⁰Draths Schmidt, Prisciani, pp. 80-107.

⁹¹For this discussion of Priscian's metrical patterns, I have made extensive use of the studies of G.E. Duckworth, "Variety and Repetition in Vergil's Hexameters," Transactions of the American Philological Association 95 (1964): 9-65 and "Five Centuries of Latin Hexameter Poetry: Silver Age and Late Empire," Transactions of the American Philological Association 98 (1967): 77-150.

⁹²The use of so many participles may also reflect the usage of Christian Latin writers, (see the remarks of C. Witke, Numen Litterarum. The Old and New in Latin Poetry from Constantine to Gregory the Great [Leiden, 1971], p. 51).

Latin Text

The text given here is that of Baehrens (see Introduction, p. 4) I have changed his punctuation or departed from his emendations to return to a manuscript reading at the following points: lines 4 and 5: comma after tantum removed, comma inserted after sequeris; lines 1 and 109: romani capitalized; line 32, Baehrens pravorum, Mss. A and B raptorum; line 49, Baehrens cesserit, Ms. A cesserat; line 103, Baehrens has memoralibus, perhaps a printing error for memorabilis; lines 112-116, punctuated as a question rather than a statement; line 301, Baehrens Qua, Ms. A. Quas.

De laude Anastasii imperatoris.

Praefatio

Summi poetae quae solent in versibus
 Quos imperatorum modulantur laudibus,
 Proferre, caelum cum petunt et sidera
 Adversa naturae sequentes impie,
 Tibi sciens quod displicent nimis pio, 5
 Nihil nefandum, nil nisi verum loquar.
 Nam qui tribuit mortalibus caelestia,
 Sapientium damnatur arbitrio pari;
 Et si qua vere praedicat, non creditur,
 Cum falsa ceperit canens exordia. 10
 Quare, precor, libenter audias tua,
 Quae cuncta non ego potero producere
 (Non mille dentur si mihi linguae, simul
 Fons ingeni sit carmen effundens novum).
 Sed parte ferre qua valeo pro viribus, 15
 Decerpta lucem conferat quae cantibus.
 Quod more miro fit; solent nam carmina
 Addere decus rebus magis quam sumere.
 Deo favente iam subibo pondera
 Laudis, serenus quae relevat vultus mihi, 20
 Praesens ubique cernitur qui sensibus,
 Arcana nudans principis mitissimi.

* * *

Accipe Romanum clementi pectore carmen,
 Accipe, quod soleo caelesti reddere regi
 Munere pro vitae, pro pulchro lumine solis;
 Namque deum sentis placari carmine tantum
 Quem sequeris, princeps animo iustissime recto, 5
 Qui tibi regna dedit, cui debes omnia soli
 Prospera, quae bellis pariter vel pace tulisti.
 Audax nam venio praeconia dicere vestra,
 Quae finit caelum, quibus omnis cingitur orbis.
 Nec mirum tales ex tanta stirpe creatos 10
 Pompeii, proprio quem culmine Roma locavit;
 Cuius quis meritos valeat numerare triumphos,
 Quos vidit Titan linquens repetensque profundum,
 Quos medio veniens steterat miratus Olympo?
 Sed tamen egregio, Pompei, cede nepoti. 15
 Namque genus, quod tu, terrarum victor ubique,
 Indomitum Tauri linquebas collibus altis,

Hic domuit penitus convellens semina belli;
 Quod celso positum fortunae vertice nuper
 Et nullum finem credens felicibus esse 20
 Impia condebat terris monumenta dolorum
 Vexatis domibus raptu stuprique furore:
 Cum similes omnes ad pessima damna putabant,
 Non honor aut aetas potuit defendere quemquam,
 Legibus eversis, certo munimine rerum, 25
 Vique potestatem sola tellure tenente:
 Tunc pravi scelerum capiebant praemia laeti.
 Iudiciis nimium iustos damnare coactis;
 Nam vanum nomen retinebant inrita iura,
 Umbraque iustitiae rebus restabat inanis. 30
 Paupertas nulli tenuis prodesse valebat,
 Quae solet esse salus raptorum tempore regum;
 Namque dabat poenas, ut non praesentia ferret,
 Et stupuit sese damnis maioribus esse
 Quam plenos opibus largis gravibusque metallis. 35
 Corpora nam, spoliis si copia nulla dabatur,
 Vexabant vinculis, vexabant stipite duro.
 Cladibus his tandem caeli rex liberat orbem,
 Cum dominum (melius sed patrem dicere possum)
 Praebet Anastasium tanta pietate vigentem, 40
 In cuius vita virtutes cernimus omnes:
 Est iustus, sapiens, castus fortisque piusque,
 Est clemens, stabilis, moderatus, mitis, honestus,
 Et, loquar ut breviter quod sentio corde sub imo,
 Possidet hic veterum quidquid laudatur in ullo: 45
 Antoninum huius pietas, sapientia Marcum,
 Et mitem Nervam lenissima pectora vincunt,
 Promeruitque Titus non tantum mente benigna;
 Gloria magnanimi Traiani cesserat isti:
 Nam quis tot domuit simul uno Marte tyrannos, 50
 Rupibus adverso quos duxit Isauria fato?
 Quos bonitas domini placidissima cedere iussit
 Moenibus ex urbis, voluit nec laedere prorsus,
 Quamvis supplicium debentes solvere mundo;
 Sed non ille pater, qui sustinet omnia dextra 55
 Atque pari libra iusti momenta repensat,
 Adnuit impune sceleratam linquere gentem.
 Nam furor immissus commovit Marte nefando
 Et Romae caecos rapiendas traxit ad arces,
 Vindicta ut pereant merita lucemque relinquunt. 60
 Tristitia nam rursus cupientes damna referre
 Et Latiis multo regnis peiora minantes
 Principis invicti felix exercitus armis
 Ductoresque fide nec non virtute potentes.
 Omnibus adficiunt caesos profugosque ruinis 65
 Cum ducibus sceleris ducentibus improba signa.
 Ut leo, qui regnans silva dominatur in alta

Per Libyae saltus, nisi nobilis ira lacessat,
 Non movet arma, suas stimulat nec verbere vires;
 At si commoveat clamor, si turba coronae, 70
 Infremit horrendum simul et distendit hiatus
 Sanguineis torquens ardentia lumina flammis
 Et ruit in medium, prosternens arma virosque
 (Nec vis ulla potest vementi obsistere contra:
 Impetus hos frangit, pulsos hos demetit unguis, 75
 Pars lacerata iacent inimici dentibus oris,
 Hos metus exanimat pereuntes vulnere nullo):
 Viribus Augustus sic saevos perculit hostes
 Per varios sternens casus non fanda furentes. 80
 Graecia iam taceat iactans mihi Bellerophonten,
 Qui vicit Solymos, ut rursus bella moverent:
 At semel hos dominus noster felicibus armis
 Sic domuit, post haec ne possint esse rebelles;
 Quod nec ductorum Servilius optimus olim,
 Pro merito laudum cui nomen Isauricus illo 85
 Marte datum fuerat, potuit praestare Latinis.
 Non illos aurum, non vis, non copia ferri,
 Ne castella quidem praeruptis ardua saxis;
 Nec tantae validis munitae moenibus urbes
 Quantas non ullus victorum ceperat ante, 90
 Exitiis rapiunt dignis et principis irae;
 Et qui spe fluxa frustrati cuncta tenebant
 Nil satis esse sibi credentes tela movendo,
 Cautibus angustis conclusi fata trahebant
 Peioremque famem crudeli morte tulerunt, 95
 Quae plus corrumpit quam cetera funera victos,
 Et mentes avidas orbis consumpsit egestas.
 Principe pro iusto taceat quis fulminis ictus?
 Nam quos non valuit robur corrumpere Martis,
 Nec tot ductorum circumdata moenia vallo, 100
 Deicit hos summi genitoris dextera flagrans
 Iniustos contra praesenti numine pugnans.
 O pietas praestans, toto memorabilis aevo,
 Pro qua cum ventis sociantur proelia nimbis,
 Ignibus et rabidis armantur fulgura bello 105
 Percutiuntque sono concussa tonitrua montes.
 Quid tempestates memorabo fluctibus ortas,
 Atque hostis Lyciae proiectas litore classis,
 Cum vice Romani functae sunt militis undae,
 Sceptrafer et cepit pelago pugnante triumphum? 110
 Omnia sic habuit virtus elementa salutis!
 Quis repetat totiens acies stragesque peractas
 Aequatasque solo sublimi tegmine turres,
 Agminibus domitis cum parte cadentibus omni
 Flumina torrebant fluviis mutata cruoris 115
 Et prope corporibus raptis sunt ostia clausa?
 Tunc mare confuso rutilavit sanguine tinctum

Et saturi pisces tempere cadavera plura.
 Sic qui sperabant captivas ducere matres
 Atque frui spoliis urbis sacrique palati 120
 Et reges iterum (infandum!) se reddere nobis,
 Lumine cum caeli terrae caruere sepulcris.
 At reliqui patrias sedes urbesque relinquunt
 Orbati natis, lugentes pignora cara:
 Moenia subvertunt, quaecumque reliquerat ignis, 125
 Et victi aethereo poenas sensere Tonanti
 Reddere se iustas contempto mille per annos
 Ultoremque deum post clades esse fatentur
 Atque sui casus se causam scire fuisse.
 Sed tamen Augusti superat clementia cuncta, 130
 Qui stratos relevat, domuit quos Marte superbos,
 Hostibus et pacis concedit munera pacis,
 Gaudens nunc proceres securos fidere vita
 Imperiumque suum vivendi ponere fruotum. 135
 Insidias nemo diras metuitque venenum
 Linguae, quo multi ceciderunt crimine ficto.
 Perdita res populi fuerat sub tempore diro,
 Restituit tamen hanc domini prudentia mira,
 Perficiens firmum quod cepit debile regnum. 140
 Multa simul vario concurrunt ordine rerum
 Diversosque trahunt angusto pectore sensus;
 Ac veluti Delphis Phoebas cum numine plena
 Omnia quae fuerant, quae sunt pariterque futura
 Conspicit et cupiens prohibetur prodere luci,
 Sic ego concipiens tua, princeps, plurima facta, 145
 Quae tibi debentur diversis partibus orbis,
 Non possum verbis animo proferre parata;
 Quocirca laudum relego fastigia summa.
 Nunc hominum generi laetissima saecula currunt,
 Quos inopes dudum faciebant iussa nefanda; 150
 Quae propter multi sedes fugere parentum,
 Haec pater et dominus terrae delevit in aevum
 Argenti relevans atque auri pondere mundum,
 Perpetuoque parans sibi maxima praemia caeli
 Divitias temnit, quo prodest omnibus unus. 155
 Namque cibum poterant qui vix acquirere vitae,
 Oblato miseri thensauris munere flebant,
 Munere cum gemitu tristi lacrimisque coacto;
 Quippe dabat causas violentis lucra parandi
 Et mala, quae plures pridem dixere canentes 160
 Romano vestras uel Graio carmine laudes.
 Et quo sceptris loco dederat tibi rector Olympi,
 Quo caput ipse tuum primo diademate cinxit,
 Hic sibi donari librorum vidit acervos
 Censibus infestos, servantes scripta dolorum, 165
 Munera suscipiens flammis aeterna beatis,
 Ad quas accessit placidus magis omnibus aris.

Aspexit vestros radiis sol aureus ignes,
 Et placuere diem violantia lumina fumo,
 Quae pura fulgens accendis mente serenus. 170
 Ipse locus vobis ostendit iure tropaea,
 Obtulit et vinctos oculis domitosque tyrannos
 Ante pedes vestros mediis circensibus actos.
 Aemilius quondam Paulus fortissimus ille
 Sic regem Persen populo spectante latino 175
 Curribus invectus Tarpeiam traxit ad arcem
 Placavitque Iovem Capitolia templa tenentem;
 Omnipotens sed te superum conspexit ab arce
 Numina placantem caelestia templa tenentis.
 Auspiciis gaude, princeps, felicibus aulae, 180
 Cui deus omniparens renovandum credidit orbem
 Iustitiamque iubet descendere rursus ab axe
 Et faciles precibus populorum praebuit aures,
 Quorum prostratas recreasti funditus urbes
 Portibus et muris, undarum et tractibus altis. 185
 Nunc tuto nautae repetunt clusa ostia velis,
 Qui dubio quondam peiora pericula ponto
 Iam patrias oras tolerabant nave tenentes,
 Naufragium ratibus fessis statione minante
 Disiectis claustris, quibus aequor frangitur altum; 190
 Sed nunc vota deo servati pectore toto
 Pro pietate tua, qua respicis omnia, fundunt.
 Agricolas miserans dispendia saeva relaxas;
 Curia perversis iam cessat moribus omnis,
 Nec licet iniustis solito contemnere leges: 195
 Nunc equites horrent rectorum iussa vehentes
 Nec lucri causa commiscent sacra profanis.
 Iudicis ipse sedens iudex caelestis imago
 Per te respondes populis oracula sancta,
 Proicis et nullos, nisi qui non iusta repossunt. 200
 Aurum non adhibes, moderantes ante solebant
 Quod dare, ne liceat socios evertere furtis,
 Exemploque doces quaestum contemnere turpem.
 Tirones forti numeros nunc milite complent
 Veraque non pretio, sed robore signa merentur. 205
 Quid quod dispensas cerealia munera vitae,
 Luxurie prohibens urbes cautusque futuri.
 Nec sensum populis caeli paenuria praebet,
 Si desint imbres, nec linquit copia victus,
 Consiliisque tuis servamur saepe paternis. 210
 Aegyptum septem sic servat Iosiphus annos
 Ille, pudicitiae meruit qui sidera fama,
 Cuius placavit sapientia numinis iras,
 Memphitae regis solvens insomnia mira;
 Horrea nam primus Nili construxerat oris 215
 [Luxurie prohibens urbes cautusque futuri]
 Atque famem potuit divina vincere cura.

Per te seditio penitus deletur ab urbe
 Innocuos spolians sub terras sole retracto;
 Nam cives mediis caedebant moenibus ense 220
 Bacchantes stimulis vini plausuque frementes
 Et spoliis pacis gaudentes nocte paratis;
 Ipse vetas ludos, animarum damna, nefandos
 Atque voluptates prohibes a sanguine sumi,
 Corporis et causa pascendi perdere vitam, 225
 Humanos arcens lacerari dentibus artus,
 Dentibus, armatur rabies quibus atra ferarum;
 Et superans omnes mentis novitate benignae,
 Sufficis haud animo cupienti commoda cunctis
 Largiri; quamvis numerum vincentia donas, 230
 Ingenuos relevas occulte munera praestans;
 Namque cupis superi te cerni lumine solo,
 Corruptique tuum non ulla superbia pectus
 Affectusque bonos minime fortuna novavit;
 Et quicumque prius, caperes quam sceptrum rogatus, 235
 Offendit propriae temeratus crimine culpae,
 Felicis domini fruitur nunc tempore laeto
 Praemia pro poenis speratis sumere mirans.
 Omnia sed superat, princeps, praeconia vestra
 Propositum, sapiens quo fidos eligis aulae 240
 Custodes, per quos Romana potentia crescat,
 Et quo, Roma vetus misit quoscumque, benigne
 Sustentas omni penitus ratione fovendo,
 Provehis et gradibus praeclaris laetus honorum,
 Ne damni patriae sensus fiantve dolores; 245
 Fortunam quare tibi debent atque salutem
 Votaque suscipiunt pro te noctesque diesque.
 Nec non eloquio decoratos, maxime princeps,
 Quos doctrina potens et sudor musicus auget,
 Quorum Romanas munit sapientia leges, 250
 Adsumis socios iusto moderamine rerum;
 Et solus doctis das praemia digna labore,
 Muneribus ditans et pascens mente benigna.
 Haec propter celsi dominator maximus axis
 Infestos vestris avertit ab arcibus hostes, 255
 Quos furor iniustus violato foedere movit,
 Euphratis vasti prope maxima flumina raptim
 Ex improviso latronum more ruentes.
 Sed deus in propriam cladem converterat illos,
 Consiliisque tuis iustissima damna tulerunt. 260
 Haec eadem cunctos, bello quicumque lacessunt
 Imperii columnen vestri pacemque, manebunt,
 Ut sol oceano tollens mergensque iugales
 Cernat Anastasii florere per omnia nomen:
 Utraque Roma tibi iam spero pareat uni 265
 Auxilio summi, qui conspicit omnia, patris,
 Quem placas omnem stabilis pietate per orbem

Templa novans renovansque deo fulgentia semper
 Lucraque vera putans aurum consumere iuste. 270
 Experti nuper sumus ergo, sceptrifer, omnes,
 Quanta tuum pectus servat praesentia regis
 Caelestis, propria bonitate pericula pellens.
 Nam cum mole sua supra te navis iniqua
 Sese cum ventis ferret velisque nefandis
 Atque salus dubiae penderet maxima vitae, 275
 Vitae, qua leges Latiae, qua cuncta tenentur,
 Ipse deus pelago praesens exhaustit ab alto,
 Quantus adest pro te ostendens discrimine magno,
 Non aliter summum solitus monstrare favorem.
 Sancta pios homines testantur scripta per aevum, 280
 In quibus historiae tales sunt mille bonorum,
 Quorum sic virtus praefulserat omnibus annis,
 Dextra quod eripuit divina e casibus illos,
 Nec prius enituit pietas quam tecta salute,
 Ex insperato dederat quam numen Olympi. 285
 Hoc rex omnipotens in vobis ipse probavit,
 Qui peperit mundum, qui lumine cuncta tuetur,
 Quem recolens animo veneraris tempus in omne,
 Pignoribus dignis decoratus sanguinis alti;
 Nam quid commemorem Pauli mitissima corda, 290
 Quem tibi coniungit munimen laudis honestas,
 Non solum generis venerandi vincula sacra;
 Nam mores sequitur mediocres pectore casto.
 Ore canam quonam pietatis culmina tantae,
 Qua fratris natos animo complecteris aequo, 295
 Non patrum tantum, sed patris more colendo,
 Indole quos nutris dignos et stirpe parentum?
 Hypatii vestri referam fortissima facta,
 Qui Scythicas gentes ripis depellit ab Histri,
 Quem vidit validum Parthus sensitque timendum? 300
 Quas laudes meritas Augustae dicere possim,
 Auctor quae fuerat tantorum et causa bonorum,
 Dum patrium munit tam firmo principe regnum
 Permittitque viro mundum seseque tuendam?
 Ex omni sensus invicta cupidine prava, 305
 Cuius fama piae vulgatur in omnibus oris,
 Plus fecit quam quod sexus concesserat illi,
 Provida cum tantum Romano profuit orbi.
 Numen, quod caelum, terram pontumque revisit,
 Ausoniis servet regnis haec munera semper, 310
 Barbariaeque ferae capiant iuga vepa subactae,
 Votaque firmentur populi sanctique senatus.

IN PRAISE OF THE EMPEROR ANASTASIUS

Preface

The sentiments which the greatest poets are accustomed to express in their verses composed in praise of emperors - when they impiously follow a course contrary to nature and entreat heaven and the stars - are displeasing to you because of your outstanding piety. Knowing this, I shall say nothing blasphemous, nothing untrue. For the poet who grants divine attributes to mortal men is condemned in the judgement of all wise men. And if he does proclaim something which is true, he is not believed because he has chosen an untrue beginning for his song. Therefore, I pray, may you with pleasure listen to a recital of your deeds. I shall not be able to proclaim them all, not if I should be given a thousand tongues and not if I had a fountain of genius pouring forth new song. But in accordance with my strength and ability I have selected some part of your accomplishments to bring splendour to my song. And this is remarkable, for poems usually add lustre to deeds rather than receive it from deeds. With the favour of God I shall now take up the burden of praise, a burden lightened by the serene countenance, which everywhere is seen visible to the senses, revealing the secrets of our most gentle Princes.

1 - 9

Accept a Roman song with a kindly heart. Accept what I am accustomed to render to the heavenly King in return for the gift of life and the beautiful light of the sun. For you know, o most just Princes of upright heart, that God whom you follow and whose power is so great is placated by song, God who granted you sovereignty and to whom alone you owe all the good fortune which you have won equally in wars or in peace. For it is with audacity that I come to celebrate your praises, which the heavens describe and by which the whole earth is girded.

10 - 18

Nor is it strange that such a man has sprung from the mighty stock of Pompey whom Rome placed on her highest pinnacle. Who could count the triumphs Pompey so rightly won, which the Sun saw when he left and sought again the deep sea and because of which, on his journey, he had stopped amazed in the middle of Olympus? But yet, o Pompey, yield to a renowned descendant. For the race which you, the conqueror of all the world, left untamed in the high hills of Taurus, this man has defeated, uprooting utterly the seeds of war.

19 - 37

This race, not long ago established on the lofty crest of fortune and believing that there was no end to their good fortune, persecuted households with the violence of pillage and rape and so set up on the earth impious memorials of grief. At that time when they [the Isaurians] considered that all men alike should suffer the har-

shest penalties, neither rank nor age could protect anyone because the laws, the sure defence of order, had been overthrown and force alone held power in the land. Then evil men took pleasure in seizing the rewards of their crimes, when the courts of justice were forced to condemn the just to excessive punishments. For the laws losing their authority retained but an empty name and justice was left a mere shadow in the world.

Abject poverty which in the reigns of rapacious kings usually provides protection had no power to benefit anyone. For indeed the poor man suffered such hardships that he could not endure his present circumstances and he was amazed that he was liable to more serious losses than wealthy men with vast resources and valuable metals. For if there was afforded them no opportunity for plunder, they [the Isaurians] loaded their victims' bodies with chains and beat them harshly with clubs.

38 - 49

At last the King of heaven delivers the world from these sufferings when He gives us Anastasius as our lord, although I can better say as our father, Anastasius who is strong because of his piety and in whose life we beheld all virtues. He is just, wise, chaste, brave and pious; he is merciful, steadfast, moderate, gentle and honourable. Let me briefly express what in my innermost heart I feel. Anastasius possesses every quality admired in any of the ancients: his piety surpasses that of Antoninus, his wisdom that of Marcus, and his most merciful heart that of gentle Nerva. Titus was

not so deserving of praise [as he] by reason of his kindness. The glory of the gallant Trajan has yielded to yours.

50 - 66

For who in a single war has conquered so many tyrants, whom Isauria brought forth from her rocky peaks though fate opposed her? In his most merciful goodness, our lord ordered them to depart from the walls of the city, and he had no desire to harm them at all, although they owed to the world a debt of punishment. But the Father who upholds all things in His right hand and who weighs the value of justice with a fair scale did not nod agreement to leave an evil race unpunished. For madness was inflicted upon them, madness moved them with the thought of impious war and incited them in their blindness to ravage the citadels of Rome, in order that they suffer their deserved punishment, that they perish and leave the light. For when they wanted to bring back once more harsh suffering and when they threatened even worse devastation to the Latin realm, the triumphant army of the unconquered Princeps and his commanders, powerful in their loyalty as well as in their courage, visited them with slaughter and rout and with total ruin, together with the commanders of the rebellion even as they were leading the impious standards.

67 - 79

Just as the lion who rules and is master in the lofty forest throughout the groves of Libya does not stir to arms nor urge on his strength with the lashing of his tail unless noble wrath has roused him - yet if some clamour or a crowd of encircling men should provoke

him, he roars ferociously, opens wide his jaws, and rolls his eyes burning with blood-red flames. He charges into their midst laying low men and arms; no force can withstand his rage. His attack tears some to pieces; others he strikes and mauls with his claws. Some lie dead, torn to pieces by his fierce teeth: fear unmans others and they perish though unwounded. Thus the Emperor with his might has struck down his savage enemies despite their rage for unspeakable deeds and has overthrown them with a succession of various catastrophes.

80 - 86

Now let Greece be silent, Greece which boasts to me of Bellerophon who conquered the Solymi in such a way that they once again went to war. By contrast, once and for all our lord with his triumphant army has conquered these men to ensure that, henceforth, they may never be able to rebel. Not even Servilius, once a most distinguished commander on whom, as deserved praise, the title of Isauricus had been bestowed because of his campaign, was able to accomplish this feat for the Romans.

87 - 97

Neither gold, nor might, nor supplies of arms, nor indeed strongholds high on steep crags, nor such great cities fortified with strong walls as no conqueror had ever taken before snatch them from their just destruction and the wrath of the Princeps. And they who, deceived by fickle hope, held all in their power and were insatiable while they were waging war dragged out their lives imprisoned among the confining cliffs: they suffered famine, a fate worse than

the cruelty of death. After they had been conquered, famine killed them rather than any other form of death and want consumed men greedy for the world.

98 - 111

Who could refrain from mentioning the lightning bolts which struck to protect our just Princes? For the fiery hand of the supreme Father, present in His power and fighting against the unjust, strikes those men whom neither the might of Mars had the power to destroy nor the walls besieged on all sides by a rampart of so many commanders. Oh remarkable piety worthy of being remembered for all time! In support of this piety winds and storm clouds are allied to his battles; the lightning flashes are armed for war with devouring fire and the thunder reverberates and smites the mountains with its crash. Why shall I mention the storms which arose at sea and the enemy fleet wrecked on the Lycian shore? Then the waves took on the task of Roman soldiers and the sceptre-bearer triumphed because the sea fought for him. Thus virtue held all the elements for salvation.

112 - 118

Who could recall the battles and the slaughter so often executed, the towers with their lofty defences levelled to the ground, when the rivers, changed by torrents of blood, grew warm and their mouths were almost choked with corpses carried down because the vanquished troops were falling everywhere? Then the sea gleamed red, dyed with the blood that mingled with its waters, and the sated fish spurned more bodies.

119 - 129.

Thus those who hoped to lead home captive matrons and enjoy the spoils of the city and the sacred palace and - oh unspeakable thought - to return to us again as kings have been deprived not only of the light of the sky but also of burial in the earth. The survivors deprived of their children and mourning dear pledges of love abandon the cities of their forefathers and their homes. They destroy whatever walls the fire had spared and in defeat they have realized that they are suffering just punishment for despising the heavenly God of thunder for a thousand years. After their defeat, they confess that God is wreaking vengeance and that they know they were the cause of their own downfall.

130 - 139

But yet the mercy of the emperor prevails over all. He raises up the conquered, whose pride he has subdued in war, and grants to the enemies of peace the gifts of peace. He rejoices that now secure the nobles have confidence that they will live and that his rule makes their lives flourish. No one now fears dread treachery and the poisonous tongues which caused many to die on false charges. Moreover, our lord in his marvellous wisdom has restored the prosperity of the people, which had been destroyed in time of adversity, and he has firmly restored an empire enfeebled when he succeeded as ruler.

140 - 148

In confused order many thoughts crowd together simultaneously in my mind and they pull all kinds of sentiments from a heart unequal to the task. Just as when at Delphi the priestess of Apollo, full of divine inspiration, sees all things which have been, which are and which shall be and, despite her desire, is prevented from revealing them to the light, so I, Princeps, although constantly aware of the countless deeds for which you are responsible in different parts of the world, cannot compose in words what is ready in my mind; therefore, I am recalling only the highest pinnacles of your glorious accomplishments.

149 - 161

Now there is passing a most prosperous age for the race of men. Once impious edicts impoverished men and forced many to flee from the homes of their ancestors. These laws the father and lord of the earth destroyed forever and relieved the world from the burden of silver and gold. Preparing for himself for eternity the supreme rewards which heaven grants he despises riches and because of this, one man benefits all men. For those who were scarcely able to obtain the food essential for life used to weep in their wretchedness after they had presented tribute to the treasury, tribute which had been collected to the accompaniment of their mournful groans and tears. Certainly this situation gave opportunities to violent men for contriving both gains and evils, which many poets have mentioned before when singing your praises in Latin or Greek song.

162 - 171

And in the place where the ruler of Olympus had given you your sceptre and where He himself first crowned your head with the diadem, here He saw dedicated to Himself piles of ruinous assessment lists, written records of grief. He welcomed these eternal gifts from the blessed flames which He approached more indulgently than any altar. The sun with its golden rays beheld your fires and the light which violated the day with its smoke pleased him, a light which you, serene and radiant because of your pure mind, kindle.

171 - 179

This very place rightly displayed trophies to you and offered to view the fettered and defeated tyrants who were driven to your feet in the middle of the Circus spectacles. Once in the same manner while the Latin people watched, Aemilius Paulus, that bravest of men, riding in his chariot dragged King Perses to the Tarpeian citadel and placated Jupiter the lord of the Capitoline temples. But it was all powerful God who beheld you from the citadel of the heavens as you placated the divine majesty of Him who rules over the celestial temples.

180 - 192

Rejoice in omens auspicious for the court, o Princeps. God the creator of all has entrusted to you the restoration of the world. He commands justice to descend again from heaven and He has lent His ears to the prayers of the peoples. You have restored from the foundations their devastated cities, by building harbours, walls and lofty

aqueducts. Now in safety sailors sail back into enclosed harbours. When once they were holding a course to their native shores, they suffered worse dangers than they had endured on the treacherous waters of the open sea and their anchorage threatened shipwreck for their weary vessels. For the barriers by which the sea is broken had been torn asunder. But now, because of their preservation, they pour forth prayers to God with all their hearts, thanking Him for the piety which makes you care for all things.

193 - 205

Because you pity the farmers you lighten their heavy expenses. For every curia refrains from evil practices and the unjust are not allowed to scorn the laws as was their custom. Now the horsemen who carry the orders of officials are afraid, nor for the sake of profit do they combine the sacred and the profane.

You yourself, a reflection of the heavenly judge, sit in judgement, and you with your own mouth give holy oracles to the people. You turn aside none but those who ask for what is not just. You do not use gold, which those ruling before were accustomed to give, to prevent intrigue from subverting your associates. By your example you teach men to despise foul gain. Recruits now swell the army ranks with strong soldiers and their bravery not bribery earn them true standards.

206 - 217

What more am I to say? You distribute the grain supplies, the gift of life, and taking thought for the future you check the ex-

travagance of the cities. If ever the rains should fail, the people do not feel the sky's poverty, the supply of food does not fail, but rather we are many times kept safe by your paternal wisdom. Thus Joseph preserved Egypt for seven years. He, who merited eternal praise because of the fame of his chastity, in his wisdom interpreted the strange dreams of the king of Memphis and so appeased the divine wrath. For Joseph had been the first to construct store-houses on the banks of the Nile and he was able to overcome famine with his divinely-inspired providence.

218 - 227

Through your authority, civil discord, which despoils innocent victims when the sun has set beneath the earth, is being completely eliminated from the city. For within the city walls, under the stimulus of wine, rioters beating their hands and rejoicing in the spoils of peace which they had gained by night, used to put their fellow citizens to the sword. You also forbid the evil games, that damnation of souls. You prevent bloodshed from being a source of pleasure, you prevent men from losing their lives to feed their bodies and human limbs from being torn apart by the teeth which arm the deadly fury of wild beasts.

228 - 238

You surpass everyone with your unprecedented generosity of spirit and you are able to grant benefits to all because you are devoid of avarice. Although you give countless gifts, you restore the freeborn by bestowing their gifts secretly; for you wish to be ob-

served only by the eyes of God; no pride has perverted your heart nor has good fortune at all changed your benevolent disposition. Whoever offended you before you could be called to take the sceptre and was disgraced by a judgement of his guilt, now enjoys the prosperous times of your auspicious rule and is dumbfounded that he receives rewards instead of the expected punishment.

239 - 253

But, o Princeps, your wise plan of choosing loyal guardians of the royal court, to increase through them the power of Rome, and of generously supporting those sent by old Rome by favouring them in every conceivable way, surpasses all your praiseworthy deeds. You gladly promote them through the ranks of distinguished appointments so that they may not feel pain at the loss of their homeland. Therefore they owe you their prosperity and safety and they offer prayers for you night and day.

Mighty Princeps, you also choose as your associates in just government those distinguished for their eloquence who are embellished by the power of learning and the exercise of poetry, those whose wisdom protects the Roman laws. You alone grant to learned men deserved rewards for their labours, endow them with gifts and support them with your generous heart.

254 - 260

For these reasons the almighty Lord of the lofty heavens turned aside from your strongholds dangerous enemies who were roused unjustly by fury since it was they who violated their treaty, and who

suddenly and violently erupted like bandits near the mighty streams of the vast Euphrates. But God had moved them to their own destruction and because of your plans they suffered the losses they deserved.

261 - 269

This same fate will await all who threaten with war the eminence and the peace of your rule so that the sun, when he rises from the ocean with his team and returns them there, may behold the name of Anastasius flourishing in all places. Both Romes, I hope, may now obey you alone with the help of the almighty Father who sees all things and whom you with unfailing piety placate throughout the whole world, always building and rebuilding gleaming temples to God and considering the just use of gold a true gain.

270 - 279

Thus, o Emperor, not long ago we all experienced how potent is the presence of the Heavenly King which preserves your life and drives away dangers by His own benignity. For when the winds and treacherous sails pushed over above you a ship reeling over because of its bulk and the safety of your precious life hung in the balance, a life by which the Latin laws, by which everything is maintained, God Himself was present and plucked you from the deep, proving in a time of peril how He manifests Himself in His might for your sake. In no other circumstances is He accustomed to show His supreme favour.

280 - 289

The sacred writings bear witness to pious men for eternity. In them are countless stories such as this about good men whose virtue

had shone forth to all ages because the hand of God snatched them from danger. Nor had their piety shone forth until it was protected by the safety which the God of Olympus had unexpectedly given them. Thus the almighty King has shown His favour for you, He who created the world, who protects everything with His light, whom you always venerate by reflecting on Him in your heart because you have been honoured with relatives worthy of your noble blood.

290 - 300

For what am I to say of the most merciful heart of Paulus? His integrity, the bulwark of his reputation, not merely the sacred bond of venerable kinship, unites him to you. He pursues modest habits with a chaste heart. With what voice shall I celebrate the crowning achievement of your great piety, the generous spirit with which you embrace the sons of your brother, cherishing them not only as an uncle, but also as a father? You rear them as children worthy of the excellent qualities and noble lineage of their parents. Shall I mention the most intrepid deeds of your Hypatius who is driving the Scythian tribes from the banks of the Hister? The Parthian has seen that he is strong and knows that he is to be feared.

301 - 312

What well-deserved praises could I speak of the Augusta, who has been the author and the cause of such great and good deeds, while she protects the empire of her forefathers by means of so powerful a princeps and entrusts to her husband the guardianship of both the world and herself? From every base desire her heart has been immune

and the fame of her piety is spread abroad on every shore. She has achieved more than her sex allowed her to do when her foresight so greatly benefited the Roman world. May God who sees the sky and earth and sea always preserve these gifts for the Roman realms and may the savage barbarians be conquered and truly submit to the yoke and may the prayers of the people and holy senate be confirmed.

COMMENTARY

Preface

In the fourth, fifth and sixth centuries, it was common practice to introduce a hexameter poem with a separate preface in a contrasting metre. Normally the language of a work determined the metre of the preface: Latin writers favoured elegiac verse, Greek authors preferred iambs. For the development of the iambic preface, see Alan Cameron, "Pap. Ant. III 115 and the iambic prologue in late Greek poetry," Classical Quarterly 20 (1970): 119-129, and T. Viljamaa, Studies in Greek Encomiastic Poetry of the Early Byzantine Period (Helsinki, 1968), pp. 71-97.

Priscian, whose preface of twenty-two lines is set off from the poem proper by the use of iambic trimeter, is atypical in his choice of metre. His unusual adoption of the iambic metre suggests the influence of contemporary Greek poets in Constantinople. Also, the use of the iambic metre imparts a less formal, more conversational tone to the preface. This is in keeping with the relatively small scale and unadorned style of the panegyric as a whole.

The preface is divided into three sections. In the first ten lines, the author compares himself to the greatest poets (summi poetae) who have written in praise of emperors. Unlike these poets, Priscian will avoid any attribution of divinity to the emperor. He will tell only the truth lest he offend the piety of Anastasius. Lines 11 to 18 contain an appeal to the emperor to listen willingly to a recital of his accomplishments and an elaborate protestation of the

poet's inability to do justice to them. Anastasius' deeds are so numerous that they cannot all be included and so great that they will glorify Priscian's verses. The last four lines serve as a transition to the main body of the panegyric as recommended in the rhetorical handbooks (Menander Rhetor. 369.15). With the help of God, the poet will reveal the secrets (arcana) of the merciful princeps.

Much of the content of the preface is standard fare. Priscian had a long tradition of both theory and practice to guide him and certain topics had become commonplace in the introductions to encomiastic works: the claim of veracity, the self-deprecation of the writer's skill, the assertion of the greatness of the subject which compensates for the poet's incapacity. For other topics which might be included in a preface, see Viljamaa, Studies, pp. 73-83; E.R. Curtius, European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages, trans. Willard R. Trask (New York, 1953), pp. 85-89; T. Janson, Latin Prose Prefaces (Stockholm, 1964), pp. 116-158. Priscian incorporates these individual, conventional themes into a poetic manifesto which not only announces the subject of his poem, but also indicates the way in which he, as poet, will treat this subject. In the first ten lines, Priscian states that he will not follow the practice of earlier poets. He will ~~not~~ proclaim the emperor as a god and claim divine attributes for a mortal. Thus to the usual announcement that he will tell the truth, Priscian adds that he will say nothing blasphemous (nihil nefandum).

In Latin literature, the formula of attributing divinity to the emperor begins with Virgil's Georgics. At the beginning of book one, following the dedication to Maecenas, Virgil first invokes a number of agricultural deities and then concludes with a plea to Augustus whom he addresses as a future deity: tuque adeo quem mox quae sint habitura deorum/concilia incertum est (G. 1.24-25). Virgil next says that, as a god, Augustus will rule whichever domain pleases him, sky, earth, or sea (G. 1.25-39). The invocation closes with requests that Augustus help Virgil in his task and learn to heed the prayers of his subjects (G. 1.42). The themes which Virgil introduces, the invocation of the emperor as a god, the prophecy of his apotheosis, the description of his future realms and the plea for aid are imitated with suitable elaboration and variation by later poets (cf., for example, Lucan 1.44-47 and Statius Theb. 1.27-31).

The convention of addressing the ruler as a god virtually disappears from verse panegyrics praising Christian emperors, although Claudian and Sidonius, in their prefaces, do make comparisons between the subjects of their poems and pagan gods. Stilicho is a new Apollo destroying a second Python (Claudian In Ruf. 1. praef.) and, like Mars, he is advised to rest from war to listen to the Muses' song (Claudian In Ruf. 2 praef. 13-20). The rejoicing in honour of Anthemius is similar to the joy at the accession of Jupiter (Sidonius Pan. Anth. praef.). The panegyrics of Claudian and Sidonius are written using motifs from epic, peopled with divine figures and ornamented with mythological allusions. The use of mythological

comparisons in their prefaces is appropriate to their preferred style. Priscian announces plainly that he will not proclaim the divinity of the emperor. He goes beyond his predecessors by having no mythological allusions at all in his preface, and only one in the entire panegyric (see note on lines 80-81). Priscian does not even refer directly to the Muses, the traditional inspiration of poets (see further, notes on lines 14 and 19). Rather he prefers to praise the emperor with the help of God (deo favente).

In the introduction to his poem, Priscian is commenting on the poetic conventions of the verse panegyric. He begins the preface with the emphatic summi poetae and later includes two common themes, the fountain of inspiration and the thousand tongues, which had a long history in Greek and Latin poetry (see note on line 13). In this way Priscian acknowledges his debt to tradition. However, the opening lines underline his rejection of the convention of imperial divinity by including no mythological allusions, by writing the preface in a metre not used by his predecessors in Latin verse panegyric and by telling us that to call the emperor divine would offend Anastasius' piety. Thus the preface suggests the Christian tone of the panegyric as a whole. Written in a Christian context, the poem presents Anastasius as the image of the heavenly King, a ruler who prospers in all he undertakes because his piety merits divine protection. Aware that in style and imagery his panegyric differs significantly from those of his predecessors, Priscian feels it necessary to use his preface to signal these changes to his audience. For the use of

prefaces by ancient authors to explain the problems involved in their work or their treatments of subjects, see George A. Kennedy, Greek Rhetoric Under Christian Emperors (Princeton, New Jersey, 1983), p.

26.

- 1: Summi poetae: Priscian introduces his preface with a general reference to the greatest poets to recall to his audience the whole tradition of poetry written in praise of emperors. It is more usual for an author to compare himself to a specific earlier poet in the introduction to a verse panegyric. Claudian (De Cons. Stil. 3. praef.) presents himself as a modern Ennius lauding the triumphs of a new Scipio. Sidonius (Pan. Maior. praef.) compares his situation to that of Virgil and Horace who were pardoned by Augustus and then sang his praises. Corippus (Ioh. praef. 15-16) tells his audience that his epic does not equal that of Virgil, although his hero Iohannes surpasses Aeneas:

Aeneam superat melior virtute Iohannes
sed non Vergilio carmina digna cano.

- 2: modulantur laudibus: Priscian varies the usual construction in which modulor is followed by carmen or carmina in the accusative and the name of a musical instrument in the ablative, cf. Virgil Ecl. 10.51: carmina pastoris Siculi modulabor avena; Ovid Met. 14.341: dum feminea modulatur carmina voce. Cf. also Judith 16.2: modulamini illi psalmum novum.
- 3: caelum cum petunt et sidera: it has been suggested that Priscian may intend to allude to Sidonius when he speaks of

poets who refer to heaven and the stars (see Romano, "Prisciano," p. 349). Romano bases his suggestion on the fact that Sidonius mentions the sky and the stars at the beginning of several of his panegyrics. The opening lines of the panegyric on Avitus call on Phoebus to give his light to heaven as he now has an equal, Avitus, who can give light to the earth. Sidonius states that the zodiac need not boast of its constellations for Avitus also has stars:

Phoebe, peragrato tandem visurus in orbe
 quem possis perferre parem, da lumine caelo:
 sufficit hic terris, nec se iam signifer astris
 iactet, Marmaricus quem vertice conterit Atlans:
 sidera sunt isti (Pan. Avit. 1-5).

At the close of this introductory passage, Sidonius says that Avitus is the star which will guide him in his task: en sidus, quod nos per caerula servet (Pan. Avit. 16). Romano also mentions the preface to Sidonius' panegyric of Anthemius (praef. 1) which opens with a description of the celebration when Jupiter was established as the king of the gods above the stars (cum iuvenem supera astra Iovem natura locaret) and of the praise of the citizens of heaven for their new god. Sidonius compares himself to the very humblest of the divinities who praise Jove and ends with this wish:

ergo colat variae te, princeps, hostia linguae;
 nam nova templa tibi pectora nostra facis
 * (Pan. Anth. praef. 29-30).

Although in these passages Sidonius does refer to the star and heavens, such references do not seem a sufficient

basis for inferring that Priscian is alluding specifically to them. Virgil, Lucan and Statius all mention heaven and the stars when they describe the apotheosis of the emperor, cf. Lucan 1.45-47:

. . . te, cum statione peracta
astra petes serus, praelati regia caeli
excipiet gaudente polo.

