

EDITED BY PAUL ROCHE

# Pliny's Praise

*The Panegyricus* in the Roman World



AMBRIDGE

# PLINY'S PRAISE

*The Panegyricus in the Roman World*

EDITED BY

PAUL ROCHE

*University of Sydney*



CAMBRIDGE  
UNIVERSITY PRESS

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS  
Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, Cape Town,  
Singapore, São Paulo, Delhi, Tokyo, Mexico City

Cambridge University Press  
The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 8RU, UK

Published in the United States of America by Cambridge University Press, New York

[www.cambridge.org](http://www.cambridge.org)

Information on this title: [www.cambridge.org/9781107009059](http://www.cambridge.org/9781107009059)

© Cambridge University Press 2011

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception  
and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements,  
no reproduction of any part may take place without the written  
permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2011

Printed in the United Kingdom at the University Press, Cambridge

*A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library*

*Library of Congress Cataloguing in Publication data*

Pliny's praise : the Panegyricus in the Roman world / edited by Paul Roche.

p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references and indexes.

ISBN 978-1-107-00905-9

1. Pliny, the Younger. Panegyricus. 2. Pliny, the Younger – Literary style.
  3. Speeches, addresses, etc., Latin – History and criticism. 4. Praise in literature.
  5. Rome – Politics and government – 30 B.C.–284 A.D. – Historiography.
- I. Roche, Paul. II. Title: Panegyricus in the Roman world.

PA6640.Z5P58 2011

876'.01 – dc22 2011005727

ISBN 978-1-107-00905-9 Hardback

---

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or  
accuracy of URLs for external or third-party internet websites referred to  
in this publication, and does not guarantee that any content on such  
websites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.

---

## Contributors

BRUCE GIBSON is Professor of Latin at the University of Liverpool. As well as his *Statius, Silvae 5: Edited with Introduction, Translation, and Commentary* (Oxford 2006), he has published articles and book chapters on a range of Latin authors in verse and prose, including Ovid, Pliny, Statius, Silius Italicus, Tacitus and Apuleius. He is currently writing a commentary on Pliny's *Panegyricus*, and jointly editing with Thomas Harrison a volume of papers on Polybius in memory of Frank Walbank.

JOHN HENDERSON is Professor of Classics at the University of Cambridge and a Fellow of King's College. He has written wicked books and weird essays across the range of classical topics, usually reacting enthusiastically to Roman texts, with quirky books on Pliny's Letters (*Pliny's Statue: The Letters, Self-Portraiture, and Classical Art* (Exeter 2002)) and on Plautus, Seneca, Statius, Juvenal, Isidore, plus (in)famously storming articles on Latin poetry and history, e.g. collected in *Fighting for Rome: Poets and Caesars, History and Civil War* (Cambridge 1998) and in *Writing Down Rome: Satire, Comedy and other Offences in Latin Poetry* (Oxford 1999).

G. O. HUTCHINSON is Professor of Greek and Latin Languages and Literature at Oxford University. He works on Greek and Latin, poetry and prose. He has written: *Aeschylus, Septem contra Thebas: Edited with Introduction and Commentary* (Oxford 1985); *Hellenistic Poetry* (Oxford 1988); *Latin Literature from Seneca to Juvenal: A Critical Study* (Oxford 1993); *Cicero's Correspondence: A Literary Study* (Oxford 1998); *Greek Lyric Poetry: A Commentary on Selected Larger Pieces* (Oxford 2001); *Propertius, Elegies Book IV* (Cambridge 2006); *Talking Books: Readings in Hellenistic and Roman Books of Poetry* (Oxford 2008).

DOREEN INNES is Emeritus Fellow of St Hilda's College, University of Oxford. Her research interests are in classical literary criticism. She co-authored *Sopatros the Rhetor* (London 1988), edited the Loeb edition of

Demetrius *On Style* (Cambridge, Mass. 1995), and has published articles on, among others, Gorgias, Aristotle, Cicero and Longinus.

GESINE MANUWALD is Senior Lecturer in Latin Language and Literature at University College London. Her research interests include Roman epic, Roman drama, Roman rhetoric and the reception of the classical world. She has published widely on all those areas, most recently a commentary on Cicero's *Philippics* 3–9 (Berlin 2007), a revised Loeb edition of the *Philippics* (Cambridge, Mass. 2009, co-edited with John Ramsey) and a Roman drama reader (2010).

