

# ARCTOS

ACTA PHILOLOGICA FENNICA

VOL. XXVI

HELSINKI 1992 HELSINGFORS

## INDEX

Neil Adkin: "Filthy Manichees"	5
Jaakko Aronen: Notes on Athenian Drama as Ritual Myth-Telling within the Cult of Dionysos	19
Kai Heikkilä: Sappho Fragment 2 L.-P.: Some Homeric Readings	39
Siegfried Jäkel: Die ästhetische Funktion der lyrischen und epischen Elemente in der griechischen Tragödie	55
Iiro Kajanto: A Rhetorical Analysis of Ezechiel Spanheim's <i>Panegyricus</i> of Queen Christina	63
Bengt Löfstedt: Lateinische Quellen einiger mexikanischer Predigtsammlungen	79
Sari Mattero: The gluttonous <i>genius</i> : yearning for vitality and fertility	85
Leena Pietilä-Castrén: A Copy of the Praxitelian <i>Anapauomenos</i> in Finland	97
Olli Salomies: Zur Namengebung der Konsuln in den handschriftlich überlieferten Konsulverzeichnissen für die Zeit 15-284 n.Chr.	105
Heikki Solin: <i>Analecta epigraphica</i> CXLV-CXLIX	117
Veikko Väänänen: <i>DE EBRIETATE</i> , Poèmes bachiques connus en Finlande au XVIIe siècle	129
G. Michael Woloch: Ammianus' Route to Cologne	137
<i>De novis libris iudicia</i>	141
<i>Index librorum in hoc volumine recensorum</i>	165

# A Rhetorical Analysis of Ezechiel Spanheim's *Panegyricus* of Queen Christina

Iiro Kajanto

Among the great multitude of panegyrics in verse and prose, mostly in Latin, dedicated to Queen Christina, the *Panegyricus* delivered at the University of Geneva in 1651 by Ezechiel Spanheim has been particularly esteemed.<sup>1</sup> Spanheim, 1629-1710, is mainly remembered as a skilful diplomat in the service of the German Electors, but he was also a classical scholar, who did remarkable pioneering work in the study of ancient coins.<sup>2</sup>

In another connection I have dealt with one aspect of this remarkable oration, the arguments he mustered to counter the general idea of women's intellectual inferiority.<sup>3</sup> In Christina's panegyrics this was a favourite topic, and the arguments the young orator presented were not very original, culled as they were from the vigorous though still small pro-feminist literature of the age.

It is not because of the ideas, or to speak in rhetorical terms, because of the *inventio* that Spanheim's oration has been claimed to be "ein Muster in der panegyrischen Gattung".<sup>4</sup> In Latin oratory, especially in the baroque age, it was primarily the form that was appreciated. The virtues, qualities

---

<sup>1</sup> *Panegyricus serenissimae et augustissimae principi Christinae... dictus in alma Genevensi academia ad XV. Kal. Octob. anno M.DC.LI.* In the following year the author published a French version of the oration. The letter of dedication shows that he had been exhorted by *personnes d'honneur & de condition* to translate it into that language. The French version was reprinted in J. Arckenholtz, *Mémoires concernant Christine reine de Suède* 2, 1751, appendix seconde, 119-144.

<sup>2</sup> V. Loewe, *Ein Diplomat u. Gelehrter. Ezechiel Spanheim. Historische Studien* 160, 1924; *Allgemeine deutsche Biographie* 35, 1893, 50-59. Spanheim's numismatic treatise *De praestantia et usu numismatum antiquorum* was published in Rome during his stay in the capital of the Pope, see J.E. Sandys, *A History of Classical Scholarship* 2, 1967 (reprint), 327. A new edition published in 1727 contains in Part Two a *vita* of Spanheim written by the editor, Isaacus Verburgius.

<sup>3</sup> *Queen Christina in Latin Panegyrics*, to be published in the *Acta of the Eighth International Congress of Neo-Latin Studies*, Copenhagen 1991.

<sup>4</sup> W.H. Graevert, *Christina Konigin von Schweden und ihr Hof*, 1837, 417.

and achievements for which the young sovereign was eulogized were usually the same from one publication to another. Besides the praise of the traditional princely virtues, which she shared with other rulers, the two unusual features of Christina, her interest in and patronage of learning, and the fact that the leader of a great warlike nation was a woman in a male-dominated society, constituted the staple of the majority of her panegyrics. The difference between them mainly lay in the more or less successful utilization of all the figures of diction and thought provided by rhetoric, the thorough teaching of which belonged to the school and university curricula throughout Europe.

