McOmish, David Malcolm (2011) *The Roman elite and the power of the past: continuity and change in Ostrogothic Italy.* PhD thesis.

http://theses.gla.ac.uk/2430/

The Roman Elite and the Power of the Past: Continuity and Change in Ostrogothic Italy

David Malcolm McOmish

PhD Thesis

Department of Classics, Faculty of Arts

University of Glasgow

September 2010

Abstract

This thesis examines the changes forced upon the Roman elite in the evolving political climate of Ostrogothic Italy. It examines what mechanisms the Roman elite employed to renegotiate their position of influence within the state. The relationship the elite had with the past provides evidence for wider changes in society. I assert that, using the language and landscape of the past, the elite formed discourses which responded to, and which attempted to facilitate a realignment in, a changing environment.

The education system still provided the Roman elite with a mechanism through which they could define themselves and prepare for what they considered to be the important aspects of the world outside the classroom. Religious discussions and debate in the post-imperial Italy of Late Antiquity were increasingly directed toward attempts to reunite the fractured Roman Empire through a unified empire of Orthodox faith. Having such a close relationship with the Roman Empire and its political and philosophical culture, education and religion are particularly suitable fields to reflect the changes to the political map of the Roman Empire. Focusing on the elite's relationship with education and religion, this thesis will uncover examples of continuity and change which are implied by the construction of, and interaction with, discourses designed to facilitate the elite's renegotiation strategies. Reconstructing the education of prominent members of the elite from their writings provides the evidence for such discourses. The emphasis on this part of the thesis is on discovering how the discourses circulating in relation to education responded to the political and philosophical problems through the language of the past and what these responses tell us about changes in the present. The religious discussion focuses on the attempts of the opinion formers in Italy to create and direct narratives designed to establish the superiority of one religious world-view over another. An examination of the language of tradition in the construction of these narratives provides evidence for the potency of the past in the decision-making process and ideology-forming strategies of the Roman elite. It also provides evidence for the changes in society to which the strategies were responding.

A final-chapter case study provides an opportunity to see evidence of the effectiveness of these discourse-forming strategies. In this chapter we see a contemporary historical source interacting with those narratives and discourses we witnessed the elite employing in the education and religion chapters. It also provides an opportunity to see how the past is used to justify the actions of the Roman elite in Ostrogothic Italy to a post-Gothic audience (as the work was composed in the immediate aftermath of the fall of Ostrogothic Italy). This final consideration provides an instructive contrast which brings into sharp focus the extent and nature of continuity and change brought about by the Ostrogothic state.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Professor Roger P H Green for the years of patient, considered advice and direction, which have provided the bedrock upon which this thesis is built. I would also like to thank Graham Whittaker at the University Library for his support in managing to acquire texts which proved vital to the development of my argument. Finally, I would like to thank my wife, Fiona, for her advice and unstinting support over the period of time taken to complete this research project. Without her, it would simply not have been possible.

Definitions/Abbreviations

AV	*Anonymus Valesianus Pars Posterior*
CAH	Cambridge Ancient History
CCSL	Corpus Christianorum Series Latina
CIL	*Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*
CLP	Clavis Patrum Latinorum
CSEL	Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum
GLK	Grammatici Latini de Keil
MGH	Monumenta Germaniae Historica
OLD	Oxford Latin Dictionary
PG	Patrologia Graeca (ed. J. P. Migne)
PL	Patrologia Latina (ed. J. P. Migne)
PLRE	*Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire*, I (ed. A. H. M. Jones, J. R. Martindale, and J. Morris (Cambridge, 1971)), II (ed. J. Martindale (Cambridge 1980))
RIS	Rerum Italicarum Scriptores

Introduction

...iam sinu in medio sic gentis invictae, quod tamen alienae,

natalium vetustorum signa retinebunt: nam iam remotis gradibus dignitatum,

per quas solebat ultimo a quoque summus quisque discerni, solum erit

posthac nobilitatis indicium litteras nosse.[1]