CARLOS F. NOREÑA is Assistant Professor of History at the University of California, Berkeley. His work focuses on the political and cultural history of the Roman empire. He is the author of *Imperial Ideals in the Roman West: Representation, Circulation, Power* (Cambridge forthcoming) and co-editor, with Bjoern C. Ewald, of *The Emperor and Rome: Space, Representation, and Ritual* (Cambridge 2010).

ROGER REES is Reader in the School of Classics, St Andrews University. He wrote *Layers of Loyalty in Latin Panegyric 289–307 AD* (Oxford 2002) and *Diocletian and the Tetrarchy* (Edinburgh 2004), and edited *Romane memento: Vergil in the Fourth Century* (London 2004) and *Ted Hughes and the Classics* (Oxford 2009). He is currently preparing a commentary on Pacatus' panegyric to Theodosius, and co-editing with Bruce Gibson an *Arethusa* volume on the reception of Pliny the Younger in late antiquity.

PAUL ROCHE is Senior Lecturer in Latin at the University of Sydney. He is the author of *Lucan, De Bello Civili Book 1* (Oxford 2009) and co-editor (with W. J. Dominik and J. G. Garthwaite) of *Writing Politics in Imperial Rome* (Leiden 2009); he has previously published on political history, public imagery and Latin literature in the early imperial period.

## Preface

This volume was conceived in the belief that Pliny's *Panegyricus* deserves and will reward more concentrated scholarly attention than it has traditionally received. Neglect is a natural *topos* in scholarly prefaces, but it has genuine substance here; in fact, neglect of the speech has not infrequently sharpened into antipathy, but neither is justified. A professed cultural disdain for formal praise threatens to alienate us from a speech whose survival makes it for us a unique specimen of early imperial senatorial oratory, whose multiple agendas so easily and obviously (indeed explicitly: *Pan.* 4.1) transcend the mere delivery of praise, and whose political outlook ranks it variously as a senatorial manifesto and a classic *locus* of imperial public-image making. But this same aversion would likewise alienate us from a vital witness to an emperor who self-consciously styled himself as a kind of epitome of imperial rule, who occupies in more ways than one a crucial liminal phase between the principates of the first and second centuries, and whose early years as emperor would otherwise be almost completely occluded to us. The *Panegyricus* is a key document in the evolution of imperial leadership ideals, but it is also a key text more generally for comprehending early imperial Rome.

The original idea for this volume was to have represented in one place examinations of the *Panegyricus*' various historical and rhetorical contexts, as well as studies offering critical engagement with the literary fabric of the Latin text as we have it. I am very grateful to all of the contributors to this volume: for agreeing to write for this project in the first place, for the outstanding quality and care invested in their chapters, and for their patience as the overall book took shape. I am equally grateful to Michael Sharp for his constant encouragement over the course of the book's development, from the initial proposal through to the final form of the manuscript. The two anonymous readers from the press offered a wealth of advice, observations and encouragement which have improved the quality and direction of the volume; it is a pleasure to thank them for

their careful reading of the manuscript. In production, both the book and the editor have benefited greatly from the assistance of Elizabeth Hanlon and that of Christina Sarigiannidou, who has been a wonderfully helpful production editor, and the acute copy-editing of Fiona Sewell, who has eliminated many errors from the typescript and sharpened its clarity and consistency throughout. Finally I would like to thank my colleagues in the Department of Classics and Ancient History at the University of Sydney for their warmth, collegiality and good humour: to work with them here is a great pleasure.

# Contents

<i>List of contributors</i>	page vii
<i>Preface</i>	ix
1 Pliny's thanksgiving: an introduction to the <i>Panegyricus</i> <i>Paul Roche</i>	1
2 Self-fashioning in the <i>Panegyricus</i> <i>Carlos F. Noreña</i>	29
3 The <i>Panegyricus</i> and the monuments of Rome <i>Paul Roche</i>	45
4 The <i>Panegyricus</i> and rhetorical theory <i>D. C. Innes</i>	67
5 Ciceronian praise as a step towards Pliny's <i>Panegyricus</i> <i>Gesine Manuwald</i>	85
6 Contemporary contexts <i>Bruce Gibson</i>	104
7 Politics and the sublime in the <i>Panegyricus</i> <i>G. O. Hutchinson</i>	125
8 Down the Pan: historical exemplarity in the <i>Panegyricus</i> <i>John Henderson</i>	142
9 Afterwords of praise <i>Roger Rees</i>	175
<i>Bibliography</i>	189
<i>Index locorum</i>	204
<i>General index</i>	206