At the time Spanheim composed and recited his panegyric, he had just been invited to occupy the Chair in Eloquence at the Calvinist *Academia* of Geneva.<sup>5</sup> In his native Netherlands, he had enjoyed the excellent teaching of such luminaries of classical scholarship as Daniel Heinsius and Claude Saumaise.<sup>6</sup> He was accordingly well equipped to deliver the panegyric on the Swedish queen on behalf of the city of Geneva.<sup>7</sup>

The *dispositio* or arrangement of the oration corresponds to the models established by ancient and carried on by later rhetoricians. After the preface (1-7),<sup>8</sup> in which with the conventional *modestia auctoris*<sup>9</sup> he explains the reasons for delivering the eulogy, there follows the *propositio* or the statement of his theme (7-8), which consists of Christina's outstanding qualities. The treatment of the theme is divided into a brief biographical part and into a much longer praise of her virtues. In the epideictic oratory, the biographical element was often reduced at the expense of the eulogy on the character of the person praised.<sup>10</sup> This was all the more natural in the case of Queen Christina, who at the time the

---

<sup>5</sup> Ch. Borgeaud, *Histoire de l'université de Geneve* 1. L'academie de Calvin 1559-1798, 1900, 400.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. the *vita* (n. 2) p. VIII.

<sup>7</sup> The Preface of the panegyric reveals that it was his father, Fr. Spanheim, who had first been entrusted with the task of panegyricizing Christina, but his death prevented him from executing it. His father had acquired a good name in Sweden by his history of the Thirty Years War, *Le Soldat Suedois ou histoire veritable de ce qui s'est passé depuis l'avenue de Roy de Suede en Allemagne iusque à sa mort*, 1634.

<sup>8</sup> Unlike many other orations printed in the seventeenth century, Spanheim's panegyric has modern pagination.

<sup>9</sup> For the *topos*, see Lausberg § 275 and Vossius pp. 107A-B.

<sup>10</sup> See Kajanto 74-79.





speech was made, on the 18th of September in 1651, had not yet celebrated her 25th birthday. Spanheim dedicated only seven pages to a description of Christina's childhood (8-15), after which he gave an account of her coronation in two pages (15-16).

The main section, the praise of virtues, opens with the assertion that Christina possesses all the virtues which make a prince perfect and which until now were not believed to be united in one person.<sup>11</sup> Bodily advantages, the mention of which Aristotle and other ancient rhetoricians recommended,<sup>12</sup> were dealt with first (18-20).

The virtues of Christina as a ruler were eulogized in ten pages. The following is a brief summary of the main points. Christina is adequate to the duties of ruling a military nation (21). She did not give the task of governance to others but took care of everything herself (22). But she also consults old and experienced counsellors, who readily agree with her reasoned views (23). Fate has made her the sovereign of a brave nation, the offspring of the ancient Goths (25). Modern Swedes carry on their exploits as vindicators of freedom and security (26). Christina captivates her subjects by love and kindnesses, and they vie in worshipping and revering her (27). Because of the devotion of her subjects, she needs no bodyguard or protection. She is approachable and friendly. She is also a good judge of character and able to see through the people who are admitted to her presence (29-30).

Spanheim, however, devoted more space to the encomium of Christina's love of learning (30-46). It is in this part that the panegyrist with obvious gusto pleads the equality of the sexes and vindicates women's right to and capability of learning. In the end of the section on virtues he pays the customary tribute to piety, which completes all the other good qualities of the queen.<sup>13</sup> The peroration is less conventional. Instead of praying for a long life and future successes, Spanheim expresses the hope that Christina would reconcile the warring Protestant sects, a feat which would win her eternal fame. It should be remembered, however that

---

<sup>11</sup> *Explerent singulae (scil., virtutes) iustum Panegyricum, quae divisae augustissimos Heroas tot locis ac temporibus distinctos vix capientes, nunc conjunctae unius Pectoris angustiis coarctantur* (18,9-13).

<sup>12</sup> Aristotle, rhet. 1,5,6 and 11; cf. Kajanto 155.

<sup>13</sup> *Quam praeclare vero AUGUSTA, omnia illa in Te decora absolvit non ambitiosa aut affectata in Deum Pietas, quae ut virtutum aliarum mater ac alitrix, ita prima in purpurae Tuae limbo refulget* (46,23-47,1).

Spanheim was a Calvinist and recited the panegyric in the heartland of Calvinism.

In this paper, I shall not be analysing the arguments Spanheim mustered for Christina's praise nor anything else that properly belongs to the *inventio*. Instead I shall deal in some detail with the *elocutio* or style of the oration. As I have already observed, it constituted one of its main claims to fame.