Sidonius' understanding of the 'fall' of the Roman Empire is one contemporary characterization with which one can at once sympathize and understand. This is a period of dramatic transformation and Sidonius' own social and cultural biases naturally led him toward a view about what was - and was not - indicative of the empire and its end. It is difficult to argue that the removal of the offices of state in a major part of the West was not significant and marked the end of a historical process. However, attempting to comprehend and understand the ebb and flow of change and continuity in the later Roman World through the prism of a partial and partisan viewpoint is a limiting exercise.[2] Such an approach runs the risk of diluting an appreciation of the significance and intensity of the myriad of changes and continuities which constituted the rich and diverse world of the 5th and 6th centuries. Throughout the West there is evidence that there were a multitude of changes, each following their own pace and logic. As we shall see as this thesis unfolds, Sidonius' paradigm of fall is an inappropriate explanatory framework for what is happening elsewhere in the West. If we accept Sidonius' characterization of Rome, we must also accept that the evidence from Rome and Italy suggests that this Rome did not fall. The cultural and political horizons of the group which Sidonius characterizes did not recede for some time. Above all, however, his narrowly restricted definition of a Roman (that of a highly educated secular office bearer) fails to provide us with a fuller representation of the Romans who created, developed, and maintained 'Roman' culture in this period. This representation presents Sidonius inhabiting a reassuring

---

[1] Sidonius, *Ep*. 8.2.2.

[2] The historian Marcellinus, writing of matters occurring at exactly the same time (476 A.D.), observed: *Hesperium Romanae gentis imperium, quod septingentesimo nono urbis conditae anno primus Augustorum Octavianus Augustus tenere coepit, cum hoc Augustulo periit, anno decessorum regni imperatorum quingentesimo vigesimo secundo, Gothorum dehinc regibus Romam tenentibus The Chronicle of Marcellinus*, 26 (in Croke's 1995 edition). Macellinus also characterizes the 'fall' in a fashion sympathetic to his own cultural bias (a piece of retrospection favourable to contemporary Eastern sensibilities in the early 6th century, when the Goths were seen, as we shall see, as a barrier to Eastern political and religious ideology). Arnaldo Momigliano reminds us that the crash was not quite as noticable to other contemporaries: Momigliano (1980), "La caduta senza rumore di un impero" *Sesto contributo alla storia degli studi classici,* Roma, Edizioni di storia e letteratura.

cultural space which sets him apart from his new Germanic overlords, but it fails to alert us to the depth and extent of the continuities and changes Roman civilization was confronted with in the West. This thesis will attempt to unearth the nature and extent of the continuities and changes experienced by the Roman elite (a term, the semantic implication of which we shall define below) in Italy by examining the political, social, and cultural implications of their responses to these pressures (the narrative strategies they employed, the cultural milieu they inhabited - consciously and intuitively). As we shall see, Italy presents us with a different West, and a different set of elites, which combine to present us with a incredibly diverse and fascinating cultural landscape.

Subject Matter

I will now discuss the focus of this thesis and how it will add to that bigger picture. Firstly I shall describe the central concern of this study. I shall then explain why I have chosen to look at this subject. Finally, I shall describe how (methods) I will approach my task. I intend to look at one region of the West (historically and culturally a crucial region), examining the progress of one set of individuals within this region (socially and culturally a central group), and within one clearly definable chronological period (a period with both tumultuous political change and uncharacteristic stability). The group whose activities I shall be examining are the Roman elite. The region under investigation will be Italy; the period will be the reign of Theoderic the Great (490-526 A.D.). I have chosen a period and location which I think fertile ground for an investigation. It meets the necessary conditions outlined above: within its parameters a cohesive and concentrated study can be conducted; and it feeds into the more general picture of evolving culture in Late Antiquity. The concern will be to examine the language and discourse of those within Roman society who are consciously and subconsciously creating, perpetuating, and developing traditional and contemporary concepts of Roman civilization. The focus will very much be on the relationship their cultural universe has with both traditional Roman civilisation in Late Antiquity (and its circulating discourses) and with the contemporary society of Italy under Theoderic the Great (and its circulating discourses).

I shall now explain why I chose the period, location, and group. Firstly, I chose to focus on the period 490 A.D. to 526 A.D. because it is not only clearly part of a cultural and political continuum, but it also betrays elements of cultural and political phenomena which are clearly innovations. Italy and Rome are under the control of a stable government, but individuals and groups from within Italy (from within the circle of cultural-discourse formers described above) are not only inhabiting this cultural space in familiar ways, they also exhibit behavioural patterns which betray the contours of change beneath the surface. Throughout any period such as this where change can be discerned, a survey which seeks to examine the nature and scale of transformation must provide - no matter how arbitrary – a starting point. This starting point should give the study as much material for investigation as possible. Therefore, I also gravitated towards this period because, from the deposition of Romulus Augustulus to the final accession of Theoderic (some 17 years or so), a sufficient enough period of time seemed to have passed for any cultural and political transformations of the sort Sidonius and Marcellinus describe to have begun to embed themselves in the cultural landscape. Indeed, the end of Theoderic's reign sees exactly half a century since the deposition of Romulus Augustulus. I was interested to see if the relatively stable quarter of a century which leads up to this 50th anniversary was a period in which the power-brokers of Italy inhabited a recognisably late-antique cultural and political continuum, or if it was a period in which the Ostrogothic state facilitated a changed cultural discourse within the various outlets for the expression of Roman culture in Late Antiquity.