In the passage quoted above, for example, Lucan speaks of the stars and the heavenly palace. Claudian, in a far more memorable passage than any written by Sidonius, speaks of the death of Theodosius as a return to heaven: he describes Theodosius' ascent through the spheres, his welcome as a new star and addresses the emperor as decus aetherium (De III Cons. Hon. 161-188). Moreover, nowhere else in the panegyric does Priscian seem to refer to a work by Sidonius, although he frequently echoes Virgil, Lucan and Claudian. It seems reasonable, then, to conclude that Priscian intends no specific reference to any one poet. He is describing the convention of invoking the emperor as a deity in the introduction to a work, particularly when the stars were involved, a convention which he will not follow.

- 4: Adversa naturae: Lucan and Claudian speak of the emperor's role as god as being in accordance with nature: cf. Lucan 1.51-52: iurisque tui natura relinquet/quis deus esse velis, ubi regnum ponere mundi; Claudian De III Cons. Hon. 106-107: quamvis emeritum peteret natura reverti/numen et auratas

astrorum panderet arces. See also Sidonius Pan. Avit. praef.

1: For Priscian it is against the natural order of things to claim divinity for a mortal.

5: nimis pio: contrasts with impie at the end of line 4. Nimis is used here with the meaning "very" or "exceedingly", rather than in more commonly found sense of "excessively", cf.

Catullus 56.4: res est ridicula et nimis iocosa. This is the first reference in the panegyric to the piety of the emperor.

A description of the manifestations of this imperial virtue and of the rewards such piety brings to the emperor and his subjects will be one of the main themes of the poem.

6: Nihil nefandum, nil nisi verum loquar: the rather convoluted first lines lead up to Priscian's assertion that he will proclaim the truth, an assertion emphasized by anaphora, alliteration and assonance. Priscian indeed has convinced one reader that he is telling the truth. Romano, though he acknowledges that the claim to veracity is a commonplace of panegyric, thinks that Priscian is telling the truth in his panegyric both, because as a grammarian accustomed to exact research, Priscian would have based his work only on established facts and because as a Christian he would not have spoken false praise of the emperor (Romano, "Prisciano," p. 349). Romano feels that, shorn of mythological adornment, Priscian's narrative is somewhat bald and would have been unconvincing without the animation and warmth of sincerity

(tuttavia animazione e calore dalla sincerità dell'elogio,
Romano, "Prisciano," p. 350). Granted that in many ways
Anastasius was an admirable emperor, it is difficult to es-
timate the sincerity and veracity of a panegyrist whose
mandate, as described in the rhetorical handbooks, is to in-
clude only the good qualities of the emperor (Menander Rhetor
368.1-10).

- 7-8: John Lydus (De Mag. 2.3., trans. T.F. Carney, Bureaucracy in
Traditional Society, book 3 [Lawrence, Kansas, 1971], p. 42)
agrees with Priscian that it is wrong to attribute divinity to
a mortal. He writes of Augustus:

He requested not to be styled a god, but rather
"divine", presumably from pious modesty, and this
honorific styling was conferred upon all of his
successors. One styling is the prerequisite of
those who are sons by blood, the other for those
who become so by adoption, the title being
conferred upon emperors for honorific purposes -
or rather for purposes of blasphemous flattery.

- 10: falsa: contrasts with vere in line 9. It means "untrue", but
in the context of the preface may also suggest a mistaken ap-
proach to panegyric.

- 12: Quae cuncta non ego potero producere: it was common for a
panegyrist to protest that he had neither the strength nor the
ability to do justice to the deeds of his subject. Corippus
(In laud. Iust. 1.3-5) expresses the same idea:

. . . licet omnia nullus
inclita gestorum valeat monumenta piorum
ordinibus numerare suis,

13: mille . . . linguae: this theme goes back to Homer (Il. 2. 488-90). Homer asks the Muses to name the captains and leaders of the Greeks. The common folk, he says, he could not name without the help of the Muses even if he had ten tongues, ten mouths, a tireless voice and a heart of bronze. This Homeric image is used and developed by later writers and is especially popular with late Latin writers (see P. Courcelle, "Histoire du cliché virgilien des cent bouches," Revue des Etudes Latines 33 [1955]: 231-240). While Greek writers prefer to keep the Homeric number of ten tongues (see Alan Cameron, "The Vergilian Cliche of the Hundred Mouths in Corippus," Philologus 3 [1967]: 309), Latin writers increase the number to one hundred. Virgil (G. 2.42-44) exclaims:

non ego cuncta meis amplecti versibus opto,
non, mihi si linguae centum sint oraque centum,
ferrea vox.

Ovid (Fast. 2.119-121) improves on Virgil and increases the number to one thousand:

Nunc mihi mille sonos, quoque est memoratus Achilles
vellem, Maeonide, pectus inesse tuum
dum canimus sacras alterno, pectine Nonas.

Priscian uses the variation of the thousand tongues to emphasize the number and greatness of Anastasius' deeds. He follows earlier writers in using the theme to suggest his inability to deal exhaustively with his subject (cf. Virgil G. 2.42-44) and in linking the theme to the idea of the divine inspiration of the poet, cf. Silenus Italicus Pun. 4.525-527:

Non, mihi Maeoniae redeat si gloria linguae
centenasque pater det Phoebus fundere voces
tot caedes proferre queam,

- 14: Fons ingeni sit carmen effundens novum: the image of a fountain as the source of poetic inspiration is a commonplace in Greek and Latin poetry and one which is often found in the introductions to poetic works, cf. Virgil G. 2.174-176:

. . . tibi res antiquae laudis et artis
ingredior, sanctos ausus recludere fontis
Ascaeumque cano Romana per oppida carmen.

Cf. also Statius Achil. 9-10: da fontes mihi, Phoebae, novos ac fronde secunda/necte comas. The fountain is the fountain of the Muses and poets frequently allude to the theme in some way, either by naming a specific Muse (cf. Horace Carm. 1.26.6), by mentioning places associated with the Muses, such as Pirene or Helicon, (cf. Statius Sil. 1.2.4-6) or by referring to Hesiod, since the association of the Muses with a fountain of poetic inspiration goes back to the introduction to the Theogony. Poets about to introduce a new subject or a genre of poetry new to them often use the image of drinking from a new fountain; cf. Lucretius 1.927-928: iuvat integros accedere fontis/atque haurire, and the quotation from the Achilleis above. Although he follows the tradition by mentioning a fountain of new song in the introduction to his panegyric, Priscian does not allude to the Muses. Priscian, rather than expanding upon either this theme of the fountain of the Muses, or upon the theme of the hundred tongues (cf.

line 13), has chosen to combine brief allusions to both. For an example of a somewhat similar combination of the two themes in a contemporary prose work, cf. Ennodius Vita Epiphani 83:

Cuius itineris molestias necessitatesque non
valeam per ordinem digerere, nec si mihi centum
linguarum fluminibus per meatus inriguos verba
fundantur.

15-16: these two lines are difficult to analyze grammatically. There are problems in determining the case of qua and decerpta and in determining the relationship of the relative clauses to the rest of the passage. Since the licence permitted in the iambic metre used by the Roman dramatists allows decerpta to be construed as an ablative, it seems best to understand parte decerpta as an ablative absolute, with the qua of the first relative clause also attracted into the ablative. A relative clause of purpose (luce[m] conferat quae cantibus) follows. There is an ellipsis of the main clause, but the sense can be provided from line 12 at the beginning of the passage. A literal translation is; but that part, which I am able to bear up under according to my strength, having been selected to bring splendour to my song, [I shall be able to proclaim your praise].

19: Deo favente: Priscian will have the help and inspiration of God in undertaking his burden of praise. Priscian seems to invite a comparison between his source of inspiration and those of other poets. The summi poetae claimed the emperor as the divine power assisting them. Lucan (1.63) says of Nero:

83

sed mihi iam numen. The Muses had been acclaimed as the inspiration of poets from the time of Homer. In lines 13 and 14 which refer to the themes of the hundred tongues and the fountain of inspiration, both specifically associated with the Muses, Priscian acknowledges their traditional role only to demonstrate here that he has no need of them. In this Priscian follows the practice of Christian writers of religious poetry. Paulinus of Nola (Carm. 10.21-22), for example, states that hearts dedicated to Christ reject Apollo and the Muses (negant Caminis nec patent Apollini/dicata Christo pectora). For Paulinus, Apollo and the Muses stand for the secular literature which he can no longer write because of his religious belief, and in his hymns Christ replaces the Muses and His aid is invoked. Priscian follows this practice for his secular poem because, as he has explained earlier in the preface, it is wrong to call a mortal divine and by implication all references to pagan deities are inappropriate in a poem praising a pious Christian emperor. In his other poetic work, Priscian also requests the help of the King of heaven (Periegesis 1-4). This request is an addition to the original poem of Dionysius which Priscian further adapts by removing a number of mythological allusions (see Draths Schmidt, Prisciani, pp. 11-15). For the problems writers of religious poetry faced in combining their Christian beliefs and content with the traditional practices of Latin

poetry, see C. Witke, Numen Litterarum. The Old and New in Latin Poetry from Constantine to Gregory the Great (Leiden, 1981).

- 20: serenus . . . vultus: serenus was one of a cluster of adjectives used to describe the appearance of the emperor at official functions, when he was meant to appear as the embodiment of order and peace. As Synesius says in De Regno (trans. Augustine Fitzgerald, The Essays and Hymns of Synesius of Cyrene, vol. 1 [London, 1930], p. 119), "divine calm should extend even to his countenance". Ennodius (Pan. 21) describes Theodoric as having eyes blooming with constant serenity (vernant lumina serenitate continua). Tranquillus, placidus, mitis and clemens were used to express related ideas. For the use and significance of this group of adjectives, see Averil Cameron, Corippus, p. 192, n. 309. Priscian describes Anastasius as mitis in the last line of the preface and as clemens in the first line of the panegyric. The image of the Roman emperor as a figure of majestic serenity appears in the art as well as the literature of the later Roman empire. See MacCormack, Art and Ceremony, pp. 71-72, for a discussion of the motif of imperial tranquility in the Barberini diptych which may represent Anastasius.

- 21: Præsens ubique cernitur qui sensibus: Ausonius (Gratiarum Actio 1) states that because of the benefits of his rule the emperor's presence is felt everywhere (ades enim locis om-

nibus, nec nam miramur licentiam poetarum, qui omnia deo plena
 dixerunt), and Priscian may intend a similar interpretation
 here.

22: arcana: another way of saying that the truth will be
 revealed. Justin II's wife, Sophia, and mother, Vigilantia,
 revealed his arcana to the panegyrist Corippus, cf. In laud.
Iust. 1.9-11:

vos divae, date verba, et quae Vigilantia mater
 et quae summa regens Sapientia protegis orbem.
 vos mihi pro cunctis dicenda ad carmina Musis
 sufficitis; vos quaeque latent arcana monetis.

See also Pliny the Younger's statement (Pan. 83.1) that the
 high estate of the emperor permits no privacy: omniaque arcana
noscenda famae proponit atque explicat.

Lines 1-9: captatio benevolentiae.

1 - 3: accipe: for the anaphora of accipe beginning a series of
 clauses, cf. Lucan 8.121-124:

Accipe templorum cultus aurumque deorum
 Accipe, si terris, si puppibus ista inventus
 Aptior est; tota, quantum valet, utere Lesbo.
 Accipe: ne Caesar rapiat, tu victus habeto.

Priscian's reminiscence of a passage in which the citizens of
 Mitylené offer Pompey shelter, money and men prepares for the
 mention of Pompey as the ancestor of Anastasius, line 15.

There seems to be an allusion to a second passage from
Lucan in these first three lines of the panegyric. In the
 opening lines of his poem, Lucan (1.63-66) addresses the em-
 peror Nero as the divinity who inspires his verse:

sed mihi iam numen; nec si tē pectore vates
 accipio, Cirrhaea velim secreta moventem
 sollicitare deum Bacchumque avertere Nysa:
 tu satis ad vires Romana in carmina dandas.

As an example of the attribution of divine qualities to a mortal emperor by a poet, the reminiscence links the opening lines of the panegyric with the preface. In addition, Priscian is able to underline the difference between his source of inspiration and that of Lucan. Although both poets compose Roman songs, Priscian is aided by God whose power and whose relationship to the emperor he proceeds to describe.

Priscian also may be recalling Ovid Pont. 4.1.1-2:

Accipe, Pompei, deductum carmen ab illo
 Debitor est vitae qui tibi, Sexte, suae.

Ovid, an exile in Thrace, felt that he owed his life to Sextus Pompey, the governor of the neighbouring province of Macedonia who protected Ovid and also paid the poet's expenses.

Priscian's appeal to Anastasius' kindly heart may be a request for a similar display of generosity. For Sextus Pompey and his relationship with Ovid, see Epistulae ex Ponto, ed. and trans. J. Andre (Paris, 1977), pp. xxx, 113.

1: Romanum . . . carmen: Latin song. On official occasions panegyrics were presented in both Greek and Latin. Priscian refers to this practice later in the poem (see note on line 161).

clementi pectore: the theme of the emperor's mercy is stressed throughout the poem.

- 2: quod soleo caelesti reddere regni: Menander Rhetor (369.5) suggests the idea that both god and emperor are propitiated by song as a topic for the introduction to a basilikos logos:

ὡςπερ οὖν τὸ κρεῖττον ὕμνοις καὶ ἄρσταις
ἱλασκόμεθα, οὕτω καὶ βασιλέα λόγοις.

Caelesti echoes the caelestis of the preface (line 7) and suggests the idea of the separation of the divine and human realms which appears later in the poem (see line 152 and the note on lines 177-178). By offering to Anastasius a song of praise of the kind he offers to God, Priscian presents the emperor as the earthly counterpart of the heavenly King and introduces an image of Anastasius which dominates the panegyric (see note on line 198). For the Christian concept that the primary function of poetry was the praise of God, see R. Ficarra, "Motivi ed orientamenti cristiani nel De laude Anastasii di Prisciano," in Studi in onore di Anthos Ardizzoni (1978), p. 361.

- 3: munere pro vitae: the praise of God as the creator of life, an important theme in Christian poetry, is alluded to here only briefly. For the elaboration of this theme in a later panegyric, see Corippus In laud. Iust. 2.11-29 and Averil Cameron's notes on this passage indicating Corippus' debt to earlier writers in her Corippus, p. 150.
- 4: deum sentis placari carmine tantum: cf. Horace Epist. 2.1.138: carmine di superi placantur. Tantum can be trans-

lated in two ways: used adverbially and translated as "only", tantum suggests that Priscian may be referring to differences between the worship of pagans and Christians. Other Christian writers draw attention to these differences. Eusebius, for example, in his biography of Constantine, notes that on the occasion of his decennalia the emperor offered prayers of thanksgiving to God as sacrifices without flame or smoke (Vita Constantini 1.48) and he also refers to the eucharist as a bloodless sacrifice (4.45). Used in this way, tantum emphasizes carmine and by implication suggests that Priscian's poem is the highest form of praise for Anastasius. Although this adverbial meaning may well be intended, tantum can also be understood as an adjective agreeing with deum. Tantum immediately precedes quem sequeris in the following line and we have deum . . . tantum quem sequeris as one idea. Translated in this way, tantum emphasizes the power of God, the protector of Anastasius, a theme which dominates the poem.

5: iustissime: the short "e" demanded by the metre indicates a vocative rather than an adverb.

6-7: Priscian indicates that God is the source of Anastasius' rule and of the military success and prosperity enjoyed by the empire, cf. Corippus In laud. Iust. praef. 19-20:

solum excellentem conscendere iussit in arcem
te pater omnipotens, summaque in sede locavit.

6: qui tibi regna dedit: cf. Lucan 8.559: qui tibi regna dedit.

The passage from Lucan to which Priscian may allude here is

part of an apostrophe addressed to Ptolemy after his decision to have Pompey, who had given him his throne, assassinated.

The reference may be intended to prepare for the mention of Pompey at line 15.

7: bellis pariter vel pace tulisti: a reference to the conventional division of a basilikos logos into deeds of war and peace, a division which Priscian follows.

8: Audax: to claim that they are acting boldly in presenting their work is one way for writers to stress the greatness of their subject, and such a claim is a standard topic in introductions (cf. Virgil G. 1.40: da facilem cursum atque audacibus adnue coeptis).

venio . . . dicere: an infinitive of purpose after a verb of motion. The construction is found in colloquial Latin and in poetry (cf. Virgil Aen. 1.527-528: non Libykos populare Penates/venimus).

Lines 10-18: Anastasius is a descendant of Pompey the Great whose military triumphs he surpasses.

10-11: ex tanta stirpe . . . Pompeii: Christodorus, who wrote a six book epic on Anastasius' Isaurian campaigns, also mentioned Anastasius' descent from Pompey in his ecphrasis on the statues of the baths of Zeuxippus which is included in The Greek Anthology (2.398-406, trans. W.R. Paton [London and New York, 1916], pp. 89-90):

Καὶ πρόμος εὐκαμάτων Πομπήϊος Ἀύσονιῶν,
 φαιδρὸν ἰσαυροφόνων κειμήλιον ἠνορεῶν,
 στειβομένας ὑπὸ ποσσὶν Ἰσαυρίδας εἶχε μαχαίρας,
 σημαίνων ὅτι δοῦλον ὑπὸ ζυγὸν αὐχένα Ταύρου
 εἴρυσεν, ἀρρήκτῳ πεπεδημένον ἄμματι Νίκης.
 κεῖνος ἀνὴρ, ὃς πᾶσιν ἔην φάος, ὃς βασιλῆος
 ἠγαθήν ἐφύτευσεν Ἀναστασίῳ γενέθλην.
 τοῦτο δὲ πᾶσιν ἔδειξεν ἐμὸς σκηπτουῖχος ἀμύμων,
 δηώσας σακέεσσιν Ἰσαυρίδος ἔθνεα γαίης.

Pompey, the leader of the successful Romans in their campaign against the Isaurians, was treading under foot the Isaurian swords, signifying that he had imposed on the neck of Taurus the yoke of bondage, and bound it with the strong chains of victory. He was the man who was a light to all and the father of the noble race of the Emperor Anastasius. This my excellent Emperor showed to all, himself vanquishing by his arms the inhabitants of Isauria.

Discussing the references to Anastasius' descent from Pompey

in Priscian and Christodorus, Alan Cameron ("The House of Anastasius," Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies 57 [1978]:

260) points out that "this repetition of so unlikely yet so precise a claim suggests something more than the frivolous and casual compliment of imperial panegyric". He suggests that Anastasius' father was called Pompeius and notes that the name recurs in other members of Anastasius' family. For Priscian's praise of the members of Anastasius' family, see lines 290 - 300 and commentary notes.

Priscian follows the example of earlier writers of panegyric who, when faced with the task of praising emperors who had no strong dynastic claim to the throne or whose background was obscure, did not hesitate to proclaim that such emperors were descended from illustrious predecessors. The author of a panegyric on Constantine (Pan. Lat. 7.2.2; Mynors,

6.2-2) traced Constantine's line back to the emperor Claudius Gothicus. Claudian (De IV Cons. Hon. 19) traced the descent of Theodosius I from Trajan and claimed him as the founder of the Theodosian dynasty.

Procopius of Gaza (Pan. 2), however, makes no similar mention of Anastasius' descent from Pompey. He chooses instead to emphasize the birthplace of the emperor, Dyrrachium, the ancient Epidamnus. By so doing he is able to claim Heracles and Zeus as ancestors of Anastasius, since Epidamnus, which was colonized by the Corcyraeans and the Corinthians, had Phalius, a descendant of Heracles, as its founder (Thucydides 1.24.2). Procopius may not have known that the name Pompeius occurred in Anastasius' family and in any case he was writing for a Greek audience which probably had little knowledge of or interest in Roman history. That Priscian and Christodorus do trace Anastasius' family back to Pompey suggests that in the literary and court circles in Constantinople there was an interest in the period of the civil wars and in Lucan as the poet of that period. Certainly Priscian often imitates Lucan and presumably expected his audience to recognize and appreciate his virtuosity. Also John Lydus, who studied in Constantinople during the last years of Anastasius' reign, demonstrates more knowledge about the history of the late Republic and the civil war between Pompey and Caesar than he does about any other period of Roman history (see Carney, Bureaucracy in Traditional Society, book 2, p. 37).

- 10: tales ex tanta stirpe creatos: Priscian's use of the plural form tales is somewhat surprising. He has used the singular in referring to Anastasius up to this point, and in line 15 Pompey is admonished to yield to his descendant (cede nepoti). It is possible to take the plural form as a reference to Anastasius' family, but if so one would expect Priscian to enlarge upon the topic in this, the appropriate section of the panegyric. Tales is probably a poetic plural, a common device (cf. for example, Virgil Aen. 6.422), used here by Priscian because the accusative singular talem would not fit the metre.
- stirpe creatos: Priscian frequently borrows the last two feet from lines of earlier writers, cf. Virgil Aen. 10.543:
Volcani stirpe creatus; Ovid Met. 1.760: sum caelesti stirpe creatus; Ovid Met. 14.699: humili de stirpe creatus.
- 12: meritos . . . triumphos: Pompey celebrated triumphs for victories over Domitius Ahenobarbus, the Numidian pretender Iarbus, Stertorius and Mithridates.
- 13-14: for language and word order, cf. Virgil Aen. 7.218: extremo veniens Sol aspiciebat Olympo.
Titan: used by poets as a personification of the sun. The sun stands still in amazement at the sight of Pompey's triumphs, which like the sun's own journey stretch from east, the victory over Mithridates, to west, the victory over Stertorius. The image of the sun thus is included to underline the greatness of Pompey's military victories. The use of

Titan for sun is appropriate for a recollection of Pompey's achievements, set as they were in Rome's distant pagan past. Elsewhere in the poem, Priscian uses Sol with its Christian associations (see note on line 168).

- 15: Sed tamen egregio, Pompei, cede nepoti: despite the greatness of his achievements, Pompey must yield to his descendant, Anastasius. Priscian here employs a standard device of imperial panegyric: he describes the deeds of a heroic figure from the past and then points out how the emperor has surpassed even such an illustrious and worthy predecessor. Claudian (De Cons. Stil. 1.193-196) uses the same technique. He compares Stilicho's exploits in war with those of Drusus and Trajan, and he addresses these two worthies in terms similar to Priscian's exhortation to Pompey:

cedant, Druse, tui, cedant, Traiane, labores.
vestra manus dubio quidquid discrimine gessit,
transcurrens egit Stilicho totidemque diebus
edomuit Rhenum, quot vos potuistis in annis.

In using this device, Priscian is following the precepts of the rhetorical handbooks. Menander Rhetor (377, trans. D.A. Russell and N.G. Wilson [Oxford, 1981], p. 93) advises:

ἤξεισ ὁ ἐπὶ τὴν τελειοτάτην σύγκρισιν ἀντεξετάζων
τὴν αὐτοῦ βασιλείαν πρὸς τὰς πρὸ αὐτοῦ βασιλείας,
οὐ καθαιρῶν ἐκεῖνας (ἀτεχνον γάρ) ἀλλὰ θαυμάζων μὲν
ἐκεῖνας, τὸ δὲ τέλειον ἀποδίδουσ τῇ παρουσίᾳ.

You should then proceed to the most complete comparison, examining his reign in comparison with preceding reigns, not disparaging them (that is bad craftsmanship) but admiring them while granting perfection to the present.

16-17: genus . . . indomitum Tauri linquebas collibus altis: the people referred to are the Isaurians who inhabited a mountainous and inaccessible region in Asia Minor located on the northern side of the Taurus and bounded by Phrygia on the north, Lyconia on the east, Cilicia on the south and Psidia on the west. Within these boundaries, the Isaurians dwelt in scattered villages or strongholds and lived by banditry and piracy. Although the territory was conquered for Rome by Servilius Isauricus (see note on line 84) and became a part of the province of Cilicia when this province was enlarged by Pompey as part of his settlement of the east, the Isaurians were never completely subdued. The mountainous terrain, mentioned here by Priscian (see note on line 88), made military operations against the Isaurians extremely difficult and they continued to harass the neighbouring provinces and the coast of Asia Minor, especially after the breakdown of stable government in the third century A.D. Probus found it necessary to mount a major campaign in 279 or 280 against the Isaurian chieftains who were raiding Lycia and Pamphylia. He was apparently successful in temporarily checking their depredations and in gaining control of Isaurian strongholds. His attempt to prevent further trouble by settling veterans in Isaurian territory failed, although Probus made it a condition that the veterans' sons had to join the army so that they would not learn to be robbers (ne latrocinare umquam

discerent) (Scriptores Historiae Augustae Probus 16).

Ammianus Marcellinus describes at length a major uprising of the Isaurians in 353 A.D. (14.2) and records further problems with bands of Isaurian brigands in 359 (19.13.1) and 368 (27.9.6). Valens was unable to check Isaurian raids on cities in Lycia and Pamphylia in 376 (Zosimus Hist. Nov. 4.20). Early in the fifth century Isaurian raids became even more widespread, and they devastated Asia Minor (Eunapius fr. 84.86; Zosimus, Hist. Nov. 5.25; Sozomen Hist. Eccl. 8.27; Marcellinus comes s.a. 405 and 441).

Given this turbulent and bloody history, Priscian's statement that Pompey left the Isaurians unconquered is certainly justified. In this Priscian differs from Christodorus who describes Pompey as the conqueror of the Isaurians and says that it is Anastasius' duplication of this feat which reveals his descent from Pompey (see note on lines 10-11). Priscian's hic domuit (line 18) is equally justified.

Anastasius' solution to the Isaurian problem (see note on line 123) removed the Isaurians as a major threat to the peace of Constantinople and Asia Minor, although sporadic incidents continued to occur (see P. Peeters, "Hypatius et Vitalien," Annuaire de l'Institut de Philologie et Histoire Orientales et Slaves 10 [1950]: 31, n. 2).

linquebas: linquo seems to be a favourite word with Priscian (cf. lines 13 and 17). The use of the simple rather than the

compound form of the verb is common in late Latin writers. For examples, see S. Gamber, Le livre de la 'Genese' dans la poesie latine au v^e siecle, (Paris, 1899), p. 189.

- 18: for the expression semina belli occurring in the same position in the verse, cf. Lucan 3.150: ocius avertat diri mala semina belli; Claudian De Bello Goth. 25-26: et virides galeis sulcos fetasque novales/Martis et in segetem crescentis semina belli.

Lines 19-37: the crimes committed by the Isaurians.

- 19: celso positum fortunae vertice nuper: the crest of fortune for the Isaurians was the reign of the Isaurian emperor Zeno (474-491). Zeno rose to power under Leo I (457-474), who, to reduce his dependence on the Alan Aspar and his Gothic allies, sought an alliance with the Isaurians. With the aid of the Isaurian chieftan Tarasicodissa, who later took the name Zeno, a large body of Isaurians was stationed at Constantinople (V. Dan. Styl. 55). Sometime about 467 Zeno married Ariadne, the elder daughter of Leo, and was appointed magister militum per Thracias (V. Dan. Styl. 65). A son, Leo II, was born to Ariadne, and Zeno became consul in 469. In 471 Aspar was assassinated and Theodoric, his nephew by marriage and a Gothic chieftain in Thrace, rose in rebellion. Eventually a compromise was effected between Leo and Theodoric which virtually secured power in Constantinople and the east for the Isaurians and abandoned the European provinces to the Goths (Malchus fr. 2). When Leo died in January 474, he was succeeded by Zeno's

son who proclaimed his father co-emperor. When Leo II died in the same year, Zeno became sole ruler (John Malalas 376; Candidus 1; V. Dan. Styl. 67).

Zeno's reign was punctuated by revolts of which that of Verina, Leo I's wife, and her brother Basiliscus in 475 and that of Illus, a fellow Isaurian, in 484 were the most serious. Nonetheless, Zeno succeeded in retaining his throne and he rewarded his Isaurian followers with money and position. Zeno favoured his own people favens gentis suae (Anonymus Valesianus 40), and Joshua the Stylite (Chron. 12, trans. W. Wright, [Cambridge], 1882; repr., Amsterdam, [1968], p. 9) tells us that "he bestowed honour and authority upon all his fellow countrymen and for this reason he was much hated by the Greeks". To ensure the loyalty of the Isaurians during the revolt of Illus, Zeno awarded them a subsidy of 1400 pounds of gold per year (Evagrius Ecc. Hist. 13.35 says 5000 pounds) which Anastasius abolished when he came to the throne (John of Antioch Exc. de ins. 100).

For the language, cf. Virgil Aen. 5.35: at procul excelso miratus vertice montis. Note the contrast between the physical vertice of Acestes as he watches Aeneas' ship return to Sicily and the metaphorical use of the term by Priscian.

19-37: once established in power the Isaurians lived up to their reputation as bandits by engaging in pillage, rape and other outrages against which the laws could offer no protection.

This description given by Priscian of the crimes of the Isaurians is confirmed by other sources, although they too give few details of the Isaurians' abuse of power. Evagrius (Ecc. Hist. 3.2) mentions the barbarian incursions during Zeno's reign and then remarks that Zeno, in barbarian fashion, seized whatever escaped them. He also states that, when the heads of captured Isaurian leaders were displayed at the order of Anastasius, the people of Constantinople rejoiced because they had been badly treated by Zeno and the Isaurians (Ecc. Hist. 3.35). During the rebellion of Marcian in 479, the Isaurians took advantage of the opportunity to sack towns in Cilicia (E.W. Brooks, "The Emperor Zenon and the Isaurians," English Historical Review 8 [1893]: 220). Both Theophanes (AM 5985) and Theodore Lector (Epit. 2) state that Anastasius expelled the Isaurians from Constantinople because of their crimes (see note on lines 52-53). To Procopius of Gaza (Pan. 9), the Isaurians are mountain brigands who "fall upon us and carry off as spoils the property of their neighbours". In addition to these general statements, we know that Zeno had Zosimus, a rhetor of Gaza, executed (Cedrenus 1.622). Pelagius, an ex-silentiary and an epic poet, was put to death by Zeno in 490. He was charged with paganism, but Cedrenus (1.621) and Zonaras (Epit. 14.2) suggest that the real reason was his criticism of Zeno's acts. The praetorian prefect Arcadius was also in danger of losing his life after he op-

posed the death of Pelagius. However, he took refuge in a church and only had his property confiscated (Theophanes AM 5982; John Malalas 390; John of Nikiu Chron. 88.95-6; Cedrenus 1.622). Priscian may have such incidents in mind when he says that all men, no matter what their rank or age, suffered under the Isaurians (lines 23-24). Certainly Zeno's behaviour contrasts with Anastasius' patronage of men of learning which is praised by Priscian later in the poem (see note lines 245-253).

To cite such abuses of power by the emperor's predecessor, although rarely specifically naming him, was a standard device of imperial panegyric. Pliny the Younger's practice in this matter set the pattern (see his references to Domitian, Pan. 2.2-3 and 53.5).

When Menander Rhetor (378.20, trans. Russell and Wilson, p. 95) outlines the topics to be included in a speech to welcome the arrival of a governor, he suggests that the orator should describe the earlier hardships suffered by the governor's subjects:

ἢ γὰρ κακῶς πεπονθότων αὐτῶν παρὰ τοῦ μικροῦ πρόσθεν
ἀρχοντος διατυπώσεις καὶ αὐξήσεις τὰ δυσχερῆ μηδὲν
βλασφημῶν τὸν παυσάμενον ἀλλὰ ἀπλῶς τὴν δυστυχίαν
τῶν ὑπηκόων λέγων, ...

You should give a vivid portrayal of a situation in which they were badly treated by the previous governor, and amplify their hardships, not, however, speaking ill of the predecessor, but simply reporting the subjects' misfortune.

21: condebat . . . monumenta dolorum: compare Priscian's use of the phrase monumenta dolorum with that of other poets, cf.

Virgil Aen. 12.945-47:

illem, oculis postquam saevi monumenta doloris
exuviasque hausit, furibis accensus et ira
terribilis.

The memorial of cruel grief is the belt of Pallas which, worn by Turnus, reminds Aeneas of Pallas' death. Claudian (De Bello Goth. 614-615) uses the phrase to refer to the spoils taken from the Romans by the barbarians at the battle of Adrianople:

. . . neque enim feralis praeda moratur
sed iustos praebent stimulos monumenta doloris.

The loot thrown in their path by the enemy reminds the Roman troops of past defeat. In both Virgil and Claudian, the monumenta are physical objects, reminders of past suffering. In Priscian, the monuments are actually composed of sorrows and suffering, hence the change to dolorum, the genitive plural instead of the genitive singular of the earlier writers. The use of condo, which is normally associated with the setting up of temples, altars and other material monumenta, emphasizes the unhappy nature of the memorials established by the Isaurians. For monumenta used in a similar way, cf. Corippus In laud. Iust. 4.359-61:

paucorum multis prosunt exempla malorum,
quorum post mortem nostrae monumenta perhorrent
et damnant leges.

The monumenta here are the memories of evil men which the law condemns.

- 22: furore: the use of the term furor (cf. also lines 58 and 78) gives a Vergilian colouring to Priscian's description of the Isaurian war, a war in which an emperor described as nimis pius (praef. line 5) confronts enemies possessed by furor.
- 23: Cum similes omnes ad pessima damna putabant: there are two problems here: the use of cum with the indicative, when cum causal with the subjunctive would seem more logical, and the construction of ad pessima damna. Rather than suggesting a causal relationship between the actions of the Isaurians and the disappearance of law and justice, Priscian seems to wish to emphasize the time when the suffering caused by the Isaurians took place, and thus he implies a contrast with the happy state of the empire under Anastasius. Tunc at line 27 also stresses time. Priscian, therefore, uses cum with the indicative to define this time relationship. Ad is probably used here with the meaning of "in regard to" or "in relation to", cf. Terence Heaut. 2.3.129: ad has res quam sit perspicax, and Sallust Jug. 73: ad integrum bellum cuncta parat. A literal translation is: When they considered all to be alike in respect to the worst punishments.
- 24: non honor aut aetas potuit defendere quemquam: the idea that neither rank nor age can offer protection in times of unrest is a commonplace, cf. Lucan 2.104: nulli sua profuit aetas.

Lucan is describing a massacre which took place in Rome during the civil war between Marius and Sulla. Tacitus (Hist. 3.33) uses similar language to describe the sack of Cremona in the civil war of 69 A.D.: non dignitas, non aetas protegebant.

29-30: Nam vanum nomen retinebat invita iura/Umbraque iustitiae rebus restabat inanis: these evocative lines seem to echo and combine a number of images from Lucan: cf. 2.303: nomen, Libertas, et inanem prosequar umbram; 2.316: me frustra leges et inania iura tuentem; 5.389-390: addidit et fasces aquillis et nomen inane/imperii rapiens.

31-37: the serious financial difficulties faced by Zeno as a result of rebellion, barbarian attacks and the need to pay subsidies to the Goths and the Isaurians may have led to such acts of oppression and extortion as are described here by Priscian. The author of the Vita S. Danielis Stylitae (91), although in general giving a favourable portrayal of Zeno, records an incident which tends to support Priscian's view. The saint as he foretells Zeno's death warns the emperor to keep himself from avarice in the time remaining to him. Procopius of Gaza (Pan. 5) includes in his panegyric a similar section describing the sufferings of both rich and poor under the Isaurians:

Ο δὲ νῦν εὐδαίμων, μικρὸν ὕστερον τὰς χρηστὰς ἐλπίδας ἀποβαλὼν εἰς ἀτυχοῦντων μετεβάλλετο σχῆμα, ἐν ᾧ οὐδὲ ἦν ἔχειν τι καὶ ἀπορεῖσθαι διὰ τὴν τῶν ὁμοίων ἐλπίδα, ξένον δὲ τι πρᾶγμα καὶ παρὰ φύσιν ὑπῆρχεν· ὁ γὰρ πλοῦτος τοὺς κεκτημένους ἐλύπει.

A man even now fortunate, after a little while, having cast away hope, put on the garments of the unfortunate. It did not matter whether you had possessions or not since the same fortune was to be expected by all. A monstrous and unnatural condition existed. For the rich man sorrowed for his possessions.

However, in Zeno's reign, the praetorian prefect Erythrius resigned rather than increase taxes or use unjust methods of obtaining revenue (Malchus fr. 6), and one of his successors in the office, Sebastianus, resorted to the comparatively harmless practice of selling offices and honours to obtain money for the emperor.

- 32: raptorum . . . regum: raptorum appears in both manuscripts but is emended by Baehrens to pravorum which repeats the pravi of line 27 and is appropriate to the context although not particularly vivid or descriptive. Baehrens apparently rejected raptorum, genitive plural of raptor, raptoris, because this noun is seldom used as an adjective and then only as an attribute of wolves (cf. Virgil Aen. 2.355-57: sic animis iuvenum furor additus. . . inde lupi ceu/raptores atra in nebula, quos improba ventris/exegit caecos rabies; Ovid Met. 10.540-541: raptoresque lupos armatosque unguibus ursos/vitat). I prefer raptorum since neither grammatical nor metrical usage preclude the manuscript reading. Although its use is limited in Classical Latin, Priscian does have a precedent for the use of raptor as an adjective. Moreover, it is possible that Priscian was attempting a variation of the Vergilian usage. In Aeneid 2, raptores is used in a simile,

the young Trojans are compared to ravening wolves. Priscian has applied the adjective directly rather than indirectly to humans in a passage where the meaning is appropriate and descriptive. The retention of raptorum also preserves the alliteration which ties together the three words at the end of the line and balances the alliteration of the first half of the line.

- 33: namque dabat poenas: the subject of dabat must be pauper, understood from paupertas, line 31.
- 35: plenos opibus largis gravibusque metallis: the line is intended to suggest vast wealth and resources as a contrast with the paupertas tenuis of line 31 and to underline the paradox by which the poor suffer more losses than the rich. To achieve these effects Priscian takes the unusual step of using plenos as a substantive and employs general and inclusive terms rather than specific words for land, property or money. Ops refers to any kind of wealth, power or influence. Metallum can be used of any object made of precious metals (cf. Lucan 7.740-741: cunctis en plena metallis/castra patent, where the metallis refers to the loot, furniture, art works, coins, awaiting Caesar's men in Pompey's camp). Priscian may intend a reminiscence of Lucan's line. If so, Priscian's plenos may be a variation of the plena of Lucan. Gravis, normally used to express the value of specific metals, for example aes (cf. Livy 4.60.6), is here used with the inclusive metallis.

- 37: Vexabant vinculis, vexabant stipite duro: Priscian uses anaphora at the climax of the passage (cf. praef. line 6). For the language, cf. Virgil Aen. 7.524: stipitibus duris agitur.

Lines 38-49: a description of the virtues of Anastasius.

- 38: Cladibus his tandem caeli rex liberat orbem: for God as the deliverer of mankind from evil. cf. Psalms 50:16: libera me de sanguinibus, Deus, Deus salutis meae; Matt. 6:13: libera nos a malo. For further examples, see A. Blaise, Le vocabulaire latin des principaux themes liturgiques (Turnhout, 1966), p. 187.

Procopius of Gaza (Pan. 5) concludes his description of the crimes of the Isaurians in a similar way but with the emphasis on the role of Anastasius in freeing the world from disaster:

Οὕτω δὲ τούτων ἔχόντων καὶ πάντων ἀπειρηκότων ταῖς συμφοραῖς, ὡς περ θεὸς ἐκ μηχανῆς ἀναφανείσ χειρα προὔτεινες ἐλευθέριον κάκεινα πέρας εἶχεν ἢ δὲ τῶν πραγμάτων ἀχλὺς διελύετο.

Such was the situation, and when all had given up hope in their misfortune, appearing like the god from the machine, you [Anastasius] stretched out your hand and gave us freedom. And immediately our troubles came to an end and the darkness disappeared.

- 39: cum dominum (melius sed patrem dicere possum): a common theme in imperial panegyric, cf. Pliny the Younger Pan. 2.3: non enim de tyranno sed de cive, non de domino sed parente loquimur. Corippus (In laud. Iust. 1.167-168) has Justin say

of Justinian: patrem res publica perdit et orbis/non dominum.

The image of Anastasius as pater recurs throughout the poem (see lines 152 and 210 and note on line 152).

40: Praebet Anastasium: here, as throughout the poem, Priscian insists on the Christian tradition that God is the source of imperial power, cf. Rom. 13.1: non est enim potestas nisi a Deo.

pietate: the most important imperial virtue. It is described by Agapetus (Ekthesis 15, trans. E. Barker, Social and Political Thought in Byzantium [Oxford, 1957], p. 56) as follows:

It is the crown of piety that adorns the King above the ornaments of kingship. Wealth vanishes; glory perishes. But the glory of god-like government is prolonged for eternal ages, and it sets its possessors beyond the reach of oblivion.

It is the emperor's piety which makes him worthy to rule since this virtue makes him the image of the heavenly king.

Agapetus addresses Justinian as "thou divinely made image of piety" (Ekthesis 5, trans. Barker, p. 55).

42-43: the emperor's pietas is manifested in the virtues through which his rule benefits his subjects. Procopius of Gaza (Pan. 4), who also stresses Anastasius' outstanding piety as the virtue which makes him worthy to be emperor, agrees that the emperor's piety ensures his possession of all the other virtues.

The first four adjectives describing Anastasius, iustus, sapiens, castus and fortis, reflect the four traditional cardinal virtues iustitia, prudentia, temperantia and fortitudo, cf. Priscian Ars grammatica 17.6: magna viris gloria est prudentia et fortitudo et pudicitia et iustitia.

For the origin of the scheme of the cardinal virtues and the development of the scheme in Greek and Roman Literature from its origin to the early Christian period, see H. North, "Canons and Hierarchies of the Cardinal Virtues in Greek and Latin Literature," in The Classical Tradition, ed. L. Wallach (Ithaca, New York, 1966), pp. 165-183.

castus: chastity or restraint in sexual matters was a manifestation of the virtue of temperance. The virtue is praised in a number of imperial panegyrics, although given no particular prominence. Pliny the Younger (Pan. 20.2) says of Trajan that husbands and fathers do not fear his approach and that his chastity is an inborn, not an acquired virtue. Ausonius (Gratiarum Actio 14) in the context of general praise of Gratian's moderation states that the bed of a priest is not more chaste (non pontificis cubile castius). Similarly Pacatus (Pan.Lat. 12.30; Mynors, 2.30) praises Theodosius for displaying the chastity of a priest. The mention of chastity rather than the inclusive temperantia gives a certain emphasis to this virtue and Priscian returns to the idea later in the poem (see note on lines 208-217).