The **language** of the oration is lucid and almost purely classical. In this age, Latin poetry and oratory were normally more classical and Ciceronian than was the case in other literary genres, notably in scientific and philosophical prose, in which the use of non-classical terms was allowed and in which medieval syntactic features were often more or less common.<sup>14</sup> But this does not mean that there would not have been considerable variety in the quality of oratorical Latinity between different orators. Not a few of the panegyrics on Christina which I have studied contain almost unintelligible passages.

In the long oration of Spanheim, I have found only an insignificant number of syntactic unclassicism, none of them flagrant.<sup>15</sup> *Propriis opibus* instead of *suis opibus* (26,18) and *tanquam* instead of *velut* (37,12 and 39,6) are minor offences against classical syntax.<sup>16</sup>

Unclassical words were equally rare. *Syllabus* (40,22), which has survived in English, first appeared in Augustine; *subluridus* (41,25), though unknown in ancient Latin, is a rather obvious formation on the model of *sublucidus* and other similar words; *apices* (43,22) and *litterator* (46,9) are only partly unclassical.<sup>17</sup> Only two words were clearly unclassical, *promiconda* (7,14), which Spanheim's French version renders by *le thresor*, treasure, and *redhostimentum* (7,16 and 26,5), recompense. I have not found these words in the dictionaries of medieval and later Latin, but because it is especially the neo-Latin coinages that are

---

<sup>14</sup> Cf. my discussion of Spinoza's Latinity, in *Les textes de Spinoza. Etudes sur les mots, les phrases, les livres* (forthcoming).

<sup>15</sup> I consider unclassical everything written before A.D. 200.

<sup>16</sup> L.H.S. 2, 179: *proprius* as a rival of *suus* belongs to Late Latin, whereas *tanquam* in the function of *velut* was already found in Seneca, *ibid.* 597.

<sup>17</sup> In Gellius 13,31,10 *apices* meant part of a letter. In medieval Latin, it came to signify an epistle, especially by a high-placed person, J.F. Niermeyer, *Mediae latinitatis lexicon minus*, 1976, s.v. For *litterator*, which Spanheim translates by *homme des lettres*, see *Thes.* 7,2,1530.

insufficiently registered, this does not mean that they would have been created by Spanheim.

Nor was Spanheim given to the erudite snobbery of bedecking his pages with rare words gleaned from a classical author. His vocabulary consisted of the common stock of classical words. Only once do we encounter a Ciceronian hapax, *myrothecium* (see below p. 76). *Germaniae Telamo* (10,9) is a term of architecture, a pillar of a male figure, found in Vitruvius. Further, phrases appropriated from classical authors were few, which is a sign of an experienced orator. Learning the expressions of Cicero and others by heart was a favourite didactic method, but it often resulted in writings that were wellnigh pastiches, consisting of borrowings which for the main part were unacknowledged.

In Spanheim's oration, there are only a few recognizable reminiscences, *Umbratili vita pallescere* (32,3) comes from Quintilian 1,2,18; the somewhat unusual expression *publicum egregium* (35,2), translated as *le bien Public*, may have been taken from Tacitus, ann. 3,70; finally, *ni mens laeva auguratur* (46,18) resembles Virgil, ecl. 1,16 *si mens non laeva fuisset*. Spanheim's Latinity is thus remarkably free from *bona aliena*, which we must consider one of the reasons for its general excellence.<sup>18</sup>

In **sentence structure**, Spanheim generally follows the pattern of periods composed of brief parallel clauses and completed by the main clause, which is usually longer than the other clauses. In praising the successful way Christina combines the virtues of both sexes, he writes, for example:

1. *Viris imperatura virilibus curis animum distringere;*
2. *sexus (scil., female) mollitiem frangere;*
3. *imbecillitatem exuere;*
4. *veneres mascula virtute temperare;*
5. *singula utriusq. decora in Te unam transfundere,*
6. *tam felici quam stupendo exitu aggressa es* (14,8-13).

The passage is also a typical example of the figure of enumeration, to which I shall return later on.

---

<sup>18</sup> For a few borrowed metaphors, see p. 76.

Spanheim's predilection for parallel clauses may partially explain the most conspicuous feature of his rhetorical language, the remarkable frequency of anaphora. There is scarcely a page without a string of anaphoric clauses, and not a few pages have more than one group.