## CHAPTER I

# *Pliny's thanksgiving: an introduction to the Panegyricus*

*Paul Roche*

### PRECURSORS AND PREDECESSORS

On 1 September 100 CE, Pliny the Younger rose in the senate to deliver the oration we know as the *Panegyricus*. This was a *gratiarum actio*, a 'vote of thanks', offered up to the emperor Trajan (98–117). It was given on the occasion of Pliny's attainment of the consulship, the prime goal of regular senatorial ambition and the highest rung, albeit of suffect status, on the normal *cursus honorum*.<sup>1</sup> Pliny claims as the pretext for his speech a *senatus consultum* which had recommended that a vote of thanks be rendered to the emperor by the consuls (*Pan.* 4.1, cf. 90.3; *Ep.* 3.18.1, 6.27.1). In the speech and in his letters, Pliny immediately subjoins to this recommendation a normative aim: to demonstrate through praise the behaviour and characteristics expected of a good *princeps* (*Pan.* 4.1; *Ep.* 3.18.2). In offering praise to his emperor on this occasion, Pliny was participating in a vibrant rhetorical tradition. Its tropes and themes reflect a vital and continuous contemporary culture,<sup>2</sup> while its roots extended a very long way back into republican culture and politics on the one hand, and on the other into Greek traditions of praise which had been crystallized to a certain extent by Isocrates in the mid-fourth century BCE, but had predated him considerably.<sup>3</sup>

Special emphasis falls upon the *laudatio funebris*, or funeral oration, in Polybius' account of the aristocratic funeral (6.53–4). He recounts this institution to illustrate the republic's capacity to induce its youth to perform acts of bravery and to endure danger for the sake of reputation.<sup>4</sup> The oration was given from the rostra in the Forum on the occasion of both public and private funerals. The laudand could be of either sex, although women are

<sup>1</sup> And more: 'the pinnacle of the Roman social and political order', as Pliny constructs it in the speech; see Noreña, p. 38 in this volume.

<sup>2</sup> See Gibson, pp. 104–24 in this volume. <sup>3</sup> See e.g. Braund (1998) 53–4.

<sup>4</sup> On which: Vollmer (1925); Crawford (1941); Kierdorf (1980).

more commonly encountered as subjects of a *laudatio* in the last century BCE.<sup>5</sup> A second oration might also be delivered before the senate in the case of an exceptionally important individual.<sup>6</sup> The practice of delivering a funeral oration was apparently very early, and (naturally tendentious) claims were made for the venerable antiquity of the practice. Plutarch asserts, for instance, that P. Valerius Poplicola delivered the *laudatio* for L. Junius Brutus the liberator (Plut. *Pub.* 9.7.102). Likewise, Dionysius of Halicarnassus claimed that the Roman *laudatio* predated the Athenian funeral oration, the *epitaphios logos* (5.17.3). The *epitaphios logos* was in any case a distinct phenomenon on a number of counts. It had as the subject of its praise a collective of fallen warriors and its exclusive context was the public funeral. There was moreover a civic dimension to the *epitaphios logos* which was muted by comparison within the *laudatio funebris*. In the Athenian funeral oration, the virtues of the dead came before the achievements of the city. The speech also offered consolation to living relatives and an exhortation to the audience to imitate the virtues of the dead.<sup>7</sup>

In the *laudatio funebris*, the orator would be the son of the deceased, or another suitable relative. A serving magistrate within the family would be an especially appropriate choice (Polyb. 6.53.2). The speech would comprise two parts: praise of the individual's achievements, followed by praise of his or her ancestors. Sources underscore the simple and unadorned nature of the speech. This was an ideal which was in tension both with the practical political utility of the speech and with panegyric's broader tendency to embellish and adorn (i.e. to be *laeta et magnifica et sublimis*; Quint. *Inst.* 11.3).<sup>8</sup> The object of a *laudatio funebris* was to locate and measure the contribution of the deceased to the reputation of his ancestors. In the imperial period, the emperor was eulogized by his successor, in accordance with a decree of the senate (Quint. *Inst.* 3.7.2). After the delivery of the *laudatio funebris*, it was preserved by the family of the deceased, and could be published more widely. Cicero writes of the enjoyment derived from reading *laudationes* (*Orat.* 11.37; *Brut.* 16.61–2).