I chose the location because the accession of Theoderic to rule in Italy presents a Gothic king ruling the heart of the old empire - Italy and Rome.[3] Italy was the spiritual, political and cultural heart of the West. The main institutions constraining and controlling cultural and political behaviour (the church, the senate, the law courts, and the educational establishments which supported them) provided the elites of Italy with an incredibly enabling platform upon which to advance their goals. The

---

[3] Theoderic's formal title has long been the subject of dispute. Mommsen (*Gesammelte Schriften* VI, 362-369), Stein (*Histoire du Bas-Empire II*, 116) posit the idea that he was both king and imperial officer (*magister militum*). Jones (1962), suggests a less ordered situation, where Theoderic's rule as a king was the *real politik*, and the titles and insignia of imperial office retrospective wishful thinking on the part of some Romans (see 129 especially). Regardless, Theoderic, a gothic king, did now inherit the infrastructure (and its dependent cultural outlets) of the Western Roman Empire.

institutions and practices of these institutions created networks within which any serious opinion former within Roman society could move. The Imperial bureaucracy and the sacred consistory stationed in Italy required in its officials certain specialist attributes which required a traditional education. Significant change in the political administration of the empire would surely have had an effect upon the networks and spheres of influence within which the Roman elite operated. Also, the increasing power of the papacy in Rome, and its close associations with both the Imperial government and the Italian aristocracy provided another powerful network of relations within which the Roman elite could work. The advent of a non-catholic government would have implications for the elite's ability to interact with its traditional arrangements.

Again, it was for several reasons that I chose to focus this time- and location-specific examination upon the Roman elite. Most obviously for any study which attempts to discover something about fundamental transformation within a civilisation, a prime motivation must be to discover something of the essence of the civilisation in question. And whatever we consider Roman civilisation to consist of,[4] there can be little doubt that those who control the cultural and political discourse play a seminal role in determining major aspects of it. Who were this Roman elite? This is something that this thesis will attempt to define a little more clearly. Provisionally, one can say that an elite is a class in society which defines and propagates the cultural discourse of a society. When attempting to address the problems social science has in providing any clear definition of elite, Peter Brown says: "One aspect, at least, of the elites of late antiquity is sharply characterized for us: they are *political* elites in that they derive their meaning from an imperial system."[5] This narrow definition of an elite would seem to be particularly unhelpful to someone working within the confines of a period where such an imperial system is no longer in operation. Far from it. There were structures which the imperial system generated to maintain the offices which provided that 'meaning'. The fate of these structures provides the key to understanding key changes and continuities in our period. From the religious life,

---

[4] Brian Ward-Perkins (2005), in his discussion on the end of civilisation in Antiquity, suggests a sophisticated network of economic and material benefits, crossing all social boundaries.

[5] Brown (2000), 330.

whose state-controlled offices they historically sought to dominate, to the literary heartbeat of intellectual life (where the education which sustained that life was formed by their political and cultural preoccupations), the Roman elite were *the* crucial variable which gave life to these institutions and vice versa (as Brown's quotation implies). Investigating the activities of literary, religious, and cultural elites in a context where the state is not easily detached from developments in those fields, provides us with an opportunity to see not only the elite evolving, but the world around them too. Focusing on their activities in this period, therefore, should tell us something about any transformations taking place in the nature of Roman civilisation in this crucial period of Late Antiquity.

In short, then, examining this period allows me to do several things: examine the Roman elite's responses to their new political setting; closely scrutinise the Roman elite's ability to express itself in terms redolent of traditional Roman practice *and* in contemporary terms; and investigate two areas of life (education and religion) central to those behavioural patterns. It brings together a number of factors which provide fertile territory for a discussion on the processes at play as the Roman elite use the landscape of their past to interact with the changes and continuities of life in the Italy of Late Antiquity.