- 44: for the phrase corde sub imo in a similar position at the end of a verse, cf. Silius Italicus Pun. 15.587: fremit amens corde sub imo.
- 45-49: the use of historical figures as exempla or types of virtues and vices was a traditional feature of Roman literature, especially of history, biography and panegyric. For the development and use of exempla, see L.R. Lind, "Roman Moral Conservatism," in Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History, vol. 1, ed. by C. Deroux (Brussels, 1979), pp. 7-58, and H.W. Litchfield, "National Exempla Virtutis in Roman Literature," Harvard Studies in Classical Philology 25 (1914): 1-71. It was the great heroes of the Republican period who best exemplified traditional Roman virtues, and by the time of Augustus the creation of exempla seems to have ceased (Lind, p. 14). Under the empire the traditional exempla were catalogued in handbooks such as that of Valerius Maximus, and it was not until the late fourth century that a canon of the good emperors embodying specific imperial virtues was developed (see R. Syme, Emperors and Biography [Oxford, 1971], p. 94). The emperors who comprised the canon were usually the Antonine emperors from Nerva to Marcus Aurelius, although Augustus, Titus and Septimius Severus also appear. In his choice of emperors and in the virtues assigned to each emperor, Priscian is in accord with the traditional list as it appears in the fourth and fifth centuries, as a comparison

with the three following earlier catalogues of emperors and imperial virtues indicates.

1. Pacatus' panegyric on Theodosius, Pan. Lat. 12.11.6;

Mynors 2.11.6:

Hanc mihi gratiam refers quod te etiam felix desideravi? quod cum me Nerva tranquillus, amor generis humani Titus, pietate memorabilis Antoninus teneret, cum moribus Augustus ornaret, legibus Hadrianus imbueret, finibus Traianus augetet, parum mihi videbar beata quia non eram tua?

2. Symmachus' letter to Ausonius, Ep. 1.13.3:

bonus Nerva, Traianus strenuus, Pius innocens, Marcus plenus officii temporibus adiuti sunt, quae tunc mores alios nesciebant.

3. Ammianus Marcellinus' praise of Julian, 16.1.4:

Namque incrementis velocibus ita domi forisque colluxit, ut prudentia Vespasiani filius Titus alter aestimaretur, bellorum gloriosis cursibus Traiani simillimus, clemens ut Antoninus, rectae perfectaeque rationis indigine congruens Marco, ad cuius aemulationem actus suos effingebat et mores.

The similarity between these lists and that of Priscian is evident, although Priscian's is the most comprehensive. The inclusion of such a catalogue of emperors and virtues in a panegyric is somewhat unusual. Writers usually preferred to develop a comparison between their subject and one or two earlier emperors, cf. Claudian De VI Cons. Hon. 335-350 where Honorius is compared to Trajan and Marcus Aurelius, and De IV Cons. Hon. 315-320 where Trajan is held up as an example to Honorius. Priscian, however, has chosen to give a long list of virtues and exempla to expand the tanta pietate vigentem of

line 40 and to explain why God chose Anastasius as the saviour of the world.

The catalogue of emperors in Priscian's panegyric seems to indicate that his audience had some knowledge of the history of the early empire, even if this knowledge was limited to the names of the emperors and the traditional vices and virtues assigned to them. Zosimus, Priscian's contemporary, provides confirmation that at least a superficial knowledge of the early empire could be expected of an educated audience and also gives evidence of a tradition that the Antonine emperors were "good" emperors. In the first book of his history, Zosimus (Hist. Nov. 1.5-7) surveys the first two centuries of the history of the Roman empire and he finds the Antonine emperors to be an exception to his theory of the evil effects of the principate; they are good men who expanded the empire.

If we accept the use of imperial exempla in panegyric as a criterion for knowledge of Roman history in the literary circles of Constantinople, it seems that knowledge of the early empire and the canon of good emperors declined steadily throughout the sixth century. John the Lydian praises Justinian as follows (De Mag. 2.28., trans. Carney, p. 61):

For he not merely rivalled Trajan in his feats of arms but outrivalled Augustus himself in his piety towards God and the moderation of his way of life, and Titus in gentlemanliness and Aurelius in brilliance of mind.

In John the Lydian, Nerva has disappeared from the catalogue and Antoninus Pius has been replaced by Augustus. Along with Augustus, the emperors mentioned by John, Trajan, Titus, and Marcus Aurelius, would have been the best known (see notes on individual emperors below lines 46-49). Corippus uses almost no imperial exempla in his panegyric on Justin II. While this may be partly because of the new form of the imperial panegyric written by Corippus, it may also reflect the lack of knowledge of his Greek-speaking eastern audience.

- 45: Possidet hic veterum quidquid laudatur in ullo: Sozomen (Hist. Eccl. praef. 9) praises Theodosius II as possessing all virtues and excelling all emperors before him in these virtues.
- 46: Antoninum . . . pietas: Priscian has emphasized Anastasius' piety throughout this section of the panegyric (pietate, line 40, pius, line 42) and he begins his catalogue by comparing Anastasius' piety with that of Antoninus Pius, the exemplum of piety in earlier writers, cf. Ausonius De XII Caesaribus 65-66: vocatu/consultisque Pius, nomen habens meriti; Eutropius 8.8.4: Pius propter clementiam dictus est; Aurelius Victor De Caesaribus 15.2: Hunc fere nulla vitiorum labes commaculavit; Ammianus 30.8.12: ut Antoninus Pius erat serenus et clemens; Pan. Lat. 12.11.6; Mynors 2.11.6: pietate memorabilis Antoninus.

- sapientia Marcum: Marcus Aurelius epitomized the type of the philosopher king; cf. Ausonius De Caesaribus 69-70: qui scita Platonis/flexit ad imperium, and Aurelius Victor De Caesaribus 16.1: philosophandi vero eloquentiaeque studiis longe praestantem. The perfect emperor should combine his wisdom with the military greatness of Trajan, cf. Ammianus Marcellinus' praise of Valentinian (30.9.1): si reliqua temperasset, vixerat ut Traianus et Marcus, and his praise of Julian (16.1.4), see above p. 109.
- 47: mitem Nervam: Nerva exemplified gentleness and mercy; cf. Sidonius Pan. Avit. 112: tranquillus Nerva; Pan. Lat. 12.11.6; Mynors 2.11.6: Nerva tranquillus.
- 48: Promeruit Titus non tantum mente benigna: cf. Virgil Aen. 1.304: mentemque benignam. Suetonius (Tit. 1) described Titus as the amor deliciae generis humani and later writers echoed the phrase, cf. Ausonius De XII Caesaribus 46: orbis amor, and Pan. Lat. 12.11.6; Mynors 2.11.6: amor generis humani Titus. Titus was considered a paragon among emperors and was praised for both his clemency and generosity (Aurelius Victor De Caesaribus 10.1). For further references to Titus' virtues, see Pliny the Younger Pan. 35.4 and Ausonius Gratiarum Actio 16.72.
- 49: Gloria magnanimi Traiani: Trajan was famed for both his military exploits and his clemency and his generosity. Sidonius has Roma describe Trajan as fortis, pius, integer,

acer (Pan. Maior. 115). Claudian (De VI Cons. Hon. 335-338) describes the Dacian victories of bellipotens Ulpus in his panegyric on the sixth consulship of Honorius, but in an earlier panegyric (De IV Cons. Hon. 315-319) says that Trajan's true glory is his clemency rather than his military triumphs:

. . . victura feretur
gloria Traiani, non tam quod Tigride victo
nostra triumphati fuerint provincia Parthi
alta quod invectus fractis Capitolia Dacis
quam patriae quod mitis erat.

This comparison to Trajan concludes the catalogue of emperors and serves also as an appropriate introduction to Priscian's description of the Isaurian wars in which Anastasius will both conquer the enemy and show clemency towards the defeated.

Anastasius' military exploits are also compared to those of Trajan in an anonymous epigram from the Greek Anthology (9.210, trans. Paton, p. 109):

Δέρκεό μοι κρατερῶν καμάτων ἐγκύμονα βίβλον
ἦν πάρος Ἀδριανὸς μὲν ἀναξ ἔχεν ἐν πολέμοισι,
κρύψε δ' ἀεργίῃ χρόνον ἀσπετον ἐγγύθι λήθης.
ἀλλ' ὑπὸ καρτερόχειρος Ἀναστασίου βασιλῆος
ἤλυθον ἐς φάος αὖθις, ἵνα στρατιῆσιν ἀρήξω.
οἶδα γὰρ ἀνδροφόνου καμάτους πολέμοιο διδάσκειν·
οἶδα δὲ πῶς μετ' ἐμεῖο καὶ ἐσπερίης ἀλδς ἄνδρας
καὶ Πέρσας ὀλέσεις, καὶ αἰνομόρους Σαρακηνοῦς,
καὶ θοὸν ἵπποκέλευθον ἀρειμανέων γένος Οὐννων,
πετρῶν τ' ἐφ' ὑπερθεὶν ἀλυσκάζοντας Ἰσαύρους.
πάντα δ' ὑπὸ σκῆπτροῖσιν Ἀναστασίου τελέσω,
ὄν καὶ Τραϊανοῖο φαάντερον ἤγαγεν αἰών.

Look on me, the book pregnant with vigorous toil,
the book that the Emperor Hadrian had by him in
his wars, but which for ages lay disused and nearly
forgotten. But Anastasius, our powerful emperor,
brought me to light again, that I might help his
campaigns. For I can teach the labours of murderous

war; and I know how, with me, thou shalt destroy the men of the western sea, and the Persians, and the doomed Saracens, and the swift cavalry of the warlike Huns, and the Isaurians taking refuge on their rocky summits. I will bring all things under the sceptre of Anastasius, whom time brought into the world to outshine even Trajan.

magnanimi: the virtue of magnitudo animi or greatness of soul included the qualities of bravery, generosity and clemency; it was the virtue "which made a man both free and happy, a realization of his true nature through his noble behaviour toward his fellowman" (Lind, "Roman Moral Conservatism," p. 22). Lind (pp. 19-22) discusses the development of the concept of magnitudo animi in Latin writers from Cicero to Seneca and the influence of the various philosophical schools on this development.

cesserat: Baehrens emended the pluperfect of the manuscript to cesserit, the perfect subjunctive. It is difficult to understand his reasoning. As a perfect subjunctive cesserit must serve either as a wish or a potential subjunctive. In either case it refers to the future. Yet line 49 serves as a transition to carry the idea of military glory into the next section of the panegyric dealing with the Isaurian campaigns, and in it Trajan's glory is compared to the glory Anastasius won in the Isaurian war, which had ended at the time the panegyric was delivered. Moreover, it is a panegyric convention that the subject has surpassed all those to whom he is compared. The most natural tense here would be the perfect,

but in colloquial Latin and in poetry there are a number of examples of the pluperfect being used in place of the perfect or the imperfect. For examples of the pluperfect used in this way in the Latin elegists, see M. Platnauer, Latin Elegiac Verse (Cambridge, 1951), pp. 112-114. See also L.R. Palmer, The Latin Language (London, 1954), p. 308. For this use of the pluperfect in a late Latin poem, cf. Carmen de Providentia Dei 789-90:

ac fit quisque sibi iudex ultorque severus
quod fuerat prius interimens, aliusque resurgens.

Priscian uses the pluperfect for the perfect again in the poem at line 302.

Lines 50-66: Anastasius exiled the Isaurians; they rebelled against the emperor.

50-51: tot . . . tyrannos . . . duxit Isauria: tyrannos is used here of the Isaurians as usurpers. For the use of tyrannus to mean a usurper and one who lacks the qualities of a legitimate king, see R. MacMullen, "The Roman Concept Robber-Pretender," Revue Internationale des Droits de l'Antiquite 10 (1963):

221-225. Anastasius is described as a slayer of tyrants for his victory over the Isaurians (Anth. Gr. 9.656.1). A revolt broke out in Isauria soon after Anastasius was chosen as emperor (Joshua the Stylite Chron. 23; Zacharias Rhetor Hist. Eccl. 7.2; John Antioch fr. 214b; Theophanes AM 5985).

Leading the rebellion were Conon, the bishop of Apamea and a former military commander under Zeno (John of Antioch fr.

214b; Evagrius Ecc. Hist. 3.35; and Lilingis who was the comes et praeses Isauriae (Theophanes AM 5985; John of Antioch fr. 214b; Jordanes Rom. 355; Marcellinus comes s.a. 492). For other leaders of the rebellion, see note on lines 65-66.

52-53: shortly after his accession, Anastasius took advantage of a serious riot which broke out in Constantinople (John of Antioch fr. 214b; Marcellinus comes s.a. 491) to take strong measures against the Isaurians. For a discussion of whether Isaurian intrigue was responsible for this riot and whether the Isaurians and the Chalcedonian faction were allied against Anastasius, see Brooks, "The Emperor Zenon," p. 231-32. Longinus, Zeno's brother, was forced to become a presbyter and was banished to the Thebaid (John of Antioch fr. 214b). At the same time, all the Isaurians in Constantinople were expelled from the city and the payment which Zeno had made to them was withdrawn (Theodore Lector Epit. 2.9; John of Antioch fr. 214b; Theophanes AM 5984, 5985). Shortly afterward all their property was confiscated (John of Antioch fr. 214b). Evagrius (Ecc. Hist. 3.29) says that many of the Isaurians left at their own request. It may be that Anastasius expelled only the leading Isaurians and the others may have feared a massacre such as occurred under Basiliscus (see Brooks, "The Emperor Zenon," p. 217). Among the Isaurians who either left or were expelled from Constantinople were Longinus of Cardala who was dismissed from his post as magister officiorum for

supporting the claim to the throne of Zeno's brother (Theophanes AM 5983,5984; Evagrius Ecc. Hist. 3.29) and Athenodorus, a senator (John of Antioch fr. 214b; Theophanes, AM 5985). Both men joined the rebels in Isauria. Priscian attributes Anastasius' expulsion of the Isaurians rather than his killing them to his goodness and mercy so that their subsequent rebellion will seem more heinous and their defeat a triumph of justice.

55:

ille pater: God the heavenly father as opposed to Anastasius.
dextra: the concept of the dext(e)ra Dei or the manus Dei has its roots in the traditions of both pagan and Jewish art and literature. The right hand outstretched or raised in a gesture of beneficence is associated with a number of pagan deities, notably Serapis and Sol Invictus, and the gesture passed into imperial iconography in the Severan period (see H.P. L'Orange, Studies on the Iconography of Cosmic Kingship in the Ancient World [Oslo, 1953], pp. 139-159). One specific context in which the dextera Dei appears is in scenes of the consecratio of emperor. The anonymous panegyrist of Constantine (Pan. Lat. 7.7; Mynors 6.7) invokes the image to describe the reception in heaven of the emperor's father, Constantius:

Vere enim profecto illi superum templa patuerunt,
 receptusque est consessu caelitem, Iove ipso dexteram
 porrigente.

A similar scene is depicted on coins issued after the death of Constantine and described by Eusebius (Vita Constantini 4.73): the emperor appears sitting in a quadriga and a hand stretches downward to receive him into heaven. For a discussion of the use of the image in the panegyric, see MacCormack, Art and Ceremony, pp. 108-111. For the coins as exhibiting a mixture of pagan and Jewish motifs, see MacCormack, pp. 123-124 and J.D. MacIsaac, "The Hand of God, a Numismatic Study," Traditio 31 (1975): 325.

The image of the hand of God in Christian art and literature owes much to the influence of Jewish tradition, in which the hand of God is a symbol of the presence and action of God in the world. In the Old Testament, the hand of God can symbolize the justice of God and His power to punish (1 Sam. 6:11) and also His mercy and love (Job 5:18). For further examples, see L'Orange, Studies, pp. 159-162. Christian artists use the motif to express not only the resurrection (A. Grabar, Christian Iconography [Princeton, New Jersey, 1968], pp. 115 and 123), but also the idea of the presence of God working in the world so that all is done according to His will and plan (as, for example, in the mosaics depicting sacrifices of Abraham and of Abel and Melchisedec in San Vitale, see Ernst Kitzinger, Byzantine Art in the Making [Cambridge, Mass., 1977] p. 82). This idea of the hand of God as a symbol of providence is expressed by Eusebius (Hist. Eccl. 10.4.6,

trans. J.E.L. Oulton (New York, 1932), p. 2:

But now indeed no longer by hearing or by report do we learn of the stretched out arm and the heavenly right hand of our all-gracious God and universal king; nay by deeds as, one might say, and with our very eyes do we behold that those things committed to memory years ago are faithful and true.

The dextera Dei as a symbol of God's assurance of military victory for the empire was a common motif in literature and art under the Christian emperors. At the conclusion of his eulogy of Constantine (Oratio de laudibus Constantini 10.7, trans. Drake, p. 102), Eusebius proclaims:

God Himself, the Supreme Sovereign, stretches out his right hand to him from above and confirms him victor over every pretender and aggressor.

Visual images of the hand of God in a similar context may have been a familiar sight. Eunapius (fr. 78), for example, describes one of the large painted tableaux, carried in imperial processions and exhibited in the Hippodrome at triumphs, which depicted a hand coming out of the clouds and an inscription: "The Hand of God drives away the barbarians."

The link between God and emperor was represented by an image of the hand of God crowning the emperor with a diadem. This use of the hand of God was confined for the most part to a series of coins of the early fifth century. Later in the century the image was transferred to coins of empresses and its last appearance, in the reign of Zeno, is on coins of Zenonis, the wife of the usurper Basiliscus (see MacCormack, Art and Ceremony, pp. 189-191 and 256-257, and MacIsaac, "The

Hand Of God," pp. 324-328). In Byzantine art, the image of the divinity crowning the emperor does not reappear until the late ninth century (MacCormack, p. 257). The hand of God may have been too explicit a symbol for the relationship between God and emperor. Corippus (In laud. Iust. 1.33) combines classical and Christian motifs when he has the Virgin, described in language which recalls the scene of Venus appearing to Aeneas, come to Justin in a dream to invest him with the imperial regalia and crown him with her right hand (see Averil Cameron, Corippus, p. 129).

Priscian's use of the image reflects the Jewish-Christian tradition. Here and at line 101 the dextera Dei symbolizes divine justice and punishment. Later in the poem (line 283) it represents God's mercy and salvation. Underlying the repeated use of the image are the themes of the divine presence at work in the empire and the legitimacy of Anastasius' rule.

56: pari libra iusti momenta repensat: God weighs the importance of justice for the Isaurians and divine justice prevails even over the mercy of the emperor, cf. Pan. Lat. 10.7; Mynors 4.7:

Ille igitur vis, illa maiestas fandi ac nefandi
discriminatrix, quae omnia meritorum momenta
perpendit, librat, examinat, illa pietatem
tuam texit, illa nefariam illius tyrannis fregit
amentiam

The image of Zeus weighing the fates of men goes back to Homer, cf. Il. 8.68-72; 22.209-213. Cf. also Virgil Aen.

12.725-727. Christians adopted the image of the scale for their own deity, cf. Eusebius Oratio de laudibus Constantini 19, trans. Drake, p. 101: "and surely this is the greatest proof of the power of the One he honors that He has handled the scales of justice so impartially and had awarded to each party its due".

- 57: for the language cf. Virgil Aen. 9.137: ferro sceleratam excindere gentem.
- 58-60: the Isaurians expelled from Constantinople joined forces with the rebels in Isauria: their army was about 15,000 strong and they were supplied with money from a store kept in Isauria by Zeno. With men and money, the Isaurian rebels attacked cities in the surrounding provinces, until defeated by the imperial forces at the battle of Cotyaeum in 492 (Theophanes AM 5985; Zonaras Epit. 14.3.22).
- 58: furor immissus: the madness was deliberately sent upon the Isaurians by God so that they might perish. For a similar expression, see Pacatus (Pan. Lat. 12.30; Mynors 2.30) explaining why the usurper Maximus broke the accord between himself and Theodosius:

Tandem in nos oculos deus retulit et bonis Orientis intentus ad mala nostra respexit et hunc sacerrimo capiti obiecit furorem ut foedus abrumpere, ius fetiale violare, bellum edicere non timeret.

- 59: for similar language, cf. Lucan 6.14: Dyrrachii praecipit rapiendas tendit ad arces. Lucan here is describing Caesar as marching to seize the fortress of Dyrrachium. Dyrrachium was

Anastasius' birthplace, and Priscian may want to suggest an attack on Anastasius as well as on Rome.

- 60: for the expression lucemque relinquant, cf. Virgil Aen. 10. 855-856: nunc vivo neque adhuc homines lucemque relinquo/sed linquam.
- 63: Principis invicti felix exercitus armis: felix is a transferred epithet: the army is fortunate because of the emperor's felicitas. Praise of the emperor's felicitas is a standard feature of imperial panegyric. Felicitas is a divine gift, the result of the emperor's pietas, and it brings military victory to the emperor and prosperity to his subjects. For felicitas in Latin panegyric, see M.P. Charlesworth, "Pietas and Victoria," Journal of Roman Studies 33 (1943): 1-10, and R.H. Storch, "The XII Panegyrici Latini and the Perfect Prince," Acta Classica 15 (1972): 71-76. See line 82 for felicibus armis and note on line 237.
- Principis invicti: cf. Lucan 5.324: ac ducis invicti rebus lassata secundis. If Priscian does intend to recall this verse of Lucan, the context of the line, Caesar's address to mutinous troops, is appropriate to Priscian's description of the punishment of the rebellious Isaurians.
- 64: ductoresque fide: in the fifth and sixth centuries, the emperor no longer led his troops into battle personally as the soldier emperors of the third and fourth centuries had done. For the reasons for this change, see W. Kaegi, Byzantine

Military Unrest 471-843 (Amsterdam, 1981), pp. 20-25. Kaegi (p. 22) quotes Sozomen Hist. Eccl. 9.16.1: "it is sufficient for an emperor to retain power merely by giving careful honor to the divine".

The commanders of the imperial forces against the Isaurians were John the Scythian, John the Hunchback, the future emperor Justin, Apskal a Goth, and, two Huns Sigilzan and Zolbo.

65-66: Omnibus adficiunt caesos profugosque ruinis/cum ducibus sceleris: of the Isaurian leaders, Longinus of Cardala and Athenodorus were taken prisoner and beheaded in 497 (John Malalas 399; Theophanes AM 5988, Victor Tonnennensis s.a. 495; Evagrius Ecc. Hist. 3.35; Marcellinus comes s.a. 497). Longinus of Selinus (see notes on lines 107-108 and 172) was captured and executed in 498 (Marcellinus comes s.a. 498; Evagrius Ecc. Hist. 3.35; John Malalas Exc. de ins. 87; Theophanes AM 5987-8). Lilingis was killed at the battle of Cotyaeum (Theophanes AM 5985; John of Antioch fr. 214b; Jordanes Rom. 355; Marcellinus comes s.a. 492); Conon died of wounds received in a battle near Claudiopolis in 493 (Theophanes AM 5986); Indes (see note on line 172) was executed in 498 (John Malalas Exc. de ins. 37; Evagrius Ecc. Hist. 3.35).

Lines 67-79: epic simile: the victorious Anastasius is compared to a lion.

67-78: an analysis of this simile provides an excellent illustration of the way Priscian echoes earlier Latin epic writers and adapts them for his own purposes. Passages are quoted in full and set in context. Sections used by Priscian are underlined and line references to Priscian are given in ().

Virgil

Aen. 2.405. Description of Cassandra.

ad caelum tendens ardentia lumina frustra (72).

Aen. 7.448-449. Allecto incites Turnus to war.

. . . tum flammea torquens
lumina (72) cunctantem et quaerentem dicere plura.

Aen. 9.551-553. Escape of Helenor from the Latins.

ut fera, quae densa venantum saepta corona (70)
contra tela furit seseque haud nescia morti
inicit et saltu supra venabula fertur.

Aen. 9.792-796. Turnus retreats before the Trojan attack.

. . . ceu saevum turba(70) leonem
cum telis premit infensis! at territus ille,
asper, acerba tuens, retro redit et neque terga
ira dare aut virtus patitur, nec tendere contra
ille quidem hoc cupiens potis est per tela
viroisque (73).

Aen. 11.741 and 746-747. Tarchon rallies his men and carries off Venulus.

haec effatus equum in medios, (73) moriturus
et ipse . . . volat igneus aequore Tarchon,
arma virumque ferens (73).

Aen. 12.4-8. Turnus is compared to a wounded lion.

. . . . Poenorum qualis in arvis
 saucius ille gravi venantum vulnere pectus
 tum demum movet arma (69) leo, gaudetque
 comantis excutiens cervice toros fixumque
 latronis impavidus frangit telum et fremit
 (76,71) ore cruento.

Lucan

1.205-212. Caesar at the Rubicon is compared to a lion.

. . . . sicut squalentibus arvis
 aëstiferæ Libyes (68) visq̄ leo cominus hoste
 subsedit dubius, totam dum colligit iram; (68)
 mox ubi se saevae stimulavit verbere caudae (69)
 erixitque iubam et vasto grave murmur hiatu
infremuit (71), tum, porta levis si lanceâ Mauri
 haeréat aut latum subeant venabula pectus,
 per ferrum tanti securus volneris exit.

4.759. Weary war horses urged on.

. . . . neque verberibus stimulisque coacti(69)

6.565. A witch mutilates a corpse.

truncavitque caput compressaque dentibus ora (76).

Statius

Theb. 7.529-32. Reaction of Argive troops to Jocasta's appeal.

. . . . quales ubi tela virosque(73)
 pectoris impulsu rabidi stravere leones
 protinus ira minor, gaudentque in corpore capto
 securam differre famem.

Theb. 7.670-674. Capaneus compared to a lion.

qualis ubi primam leo mane cubilibus atris
 erexit rabiem et saevo speculatur ab antro
 aut cervum aut nondum bellantem fronte iuvenum
 it fremitu gaudens, licet arma gregesque laccessant (68)
 venantum, prædam videt et sua volnera nescit.

Theb. 7.798-799. Earth opens to receive Amphiaraus.

. . . alius tremor arma virosque(73)
mirantesque inclinat equos.

Theb. 8.124-126. Amphiaraus' reception in the Underworld.
Pluto compared to a lion.

ut leo Massyli cum stetit obvia ferri
tunc iras, tunc arma citat (69); si decedit hostis
ira supra satis est vitamque relinquere victo.

Silius Italicus

Pun. 4.10-11. Reaction to Hannibal's arrival in Italy.

. . . subitus per omnem
Ausonium Mavors strepit et ciet arma virosque (73).

Pun. 5.607-608. Hannibal against Flaminus.

tum praeceps ruit in medios (73) solumque fatigat
Flaminium incessens.

Claudian

Cons. Man. 222-223. Manlius' virtue of moderation.

. . . nec dentibus umquam
instrepis horrendum, fremitu (71) nec verbera poscis.

In Eutrop. 2.431. Description of a sea monster.

palpitat et vanos scopulis inlidit hiatus (71).

In Eutrop. 2.453-455. Defeat of Leo.

. . . valuit pro vulnere terror (77)
implevitque vicem iaculi vitamque nocentem
integer et sula formidine saucius efflat.

The simile is a pastiche of ideas, words and phrases from Latin epic. To these borrowed elements, however, Priscian adds details of his own which form and control the images presented in the comparison. In lines 67, 68 and 74, Priscian establishes that the lion is a ruler, that his wrath

is noble and that he is invincible. The rest of the simile merely supports and expands these central themes. After developing Statius' (Theb. 8.124-126) idea that the lion does not attack unless provoked, Priscian describes the power and fury of the lion and the terrible effects of his wrath on his enemies. He thus weaves original and borrowed concepts into a coherent and elaborate simile, effective in itself, although it presents an image of Anastasius which is not in harmony with that developed in the panegyric as a whole (see Introduction, pp. 31-32).

The comparison of Anastasius to a ferocious lion is not found only in Priscian. Zacharias Rhetor (Hist. Eccl. 7.8, trans. F.J. Hamilton and E.W. Brooks [London, 1899], p. 170) quotes a letter from Simon Presbyter to Samuel the archimandrite. The letter describes Anastasius' expulsion of the patriarch Macedonius as follows: "God stirred up the spirit of the believing King like a lion to the prey, and he roared, and made the whole faction of the enemies of truth to tremble".

67: regnans . . . dominatur: emphasis on the lion as ruler.

Anastasius is described as dominus throughout the poem, cf. lines 39, 138, 152, 237. The length and prominence of the simile suggest that Priscian may have intended a pun on the name of Leo I (457-474), the father of the empress Ariadne. The first words of the simile could be taken as ut leo or ut

Leo and it is not until silva that the meaning is made clear. Such an interpretation would be in keeping with Priscian's purpose of demonstrating Anastasius' right to the imperial throne.

- 68: Libyae: the lion was traditionally associated with Africa as in Lucan 1.206. Timotheus of Gaza wrote a prose work on the animals of India, Arabia, Egypt and Libya (Suidas T 621). An edict of Anastasius addressed to the comes and dux Daniel and dealing with the military administration of Libya is known from a Greek inscription, (see A. Chastagnol, La fin du monde antique [Paris, 1976], pp. 310-313). Priscian's use of the word may reflect an interest in and knowledge of Libya on the part of his audience.

nobilis: noble or heroic (cf. Lucan 3.614: plus nobilis irae), also well-known or renowned, and this meaning may also be present here.

- 70: corona: used of hunters as here by Virgil Aen. 9.562. For the lion hunt as a popular scene in art, see J.M.C. Toynbee, Animals in Roman Life and Art (New York, 1973), pp. 25-30, 65-66.

- 77: for the idea that fear alone can cause death, cf. Claudian In Eutrop. 2.453-455:

. . . valuit pro vulnere terror
implevitque vicem iaculi, vitamque nocentem
integer et sola formidine saucius efflat.

These lines of Claudian describe that Leo sent by Eutropius against Tarbigilus and defeated by him (Zosimus Hist. Nov. 5. 165).

79: non fanda furentes: recalls line 58, furor . . . marte nefando. Fanda is an internal accusative. The same construction is used by Priscian at line 71 (infremit horrendum) and also appears in several of Priscian's models for the lion simile, cf. Aen. 9.79: acerba tuens; Cons. Man. 2.22: instrepis horrendum.

Lines 80-86: Anastasius is compared to Bellerophon and P. Servilius Isauricus.

80-81: this is the only specific reference to pagan mythology in the poem, and it raises both the question of Priscian's use of myth and the problem of the status of the hero Bellerophon in Christian literature and art.

On the one hand, the comparison of Bellerophon and Anastasius in a poem characterized by the overall Christian tone of its imagery may simply reflect the acceptance by the Christians of classical literature and myth and the synthesis of the two cultures which had taken place by the fourth century (see Ihor Ševčenko, "A Shadow Outline of Virtue: The Classical Heritage of Greek Christian Literature [Second to Seventh Century]," in Age of Spirituality: A Symposium, ed. Kurt Weitzmann (New York, 1980), pp. 53-74). If this is the case, the mythological figure of Bellerophon is inserted in

the poem as an ornament required by literary convention and is as appropriate in its Christian context as the pagan personifications of the river Jordan which, depicted in accordance with classical artistic tradition, witness the baptism of Christ in the mosaics adorning the baptistries in Ravenna (see Giuseppe Bovini, Ravenna Mosaics, trans. G. Scaglia, [Oxford, 1978], pp. 19, 23-24). Bellerophon is sometimes identified with the emperor in art of the late Roman period. For a description of a mosaic from the palace of Theodoric in Ravenna showing the emperor as Bellerophon surrounded by representations of the seasons, see G. Hanfmann, The Season Sarcophagus in Dumbarton Oaks (Cambridge, Mass., 1951), 1:168 and 261. Thus Bellerophon's defeat of the Solymi, who were often identified with the Isaurians (see note on line 81), provides an apt and obvious image for the victory of Anastasius over this people. Moreover, Bellerophon was a Corinthian hero and Dyrrachium, Anastasius' native city, had been founded by Corinth. Priscian is thus using myth to demonstrate the knowledge of classical literature and the literary skill typical of a late antique man of letters, and adorning his panegyric with the kind of mythological allusion expected in such a work. Since only individual comparisons occur elsewhere in the poem, this cluster of comparisons: epic simile, mythological allusion, and an exemplum drawn from Roman history, does suggest, especially as it appears early in

the poem, that Priscian was showing off his ability and flexing as it were his rhetorical muscles.

However, Christianity may have added another dimension to the myths about Bellerophon. In Christian literature and art, certain figures from pagan mythology were allegorized or depicted as types of Christ or of characters from the Old Testament. In his essay, Ševčenko, "A Shadow Outline of Virtue," p. 57, notes that Methodius, Bishop of Olympus, who quotes the section of the Iliad telling the story of Bellerophon's destruction of the Chimera, identified the Chimera with the dragon of Revelation and stated that Christ had killed the Chimera, thus implying that Christ was a new Bellerophon. Certainly the image of Bellerophon as a destroyer of evil is appropriate to Priscian's description of the Isaurians as establishing impious memorials (impia monumenta) on earth (see line 21) and moved by evil war (martē nefando), see line 158.

It is also possible that Christians may have noted the similarity between Bellerophon and the patriarch Joseph, for the story of Bellerophon's rejection of the advances of Stheneboea, wife of Proteus, has strong parallels with the Biblical story of Joseph and Potiphar's wife. Bellerophon appears as an exemplum of chastity in classical literature (cf. Horace Carm. 3.7.15.), and Priscian may simply have hoped that his audience would recognize another point of comparison

between the hero and Anastasius, who has been described as castus earlier in the poem (see line 42). However, Priscian's comparison of Anastasius to Joseph (lines 208-217) suggests that Priscian may have known of a Christian tradition identifying the two figures. M. Simon, who discusses the aspects of the Bellerophon myth which might have contributed to a Christianization of the hero, considers the Joseph-Bellerophon similarity but rejects it as a factor in the process of christianization (see "Bellerophon chretien," in Melanges offerts a Jérôme Carcopino [Vendome, 1966]: 889-903).

Scenes from the myths of Bellerophon, especially the slaying of the Chimera, were popular subjects in the late antique art. Art historians are exercised by the problem of whether, at least in some instances, Bellerophon appears in the art as an image of Christ, a saviour and destroyer of evil. George Hanfmann, who reviews the problem and the evidence, concludes that Bellerophon's Christianization is "doubtful" (see G. Hanfmann, "The Continuity of Classical Art: Culture, Myth and Faith," in Age of Spirituality: A Symposium, ed. Kurt Weitzmann [New York, 1980], pp. 75-100). Priscian's use of Bellerophon is certainly not decisive evidence, yet taken with Methodius' interpretation of the myth, it does at least suggest that, in certain contexts, Bellerophon could be depicted in Christian terms by a writer or an artist.

I have discussed the reference to Bellerophon because it seems to me important for any attempt to understand Priscian's technique and the milieu in which he was writing to discover what literary associations and visual images Priscian could expect his audience to bring to the poem. Priscian may well have intended his simple reference to the defeat of the Solymi to recall to the audience the two more colourful myths of the Chimera and Sheneboea, both popular in art, and hoped that the combination of classical and Christian images thus evoked would enrich his portrayal of the emperor.

- 81: Solymos: for Bellerophon's victory over the Solymi, see Homer Il. 6.184-85 and Pindar Ol. 13.63-92. Procopius of Gaza, like Priscian, seems to identify the Solymi with the Isaurians (Pan. 9.) and Zosimus (Hist. Nov. 4.20) makes a similar identification.
- 82: felicibus armis: for the use of felicibus, see note on line 63 and cf. Virgil Aen. 7.745: Ufens, insignem fama et felicibus armis; Lucan 3.338: nec momenta sumus, numquam felicibus armis.
- 84: Servilius: P[ublius] Servilius Vatia Isauricus assisted Sulla in his last campaigns against the party of Marius and was consul in 79 B.C. As proconsul of Cilicia he campaigned against pirates based in southern Asia Minor and in 76-75 B.C. against the Isaurians. He achieved considerable success and captured several towns including Isaura Nova, although his

gains were not followed up because of the outbreak of war with Mithridates. Because of his success Servilius became a type of military hero. See, for example, the references to Servilius in Claudian (In Eutrop. 1.217): indomitos curru Servilius egit Isauros and Sidonius (Pan. Anth. 463-464): adieci Syriae, quos nunc moderaris, Isauros/hos quoque sub nostris domuit Servilius armis.

For the use of republican rather than imperial figures as exempla, see Litchfield, "National Exempla virtutis in Roman Literature," p. 59.

85: pro merito laudum: the expression pro merito with the genitive is used, as it is here, with the sense of propter or causa by a number of late Latin writers, cf. Vegetius De re militari 1.17: pro merito virtutis; Lactantius Institutiones Divinae 5.10.12: pro merito impietatis suae.

86: for the language, cf. Claudian Cons.Man. 153-154: Spartanis potuit robur praestare Lycurgus/matribus.

Lines 87-97: despite their resources the Isaurians are besieged in their mountain citadels.

87-97: these lines are a combination and elaboration of two antitheses found in Claudian: former rulers of the world are confined to one small space (De IV Cons. Hon. 478-481), and want overcomes those once rich in spoils (De Bello Goth. 94).

87: aurum . . . copia ferri: for the great supply of gold and arms hidden by Zeno in Isauria and used by the rebels, see Theophanes AM 5985, and Joshua the Stylite Chron. 12.

88: castella . . . praeruptis ardua saxis: the Isaurian robber chieftains conducted their raids from hilltop strongholds. One such stronghold mentioned in the sources is the castellum of Papius (John of Antioch fr. 206.2). Brooks ("The Emperor Zenon," p. 228) identifies this stronghold of Papius with an impregnable fortress prepared by Zeno as a refuge for himself (Joshua the Stylite Chron. 12). Zeno's fortress had only one path leading to it, a path so narrow that only one person at a time could ascend (Joshua the Stylite Chron. 17). The protection afforded the Isaurians by the mountainous nature of their territory is a common theme. Ammianus (14.2.6), for example, describes the difficulties and danger of fighting the Isaurians in their own territory as follows:

Coactique aliquotiens nostri pedites ad eos
persequendos scandere clivos sublimes, etiam si
lapsantibus plantis fruticeta prensando vel
dumos, ad vertices venerint summos, inter arta
tamen et invia, nullas acies explicare permissi,
nec firmare nisu valido gressus; hoste discursatore
rupium abscisa volvente superne, periculose
per prona discedunt, aut ex necessitate ultima
fortiter dimicantes, ruinis ponderum immanium
consternuntur.

For similar language used of towns and forts in mountainous terrain, cf. Virgil G 2.156: tot congesta manu praeruptis oppida saxis; Aen. 3.271: Neritos ardua saxis; cf. Carmen de Providentia Dei praef. 33-38:

. . . heu! caede decenni
Vandalicis gladiis sternimur et Geticis.
non castella petris, non oppida montibus altis
imposita, aut urbes amnibus aequoreis,
barbarici superare dolos atque arma furoris
evaluere omnes, ultima pertulimus.

- 89: tantae . . . urbes: an exaggeration as Isauria was famous for its mountain strongholds rather than its cities. The Isaurian city of Claudiopolis was captured in 493 by Diogenes, one of Anastasius' military commanders and a relative of the empress Ariadne. He was subsequently besieged in the city by the Isaurians who came down from the mountains and surrounded Claudiopolis. Diogenes was rescued by John the Hunchback who routed the Isaurian forces (Theophanes AM 5986). The other city mentioned in connection with the rebellion is the Isaurian Antioch where Longinus of Selinus and Indes held out until 498 (Marcellinus comes s.a. 498; Evagrius Ecc. Hist. 3.35; Theophanes AM 5987-88).
- 92-95: Priscian contrasts the strong position of the Isaurians in the early stages of their rebellion, when they controlled territory and resources (cuncta tenebant) and were actively engaged in battle (tela movendo), with their later confinement in their mountain citadels under siege conditions at the close of the war. The description serves to emphasize the might of an emperor who can destroy such a powerful enemy.
- 93: tela movendo: the ablative gerund movendo could be functioning here either as an instrumental ablative with cuncta tenebant (line 92) or as a present participle. I have chosen the later construction for the translation because this interpretation fits in better with the preceding indirect statement (Nil

satis esse sibi credentes) which forms an awkward interruption of the thought if movendo is taken as an ablative.

tela: Procopius mentions Isaurian javelins although he does not describe them (De Bello Gothico 1.29.42), but in this context tela probably means weapons in general.

94-95: after being defeated by Anastasius' armies at the battles of Cotyaeum and Claudopolis, the Isaurians retreated to their mountain fortresses under the leadership of Longinus of Cardala (John of Antioch fr. 214b; Theophanes AM 5987). Although supplies were sent in to them by Longinus of Selinus (see note on lines 107-108), the strongholds were captured over the following five years. As Priscian claims, famine must have been a major factor in the final submission of the Isaurians. For a similar episode, see Zosimus' account (Hist. Nov. 1.69) of Lydius, an Isaurian brigand, who took refuge from the troops sent against him in a town located on a cliff and protected by deep ravines. Lydius was killed and lack of supplies forced his few remaining men to surrender.

95: Cautibus angustis conclusi: for a similar description of Isaurian territory, cf. Scriptores Historiae Augustae Probus 16: omnia illa quae angusta adeuntur loca.

97: Et mentes avidas orbis consumsit egestas: Priscian is echoing Claudian (De Bello Goth. 93-94): quae vindicta prior quam cum formido superbos/flectit et adsuetum spoliis adfligit egestas?

Lines 98-111: God causes a storm to wreck the Isaurian fleet.

98: fulminis ictus: the description of the defeat and destruction of the Isaurians is framed by Priscian's vision of the God of thunder punishing the unjust and avenging their deeds (line 126). Priscian combines the image of Jupiter tonans with the Christian manus Dei (line 101: dextera flagrans) which smites the unjust.

99: for the language, cf. Claudian De Bello Gild. 415-416:
notissima Marti/robora

100: ductorum . . . vallo: a striking phrase. Vallum usually refers to walls and fortifications. In Priscian's variation, the leaders of the imperial army take the place of physical walls. For the language, cf. Virgil Aen. 6.549: moenia lata videt, triplici circumdata muro; Lucan 2.450: moenia et abrupto circumdant undique vallo.

101-102: dextera . . . praesenti numine: in Statius' Thebaid, Capaneus invokes his right hand as an invincible deity. Here it is the right hand of the summus genitor which fights for Anastasius, cf. Statius Theb. 9.548-550:

. . . ades o mihi, dextera, tantum
tu praesens bellis et inevitabile numen,
te voco, te solam superum contemptor adoro.

See further, the note on line 55 for the dextera Dei as a sign of God's presence at work in the world.

103: toto . . . aevo: for similar wording, cf. Claudian De VI Cons. Hon. 55-56: nil optimus ille/divorum toto meruit felicius aevo.

104-111: the theme of the elements fighting on behalf of the emperor at God's command appears in the works of other late Latin writers. Claudian's description of Theodosius' victory over Eugenius and Arbogast at the battle of the Frigidus (De III Cons. Hon. 96-98) contains the following passage:

o nimium dilecte deo, cui fundit ab antris
Aeolus armatas hiemes, cui militat aether
et coniurati veniunt ad classica venti.

Like Claudian, Priscian begins with an apostrophe suggesting the protection of the emperor by the deity. As is his practice, he omits any reference to figures of pagan mythology such as Aeolus and instead elaborates Claudian's armatas hiemes and image of the winds coming as soldiers to the call of the trumpets by providing a more detailed description of a tempest with storm clouds, thunder and lightning fighting for Anastasius. Claudian concludes his reference to Theodosius' victory with a description of the river Frigidus with its waters red with blood and choked with corpses (De III Cons. Hon. 99-101). Priscian continues with a similar description, although he does not seem to be referring to any specific incident (see note on lines 112-118, where the passage of Claudian is quoted):

In his life of Epiphanius, Priscian's contemporary Ennodius (Vita Epiphani 128) has Epiphanius say to Theodoric:

Quotiens utilitatibus tuis aer ipse servierit,
si recenset, tibi caeli serena militarunt, tibi
convexa pluvias pro voto funderunt. Quis resistere
dexteræ tuæ ausus fuit et cum gratia superna pugnant?