**Anaphora** is specifically a Latin rhetorical device, usually called *repetitio*, while the word *anaphora* came into use only in late Latinity.<sup>19</sup> Rhet. Her. 4,19 recommends the figure because it gives the discourse charm, impressiveness and vigour. In the Latin literature of antiquity, it was in favour among Silver Latin writers, such as Seneca the Younger, whose sentence structure was similar to that of Spanheim.<sup>20</sup> In classical Latin, though, anaphora was seldom as ubiquitous and almost obtrusive as it was in post-classical writers. Even such anti-rhetorical authors as Descartes and Spinoza were unable to avoid it.<sup>21</sup>

In Spanheim, the number of anaphoric clauses in a period varied from two to nine, but in the majority of cases their number was only two or three. The anaphoric words were usually adverbs, e.g. *hic, hinc, ita*, the interjection *o, si, sic, ut*, and *vix*, which was found in no less than nine passages; more rarely prepositions, *a(b), inter, post*; adjectives, *dignam, dignum, novus* and nouns, *dies*, while pronouns were more common, e.g. *id, qui, quae*, the indeclinable *tot* in eight passages. But the pronouns often agreed with their main words, producing the figure of polyptoton, *illud... illa... illud... illa... illa... ille... illa*, quoted below on p. 74.

Anaphoras sometimes seem almost excessive. In a passage in the Preface (6), where Spanheim elaborates the *topos* of the insufficiency of rhetoric for the task at hand (cf. above n. 9), there are three clauses beginning with *vel*, four with *sic*, two with *cujus*, and four with *hic*, quoted later on (p. 76).

Anaphoras consisting of two words were unusual. In Spanheim, however, we find *in illa... luce, in illa... dignatione* (32,2-8). On the same page, there is the construction *illud est* followed by three *quod*-clauses, *illud ipsum est* with two *quod*-clauses, and finally *illud ipsum denique est*, a combination of anaphora and mounting *gradatio*.<sup>22</sup>

<sup>19</sup> Lausberg § 629; Martin 303.

<sup>20</sup> L.H.S. 2, 695.

<sup>21</sup> See my work mentioned in n. 14.

<sup>22</sup> For *gradatio*, see Dupriez 200-201.

Because Spanheim utilized anaphoras throughout his discourse, it is not possible to maintain that they would have been a feature of particularly rhetorical passages. However, in eulogizing Christina's pious attribution of all her successes to God, the pronoun *illi*, to him, scil., to God, is repeated nine times: *illi tutelam regni, illi... illi... illi... illi... illi... illi... illi... illi unam denique tot decora sustinendi felicitatem transcribis* (47,23-48,6). All the clauses are parallel, and the main clause is placed last. Besides anaphoras, the passage is also marked by the figure of enumeration, which will be discussed later on. It is perhaps due to the importance of the passage, the encomium of Christina's piety, which precedes his concluding wish that Christina will be the conciliator of warring Protestant denominations, that made Spanheim employ an excessive number of anaphoras, which often served to heighten the emotional impact of a passage.

Syntactic **chiasmi** in Spanheim were less frequent than anaphoras,<sup>23</sup> but were not entirely absent. The ancient rhetoricians ignored the figure, the term itself only being coined in 1845.<sup>24</sup> Rhet. Her. 4,38 uses the word *commutatio* and Quint. 9,3,85 the Greek word ἀντιμεταβολή, but they suggest antitheses more than chiasmi in the sense of the criss-cross order of syntagmas in juxtaposed clauses. In practice, however, Roman writers often employed the figure, especially to achieve a certain *inconcinnitas*.<sup>25</sup>

Spanheim's chiasmi were usually simple, *animi magnitudine, robore corporis* (9,21); *inter tot lubrica fortunae & tot laborum avocamenta* (42,19-20); *Roma faecunda miraculis & prodigiorum Parens* (40,8-9). It is only rarely that a sentence contains more than one chiasmus. Significantly, the most explicit passage occurs in the Peroration, which like the Preface was usually rhetorically more finished than the rest of the discourses. Spanheim assures that

1. *per omnes aetates proclamaberis Fidei iuxta ac litterarum Praesidium,*
2. *Sexus Tui Portentum,*

<sup>23</sup> Dupriez 95 defines the figure as "the placing in inverse order of the segments formed by two syntactically identical groups of words".

<sup>24</sup> Lausberg 2,893. Cf. § 801.

<sup>25</sup> L.H.S. 2, 697.

3. *Victrix Masculi*,
4. *Stupor Gentium*,
5. *orbis Arctoi Miraculum*,
5. *Tuorum Delicium*,
6. *Decus & Gaudium Seculi* (51,12-16).

Marking the genitive with 'a' and the main word with 'b' we accordingly have the series a - b, a - b, b - a, b - a, a - b, a - b, b - a. By this means he could somewhat reduce the monotony resulting from an excessive number of brief parallel clauses.