Core Topics

This now brings me to the areas of elite activity which I have chosen to be the main focus of this thesis: education and religion. I see education as a particularly important issue for gaining an understanding of the Roman elite under Theoderic. The remarkably static nature of the curriculum in Late Antiquity [6] reflected both a desire to interact with a vision of the past - retaining clear lines of reference to and within a cultural continuum - and a need to feed the governmental and civic institutions of the state with officials with the necessary skills to successfully administer the state. Furthermore, the education system provided a forum which facilitated cultural cohesion within the elite group itself. "It joined imperial governors and local notables

---

[6] See note 41 below.

in a shared sense of common excellence."[7]   Concepts of both cultural cohesion and political necessity, contributed to its character. This underlying philosophy informed the make-up of the curriculum itself. As we shall see in the chapter on education, there was a restricted, prescribed list of authors in this curriculum with whom the young student must interact. This subject thus makes for extremely fertile ground upon which to conduct studies into both the nature and extent of continuity and change. By looking at which authors were originally used and how they were used, we can compare the breadth of similarity of content and the methodological changes in emphasis, if any, between education in Imperial Late Antiquity and in Ostrogothic Italy. This brings us to a more fundamental question: had the state changed? According to Sidonius, in Gaul it had - and in a fundamental way.[8] A primary interface between the elite and the state was the education system. Is there any political change which affects the education system? Or, if the content and philosophy of the system remained, what were the aspects of the Ostrogothic state which facilitated this continuity?

So in the chapter on education I plan to look at several areas. I intend to look at the institutions of education themselves and examine what the evidence tells about about their function within society. I shall then ask what sort of relationship the institutions of 490 to 526 A.D. had with those of the late antique period in the West. It is within this context that we will attempt to examine the nature of the education system under Theoderic. This examination will involve comparing the evidence we have for the maintenance and propagation of education in Ostrogothic Italy to what we have for the content of the remarkably homogeneous system from the later Roman Empire in the West. Furthermore, I shall ask what the implications of the changes and continuities are for our understanding of: who the Roman elite were in this period; what their relationship to the past was; and how that past was used to help them confront the present. Finally, it is my intention that the education chapter shall also function as an introduction to the character of the individuals whose literary, religious, and social activities conditioned (or sought to condition) the behavioural patterns of

---

[7] Brown (1992), 39

[8] See above note 1.

those who inhabited the political state that was Ostrogothic Italy. One thing that I hope will become clear to the reader of this thesis is that different groups from within the Roman elite had differing visions of what Roman civilisation was, and what it should and could be. As we examine the educational activities and backgrounds of individuals like Boethius and Ennodius, we will discern the contours of those different visions. Once we appreciate who they are (where they have come from) we can better understand the process which encouraged them to gravitate towards one concept of tradition over another. In this regard, the education chapter shall also function as an introduction to the cultural biases of the elite. It is from within the confines of these cultural biases and predilections that we form a more rounded appreciation of who the elite were, what they were responding to, and what it all implies about continuity and change in Ostrogothic Italy.

Religion provides a subject which is equally as instructive as education. The great growth industry of Late Antiquity is undoubtedly the religious debates which sought to provide a universally accepted form of Christianity. The Christian church supplied an increasingly dominant outlet for the expression of power and ideology in Late Antiquity. Contemporary ideological concerns had exercised the educated Roman mind since the movement of the church to the centre of Roman concerns in the 4th and 5th centuries. Figures such as Augustine, Jerome, and Ambrose had involved themselves in the articulation of a Christian discourse which sought to direct and reflect the concerns of the Christian church. An examination of the language of the elite as they interact with theological issues reveals not only the christological or generally theological nature of the debate, but also the pressure brought to bear on the interlocutors by dominant political ideologies. This part of the investigation will show that the elite were adapting and adjusting their positions in a fluid political situation in order to augment their own power – and then using that power to secure the supremacy of their own ideology.

Overall it is my intention to examine the Romano-Italian elite's approaches to education and religion in order to determine what their relationship with the past and tradition can tell us about the specific political and social circumstances in which they

operated. This is desirable because, by concentrating on the activities which the elite are involved in, we can glimpse the contours of the society and its problems to which they were responding. I shall look at the language employed, and discourses interacted with, in order to learn something about how elite behaviour reveals aspects of continuity and change in that society. The logic and pace of change is often revealed by the way in which the elite interact with the past. Innovation, as we shall see, is often hidden by the glint of tradition. Continuity is often only perceptible if we perceive the conditions of production still operating beneath its surface. In short, by examining the messages encoded in their use of their history and traditions, this thesis will attempt to understand the familiar and new concerns and preoccupations of the Roman elite of the Ostrogothic period.