There were other Roman precursors. The year 63 BCE saw Cicero's inaugural consular speech before the public assembly, the second *De Lege Agraria*. In it, he states that the first *contio* of a new consul was by tradition

<sup>5</sup> See Crawford (1941) 21–2.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Augustus, praised by Tiberius in the Temple of Caesar and by Drusus from the rostra (Cass. Dio 56.34; Suet. *Aug.* 100.3).

<sup>7</sup> On this see Loraux (1986) 1–3, 42–3.

<sup>8</sup> On the style of the encomium, see Innes, pp. 69–70 and Hutchinson, pp. 125–41 in this volume.

devoted to (a) rendering thanks to the people in return for their *beneficium*, and (b) praising the consul's own family (*Agr.* 2.1). A similar function to that of the *laudatio funebris* thus emerges in Cicero's formulation, in that the type and measure of the contribution made by the speaker to his family's dignity were at issue.<sup>9</sup> One significant departure from the funeral oration is that the praise in this context was explicitly self-reflexive. This custom was adapted in the imperial period. Now the new consuls rendered thanks, *ex senatus consulto* (*Pan.* 4.1, cf. 90.3), both to the gods and to the emperor, in essence, for the latter's gift of their office.<sup>10</sup> This new manifestation of the consular thanksgiving was in place by the end of Augustus' principate,<sup>11</sup> and it endured throughout the early imperial period. This was, for example, the type of speech (it seems) that Verginius Rufus was rehearsing for his third consulship of 97 when he slipped and broke his thigh (*Plin. Ep.* 2.1.5). Each year of the imperial period, then, every ordinary and suffect consul – or perhaps a representative from each pair – delivered a speech in the senate whose basic form, theme and intent would have been identical to those of the *Panegyricus*. But we are not permitted to imagine that the published version of Pliny's speech is representative of this proliferation of thanksgiving speeches. Pliny's speech is, self-consciously, a radical extension of the generic norms obtaining in the first century CE.

Formally prescribed discourses of praise were not, of course, unique to the Romans. Isocrates makes a claim to being the original author of a prose encomium in his *Evagoras* (c.370 BCE). The most important axes on which his claim rests are that his praise is expressed in prose rather than poetry, and that its subject is a human being rather than a mythological figure (*Evag.* 8).<sup>12</sup> He also qualifies his claim on primacy by a clause in which he claims to have anticipated 'those who devote themselves to philosophy'. Others then may have anticipated these men in authoring prose encomia. In any case, Isocrates' claim is almost demonstrably false. Aristotle writes of an encomium of Hippolochus of Thessaly (*Rhet.* 1368a17) and Isocrates' own *Busiris* displays through its tropes and methods that encomia were clearly subject to prescription by professional rhetoricians.<sup>13</sup> In fact, the restrictive concessions that Isocrates has to establish in order to make a claim on

<sup>9</sup> Cf. *Agr.* 2.1: *Qua in oratione non nulli aliquando digni maiorum loco reperiuntur, plerique autem hoc perficiunt ut tantum maioribus eorum debitum esse videatur, unde etiam quod posteris solveretur redundaret.* See further Manuwald, pp. 96–7 in this volume.

<sup>10</sup> Cf. Talbert (1984) 227–9; Millar (1993) 14: 'the Emperor is the *auctor* of the *honor*, and the consulship itself is a gift (*res data*) which partakes of the *maiestas* of the giver' (on the language of *Ov. Pont.* 4.9.65–70).

<sup>11</sup> Cf. *Ov. Pont.* 4.4.23–42 on the consul of 13, and *Pont.* 4.9.41–52, 65–70 on the consul of 17.