Although his language is less elaborate than that of Priscian, Ennodius employs vocabulary (servierit, militarunt) which personifies the elements as the servants and soldiers of the king.

The representations of the emperor in the two passages differ somewhat. Ennodius uses the image of the right hand to depict the king himself as a warrior, though one fighting with divine support. Anastasius is not presented as personally involved in action. Rather it is the right hand of God fighting on his behalf which brings him victory (lines 101-103), his virtue, not his physical prowess, which brings triumph (line 111).

106: images of Jupiter, the heavenly father, shaking the world with his thunderbolts are common in Latin literature, cf. Claudian De Cons. Stil. 2.26-27: qui cuncta sonoro/concutiens tonitru Cyclopum spicula differt; Silius Italicus Pun. 5.70-72:

ac super haec divum genitor, terrasque fretumque
concutiens tonitru, Cyclopum rapta caminis
fulmina Tyrrhenas Thrasymenni torsit in undas.

Priscian here uses similar language of the Christian God.

107-108: there is no mention of a storm wrecking an Isaurian fleet in the other extant accounts of the Isaurian war. We do know that Longinus of Selinus supplied his besieged countrymen by sea (Theophanes AM 5987), and it is possible that this fact and the incident described here by Priscian are connected.

111: elementa salutis: an unusual expression in which Priscian seems to be playing on various connotations of elementa. Priscian has just described how clouds, winds, sea, and lightning fight on behalf of Anastasius. In other writers, elementa often refer to physical elements such as earth and sea (cf. Ammianus 17.13.15: per elementum utrumque Sarmatas vicentium ira virtusque delevit) or fire and clouds (cf. Cyprianus Gallus Heptateuchos deut. 21: elementa dei). As used here by Priscian elementa take on the meaning of elements in the modern sense of weather, which virtue has fighting on its side. A second meaning which also seems to be working here is elementa in the sense of first principles or foundations (cf. Lactantius Institutiones Divinae 6.12.16: prima virtutis elementa). Anastasius' virtue provides a firm foundation of safety for himself and the empire.

Lines 112-118: a description of the battlefield and the slaughtered Isaurians.

112-116: Quis repetat . . . clausa: an interrogative with a potential subjunctive which I have punctuated as a question parallel to Quid . . . memorabo, lines 107-110, above; cf. also lines 12-14, 290-300 and 301-304. Baehrens' text has a semi-colon after clausa which may be a misprint for a question mark.

112: cf. Corippus In laud. Iust. praef. 10: quos totiens victos numeret per proelia Francos.

113: for the language, cf. Silius Italicus Pun. 12.425: incussit
sese atque aequavit moenia terrae.

115-118: like the lion simile, this passage provides a good demonstration of Priscian's use of earlier writers. The context is given, the relevant sections underlined and line references to Priscian are given in ().

Claudian

De III Cons. Hon. 99-101. Theodosius' victory at the battle of the Frigidus.

Alpinae rubuere nives, et Frigidus amnis (117)
mutatis fumavit, aquis turbaque cadentum (115, 114)
staret, ni rapidus iuvisset flumina sanguis.

De IV Cons. Hon. 628-636. Theodosius' defeat of the Gruthungi, on the Danube.

. . . fluitantia numquam
largius Arctos pavere cadavera pisces (118);
corporibus premitur Peuce; per quinque recurrens
ostia barbaricos vix egerit unda cruores (116)
confessusque parens Odothaei regis opima
rettulit exuviasque tibi: civile secundis
conficis auspiciis bellum. tibi debeat orbis
fata Gruthungorum debellatumque tyrannum:
Hister sanguineos egit te consule fluctus (117).

De VI Cons. Hon. 207-209. Defeat of Alaric at Verona.

. . . multisque suorum
diras pavit aves, inimicaque corpora volvens (116)
Ionios Athesis mutavit sanguine fluctus (115).

Lucan

4.785-87. Curio is defeated by Numidian cavalry.

. . . fluvios non ille cruoris (115)
membrorumque videt lapsum et ferientia terram
corpora: compressum turba stetit omne cadaver.

1.615. Sacrifice performed by the Etruscan seer Arruns, portents of civil war.

diffusum rutilo nigrum pro sanguine virus (117).

2.713. Pompey flees to the East.

hic primū rubuit civili sanguine Nereus (117).

7.473. Start of the battle of Pharsalia.

primaque Thessaliam Romanū sanguine tinxit (117).

Such descriptive passages evoking the horror of war and picturing the vast numbers of the slain are commonplace in Latin epic and historical works. For descriptions of war in Byzantine art and literature, see Henry Maguire, Art and Eloquence in Byzantium (Princeton, New Jersey, 1981), pp. 24-42. For a more general discussion of description in ancient literature, see G. Downey, "Ekphrasis," in Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum, vol. 4, ed. T. Klauser (Stuttgart, 1959), pp. 921-944. Priscian here is most directly inspired by the lines from Claudian's panegyric on the third consulship of Honorius which describe the battle of the Frigidus (see also the note on lines 104-111). Selecting suitable details from this and other passages from Claudian and Lucan, Priscian amplifies and alters them; for example, he uses torrebat to suggest the movement as well as the warmth of the water rather than fumavit (De III Cons. Hon. 100) and he replaces the pavere of Claudian (De IV Cons. Hon. 629) with the stronger tempere. He combines both borrowed and original features in a unified whole which moves from the battlefield to the sea, and he imposes a pattern which balances water (the rivers run

warm with blood), bodies (the river mouths are choked with corpses), water (the sea is stained with blood), bodies (the sated fish spurn the corpses).

Priscian does not turn to Claudian and Lucan only for a supply of images of war and death. The context in which these borrowed images occur is equally important. The passages from Lucan occur in the context of civil war, and, while the details taken from Claudian refer to victories over barbarians, in the first passage quoted they are combined with references to Eugenius' revolt. The twin ideas of civil war and barbarian invasion are appropriate to the Isaurian war which Priscian is discussing here but could also suggest the revolt of Vitalian and his barbarian troops.

118: tempere: poetic usage in place of classical contemnere. See Virgil Aen. 6.620 and Lucan 3.957. Temnit is used at line 155.

Lines 119-129: the Isaurians are exiled from their homeland, but acknowledge that their punishment is just.

119-125: a description of the sufferings of the population of a city captured in war was standard fare in Greek and Roman poetry, oratory and historiography. Quintilian (Inst. 8.3.66-70), for example, explains how to amplify a description of a captured town and so move the emotions of an audience. For a discussion of this topic, see G.M. Paul, "Urbs Capta: Sketch of an Ancient Literary Motif," Phoenix 36.2 (1982): 144-155.

Priscian includes stock elements common to such descriptions and uses them to arouse specific emotional reactions. At the beginning of the passage (lines 119-120), Priscian mentions two events which often accompanied the capture of a city, the sack of the city and the carrying off of the women into slavery, to indicate what would have happened had the Isaurian army succeeded in capturing Constantinople. Only when, by depicting these two scenes, he has demonstrated that the Isaurians deserved to suffer defeat and punishment, can he afford to arouse the pity of the audience by describing that punishment, the destruction of the Isaurian cities and the mourning of the inhabitants for their dear ones (lines 123-125). Priscian thus uses conventional motifs to arouse in his hearers the two contrasting emotions which he personifies in the images he evokes of the avenging God (lines 126-128) and the merciful Anastasius (lines 130-132).

- 119: for the language, cf. Lucan 8.342: capto ducere reges.
- 120: sacrique palati: the epithet sacer was used of anything connected with the emperor. Corippus (In laud. Iust. 1.363) also describes the imperial palace as sacred: lux sacra palatia complet. The Variae of Cassiodorus show the adjective used in a variety of contexts pertaining to the emperor. In his letter to the senate on the elevation of Tutum to the patriciate (Var. 8.10), King Athalaric mentions his early position as an attendant in the imperial bedchamber: Statim rudes annos ad

sacri cubiculi secreta portavit. Cassiodorus also refers to royal robes as sacra vestis (Var. 112.6.7) and to an imperial command as a sacra iussio (Var. 3.15). He several times uses the expression vice sacra in the sense of pro rege, as in his discussion of the praetorian prefect, who acts as a judge everywhere as the representative of the emperor (Var. 6.3): vice sacra ubique iudicat. The central administration, the comitatus, is described as sacratissimus (Var. 8.32). One of the chief financial officials of the government was the comes sacrarum largitionum (A.H.M. Jones, The Later Roman Empire [Oxford, 1964], pp. 366-70) and the various secretariats were known as the sacra scrinia.

urbis: Constantinople.

121: iterum: Longinus, the brother of the emperor Zeno and consul in 490, had hoped to succeed his brother on Zeno's death in 491 with the support of Longinus of Cardala and the Isaurians in Constantinople, cf. Joshua the Stylite Chron. 23, trans. Wright, p. 15: "the Isaurians, after the death of Zenon rebelled against the emperor Anastasius and were wishing to set up an emperor who was pleasing to themselves" (cf. Theophanes AM 5983). Although exiled by Anastasius, Longinus might well have become a second Isaurian emperor if their rebellion had been successful.

122: for a similar example of deprivation of burial, cf. Lucan 2. 732-33: non quia te superi patrio privare sepulchro/maluerint.

123: reliqui patrias sedes urbesque relinquunt: after the capture and death of the Isaurian leaders, large numbers of the Isaurians were settled in Thrace which had been devastated by barbarians (Theophanes AM 5988). See also Procopius of Gaza Pan. 10: ". . . you gave them a city built by yourself and a fertile region. And now they use their courage properly to protect others".

... καὶ πόλιν ἐδίδους, ἣν αὐτὸς ἐδημιούργησας,
καὶ χώραν εὐδαίμονα, καὶ νῦν δεόντως χρώνται τῇ
ρώμῃ καὶ τῶν ἄλλων προβέβληται.

The Isaurians continued to serve in the Roman army and were mentioned as helping to defend Constantinople against Vitalian in 513 (John of Antioch fr. 214e 17).

124: for the language, cf. Lucan 2.297-9: ceu morte parentem/
natorum orbatum longum producere funus/ad tumulos iubet ipse
dolor.

125: moenia subvertunt, quaecumque reliquerat ignis: the Isaurian strongholds were destroyed to prevent any further uprisings (John Malalas 393), cf. Joshua the Stylite Chron. 23, trans. Wright p. 15: "The Isaurians were overcome and destroyed and slaughtered and all their cities were razed and burned".

126-127: the isolation of Isauria hindered the spread of Christianity among the Isaurians and many remained pagans into the fifth century (see E.A. Thompson, "The Isaurians Under Theodosius II," Hermathena 68 (1946): 29). During the reign of Zeno, the pagan philosopher Pamprepius of Panopolis played a leading

role in the rebellion of the Isaurian general Illus. Although Zeno, Illus and other Isaurians were Christian, it is probable that a number were still pagan in the sixth century. Priscian here suggests that the Isaurians who rebelled against Anastasius were pagans, and that this is one reason for their defeat and punishment.

- 126: tonanti: epithets and terms used to describe Jupiter were adopted by Christian poets when they wished to refer to God the Father. For examples, see H. Hagendahl, The Latin Fathers and the Classics (Goteborg 1958), pp. 88-9.

For aetherio and Tonanti in similar positions in the verse, cf: Lucan 5.93-99:

. . . forsan terris inserta regendis
aere libratum vacuo quae sustinet orbem
totius pars magna Iovis Cirrhaea per antra
exit et aetherio trahitur conexa Tonanti.
hoc ubi virgineo conceptum est pectore numen
humanum feriens animam sonat oraque vatis
soluit

In this passage from Lucan, the god is embedded in the world to rule and sustain it, a theme which Priscian develops in this passage and throughout the panegyric.

- 127: mille per annos: mille is used here not to indicate an exact span of time, but rather to mean countless or innumerable and so to emphasize the enormity of the Isaurians' crime, cf. Claudian In Eutrop. 1.475.

- 128: ultoremque deum: Priscian's description of God as an avenger would suggest to the audience a number of Biblical passages in

both the Old and New Testaments in which God the Father appears as a god of vengeance (cf. Psalms 58:11; 94:4; Deut. 32:35; Rom. 12:19) For further examples, see Blaise, Vocabulaire latin, p. 272. For God as an avenging judge, cf: Carmen de Providentia Dei 747-748: vellesne per omnes/ultricem culpas descendere indicis iram.

Lines 130-139: Anastasius rectifies injustices committed under Isaurian rule.

130-139: this passage provides a transition between the two major divisions of the panegyric. Priscian concludes the section on the emperor's deeds in war with a description of Anastasius' clemency to his defeated enemies. He then summarizes the gifts which Anastasius' peaceful rule have brought to the empire.

130: clementia: mercy distinguishes the king from the tyrant, cf. Carmen de Providentia Dei 749-750: et quo magnanimi clemens patientia Regis/distaret saeva immitis feritate tyranni.

Clementia was one aspect of philanthropia, a virtue by which the emperor revealed himself as the image of God. See, for example, Agapetus Ekthesis 37, trans. Barker, p. 59:

He who has attained to great authority should imitate, so far as he can, the Giver of that authority. If in any way he bears the image of God, who is Joverall, and if through Him he holds rule over all, he will imitate God best if he thinks that nothing is more precious than mercy.

Priscian here underlines the mercy of Anastasius towards his enemies by contrast with the picture of God the avenger he has

built up in the previous passage. For the virtue of philanthropia and for clementia as an aspect of philanthropia, see notes on lines 228-238 and 236-238.

131-132: an allusion to Virgil's famous command to the Romans at Aeneid

6.853: parcere subiectis et debellare superbos; cf. also Ovid

Am. 1.2.49-50: adspice cognati felicia Caesaris arma/qua

vicit, victos protegit ille manu.

133: proceres: court officials and dignitaries, as opposed to the senators. They wore official court dress and accompanied the emperor on ceremonial occasions. See Averil Cameron, Corippus, 128, n. 27, for a discussion of the proceres in art and in the literary sources.

135-136: venenum linguae: false accusations made by delatores. A } similar phrase, venena linguarum, is used by the Scriptores Historiae Augustae Tyr. Trig. 30, although it does not refer specifically to delatores. The theme of the emperor punishing and banishing informers is a commonplace in imperial panegyric, cf. Pliny the Younger Pan. 34: Vidimus delatorum agmen inductum, quasi grassatorum quasi latronum. Poets tend to avoid the term delator, cf. Claudian De IV Cons. Hon. 493-95: non inminet ensis, nullae nobilium caedes; non crimina vulgo/texunter; De Cons. Stil. 2.120-21: non insidiator oberrat/factorum quemcumque reum.

The cry, "Cast out the informers!" (Constantine Porphyrogenitus De Cer. 92) was among the acclamations which

greeted Anastasius at his accession. We thus have evidence that the actions of such men were considered a problem by the people of Constantinople. That delatores were active in Zeno's reign is clear from the advice given to Zeno before his death by Daniel the Stylite (V. Dan. Styl. 91). The saint tells Zeno that, although his good works should give him confidence when he enters the presence of God, he must abstain from covetousness and banish informers. Procopius of Gaza (Pan. 5) confirms that Anastasius did not encourage informers to accuse the wealthy and thus enrich the treasury, but rather expelled the delatores from Constantinople.

137-138: res . . . restituit: Priscian may be thinking here of Ennius' famous line on Fabius Cunctator: unus homo nobis cunctando restituit rem (Cicero De Officiis 1.84).

139: Perficiens firmum quod cepit debile regnum: John the Lydian (De Mag. 3.45, trans. Carney, p. 97) explains how Zeno weakened the empire and the financial measures which Anastasius took to strengthen the state:

He [Zeno] was a coward, . . . , and bought his way out of wars He compelled the prefect to purchase peace with a lavish expenditure of gold, while he busied himself with confiscations of the property, and encompassing the downfall, of the states magistrates. . . . Fortune set Anastasius over the citizenry, who were in the grip of a death wish. Anastasius explored every means of paying off the deficiency in public means. Like some pater familias, after firmly ear-marking for the essential routine outgoings, he kept requiring accounts for expenditures and meeting them fairly, shunning excess.

Lines 140-148: introduction to the second half of the poem; the poet will describe only the greatest of the emperor's deeds.

140: for similar images of confusion, cf. Virgil Aen. 7.44-45:

Maior rerum mihi nascitur ordo, / maius opus moveo; Aen. 12.665:

obstipuit varia confusus imagine rerum; Claudian In Eutrop.

1.497-499:

eunuchi si iura dabunt legesque tenebunt
ducant pensa viri mutatoque ordine rerum
vivat Amazonio confusa licentia ritu.

Cf. also Corippus In laud. Iust. 1.3-5:

. . . licet omnia nullus
inclita gestorum valeat monumenta piorum
ordinibus numerare suis,

Rhetorical theory dictated that the panegyrist signal a change of subject (Menander Rhetor 372.15). Priscian indicates ? transition between two major topics with a reminiscence of the invocation to the muse with which Virgil begins the second half of the Aeneid. However, Virgil sings of horrida bella (7.41) while Priscian is introducing his account of Anastasius' achievements in peace. No doubt Priscian expected his audience to appreciate his exchange of themes of war for themes of peace. He may also have wished to suggest that the peace of the empire was once more threatened by war and treachery from the West.

141: for the language, cf. Claudian Cons. Man. 81: parturit in-
numeros angusto pectore sensus; Virgil Aen. 12.914-915: tum
pectore sensus/vertuntur varii; Lucan 5.759-760: vix tantum
infirmam dolorem/cepit, et attonito cesserunt pectore sensus.

142-144: Priscian introduces the second half of his panegyric with a second modest disclaimer of his ability to do justice to his theme (see praef. 12-16, for the same motif). He embellishes this plea of inadequacy with a comparison of his situation and that of the priestess of Apollo at Delphi, a simile which at first glance seems strange and even incongruous.

The simile seems to have been inspired by a passage from Lucan 5.93-99:

. . . forsan terris inserta regendis
 aere libratum vacuo quae sustinet orbem,
 totius pars magna Iouis Cirrhaea per antra
 exit et aethereo trahitur conexa Tonanti.
 hoc ubi virgineo conceptum est pectore numen,
 humanam feriens animam sonat oraque vatis-
 soluit. . . .

Priscian has two specific objectives when he compares himself to the Delphic Sibyl. The explicit point of the comparison is the fact that Priscian, like the priestess, has a mind teeming with knowledge which he cannot reveal. Later in the Lucan passage, although all time is gathered up together and all the centuries press upon her breast (5.177-178), the priestess is not allowed to reveal all she knows: nec tantum prodere vati/quantum scire licet (5.176-177). Thus the simile underlines Priscian's own inability to reveal all the deeds of Anastasius.

Implicit in the comparison is the poet's claim of divine inspiration, since it is the divine element in the world which inspires the priestess at Delphi. Priscian by

this simile thus indicates less directly than in the preface (lines 12-16) that he wishes to be perceived as a divinely inspired vates who reveals the power of God in the world as that power is manifested in the deeds of Anastasius.

The motif of the poet divinely inspired by the Muses or by Apollo was a commonplace in Latin poetry. Claudian (De Raptu Proserpinae 1.5-6), for example, in the introduction to his epic on the rape of Proserpina, attributes his poetic vision to the divine inspiration of Apollo:

iam furor humanos nostro de pectore sensus
expulit et totum spirant praeconia Phoebum.

Lucretius (5.110-112), like Priscian, compares himself to the priestess of Apollo at Delphi, but claims that his proclamations, based on reason, are surer than the words of the divinely inspired oracle:

Qua prius aggrediar quam de re fundere fata
sanctius et multo certa ratione magis quam
Pythia quae tripode a Phoebi lauroque profatur.

Priscian alludes to this tradition and signals his own claim to divine inspiration in his description of the sibyl inspired by Apollo. Yet Priscian does not imitate any such profession by an earlier poet and so distances himself from the pagan tradition.

146: for the phrase diversis partibus at the same position in the verse, cf. Virgil Aen. 12.521: ac velut immissi diversis partibus ignes; Ovid Met. 6.53: haud mora, constituunt diversis partibus ambae.

148: relego: "I go over again". Priscian's use of this word implies that Anastasius' deeds are well known and have often been praised before. He says this again more explicitly at line 161.

Lines 149-161: Anastasius abolishes the chrysargyron.

149-161: one of the more popular achievements of Anastasius' reign was the abolition of the chrysargyron (collatio lustralis) in May 498 (CJ 11.1.1). The chrysargyron was instituted by Constantine (Zosimus Hist. Nov. 2.38) and was a tax on the revenues of merchants and tradesmen. Procopius of Gaza lists those liable to the tax as craftsmen, market gardeners, fishermen, merchants and prostitutes (Pan. 13). Money lenders were also included (CTh 13.1.18). Originally levied every five years and paid in silver and gold, by the fifth century it was collected every four years and in gold (Zosimus Hist. Nov. 2.38; Joshua the Stylite Chron. 31). After the abolition of the tax by Anastasius, the revenue which the tax had brought in was made up from the res privata (John Malalas 98). A new ministry, the patrimonium, was created and the comes patrimonii administered estates which were transferred to this new department from the res privata (John the Lydian De Mag. 2.27; cf. Jones, Later Roman Empire, p. 425).

The emperor seems to have had a number of reasons for the abolition of the chrysargyron. At this time in his reign Anastasius was in the financial position to remove the tax.

He was no longer paying a subsidy to the Isaurians (see note on line 19), the confiscation of the property of Zeno and the other Isaurian leaders had added to the treasury and the imperial estates, and the state was at peace following the end of the Isaurian war. The commutation of the payment of the land tax in kind to payment in money (see note on lines 193-194) ensured a supply of precious metal for the treasury without recourse to the hated tax. Anastasius may also have wished to revitalize the cities by encouraging industry and commerce. The removal of the tax may have been part of an overall reform of the empire's finances; the reform of the currency took place in the same year. For the Anastasian currency reform, see R.P. Blake, "The monetary reform of Anastasius and its economic implications," in Studies in the History of Culture (Menasha, Wisconsin, 1942), pp. 84-97, and D.M. Metcalf, The origins of the Anastasian currency reform (Amsterdam, 1969). Ancient writers who mention the tax stress the fact that Anastasius was moved by the hardships caused by the tax. Priscian (lines 156-158), Procopius (Pan. 13) and Zosimus (see note on lines 156-158) all describe these hardships and Cedrenus (357) says that Anastasius abolished the chrysargyron after the suffering of the people was pointed out to him both by a group of monks from Jerusalem and in a tragedy written by Timothy of Gaza. Some authors suggest that Anastasius was also motivated by moral and religious con-

siderations (see note on lines 164-70). Because it taxed the earnings of prostitutes, the chrysargyron was considered incompatible with Christian morality. Evagrius (Ecc. Hist. 3.39) describes it as a tax hateful to God. Chastagnol ("Zozime II, 38 et l'Histoire Auguste," Bonner Historia-Augusta-Colloquium 1964-1965 [Bonn, 1966], p. 76) suggests that the references to the hardships of the cities and to the prostitutes reflect official propaganda concerning the reasons for the removal of the tax. Whatever the motives, and there were probably a number of reasons, the state was not the loser. At his death, Anastasius left 320,000 pounds of gold in the treasury (Procopius Historia Arcana 19) and a reputation for parsimony (CJ 2.7.25: parca posterioris subilitas principis).

- 149: for the language, cf. Virgil Aen. 1.743: unde hominum genus; Aen. 1.605-606: quae te tam laeta tuerunt/saecula?; Ecl. 4.46: 'Talia saecula' suis dixerunt 'currite' fuis; Ovid Met. 1.203: humanum genus est totusque perhorruit orbis; Lucan 2. 226: humani generis maiora in proelia damno; Corippus In laud. Iust. 3.78: ferrea nunc aereunt atque aurea saecula surgent.

Of the possible sources of inspiration listed above, the golden age imagery of Eclogue 4 is both the most appropriate and perhaps the most likely to be recognized by the audience. The theme of renovatio, of a new golden age under Anastasius' rule, is prominent in the second half of the panegyric, cf. lines 138 and 180.

152: dominus terrae: for kings and emperors described as the lords of earth, cf. Claudian De IV Cons. Hon. 22-23: terrae dominos pelagique futuros/immenso decuit rerum de principe nasci; Ovid Pont. 1.9.35-36: nam tua non alio coluit penetrata ritu/terrarum dominos quam cœlis ipse deos; Lucan 8.208-209: terrarum dominos et scepra Eoa tenentes/exul habet comites. To the phrase terrae dominus used by the earlier poets, Priscian adds pater in keeping with the image of Anastasius he presents throughout the panegyric.

153: argenti . . . auri pondere: the words refer specifically to the hated tax, the chrysargyron, but in earlier writers the expression has the less explicit connotation of riches or mass of gold and silver, cf. Silius Italicus Pun. 15.497: augebant animos argenti pondere et auri; Virgil Aen. 1.358-359: auxiliumque viae veteris tellure recludit/thesauros ignotum argenti pondus et auri; Claudian De Cons. Stil. 2.58-59: nt Stilicho non divitias aurique relictum/pondus.

154: praemia caeli: a specifically Christian concept. For the belief in rewards in heaven, see Matt. 5:12: gaudete et exultate quoniam merces vestra copiosa est in caelis; cf. Eph. 6:8; Matt. 19:21; Mark 10:21; Luke 18:22; cf. also Carmen de Providentia Dei 746-747: at qui nec poenam iniustis, nec praemia sanctis/restitui ad praesens quereris. For praemia as the gift of eternal life, see Blaise, Vocabulaire latin, p. 447. Public benefactors in the Greek and Roman world did ex-

pect to receive the rewards of honour and praise from their fellow citizens and also of a measure of immortality. Such rewards could take the form of inscriptions, statues or feasts and religious ceremonies. Thus, although the nature of the reward differed, both Christians and pagans did think in terms of rewards for beneficence, despite the efforts of some Christian writers to elevate Christian thought above the reward concept. For a discussion of the topic of public generosity in the ancient world, see A.R. Hands, Charities and Social Aid in Greece and Rome (London, 1968), pp. 26-61.

155: temnit: see note on line 118.

156-158: Zosimus (Hist. Nov. 2.38, trans. Ronald T. Ridley [Canberra, 1982], p. 41) describes the oppressiveness of the chrysargyron in similar terms:

. . . as each fourth year came round when this tax had to be paid, weeping and wailing were heard throughout the city, because beatings and tortures were in store for those who could not pay owing to extreme poverty. Indeed, mothers sold their children and fathers prostituted their daughters under compulsion to pay the exactions of the chrysargyron.

Joshua the Stylite's description of the rejoicing which greeted the remission of the tax (Chron. 31, trans. Wright, p. 22) provides a strong contrast to the scenes of the misery caused by its exaction painted by Priscian and Zosimus:

The Edessenes used to pay once in four years 140 pounds of gold. The whole city rejoiced and they all put on white garments, both small and great, and carried lighted tapers and censers full of burning incense and went forth with psalms and hymns, giving thanks to God and praising the emperor . . .

156: Namquē cibum poterant qui vix acquirere vitae: Corippus (In laud. Iust. 2.376-77) has weeping petitioners claim that they have not the food to sustain life: vix nobis vitae constant alimenta diurnae/afflictis.

158: for similar language, cf. Virgil Aen. 2.196: captique dolis lacrimisque coactis.

159: dabat: the subject is munus, understood from line 158.

161: Romano vestras nel Graio carmine laudes: in late fifth and sixth century Constantinople, it seems to have been still possible to recite panegyrics in both Latin and Greek as part of the ceremonial surrounding imperial celebrations. Corippus (In laud. Iust. 4.154-156) tells us that panegyrics in both languages were recited in honour of Justin's consulship:

tunc oratorum geminae facundia linguae
egregias cecinit sollemni munere laudes
consulis Augusti.

John the Lydian (De Mag. 3.28) boasts that he, rather than orators from Rome, was asked by the emperor to write a panegyric in Latin. The De laude Anastasii may have been one of a pair of panegyrics and, although they were not written for the same occasion, Priscian's panegyric and the prose panegyric in Greek of Procopius of Gaza do provide an instance of Latin and Greek panegyrics on the same subject. In addition, there survive fragments of a verse panegyric in Greek which may have been written in honour of Anastasius (see

Viljamaa, Greek Encomiastic Poetry, pp. 56-58). Viljamaa attributes this fragmentary panegyric to Christodorus of Coptos who wrote a poem in praise of Anastasius' victory over the Isaurians (see further note on lines 10-11). Another poet contemporary to Priscian known to have written verse panegyrics is Colluthus of Lycopolis (Viljamaa, p. 31).

Lines 162-170: Anastasius burns the tax records in the Hippodrome.

162: rector Olympi: an example of a term for Jupiter applied to the Christian God, cf: Claudius Marius Victor Alethia 1.158-159, which describes God at the creation of the world: tunc rector Olympi/stat data summa operi, bona sunt quaecumque creavi.

quo . . . loco: the Hippodrome in Constantinople.

162-163: Anastasius receives his authority directly from God who symbolically invests him with the imperial regalia.

163: Quo caput ipse tuum primo diademate cinxit: for the diadem as a symbol of kingship and rule, cf. Claudian De VI Cons. Hon. 65-66: quamuis diademate necdum/cingebare comas. The diadem was first adopted as a symbol of power by Constantine (see A.E.R. Boak, "Imperial Coronation Ceremonies in the Fifth and Sixth Centuries," Harvard Studies in Classical Philology 30 [1919]: 45-46).

164-170: Anastasius had the tax records publicly burned in the Hippodrome. A similar scene is described by Corippus (In laud. Iust. 2.161-405), yet the accounts of the two poets are

very different. The scene in Corippus is long and detailed. After his coronation, Justin repays Justinian's debts and burns the accounts. Corippus describes the physical setting, the crowd of weeping suppliants, and their pleas, the emperor's reaction, the flames burning the records and the yellow stream of gold being distributed. The scene is the climax of the book and shows Justin in his pietas and clementia to be the imago Christi (427-428). Priscian avoids any piling up of detail and presents a single striking image. God the Father, who has crowned the emperor, dominates the scene which Priscian depicts as a sacrifice, a religious ritual. The burning records are munera aeterna offered to God who receives them from the flammae beatae at which He attends as if at an altar. Anastasius appears only in the last line (170), presiding over the ceremony which has become a symbol of the relationship between God and emperor.

168: sol aureus: God the Father receives the gift and Christ, symbolized by the sun, beholds the sacrifice. For the identification of Christ with the sun, the Sol iustitiae and Sol invictus, see F. Dvornik, Early Christian and Byzantine Political Philosophy (Washington, D.C., 1966), 2:631-632 and E. Kantorowicz, "Oriens Augusti", Dumbarton Oaks Papers 17 (1963): 119-177. Priscian does not explicitly identify the golden sun with Christ but, given the context and the familiarity of the topic in Christian literature and art, he must have expected the audience to make the association.

170: Quae pura fulgens accendis mente serenus: for a serena mens as an attribute of the ruler, cf. Claudian De III Cons. Hon.
 182-183: natorum per regna venis, qui mente serena/maturoque
genti iunctas moderamine gentes.

serenus: describes the calm, impassive appearance expected of the emperor at official functions (see Averil Cameron, Corippus, p. 192, n. 309). The word is associated with other adjectives such as placidus (line 32), benignus (line 228, 248) and clemens and alludes also to the mercy and generosity shown by Anastasius in abolishing the chrysargyron. See also the note on line 20 of the preface.

This line is the climax of the central passage of the panegyric in which Anastasius is presented in the role of a priest-king who kindles sacrificial fires and offers welcome gifts to God. The intermediary between God and men, he stands gleaming, both physically, in his glistening robes (fulgens) and spiritually with pura mens, the true imago Christi.

The image of Anastasius as a priest is clear and vivid despite the brevity of the passage and the fact that Priscian uses no overtly Christian language. Priscian could anticipate that his audience would be familiar with the concept of attributing a priestly character to the emperor. The idea that the emperor, as the representative of God on earth, has certain sacerdotal powers and responsibilities goes back to Constantine and is pervasive in both secular and religious

104

literature. Priscian's contemporary Ennodius (Pan. Theod. 17) says that Theodoric displays the qualities of both King and priest: exibes robore, vigilantia, prosperitate principem, mansuetudine sacerdotem. Unlike Priscian, however, the western panegyrist does not include the theme of divine election as a justification of Theodoric's rule (see MacCormack, Art and Ceremony, p. 231). Anastasius himself asserts the sacerdotal nature of the emperor in a letter to the Roman senate written in 516. Anastasius asks the senate to use its influence with the pope to help bring about an end to the Acacian schism and in the formal list of his titles which heads the letter he includes that of pontifex inclitus (for the text of the letter, see A. Thiel, ed., Epistulae Romanorum pontificum genuinae [Braunsberg, 1867-1868], p. 765).

Procopius of Gaza also refers to Anastasius as a priest, and a comparison of the two panegyrics is instructive. Procopius gives no brilliant vision of a Priest-King. In the section of his panegyric devoted to accomplishments indicating the character of the subject, Procopius alludes to an episode in Anastasius' career before he became emperor. On the death of the incumbent, Anastasius had been considered as a candidate for the see of Antioch (Theophanes AM 5983). Procopius suggests that Anastasius' piety drew him toward the priesthood (Pan. 3) and tells us that although he was offered the honour of priesthood, he did not actually receive the office because

he was destined for a higher position (Pan. 4). There is no suggestion of divine election, the reference is used to show that Anastasius' piety fitted him to be emperor.

Lines 171-179: Anastasius displays the captured Isaurian leaders in the Hippodrome.

171: Corippus (In laud. Iust. 2.407-425) follows the scene of the record burning with a description of Justin displaying his clemency by releasing prisoners. Priscian goes on to describe the tangible result of the relationship between God and emperor he has depicted in the tax-burning scene, victory for the empire symbolized by the triumph celebrated by Anastasius over the Isaurian leaders. The setting for this triumph, as it is for the burning of the tax records, is the Hippodrome which increasingly became the setting for imperial ceremonial (see Alan Cameron, Circus Factions [Oxford, 1976], pp. 230-70). As part of this process, victory spectacles staged in the Hippodrome and combined with chariot races began to replace the triumph which had been part of the ceremonial of the adventus of the emperor from the fourth century. For the changes and developments in imperial victory celebrations during the later Roman empire, see Michael McCormick, Eternal Victory: Triumphal rulership in late antiquity, Byzantium, and the early mediaeval West (Cambridge, 1986), pp. 36-64.

172-73: the victory spectacles in the Hippodrome, as described here by Priscian, included the procession of captives and display of

booty which characterized earlier triumphal parades. Leaders of the enemy were forced to prostrate themselves before the emperor seated in the imperial box. The military practice of stripping usurpers of their insignia and forcing them to perform proskynesis before the emperor may have provided a model for the victory spectacle (cf. Claudian De IV Cons. Hon. 81-6 for a picture of the usurpers Maximus and Eugenius before the victorious Theodosius).

172: obtulit et vinctos oculis domitosque tyrannos: for the wording, cf. Virgil Aen. 2.589-590: cum mihi se non ante oculis tam clara videndam/obtulit. Longinus of Selinus and Indes were the Isaurian leaders exhibited as part of the triumphal spectacle in Constantinople. According to Evagrius (Ecc. Hist. 3.35), they were led in triumph along the streets and the Hippodrome with iron chains about their necks and hands. After this public exhibition, Longinus was sent to Nicea in Bithynia, tortured and beheaded (Marcellinus comes s.a. 498).

173: ante pedes. . . actos: the rebel leaders are driven forward to perform the proskynesis. Priscian's words suggest that Anastasius did not perform the ritual trampling upon the enemy (calcatio), although Cassidorus (Var. 3.51.8), in his description of the circus, implies that calcatio actually was carried out: Spina infelicium captivorum sortem designat ubi duces Romanorum supra dorsa hostium ambulantes laborum suorum gaudia perceperunt. Calcatio as a symbol of the emperor's

triumph over his enemies was a common theme in art, for examples see J. Babelon, "Le theme iconographique de la violente," in Studies Presented to David M. Robinson, eds. G.E. Mylonas and D. Ramond (St. Louis, 1953), 2:278-288 and A. Grabar, L'Empereur dans l'art byzantin (Paris, 1936), p. 129; cf. also Corippus In laud. Iust. 1.286: effera Vandalici calcantem colla tyranni, of a scene depicted on the pall ordered by Sophia for Justinian's funeral.

174-177: for Aemilius Paulus used as an example of a famous triumphator, cf: Claudian De Cons. Stil. 3.30-33:

non alium certe Romanae clarius arces
suscepere ducem, nec cum cedente rediret
Fabricius Pyrrho nec cum Capitolia curru
Pellaeae domitor Paullus conscenderet aulae.

Cf. also De bello Goth. 126-7:

nec magis insignis Pauli Marique triumphus
qui captos niveis reges egere quadrigis.

174: L[ucius] Aemilius Paulus Macedonicus ended the third Macedonian war when he defeated King Perseus at Pydna in 168 B.C. Perseus was captured and adorned Paulus' triumph in Rome and Paulus was one of a number of triumphators who provided exempla of the victorious general. Claudian, in the first passage cited above in the note on lines 174-177, refers to Fabricius, Marius and Pompey as well as Paulus. Priscian may have chosen Paulus because his achievement in abolishing the tributum as a result of his victory suggested Anastasius' abolition of the collatio iustralis; this implies that the

abolition of the tax may have been declared in honour of Anastasius' triumph (see McCormick, Eternal Victory, p. 61).

175: for the wording, cf. Lucan 1.483-484: iussamque feris a gentibus urbem/Romano spectante rapi.

176: descriptions of the traditional Roman triumph often included references to the chariot of the victorious general and to the Capitoline hill or its outcrop, the Tarpeian rock, cf. Ovid Pont. 2.1.57: tu quoque victorem Tarpeias scandere in arces; Lucan 8.553-554: non domitor mundi nec ter Capitolia curru/ invectus; Claudian De Cons. Stil. 1.213-214: captivoque rogant, quam si post terga revincti/Tarpeias pressis subeant cervicibus arces.

177-178: although the comparison between Anastasius and Aemilius Paulus focuses first on the similarity between the two men who both displayed captured enemy leaders at their triumphs, the difference between the two revealed in these lines is more important in the overall scheme of Priscian's panegyric. Paulus offers his thanks to a Jove located in the Capitoline temple on the Tarpeian rock, Anastasius to the all-powerful God the Father who, according to Priscian, dwells in celestial temples in a heavenly citadel. The combined repetition and contrast of Tarpeiam arcem and superum arce, of Capitolia templa and caelestia templa underline the contrast between the earthly realm and the heavenly kingdom, between pagan past and Christian present, and stress once again God's protection of Anastasius.

- 178: Jupiter is no longer omnipotens, cf. Carmen de Providentia Dei 691: solus Deus omnipotens Rex.
- 179: caelestia templa: cf. Psalms 10:5: Dominus in templo sancto suo, Dominus in caelo sedes eius. As well as referring to the heavenly realm of the Christian God (see note on lines 177-178), caelestia templa may also suggest the many churches which Anastasius built in Constantinople (Theodore Lector Epit. 11.21). Templum was used of Christian churches from the fourth century on (cf. Carmen de Providentia Dei praef. 45: quare templa Dei licuit popularier igni, and see M. McHugh, The Carmen de Providentia Dei (Washington, D.C., 1964), p. 312, for a note on "the Christian use of templum"). More specifically, as Paulus gives thanks in the Capitoline temple, Priscian may wish to allude to a service of thanksgiving celebrated in a church, perhaps Hagia Sophia, by Anastasius in honour of the victories of Hypatius over Vitalian (see Chauvot, "Observations sur la date," p. 547).

Lines 180-192: the renovatio under Anastasius.

180-192: the renewal of the empire in a new golden age was often associated with imperial victory (see Babelon, "Le thème iconographique," p. 181). Priscian thus follows his scene of triumph with a description of the renewal of the empire under Anastasius.

- 181: omniparens: in classical authors normally used of the Earth, cf. Virgil Aen. 6.595: Terrae omniparentis alumnum; in

Christian writers used of Christ and God the Father, cf.

Paulinus of Nola Carm. 22.85: omniparens sapientia Christus . . . novat omnia rerum; Dracontius De Laudibus Dei 3.24: editor omniparens.

renovandum . . . orbem: the theme of renewal prominent in this second part of the panegyric is a common one in imperial panegyric. Like other pagan concepts, the idea of renovatio took on a Christian colouring, that of spiritual renewal, cf. Carmen de Providentia Dei 499: non renovat quemquam Christus nisi corde recepto. See further, Blaise, Vocabulaire latin, p. 376.

182: Iustitiam: Dike, the personification of justice, appears in Hesiod as one of the Horae (Theogony 90). Aratus identifies her as the constellation Virgo who left the earth when the bronze age began (Phaen. 90). Ovid has her depart from earth in the iron age (Met. 1.149-150). Catullus (64.405-406) describes the situation among men when Justice has departed from the earth in language similar to Priscian's description of the crimes committed by the Isaurians and of the evils cured by Anastasius' beneficent rule: omnia fanda, nefanda malo per mixta furore/iustitiam nobis mentem avertere deorum; cf. line 58 of the panegyric: nam furor immissus commovit morte nefando. The return of Justice to earth as the sign of a new golden age is a commonplace (cf. Virgil Ecl. 4.6-7 and Claudian In Ruf. 1.52-7). Priscian suggests the idea of a new

golden age returning with Justice to the earth by using terms associated with the golden age, auspiciis . . . felicibus (line 180) and renovandum (line 181). He combines the classical concept of Justice with the Christian idea that God is the author of Justice through which He rights wrongs and saves mankind (cf. Rom.1:17). Thus the return of Justice is one more link between Anastasius and God, who has sent Justice from heaven to help Anastasius in his task of renovatio in response to the prayers of the people. The motif of the return of Justice becomes another variation on Priscian's recurrent theme that Anastasius is God's choice as emperor. Compare Claudian (De IV Cons. Hon. 98-99) on Theodosius' defeat of the usurpers Maximus and Eugenius: illi iustitiam confirmavere triumpho/praesentes docuere deos.