Scholarly Debate on this Period

I will now say something about where, within the scholarship of Late Roman history, my approach will place itself. The ultimate goal of this thesis is simple enough. As outlined above, it is to provide some insightful observations on the nature of continuity and change within Italian Roman elite culture (education and religion) in the evolving landscape of Late Antiquity. The route which must be navigated to attain this goal is anything but simple. With the changes forced upon the study of history by dominant methodological concerns, the study of this period and subject presents problems which will be familiar to many historians. The perennial problems associated with historical narrative reconstruction are familiar: confronting the inadequacies of sources, filtering out their biases, dealing with their contradictions; avoiding value judgements which distort the cultural integrity of the contemporary world under discussion; and the dangers for accurate historical reflection of trying to impose order on a subject to make it comprehensible. All of these problems still exist, but recent approaches to scholarship have produced more obstacles for the historian (which have become especially prominent for historians of this period) to overcome. Study of Late Antiquity has seen a polarisation of opinions about the nature of change and continuity which challenges some fairly fundamental views about what Late Antiquity actually is. A look at the intense disagreement over the terms that are used to define scholarship in this area demonstrates the point.

The use of words, in a late antique context, like 'transformation', 'continuity', and 'change' on the one hand, and 'decline', 'crisis', 'catastrophe', and 'collapse', on the other, often defines how one will approach Late Antiquity. The increase in the use of the terms 'transition' and 'transformation' coincides in Anglophone classical scholarship with the rise of the term Late Antiquity itself. It finds its origins in Peter Brown's ground-breaking work of 1971, *The World of Late Antiquity*.[9] In it, Brown posits the idea that, far from imagining that Roman culture and civilisation comes an abrupt end in the 4th and 5th centuries, we should view the entire period from the late 2nd century to the mid 8th as a distinct period, characterised by lively and colourful organic change, in its own right. This view sees the 'transformation' of the old classical world into the medieval period as a long process which is facilitated by the changes which take place during the 'late antique' transitional period. This new world opened up a potentially infinite array of future studies. The possibilities presented by departing from the conventional language of crisis and collapse are summed up in Averil Cameron's positive response to the European Science Foundation's title for the then new work, *The Transformation of the Roman World*: "It [the title] seems to suggest that change was not so dramatic as the 'crisis' framework implies: it was in fact slow, and involved multiple smaller changes at all levels of society".[10]

This attitude obviously has implications for the way in which historical research is conducted. These 'smaller changes' now become the focus for intense and concentrated research by specialists who understand the particular atom under investigation. It encourages research on specific aspects of society at specific levels and attempts to discern the myriad of influences determining its character. The other implication of the idea of 'smaller changes' is that quite a lot stayed the same. Thus

---

[9] German scholarship had used the term *Spätantike* for some 70 years before Brown's work. Alois Riegl's *Spätrömische Kunstindustrie* (1901) the origin of the term in German scholarship. Francophone scholarship too subsequently interacted with, and developed the concept: Henri Pirenne (1937), *Mahomet et Charlemagne*. Henri-Irene Marrou (1938) rejects the idea of decline in this periodization, subsequently making a positive affirmation of Late Antiquity's exstence as a thing in and of itself - *Décadence Romaine Ou Antiquité Tardive? : IIIe-VIe Siècle* (1949). The legacy and impact of Brown's work not just on Anglophone scholarship, but also on scolarship throughout Europe and North America has been revisited in a series of articles in: 'The World of late Antiquity Revisited' *Symbolae Osloenses 72*.

[10] Cameron (1998), 10

the scope of investigation broadens as one is forced to pay attention to the increasingly intricate strands of threads which make up the fabric of the phenomena under investigation. Confronted with such a world it thus becomes extremely difficult to construct grand narratives which place a handful of crises as the harbingers of fundamental decline. In this world of transition between the classical and the medieval, examining the interconnected relationships between different aspects of phenomena is the priority. Value-free judgements about events and their significance within the immediate network of cultural and societal trends provide the basis for historical enquiry. Therefore, the importance of discussing the language and signs, that is, the semantic implications, of those cultural networks is increasingly important.

Though not quite implying the same absolute distrust of the structures and reality-reconstruction techniques of history as postmodernism, this approach does share some characteristics with that philosophical movement. In concentrating on intense examination of the atoms and their progress in this atomised universe, it rejects the 'grand theorising' of the modernist, enlightenment historical narratives. Like postmodernism, it emphasizes the complex and plural nature of activities that take place on several cultural and societal levels. Its philosophy says that the complexity of this transforming and evolving world cannot be reasonably conveyed by simple and crude narratives of 'cataclysm' and 'decline'. It resists the limiting uniformity imposed upon it by an all-encompassing narrative of 'fall'; a uniformity which reduces all regions, all economies, all local cultures, all political climates, and all military conditions to a level which fits the narrow confines of the narrative purpose. However, unlike genuinely postmodern approaches to history, it believes that these fragments can be viewed as component parts of a discernable and comprehensible society (Late Antiquity), which can be revealed to us through literary and material culture.