<sup>12</sup> A good, succinct overview at Hunter (2003) 13–15. <sup>13</sup> Hunter (2003) 14.

primacy in the *Evagoras* are indicative of the rich poetic and cultural traditions of epideictic praise feeding into prose encomia in his day. A close rhetorical and thematic nexus obtains between archaic (and especially Pindaric) praise poetry and the Athenian *epitaphios logos*. Isocrates' true claim to generic primacy might more helpfully be seen as his fusion of the two strands.<sup>14</sup>

The *Panegyricus* was thus the inheritor of a number of important cultural, political, rhetorical and literary contexts which had been developing in specific modes and circumstances in both Greece and Rome for over five hundred years prior to its delivery. The various functions and nuances attending these precursors do make their presence felt within the rhetorical fabric of Pliny's speech in the contexts of its delivery, and in its modes of production. But we are liable to mislead if we promote the importance of these similar but distinct genres at the expense of the specific cultural, social and political circumstances informing the moment of the speech itself.<sup>15</sup> Each speech in the epideictic mode both constructs its own response to the immediate circumstances informing its delivery and signals its own relationship with its perceived or declared precursors.<sup>16</sup> It is the function of this volume to examine Pliny's *Panegyricus* against precisely these tendencies.

#### SIGNIFICANCE

The *Panegyricus* is an exceptionally important speech. This is a fact more often conceded than celebrated in modern scholarship.<sup>17</sup> It is 'our best example of imperial *eloquentia*'.<sup>18</sup> It is the only complete speech to survive to us from the last of Cicero's *Philippics* in 43 BCE to the celebration of the emperor Maximian's birthday in 289 (*Pan. Lat.* x(2)), a speech which itself draws upon the language and imagery of Pliny's praise.<sup>19</sup> We can also assign importance to the *Panegyricus* irrespective of the accident of its survival. It is innovative. Pliny's is apparently the first of the consular

<sup>14</sup> Braund (1998) 54: 'Like Pindar in his epinician hymns, Isocrates praises an individual; as in the funeral oration, his subject is dead'; cf. Hunter (2003) 15. On Isocrates and Pindaric encomium see Race (1987).

<sup>15</sup> Braund (1998) 55.

<sup>16</sup> For a concrete illustration of this tendency see Rees, pp. 175–88 in this volume.

<sup>17</sup> The expressed disappointment of Syme (1938) 217–24 (here endorsing and transmitting the aesthetic criteria of his nineteenth-century predecessors), Syme (1958a) 114, 94–5 and Goodyear (1982) 660 has become totemic of the speech's modern reception. For two representative examples see Seager (1983) 129 and Kraus (2000) 160.

<sup>18</sup> Gowing (2005) 120.

<sup>19</sup> Although the overall impact of the *Panegyricus* upon the *XII Panegyrici Latini* must not be overstated: see Rees, p. 187 in this volume.

*gratiarum actiones* to be revised, expanded and published.<sup>20</sup> The reason for this revision and unusually wider dissemination is alluded to in a number of places within the speech and the letters which mention it. In a letter to Vibius Severus (*Ep.* 3.18) Pliny claimed that he believed it his duty as one of the *boni ciues* to publish the speech in order to encourage Trajan along what he saw as the right path, and to offer instruction to future emperors through the content of this document (3.18.2). We might also add as an influence the Trajanic innovation of publishing senatorial acclamations in the *acta diurna* (*Pan.* 75, 95.1): publishing the *Panegyricus* was a decision very much in step with the spirit of its age. The immediate reception of the speech and its publication is difficult to gauge accurately, since all of the evidence for it comes from Pliny himself. One might tentatively consider as indices of the speech's perceived contemporary relevance the small clique of Pliny's friends who were not satisfied with two days of recitation of the *Panegyricus* and asked for a third (3.18.4). The success of the speech is unlikely to be unrelated to the fact that Vettienus Severus wrote to Pliny for advice on how to compose a related species of *gratiarum actio*, that delivered by the consul designate (*Ep.* 6.27). Finally, one aspect of Pliny's achievement can be measured by the fact that the literary genre of the prose panegyric was established by the 140s.<sup>21</sup>

#### PLINY'S PROGRAMME

The notion found in rhetorical treatises and endorsed by Pliny, that praise ought to persuade the recipient to a desirable course of action (Arist. *Rhet.* 1.9.36; cf. Plin. *Ep.* 3.18, *Pan.* 4.1), prompts a summary consideration of Pliny's programme of advice for his emperor. In Pliny's formulation, the speech was delivered 'so that good rulers should recognize what they have done and bad ones learn what they ought to do' (*ut . . . boni principes quae facerent recognoscerent, mali quae facere deberent*). Indeed, a consistent programme of advice is recoverable from the specific *loci* of praise within the speech. Viewed through this lens, the *Panegyricus* emerges as a manifesto in the true sense of the word. It offers admonitory guidance to Trajan not only on issues which were central to the concerns of the senatorial aristocracy, but on many other aspects of the principate besides. It is important, both because it offers a prominent senator's totalizing view of what an ideal

<sup>20</sup> Dury (1938) 3–8; see too Noreña, pp. 40–1 in this volume.