**Antithesis** or the contrasting of two ideas,<sup>26</sup> which was a notable figure of baroque literary style, particularly in what are called lapidary compositions,<sup>27</sup> are inconspicuous in Spanheim's discourse. There are only a few and perhaps unintentional antithetical passages. Spanheim argues that Christina paid little attention to external luxury. Hence her uncared-for royal palace suggested *imperantis non ocium aut luxum, sed curas & frugalitatem* (12,1-3), where both pairs of words are antithetically contrasted. The historical veracity of the assertion is questionable, but in a panegyric, especially in the baroque age, this did not always matter. .

Besides anaphora, the other frequently used figure was **hyperbaton**.<sup>28</sup> The ancient rhetoricians, Rhet. Her. 4,44 and Quint. 8,6,62 recommended it to avoid harsh compositions and to aid prose rhythm. But they were equally well aware of the risks of its excessive use, which could render the thought obscure.<sup>29</sup> In post-classical Latin oratory, there was often veritable abuse of hyperbaton, which may have contributed to the discrediting of Latin oratory during the Age of Reason. Certainly, splitting a syntagma by a long chain of other words did not always make it easy to grasp the meaning of a period. In delivery, though, a hyperbaton could be distinguished by stressing it differently, but to my knowledge we have little information about this aspect of delivery.

Few pages of Spanheim did not carry at least one hyperbaton, and not a few had several. The opening period of the oration has one of the

---

<sup>26</sup> Dupriez 50.

<sup>27</sup> See my discussion in *On Lapidary Style in Epigraphy and Literature in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*, due to appear in *Humanistica Lovaniensia*.

<sup>28</sup> Lausberg §§ 716-18; Martin 308-10; the Latin term was *traiectio*.

<sup>29</sup> Rhet. Her., loc. cit.; Quint. 8,2,14 *Quare nec sit... traiectione tam tardus ut ultra modum finis ejus differatur*.

longest: *si Regiae Tuae (... 12) fores (... 4) non cunctabundus pulso (1,4-7)*. But this is greatly surpassed by a period in the next page, which amplifies the idea that it would be a shame if Geneva kept silent about Christina's praises: *Turpe inquam fuisset ac absonum, Genevam nostram, qua non Urbs alia (... 7); non alia gloriae Tuae (... 12) magnitudini (... 3) impensius favet, in illa (... 6) populorum turba non agnoscere (2,14-22)*. The main clause is underlined. It is separated by no less than 43 words, which include other hyperbatons. The example is, however, untypical. In Spanheim's hyperbatons, the syntagmas were usually separated by less than ten words.<sup>30</sup> Again, the words constituting a hyperbaton were usually the attribute or genitive and the words they modify, whereas here it is the accusative or the subject and the infinitive or the predicate that are placed at the beginning and the end of a period. In the first example quoted above (p.70), it is the genitive and in the last an attribute: *illa... turba*, that make up the hyperbatons. Besides pronouns, adjectives and participles could also be separated from their modificands, e.g. *inter perpetuas (... 8) destinationes & curas (34,20-22)*.

For Spanheim, hyperbaton clearly seems to have been more a figure of higher rhetoric than was anaphora. Whereas anaphoras were found throughout the discourse, though with a certain intensification in the Preface and Peroration, conventionally the rhetorically most elaborate sections of an oration, hyperbatons showed a still more marked frequency in these parts, especially in the Preface.

In not a few orators, the extravagant and unskilful use of hyperbaton justifies the warning of rhetoricians against the injudicious employment of the device. Spanheim, however, seldom obscures his discourse by overlong and complicated hyperbatons. The example quoted from the Preface is exceptional not only in the number of the separating words but also in the fact that the syntagma split by the hyperbaton represents the subject and the predicate, which in an ordinary Latin sentence could be placed at the beginning and at the end.

Language, sentence structure and rhetorical figures do not, however, make up the essence of oratory. They could be, and were often found in other literary genres, even in philosophical prose.<sup>31</sup>

---

<sup>30</sup> I have omitted the cases in which syntagmas were split by only one or two intervening words.

<sup>31</sup> *Stylus Philosophicus*, which comprehends Latin in scholarly and scientific works, normally shunned the conspicuous use of rhetorical devices, see Kajanto, Johannes

**Amplification** or to use the definition of Dupriez, "the grandiloquent development of ideas so as to make them more richly ornamented, broader in scope, or more forceful",<sup>32</sup> was the kernel of rhetorical discourses and in particular of epideictic orations.<sup>33</sup> The content of an oration was often in adverse relation to its length. But it is unjustified to dismiss Latin oratory in the baroque age, as Sven Lindroth does, with the disparaging remark that its purpose was "to say little in many words".<sup>34</sup> What mattered was *how* it was said. In the baroque age, the beauty of form was appreciated as never before.