Despite this explosion of studies on the new Late Antiquity,[11] the framework of 'cataclysm' and 'fall' has not disappeared. One of the most refreshing and intelligent pieces of work on Late Antiquity in recent times has, only recently, been produced by

---

[11] I have borrowed the term: A. Giardina, 'Esplosione di tardoantico', *Studi storici* 40:1 (1999), 157-80

Bryan Ward-Perkins.[12] He admits that he naturally gravitates towards the views of those enlightenment historians so much despised by postmodernists and vigorously questioned by those who have enthusiastically embraced the Brown-inspired approach to the study of Late Antiquity. The views of the Scottish enlightenment historian, William Robertson, are used by Ward-Perkins to outline his own sympathies: "In less than a century after the barbarian nations settled in their new conquests, almost all the effects of the knowledge and civility, which the Romans had spread throughout Europe, disappeared. Not only the arts of elegance, which minister to luxury, and are supported by it, but many of the useful arts, without which life can scarcely be contemplated as comfortable, were neglected or lost."[13] Ward-Perkins' work is very much directed towards addressing the nature of the changes in Late Antiquity from an archaeological perspective. This means, of course, that the progress of the 'decline' which Ward-Perkins painstakingly and eruditely charts is necessarily concerned with material culture. As Ward-Perkins sees 'civilization' as a sophisticated network of economic and material benefits, crossing all social boundaries, perhaps it is not surprising to see him characterise the collapse of the supra-national economy into local economies as the 'end of civilization'.[14] After all, this system created and sustained so many of the material benefits he views as the defining characteristic of civilisation. A similar observation can be made with regard to Peter Heather's work of 2005, *The Fall of the Roman Empire*. Heather's work has such a heavy focus on the military aspect of Imperial infrasctructure that, in order for the title of the work to hold water, we must view the Roman military as the Roman Empire. In not ignoring these significant developments to aspects of Roman culture, both authors have provided valuable insight into economic and military developments in Late Antiquity.

How this Thesis engages with that Scholarly Debate

---

[12] Brian Ward-Perkins (2005). Peter Heather (2005), also interacts with the 'fall' paradigm. Marcone (2008) while providing an insightful appraisal of both approaches to the periodization, highlights the problems for conceptual cohension associated with the continuity approach, and helpfully summarizes recent reactions against the continuity paradigm.

[13] Ibid, 2, quoting from the introduction to William Robertson's: *The History of the Reign of Charles V*. (London, 1769).

[14] The subtitle for his excellent work of 2005.

This now brings me to the place this thesis will stake in relation to the various competing methodologies and their approaches to the problem. This thesis is concerned with investigating the language and discourses circulating in our period. It is only natural, therefore, that materials of investigation focus very firmly upon the written word. In any contemporary evaluation of historical texts one would be excessively cautious of the reliability of any picture sketched out using straightforward scientific method (that is, allowing the accumulated 'facts' and instances of defined – often by the historian or the school of thought the historian follows - phenomena speak for themselves). The nature of Classical scholarly investigation, especially in the 5th century West, with its want of evidence, and the fragmentary nature of the scant evidence, requires both empirical method and a more theoretical analysis of discourse. Through empirical method - with an emphasis on meticulous research, and an intimate concern for authenticating textual allusions and appropriations - we can recreate a workable literary framework with which to interact. This literature then becomes the focus for an analysis of the language and discourse. This will inform any fundamental conclusions about the nature of the relationship between the Roman elite and its traditional and contemporary surroundings. So my approach will seek, by conscientious scholarship, to recreate, through the disparate and fragmentary sources, a literary picture of education and religion. It will then discuss the implications of those findings.

I intend this study to take a context-specific approach to uncovering something about the nature of my own particular patch of the late antique world. Since this thesis will focus on examining the activities of the elite, its will naturally examine the society to which the behaviour of the elite is responding. The part of the late antique continuum which the subject inhabits is then far easier to discern. I mean to examine important individual elements of Roman elite culture on their own terms. I want to look at these elements as creations of their own specific culture and time. I will not simply examine examples of tradition and present them as evidence of continuity. In the same way, I will not seek to 'discover' innovation and present it as change. I want to look beyond the language of the text to see what structures are influencing and reflecting change. I want to see what can be discovered about the formation of the discourses in this

period by reference to the invisible political, religious and social structures which inform and shape them. So, by looking at the elite's interaction with its past and their traditions, I am, in fact, hoping to uncover something about continuity and change in wider society. The pressures which moulded the behavioural patterns of the Roman elite in a time of fluidity and cultural transformation can be revealed by their use of the past to cut a position for themselves in a changing political and cultural landscape. My discussion about the nature of continuity and change will be primarily focused on discussing the period on its *own* terms.