<sup>21</sup> For the immediate generic impact of the speech, see Rees, p. 176 in this volume.

emperor should be, and because it embodies the values which a newly ennobled member of the senate wished to be seen to endorse.

The following suite of advice has been assembled from those moments in the *Panegyricus* when Pliny either commends Trajan's actions – whether real, alleged to have happened, predicted, or claimed for Trajan by Pliny – or is explicitly prescriptive regarding the ideal behaviour of the *princeps*. In order to arrive at this programme, Pliny's varying statements of approval have been recast into simple and impersonal admonitions. The following duties of the good emperor emerge.

The emperor ought to sustain the notion of his own social parity with his peers (2.3, 2.4, 22.1–2, 23.1, 24.2, 42.3, 48, 49.5, 60.4, 64.4, esp. 71, 78.4). His supremacy ought not to diminish or impair the *dignitas* of his subjects (19.1–2, 22.2, 24.5, 77.4). The emperor ought to be accessible (23.3, 24.3–4, 47.4–5). He ought to be prompt and present in his help (80.3). The emperor ought to prefer simplicity of appearance or taste, and cultivate the appearance of his former status as a private citizen; he ought to disdain artifice (3.5, 3.6, 20.1, 23.6, 24.2, 24.3, 43.2, 49.7–8, 81) and the extravagant blandishments of previous emperors (7.3, 82.6, 82.9).

The emperor ought to refuse, or remain reluctant to accept, further powers and titles (2.3, 3.5, 7.1, 9.4, 10.4, 11.4, 21.1, 55.9, 65.1) – for himself or for his family (84.6) – or an excessive number of consulships (56.3, 57.1–5, 58, 79); he ought to discourage extravagant praise (54.3–4, 55), or praise offered in or on inappropriate media, occasions, genres and contexts (54.2). He must not descend into tyranny (45.3, 55.7) or corruption (53.1–5) or inspire fear (46.1, 46.7). The emperor's words and promises ought to be trusted (66.5); he ought to be constant (66.6, esp. 74). He ought to bind himself to the laws (65).

The emperor ought to participate fully in civic and political functions, ceremonies and rituals (60.2, 63.1–3, 64, 77, esp. 77.8, 92.3). He must take the consulship seriously (59, 93.1) and observe constitutional regulations about the consulship (60.1, 63–77, 76). He ought to allow the senate a sensible and dignified function (54). He ought to listen to the senate's opinion; his choices and emotions ought to be mirrored in theirs (62.2–5, 73); he ought not to promote his own favourites against the senate's choice (62.6). He ought to encourage the senate to be free and to participate in the running of the state (66.1–2, 67, 69, 76, 87.1, esp. 93.1–2); he ought to treat the senate with respect (69.3, *reuerentia*); he ought to allow ex-consuls to assist him freely and fully with their aid and counsel (93.3).

The emperor must attend to and accommodate senatorial requests or prayers (2.8, 4.3, 6.4, 33.2, 60.4, implied at 78.1, 86–7), and prayers in

general (79.6): this is an earthly reflection of the gods' accommodation of human prayers (3.5). Conversely, he must not accommodate the 'insinuating counsel' of self-interested parties, such as *delatores* (41.3): the emperor ought not to permit delation (34, 36, 37–9, 42, 62.9).

The emperor ought to embody selfless and unceasing service to the state (5.6, 7.1, 7.3, 21.1–4, 67.4, 68, 79.5). He ought to behave and administer the empire with maximum transparency and visibility (20.5, 21.4, 49.5, 56, 62.9, 83.1).

The emperor ought neither to buy peace, nor to claim undeserved triumphs, but should increase the empire in the best tradition of the middle republic (12.1–4, 16–17, 56.4–8). The emperor ought to be personally active with the army (13.1–5); he ought to increase their discipline (18.1, 19.3–4, 23.3), but not value them over the civilian population (25.2).