184-192: Priscian begins his treatment of the renovatio experienced by the empire under Anastasius with a description of the physical restoration of its cities by the emperor. Peter Brown ("Art and Society in Late Antiquity," in Age of Spirituality: A Symposium, ed. Kurt Weitzmann [New York, 1980], pp. 19-20) notes that during the Late Antique period "to 'renew' a city was the most praiseworthy achievement of the powerful" and that "the emperor merely stood at the top of a pyramid of competitive builders". Nonetheless the emperor was in a unique position; not only did he control more resources than other benefactors, but his building activity was regarded as a

reflection of the creative power of God and a symbol of his role as the vice-regent of the heavenly king. G. Downey ("Imperial Building Records in Malalas," Byzantinische Zeitschrift 38 [1938]: 10-11, n. 3), after pointing out that the verb, used by Malalas of imperial building, has the sense of 'create' or 'form' as it does in the Old and New Testament, goes on to suggest that:

The importance of building activities as a manifestation of the emperor's [divine] function is illustrated by the regularity with which these activities were described in Byzantine panegyrics and imperial biographies, and the significance attached to such works is shown by the unusual length of some of these descriptions. For example, . . . the description of the buildings of Anastasius I in Procopius' of Gaza's panegyric of the emperor

By following up his statement that God has entrusted the renewal of the world to Anastasius with a description of the emperor's building programme, Priscian is suggesting that God has delegated to Anastasius the function of being the creator of all things on earth.

Anastasius' building programme must have been extensive, for fires, riots, earthquakes and enemy attacks all took their toll of the cities in the east during his reign.

Unfortunately Priscian is the least helpful of all the ancient sources in providing information about the occasions which necessitated imperial building and restoration and about the kinds of projects which were undertaken. Other sources, however, confirm the impression given here by Priscian that

Anastasius undertook numerous building projects and give at least some specific details. John Malalas (409) mentions that Anastasius erected buildings in a number of cities. He lists walls, aqueducts, public baths and harbours, but does not describe individual projects.

After recording the riots at Antioch in 507, John of Nikiu tells us that "the emperor rebuilt the edifices which had been burnt and he constructed many beautiful streets; for in his mercy and compassion he loved to build edifices" (R.H. Charles, trans. The Chronicle of John, Bishop of Nikiu [London, 1916], p. 124).

A considerable amount of rebuilding was necessary in the area around Edessa after the devastation of the Persian War (502-506 A.D.). Joshua the Stylite gives evidence that Anastasius financed such projects as the rebuilding of a wall for Batnan-Quastra (Chron. 89, trans. Wright, p. 70). In Edessa itself, the governor received two hundred pounds of gold from the emperor to repair the damage caused by the war, and he used the money to reconstruct part of the city wall, two aqueducts and a public bath (Chron. 87, trans. Wright, p. 69).

Procopius of Gaza devotes a lengthy section of his panegyric to a description of Anastasius' building projects. He mentions four specific examples, the provision of an aqueduct for the city of Hierapolis (Pan. 18), the restoration

of the harbour at Caesarea' (Pan. 19), the repair of the Pharos at Alexandria (Pan. 20), and the building of the Long Wall in Thrace (Pan. 21). . . With the exception of the Long Wall, one of Anastasius' most celebrated works, the projects Procopius mentions are of economic importance to the cities involved and to that area of Syria and Palestine most familiar to his audience in Gaza.

Priscian provides no such detailed and specific references for his audience. His very general allusions to Anastasius' building programme are perhaps intended to create the impression of an almost limitless number of projects undertaken throughout the empire, an impression in keeping with his description of Anastasius as the restorer of the world. For an extensive discussion of Anastasius' building activity, see Capizzi, L'imperatore Anastasio, pp. 188-232. See also the note on line 268 for churches attributed to Anastasius.

184: Quorum prostratas recreasti funditus urbes: perhaps an allusion to the earthquakes which caused considerable damage in the east in the reign of Anastasius, although none are recorded as occurring in the vicinity of Constantinople (see Capizzi, L'imperatore Anastasio, pp. 193-4). In mentioning cities restored by Anastasius, Priscian may also be referring to the rebuilding at Antioch or Edessa. He may even be alluding to the city of Dara on the eastern frontier which Anastasius transformed from a village into a massively for-

tified city at the end of the Persian war (Procopius Aed. 2.1:4-10). For Anastasius' building activity at Dara and for other building projects for which Anastasius was responsible, but which were claimed for Justinian by Procopius, see Brian Croke and James Crow, "Procopius and Dara," Journal of Roman Studies 73 (1983): 143-159. It is also possible, although we have no confirmation from other sources, that Priscian is referring to restoration in Constantinople itself, rebuilding made necessary by fires which devastated parts of the capital.

185: Portibus et muris, undarum et tractibus altis: Priscian lists the kinds of buildings, aqueducts, walls and harbours described by Procopius of Gaza, but without his detail and examples. He may intend a reference to the aqueduct at Hierapolis mentioned by Procopius, since that city was an important trading centre (Chauvot, Procope de Gaza, pp. 160-61).

There are a number of possibilities as to which city walls Priscian may be referring. In the aftermath of the Persian war, walls were rebuilt for cities such as Edessa. Anastasius provided his birthplace the city of Dyrrachium with a wall, although we do not know the date (Suidas A 2077). An important construction in the vicinity of Constantinople and so familiar to his audience would have been the famous Long Wall in Thrace, built to protect the suburbs of the capital from the Bulgars (Procopius Aed. 4.9.6). For the location of the Long Wall and its remains, see R.M. Harrison, "The Long

Wall in Thrace", Archaeologica Aeliana 47 (1969): 33-38. For a discussion of the Anastasian construction of the wall and the date of construction, see Brian Croke, "The Date of the Anastasian Long Wall in Thrace," Byzantine Studies 23 (1982): 59-78.

Finally, Priscian mentions the rebuilding of harbours, and it is this aspect of Anastasius' building programme which he then amplifies and emphasizes in lines 186-192. Of such works known to us, Priscian may be alluding to the work on the harbour at Caesarea mentioned by Procopius of Gaza. Even more likely is a reference to the Pharos at Alexandria, a famous structure and one which protected a harbour essential for the shipment of the grain supply to Constantinople. Two other sources tell us that Anastasius made improvements to the harbour built by the emperor Julian at Constantinople. Marcellinus comes (s.a. 509) mentions dredging operations in this harbour in 509: Portus Iuliani undis suis rotalibus machinis prius exhaustus caenoque effosso purgatus est.

Perhaps at the same time Anastasius added to the harbour a breakwater mentioned by Suidas (A 2077). The emphasis which Priscian gives to Anastasius' rebuilding of harbours suggests that he may be referring to this work on the Julian harbour, but it is impossible to be certain.

186-192: Priscian describes the difficulties which had threatened sailors in language which is similar to that used by Procopius

of Gaza in his account of the restoration of the harbour at Caesarea (Pan. 19):

...ἀπειρηκόςτος αὐτῇ τοῦ λιμένος τῷ χρόνῳ καὶ πρὸς πᾶσαν ἀπειλὴν θαλάττης ἠνεψήθη . . . ; οὐ περιεΐδες δεομένην καὶ θρηνοῦσαν αἰεὶ τὰς ὀλκάδας, αἱ πολλάκις διαφυγοῦσαι τὸ πέλαγος ἐν τῷ λιμένι τὴν ναυαγίαν ὑπέμειναν, . . . Ἄλλὰ γὰρ σοῦ βουλήθέντος νεάζει καὶ θαρροῦσα δέχεται τὰς ναῦς, καὶ πλήρης τῶν ἐπιτηδείων ἡ πόλις.

The port [of Caesarea] had been ruined by time and was open to the menace of the waves You did not spurn the prayers of the city as it sorrowed for the merchant ships which often, having overcome the dangers of the deep, survived shipwreck in the port But through your good will the city was rejuvenated and it welcomes ships with confidence and has abundant supplies of necessities.

Both panegyrists employ a variation of the paradox that sailors are in more danger in harbour than on the open sea. Procopius, however, uses the literary motif to amplify a reference to a specific construction project undertaken by Anastasius. Priscian emphasizes the changed lot of the sailors and their gratitude to the emperor to evoke the role of the emperor and his relationship with God who entrusted to him the task of renewal.

186: clusa ostia: Chauvot (Procopé de Gaza, p. 77) plausibly suggests that clusa, which was substituted by Baehrens for the vix of the manuscript, be emended to vera, an adjective which Priscian uses three times elsewhere (lines 205, 269, and 311).

Lines 193-205: Anastasius' financial, judicial and military reforms.

193-207: Priscian praises measures taken by Anastasius to end corruption in public life. Unfortunately the allusions are brief

and couched in such general terms that it is impossible to be certain to which reforms the poet is referring. Since Priscian wants to convey an image of Anastasius as the restorer of the moral, as well as the physical fabric of the empire, the emphasis in the passage is on the emperor checking corruption by upholding the laws and dispensing justice. Priscian's technique again differs from that of Procopius of Gaza. Procopius (Pan. 11-12) also deals with the topic of corruption in public life, but he focuses on a specific abuse, suffragium or the sale of offices, a practice which results in incompetent officials who seek private gain rather than the public good and cause much suffering for those whom they govern. For suffragium and the measures taken by Anastasius to check this practice, see C. Collot, "La pratique et l'institution du suffragium au Bas-Empire," Revue Historique de droit français et étranger 43 (1965): 185-221.

193-194: Priscian could be referring to a number of financial and administrative reforms carried out under Anastasius. The abolition of coemptio or compulsory purchase of supplies for the army except in emergencies (CJ 10.27.2) must have been of great benefit to landowners. Another important reform was the change in the method of collecting the land tax (annona). The local curia of each city had been responsible for collecting this tax and the system was subject to abuse and led to loss of revenue (Jones, Later Roman Empire, p. 235). Anastasius

replaced the payment of the land tax in kind with payment in gold (John Malalas 394; CJ 10.27.2), a measure which may have aggravated the unhappy condition of the peasantry rather than ameliorating it (see the comment of Evagrius below).

Marinus, Anastasius' chief financial advisor, was responsible for the creation of officials called vindices who were put in charge of collecting the tax (John the Lydian De Mag. 3.49; John Malalas 400; Evagrius Ecc. Hist. 3.42). The vindices were appointed by the praetorian prefect, and the appointments went to those who could purchase them. Although the officials of the curiales continued as the actual tax collectors (see W. Liebeschuetz, "The Origin of the Office of the Pagarch," Byzantinische Zeitschrift 66 [1973]: 40.), the vindices supervised them and were probably intended to see to it that the wealthy and influential did not avoid paying their due amount of tax and that the officials and curiales did not make an illegal profit.

A further measure intended to curb abuses by curiales was taken in 505 A.D. The election of the defensor civitatis, the official whose task it was to protect citizens against official oppression, was transferred from the curia to a group composed of great landowners, ex-officials, the clergy and the bishop (CJ 1.4.19). It is not certain whether Anastasius was reviving an earlier law of Honorius which similarly regulated the election of the defensor civitatis (CJ 1.55.8), or was

introducing this measure for the first time in the east (see Jones, Later Roman Empire, p. 726). For the view that this change and the institution of the vindices were part of an attempt to renew civic institutions threatened by the decline of the curial order, see Liebeschuetz, "Origin," p. 45.

Priscian's linking of praise of Anastasius for relieving the burdens of farmers with his statement that the curiales and public officials no longer indulge in evil and unjust practices for profit, suggests he may well be thinking of the institution of the vindices here. If this is so, he is the only extant source to praise this reform. John the Lydian says that the vindices treated the cities like hostile communities, although he has to admit that imperial revenues increased (De Mag. 3.49). Evagrius, on the other hand, says that revenues decreased, and the changes to the annona were a burden to the provincials (Ecc. Hist. 3.42). Both writers regret the deleterious effects of the change on the curiales. For a useful discussion of the extent to which the vindices eroded the functions of the curiales and of the problem of the date and scope of the institution of the vindices, see Chauvot, Procope de Gaza, pp. 154-59. See also P.J. Alexander, The Oracle of Baalbek (Washington, D.C., 1967), pp. 95-6, for the oracle's view of Anastasius as a persecutor of the poor rather than as a benefactor.

195: solito contemnere leges: for evidence of extortion by the decurions and other abuses of their position, see Jones, Later Roman Empire, p. 756. For the language, cf. Claudian De Cons. Stil. 2.233: Augusti potuit soceri contemnere fasces.

solito: "according to custom"; normally used in the ablative with a preposition, cf. Velleius Paterculus 2.41.3: si quando aliquid ex solito variaret. Priscian may have omitted the preposition or, and this is perhaps more likely, he may be using the ablative almost as an adverb as was common with a number of nouns, for example, iure or consilio (see E.C. Woodcock, A New Latin Syntax [London, 1959], p. 34, for further examples).

196-197: equites horrent . . . rectorum/nec lucri causa commiscent sacra profanis: administrative, legal and other technical terms were sedulously avoided by Greek and Roman writers. It is, therefore, not possible to be certain what Priscian means by the terms equites and rectores. The most likely possibility seems to be that the equites are messengers (cursores) attached to the staffs of provincial governors (Jones, Later Roman Empire, p. 593), since rector is used to mean a provincial governor in the historians (cf. Tacitus Hist. 1.59; Suetonius Vesp. 8.4) and in the legal codes (CTh 7.6.2). Provincial governors were responsible for the collection of rents for the res privata (Jones, Later Roman Empire, p. 414) and for the collection of taxes for the

praetorian prefecture and the sacrae largitiones (Jones, Later Roman Empire, p. 450). It is possible that the equites were involved in tax collection and that the institution of the vindices checked abuses amongst them as among the curiales. Another possibility is that Priscian may be referring to the agentes in rebus who were officials of the magister officiorum. After After serving as official couriers the agentes in rebus were promoted to administrative duties which provided ample opportunities for illegal profit (cf. CTh 6.29.5; 6.29.8). If equites does refer to the agentes in rebus, then the rectores are officials in charge of this corps. In any event, Priscian seems to be indicating that Anastasius checked abuse of the farmers by minor officials who were no longer able to use their sacra (official duties) for personal profit, perhaps because of the institution of the vindices or the strengthening of the office of the defensor civitatis who provided protection for the lower classes and a cheap and accessible court of justice (Jones, Later Roman Empire, p. 145). For the agentes in rebus, see A.H.M. Jones, "The Greeks under Roman Rule," Dumbarton Oaks Papers 17 (1963): 14.

Chauvot (Procope de Gaza, p. 147) suggests that line 197 is a reference to measures taken by Anastasius to limit the right of bishops to alienate church property (CJ 1.2.47), a measure which he sees as intended to prevent unscrupulous

clergy from dissipating church estates. I feel that Priscian would have signalled so drastic a change of subject and prefer to keep equites as the subject of commiscent. Moreover, it is not necessary to understand sacra in such a literal sense, since the word has a connotation in the context of public administration (see note on line 120), the topic which Priscian is addressing in this passage. The logic of the passage thus suggests that sacra refer to the rectorum iussa carried by the horsemen. In addition, it seems unlikely that Priscian would so far depart from his usual practice as to have included a reference to a reform at once so minor and so specific.

197: commiscent sacra profanis: Priscian may be recalling Horace Epist. 1.16.54: sit spes fallendi, miscebis sacra profanis; cf. Claudian De IV Cons. Hon. 239-240: quippe opifex veritus confundere sacra profanis/distribuit partes animae sedesque removit; Claudian Carm. Min. 80.2: insomnis Pharius sacra profana rapit; Ovid Met. 3.710: his oculis illum cernentem sacra profanis.

198: Iudicis ipse sedens iudex caelestis imago: for a similar expression of the idea that the emperor is the image of God, cf. Corippus In laud. Iust. 2.428: ille est omnipotens, hic omnipotentis imago. Eusebius developed the political theory that as the empire was the image of the heavenly Kingdom, so the emperor was the image of God. Much has been written on Eusebius' theories and their basis in Hellenistic concepts of

the ruler. For the classic discussion of Eusebius' political theory, see N. Baynes, "Eusebius and the Christian Empire," in his Byzantine Studies (London, 1955), pp. 168-172. More detailed treatment can be found in Dvornik, Early Christian and Byzantine Political Philosophy, 2:611-658, and R. Farina, L'impero e l'imperatore cristiano in Eusebio di Cesarea (Zurich, 1966). Priscian is more specific than Corippus in his use of the concept of the emperor as the imago Dei. He has already associated the renovatio under Anastasius with the return of Justice and he returns to this theme here as he depicts the emperor as the image of God, the heavenly judge.

The image of God as a heavenly judge appears in both the Old and New Testaments, cf. Psalms 7:11: Deus iudex iustus, fortis, et patiens and, referring to Christ, Acts 10: 42: qui constitutus est a Deo iudex vivorum ac mortuorum. In his first instruction to Justinian, Agapetus (Ekthesis 1) states that the emperor imitates the Kingdom of God by exercising justice and teaching it to others, cf. line 203.

199: oracula: cf. Claudian De VI Cons. Hon. 35-38:

ecce Palatino crevit reverentia monti
exultatque habitante deo potioraque Delphis
supplicibus late populis oracula pandit
atque suas adsigna iubet revirescere laurus.

Cf. also Claudian Cons.Man. 34-37:

. . . terris edicta datus
supplicibus responsa venis. oracula regis
eloquio crevere tuo, nec dignius umquam
maiestae meminit sese Romana locutam.

As used by Claudian oracula has two connotations, a divinely inspired utterance of a prophet and an imperial edict (for this latter meaning, cf. CT 8.4.26; 11.21.3). Both meanings are probably intended here as both continue ideas presented in the previous line. In the sense of an edict, oracula carries on the image of the emperor as iudex; in the sense of a divinely inspired utterance, the word underlines the close relationship between God and emperor already stated in iudicis . . . iudex caelestis imago.

per te: Anastasius' role is to act as a mediator between his subjects and God.

200: Proicis et nullos nisi qui non iusta reposcent: cf. Procopius of Gaza Pan. 12:

Σοῦ δὲ παρακαθημένου τῷ βήματι πρὸ μὲν τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν ἡ δίκη, . . . καὶ εἶλε σοῦ τις τὴν γνώμην οὐ χρυσοῦν προτεινόμενος, ἀλλ' ἀρετῇ πλουτῶν καὶ μεταβάλλειν ἀνθρώπους εἰς εὐδαιμονίαν εἰδώς.

"When you sit at the tribunal, justice appears And not the man who offers gold but the man rich in virtue, who knows how to render men happy, receives your decision".

202-203; these lines contain three elements, a main clause (Aurum non adhibes), a relative clause suggesting a comparison with earlier rulers' use of gold (moderantes ante solebant/quod dare), and a negative purpose clause (ne liceat socios evertere furtis), which it is not easy to fit together into a comprehensible whole. The translation of socios is especially difficult. Romano ("Prisciano," p. 341) understands socios in

its military sense as allies, but this translation is out of place in a passage which deals with internal, domestic reforms. Chauvot (Procope de Gaza, p. 78) suggests that the socios could be peasants from the same village or tax district who for purposes of taxation are held responsible for paying the tax due on abandoned land in their district. He interprets the main clause as meaning that Anastasius does not sell offices and privileges for gold and thus the peasants are not subject to extortion by dishonest governors. This interpretation of the lines is certainly possible, but I feel that this meaning for socios may perhaps be too limited and specific. I have preferred to understand socios to mean colleagues or associates. Anastasius does not use gold for such purposes as bribery or the selling of offices, but is rather an example of an honest administrator (line 204) and his colleagues are not corrupted by deceit and intrigue (furtis). We know that Zeno's chief officials benefited from selling offices and are said to have shared the purchase price with the emperor. Zeno is also said to have sold offices to members of his staff who then sold them at a profit (Malchus 9). Anastasius, on the contrary, according to John the Lydian (De Mag. 3.17., trans. Carney, p. 75), encouraged honest practices:

The emperor in his wrath entrusted the confiscating of property and sentences of banishment; . . . , to the prefecture alone and to no other magistracy. In carrying out this commission such mastery and so much

eager skilfulness was exhibited by the commentarienses of that time, in conjunction with entire honesty and restraint from any kind of sharp practice aiming at speculation, that the emperor, in admiration of the fine qualities of the men at that time in the service, entrusted to them all the affairs that cropped up.

203: Exemploque doces quaestum contemnere turpem: cf. Evagrius (Ecc. Hist. 3.1) who says that the emperor should be a living image of virtue for imitation and the instruction of his subjects. The virtues of justice and temperance are praised in the passage beginning line 193. Anastasius is the imago caelestis iudicis who teaches his people that justice not gain makes the empire the image of the heavenly Kingdom. His example teaches the curiales (line 194), the government officials (line 196) and the military (lines 204-205), who have in the past been led astray by avarice, to return to their true duty. See Menander Rhetor (376) for the connection between justice and temperance. As the emperor imitates God, so his subjects should imitate him, cf. line 198. For a similar sentiment, cf. Corippus In laud. Iust. 2.400: qui virtute animi mentem calcavit habendi. Pliny the Younger (Pan. 44-45) also extols the value of the emperor's virtues as an example for his subjects.

204-205: Tirones forti numeros nunc milite complent/veraque non pretio, sed robore signa merentur: Procopius of Gaza (Pan. 7) also comments on the strength of Anastasius' army and the impressive quality of the soldiers and recruits, whom he describes

as strong, vigorous, and in the prime of life, true servants of Ares. Both panegyrists compare the number and the quality of the troops under Anastasius with the unhappy state of the army before his accession. Procopius claims that previously soldiers had been weak and worn out with age, trembling and fearful and themselves needing a protector. Priscian suggests this comparison with the single word, nunc, while Procopius is more explicit. Procopius places his reference to the army in a military context; it is a part of his description of the measures taken by Anastasius against the Arab nomads whose raids had been devastating cities in the eastern provinces. The cities, says Procopius, had once been abandoned by their defenders, but now are protected. Priscian has placed his reference to the army in the section of the panegyric dedicated to Anastasius' accomplishments in times of peace. The restoration of the army is symptomatic of the general renovatio of the empire under Anastasius. The lines form the climax of a passage dealing specifically with the disappearance of corruption from all areas of public life under a just emperor. Priscian emphasizes that the soldiers earn true standards and that they are motivated by bravery and not by greed. If the poem was written in 513, Priscian may intend an allusion to the forces of Vitalian. Anastasius had cut the annona for the federate troops in Thrace, and this was the immediate cause of their rebellion. Priscian thus may be

comparing the true Román army of Anastasius not only with the weak and corrupt army of the past, but also with the barbarian mercenaries of Vitalian. For the problem of the extent of the barbarisation of the Roman army in the sixth century, see J.L. Teall, "The Barbarians in Justinian's Armies," Speculum 40 (1965): 294-332.

Other sources confirm the claim of the two panegyrists that Anastasius commanded a very large military force. Procopius (De Bello Persico 1.8.4) says that the army mustered against the Persians was the largest ever seen on the eastern frontier. Joshua the Stylite (Chron. 54) estimates that during the Persian campaign the combined forces of the three commanders numbered fifty-two thousand. The army sent against Vitalian in 513 was an even larger one of eighty thousand men (John of Antioch Exc. de ins. 103).

At his accession Anastasius was enjoined by the crowd in the Hippodrome to restore the army (Constantine Porphyrogenitus De Cer. 92.246), and several of Anastasius' laws indicate his concern for and interest in the army. For example, the fees payable by the limitanei to the officials of the duces were strictly regulated (CJ 12.35.18), and another edict ensured that soldiers were not cheated of their pay by army paymasters (CJ 12.37.16). One law deals with recruits, who are to be placed in the lower ranks of the army and not promoted except in cases of devotion to duty or military

necessity (CJ 12.44.3). Joshua the Stylite tells us about the measures taken to supply the army. During the Persian war, grain was sent to Edessa from Alexandria to be baked by the citizens for the soldiers (Chron. 70), and Joshua notes that: "To the Greek troops . . . nought was lacking but everything was supplied to them in its season and came down with great care by order of the emperor" (Chron. 77, trans. Wright, p. 62). For a similar expression, cf. Lucan 1.305: implentur validae tirone cohortes.

204: numeros: from the fourth century numerus became a general term to describe all kinds of military units, see Stein, Bas-Empire 2:85.

205: for the language, cf. Claudian De Cons.Stil. 3.83-84: sed robore freta Gabino/te duce Romana tandem se vindicat ira.

Lines 206-217: the providentia of Anastasius; he is compared to the Patriarch Joseph.

206-210: Priscian does not explain what measures Anastasius took to protect the cities of the empire against famine. The city councils were responsible for seeing that sufficient bread was for sale at reasonable prices. For some of the problems faced by the councils in performing this task, see Libanius Oratio 29 and Gregory Nazianus Oratio 43.34-35. Constantinople was supplied with grain from Egypt and the praetorian prefect was responsible for its collection and transportation. Once in Constantinople the grain was stored in state granaries and

then baked for distribution in public and private bakeries. One reason for Anastasius' repair of the Pharos at Alexandria (see note on lines 184-192) was probably to safeguard the grain fleet. Priscian's mention of the horrea built by Joseph in Egypt (line 215) suggests that Anastasius may have added to the number of state granaries in Constantinople. Both measures would have shown him to be cautus futuri (line 207). The appointment of vindices, who in addition to supervising the collection of taxes (see note on lines 193-197) were placed in control of municipal finances (Jones, Later Roman Empire p. 236) and thus were in a position to see to it that sufficient funds were allocated for the purchase of grain, may have been one way in which Anastasius checked the extravagance of the cities (line 207). A law of Anastasius dealing with the election of civic corn buyers may have been another measure to ensure that the cities carried out their responsibilities. The law stated that the corn buyer should be elected from active or retired members of the provincial civil service because such men would have the experience of public business necessary for such a burdensome office (CJ 10.27.3).

If famine did occur Anastasius was quick with relief. When first a plague of locusts and then a hot wind destroyed the grain in Mesopotamia, Anastasius reduced the taxes and gave money to be distributed to the poor (Joshua the Stylite Chron. 38-45).

207: cautusque futuri: for a similar expression, cf. Paulinus of Nola Carm. 10.306: corda tremunt gestitque anima id iam cauta futuri.

208-217: Priscian here refers to two important events in the life of the patriarch Joseph, his interpretation of Pharaoh's dream (Gen. 41:1-36) which saved Egypt from famine (Gen. 41:47-57) and his rejection of the advances of Potiphar's wife (Gen. 39:7-18). Priscian's use of an explicit comparison between a Biblical figure and an emperor is unparalleled in earlier imperial panegyric, although the image of Joseph as a type of ideal statesman and ruler goes back to Philo.

Colourful and dramatic, the story of Joseph was popular with Christian writers and artists in both east and west. For the story in Egyptian art and literature, for example, see G. Vikan, "Joseph Iconography on Coptic Textiles," Gesta 18 (1979): 99-108. Writers of religious works presented Joseph in three ways: as an adumbration of Christ, since the events of his life seemed to prefigure Christ's passion, as a moral exemplar illustrating such virtues as mercy, chastity, temperance and filial piety, and as an ideal administrator, the perfect model for priest or bishop. For a convenient collection and discussion of passages illustrating these themes, see Meyer Schapiro, "The Joseph Scenes on The Maximianus Throne in Ravenna," in his Late Antique, Early Christian and Mediaeval Art (New York, 1979), pp. 34-47.

The figure of Joseph, especially in his role as administrator, also appealed to writers of secular works. Sidonius (Epist. 6.12.7) praises Patiens, Bishop of Lyon, for relieving a famine in Gaul by comparing the bishop and the patriarch:

. . . reverentia venerabilis patriarchae Ioseph historiam diligentiam comparemus, qui contra sterilitatem septem uberes annos insecuturam facile providit remedium quod praevidit.

Sidonius chooses a Biblical comparison lest, he says, one from Greek mythology should offend the bishop's piety. Cassiodorus (Var. 6.3) claims that Joseph is the originator of the office of the praetorian prefect:

nam cum Pharo rex Aegyptius de periculo futurae famis inauditis somniis urgeretur nec visionem tantam humanum posset revelare consilium, Ioseph vir beatus inventus est, qui et futura veraciter praediceret et periclitanti populo providentissime subveniret. Ipse primum huius dignitatis infulas consecravit: ipse carpentum reverendus ascendit.

Priscian thus follows a well-established tradition when he uses a comparison to Joseph to present Anastasius as an ideal administrator and to celebrate the emperor's sapientia and pudicitia. Yet unlike earlier writers and his western contemporary Cassiodorus, Priscian sees Joseph's virtues as specifically imperial ones, and he shares this vision of Joseph as king with his contemporary, Romanos the Melodist. Margaret Riddle, in seeking to explain the use of imperial iconography to depict the triumph of Joseph in Byzantine art, notes the appearance of Joseph as an imperial

figure in sixth century eastern literature, notably in two hymns by Romanos the Melodist who began his career in Constantinople in the last years of Anastasius' reign (see Margaret Riddle, "Illustrations of the Triumph of Joseph the Patriarch," Byzantina Australiensia [1981]: 69-81). In several of these hymns Joseph is described as basileus. In the prooemion to Hymn 43, Romanos states that Joseph "placed his hope in God and through him was given the crown of the kingdom" (trans. Riddle, p. 72). Later in the same hymn, stanza 17, "Romanos tells us that when Joseph reigned over Egypt one could see a king govern his people as he should with paternal affection, and that he proved a great provider for his people" (Riddle, p. 72).

It is interesting to note the similarities between Priscian's presentations of Anastasius and Joseph and the picture of Joseph the king in Romanos. However, whether either writer influenced the other or whether both were influenced by an image of Joseph as an imperial figure developing in the east in the sixth century are difficult questions to answer.

Priscian's simile is well-chosen to show Anastasius as "a most admirable supervisor and arbiter in times of both famine and plenty and most capable of presiding over the requirements of both" (Philo, On Joseph, trans. F.H. Colson [Cambridge, Mass., 1935], p. 271). The simile also allows

Priscian to praise Anastasius' chastity, not a quality considered especially praiseworthy by earlier imperial panegyrists and therefore lacking traditional exempla.

209: si desint imbres nec linquit copia victus: from the Augustan period and in Silver Latin, the subjunctive in generalizing conditions becomes common. The tenses most commonly used are the imperfect and the pluperfect: the present remains rare, but cf. Tacitus Agr. 13: munere impigre obeunt, si iniuriae absint. The use of linquo used intransitively as it is here in the sense of "run out" or "fail" is unusual, but cf. Virgil Catalepton 13.35: cinaede Luciene, liquerunt opes.

214: this line picks up one of the main themes of the poem. Like Joseph, Anastasius is an intermediary between God and man, an interpreter of God's will and design for the world, cf. the use of oracula, line 199.

217: divina . . . cura: the story of Joseph is used by the author of the Carmen de Providentia Dei to illustrate the moral that "all things happen for mysterious reasons under the judgement of a just God". (Carmen de Providentia Dei 370, trans. McHugh, p. 279). Cura is used throughout this poem to mean divine providence. Divinus, like sacer and sanctus, was used to describe anything connected with the emperor.

Lines 218-227: seditio disappears; the venationes are abolished.

218: per te seditio penitus deletur ab urbe: by seditio Priscian means riots sparked by the rivalry of the factions over con-

tests and performances in the circus, theatre and amphitheatre. For the history, activities and functions of the factions, see Alan Cameron, Circus Factions (Oxford, 1976). See also his Porphyrus the Charioteer (Oxford, 1973), and J.R. Martindale, Public Disorders in the Late Roman Empire, Their Causes and Character (unpublished B. Litt. thesis, Oxford, 1960). These riots and disturbances were characterized by stone-throwing, the burning of buildings and often by armed conflict and considerable loss of life. Such violent incidents involving the factions increased after the mid-fifth century (Alan Cameron, Circus Factions, pp. 225-29; Porphyrus, p. 237) and were frequent in the first years of Anastasius' reign, when riots, beginning in theatre, Hippodrome or theatre escalated to engulf the capital. The following incidents are recorded in the sources:

1. 491. A disturbance in which the Circus and a large part of Constantinople was devastated by fire (Marcellinus comes s.a. 491).
2. 493. Riots in the theatre which the city prefect Julian failed to check were followed by demonstrations against the prefect in the Hippodrome. Anastasius sent in the soldiers who were unable to check the violence. Serious fires spread in the vicinity of the Circus and statues of the emperor were pulled down. Many were killed (John of Antioch fr. 214b) Marcellinus comes s.a. 493).
3. c.494. In Antioch members of the Green faction attacked the comes orientis Calliopius (John Malalas 302).
4. 499-500. The conduct of the city prefect Helias caused fighting to break out among the crowd celebrating the festival of the Brytae at Constantinople (John of Antioch fr. 214c).

5. 501. Fighting again broke out between the factions at the Brytae. Three thousand people were killed, including an illegitimate son of Anastasius (Marcellinus comes s.a. 501; John Malalas 394; John of Antioch fr. 214c).
6. 507. Anastasius refused a request for the release of some Greens arrested for stone-throwing during a demonstration in the Hippodrome. A riot ensued and a new prefect, Plato, a patron of the Greens, was appointed. (Marcellinus comes s.a. 507; John Malalas 394). Note that Cameron, Porphyrius, p. 294 and Bury, Later Roman Empire: 1.437 both date the Malalas account to 498, but see The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire, ed. J.R. Martindale (Cambridge, 1980), 2:892 for reasons for 507 date.)
- There were also serious riots in Antioch sparked by a Green victory in the Hippodrome. The imperial troops restored order with difficulty (John Malalas 395-398).
7. 514. A riot broke out in the Hippodrome when Anastasius cancelled the races as a punishment for earlier disturbances (John of Antioch Exc. de ins. 103.

It is clear that most of the factional riots took place early in Anastasius' reign. The riot of 507 which interrupted the long peaceful period in Constantinople may have been a "sympathetic reaction" to the Green uprising in Antioch (Alan Cameron, Porphyrius, p. 241). Anastasius' efforts to check factional violence seem to have been well known. Writing to Anastasius in 494 (Thiel, Epistolae-Romanorum pontificum, p. 357), Pope Gelasius suggests that these efforts were meeting with some success: Taceo, quod pro rebus ludicris populares tumultus nunc etiam vestrae pietatis auctoritas refrenarit. Until 501 Anastasius dealt harshly with the rioters. John Malalas (393) tells us that Anastasius favoured

the Red faction in order that he might deal impartially with the two major factions, the Greens and Blues. The emperor's reaction to the problem was to send in the troops against the rioters. By so doing, Martindale (Public Disorders, p. 81) suggests that Anastasius in fact escalated the violence. After the two Brytae riots Anastasius' policy toward the factions took a new direction. He banned the venationes in 499 (see note on lines 223-227) and the pantomime in 502 (Joshua the Stylite Chron. 46; Procopius of Gaza Pan. 16). By thus confining faction rivalry to the Hippodrome, Anastasius was better able to control it. He also used his power to assign charioteers to the various factions to modify their behaviour (Alan Cameron, Porphyrus, pp. 241-244). The change in policy worked, and Priscian here indicates his awareness of Anastasius' policy and its success. Priscian does not explicitly connect the disappearance of sedition with the stricter control exercised over public spectacles, but juxtaposes the references to sedition and to the banning of the venationes and leaves his audience to make the connection between the two. Procopius of Gaza who praises Anastasius for banning both the venationes (Pan. 15) and the pantomime (Pan. 16) does make clear the relationship between public disorders and the emotions aroused by the spectacles and claims that the emperor's restrictions have saved the cities. For the restriction of pantomime performances, see Cassiodorus Var.

1.31.3: ut omne semen discordiae funditus amputetur.

seditio: Marcellinus comes uses seditio of the riot in 507.

He also speaks of bellum plebium (s.a. 491). Priscian emphasizes that the seditio involved the killing of fellow citizens (line 220).

Per te: cf. line 199.

220-222: Marcellinus comes (s.a. 501) describes the riot which originated in the theatre at Constantinople in 501 in similar terms:

dum residente Constantio ex more civium concrepant
voces, ante visa quam audita arma excutiuntur
saxaque incautos cives instar imbrium iaciuntur
ensesque vibrantes in amicorum inque vicinorum
sanguine obliti suis cum percussoribus debacchantur.

220: cives . . . caedebant . . . ense: cf. Corippus In laud. Iust.

2.336: priventur caedes, studiorum iurgia cessent. Although civilians were forbidden to carry arms (Jones, Later Roman Empire, p. 1062); ways were found to evade the restriction. Marcellinus comes (s.a. 501) describes how the Greens smuggled weapons into the theatre to use against the Blues:

nam enses saxaque in vasis inclusa fictilibus
eadem arma diversis pomis desuper cumulata sub
theatri porticu ritu vendentium statuit.

221: for the language, cf. Virgil Aen. 8.717: laetitia ludisque viae plausuque fremebant; Silius Italicus Pun. 16.336: conclamant plausuque fremunt. Chauvot (Procopé de Gaza, pp. 164 and 172) suggests that by describing the rioters as applauding Priscian is depicting them as both actors and

audience at a spectacle. The description thus serves to connect the disappearance of civic violence with the banning of public shows such as the venationes.

222: the idea of rejoicing over the spoils of combat is a common theme in Latin epic poetry, cf. Virgil Aen. 10.500: quo nunc Turnus ovat spolio gaudetque potitus; Statius Theb. 9.442-443: at tu, qui tumidus spoliis et sanguine gaudes/insontis pueri; Claudian De VI Cons. Hon. 639: armorum innocuos paci largitur honores.

223-227: Ipse vetas ludos: Anastasius abolished the venationes in 499. Joshua the Stylite records an "edict from the emperor Anastasius that fights of wild beasts in the amphitheatre should be suppressed in all the cities of the Greek empire" (Chron. 34, trans. Wright, p. 23). Venationes could consist of animals fighting bestiarum, animals fighting each other, or the execution of condemned criminals by wild beasts (see Toynbee, Animals, p. 17, and L. Robert, Les gladiateurs dans l'Orient grec [Paris, 1940], pp. 309-331). Priscian's description indicates that he was thinking of the first type with men pitted against animals.

Such spectacles had long been considered incompatible with Christian belief. Tertullian (De Spectaculis 15) considers that the shows presented in theatre, amphitheatre and circus pose a grave danger to Christian morality:

Porro et ubi aemulatio ibi et furor et bilis
et ira et dolor et cetera ex his, quae cum his
non competunt disciplinae.

Cassiodorus (Var. 5.42) condemns the venatio as an actus destabilis and a certamen infelix and notes that these spectacles were originally part of the worship of a pagan deity, Scythian Diana.

Although it was Anastasius who took the final step of suppressing the venationes, earlier Christian emperors had shown their disapproval and to a certain extent had attempted to control such spectacles. Socrates (Hist. Eccl. 7.22, trans. A.C. Zenos, Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, second series, vol. 2 [Grand Rapids, Mich., 1957], p. 165) records an incident which occurred when Theodosius II was attending a venatio in Constantinople:

. . . the people cried out, "Let one of the boldest bestiarii encounter the enraged animal". But he [Theodosius] said to them, 'Do ye not know that we are wont to view these spectacles with feelings of humanity'. By this expression he instructed the people to be satisfied in future with shows of a less cruel description.

The emperor Leo took more definite action and banned public entertainments, including venationes, on Sundays (cf. CJ 3.2.92: nihil eodem die sibi vindicet scaena theatralis aut circense certamen aut ferarum lacrimosa spectacula). In fact by the fifth and sixth centuries, venationes were probably only rarely presented (see Alan Cameron, Porphyrius, pp. 228-230), and in the west they had almost disappeared by the time of Theodoric, although there was no official edict of

abolition (see A. Chastagnol, Le sénat Romain sous le règne d'Odovace: recherches sur l'épigraphie du Colisée au v^e siècle [Bonn, 1966], pp. 60-63). Despite Anastasius' ban, venationes may have been restored. The diptychs of Areobindus, consul in 506, and of Anastasius, consul in 517, have scenes of wild beast fights. For the diptychs, see R. Delbrück, Die Consulardiptychen und verwandte Denkmäler (Berlin, 1929), pp. 107-115 and 127-133. Chastagnol (Sénat, p. 62), however, suggests that the diptychs depict a bloodless version of the venationes, simple wild beast shows with either simulated combats, or acrobatic displays. See also Alan Cameron, Porphyrus, pp. 228-9.

Priscian condemns the venationes not only because of their cruelty and brutality, but also because of their threat to Christian morality; they are animarum damna (line 223). By describing the venationes in this way, Priscian presents Anastasius as a Christian emperor in the tradition of Theodosius and Leo.

- 223: Ipse vetas ludos animarum damna nefandos: cf. Virgil G. 4.105: instabilis animos ludo prohibebis inani. Priscian may be echoing Virgil here because the savagery and depravity of the venationes is highlighted by the contrast with the light and trivial behaviour of the bees which is described by Virgil.
- 224: voluptates: Tertullian also uses voluptas to indicate the sinful pleasure to be found in public spectacles; De

Spectaculis 25: avertat Deus a suis tantam voluptatis exitiosae cupiditatem. Cassiodorus (Var. 5.42) uses voluptas specifically to describe the reaction of the audience to the death of the venator: voluptatem praestat sanguine suo et infelici sorte constrictus festinat populo placere.

225: similar descriptions of mutilated bodies are common in Latin epic poetry, cf. Ovid Tr. 5.10.51: ipsam quoque perdere vitam.

226: cf. Ovid Met. 14.196: trepidant sub dentibus artus; Lucan 2.164-165: nec Graecia maerens/tot laceros artus Pisaea flevit in aula; Silius Italicus Pun. 4.379: pugnantque feris sub dentibus artus; Claudian In Ruf. 2.431: laceros iuvat ire per artus. The line from Claudian refers to the death of Rufinus who, according to Claudian, was killed by the eastern army as a traitor, his body torn in pieces. This allusion to the fate of Rufinus may be intended to suggest a similar fate for those who rebel against Anastasius.

Lines 228-238: praise of Anastasius' philanthropia and clementia.

228-238: philanthropia was an important attribute of Hellenistic rulers and Roman emperors. In the fourth century A.D., the advent of Christian emperors brought changes in the concept of philanthropia as an imperial virtue. As part of his theory that the emperor is the imitator of the heavenly King, Eusebius proclaimed that as God possesses philanthropy, the emperor too must demonstrate this virtue in his acts. Other writers, pagan and Christian, developed this idea. For the

changing concept of philanthropy and its importance in writers of the fourth century, see G. Downey, "Philanthropia in Religion and Statecraft in the Fourth Century after Christ," Historia 4 (1955): 199-208, and D.J. Constantelos, Byzantine Philanthropy and Social Welfare (New Brunswick, New Jersey, 1968), pp. 43-46. Agapetus expressed similar sentiments in the sixth century, and it is worth quoting several passages:

Kingship is the most honored of all things; and it is so most especially when the person who is vested with this authority does not incline to self-will but keeps his mind fixed on equity, turning aside from inhumanity as a thing that is bestial, and showing forth humanity as a quality that is God-like (Ekthesis 40, trans. Barker, p. 59).

By practising philanthropy the emperor pleases God and is rewarded:

Love those more, O most serene Emperor, who ask for gifts to you. For to these latter you will be a debtor, while the former make God a debtor to you - for he appropriates as his own the things done for them and gives good things in return for your God-loving and humanitarian intention (Ekthesis 50, trans. P. Henry, "A Mirror for Justinian: the Ekthesis of Agapetus Diaconus," Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies 8 [1967]: 289).

Philanthropy is associated with the piety of the emperor in the above passage and the same association is found in the fourth century writers (cf. Sozomen Hist.Ecc. praef.).