To bring this aspect of the investigation into sharper focus, I have included a final chapter case-study on a contemporary piece of historiography. This last chapter will provide a chance to focus on the individual elements of this thesis at work in their own chronological and cultural literary landscape – effectively looking at how this source understood and characterised what was going on around it. The individual chapters will provide the space within which I will examine how particular aspects of elite culture relate to and reflect the surrounding environment. In essence this final chapter will corroborate, in overview, evidence of the position of the late fifth- early sixth century Romano-Italian elite in the cultural landscape of Late Antiquity, which the other chapters have already highlighted. This endeavour will be facilitated by an approach which pays attention to the perception and ideology of the literary sources which form the basis of the account.

This thesis will show that the discourses of tradition and change were conditioned by clearly definable political and cultural spheres towards which Roman elites gravitated. It is possible to apprehend a cultural landscape where, "state structures generated a magnetic field which nudged individuals along defined paths, constraining choice to a limited number of possibilities."[15] The elites of late antique and Ostrogoth Italy were renegotiating their position within a constantly evolving political landscape. The spheres of power were the state religious and cultural apparatuses - both in Ostrogothic Italy and in the putative hegemonic Eastern Roman Empire. They were

---

[15] Heather (1997), 51. He is referring to the Late Roman Imperial state here and its influence over the Roman elite.

renegotiating their position in relation to the Ostrogoths and the Eastern Romans as they had with the various Western and Eastern regimes before.

It is worth re-emphasising that the focus of this thesis is on the activities of the class of influential people in Italy who are active (through influence, coersion, defence, attack) in traditional religious, political, and cultural areas. The investigation of their activities does not simply encourage a look at the individuals who execute the activity. Rather it encourages us to see the context in which the activity takes place. This is why evaluating what this section of the Roman elite are doing when they interact with the landscape of their past and its traditions is so important. By looking at what they are doing we are moving beyond the individual to see the wider picture of the cultural, political, and societal forces to which they are responding. A narrow focus and limited remit can and does speak to the general circumstances in which it takes place. The elite's responses to education, religion, and its presentation of that interaction tell us what is happening in the society around it. It tells us about the underlying continuities and changes, which, very often, the protagonists in this literary battle would rather we did not see.

Chapter 1

The Elite and Education: a Roman Education in an Ostrogothic state

Why Education?

As explained in the introduction, there are sound reasons why education was selected as the focus of this initial chapter. It would be useful to present an overview of the how the elite interacted with education in Rome and Italy. It allows us to see the contours of significant cultural, political, or societal trends existing within the late antique cultural continuum, or developing while the elite interacted with structures of the Ostrogothic state (from the fall of the Germanic general Odoacer to the death of Theoderic, King of the Ostrogoths - 493-525 A.D., a period covering over 30 years).[16] Did the advent of the new Ostrogothic government present problems and opportunities for the continuation of a traditional education system which was conditioned by its close relationship with the offices of the imperial state?[17] How does the type of education propagated and inhabited by the Roman elite reflect the nature of society before and after the Ostrogoths (do we see familiar patterns, and/or jarring discontinuities in elite interaction with education)? This feeds into the primary aim of this overall thesis: uncovering the ways in which the Italo-Roman elite used the language and landscape of their traditions and past to empower themselves to mould

---

[16] Work has been done on individual authors (among the more notable: Kennell (2000), on Ennodius; O'Donnell (1979), on Cassiodorus; numerous on Boethius – see bibliography – most notably Chadwick (1981); Green (2006), on Arator). In 1975 Riché provided a valuable, but brief overview of the situation in the region. Everett (2003), 14-54 esp., provides an excellent overview of the state of the literary elite's position in late antique Italy before the Lombard invasions. Everett does demonstrate that there had been a retreat into literary studies by a disempowered elite (22) in the West (he reminds us of Sidonius'quote encountered n. 1, above), but, as his narrative is focused on presenting a picture of general decline in the West up to the Lombard period, his account of education in Ostrogothic Italy (23-30) suffers from a slight overemphasis on decline. This chapter will concentrate on the redefinition, rebirth, and repackaging of tradition which Ostrogothic Italy inspired and encouraged.