The emperor ought to recognize and commend the good deeds of his subordinates (15.5, 18.1 military; 44.5–8, 60.5–7 civilian), and not reward *uitia* (45.3); he ought to advance the good (61–2, esp. 62.10, esp. 70, esp. 88.3, esp. 91.2 (Pliny and Tertullus)) and protect against the impact of the bad (46.8). The emperor ought to show respect to the genealogical claim to pre-eminence of the nobility, and he ought to advance them accordingly (69.5–6), but promote new men according to merit (70.1–2).

The emperor ought to be scrupulous in the delivery of his largesse (25–6, *congariūm*). He ought to care for the poor as much as the *proceres* (26.6). The emperor's generosity ought not to be dependent upon the deprivation of others, or serve as a distraction from or recompense for any vice (27.3–4, 28); he ought not to expect remuneration via wills (43.5). The emperor ought to embody financial propriety and self-control (29.4, 36.3, 50, 55.5; implicitly criticized at 41).

The emperor ought to ensure *libertas* (27.1, 58.3, 78.3) and *securitas* (27.1, 29 for the corn supply, 30.5–32 for Egypt, 35.4 from delation, 36.4 for the working of the court, 43 for wills, 44.5, 48.2 at court). He ought to allow freedom of expression at the games (33.3).

The emperor ought not to be overly prescriptive in his guidance of morality (45.4–6). He ought to support the liberal arts (47). He ought to cultivate the continuing love of his subjects (49.3). He ought to discharge the functions of friendship as well as those of imperial rule (85).

The emperor ought to have simple piety towards the gods (52). His justice ought not to be compromised by a desire for self-enrichment (80.1–2). He ought to keep close control over his family (83.2–84.8) and freedmen (88.1).

A related matter is the abstraction of such behaviour into virtues.<sup>22</sup> It has long been recognized that a fundamental characteristic of these imperial virtues is their celebration of differing nuances of the emperor's ability to moderate his own absolute power and to observe self-imposed limitations.<sup>23</sup> Trajan's virtues in the *Panegyricus* constitute the largest cluster of these abstractions attaching to a single human being in the early imperial period.<sup>24</sup> Many of them overlap in basic meaning or at least share nuances. They delineate, as it were, Pliny's view of the appropriate arenas in which an emperor should aspire to pre-eminence.

Consider the most commonly invoked virtues in the speech. Those appearing over ten times in the *Panegyricus* are *modestia* (16), *moderatio* (16), *fides* (16), *uirtus* (16), *reuerentia* (15), *cura* (14), *labor* (14), *liberalitas* (13), *securitas* (12), *pudor* (11), *pietas* (11), *benignitas* (10) and *maiestas* (10). It is completely consistent with Trajan's public imagery that *humanitas* and *diuinitas* (7 times each) receive the same emphasis within the speech.<sup>25</sup> We can clearly see Pliny's programme reflected *in nuce* in this emphasis. *Modestia* and *moderatio* form the bedrock of Pliny's prescription: synonymous terms treating Trajan's basic self-restraint (*TLL* s.v. *moderatio* 1206.5–9). *Pudor* is the inner quality which (positively put) compels such *moderatio*, or (negatively) prevents Trajan from transgressing it. The property of *reuerentia* extends this basic notion of Trajan's self-regulation into an observable demonstration of it in his behaviour. This is the deference with which he chooses to treat august bodies such as the senate (*Pan.* 69.4); it also pertains to the deference owed to his standing as emperor, his *dignitas*, his *maiestas* (*Pan.* 95; *TLL* s.v. *maiestas* 156.1–52). *Securitas* (public security) is, in essence, the benefit accruing to the community as a result of both the emperor's self-moderation and his deferential treatment of his peers.<sup>26</sup> *Fides* speaks to another aspect of this interpersonal dynamic. This is Trajan's maintenance of good faith in his relationships (*TLL* s.v. *fides* 675.10–676.45). But *fides* also has a civic dimension, by which magistrates

<sup>22</sup> For an overview see Charlesworth (1937) 105–38; Weinstock (1971) 228–59; Fears (1981) 827–948; Wallace-Hadrill (1981) 298–323.

<sup>23</sup> Wallace-Hadrill (1981) 316: 'These are all social virtues, qualities of self-restraint. The focus is not on the possession of power, but on the control of it in deference to other members of society.'