Clementia is another aspect of imperial philanthropy (see note on line 130).

In addition to the intellectual theorizing on the nature of imperial virtue and its divine counterpart, the

Christian liturgy increasingly stressed philanthropia as an attribute of God (see Downey, "Philanthropia," pp. 204-206). Priscian's contemporaries would also have been aware of Biblical passages advocating generosity and clemency (see note on line 231, and Henry "A Mirror for Justinian," p. 297, for Biblical echoes in Agapetus). Priscian thus has no need to state explicitly that Anastasius' generosity is yet another aspect of his character that makes him an imago Dei.

229: sufficis: for sufficis used, as here, with the sense of "to be able to", cf. Virgil Aen. 5.21-22: nec nos obniti contra nec tendere tantum/sufficimus.

231: occulte: indicates a profound difference between the pagan and Christian concepts of philanthropia. The generosity of a ruler or a wealthy private citizen was intended to earn the reward of public recognition and esteem and hence acts of philanthropy were highly publicized (see Hands, Charity and Social Aid, pp. 49-61). Christians on the other hand, were admonished to keep their generosity secret, known only to God and to desire only spiritual rewards in the afterlife (see note on line 149). The Christian position is stated in Matthew 6:2-4 which clearly reveals the difference in the two traditions of philanthropia:

Cum ergo facies elemosynam, noli
tuba canere ante te, sicut hypocritae
faciunt in synagogis, et in vicis, ut
honorificentur ab hominibus. Amen
dico vobis, receperunt mercedem suam.
Te autem faciente elemosynam, nesciat

sinistra tua quid faciat dextera tua:
 ut sit elemosyna tua in abscondito et
 Pater tuus, qui videt in abscondito,
 reddet tibi.

Occulte as used here by Priscian is the equivalent of the in abscondito ("secret") of Matthew, and the word is used in similar contexts by other Christian writers; cf. Prudentius Cathemerinon 8.31-32: cernit occultum Deus et latentem/munera donát.

We are fortunate in having the account of one such act of philanthropy performed by Anastasius:

But it will do no harm also to recall one deed of his that was done in secret and goes unremarked even now. For one ought to put into the account mention of one of the great man's private good qualities as well. Paul, a patrician, son of Bibianus, who was most distinguished in rank, lived in his reign. . . . Paul, who proved useful to Anastasius in regard to matters of a private nature, owed a Zenodotus (who also was numbered among the consuls but had only the honorific rank) an irredemable amount of money, coming in all to a thousand pounds' weight of gold. As Paul was despondent as to paying off the debt, Zenodotus, making a loud outcry, besought Anastasius to look after his interests. Anastasius, realizing that Paul did not have adequate resources to pay the debt, nor Zenodotus to cede it to him, gave him two thousand pounds' weight of gold, one thousand for the creditor, the remainder - and it was as much as this - as a free gift for Paul (John the Lydian De Mag. 3.48, trans. Carney, p. 99).

232: superi: according to Ficarra, this unusual use of the singular superus is meant to refer to Christ whose works of charity Anastasius is imitating (Ficarra, "Motivi cristiani," p. 366). It seems more likely, however, that Priscian is

referring to God the Father, since it is this imagery which is found throughout the poem.

233: non ulla superbia: superbia is characteristic of the tyrant rather than of the divinely appointed ruler. The Carmen de Providentia Dei (387), for example, uses the word to describe the Egyptian Pharaoh in his struggle against Moses: multis plectenda superbia plagis (387). Humility, not arrogance, was a Christian virtue and Priscian's phrase could well have recalled to his audience passages such as that from 1 Peter: 5.5: quia Deus superbis resistit, humilibus autem dat gratiam.

234: Affectusque bonos minime fortuna novavit: Priscian's use of novavit which echoes the novitate of line 228 at the beginning of this section of the panegyric underlines the contrast between the scope and quality of the philanthropia of Anastasius the private citizen and Anastasius the emperor. All men were expected to practice philanthropy. Libanius, for example, feels that this virtue is one of the most important qualities which the emperor and his subjects may share (Libanius Orationes 3.29; 11.155 and 243). But although required of all men, philanthropia was of the utmost importance for the emperor who is the earthly likeness of the divine ruler. Synesius, describing the ideal king for the emperor Arcadius, links piety and philanthropy as the virtues making the emperor the image of God:

Thus in addition to being a lover of God he becomes more than all a lover of man, for he

shows himself to his subjects in the image of the King by whom he is ruled We make beneficence a stamp of Kingship, passing in review again 'the giver of good gifts', the 'kindly one', names belonging to God being able to originate good works he will not tire in this employment anymore than does the sun when he gives his beams to plants and animals, for it is no labour for him to shine, in as much as he holds brightness in his being and is a fountain of light. (Synesius De Regno, trans. Fitzgerald, p. 143).

Only the emperor's generosity was god-like in its scope as Priscian indicates in line 228 and in his description of gifts numerum vincentia.

236-238: for clemency as an essential component of the emperor's philanthropia; see Downey, "Philanthropia," p. 201 and Henry, "A Mirror for Justinian," p. 301. Forgiveness of those who have done wrong or injured one was part of Christian doctrine and as throughout this passage, Priscian could expect his audience to recall Biblical injunctions commending the virtues and actions he attributes to Anastasius. See, for example, Matthew 6:14-15: Si enim dimiseritis hominibus peccata eorum: dimittet et vobis pater vester coelestis delicta vestra; cf. also Matt. 5:7; Luke 6:36; Mark 11:26.

237: Felicis domini tempore laeto: felicitas was an important attribute of the Roman emperor and was often connected with his pietas (cf. Pan.Lat. 3.18.5; Mynors 11.18.5: felicitem istam, optimi imperatores, pietate meruistis); for felicitas and pietas, see F. Burdeau, "L'Empereur d'après les panegyristes latins," in his Aspects de l'empire romain (Paris

1964), p. 25-29 and M.P. Charlesworth, "Pietas and Victoria," Journal of Roman Studies 33 (1943): 1-10. In the military sphere, the emperor's felicitas was the source of victory (cf. Pan.Lat 3.18.1; Mynors 11.18.1; felicitate vincitis sola). In the civil sphere, imperial felicitas manifested itself in the security and prosperity of the empire (cf. Pan.Lat. 3:15; Mynors 11.15).

Priscian refers to Anastasius' felicitas four times in the panegyric, twice in a military twice in a civil context. His felicitas results in victory over the Isaurians (see lines 63 and 82). In the second half of the poem, felicitas is closely associated with the theme of renovatio and the restoration of a golden age under Anastasius, ideas expressed here in the phrase tempore laeto (cf. 149 laetissima saecula) and mentioned more explicitly in lines 180-181: auspiciis gaude princeps felicibus aulae/cui deus omni parens renovandum credidit orbem. Anastasius' felicitas is a gift of God, the result of his piety and with his virtues of justice and mercy produces renewal for the world. For the concept of felicitas temporum and the expression of the theme in art, see Hanfmann, Season Sarcophagus, 1:165. For the expression tempus laetum, cf. Lucan 5.740: cum taedet vitae, laeto sed tempore, coniunx; 7.687-688: nunc tempora laeta/respexisse vacat.

Lines 239-253: **Anastasius chooses his officials wisely.**

239-253: Procopius of Gaza (Pan. 30) includes a brief allusion to

Anastasius' wise choice of officials in the conclusion to his panegyric. He expresses the hope that Anastasius may always rule the Roman empire and have so many great and good men assisting him to govern the empire. Priscian is much more specific and singles out two groups who have flourished under the patronage of the emperor, exiles from old Rome and men of education and culture.

239: for the use of praeconia, cf. Claudian De Cons. Stil. 2.185:
in tua centenas optant praeconia voces.

241: per quos Romana potentia crescat: for the expression Romana potentia occurring in the same position in the verse, cf. Virgil Aen. 8.99-100: tecta vident quae nunc Romana potentia caelo/aequavit tum res inopes Evandrus habebat; Ovid Tr. 5.2.35: ille deus, bene quo Romana potentia nixa est; Lucan 7. 281-282: Armeniosne movet Romana potentia cuius/sit ducis?; Claudian In Ruf. 2.4: iamque tuis, Stilicho, Romana potentia curis.

Of these possible sources for Priscian's line, the reflection of Virgil is perhaps the most evocative. The passage from the Aeneid compares the humble Rome of Evander with the glorious Rome of Augustus and suggests a comparison of vetus Roma (line 242) with Constantinople.

242-245: In the context of Priscian's praise of Anastasius for his wise choice of civil servants, those sent by old Rome are probably either men who chose to leave Italy for a career in the east or exiles from Italy. Priscian's mention of sorrow at the loss of homeland and the safety offered by Anastasius may make a reference to exiles more likely, but their identity is far from certain.

Contemporary sources tell us of many nobles and clergy who were forced to flee from persecution in Vandal North Africa (see Victor Vitensis Historia Persecutionis Africanae -Provinciae 1.12-18; 2.2.3-4; 3.6. 29-30; Theodoret Epistulae 22, 23, 29-36, 52, 53, 70; Procopius De bello Vandalico 5.9). Some of these exiles and their families went to the east and their descendants were able to reclaim their lost possessions after the reconquest of North Africa under Justinian (see Theodoret Epistulae 70; Ferrandus Vita S. Fulgentii episcopi Ruspensis; Stein, Bas-Empire 2:321). Many of these exiles seem to have remained loyal to their homeland; indeed, Zacharias Rhetor (9.17) tells us that one of the major reasons for Justinian's reconquest of Africa was pressure from African exiles in Constantinople. Other refugees from Africa went to Rome, where they may have been among the supporters of Symmachus in his struggles against Laurentinus and the pro-Byzantine party in Rome (see P.A.B. Llewellyn, "The Roman Church during the Laurentian Schism: Priests and Senators,"

Church History 45 [1976]: 418 and 426). Priscian himself is usually considered to have been an exile from Africa, although this view has now been questioned (see Introduction, p. 8). Momigliano ("Gli Anicii," p. 240) identifies the men whom old Rome has sent with Priscian's fellow exiles from the Vandal Africa. It seems unlikely, however, that Priscian especially if he was also African in origin would have described men from Africa as sent by Rome.

Gaudenzi (Sui rapporti tra l'Italia e l'impero d'Oriente fra gli anni 476-554 [Bologna, 1886], p. 64) suggests that the exiles from Rome mentioned by Priscian were followers of Laurentinus and Festus, supporters of a religious reconciliation with the east on the basis of the Henoticon and banished from Italy by Theodoric when he decided in favour of Symmachus in 505. Ferdinando Gabotto (Storia dell'Italia nel Medio Evo, 395-1313 [Torino, 1911], p. 420) rejects Gaudenzi's thesis on the grounds that there is no evidence for the exile of Laurentinus' followers and proposes to identify the exiles with men who may have been banished by Theodoric as a result of his problems in Liguria from 510 to 514. Since Priscian implies that the exiles have been established in careers, Gabotto's proposal seems unlikely, given the probable dating of the poem to 513. Other scholars have not attempted to establish a specific group of exiles but have simply taken Priscian's lines to refer to individuals banished by Theodoric

(see Bury, Later Roman Empire 1:457, n. 1 and P. Courcelle, Histoire littéraire des grandes invasions germaniques [Paris, 1964], p. 212).

Since, however, there is no specific evidence for the presence in the east of Italians banished by Théodoric, it is possible that Priscian is referring to members of families who fled from Italy to the east before the reign of Theodoric (see Sundwall, Abhandlungen, p. 196, n. 1, and for immigrants to Palestine after the fall of Rome in 410, see Jerome Ep. 130, 138, 151). The Anician family was one which had branches both in Rome and Constantinople. Anicius Olybrius had fled to Constantinople in 455 to escape the sack of Rome by the Vandals. Married to Placidia, the younger daughter of the emperor Valentinian III, Olybrius was proclaimed emperor of the west by Leo in 472. Olybrius' daughter Anicia Juliana remained in Constantinople and was married to Anastasius' general Areobindus (see note on line 300 and Introduction, p. 13). Their son Olybrius, consul in 491, was married to Irene, the daughter of the Magna who was probably the wife of Anastasius' brother Paulus (see note on line 290). Priscian's patron Julianus (see note on lines 245-53) was probably a member of the Anician family. Another person who could also have been described as sent by old Rome was also a relative of the empress Ariadne. Procopius Anthemius, consul in 515, was the son of the Anthemius who was proclaimed emperor of the

west by Leo in 467. Anthemius' brother Marcianus married Ariadne's younger sister Leontia and rebelled unsuccessfully against Zeno in 479. Both brothers escaped to Rome, but Anthemius returned to Constantinople, where Ariadne attempted to further his career (see note on lines 245-53). It is impossible to be certain to whom Priscian intends to allude; this omission is unfortunate, as it seems likely that the reference is connected with another controversial passage: the wish that both Romes may obey Anastasius (see note on-line 265). Apart from those individuals mentioned above, we have few specific references to westerners in Constantinople and the east in the reign of Anastasius. Marianus, whose father left Rome to live in Palestine fits in with Priscian's praise of Anastasius for choosing learned men as public servants. Marianus was both a consul and a praetorian prefect in the reign of Anastasius and he was known for his translation of Hellenistic poetical works from hexameters into iambs (Suidas M 194). Also probably of western origin was Laurentius, known from the letters of Avitus. Anastasius requested that Laurentius' son be sent from Gaul to Constantinople (Avitus Ep. 49). Laurentius had connections with Anastasius' magister officiorum, Celer, and also with the rebel Vitalian (Avitus Ep. 47 and 48).

242: Roma vetus: cf. line 265, where Priscian speaks of both Romes, Utraque Roma. Constantinople came to be referred to as

the new Rome (see William Hammer, "The Concept of the New or Second Rome in the Middle Ages," Speculum 19 [1944]: 50-60). Corippus uses this expression a number of times, cf. In laud. Iust. 4.141: vota que plura tuis celebrat nova Roma triumphis.

From its foundation Constantinople gradually acquired the institutions, privileges and prerogatives of the ancient capital and obtained full equality in ecclesiastical affairs at the Council of Chalcedon (see Thomas Owen Martin, "The twenty-eighth Canon of Chalcedon," in Das Konzil von Chalkedon, vol. 2, eds. A. Grillmeier and H. Bacht [Würzburg, 1953], pp. 433-448). Rome was hallowed by ancient tradition, but the seat of imperial power had been transferred to Constantinople. For the evolution of the transfer of power from Rome to Constantinople, see M. Salamon, Rozwój idei Rzymu-Konstantynopola od IV do pierwszej połowy VI wieku [The Development of the Rome-Constantinople Idea from the IVth to the first half of the VIth Century] (Katowice, 1974), in Polish but with a summary in English. For numismatic and literary evidence, see Gilbert Dagron, Naissance d'une capitale. Constantinople et ses institutions de 330 à 451 (Paris, 1974), pp. 49-60. Priscian's translation of the Periegesis of Dionysius, a Greek author probably writing in the reign of Hadrian, reflects this shift of power. Dionysius (350-356) first praises the Tiber and then acclaims Rome as the home of kings and the mother of cities. Priscian (347-50)

omits the praise of the Tiber and confines his reference to Rome to one line: Romamque genetrix regum domina for in orbem. Dionysius mentions Constantinople in one line (804) and then only to note its position opposite Chalcedon. Priscian (771-72) adds two lines: moenia Byzantii . . . Romanisque regnis dominantia mundo. Cf. Sidonius (Pan. Anth. 30-34) who acknowledges the preeminence of Constantinople and hails her as follows:

Salve, sceptrorum columen, regina Orientis
orbis Roma tui, rerum mihi principe misso
Iam non Eoo solum veneranda Quiriti
imperii sedes, sed plus pretiosa quod exstas
imperii genetrix.

For depictions of the two cities in art, especially in diptychs dated to the reign of Anastasius, see J.M.C. Toynbee, "Roma and Constantinopolis in Late-Antique Art from 365 to Justin II," in Studies Presented to D.M. Robinson, 2:261-277.

- 243: sustentas . . . fovendo: both words, with their connotations of support and nurture, pick up the image of Anastasius as the father of his people which was introduced at the beginning of the panegyric, line 39; cf. also line 253.
- 244: provehis: Pliny the Younger uses the same verb to describe the help given to men of letters by their patron, cf. Ep. 8.12.1: studiosos amat fovet provehit.
- 245-53: for similar praise of an emperor for his choice of officials, cf. Mamertinus' gratiarum actio to Julian (Pan. Lat. 11.25; Mynors 3.25):

At tu Auguste, omnibus nugis remotis, optimum et doctissimum quemque perquiris. Si quis praestat virtutibus bellicis et laude militiae, in amicis habetur; qui in oratoria facultate, qui in scientia iuris civilis excellit, ultro ad familiaritatem vocatur.

John the Lydian confirms Priscian's statement that Anastasius was the patron of the men of culture whom he employed in his government. John (De Mag. 3.50, trans. Carney, p. 100)

describes the praetorian prefects under Anastasius:

The cream of the barristers . . . were advanced by him to that magistracy; and on one occasion when he was being importuned to entrust the office to Anthemius, the son of the Anthemius who had been emperor in Rome, he expressed displeasure and did so with the remark that no one but men of literary training could fitly hold the office of prefect.

John mentions three praetorian prefects who held office under Anastasius who fit the description of men of literary training. Zoticus (De Mag. 3.26-28) for whom John wrote a panegyric in verse paid for from public funds, Sergius (De Mag. 3.21) who is described as being venerated by Anastasius because of his rhetoric, and Leontius (De Mag. 3.17) praised as a man with great knowledge of the law. John also tells us that members of the staff of the praetorian prefecture gave public demonstrations of their rhetorical skill and received honours for doing so (De Mag. 3.50).

Two other officials of Anastasius are praised for their learning: Celer, the magister officiorum for much of the reign, who is described as well-educated, devout and brave (Theophanes AM 5998) and Julianus the prefect of the city in

491, a native of Alexandria and a scholar. The latter, however, can not be said to have flourished under Anastasius. After a short time in office, he was succeeded by the emperor's brother-in-law, Secundinus (John of Antioch fr. 214b).

Priscian may be combining his commendation of Anastasius' policy with a compliment to his patron Julianus and the members of their literary circle. Priscian dedicated his Ars Grammatica to a Julianus, consul and patricius (Keil, Grammatici Latini 2:1), whose name and rank suggest that he may have been a member of the Anician family and a relative of Anicia Juliana (see The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire 2:641). Julianus has been identified by Salamon ("Priscianus," pp. 93-94) with Julianus the Egyptian who was praetorian prefect in 530-31. Julianus was also a poet and a number of his epigrams are included in the Cycle of Agathias (for the identification of the prefect and the poet, see Averil and Alan Cameron, "The Cycle of Agathias," Journal of Hellenic Studies 86 [1966]: 12-14, and Alan Cameron, "Some Prefects Called Julian," Byzantion 47 [1977]: 47-48). He may also be the Julianus who owned a codex of Statius (Helm, "Priscianus," col. 2329). Several of Julianus' epigrams indicate that he had connections with the family of Anastasius. Two poems (Anth. Gr. 7.591 and 592) are epitumbia written on Hypatius, Anastasius' nephew, and one (Anth. Gr. 7.590) on a grandson of Hypatius. Julianus also mentions a grammarian

Theodorus (Anth. Gr. 7.594) who may be the Theodorus who was a pupil of Priscian and who edited the Ars Grammatica.

Theodorus was a memoralis of the scrinium epistularum and an adiutor of the quaestor sacri palatii (Keil, Grammatici Latini 2:191, 451, 597). Both Julianus and Theodorus could well have begun their careers under Anastasius and both were men devoted to literary culture. In his dedication to the Ars Grammatica, Priscian describes Julianus as outstanding in every branch of learning, both Greek and Latin: quippe non minus Graecorum quam Latinorum in omni doctrinae genere praefulgentem (Keil, Grammatici Latini 2:1).

Viljaama (Greek Encomiastic Poetry, p. 56) notes a similarity between this passage and a passage praising an emperor's patronage of poets in a fragmentary Greek verse encomium which he considers may have been part of a panegyric on Anastasius by the poet Christodorus of Coptos. But see R.C. McCail ("P. Gr. Vindob. 29788C: Hexameter Encomium on an Un-Named Emperor," Journal of Hellenic Studies 98 (1978): 38-63) who argues that the subject of the poem is Anastasius' predecessor, Zeno. McCail includes a translation and useful linguistic and historical commentaries.

246: salutem: safety and freedom. In Christian writings, salus can also mean salvation and deliverance granted by God to men, cf. Carmen de Providentia Dei 551: notum est cunctis astare salutem. Priscian may once again be using a term which suggests Anastasius as the image of God.

- 247: for the language, cf. Ovid Met. 9.305: votaque suscipiunt
- 249: sudor musicus: I have been unable to find a parallel for this expression. The adjective musicus as used in this context with the sense of "belonging to the Muses" or "poetic" is rare, although this meaning is found in the works of two other late Latin writers. Sidonius (Epist. 3.12.6) describes an epitaph he wrote for his grandfather's tomb as a funeral offering for the Muses:

Novi quidem auctoris nostri non respondere doctrinae
epitaphii qualitatem, sed anima perita musicas non
refutat inferias.

Ennodius (Carm. 1.6, dictio 4) introduces a poem he has written in the style of the Muses, i.e., in the elegiac metre:
dicam ergo libens musico stilo gaudia mea. For Priscian, and possibly the other two writers as well, the source of this connotation for musicus is probably its use by Terence, in whose works the adjective appears three times: Phorm. 18:
palnam esse positam quod artem tractant musicam; Heaut. 23:
repente ad studium hunc se adpfficasse musicum; Hec. 21-23:

. . . ita poetam restitui in locum
prope iam remotum iniuria advorsarium
ab studio atque ab labore atque arte musica.

Priscian was familiar with Terence's plays, since one of his short grammatical works was a treatise on the metres of Terence and his adaptation of Greek metric practice. Significantly the adjective is always used by Terence in his prologues, where he discusses his literary problems and

methods and defends his practice of adapting Greek plays into Latin. Priscian's sudor musicus may well be a variation of the playwright's studium musicum and ars musica and the expression may have been used by Priscian and his circle of friends to describe their literary endeavours both in Latin and Greek. In his dedication of the Ars Grammatica to Julianus, Priscian uses the equally rare noun musica, meaning poetry, to describe the achievements of Homer and Virgil: uterque arcem possederat musicae, and then goes on to praise his patron's outstanding knowledge of both Latin and Greek (see note on lines 245-253).

250: munit sapientia leges: two of Anastasius' praetorian prefects are mentioned by John the Lydian as being especially knowledgeable in law, Leontius, praetorian prefect for the east in 510 (De Mag. 3.17) and Sergius, praetorian prefect for the east in 517 (De Mag. 2.21).

251: adsumis: for adsumo used of choosing friends or associates, cf. Horace Sat. 1.6.51: praesertim cautum dignos adsumere; Luke 18:31: assumsit Jesus duodecim.

moderamine: moderamen is used to mean government in both poetry and official documents, cf. CTh 11.30.64: verum serenitas nostra certum moderamen invenit; Carmen de Providentia Dei 185: haec igitur vis sola potest moderamina rerum.

253: pascens: picks up the idea of nurturing already presented in line 243. Priscian may intend a comparison of Anastasius and the good shepherd of the gospels (cf. John 10:3 and also Matt. 18:12 and Luke 15:4). It is typical of Priscian's highly allusive technique to use one word to suggest to his audience an image well-known to them from Christian literature and art. For Christ as the good shepherd in art, see, for example, the fifth century mosaic in the Mausoleum of Galla Placidia in Ravenna. Corippus, in depicting the emperor Justin rewarding his staff, also presents the emperor as the good shepherd, but his description is much more detailed and there are clear references to the parable as given by John (cf. In laud. Iust. 4.198-205).

ditans: cf. Corippus In laud. Iust. 4.188-189: pia praemia gaudens/praebuit, et fidos opibus ditavit alumnos.

Lines 254-260: because of Anastasius' virtues God has protected the empire from the Persians.

254-260: Priscian begins his peroration and he returns to a theme which has dominated the panegyric; Anastasius' piety, justice, wisdom and generosity guarantee him the protection of the all-powerful God who chastises the enemies who dare attack his empire. Priscian's language recalls his description of God's punishment of the Isaurians' unjust furor (see notes on individual lines) and the passage begins with the powerful image of God as celsi dominator maximus axis.

Priscian does not name the hostes defeated by God's protection and Anastasius' wisdom. Endlicher (Prisciani Grammatici, p. 67) believes that this passage refers to military operations against an Arab tribe, the Lakhmids, subjects of Persia, who, under their king Naamanes II, conducted raids in the province of Euphratensis and were defeated by the dux Eugenius in about 500 A.D. (Theophanes AM 5990; for the date, see Stein; Bas-Empire, 2:91, n. 5). Procopius of Gaza (Pan. 7) includes a relatively lengthy section praising the action taken against Arab nomads in Palestine. The nomads raided Roman cities, attacking quickly and then withdrawing to hide. Procopius does not name the Arabs as the raiders, but his description of them as barbarians who have no cities, carry their property with them and put up shelters wherever they happen to be makes the identification almost certain. Procopius is probably referring to raids carried out by two Arab tribes, the Ghassanids, whose territory bordered the province of Arabia, and the Kindites, located further south near the province of Palestine III. In 498 these two tribes were defeated by the dux Palaestinae Romanus (Theophanes AM 5990), although he was less successful in checking raids by the Kindites in Palestine, Syria and Phoenicia in 501 (Theophanes AM 5994). The extent and seriousness of the raids seem to be reflected in the attention given to them by Procopius and Theophanes. In 502 the Romans concluded a peace

treaty with these tribes and it is probably this treaty to which Procopius refers when he praises Anastasius for freeing the cities from attacks. As a result of the treaty, the Arabs became allies of Rome and fought with the Romans against the Persians (Joshua the Stylite Chron. 57). For the treaty and the inclusion of both the Ghassanids and the Kindites in the treaty, see Irfan Kavar, "Ghassan and Byzantium: A new terminus a quo," Der Islam 33 (1958): 232-55.

Although the nature of the attacks described by Priscian (Ex improviso latronum more ruentes, line 258) could refer to nomadic raids such as those mentioned by Procopius, and the repulse of the enemy (line 255) could be an allusion to the defeat of the Lakhmids in 500, the mention of a broken treaty and of a campaign near the Euphrates make it almost certain that he is referring to Anastasius's war against the Persians. In 442 a treaty between Theodosius II and the Persians confirmed both a one hundred year peace established by an earlier treaty of 422 and also a Roman obligation to pay the Persians an annual sum for the defence of the Caucasus which had originally been established by a treaty with Jovian in 363. By this same treaty, the city of Nisibis had been surrendered to the Persians for 120 years (see Bury, Later Roman Empire 2: 5-10). In 483 the Persians refused to surrender Nisibis to Zeno as agreed by the treaty of 363. Zeno retaliated by not handing over to the Persians the subsidy for

the defence of the Caucasus (Joshua the Stylite Chron. 8). Anastasius inherited this situation when he succeeded Zeno and in 491 he refused the Persian king Cavades when he renewed the demand for the subsidy (Procopius De Bello Persico 1.7.1-2; Joshua the Stylite Chron. 20). In 502 Cavades invaded Roman territory. Thus, as Priscian claims, the Persians had violated the treaty (by refusing to surrender Nisibis); the anger (anger at not receiving the subsidy) that drove them to war was, therefore, unjust (line 256). Cavades invaded first Armenia and then moved southwards into Osrhoene and Mesopotamia, the area between the Tigris and the Euphrates rivers. Joshua the Stylite tells us, for example, that after Cavades' failure to take Edessa (see note on lines 254-255), he retreated to the Euphrates (Chron. 63). The actual geographical location of Cavades' activities thus fits in exactly with Priscian's description, Euphratis vasti prope maxima flumina (line 257). The Lakhmids had invaded an area west of the Euphrates, but other equally serious attacks by Arab tribes occurred elsewhere at about the same time. If Priscian wished to allude to the Arabs, he would surely have included some reference to the Ghassanids and the Kindites. Moreover, given two military operations in territories near the Euphrates, the war against the Persians, because of such factors as the duration of the war and the extent of the territory and the number of men involved, would be more readily

identified by the audience and more worthy of the seven lines Priscian devotes to it. Thus the two details, the broken treaty and the location, given by Priscian conform to what we know of the Persian war from other sources. Less certain but also suggestive are the references to the suddenness of the attack (see note on line 258) and to the enemy being driven off from Roman strongholds by the power of God (see note on lines 254-255). It seems best, then, to interpret this passage as a reference to the Persian War (see also note on line 300).

254-55: dominator . . . avertit ab arcibus hostes: Priscian's statement that God turned away the enemy from Anastasius' strongholds may be intended to recall especially the miraculous deliverance of Edessa from the Persians as a specific example of God's protection of the empire. The city of Edessa possessed a letter written by Christ which promised that Edessa would never be taken by an enemy (Joshua the Stylite Chron. 5). Cavades did blockade the city but without success (Joshua the Stylite Chron. 58-63). The Roman commander Areobindus who had withdrawn to Edessa sent the Persian King this message: "Now thou seest that the city is not thine, nor of Anastasius, but it is the city of Christ who blessed it, and it has withstood thy hosts" (Joshua the Stylite Chron. 61, trans. Wright, p. 52). Another sign of Christ's protection of Edessa was the death of the Arab ruler Naa'manes. He

had urged Cavades to attack Edessa and threatened terrible suffering for the city. Immediately after this blasphemy, he suffered from complications to a head wound and died two days later (Joshua the Stylite Chron. 58).

Other cities saved from the Persians, although without direct divine intervention, were Theodosiopolis, Constantia and Amida, which had been captured by the Persians in 502. A conspiracy to deliver Constantia to Cavades was discovered and Cavades did not attack it (Joshua the Stylite Chron. 58).

Theodosiopolis was recaptured by Eugenius in 502 (Joshua the Stylite Chron. 52) and Amida was recaptured after a long siege in 505 (Procopius De Bello Persico 1.9.23; Joshua the Stylite Chron. 81).

- 254: dominator: uncommon in classical Latin, but cf. Seneca Thyestes 1078: aetheriae potens dominator aulae; Ep. 107.11 o parens celsique dominator poli. Dominator was used by Christian writers as a term for God, cf. Macc. 2:15.23: et nunc, Dominator caelorum, mitte angelum tuum bonum; Dan. 5:23: Sed adversum Dominatorem caeli elevatus es; Sedulius Carm.Pasch. 5.209: rerum dominator. The term was also used of the emperor, cf. Prudentius Apotheosis 448: summus dominator. celsi . . . axis: cf. line 182 where Justice is sent down from God ab axe. For axis used of the Christian heaven, see Carmen de Providentia Dei 619-620: nam cum ille ex celso deictus Lucifer axe/conciderit.

- 256: Quos furor iniustus violato foedere movit: Priscian echbes the language which he used earlier in the poem to describe the rebellion of the Isaurians, cf. line 58: furor immissus commovit marte nefando, and line 101: iniustos contra praesentium numine pugnans. For a similar assignment of blame for the war to the Persians, cf. Joshua the Stylite Chron. 21, trans. Wright, p. 14: "Let those therefore who blame him [Anastasius] because he did not give the money, rather blame him [Cavadēs] who demanded what was not his as if by force".
- 258: ex improviso . . . ruentes: cf. Procopius De Bello Persico 1.7.3 for the suddenness and unexpectedness of the Persian attack.
- 259: deus in propriam cladem converterat illos: cf. lines 55-60 where God inflicts the Isaurians with furor so that they will rebel and suffer as they have deserved.
- 260: iustissima damna: cf. line 60, vindicta . . . merita.
- Lines 261-269: prayer for the glory of Anastasius and the unity of the empire.
- 261: for the language, cf. Virgil Aen. 11.842: Teucros conatalacessere bello.
- 263-264: for the image of the chariot of the sun rising from the ocean, cf. Virgil Aen. 12.114-15: cum primum alto se gurgite tollunt/Solis equi lucemque elatis naribus efflant; Claudian De IV Cons. Hon. 191: cernere sol patiens caelum commune remisit.

- 263: iugales: for iugales meaning a team of horses, cf. Virgil
Aen. 7.280: absenti Aeneae currum geminosque iugalis; Statius
Theb. 3.268: spumantem proni mandunt adamanta iugales.
- 264: florere: has several connotations which are operating here.
 In the sense of flourish or prosper, the use of florere fits
 in with the theme of felicitas temporum (cf. note on line 237
 and also cf. Psalms 91:13: iustus ut palma florebit). The
 meaning "to be bright" fits in with the image of the sun in
 the panegyric and with the gleaming temples built by
 Anastasius which attest to his glory.
- 265: Utraque Roma tibi nam spero pareat uni: Priscian's motives
 for including this wish for the unity of the empire have been
 subject to a number of interpretations. The belief that
 Priscian himself was an exile and his mention of exiles from
 Italy in Constantinople (see note on lines 242-45) has sug-
 gested the possibility that Priscian was the spokesman for a
 'lobby group' of refugees and exiles who were urging the em-
 peror to reconquer Italy (see Bury, Later Roman Empire, 1:476,
 n. 1 and Courcelle, Histoire litteraire, p. 212): Setting
 aside the questions of whether Priscian was an exile and
 whether his earlier lines refer to men exiled by Theodoric, if
 the poem was intended to put pressure on the emperor to attack
 Theodoric, surely more attention would have been given to the
 problem of Italy and the pressure would have consisted of more
 than one vague reference to unity. There are similar objec-

tions to the other major view, for which Romano is the chief spokesman, that Priscian is expressing imperial policy and signaling the intention of Anastasius to reconquer the west ("Prisciano," 324-327). Anastasius' political, financial and religious policies indicate that he wanted to strengthen and unify the eastern provinces under his rule and that he was content with nominal authority over the west, where he pursued his interests by diplomatic rather than by military means.

Priscian's line serves two functions. In the context of Vitalian's revolt and taken both with the reference to Anastasius' patronage of westerners and the threat of God's punishment for the emperor's enemies (line 261), it is a warning to those in Constantinople with western connections and those with religious convictions who might be seen as opposed to Anastasius' rule (see Introduction, pp. 20-21). More generally, it is an expression of the theoretical unity of the empire, a brief and vague allusion to the orthodox Byzantine political formula of one God, one emperor and one empire. Yet as he evokes the unity of the empire, Priscian betrays the dichotomy that existed between theoretical unity and the practical separation of east and west. This tension is reflected in the works of contemporary writers. A letter from Theodoric to Anastasius (Cassiodorus Var. 1.1), which was probably written in 509 after the attack on the shores of southern Italy by the eastern navy in 508 (Thomas Hodgkin,

Theodoric the Goth [London, 1896], p. 217), moves back and forth between expressions of unity and separation and is worth quoting in full:

Oportet nos, clementissime imperator, pacem quaerere, qui causas iracundiae cognoscimus non habere: quando ille moribus iam tenetur obnoxius, qui ad iusta deprehenditur imparatus. Omni quippe regno desiderabilis debet esse tranquillitas, in qua et populi proficiunt et utilitas gentium custoditur. Haec est enim bonarum artium decora mater, haec mortalium genus reparabili successione multiplicans facultates protendit, mores excolit: et tantarum rerum ignarus agnoscitur qui eam minime quaesisse sentitur. Et ideo, piissime principum, potentiae vestrae convenit et honori, ut concordiam vestram quaerere debeamus, cuius adhuc amore proficimus. Vos enim estis regnorum omnium pulcherrimum decus, vos totius orbis salutare praesidium, quos ceteri dominantes iure suspiciunt, quia in vobis singulare aliquid inesse cognoscunt, nos maxime, qui divino auxilio in re publica vestra didicimus, quemadmodum Romanis aequabiliter imperare possimus. Regnum nostrum imitatio vestra est, forma boni propositi, unici exemplar imperii: qui quantum vos sequimur, tantum gentes alias anteimus. Hortamini me frequenter, ut diligam senatum, leges principum gratañter amplectar, ut cuncta Italiae membra componam. Quomodo potestis ab Augusta pace dividere, quem non optatis a vestris moribus discrepare? Additur etiam veneranda Romanae urbis affectio, a qua segregari nequeunt quae se nominis unitate iunxerunt. Proinde illum et illum legationis officio ad serenissimam pietatem vestram credidimus destinandos, ut sinceritas pacis, quae causis emergentibus cognoscitur fuisse vitiata, detersis contentionibus in sua deinceps firmitate restituta permaneat: quia pati vos non credimus inter utrasque res publicas, quarum semper unum corpus sub antiquis principibus fuisse declaratur, aliquid discordiae permanere. Quas non solum oportet inter se otiosa dilectione coniungi, verum etiam decet mutuis viribus adiuvari. Romani regni unum velle, una semper opinio sit. Quicquid et nos possumus, vestris praeconiis applicetur. Quapropter salutationis honorificentiam praeferentes prona mente deposcimus, ne suspendatis mansuetudinis vestrae gloriosissimam caritatem, quam ego sperare debui, etiamsi aliis non videretur posse concedi. Cetera vero per praesentium latores pietati vestrae verbo suggerenda commisimus, ut nec epistularis sermo redderetur extensior nec aliquid pro utilitatibus nostris praetermissis videremur.

266: summi . . . patris: to Anastasius' enemies God is the dominator axis. In His relationship with Anastasius, God is either the protecting father or the heavenly King whose power and virtues Anastasius imitates (lines 271,286).

267: omnem stabilis pietate per orbem: Anastasius' piety never fails. Stabilis may also be meant to suggest that Anastasius' rule is stable because of his piety. For the idea that the virtues of the emperor preserve the stability of his empire, cf. Claudian In Ruf. 1, praef. 17-18: qui stabilem servans Augustis fratribus orbem/iustitia pacem, viribus arma regit.

268: Templa novans renovansque deo fulgentia semper: cf. Virgil Aen. 4.260: Aeneam fundantem arces et tecta novantem.

Priscian has already mentioned the building activities which show Anastasius as the restorer of the world and the imitator of the creative activity of God (see note on lines 184-192).

This separate reference to church building in a significant context indicates that this activity was regarded in a special way as evidence of the emperor's piety and his closeness to God, and hence as especially enhancing imperial prestige. For Constantine's divinely-inspired decision to build the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, see Eusebius, Vita Constantini 3.25.

In his panegyric on Justinian's building activities, Procopius has much to say on the themes of divine inspiration and church building as a manifestation of the closeness of God and em-

peror. See now Averil Cameron's discussion of Procopius' Buildings in her Procopius and the sixth century (Berkeley, 1985), pp. 84-112. Anastasius built many churches in Constantinople (Theodore Lector Epit. 11.21). Capizzi lists twelve churches attributed to Anastasius in the capital and a number of others constructed in the provinces, although he points out that some of the attributions are doubtful and it is often difficult to make out whether Anastasius built, rebuilt or completed a particular church (Capizzi, L'imperatore Anastasio, pp. 196-198.) For the splendour of such churches (fulgentia auro), we may take as an example a church built for the monastery of Qarthamin in Tur Abdin in Mesopotamia. This monastery, dedicated to Saints Samuel and Simeon, was a famous one, and in 511-512 Anastasius built or rebuilt for the monks a church which is described in a Syrian manuscript. The east wall of the church ended in three niches. In the centre niche was a throne of white marble draped with a gold embroidered cloth. Around the throne were garlands of silver and above it was a bronze cupola surmounted by a bronze cherub. The floor around the altar of the church was decorated with coloured marble mosaic (opus sectile), while above the altar the ceiling was covered with a mosaic of gilded tesserae. Hundreds of lamps lit the church and the marble and precious metals used in the decoration would have reflected their light, truly a templum fulgens. For a more

detailed description of the church and a bibliography on the monastery, see Capizzi, L'imperatore Anastasio, pp. 221-223. Geanakaplos ("Church Building and 'Caesaropopism' A.D. 312-565," Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies 7 [1966]: 186) finds that there is a "correlation between the emperor's policy of control (or lack of control) over the church and his policy with regard to the construction of churches", and considers that any large-scale church building was meant to further imperial control over the church and to promote ecclesiastical unity. He says little about Anastasius, but church building on the scale suggested here by Priscian does indeed reflect Anastasius' known control of the church.

Downey argues that the emperor's building activity was considered an imitation of the Divine creation (cf. G. Downey, "Imperial Building Records in Malalas," pp. 299-311), and one aim of this line may be to suggest once again the concept of the emperor as the image of God. More explicitly, however, Priscian regards Anastasius' building of churches as a manifestation of his piety which earns for the emperor God's protection from his enemies and any other dangers which threaten him (see lines 270-279). In setting out the proposition that God protects Anastasius because of the emperor's piety, which is demonstrated by his building of churches, Priscian may have used the building of churches as a way of alluding to the thanksgiving service celebrated in a

church, perhaps Hagia Sophia, by Anastasius in honour of Hypatius' victory over Vitalian (Chauvot, "Observations sur la date," p. 547).

269: lucra: cf. line 197 for the unjust profit of corrupt officials.

Lines 270-289: Anastasius is miraculously saved from disaster at sea because of his piety.

270-279: the only other reference to a disaster at sea in connection with Anastasius appears in Theophanes. According to his account (AM 5984), Anastasius was shipwrecked off the coast of Alexandria and was cared for by John Talais, later Patriarch of Alexandria and then a cleric in that city. After Anastasius became emperor, John, who had been deposed and had fled to Rome, approached Anastasius and asked to be reinstated as patriarch in return for his past kindness to the emperor. Anastasius refused. John of Nikiu (Chron. 89) also mentions that Anastasius visited Egypt, but he does not refer to a shipwreck and the accounts of Theophanes and John differ substantially. For a discussion of the evidence for Anastasius' visit to Egypt, see Capizzi, L'imperatore Anastasio, pp. 60-63. He dates the visit, and perhaps the shipwreck, to 476. However, if Theophanes' version is correct, Priscian cannot be referring to this shipwreck. He says that the incident occurred recently and he tells us that God saved the life of the emperor and so cannot be referring to Theophanes' shipwreck which took place before Anastasius became emperor.

In the absence of other evidence, we can only speculate as to when Anastasius' life was threatened and saved in the manner described by Priscian. Theodore Lector and Theophanes give information which provides a possible clue. Theodore (Epit. 2.577.), followed by Theophanes (AM 6003), tells us that in the riots which followed the chanting of the Monophysite version of the Trisagion in Constantinople in 510, the populace inflamed by orthodox monks rioted and threatened the emperor who shut himself up in the palace and ordered ships to make ready in case he had to flee. In 512, on Sunday, November 4, the new Patriarch Timothy again introduced the Monophysite addition to the Trisagion into the liturgy. Three days of riot and slaughter followed, and the people called on Areobindus to become emperor. Only the appearance of Anastasius in the Hippodrome without his diadem restored order. Theophanes (AM 6005) mentions the riot and adds that the emperor fled to the security of Blachernae, presumably by ship, as he had been prepared to do when similarly threatened in 510. It may be that in his flight to Blachernae Anastasius' ship ran into trouble and the emperor's life was threatened. If, as Priscian tells us, his rescue was viewed as a miraculous intervention by God, such an incident might help to explain why the rioters in the Hippodrome were calmed by the emperor's appearance.