Ancient and modern rhetoricians gave abundant advice about how to amplify a discourse.<sup>35</sup> Comparisons, digressions, accumulation of synonyms or synonymous expressions, enumeration, quotations etc. were favourite means of amplification.

Spanheim did not make an indiscriminate use of all these devices. Unlike many less accomplished orators, he did not expand his discourse by quotations from ancient authors. Nor were there any digressions. On the other hand, he is a most diligent citer of historical *exempla*, 53 in all, the largest number among the panegyrists of Christina. Especially in the passages which pay tribute to Christina's learning, he records a great number of ancient and later women distinguished for their erudition.<sup>36</sup> One example of Spanheim's historical comparisons will be quoted on p. 75.

Besides comparisons, Spanheim's favourite methods of amplification were enumeration and redundancy. **Enumeration** or dividing a whole into its constituent parts were well-known to the ancient<sup>37</sup> as well as to later rhetoricians.<sup>38</sup> I shall quote as an example of Spanheim's

Schefferus on the *imitatio veterum*, Arctos 24, 1990, 77. Nevertheless, rhetoric was such an inseparable part of Latin education that in practice it left some modest impact on learned Latin, too; see my discussion of Spinoza's style in the work mentioned in n. 14.

<sup>32</sup> Dupriez 32.

<sup>33</sup> Aristotle, rhet. 1,9,38-40 recommends it as most suitable for epideictic orators.

<sup>34</sup> Svensk lärdomshistoria 2. Stormaktstiden, 1975 (1991), 187-88. Lindroth was, it is true, referring to students' orations.

<sup>35</sup> Quint. 8,4 deals with the various methods of amplifying a discourse; cf. Lausberg §§ 400-406.

<sup>36</sup> I shall discuss Spanheim's exemplification in a future treatise on Historical *Exempla* in the Panegyrics of Queen Christina.

<sup>37</sup> For the ancient doctrine, see Rhet. Her. 4,47 *Distributio est cum in plures res aut Personas negotia quaedam certa dispertiuntur*; Lausberg §§ 669-74.

<sup>38</sup> Vossius 4,8,3, pp. 258A-259A.

enumerations the passage in which he itemizes all the services which Christina's father, Gustavus Adolphus, had done to all and sundry:

1. *cui tot Principes profugi & extorres sceptrum ac splendorem as-  
sertum,*
2. *tot privati salutem,*
3. *tot populi quietem,*
4. *Germania vindicatam libertatem,*
5. *Europa sublatum servitutis metum,*
6. *Duces inauditas bellandi artes,*
7. *subditi late prolati imperij fines,*
8. *seculum denique maximi omnis aevi Herois gloriam & exemplum  
debet (9,11-19).*

The period is composed of eight clauses. Each of the clauses 1 - 7 records some particular aspect of the king's services, while the last clause sums up all his heroic glory. Further, they represent rulers and private people, Europe in general and Germany in particular, and the generals and subjects of Sweden, who are indebted to the king for their safety, freedom, and warlike glory, respectively. The period also observes mounting *gradatio* in that the last clause pays the Swedish sovereign the greatest possible tribute.

Enumerations were found throughout the discourse, but they were not as conspicuous as anaphoras and hyperbatons. A few of them have been referred to above, such as the long chain of anaphoric clauses in which Spanheim makes Christina attribute all her successes to God (p. 69).

The usual form of **synonymy**, the combination of two words of similar import, was a general feature of Latin since the preclassical age.<sup>39</sup> It is therefore scarcely to be considered a peculiarity of rhetorical style. In Spanheim's discourse, this type of synonymy was found in almost every page, *spirantem semper ac immortalem* (10,15-16); *rescindere... ac antiquare* (16,18-19); *cum foenore & auctario* (21,2-3), etc. As a matter of fact, they did not greatly contribute to amplification.

---

<sup>39</sup> L.H.S. 2,785-90.

**Redundancy**, defined by Dupriez as "repetition of an idea in two or more closely rephrased forms",<sup>40</sup> was a more serviceable method of amplification. In Spanheim, it is fairly common, e.g. *Quorum* (scil., the exploits of the Swedes) *beneficio tot lacrimae abstersae, tot gemitus repressi, tot querelae extinctae* (26,10-12), in which each of the clauses repeats the same idea. A similar case is e.g. the passage in which the panegyrist describes the intellectuals' veneration for their patron: *Tibi ut litterarum praesidi, ut tutelari Numini, ut sacrorum suorum Antistiti religiosa passim veneratione assurgunt* (32,19-21). The expressions were taken from religious language, but all of them meant the same. Notice that both quotations also show parallelism and anaphoras.