<sup>24</sup> There appear to be fifty-one; some of the abstractions in the following list may not meet everyone's definition of a virtue. They are *abstinentia*, *auctoritas*, *benignitas*, *bonitas*, *candor*, *castitas*, *clementia*, *comitas*, *consilium*, *continentia*, *cura*, *diuinitas*, *facilitas*, *familiaritas*, *felicitas*, *fides*, *fortitudo*, *frugalitas*, *grauitas*, *hilaritas*, *humanitas*, *indulgentia*, *iucunditas*, *iustitia*, *labor*, *liberalitas*, *magnanimitas*, *magnitudo*, *maiestas*, *mansuetudo*, *moderatio*, *modestia*, *munificentia*, *opes*, *patientia*, *pietas*, *providentia*, *pudor*, *reuerentia*, *sanctitas*, *sapientia*, *securitas*, *seueritas*, *simplicitas*, *suauitas*, *temperantia*, *tranquillitas*, *uerecundia*, *ueritas*, *uigilantia*, *uirtus*.

<sup>25</sup> See Roche (2003). <sup>26</sup> See Braund (2009) 180 on Sen. *Clem.* 1.1.8.



and judges equitably discharge their responsibilities (TLL s.v. *fides* 679.4–70).<sup>27</sup> *Liberalitas* and its near synonym, *benignitas*, encompass the personal generosity of the emperor (TLL s.v. *benignitas* 1899.21–1901.32),<sup>28</sup> while *cura* and *labor* speak to his industry. *Pietas* pertains to various aspects of his mediating role between the Roman state and the gods, his respectful devotion and attention to the duties owed to the gods and state, as well as his relationship with his family. All of these virtue terms are manifestations of his basic, all-encompassing excellence, his *uirtus*. The density as well as the variety of virtue terms in the *Panegyricus* is noteworthy and instructive: these 13 most frequent virtues appear a total of 174 times throughout the 95 chapters of the speech.

A comparison with other prominent documents which are patently concerned with promoting or evaluating imperial ideals – the *Res Gestae* (c.13), the *Senatus Consultum de Pisone Patre* (abbr. SCPP, 20 CE), Seneca's *De Clementia* (55–6 CE), and Suetonius' *De Vita Caesarum* (early second century CE) – will assist both in offering context to the imperial ideals featured in the speech and in measuring the degree to which Pliny's choice of virtues is either typical or idiosyncratic. Of the four virtues claimed for Augustus on the *clupeus uirtutis* of 27 or 26 BCE (ILS 81; RGDA 34.2) – *uirtus*, *clementia*, *iustitia* and *pietas* – both *uirtus* (sixteen times) and *pietas* (eleven times) are frequent in the *Panegyricus*, but neither could have been omitted in praise of any emperor (and *pontifex maximus*). Consider their frequency in the SCPP (*pietas* nine times; *uirtus* twice), in *De Clementia* (*pietas* twice; *uirtus* fifteen times) and Suetonius (*pietas* eleven times; *uirtus* twelve times). This would especially be the case for *uirtus* – in its military dimension (OLD 1b) – in one who self-consciously cultivated the image of himself as a *uir militaris*. It may surprise that *clementia* and *iustitia* occur with relative infrequency in the *Panegyricus* (three times each), but the discretionary and judicial nuances of *moderatio*,<sup>29</sup> *benignitas* (TLL s.v. *benignitas* 1899.21–1901.32) or *liberalitas*, upon which Pliny does place a great deal of emphasis, may have obviated the need for stressing *clementia*.

Virtues which appear in Pliny as well as in the biographies of his friend and contemporary Suetonius, but do not appear in these earlier documents, are *reuerentia* (15), *labor* (14), *pudor* (11), *grauitas* (5), *facilitas* (4), *opes* (4), *sapientia* (3), *simplicitas* (3), *fortitudo* (3), *abstinentia* (1), *castitas* (1), *comitas* (1) and *munificentia* (1). Virtues which Pliny mentions in the speech but which do not rate a mention in Suetonius are *benignitas* (10), *frugalitas* (5),

<sup>27</sup> See too Hellegouarc'h (1963) 23–40.

<sup>28</sup> See Noreña (2001) 160–4.

<sup>29</sup> For which see Braund (2009) 189 on Sen. *Clem.* 1.2.2.