- 270: sceptrifer: cf. line 110 where Anastasius is called sceptrifer at the conclusion of a description of God's intervention to protect the emperor by a violent storm which wrecks the ships of his enemies. Here God intervenes to save Anastasius himself from disaster at sea.
- 271: Quanta . . . servat: the indicative is used in place of the subjunctive in indirect questions in early Latin and poetry and becomes regular in Late Latin (cf. Corippus, In laud. Iust. 1.181: aspice quanta fuit nostrae simul urbis et orbis). Priscian may be employing the indicative here to stress the truth and reality of God's intervention to save Anastasius.
- 273-275: Priscian gives so few details of how Anastasius' life was endangered that it is difficult to form a clear picture of the incident. A clumsy, badly-balanced ship seems to have heeled over in a treacherous gust of wind and thrown Anastasius (and presumably any others on board) into the water. Since Priscian wishes to underline his theme of the divine protection of the emperor, he emphasizes the miraculous rescue and refrains from indulging in an elaborate description of the accident. Although his brevity results in confusion for the modern reader, Priscian's contemporaries would have been aware of the details of such a recent (nuper) incident. Some of the confusion may also be the result of Priscian's conflating ideas from earlier writers. Possible sources to which Priscian may have turned are given below and line references to Priscian's passage are given in ():

cf. Virgil Aen. 10.302-304: sed non puppis tua Tarchon./namque
inflicta vadis dorso dum pendet (275) iniquo (273)/anceps
sustentata diu; Virgil Aen. 9.553: fera . . . supra (273)
venabula fertur (274); Ovid Met. 1.295-296: ille supra
segetes. . ./navigat.

275: Atque salus dubiae penderet maxima vitae: cf. Claudian De
Bello Goth. 268-269: dubiaeque salutis/dux idem vatesque fuit;
Olybr. et Prob. 11: his neque per dubium pendet fortuna
favorem. The exact meaning of this line is difficult to un-
 tangle. The meaning cannot be that safety (salus) is hanging
 on (penderet) a life in danger (dubiae vitae), since pendeo in
 this sense is used with ab or ex and the ablative. Penderet
 then is being used absolutely with the meaning of "hangs
 suspended", and vitae is genitive. Thus we have "the greatest
 safety of a doubtful life was hanging suspended". The word
 order suggests that the adjectives are transferred epithets:
 "the doubtful safety of your most precious life was hanging
 suspended". This is one of the passages where, in trying to
 be poetic, Priscian succeeds chiefly in being confusing.

276: cf. Lucan 9.244-245: Fortuna cuncta tenentur/Caesaris;
 1.21-22: tum si tantus amor belli tibi, Roma, nefandi/totum
sub Latias leges cum miseris orbem. These reminiscences of
 Lucan are a good example of Priscian's use of an earlier
 writer to comment on the contemporary situation.^o The context
 of the second passage is significant. Lucan is describing the

madness of the civil war which divided Rome. By supporting Vitalian, Rome and Italy are engaging in an unlawful civil war against Anastasius who, as his miraculous rescue gives proof, is the one divinely appointed ruler of the world.

278: for the language, cf. Claudian De Bello Gild. 262: quamvis discrimine summo.

quantus adest: for the indicative in an indirect question, see note on line 271.

280: Sancta pios homines testantur scripta per aevum: sancta scripta may be a reference to the Scriptures, cf. Paulinus of Nola Carm. 24.830 and 31.405, where sacri libri refer to the Scriptures. Priscian is probably thinking of such Old Testament stories as the crossing of the Red Sea (Exodus 14), Daniel in the den of lions (Daniel 6), Shadrach, Meschach and Abednego in the fiery furnace (Daniel 3) and Jonah and the whale (Jonah 2). These stories which emphasize deliverance of just and holy men through the power of God were favourites with Christian artists and writers.

282: sic virtus praefulserat omnibus annis: cf. Claudian De Bello Goth. 261: Romula post ruptas virtus sic emicat Alpes.

283: divina . . . dextra: in this closing section of the poem, the image of the hand of God is used for the third time as a symbol of divine deliverance, cf. lines 55 and 101. In earlier epic and panegyric, it was the strong hand of the hero or emperor which symbolized safety and deliverance, cf. Claudian De Bello Goth. 41-42: tua nos urgenti dextera leto/eripuit.

eripuit: cf. Psalms 6:4: convertere, Domine, et eripe animam meam. It is interesting to note that Priscian does not associate the image of the hand of God directly with Anastasius himself, but rather with the deliverance of pious men in ages past. His placing of the image in this way may be connected with the disappearance of the image of the dextera Dei crowning the emperor from coins in the late fifth century (see note on line 55). Priscian also avoids using the hand of God as a symbol of divine election in the scene in the Hippodrome in which God bestows upon Anastasius the crown and diadem (lines 162-163).

285: for the language, cf. Claudian De Bello Goth. 361-362:
pervigil hanc requiem terris, haec otia rebus/insperata
dabant; illae tibi, Roma, salutem.

numen Olympi: the pagan terminology contrasts with the Christian terms in which the numen Olympi is described in the following lines, rex omnipotens, the creator of the world who protects all things with his light.

286: rex omnipotens: omnipotens in Classical Latin is applied to Jupiter (cf. Ovid Met. 14.816: adnuit omnipotens), but the epithet was taken over by Christian writers, (cf. Carmen de Providentia Dei 691: solus Deus omnipotens Rex). For omnipotens used earlier in the panegyric, see lines 178 and 181.

287: qui lumine cuncta tuetur: this clause can be interpreted in two ways: "who beholds everything with His eye" or "who protects everything with His light" or perhaps "His glance." Since both meanings are appropriate to the context of divine protection for holy men, Priscian may have wished both ideas to be understood here.

288: for the expression tempus in omne, cf. Ovid Tr. 1.3.34: este salutati tempus in omne mihi.

Lines 290-300: praise of Anastasius' family, Paulus and Hypatius.

290: Pauli: Paulus was the brother of Anastasius and consul in 496 (Marcellinus comes s.a. 496). He was probably married to Magna, a devout Chalcedonian who presented a defence of the Council of Chalcedon written by the Alexandrian monk Dorotheus to Anastasius (Theophanes AM 6002). From Priscian's description, his was an estimable character and his virtues reflect those of his brother Anastasius.

mitissima corda: perhaps a variation of Virgil Aen. 5.729: lectos iuvenes, fortissima corda.

291: Quem tibi coniugit munimen laudis honestas: Priscian may be echoing Claudian Carm. Min. 30.5: hunc mihi coniugit studiis communibus aetas.

293: for the language, cf. Claudian De Bello Gild. 280: tantaque mutatos sequitur provincia mores.

294: Ore canam quonam pietatis culmina tantae: Priscian addresses Anastasius as he prepares to proclaim what he describes as the

greatest achievement of the emperor's piety, his generosity to his nephews.

295-296: Priscian describes Anastasius' affectionate relationship with his nephews in terms which recall the fondness Theodosius I is alleged to have had for his niece and adopted daughter Serena, cf. Claudian Carm. Min. 29.104-107:

defuncto genitore tuo sublimis adoptat
te patruus magnique animo solacia luctus
restituens proprius quam si genuisset amavit
defuncti fratris subolem.

295: fratris natos: the identity of the brother and hence of the sons, poses a problem. The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire (2:853) considers the brother to be Paulus who is praised by Priscian in the preceding lines. In this case Probus, known to be Anastasius' nephew, but whose father is not mentioned in the sources may be Paulus' son. Alan Cameron, however, has argued persuasively in favour of identifying the brother with Secundinus, consul in 511 and the brother-in-law of Anastasius. Cameron points out that Hypatius is mentioned by Priscian in the following lines as one of the nati ("The House of Anastasius," p. 261). Hypatius and his brother Pompeius were the sons not of Paulus but of Anastasius' sister, Caesaria, and her husband Secundinus. As for Probus, Cameron considers that he too was a son of Secundinus on the basis of this line:

What does seem to me to tilt the balance of probability in favour of this (the usual) conclusion is Priscian's phrase fratris natos.

Had Probus been Paul's son it would have been both accurate and tactful, nor would it have made any difference to the metre, for Priscian to have written fratrum natos, to cover Paul as well as Secundinus. He wrote fratris because all of Anastasius' distinguished nephews were the sons of the same 'brother'. It is difficult to believe that an experienced panegyrist would have been so careless as to risk quite unnecessary offense by writing fratris if he had really been meaning to evoke the sons of two imperial brothers. Secundinus is not actually named because, being only a brother-in-law, he was not himself (unlike his sons) of the blood royal, nor quite so important a person as Paul - or indeed his own sons, as illustrated by his late consulship. If Paul had had any sons who survived to maturity, we may be sure that they would have received honours comparable to those showered so generously on Secundinus' sons. The fact that none is on record suggests of itself that there were no such sons. ("House of Anastasius," p. 262).

- 296: sed patris more colendo: Anastasius was generous to his nephews. Hypatius was consul in 500, Pompeius in 501 and Probus in 502. As well they held important military commands; see The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire 2:577-581, 898-899, 902-913.
- 297: stirpe parentum: perhaps an echo of Virgil Aen. 3.94-95: Dardanidae duri, quae vos a stirpe parentum/prima tulit tellus.
- 299: Qui Scythicas gentes ripis depellit ab Histri: two interpretations of this line have recently been proposed. According to Alan Cameron, Priscian is praising Hypatius for his fortissima facta against the Bulgars who were ravaging the Balkans between 498 and 502. Cameron suggests that Hypatius, as a magister militum per Thracias, had some "modest success"

against the Bulgars, success to which Priscian refers here and which is perhaps connected with Hypatius' consulship in 500 (Alan Cameron, "Date," pp. 314-315). Unfortunately no other source mentions any campaign of Hypatius against the Bulgars at this date. Moreover, the language of lines 299 and 300 does not support Cameron's argument. Cameron has Hypatius' success in the Balkans precede his command in the Persian War (line 300). Yet the verbs used by Priscian, vidit and sensit, depict Hypatius' part in the Persian war as past, while a present tense, depellit, describes his activities against the Scythicae gentes.

Priscian, therefore, is probably referring to an episode in Hypatius' career which took place after his return from the Persian War in 503 (see note line 300). A more persuasive interpretation of line 299 is that of Chauvot who, following Endlicher (Prisciani Grammatici, p. 75), identifies the Scythicas gentes with the barbarian federates commanded by Vitalian who rebelled against Anastasius in 513. As Chauvot points out ("Observations sur la date," p. 546, especially n.36), the sources stress the barbarian nature of Vitalian's troops. In addition, Vitalian himself was born in Moesia (John of Antioch fr. 214e), and Marcellinus comes describes him as Vitalianus Scytha (s.a. 514, s.a. 519). Anastasius himself, writing to Pope Hormisdas in 515 about the church council demanded by Vitalian (see Introduction, p. 14) speaks

of the disturbances in Scythia: ea quae de Scythiae partibus mota sunt (Thiel, Epistolae Romanorum Pontificum, p. 742).

The role played by Hypatius against the Vitalian is also well attested. The commander of the first army sent against the rebel was killed by Vitalian (Marcellinus comes s.a. 514; John of Antioch fr. 214e; Evagrius Ecc. Hist. 3.43; John Malalas 402; Theophanes AM 6006). Hypatius, perhaps as magister militum praesentalis, was then sent against Vitalian with a second army (John of Antioch fr. 214e; Jordanes Rom. 358; Victor Tonnennensis s.a. 511; John Malalas 402; Zacharias Rhetor Hist. Eccl. 7.13; Evagrius Ecc. Hist. 3.43). After some initial success in the autumn of 513 (John of Antioch fr. 214e; Severus of Antioch, Homily 34; cf. Bury, Later Roman Empire 1:449 and Stein, Bas-Empire, 2:180), the Roman army suffered serious reverses and Hypatius himself was captured (Marcellinus comes s.a. 515; Jordanes Rom. 358; Victor Tonnennensis s.a. 511; Evagrius Ecc. Hist. 3.43; Zacharias Rhetor Hist. Eccl. 7.13; 8.2; John Malalas 402; John of Antioch 214e; Theophanes AM 6005). It is the initial victory of Hypatius, a victory celebrated in Constantinople (John of Antioch fr. 214e), to which Priscian seems to be referring here.

300: Quem vidit validum Parthus sensitque timendum: Hypatius was one of three commanders of the army sent against the Persians in May, 503 (see note lines 254-260). It is perhaps difficult

at first to reconcile Priscian's description of Hypatius with accounts of his behaviour during the campaign in other sources. Hypatius and Patricius, the magistri militum praesentales, encamped with 40,000 men near the city of Amida which had been captured by the Persians early in 503 (Joshua the Stylite 54; Procopius De Bello Persico 1.8.10; Theophanes AM 5997). When Areobindus, the magister militum per orientem, asked them for help against a large Persian force, Hypatius and Patricius refused (Joshua the Stylite Chron. 55; Zacharias Rhetor Hist. Eccl. 7.5; Theophanes AM 5997). Although Patricius and Hypatius had some success against a force of Ephthalite Huns, they were put to flight by the approach of Cavades and retreated to Samosata (Procopius De Bello Persico 1.8.13-19; Joshua the Stylite Chron. 57). In the late autumn of 503, Hypatius was recalled to Constantinople, according to Theophanes AM 5998, because of conflict with Areobindus, and replaced by Celer, the magister officiorum. John the Lydian attributes the reverses suffered by the Roman army in 503 to the profligate living of Areobindus and to the cowardice and inexperience of Hypatius and Patricius (De Mag. 3.53). This is not an outstanding record, but neither does Priscian produce any exaggerated praise of Hypatius' success against the Persians; he says only that Hypatius was seen by the Persians as validus and timendus. These terms may be reconciled with John the Lydian's description of Hypatius as

inexperienced, but not with his accusation of cowardice. This latter charge may not be justified. Other sources attribute the Romans' difficulties to quarrels and disunity among the leaders, not to cowardice. In these circumstances, Hypatius the most junior and probably the youngest and most inexperienced -- Patricius was certainly elderly (Zacharias Rhetor Hist. Eccl. 7.4) -- was recalled and replaced by a more experienced commander. There is no need to accept John's accusation of cowardice or to think that Hypatius was summoned home in such disgrace as to make Priscian's modest praise of him here unbelievable (cf. Alan Cameron, "Date," p. 315). All three commanders are censured by John the Lydian and Hypatius is not singled out. On the matter of his recall, both Procopius (De Bello Persico 1.9.1 and Joshua the Stylite (Chron. 88) confuse Hypatius and ³Areobindus, suggesting that no especial and memorable blame for the Roman reverses was attached to Hypatius. Moreover, Hypatius was entrusted with further military commands under Anastasius, Justin and Justinian, an indication that no serious reservations were entertained as to his courage and competence. There is thus no reason to doubt that Priscian's listeners, who would remember the successful outcome of the Persian Wars, would accept Priscian's praise of Hypatius' contribution to that success.

Lines 301-308: praise of the empress Ariadne.

301-308:the insertion of lines in praise of the empress at the conclusion of a panegyric in honour of the emperor is a striking departure from the conventions of the genre. Menander Rhetor (376) suggests that if the empress is worthy of praise she should be mentioned in the section of the panegyric praising the emperor's temperance. The emperor's relationship with his wife provides an example of this virtue to his subjects and as a result their marriages are chaste and their children legitimate. The role of the empress in a model basilikos logos is thus a passive one, and she is not praised in her own right. Procopius of Gaza follows Menander's precepts closely. When praising Anastasius' chastity, Procopius says that the emperor's contentment with the wife, whom fortune bestowed on him along with the empire, provides a living example of virtue for his subjects (Pan. 23). In contrast, Priscian's praise of the empress is independent of his praise of any of Anastasius' virtues, and it occupies a prominent position at the end of the panegyric. Unlike Procopius, Priscian acknowledges the empress as the source of Anastasius' power and of the benefits he has bestowed on the empire; she is the auctor tantorum ac causa bonorum, and Priscian praises her wisdom in choosing so strong a princeps. For an account of the life and role of the empress Ariadne and a discussion of the implications of the position and content of Priscian's praise of the empress, see Appendix A.

- 301: Quas laudes meritas! Quas is given in the manuscript, and there seems no grammatical or metrical reason to replace it, as Baehrens does, with the ablative qua.
- 302: Auctor quae fuerat tantorum et causa bonorum: for auctor, cf. Claudian De IV Cons. Hon. 638-639: Sed patriis olim fueras successibus auctor/nunc eris ipse tuis; Lucan 8.17-18: cladisque suae vix ipse fidelis/auctor erat; 4.399-400: ille salutis/est auctor, dux ille fuit.
- For causa referring to a person, see Lucan 5.481: o mundo tantorum causa laborum.

Priscian may intend tantorum bonorum to mean both such great and good men and such great benefits and hence describes Ariadne as sponsor or supporter (auctor) and source (causa).

- 305-306: Chastity and piety are the two virtues of the women of the imperial family which are most singled out for praise by writers of the Christian era. Claudian's laus Serenae is dominated by his praise of the empress' chastity; Serena is a chaste wife to Stilicho, more chaste than Penelope or Nausicaa; she studies the poets for examples of this virtue and she disapproves of Dido. Perhaps even more important than chastity is the piety of the empress. In his Oratio Consolaria on the death of the empress Flacilla, wife of Theodosius I, Gregory of Nyssa praises the empress's chastity, philanthropy and clemency but considers piety her chief virtue. The piety of imperial women is often demonstrated by

their building of churches. Eusebius (Vita Constantini 3.43) describes Helena's piety in building churches in the Holy Land. The whole world sings of the works of Anicia Juliana who in her piety expands the church of St. Polyeuctos (Anth. Gr. 1.10). For the church of St. Polyeuctos, see R.M. Harrison, Excavations at Sarayane in Istanbul (Princeton, New Jersey, 1986). Harrison considers that the building of the church was not motivated solely by religious zeal, but that it was intended to make an imperial and dynastic statement (see Harrison, pp. 419-420). Unfortunately Priscian gives us no details of the ways in which Ariadne manifested her piety, but there are several churches attributed to Anastasius and Ariadne which suggests that she carried on the building traditions of Helena and the Theodosian empresses (see R. Janin, La géographie ecclésiastique de l'Empire byzantin, vol. 2, Les églises et les monastères [Paris, 1953], pp. 133, 356, 501).

- 306: Cuius fama pia: Daniel the Stylite confirms Ariadne's reputation for piety: ". . . after her husband's [Zeno] death the Christ-loving Ariadne would reign over the empire because of her perfect faith in the God of her fathers" (V. Dan. Styl. 3.91, trans. Elizabeth Dawes and N.H. Baynes, Three Byzantine Saints [Oxford, 1948], p. 64).
- 307: Plus fecit quam quod sexus concesserat illi: exceptional women are often praised by men for overcoming the limitations

of their sex, for being almost masculine. Gregory of Nyssa said of his sister Macrina that she had gone beyond the nature of a woman (Vita S. Macrinae 1). The biographer of Melania the Younger described her as one who had overcome the limits of her sex and acquired a virile mentality (Vita S. Melaniae 39). Dedication to virginity or bravery in martyrdom could earn a woman such a tribute (see Jo Ann McNamara, "Sexual Equality and the Cult of Virginity in Early Christian Thought," Feminist Studies 3 [1976]: 145-158). Ariadne transcended her femininity by displaying the masculine virtue of wisdom or foresight (line 308) when she chose Anastasius as emperor.

308: Cum . . . profuit cf. Claudian De Bello Gild. 96: qui profuit orbi. Cum with a past tense of the indicative defines the time when the action of the main verb occurred. Ariadne overcame the limitations of her sex when she benefited the Roman world by her choice of Anastasius as emperor.

Lines 309-312: concluding prayer:

309-312: Menander Rhetor (377, trans. Russell and Wilson, p. 95) instructs the orator to conclude an imperial panegyric with a prayer "beseeching God that the emperor's reign may endure long, and the throne be handed down to his children and his descendants". Anastasius, of course, was childless and Procopius of Gaza adapted his panegyric to this circumstance by praying that Anastasius might always rule the empire of the

Romans and always have many good men administering the government (Pan. 30). Ennodius, on the other hand, could conclude his panegyric of Theodoric more conventionally: sed utinam aurei bona saeculi purpuratum ex te germen amplificet utinam heres regni in tuis sinibus ludat (Pan. 21). Priscian varies the formula by adding a prayer for the conquest and true submission of the barbarians.

310: Ausoniis . . . regnis: the adjective is ambiguous, probably deliberately so. Ausonia for Greek and Latin poets was another name for Italy; the adjective ausonius could mean "Italian" or have the more general sense of "Roman". It is the latter meaning which is employed in a contemporary Greek epigram (Anth. Gr. 16.350) celebrating the part played by the charioteer Prophyrius in the defeat of Vitalian in 515 (see Alan Cameron, Porphyrius, pp. 125-129) and the return of liberty to the inhabitants of the Roman empire.

Claudian uses ausonius in its more specific meaning of "Italian"; for example, cum ferus Ausonias perfringeret Hannibal arces (De Bello Goth. 386) and tunc sic Ausonium re-spectans aethera fatur (De VI Cons. Hon. 273). Cf. also Ennodius Pan. 6.22 and Cassiodorus Var. 1.45.4. Priscian's inclusion of the adjective in his prayer for the continuance of Anastasius' reign indicates that the ausoniis regnis refers to the Roman empire. However, the mention of barbarians in the following line suggests that Priscian may have intended

his audience also to think of the barbarian kingdoms of the west, especially Italy, ruled by Theodoric and his Ostrogoths, although still nominally part of the Roman Empire. It is suggestive that elsewhere in the poem Priscian uses Roman or Latin when he refers to the empire, cf. 250, Romanas leges; 276, leges latiae; 308, Romano orbi; 241, Romana potentia; 175, populo Latino; 86, Latinis; 62, Latiis regnis. Only here does ausonius with its specific connotation of "Italian" appear.

- 311: barbariae ferae: probably a reference to Vitalian and his barbarian troops, see note on line 299. Perhaps there is also a reference to Theodoric and the Ostrogoths in Italy, see note on line 310.

APPENDIX A

The Empress Ariadne

The empress Aelia¹ Ariadne was the elder daughter of the emperor Leo I and his wife Verina and was born sometime before Leo became emperor in 457.² In 468 when Leo was searching for allies to support him in his struggle against the powerful Barbarian magister utriusque militiae Aspar, he married Ariadne to Zeno, an Isaurian who held the office of comes domesticorum.³ Ariadne and Zeno had a son, Leo, who succeeded his grandfather as emperor when Leo I died in 574. After his accession, the young emperor, on the advice of his mother Ariadne, crowned his father Zeno as co-emperor.⁴ Not long after this event Leo died and Zeno became sole emperor.

Zeno's rule did not remain unchallenged for long. In 475 he was faced with the rebellion of Basiliscus, the brother of Verina, who was involved in the plot against her son-in-law.⁵ Zeno was forced into exile in his native Isauria where Ariadne accompanied him.⁶ Basiliscus only remained in power for a short time. The year 476 found Zeno and Ariadne returning in triumph to Constantinople. Though Basiliscus and his wife were eventually killed, Ariadne intervened to save the life of their son who was allowed to enter the church.⁷

Zeno's reign continued to be turbulent. In 479 Marcianus, husband of Ariadne's sister Leontia, led a revolt against Zeno.

Verina was apparently again involved in the rebellion and after its failure she was exiled to Isauria by Zeno on the advice of the influential Isaurian magister officiorum Illus. From her exile, Verina sent letters to Ariadne asking to be recalled. Ariadne applied to Zeno who in turn referred her to Illus. The magister officiorum refused to consider releasing Verina from exile, asking Ariadne if she wanted her mother to crown yet another emperor to oppose Zeno. Ariadne then seems to have returned to Zeno and issued an ultimatum: Zeno must choose between herself and Illus. Zeno answered that he would welcome any action she might take to get rid of the powerful Illus. The result of the whole episode was an attempted assassination of Illus in 481.⁸ Although the plot failed, Illus seems to have felt he would be better away from Constantinople. Zeno appointed Illus as the magister utriusque militiae per orientem, and he left the capital for the east. Illus openly rebelled against Zeno in 484 and he was joined by Verina who proclaimed Illus' ally Leontius emperor. Their bid for power failed and Verina died sometime during the course of the rebellion. Some years after her death Ariadne had her body brought back to Constantinople for burial.⁹

When Zeno died on April 9, 491, Ariadne had her chance to be kingmaker. She showed herself to be a much shrewder judge of men than her mother Verina. The day following Zeno's death, after the people and soldiers had gathered in the Hippodrome, Ariadne appeared to the crowd in the kathisma accompanied by the patriarch Euphemius. The people acclaimed the Augusta and demanded an orthodox emperor. In

response, Ariadne announced that she had ordered the officials and senate to elect a Christian emperor endowed with every imperial virtue. The army would ratify the choice and the election itself would take place in the presence of the patriarch and of the holy Gospels. The crowd then asked that the prefect of the city be replaced. Ariadne replied that she had anticipated their wish and that Julian would be appointed prefect. The empress then left the Hippodrome and the officials and senators debated as to who should succeed Zeno. When they were unable to agree, the praepositus sacri cubiculi Urbicius suggested that the choice be left to Ariadne. Summoned by the officials Ariadne named the silentarius Anastasius as emperor. He was crowned by the patriarch on April 11, 491 and he married Ariadne shortly afterwards on May 20.¹⁰

Military affairs dominate the first part of Anastasius' reign and Ariadne disappears from the sources until the accounts of the religious controversies of the years 511 and 512. The few references to the empress in this context suggest that Ariadne was Chalcedonian in sympathy. During the period when the emperor was trying to rid himself of the patriarch Macedonius, we know that Ariadne and a number of important senators were disturbed by the attacks on the patriarch.¹¹ When the Chalcedonian monk St. Saba came to Constantinople in the winter of 511-512, he visited Ariadne, blessed her and urged her to guard the faith of her father Leo. Ariadne replied that he spoke well, if only Anastasius would hear.¹² Finally at the time of the Trisagion riots in 512, when Anastasius fled to

Blachernae for safety, we learn that Ariadne took him severely to task for his behaviour.¹³ We then hear no more of the empress until the notices of her death in 515.¹⁴

As is the case with his praise of her husband Anastasius, Priscian's brief encomium of the empress adds no new details to the known facts of Ariadne's life: he refers, in fact, only to her choice of Anastasius as Zeno's successor. As we have seen, the panegyrist is concerned to present an image of the emperor appropriate to a particular set of circumstance and one which will enhance the emperor's prestige. To serve his purpose Priscian, in support of Anastasius, evokes an image of the empress which is not one shaped by circumstance, but an image which utilizes generally accepted views of the nature of the role and powers of the empress.

In the late empire, the empress was recognized as sharing in the imperial power of the emperor. This concept of shared power was reflected on coins and in works of art in which the iconography of the empress became identical with that of the emperor since both display the imperial regalia of diadem and paludamentum. Daniel the Stylite's prediction that "the Christ-loving Ariadne would reign over the Empire because of her perfect faith in the God of her fathers" and that Anastasius would reign with her puts forward the same idea.¹⁵ Yet although the empress could reign, she could not rule. In her the imperial power was passive; her role, to confer legitimacy through marriage and the birth of heirs, was dynastic. To this dynastic role was added a religious one. With the triumph of Christianity, there

developed the idea that the empress, through her virtues and her piety, manifested in charity, church building and the veneration of relics, helped to secure the protection of God for the empire.¹⁶

Many empresses of the late empire conformed to this concept of the empress' role. A few, because of personality, desire and circumstance, were able to transcend the view that their power was equal but operated in a different sphere from that of the emperor and translate their latent power into active influence so that they took part in forming policy and in ruling the empire. Pulcheria, the virgin sister of Theodosius II, directed the affairs of the empire for much of his reign and after his death she married and then crowned his successor Marcian.¹⁷ Equally important and influential was Sophia, the wife of the emperor Justin the second, and she too chose a successor to the throne.¹⁸ Because of the circumstance of Zeno's death without an heir-designate, Ariadne also had the opportunity to exercise her power in the selection of the next emperor and to confirm his position through marriage. But for some reason, perhaps lack of ambition or the unfortunate example of her mother, perhaps confidence in the ability of her choice,¹⁹ Ariadne, after stepping forward to fulfill her dynastic function, seems to have remained in the background after the accession of Anastasius.²⁰

To a poet concerned to establish the legitimacy of Anastasius' rule, Ariadne's actual political influence and activities were not important. A panegyrist is primarily interested not in an historical account of actions, but in actions as symbols, and by virtue of her

acknowledge dynastic and religious roles, a Byzantine empress was a potent symbol of divinely sanctioned imperial power. It is as such a symbol that Ariadne is depicted in the art of the period. Two diptychs show Ariadne as an icon of imperial power surrounded by symbols of triumph and majesty, a domed baldachin, eagles, a laurel wreath, the imperial regalia of diadem and embroidered, pearl-edged paludamentum, sceptre and an orb surmounted by a cross.²¹

Priscian had no precedent for presenting the empress as a symbol of imperial power in the rhetorical tradition of imperial panegyric, which sanctioned mention of the empress only as a reflection of her husband's virtues and of their relationship as evidence of the emperor's temperance.²² That Priscian does praise Ariadne as a separate entity and departs from the traditions of his genre to place this praise in an unexpected and prominent position at the close of the panegyric, testifies to the growing importance of the empress as a symbol, a symbol which the poet wants to summon in support of the emperor's right to rule.

Priscian does not give us the verbal equivalent of the diptychs and describe a bejewelled empress in a palatial setting. Instead of a visual symbol of power, Priscian evokes the two roles which gave the symbol its validity and force. He reminds his audience of the empress' dynastic power which Ariadne used to select Anastasius as emperor: patrium munit tam firmo principe regnum (line 303). He then recalls the religious role of helping to ensure divine support for the regime by praising Ariadne's virtue and the fame of her piety

(lines 305-306). Only one line of the passage conveys something of impact of the diptychs: Auctor quae fuerat tantorum et causa bonorum (line 302). By describing Ariadne as auctor and causa in the first line of his praise of her, Priscian imparts to Ariadne some of the static and unchanging quality of the diptychs along with a sense of her position as separate from and above the rest of humanity.

Priscian's language in the rest of the passage in praise of Ariadne suggests something of the ambiguity inherent in the position of the empress, who possessed power but who, in theory at any rate, did not translate that power into active rule. Priscian chooses the strong verb munit to describe Ariadne's selection of Anastasius as emperor (line 303), but follows it with permittit . . . sese as, her choice made, Ariadne entrusts the world and herself to her husband. Ariadne displays not only the virtues of chastity and piety expected of an empress,²³ but also the masculine virtue of foresight which enabled her to overcome the limitations of her sex to benefit the Roman world (lines 305-308).

Unlike empresses such as Pulcheria and Sophia, Ariadne seems not to have taken advantage of the ambivalent role of the empress to convey her latent power into active influence on religious and political affairs. Her career, as a consequence, was less spectacular than theirs, her name little known to posterity. Yet through Priscian's words in her praise we can see the potency of the empress as a symbol of imperial power.

ENDNOTES

¹The nomen Aelia, adopted by both Verina and Ariadne, and also by the wife of the usurper Basiliscus, provided a link with the Theodosian dynasty. Originally the nomen of Flacilla, who became the wife of the emperor Theodosius I, Aelia became a title passed on to all the Theodosian empresses (see Kenneth Holm, Theodosian Empresses, Women and Imperial Dominion in Late Antiquity [Berkeley, 1982], p. 22).

²In 479 Marcianus justified his revolt against the emperor Zenon on the grounds that his wife Leontia, Ariadne's sister, had been born when Leo was emperor while Ariadne had been born before Leo's elevation to the purple (Theophanes AM 5971).

³For the early career of Zeno and the evidence for the date of the marriage, see Norman Baynes, "The Vita S. Danielis Stylitae," English Historical Review 40 (1925): 397-402.

⁴Theophanes (AM 5966) records that both Verina and Ariadne supported the accession of Zeno. John Malalas (378) says that Ariadne alone advised his coronation.

⁵Verina seems to have intended to depose Zeno and make her lover Patricius emperor. However, Basiliscus who was involved in the plot out-manoeuvred his sister and had himself proclaimed emperor. Patricius was killed (John of Antioch fr. 210).

⁶There are two versions of Ariadne's departure from Constantinople. John Malalas (378) says that Ariadne fled from her mother secretly and went to join her husband. Theophanes (AM 5967) claims that Zeno took Ariadne and a supply of money with him into exile. Both accounts suggest that Ariadne was important in establishing Zeno's right to the throne.

⁷Basiliscus' unpopularity stemmed largely from his religious policy. He was a Monophysite and issued a decree condemning the council of Chalcedon (Evagrius Ecc. Hist. 3.4). Accounts of Basiliscus' exile and death can be found in a number of sources including Anonymus Valesianus 9.43; Marcellinus comes s.a. 476; Evagrius Ecc. Hist. 3.8. For the fate of his son, see Theophanes AM 5969.

⁸Details of Verina's exile, Ariadne's quarrel with Illus and the assassination attempt are recorded by John Malalas 387 and Theophanes AM 5972.

⁹An excellent account of Illus rebellion and Verina's part in it can be found in Brooks, The Emperor Zeno, pp. 222-230. For

Verina's death and burial, see Theophanes AM 5975; John Malalas 389, John of Antioch fr. 214 6 and 214 12.

¹⁰ A full description of the events leading to Anastasius' accession and of his coronation is preserved in Constantine Porphyrogenitus De Cer. 1.92. See also A.E.R. Boak, "Imperial Coronation Ceremonies of the Fifth and Sixth Centuries," Harvard Studies in Classical Philology 30 (1919): 37-47 and F.E. Brightman, "Byzantine Imperial Coronations," Journal of Theological Studies 2 (1910): 359-392.

¹¹ Theophanes AM 6004.

¹² Cyril of Scythopolis Vita Sabae 53

¹³ Theophanes AM 6005.

¹⁴ Marcellinus comes s.a. 515; Victor Tonnennensis s.a. 515; Theophanes AM 6008.

¹⁵ V. Dan. Styl. 92, trans. Dawes and Baynes, p. 64.

¹⁶ For the concept of shared power, the development of the iconography of the empress in the late empire and the religious role of the empress, see Holum, Theodosian Emperresses, pp. 21-44.

¹⁷ A detailed account of Pulcheria's career is given by Holum, Theodosian Emperresses, pp. 79-111 and 217-228.

¹⁸ For Sophia, see Averil Cameron, "The Empress Sophia," Byzantion 45 (1975): 5-21.

¹⁹ Ariadne was apparently well acquainted with Anastasius before she chose him as emperor (Zacharias Rhetor Hist. Ecc. 7.1)

²⁰ A number of stories suggest that Ariadne in fact had little influence with her husband. Her relative Diogenianus was exiled by Anastasius (Theophanes AM 6011). Anastasius apparently denied Ariadne's request that Anthemius be made praetorian prefect (John Lydus De Mag. 3.50). Ariadne's liking for the patriarch Macedonius could not prevent his deposition and exile (Theophanes AM 6004).

²¹ The two diptychs are very similar in their depiction of the empress though the one in Vienna shows Ariadne seated, the other, in Florence, has her standing. The diptychs and their symbolism are discussed by R. Delbrueck, Die Consulardiptychen und verwandte Denkmäler (Berlin, 1929), nos. 50 and 52 and W.F. Volbach, Elfenbeinarbeiten der Spätantike und des frühen Mittelalters, 3rd ed. (Mainz, 1976), nos. 51 and 52. See also, Weitzmann, Age of Spirituality, pp. 31-32 and MacCormack, Art and Ceremony, pp. 257-258.

²² See commentary, note on lines 301-308.

²³ For the virtues of the empress, see Holum, Theodosian Empresses, pp. 50-58.

Appendix B: The Rhetorical Structure of the Panegyrics of Priscian and Procopius of Gaza

	Menander Rhetor	Procopius of Gaza	Priscian
1. Introduction	<p>a. An imperial panegyric presents only the good features of the subject (368.1-8).</p> <p>b. Such is the grandeur of the subject, the orator's task is difficult (368.9-15).</p> <p>c. It is necessary to speak in praise of emperors in return for blessings received (368.15-21).</p> <p>d. The orator should amplify his subject by examples (369.1-7).</p>	<p>a. The city of Gaza is at a loss to return adequate thanks for the emperor's gifts (Pan. 1).</p> <p>b. The city receives an image of her benefactor and rejoices in the sight (Pan. 1).</p> <p>c. The city, represented by the orator, is moved to offer deserved thanks to the emperor (Pan. 1).</p> <p>d. The greatness of the emperor's deeds grants facility to the orator and raises his speech to the sublime (Pan. 1). (cf. De laude Anastasii) (Pan. 1).</p> <p>e. Overcome by the abundance of material the orator is like a person in a meadow where everything is beautiful so that he doesn't know what to pick.</p>	<p>a. The poet will speak only the truth (praef. 1-10).</p> <p>b. The poet is unable to praise all the emperor's deeds; he will speak what his strength and ability allow (praef. 11-18).</p> <p>c. With the help of God the poet will praise the emperor (praef. 18-22).</p> <p>d. The poet asks the emperor to listen to his song with a merciful heart (1-3).</p> <p>e. The poet offers to the emperor a song such as he is accustomed to offer to God (4-7).</p>

	<p>e. In a second preface the orator can add that Homer and Orpheus would be needed to praise the emperor as he deserves (369.7-13).</p>		
	<p>f. The orator should provide a transition to the main speech (369.13-17).</p>	<p>f. The orator will attempt a task beyond his strength but hopes his zeal will excuse his boldness (Pan. 1).</p>	<p>f. The poet will boldly celebrate the praises of the emperor (8-9).</p>
<p>2. Native City or Nation</p>	<p>The orator should give a brief account of the emperor's native city if it is famous (369.17-27). If the city is not famous he must associate the emperor with the outstanding virtues of his nation or race as a whole, giving historical examples if possible (369.28-370.8).</p>	<p>Fortune, as was fitting, gave Anastasius a native city surpassing others in prosperity. Epidamnum projects into the sea and enjoys the benefits of land and sea. Epidamnum gave the city his name. Athenians, Corinthians and Spartans contributed to the city and adorned it with their virtues and divine ancestry (Pan. 2).</p>	
<p>3. Family</p>	<p>The orator should praise the emperor's family if it adds to his prestige. If not he should begin with the emperor himself, perhaps claiming divine ancestry for the emperor (370.8-371.3).</p>		<p>Anastasius is descended from Pompey the Great whose military achievements he has surpassed by conquering the Isaurians (10-18).</p>
<p>4. Birth</p>	<p>The orator should recall any miraculous happenings or omens which accompanied the birth of the emperor. If it is possible to do it convincingly he should invent such signs since the audience must accept his words (371.3-17).</p>		

5. Nurture and Education	The orator should indicate whether the emperor was born to the purple or became emperor by chance. He should praise his education and the subjects he excelled in. Mythological comparisons such as Achilles and Chiron should be included (371.17-372.2).	By such men (the people of Epidamrus with their virtues and divine ancestry) Anastasius was born and nourished as befits one who was to excel greatly in all things (Pan. 3).	
6. Accomplishments	The orator can include virtues and qualities possessed by the emperor in youth which showed his character and add comparisons to historical and mythological figures (372.2-13).	Anastasius considered that piety was the essential foundation for the good life and made the possession of piety his goal. He was so successful that his piety drew him toward the priesthood (Pan. 3). However, although priesthood was an honour due his virtue, Anastasius was saved for a higher honour and the service of all men. Anastasius desired piety because all other virtues would follow. And indeed he is benevolent, wise and prudent (Pan. 4).	
7. Deeds in War	a. Each major section of a panegyric should have a separate introduction, and each section should include a comparison (372.14-25).	a. When Anastasius begins to rule conditions in the empire change for the better. He gives freedom from greed and treachery (Pan. 6). Anastasius is elected emperor by people, senate and empress because of his virtue, not his birth (Pan. 6).	a. When the Isaurians were in power, the people suffered grievously from the Isaurians' perversion and corruption of justice and from their avarice which was so great that rich and poor suffered alike (19-37). God delivered the world from suffering when He gave it Anastasius as emperor. Anastasius possesses and surpasses all the imperial virtues of earlier emperors (38-49).