Enumeration and synonymy or redundancy are not, however, always easy to distinguish. In ancient rhetoric, they were often combined.<sup>41</sup> The following passage, which paid tribute to Christina's physical advantages, shows both enumeration, redundancy and synonymy:

1. *Quam pulcher enim illud oris decor,*<sup>42</sup>
2. *illa frontis majestas,*
3. *illud oculorum lumen igneum simul ac verecundum,*
4. *illa species nec fracta nec superba,*
5. *illa venusta simul ac torosa membrorum omnium compages,*
6. *ille totius corporis habitus citra sordes & mollitiem cultus,*
7. *ac illa denique, quae pingi non possunt, fulgetra fulguraque,*
8. *dignum magno hospite domicilium, & coelestissimae mentis delubrum ostentant* (18,23-19,7).

The passage voices the ancient idea of the correspondence between a beautiful body and a beautiful soul.<sup>43</sup> In the case of the Queen of Sweden, though, the praise was singularly misplaced, for her countenance was not attractive and her body somewhat misshapen. But Spanheim saw Christina

---

<sup>40</sup> Dupriez 282. In ancient rhetoric, the figure went by the name of *expolitio*, cf. Rhet. Her. 4,54; Vossius 4,2,5, p. 229A repeats the definition: *cum orationes idem significantes coniunguntur*.

<sup>41</sup> See Lausberg § 674.

<sup>42</sup> The printed oration has *adcor*, corrected by ink to *decor*. The correction was no doubt made by the author, for the copy which I have used, now in the Royal Library in Stockholm, carries on its title-page the dedication *Pour Monseigneur le Chancelier Oxenstierne*.

<sup>43</sup> Cf. my Discussion in Kajanto 155.

in person only during her Roman days. Moreover, extravagant praise was a hallmark of epideictic oratory.

The passage enumerates various components of Christina's physical appearance, but clauses 1 - 2 repeat the same idea of an imposing countenance, clauses 3 and 7 refer to her sparkling eyes, and the clauses 5 - 6 describe her body. In the main clause, *domicilium* and *delubrum* are a typical pair of synonyms.

In some cases, Spanheim tried to avoid the monotony which long enumerations composed of parallel clauses may occasion by varying the verb. In a passage he claims that Christina challenges and surpasses celebrated ancient rulers in the possession of royal virtues. I shall not, he maintains, in my brief oration praise

1. *iustitiae famam, qua Augustos et Trajanos provocas;*
2. *... Clementiam, qua Caesares ac Titos laccessis;*
3. *... Munificentiam & Liberalitatem Regiam, qua Alexandros & Philadelphos vincis;*
4. *... mansuetudinem ac temperantiam, qua Cyros & Scipiones transcendis (17,24-18,5).*

To profess that one will not speak about something but actually does so is a well-known rhetorical figure, which Rhet. Her. 4,37 calls *occultatio*. Modern English uses its Greek equivalent *paraleipsis* or *preterition*.<sup>44</sup> It is a device by which still more attention is drawn to the things allegedly omitted. The passage also illustrates Spanheim's historical citations (see p. 72). Finally, the period has the usual structure of parallel clauses and anaphoras.

**Similes** from olden times belonged to rhetorical embellishment although ancient rhetoricians advised some restraint in their use. Aristotle, rhet. 3,4 argues that they should not be too frequent because of their poetical flavour. Rhet. Her. 4,62 and Cicero, inv. 1,49 discuss the figure without comment whereas Quint. 5,11,24, too, recommends some caution in citing them. There was no sharp difference between similes and metaphors. According to Aristotle, loc. cit., a simile differs from a metaphor only by the addition of the word "like". The Roman rhetoricians,

---

<sup>44</sup> The latter term is used in Dupriez 353.

Cicero, orat. 92 and Quint. 8,6,6 argue that metaphor, *translatio*, could be resorted to if a proper term was lacking or for the sake of embellishment.