	<p>b. The orator should first consider the actions which display the emperor's courage in war, his wisdom in conducting the war. Under these heading the orator can include descriptions of places, battles, the emperor's armour and engagements and also insert speeches to relieve tension. (372.25-374.20).</p>	<p>b. Anastasius drives out everything Foreign and barbarous from the empire. He defeats the Arab nomads who have been plundering towns in the eastern provinces. The emperor. He has city walls built and repaired and forts constructed. He displays firm government and a vigorous army to the barbarians (Pan. 7). Anastasius also cleanses the empire of rebels to restore order and harmony (Pan. 8). The Isaurians grow rash and haughty compelling the empire to a just wrath (Pan. 9).</p>	<p>Anastasius orders the Isaurians from Constantinople but intends no harm to them. God inflicts them with madness and urges them to war to punish them for their crimes. The Isaurians are defeated by the brave and loyal army of the emperor (50-67). Anastasius is compared to a lion (67-76). Anastasius is compared to Bellerophon and Servilius Isauricus (80-86). Despite their great resources the Isaurians are reduced to famine and death (87-97). God sends a storm to wreck the Isaurian fleet (98-111). The rivers run red with blood and are choked with corpses (112-118). The Isaurian cities are destroyed and in their plight the survivors acknowledge that God has punished them justly (119-129).</p>
	<p>c. The orator should praise the humanity of the emperor in his treatment of the defeated (374.20-375.6).</p>	<p>c. Anastasius conquers the Isaurians first by his courage and skills as a general. Then he conquers them by his clemency. Like a father he teaches them prudence and builds them a city. Thus Anastasius surpasses Alexander in kingly spirit (Pan. 10).</p>	<p>c. Anastasius shows mercy to the Isaurians. He restores confidence and prosperity to the empire as a whole (130-139).</p>
<p>8. Deeds in Peace</p>	<p>Praise of the deeds in time of peace should be divided according to the cardinal virtues.</p>	<p>Introduction. There are two seasons among men war and peace and Anastasius' virtues are admired both in times of peace and war (Pan. 11).</p>	<p>Introduction. Anastasius accomplishments are so many and so glorious that the poet can only give the highlights (140-148).</p>

<p>a. Justice</p>	<p>The orator should praise the emperor's clemency and his accessibility to his subjects.</p> <p>The emperor provides just governors and guardians of the law who revere justice and are not mere gatherers of wealth.</p> <p>The emperor is concerned to ease the financial burdens of his subjects.</p> <p>He gives just laws and strikes out those that are not fair (375.0-376.2).</p>	<p>Anastasius rules so that greed does not corrupt justice. The man rich in virtue, not gold, receives judgement. Anastasius is greater than Lysander the Spartan (Pan. 12).</p> <p>Anastasius abolishes the chrysaeryron and burns the records as his ancestor Herakles did the heads of the Hydra (Pan. 13).</p> <p>In removing this tax completely Anastasius surpasses the deeds of Aristides and Pisisstratus (Pan. 14).</p>	<p>Anastasius celebrates a triumph over the captured Isaurian leaders. He is compared to Aemilius Paulus (171-179).</p>
		<p>Anastasius bans the venationes (Pan. 15) and the pantomime. Now the cities of the empire are safe (Pan. 16).</p> <p>Anastasius displays generosity to individual cities as well as to the empire as a whole (Pan. 17).</p> <p>He builds aqueducts (Pan. 18), a harbour at Caesarea (Pan. 19), repairs the Pharos at Alexandria (Pan. 20) and builds the Long Wall in Thrace (Pan. 21).</p> <p>Anastasius is merciful and listens to petitions. He guards the citizens against barbarians and wrongdoers.</p> <p>In his kindness he gives justice to his subjects and makes fitting laws.</p> <p>Because of their righteous fear of the emperor, his subjects' business contracts are just, their marriages chaste, their children legitimate (Pan. 22).</p>	
			<p>Justice returns to the world under Anastasius' rule. He restores cities, walls and harbours (180-192).</p> <p>Anastasius prevents extortion on the part of officials and helps the farmers.</p> <p>He is the image of the heavenly judge. He is not avaricious. Under him the army is strong (193-208).</p>

b. Temperance	<p>Temperance is close to justice. Because his subjects take the emperor's life as their example, marriages are chaste, children are legitimate and festivals and spectacles are conducted with splendour, but also with moderation.</p>	<p>Like Joseph, Anastasius administers the grain supply with foresight and checks the wasteful habits of the cities (206-217). He has abolished civil discord and banned the venationes (218-227). He is generous even to the undeserving (228-238).</p>	
	<p>Anastasius' life is a living example of moderation to his subjects. He has one wife, the companion of his life and thoughts, and he admires no other woman (Pan. 23).</p>		
c. Wisdom	<p>If the empress is a worthy lady, the orator should mention her at this point. The emperor loves and admires only her (376.2-13).</p>		
	<p>Praise of the emperor's wisdom should begin with a suitable introduction. It is this virtue which enables the emperor to utilize his other virtues successfully. (376.13-23)</p>	<p>Anastasius wisely chooses learned men as his associates in government and grants them many benefits (239-253).</p>	
9. Fortune	<p>Because of his fortune the emperor succeeds in all things. He has children, friends and loyal troops (376.24-31).</p>	<p>Because of Anastasius' virtues God protects the empire from his enemies (254-269). God saved the emperor from death at sea as He saved the pious men of earlier times (270-289). The poet praises Anastasius' brother Paulus and his nephew Hypatius (290-300). The poet praises the empress Ariadne (301-308).</p>	

10. Complete Comparison	<p>The orator should make a comparison of the emperor's reign with preceding reigns, granting greatness to the past but perfection to the present (376.31-377.10).</p>	<p>Anastasius is compared to Cyrus who reduced his subjects to servitude. Anastasius frees his subjects from tribute and there is liberty for all to obey his benevolent commands (Pan. 25).</p> <p>Anastasius is compared to the Spartan King Agesilaos. Like Agesilaos Anastasius has taught the barbarians moderation and his removed the disease of rebellion from his land (Pan. 26).</p> <p>Anastasius is like Alexander in his judgement, his generosity, and his moderation (Pan. 27).</p>
11. Conclusion	<p>The orator should mention the prosperity of the cities, their markets and their festivals.</p> <p>The sea is sailed without danger.</p> <p>Piety towards the gods increases.</p> <p>Neither barbarians nor other enemies are feared.</p> <p>All safety and abundance come from the emperor's justice. In return all cities and nations honour him with songs of praise and images.</p> <p>The panegyric should end with a prayer that the emperor's reign be long and his throne pass to his descendants (377.10-30).</p>	<p>Because of Anastasius the cities are prosperous, peace causes them to flourish.</p> <p>War and sedition have been driven out.</p> <p>Merchants sail without danger.</p> <p>Helmet, sword and spear are made into ploughs (Pan. 28).</p> <p>All things advance according to nature.</p> <p>God is good and is honoured with pious deeds.</p> <p>Cities are adorned with statues honouring the emperor. Speeches honour the statues (Pan. 29).</p> <p>May Anastasius always rule the empire. The cities in their good fortune weave garlands, dedicate tablets and delight in songs in his honour (Pan. 30).</p> <p>May God preserve Anastasius' gifts for the empire and may the barbarians be conquered (309-312).</p>

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

- Anonymus Valesianus. Edited by Th. Mommsen. Monumenta Germaniae Historica (Auctores Antiquissimi). Vol. 9, part 1. Berlin, 1892.
- Athanasius. The Conflict of Severus, Patriarch of Antioch. Translated by Edgar J. Goodspeed. Patrologia Orientalis. Vol. 4. Paris, 1908.
- Avitus. Opera. Ed. by R. Peiper. Monumenta Germaniae Historica (Auctores Antiquissimi). Vol. 6, part 2. Berlin, 1883.
- Candidus. Edited by C. Müller. Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum. Vol. 4. Paris, 1851.
- Cassiodorus. Variae. Edited by Th. Mommsen. Monumenta Germaniae Historica (Auctores Antiquissimi). Vol. 12. Berlin, 1894.
- Cedrenus, George. Historiarum Compendium. Edited by Emmanuel Bekker. Bonn, 1838.
- Chronicon Paschale. Edited by L. Dindorf. Bonn, 1832.
- Claudius Marius Victor. Alethia. Edited by P.F. Hovingh. Corpus Christianorum, series Latina. Vol. 98. Turnholt, 1960.
- Codex Iustinianus. Edited by P. Kruger. Berlin, 1929.
- Codex Theodosianus. Edited by Th. Mommsen and P. Kruger. Berlin, 1905.
- Constantine Porphyrogenitus. De Cerimoniis Aulae Byzantinae. Edited by J.J. Reiske. Bonn, 1829-30.
- Corippus. Iohannidos seu de bellis Libycis libri viii. Edited by J. Patsch. Monumenta Germaniae Historica (Auctores Antiquissimi). Vol. 3. Berlin, 1897.
- Cyprianus Gallus. Heptateuchos. Edited by R. Peiper. Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum. Vol. 23. Vienna, 1881.
- Cyril of Scythopolis. Vita Sabae. Edited by E. Schwartz. Leipzig, 1939.

- Ennodius. Opera. Edited by F. Vogel. Monumenta Germaniae Historica (Auctores Antiquissimi). Vol. 7. Berlin, 1885.
- Eunapius. Edited by C. Müller. Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum. Vol. 4. Paris, 1851.
- Eusebius of Caesarea. Historia Ecclesiastica. Edited by E. Schwartz. Die Griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte. Vol. 9. Leipzig, 1903-1909.
- _____. Vita Constantini. Edited by F. Winkelmann. Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte. Vol. 57. Berlin, 1975.
- Evagrius. Ecclesiastical History. Edited by J. Bidez and L. Parmentier. London, 1898.
- Excerpta historica iussu imp. Constantini Porphyrogeniti confecta. Edited by U.P. Boissevain, C. de Boor and Th. Büttner-Wobst. Leipzig, 1903-1910.
- Gregory of Nyssa. Vita S. Macrinae. Edited and translated by P. Maraval. Sources chretiennes 178. Paris, 1971.
- Jerome. Epistulae. Edited by I. Hilberg. Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum. Vols. 54-56. Vienna, 1910-1919.
- John of Antioch. Fragments. Edited by C. Müller. Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum. Vols. 4 and 5. Paris, 1851 and 1870.
- John Lydus. De Magistratibus populi Romani. Edited by R. Wunsch. Leipzig, 1903.
- John Malalas. Chronographia. Edited by L. Dindorf. Bonn, 1831.
- John of Nikiu. Chronicle. Translated by R.H. Charles. London, 1916.
- Jordanes. Getica. Edited by Th. Mommsen. Monumenta Germaniae Historica (Auctores Antiquissimi). Vol. 5. Berlin, 1882.
- _____. Romana. Edited by Th. Mommsen. Monumenta Germaniae Historica (Auctores Antiquissimi). Vol. 5. Berlin, 1882.
- Joshua the Stylite. Chronicle. Translated by W. Wright. Cambridge, 1882; reprint, Amsterdam, 1968.
- Libanius. Opera. Edited by R. Foerster. Leipzig, 1903-1927.
- Malchus. Fragments. Edited by C. Müller. Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum. Vol. 4. Paris, 1851.

- Menander Rhetor. Edited and translated by D.A. Russell and N.G. Wilson. Oxford, 1981.
- Marcellinus comes. Chronicle. Edited by Th. Mommsen. Monumenta Germaniae Historica (Auctores Antiquissimi). Vol. 11. Berlin, 1984.
- Panegyrici Latini. Edited by E. Galletier. Paris, 1949-1955.
- _____: Edited by R.A.B. Mynors. Oxford, 1964.
- Paul the Deacon. Historia Langobardorum. Edited by L. Bethmann and G. Waitz. Monumenta Germaniae Historica (Scriptores rerum Langobardicarum). Berlin, 1878.
- Procopius of Caesarea. Opera. Edited by J. Haury and G. Wirth. Leipzig, 1962-1964.
- Procopius of Gaza. Panegyricus in imperatorum Anastasium. Edited by K. Kempen. Bonn, 1918.
- Sedulius. Carmen Paschale. Edited by J. Huemer, Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum. Vol. 10. Vienna, 1885.
- Severus of Antioch. Epistulae. Edited and translated by E.W. Brooks. Patrologia Orientalis. Vols. 12 and 14. Paris, 1915 and 1919.
- _____. Hymns. Edited and translated by E.W. Brooks, Patrologia Orientalis. Vols. 6 and 7. Paris, 1911.
- Sextus Aurelius Victor. Liber de Caesaribus. Edited by Pierre Dufraigne. Paris, 1975.
- Socrates. Ecclesiastical History. Translated by A.C. Zenos. Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, second series. Vol. 2. Grand Rapids, Mich., 1957.
- _____. Historia Ecclesiastica. Edited by W. Bright. Oxford, 1878.
- Sozomen. Ecclesiastical History. Translated by Chester D. Hartranft. Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, second series. Vol. 2. Grand Rapids, Mich., 1957.
- _____. Historia Ecclesiastica. Edited by J. Bidez and G.G. Hansen. Die Griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte. Vol. 50. Berlin, 1960.
- Suidas. Lexicon. Edited by A. Adler. Leipzig, 1928-1938.

- Symmachus. Opera. Edited by O. Seeck. Monumenta Germaniae Historica (Auctores Antiquissimi). Vol. 6.1. Berlin, 1883.
- Synesius. De Regno. Translated by Augustine Fitzgerald. In The Essays and Hymns of Synesius of Cyrene. Vol. 1. London, 1930.
- _____. Hymni et Opuscula. Edited by N. Terzaghi. Rome, 1944.
- Theodore Lector. Epitome Historiae Ecclesiasticae. Edited by G.C. Hanson. Die Griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte. Vol. 54. Berlin, 1971.
- Theodoret. Epistulae. Edited by Y. Azema. Sources chrétiennes. Vols. 40, 98, 111. Paris, 1955, 1964, 1965.
- Theophanes. Chronographia. Edited by C. de Boor. Leipzig, 1883.
- Victor Tonnennensis. Chronicle. Edited by Th. Mommsen. Monumenta Germaniae Historica (Auctores Antiquissimi). Vol. 11. Berlin, 1894.
- Victor Vitensis. Historia Persecutionis Africanae provinciae. Edited by C. Helm. Monumenta Germaniae Historica (Auctores Antiquissimi). Vol. 3. Berlin, 1879.
- Vita S. Danielis Stylitae. Edited by H. Delehaye. In Les saints stylites. Brussels, 1923.
- Vita S. Melaniae. Edited and translated by D. Gorce. Sources chrétiennes. Vol. 90. Paris, 1962.
- Zacharias Rhetor. Historia ecclesiastica. Edited and translated in Latin by E.W. Brooks. Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium (Scriptores Syri). Vol 3, 5-6. Louvain, 1924.
- _____. The Syriac Chronicle known as that of Zachariah of Mitylene. Translated by F.J. Hamilton and E.W. Brooks. London, 1899.
- _____. Vita Severi. Edited and translated by M.A. Kugener. Patrologia Orientalis. Vol. 2. Paris, 1907.
- Zonaras. Epitome historiarum. Edited by Th. Büttner-Wobst. Bonn, 1897.
- Zosimus. Historia Nova. 3 vols. Edited by F. Paschoud. Paris, 1971 and 1979.
- _____. New History. Translated by Ronald T. Ridley. Canberra, 1982.

Secondary Sources

- Alexander, Paul J. The Oracle of Baalbek. Washington, D.C., 1967.
- Alföldi, A. Die monarchischen Repräsentation in römischen Kaiserreiche. Darmstadt, 1970.
- Auerbach, E. Literary Language and its Public in Late Latin Antiquity and in the Middle Ages. New York, 1965.
- Baldwin, B. "Vergil in Byzantium." Antike und Abenland 28 (1982), 81-93.
- Barker, E. Social and Political Thought in Byzantium from Justinian to the Last Paleologus. Oxford, 1957.
- Barnea, I. "Contributions to Dobrudja History under Anastasius I." Dacia, n.s. 4 (1960), 363-373.
- Baynes, N.H. "Eusebius and the Christian Empire." In his Byzantine Studies and Other Essays, pp. 168-172. London, 1955.
- Baynes, N.H. "The Vita S. Danielis Stylitae." English Historical Review 40 (1925), 397-402.
- Babelon, J. "La theme iconographique de la violence." In Studies Presented to D.M. Robinson, 2: 278-288. Edited by George Mylonas and Doris Raymond. St. Louis, Missouri, 1953.
- Beckwith, John. The Art of Constantinople. London, 1968.
- Blaise, A. Le vocabulaire latin des principaux themes liturgiques. Turnhout, 1960.
- Blockley, R.C. "The Panegyric of Claudius Mamertinus on the Emperor Julian." American Journal of Philology 93 (1972), 437-450.
- Boak, A.E.R. "Imperial Coronation Ceremonies of the Fifth and Sixth Centuries." Harvard Studies in Classical Philology 30 (1919), 37-47.
- Born, L.K. "The Perfect Prince According to the Latin Panegyrists." American Journal of Philology 55 (1934), 20-35.
- Brehier, L. Les institutions de l'empire byzantin. Paris, 1970.
- Brightman, F.E. "Byzantine Imperial Coronations." Journal of Theological Studies 2 (1901), 353-392.

- _____. Liturgies Eastern and Western. Vol. 1, Eastern Liturgies. Oxford, 1896.
- Brooks, E.W. "The Emperor Zenon and the Isaurians." English Historical Review 8 (1893), 209-238.
- Brown, Peter. "Eastern and Western Christendom in late Antiquity: a parting of the ways." Studies in Church History 13 (1976), 1-24.
- Browning, R. Studies in Byzantine History, Literature and Education. London, 1977.
- Burdeau, Francois. "L'empereur d'après les panégyriques latins." In Aspects de l'empire romain, pp. 1-60. Edited by F. Burdeau, N. Charbond, and M. Humbert. Paris, 1964.
- Burgess, T.C. Epidictic Literature. Chicago, 1902.
- Bury, J.B. History of the Later Roman Empire from the Death of Theodosius I to the Death of Justinian (A.D. 395 to A.D. 565). London, 1923.
- Cameron, Alan. Circus Factions. Blues and Greens at Rome and Byzantium. Oxford, 1976.
- _____. Claudian, Poetry and Propaganda at the Court of Honorius. Oxford, 1970.
- _____. "The Date of Priscian's De laude Anastasii." Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies 15 (1974), 313-316.
- _____. "The Date of Zosimus' New History." Philologus 113 (1969), 106-110.
- _____. "The Empress and the Poet." Yale Classical Studies 27 (1982), 217-89.
- _____. "Pap. Ant. III.115 and the Iambic Prologue in late Greek Poetry." Classical Quarterly 20 (1970), 119-129.
- _____. Porphyrius the Charioteer. Oxford, 1973.
- _____. "Some Prefects Called Julian." Byzantion 47 (1977), 42-64.
- _____. "The Vergilian Cliché of the Hundred Mouths in Corippus." Philologus 3 (1967), 308-309.
- _____. "The Wandering Poets: A Literary Movement in Byzantine Egypt." Historia 14 (1965), 470-509.

Cameron, Averil. Agathias. Oxford, 1970.

_____. "The Early Religious Policies of Justin II." Studies in Church History 13 (1976), 51-67.

_____. "The Empress Sophia." Byzantion 45 (1975), 5-21.

_____. Flavius Cresconius Corippus, In laudem Iustini Augusti minoris. London, 1976.

_____. "Images of Authority: Elites & Icons in Late Sixth-Century Byzantium." Past & Present 84 (1979), 3-35.

_____. Procopius and the sixth century. Berkeley, 1985.

Cameron, Averil and Alan. "The Cycle of Agathias." Journal of Hellenic Studies 86 (1966), 6-25.

Capizzi, C. L'imperatore Anastasio I (491-518). Orientalia Christiana Analecta 184. Rome, 1969.

Carney, T.F. Bureaucracy in Traditional Society. Romano - Byzantine Bureaucracies Viewed From Within. Lawrence, Kansas, 1974.

Caspar, E.L.E. Geschichte des Papstums. Vol. 2. Tübingen, 1930-1933.

Cernousov, E. "Des Evagrius Scholastikos Kirchengeschichte als eine Quelle für die Zeit Anastasios I Dikoros." Byzantinische Zeitschrift 17 (1927), 29-34.

_____. "Études sur Malalas. Époque d'Anastase Dikoros." Byzantion 3 (1926), 65-72.

Chadwick, Henry. Boethius. The Consolations of Music, Logic, Theology, and Philosophy. Oxford, 1981.

Charanis, P. Church and State in the Later Roman Empire: the religious policy of Anastasius the First, 491-518. Madison, Wisconsin, 1939.

_____. "Coronation and its Constitutional Significance in the Later Roman Empire." Byzantion 15 (1940-1941), 49-66.

Charlesworth, M.P. "The Virtues of a Roman Emperor: Propaganda and the Creation of Belief." Proceedings of the British Academy 23 (1937), 105-133.

Chastagnol, André. Le Sénat Romain sous le règne d'Odoacre. Recherches sur l'épigraphie du Colisée au v^e siècle. Bonn, 1966.

- _____. "Zosime II, 38 et l'Histoire Auguste." In Bonner Historia-Augusta-Colloquium 1964/1965, pp. 43-78. Bonn, 1966.
- Chauvot, A. "Observations sur la date de l'éloge d'Anastase de Priscien de Césarée." Latomus 36 (1977), 539-550.
- _____. Procopé de Gaza, Priscien de Césarée, Panégyriques de l'empereur Anastase Ier. Bonn, 1986.
- Chesnut, G.F. The First Christian Histories, Eusebius, Socrates, Sozomen, Théodoret and Evagrius. Paris, 1977.
- Clover, F.M. Flavius Merobaudes. A translation and historical commentary. Transactions of the American Philosophical Society 61, 1 (1971).
- Coleman-Norton, P.R. Roman State and Christian Church. London, 1966.
- Collot, C. "La pratique et l'institution du suffragium au Bas-Empire." Revue Historique de droit français et étranger 43 (1965), 185-221.
- Constantelos, D.J. Byzantine Philanthropy and Social Welfare. New Brunswick, New Jersey, 1968.
- Corpet, E.F. Poesies de Priscien: La Périégese. Les poids et mesures. Eloge de l'empereur Anastase. Paris, 1845.
- Costanza, S. "Orientamenti cristini della Storiografia di Agatia." Helikon 2 (1962), 90-111.
- Courcelle, P. "Histoire du cliché virgilien des cent bouches." Revue des Études Latines 33 (1955), 231-243.
- _____. Histoire littéraire des grandes invasions germaniques. Paris, 1964.
- _____. Late Latin Writers and their Greek Sources. Translated by H.E. Wedeck. Cambridge, Mass., 1969.
- Cranz, F.E. "Kingdom and Polity in Eusebius of Caesarea." Harvard Theological Review 45 (1952), 47-67.
- Croke, Brian. "Justinian's Bulgar Victory Celebration." Byzantinoslavica 41 (1980), 188-95.
- Croke, Brian and James Crow. "Procopius and Dara." Journal of Roman Studies 73 (1983) 1, 143-159.

- Curtius, E.R. European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages.
Translated by W.R. Trask. New York, 1953.
- Dagron, G. "Aux origines de la civilisation byzantine: langue de culture et langue d'Etat." Revue Historique 489 (1969), 23-56.
- _____. Naissance d'une capitale, Constantinople et ses institutions de 330 à 451. Paris, 1974.
- Daly, L.J. "Themistius' Concept of Philanthropia." Byzantion 45 (1975), 22-40.
- Dawes, Elizabeth and N.H. Baynes. Three Byzantine Saints. Oxford, 1948.
- Delbrueck, R. Die Consulardiptychen und verwandte Denkmäler. Berlin, 1929.
- Downey, G. "The Christian Schools of Palestine: A Chapter in Literary History." Harvard Library Bulletin 12 (1958), 297-319.
- _____. "Education in the Christian Roman Empire: Christian and Pagan theories under Constantine and his successors." Speculum 32 (1954), 48-61.
- _____. Gaza in the Early Sixth Century. Norman, Oklahoma, 1963.
- _____. "Philanthropia in Religion and Statecraft in the Fourth Century after Christ." Historia 4 (1955), 199-208.
- _____. "Imperial Building Records in Malalas." Byzantinische Zeitschrift 38* (1938), 1-15, 299-311.
- Drake, H.A. In Praise of Constantine. A Historical Study and New Translations of Eusebius' Tricennial Orations. University of California Publications, Classical Studies, 15. Berkeley, 1976.
- Draths Schmidt, R. De Prisciani grammatici Caesariensis carminibus. Breslau, 1907.
- Duchesne, L. L'Eglise au VIe siècle. Paris, 1925.
- _____. "L'Illyricum ecclésiastique." Byzantinische Zeitschrift 1 (1892), 530-550.
- Duckworth, G.E. "Five Centuries of Latin Hexameter Poetry: Silver Age and Late Empire." Transactions of the American Philological Association 98 (1967), 77-150.

- _____. "Variety and Repetition in Vergil's Hexameters." Transactions of the American Philological Association 95 (1964), 9-65.
- Dvornik, F. Early Christian and Byzantine Political Philosophy, 2 vols. Dumbarton Oaks Studies 4. Washington, D.C., 1966.
- _____. "Emperors, Popes and General Councils." Dumbarton Oaks Papers 6 (1951), 1-26.
- _____. "Pope Gelasius and the Emperor Anastasius I." Byzantinische Zeitschrift 44 (1951), 111-116.
- Ellspermann, G.L. The Attitude of the Early Christian Latin Writers Toward Pagan Literature and Learning. Washington, 1949.
- Endlicher, S.L. Prisciani Grammatici de laude imperatoris Anastasii et de ponderibus et mensuris carmina. Vienna, 1828.
- Fabre, Pierre. "Le developpement de l'histoire de Joseph dans la litterature et dans l'art au cours de douze premiers siecles." Melanges d'Archeologie et d'Histoire 39 (1921), 193-211.
- Farina, R. L'impero e l'imperatore cristiano in Eusebio di Cesarea. La prima teologia politica del cristianesimo. Zurich, 1966.
- Fears, J.R. Princeps a diis electus. The Divine Election of the Emperor as a Political Concept at Rome. American Academy in Rome, Papers and Monographs 26, 1977.
- Ficarra, R. "Motivi ed orientamenti cristiani nel De laude Anastasii di Prisciano." In Studi in onore di Anthos Ardizzoni, pp. 357-371. Edited by E. Livrea and G.A. Privitera. Rome, 1978.
- Fraustadt, G. Encomiorum in litteris Graecis usque ad Romanum aetatem historia. Leipzig, 1909.
- Frend, W.H.C. "Eastern Attitudes to Rome During the Acacian Schism." In his Town and Country in the Early Christian Centuries. London, 1980.
- _____. "Old and New Rome in the Age of Justinian." In Relations between East and West in the Middle Ages, pp. 11-29. Edited by D. Baker. Edinburgh, 1973.
- _____. The Rise of the Monophysite Movement. Cambridge, 1972.
- Fuhrmann, M. "Die lateinische Literatur der Spatanike." Antike und Abenland 13 (1969), 56-79.

- Gabotto, Ferdinando. Storia della Italia Occidentale nel Medio Evo (395-1313). Torino, 1911.
- Gagé, J. "La théologie de la Victoire impériale." Revue Historique 13 (1933), 1-43.
- _____. "La Victoire impériale dans l'empire chrétien." Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuses 13 (1933), 370-400.
- Gamber, Stanislaus. Le Livre de la 'Genese' dans la poeste latine au Ve siècle. Paris, 1899.
- Gaudenzi, A. Sui rapporti tra l'Italia e l'impero d'Oriente fra gli anni 476-554. Bologna, 1886.
- Geanakoplos, D.G. "Church and State in the Byzantine Empire: A Reconsideration of the Problem of Caesaropapism." Church History 34 (1965), 381-403.
- _____. "Church Building and 'Caesaropapism' A.D. 312-565." Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies 7 (1966), 167-186.
- Gibson, Margaret, ed. Boethius. His Life, Thought and Influence. Oxford, 1981.
- Glück, M. Priscians Partitiones und ihre Stellung in der spätantiken Schule. Hildesheim, 1967.
- Goffart, W. Barbarians and Romans. Princeton, 1980.
- _____. "Zosimus, the First Historian of Rome's Fall." American Historical Review 76 (1971), 412-441.
- Goodenough, E.R. "The Political Philosophy of Hellenistic Kingship." Yale Classical Studies, (1928), 55-102.
- Grabar, A. Christian Iconography. A Study of its Origins. Princeton, 1968.
- _____. L'Empereur dans l'art byzantin. Recherches sur l'art officiel de l'empire d'orient. Strasbourg, 1936; reprint, London, 1971.
- Green, R.P.H. The Poetry of Paulinus of Nola. A Study of his Latinity. Collection Latomus 120. Brussels, 1971.
- Greenslade, S.L. Church and State from Constantine to Theodosius. London, 1954.

- Grierson, P. "The Monetary Reforms of Anastasius and their Economic Consequences." In Patterns of Monetary Development in Phoenicia and Paléstine in Antiquity, pp. 283-302. Edited by A. Kindler. Tel Aviv, 1967.
- Grierson, P. "The Tombs and Obits of Byzantine Emperors (337-1043)." Dumbarton Oaks Papers 16 (1962), 1-65.
- Griffiths, F.T. Theocritus at Court. Leiden, 1979.
- Grosdidier de Matons, J. Romanos le Mélode et les origines de la poésie religieuse à Byzance. Paris, 1977.
- Hagen, H. Catalogus codicum Bernensium. Bern, 1875.
- Hagendahl, H. Latin Fathers and the Classics. Goteborg, 1958.
- Halsberghe, Gaston H. The Cult of Sol Invictus. Leiden, 1972.
- Hands, A.R. Charities and Social Aid in Greece and Rome. London, 1968.
- Hanfmann, G. "The Continuity of Classical Art: Culture, Myth, and Faith." In Age of Spirituality: A Symposium, pp. 75-100. Edited by K. Weitzmann. New York, 1980.
- _____. The Season Sarcophagus in Dumbarton Oaks. Cambridge, Mass., 1951.
- Harrison, R.M. "The Long Wall in Thrace." Archeologia Aeliana 47 (1969), 33-38.
- Helm, R. "Priscianus." Real-Encyclopaedie der Klassischen Alterumswissenschaft. Vol. 22.2.
- Hemmerdinger, B. "Les lettres latines a Constantinople jusqu'a Justinien." Byzantinische Forschungen (1966), 174-178.
- Henry, P. "A Mirror for Justinian: The Ekthesis of Agapetus Diaconus." Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies 8 (1967), 281-308.
- Holum, K.G. "Pulcheria's Crusade of AD 421 and the Ideology of Imperial Victory," Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies 18 (1977), 153-172.
- _____. Theodosian Emperresses. Women and Imperial Dominion in Late Antiquity. Berkeley, 1982.
- Honigmann, E. Eveques et eveches monophysites d'Asie anterieure au VI^e siecle. Louvain, 1951.

- Hodgkin, Thomas. The Letters of Cassiodorus. London, 1886.
- Huskinson, J. "Some Pagan Mythological Figures and their Significance in Early Christian Art." Papers of the British School at Rome 42 (1974), 68-97.
- Janin, R. La géographie ecclésiastique de l'Empire byzantin. Vol. 2, Les églises et les monastères. Paris, 1953.
- Janson, T. Latin Prose Prefaces. Studies in Literary Conventions. Stockholm, 1964.
- Jones, A.H.M. "The Constitutional Position of Odoacer and Theodoric." Journal of Roman Studies 52 (1962), 126-130.
- _____. "The Greeks under Roman Rule." Dumbarton Oaks Papers 17 (1963), 1-19.
- _____. The Later Roman Empire. Oxford, 1964.
- Kaegi Jr., W.E. Byzantine Military Unrest 471-843. Amsterdam, 1981.
- _____. Byzantium and the Decline of Rome. Princeton, 1969.
- _____. "The 5th Century Twilight of Byzantine Paganism." Classica et Mediaevalia 27, 1968.
- Kantorowicz, E.H. "Deus Per Naturam, Deus Per Gratiam." Harvard Theological Review 45 (1952), 253-277.
- _____. Laudes Regiae. Berkeley, 1946.
- _____. "Oriens Augusti: Lever du Roi." Dumbarton Oaks Papers 17 (1963), 119-177.
- Kawar, Irfan. "Ghassan and Byzantium: A new terminus a quo." Der Islam, 33:3 (1958), 232-258.
- Kempen, C. Procopii Gazaei in Imperatorem Anastasium Panegyricus. Dissertation, Bonn, 1918.
- Kennedy, George A. Classical Rhetoric and its Christian and Secular Tradition from Ancient to Modern Times. Chapel Hill, 1980.
- _____. Greek Rhetoric Under Christian Emperors. Princeton, New Jersey, 1983.
- Kitzinger, E. "The Cult of Images in the Age before Iconoclasm." Dumbarton Oaks Papers 8 (1954), 82-150.

- _____. "The Hellenistic Heritage in Byzantine Art." Dumbarton Oaks Papers 17 (1963), 97-115.
- _____. Byzantine Art in the Making. Cambridge, Mass., 1977.
- Krumbacher, K. Geschichte der byzantinischen Literatur, 2nd ed. Munich, 1897.
- Kustas, Georg L. "The Function and Evolution of Byzantine Rhetoric." Viator: Mediaeval and Renaissance Studies 1 (1970), 55-73.
- _____. Studies in Byzantine Rhetoric. Thessalonike, 1973.
- Lamma, P. "La politica dell'imperatore Anastasio I (491-518)." Rivista Storica Italiana 56 (1940), 167-191.
- Lebon, Joseph. Le Monophysisme Sévérien. Etude historique, littéraire et théologique sur la résistance monophysite au concile de Chalcedoine jusqu'à la constitution de l'Eglise Jacobite. Louvain, 1909.
- Lemerle, P. "Invasions et migrations dans les Balkans depuis la fin de l'époque romaine jusqu'au VIII^e siècle." Revue Historique 211 (1954), 265-308.
- _____. Le premier humanisme byzantin. Notes et remarques sur enseignement et culture à Byzance des origines au X^e siècle. Paris, 1971.
- Levine, C. Caesarea under Roman Rule. Leiden, 1975.
- Levine, Ph. "The Continuity and Preservation of the Latin Tradition." In The Transformation of the Roman World, pp. 206-231. Edited by L. White. Berkeley, 1966.
- Liebeschuetz, W. "The Origin of Office of the Pagarch." Byzantinische Zeitschrift 66 (1973), 38-60.
- Litchfield, H.W. "National exempla virtutis in Roman Literature." Harvard Studies in Classical Philology 25 (1914), 1-71.
- Llewellyn, P.A.B. "The Roman Church During the Laurentian Schism." Church History 45 (1976), 417-427.
- L'Orange, H.P. Likeness and Icon: selected studies in classical and early mediaeval art. Oden, 1973.
- _____. Studies on the Iconography of Cosmic Kingship in the Ancient World. Oslo, 1953.

- Lowe, E.A. Codices Latini antiquiores. A Paleographical Guide to Latin Manuscripts prior to the Ninth Century. Vol. 3. Oxford, 1933-1934.
- Luscher, A. De Prisciani studiis Graecis. Dissertation, Breslau, 1911.
- McGill, R.C. "The Cycle of Agathias. New Identifications Scrutinized." Journal of Hellenic Studies 89 (1969), 87-96.
- _____. "P.Gr. Vindob. 29788C: Hexameter Encomium on an Un-named Emperor." Journal of Hellenic Studies 98 (1978), 38-63.
- MacCormack, Sabine. Art and Ceremony in Late Antiquity. Berkeley, 1981.
- _____. "Change and Continuity in Late Antiquity, the Ceremony of Adventus." Historia 21 (1972), 721-752.
- _____. "Latin Prose Panegyrics: Tradition and Discontinuity in the Later Roman Empire." Revue des études augustiniennes 22 (1976), 29-77.
- _____. "Roma, Constantinopolis, the Emperor, and His Genius." Classical Quarterly 25 (1975), 131-150.
- _____. Themes in Imperial Art and Panegyric from the late third to the sixth century. D. Phil. Dissertation, Oxford, 1974.
- McCormick, Michael. Eternal Victory: triumphal rulership in late Antiquity, Byzantium, and the early mediaeval west. Cambridge, 1986.
- _____. "Odoacer, Emperor Zeno and the Rugian Victory Legation." Byzantion 47 (1977), 212-227.
- McHugh, M.P. The Carmen de Providentia Dei Attributed to Prosper of Aquitaine: A Revised Text with an Introduction, Translation and Notes. Washington, D.C., 1964.
- MacIsaac, J.D. "The Hand of God," Traditio 31 (1975), 322-328.
- MacMullen, R. "Roman Bureaucratese," Traditio 18 (1962), 364-478.
- _____. "The Roman Concept Robber-Pretender." Revue Internationale des Droits de l'Antiquité 10 (1963), 221-225.
- McNamara, Jo Ann. "Sexual Equality and the Cult of Virginity in Early Christian Thought." Feminist Studies 3 (1976), 145-158.

- Magie, D. Roman Rule in Asia Minor. Princeton, New Jersey, 1950.
- Maguire, H. Art and Eloquence in Byzantium. Princeton, New Jersey, 1981.
- Mango, Cyril. The Art of the Byzantine Empire 312-1453. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1972.
- Markus, R.A. From Augustine to Gregory the Great. London, 1983.
- _____. "Paganism, Christianity and the Latin Classics in the Fourth Century." In Latin Literature of the Fourth Century, pp. 1-21. Edited by J.W. Binns. London, 1974.
- Marrou, H.I. Mousikos Aner. Grenoble, 1937.
- Martin, T.O. "The twenty-eighth canon of Chalcedon: a background note." In Das Konzil von Chalkedon, 2:433-458. Edited by A. Grillmeier and H. Bacht. Würzburg, 1953-1962.
- Martindale, J.R. Public Disorders in the Late Roman Empire. B. Litt. Dissertation, Oxford, 1960.
- _____. The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire. Vol. 2. Cambridge, 1980.
- Mathew, G. Byzantine Aesthetics. London, 1963.
- Momigliano, A., ed. "Cassiodorus and the Italian Culture of his Time." Proceedings of the British Academy 41 (1955), 207-245.
- _____. The Conflict Between Paganism and Christianity in the Fourth Century. Oxford, 1963.
- _____. "Gli Anicifi et la storiografia latina del VI secolo D.C." In his Secondo contributo alla storia degli studi classici, pp. 231-253. Rome, 1960.
- Moorehead, John. "The Laurentian Schism: East and West in the Roman Church." Church History 47 (1978), 125-136. -
- Morey, C.R. "The Early Christian Ivories of the Eastern Empire." Dumbarton Oaks Papers 1 (1941), 43-55.
- Nadeau, Ray. "The Progymnasmata of Aphthonius in Translation." Speech Monographs 19 (1952), 264-285.
- Nelson, J. "Symbols in Context." Studies in Church History 13 (1976), 97-119.

- Nissen, T. "Historisches Epos und Panegyrikos in der Spätantike." Hermes 75 (1940), 298-325.
- Nock, A.D. Early Gentile Christianity and Its Hellenistic Background. New York, 1964.
- _____. "A Diis Electa: A Chapter in the Religious History of the Third Century." Harvard Theological Review 23 (1930), 251-274.
- North, Helen. "Canons and Hierarchies of the Cardinal Virtues in Greek and Latin Literature." In The Classical Tradition, pp. 165-183. Edited by L. Wallach. Ithaca, New York, 1966.
- O'Flynn, J.M. Generalissimos of the Western Empire. Edmonton, 1983.
- Passalacqua, M.I. Codici di Prisciano. Sussidi eruditi 29. Rome, 1978.
- Paul, G.M. Urbs Capta: Sketch of an Ancient Literary Motif. Phoenix 36.2 (1982), 144-155.
- Peeters, P. "Hypatius et Vitalien. Autour de la succession de l'empereur Anastase." Annuaire de l'Institut de Philologie et Histoire Orientales et Slaves 10. Brussels, 1950.
- _____. "Jaques de Saroug appartient-il a la secte monophysite?" Analecta Bollandiana 66 (1948), 134-198.
- Pharr, C., trans. The Theodosian Code. Princeton, 1952.
- Pack, R.A. The Greek and Latin Literary Texts from Greco-Roman Egypt. 2nd ed. Ann Arbor, 1965.
- Previale, L. "Teoria e prassi del panegirico bizantino." Emerita 17 (1949), 72-105 and 18 (1950), 340-366.
- Pichon, R. Les derniers écrivains profanes. Paris, 1906.
- Riche, P. Education and Culture in the Barbarian West sixth through eighth centuries. Translated by J.T. Contreni. Columbia, S.C., 1976.
- Riddle, Margaret. "Illustrations of the 'Triumph' of Joseph the Patriarch." Byzantina Australiensia 1 (1981), 69-81.
- Robert, L. Les gladiateurs dans l'Orient grec. Paris, 1940.
- Romano, D. "Prisciano a Bisanzio." Atti Accademia Scienze, Lettere e Arti di Palermo 4, vol. 25, part 2 (1966), 305-355.

- Ruether, Rosemary. Gregory of Nazianzus. Oxford, 1969.
- Runciman, Steven. The Byzantine Theocracy. Cambridge, 1977.
- _____. "Some notes on the role of the Empress." Eastern Churches Review 4 (1972), 119-124.
- Rusch, W.G. The Later Latin Fathers. Studies in Theology. London, 1977.
- Salamon, M. "Priscianus und sein Schülerkreis in Konstantinopel." Philologus 123 (1979), 91-96.
- Schapiro, M. "The Joseph Scenes on the Maximianus Throne in Ravenna." In his Late Antique, Early Christian and Mediaeval Art, pp. 35-47. New York, 1979.
- Setton, Kenneth. Christian Attitude towards the Emperor in the Fourth Century. New York, 1941.
- Sevcenko, I. "A Shadow Outline of Virtue: The Classical Heritage of Greek Christian Literature (Second to Seventh Century)." In Age of Spirituality: A Symposium, pp. 53-74. Edited by K. Weitzmann. New York, 1980.
- Sherrard, Ph. Greek East and Latin West. London, 1959.
- Simon, M. "Bellerophon Chrétien." In Mélanges offerts à Jérôme Carcopino, pp. 889-903. Vendôme, 1966.
- Stein, E. Histoire du Bas-Empire, 2 vols. Edited by J.R. Palanque. Paris, 1949 and 1959.
- Storch, R.H. "The XII Panegyrici Latini and the Perfect Prince." Acta Classica 15 (1972), 71-76.
- Sundwall, J. Abhandlungen zur Geschichte des ausgehenden Romertums. Helsinki, 1919.
- Syme, R. Emperors and Biography. Oxford, 1971.
- Thiel, A., ed. Epistulae Romanorum pontificum genuinae. Braunsberg, 1867-1868.
- Thompson, E.A. "The Foreign Policies of Theodosius II and Marcian." Hermathena 76 (1950), 58-75.
- _____. "The Isaurians under Theodosius II." Hermathena 68 (1946), 18-31.

- _____. Romans and Barbarians. Madison, Wisconsin, 1982.
- Topping, E.C. "The Poet Priest in Byzantium." Greek Orthodox Theological Review 14.1 (1969), 31-41.
- Toynbee, J.M.C. Animals in Roman Life and Art. London, 1973.
- _____. "A New Roman Mosaic Pavement found in Dorset." Journal of Roman Studies 54 (1964), 7-14.
- _____. "Roma and Constantinopolis in Late Antique Art from 312-365." Journal of Roman Studies 37 (1947), 135-144.
- _____. "Roma and Constantinopolis in Late Antique Art from 365-Justin II". In Studies Presented to D.M. Robinson, 2:261-277. St. Louis, 1953.
- Townsend, W.T. "The Henotikon Schism and the Roman Church." The Journal of Religion 6 (1936), 78-86.
- Ullmann, W. The Growth of Papal Government in the Middle Ages. London, 1955.
- Vasiliev, A.A. Justin the First. An Introduction to the Epoch of Justinian the Great. Cambridge, Mass., 1950.
- Volbach, W.F. Elfenbeinarbeiten der Spätantike und des frühen Mittelalters. 3rd ed. Mainz, 1976.
- Viljamaa, T. Studies in Greek Encomiastic Poetry of the Early Byzantine Period. Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum Societatis Scientiarum Fennicae 48. Helsinki, 1968.
- Van De Woestijne, Paul. La Periegese de Priscien. Brussels, 1953.
- Wagenvoort, H. Felicitas imperatoria. Mnemosyne 7 (1954), 300-322.
- Wallace-Hadrill, A. "The Emperor and His Virtues." Historia 30 (1981), 298-323.
- Wedek, Harry, E. "The Catalogue in Late and Mediaeval Latin Poetry." Medievalia et Humanistica 13 (1960), 13-16.
- West, D. and T. Woodman, eds. Creative Imitation and Latin Literature. Cambridge, 1979.
- Weitzmann, K. Greek Mythology in Byzantine Art. Princeton, 1951.
- _____. "The Survival of Mythological Representations in Early Christian and Byzantine Art and their Impact on Christian Iconography." Dumbarton Oaks Papers 14 (1960), 43-68.

- Whitbread, L.G. "A note on Priscian the Grammarian." Latomus 36 (1977), 811.
- Williams, G.H. "Christology and Church State Relations in the Fourth Century." Church History 20 (1951), 3:30-33 and 4:3-26.
- Witke, C. Numen Litterarum. The Old and New in Latin Poetry from Constantine to Gregory the Great. Leiden, 1971.
- Wozniak, F.E. "East Rome, Ravenna, and Western Illyricum: 454-536 A.D." Historia 30 (1981), 351-382.