There was remarkable difference between orators in their use of similes and metaphors. Panegyrists with a certain skill at poetry could easily coin fresh comparisons from keen observation of nature while others, if they cited them at all, were content with old similes and trite metaphors, which were scarcely felt to be metaphors at all. Spanheim seems to belong to the latter more than to the former category. In contrast with the multitude of historical *exempla*, his similes were few and seldom expressive. Comparing the queen to the sun (20,1-2; 41,25-42,5) or to a new and benign star (11,3-4) is anything but original. Nor were similes borrowed from the race-course very fresh:<sup>45</sup> your excellencies are so immense that after almost exhausting my strength in praising them, I have scarcely come to the *lineas et carceres*, the starting line (30, 19-22), which is also an example of the *topos* of *modestia*, the orator protesting his inadequacy to the task. He uses the same simile in praising the young sovereign's intellectual gifts: in a brief time you have covered such a vast field of learning that the impulse which had drawn you to the starting line soon took you to the *meta*, the winning post (33,13-15).

For the sake of redundancy, Spanheim sometimes accumulates metaphors. In lamenting the insufficiency of rhetoric to the eulogy of Christina, he exclaims:

1. *Hic enim jejunas agnoscimus Rhetorum regulas;*
2. *hic primum exhausta illorum myrothecia;*
3. *hic infantem eloquentissimorum hominum eloquentiam;*
4. *hic accisas ejus vires, & sine toris ac nervis languidam, maciem suam ac squallorem ostentantem (6,15-20).*

Clauses 2 and 4 are clear metaphors, and the latter clause contains two pairs of them. None of the metaphors was original. They had been exploited for describing styles by Cicero,<sup>46</sup> Pliny the Younger,<sup>47</sup> and

<sup>45</sup> See Thes. 3,434: *carcer* translate i.q. *initium*.

<sup>46</sup> Att. 2,1,1 *Meus autem liber... totum Isocrati myrothecium ... consumpsit*.

<sup>47</sup> Epist. 5,8,10 *hanc* (scil., *historiam*) *saepius ossa, musculi, nervi, illam* (scil., *orationem*) *tori quidam et quasi iubae decent*.

Quintilian.<sup>48</sup> But because *imitatio* of classical Latinity was the guiding principle of humanist writers, and nowhere more so than in panegyric oratory, they were more often than not content with the inventions of the ancients.

**Metonymy** was another means of giving discourse vividness and variety.<sup>49</sup> In Spanheim metonymy is not commonly used, excepting such common metonymies as Mars for war (10,7) and Pallas et Musae for learning (31,10; 32,8-9). In a number of passages, he elaborates the well-known metonymy of *purpura* for royal power.<sup>50</sup> The royal virtues, which the past admired in great princes, are embroidered on your purple, sparkling with ever new ornaments (17,5-8).<sup>51</sup> The image is, however, flat, and juxtaposing abstracts like virtues with concrete things like ornaments, not particularly felicitous. In two other passages, the metonymy is more conventional: excessive dependence on your counsellors would dim the splendour of your purple (23,6-9); the splendour of all other learned women is obscured by the brilliance of your purple, followed by the synonymous but non-metonymical expression *AUGUSTA pulchritudo* (42,5-8).

But all in all, figurative language was not one of the strong points of Spanheim's masterpiece of oratory.

To conclude, although Spanheim's syntax and vocabulary, with few exceptions, were classical and Ciceronian, his style was to a certain extent anti-Ciceronian. With its predilection for strings of parallel clauses, more often than not distinguished by anaphoras, it showed marked affinity with the style of Silver Latin authors.

## ABBREVIATIONS

Dupriez = Bernard Dupriez, *A Dictionary of Literary Devices*, translated and adapted by Albert W. Halsall (original in French), 1991.

<sup>48</sup> *Macies* in 2,4,9; cf. Tacitus, dial. 21,1; *squalor* in 2,5,23.

<sup>49</sup> Lausberg §§ 565-71.

<sup>50</sup> E.g. Verg., *georg.*, 2,495-96 *illum non Populi fasces. non purpura regum / flexit*. Lausberg § 568,5 describes this kind of metonymy as Symbol-Beziehung.

<sup>51</sup> There is a variety of the same metonymy in 46, 25-47, 1: quoted in n. 13.

Kajanto = Iiro Kajanto, *Humanism in a Christian Society II. Classical Moral Philosophy and Oratory in Finland 1640-1713*, 1990 .

Lausberg = Heinrich Lausberg, *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik 1-2*, 1960.

L.H.S. 2 = Leumann-Hofmann-Szantyr, *Lateinische Grammatik 2. Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik*, 1965.

Martin = Josef Martin, *Antike Rhetorik. Technik und Methode*, 1974.

Vossius = Gerardus Johannes Vossius, *Commentariorum rhetoricorum sive oratoriarum institutionum libri sex*, in *Opera omnia III*, 1697 .