[17] Andrew Gillett (2001), in his excellent reappraisal of the location of the Western court in late antique Italy, has shown that not only did the capital prosper from the presence at Rome of the Imperial court, but that elite political and religious activities enjoyed a renewed relevance. As Gillett says, however, the legitimacy and stability of the court among the elite at Rome depended upon the support of Constantinople (Gillett, 165). As we shall see, despite the Eastern Emperor Zeno's initial support, Constantinople steadfastly refused to support Theoderic (see chapter 3). Theoderic's court was based in Ravenna and was not subject to Eastern patronage.

the cultural landscape of the present and future.[18] For the focus of this chapter is very much an examination of the relationship self-consciously 'Roman' individuals - who are actively and passively influencing their cultural, religious, and political surroundings - have with concepts of tradition. Education is the foundation upon which generations of Roman power brokers had built their identity. Education is a mechanism through which groups remain in a dialogue with their past. It is not simply an inorganic mechanism which fabricates an empty, anachronistic, and fossilised cultural comfort blanket. It can provide the possibility for cultural continuity while still being relevant to the world outside: in short it is a facet of Roman elite life which can be used to empower a argument in the present by using the traditions of the past in a relevant, still-living fashion. Education is an area in which Roman opinion makers understood that tradition and the past were the basis for the very deep, ancient roots of their contemporary identity. I want to see how the Roman elite navigated their way through the political and cultural landscape of Ostrogothic Italy using a medium, education, described as stubbornly static and deeply conservative.[19]

Approach

I am acutely aware that one must be wary of any approach which inhibits one's ability to present as reflective picture as possible within the narrow limits provided by a doctoral thesis. I want to understand how the Roman elite's approach to, and interaction with education shaped and was shaped by political the world around them. It is possible to address the above issues surrounding political and cultural evolution in Ostrogothic Italy within the confines of a discussion whose parameters are not determined by an acceptance of lazy generalisations. The danger is well summed up thus: 'The notion of a break, in culture, politics, or institutions, prevents us from seeing late antiquity as an integrated culture or set of cultures in its own right, and encourages us mentally to assign fifth- and sixth-century groups either to the toga or

---

[18] For the perceived contemporary view that some areas of cultural and political expression had indeed been taken away by the collapse of Western government, see Sidonius' and Marcellinus' remarks above (note 1); as we shall see, the author of the *Anonymus Valesianus II* has Odoacer ostentatiously affirming that the West no longer has an emperor. Contemporaries had an ideological investment in presenting the present in a particular way. Education is another area which allowed the elite to interact with their own conception of what was and was not culturally and politically important.

[19] See below: notes 25-26; notes 39-40; note 165

to furs and pantaloons.'[20] In this thesis the relationship between the education system necessitated by the imperial system and that operating under the Ostrogothic government will not be examined with a focus on determining the validity of this dichotomy. Rather, the functions and role of the education system will be examined and evaluated in light of what they contributed to the reflection and projection of the social and political ideologies of members of the Roman elite. It is as part of a complex political environment that I want to look at the progress of the education system in Ostrogothic Italy. Therefore this chapter will, like the other chapters of this work, survey its topic as part of an analytical framework which focuses on the various political, cultural, and factional forces at work, as the Roman elite attempts to define and develop the world around them through their education system. Its *telos* is not proving that the government of Theoderic was different and did bring change. It is about looking at the uses made of traditional outlets of cultural expression and examining what they tells us about the individuals using them (their cultural, political, and religious predilections). The discovery within this discussion of either fundamental change, or evolutionary curve within a recognizable continuum, is secondary, but welcome end to the primary process.

Part of this process of presenting a rounded picture involves contextualising as much as possible. Any chronological period and political regime create the environment in which a culture in its own right evolves, with different cultural elements (or variables) providing impetus and re-creative opportunities. In order to delineate a broadly representative picture of the elite's relationship with education and learning in this unique environment, we must understand how it came to be in the form it was. When examining those elements of received traditional Roman education, which find their way into the language and structures of the educational landscape, it will be instructive to say something about their conditions of production. A study of late antique education and classical learning in general will provide a context in which the nature and developments of the Italian elite's education system can be understood. Therefore following each investigation which attempts to reconstruct educational evidence from the sources, there will be a supplemental discussion locating that

---

[20] Amory (1997), 2

evidence within the broad sweep of educational trends. This discussion will focus on evaluating: the conditions of production (which forces – social/political/cultural – formed it) of seminal elements of 'traditional' learning; and how this traditional learning fits into the wider landscape of the Later Roman Empire and Late Antiquity in general.

Understanding this will help us better determine the nature of 'continuity and change' in our period. Being able to see the differences in the conditions of reproduction in much starker relief is important. For understanding the process of adopting and adapting anterior forms (in this case, an education system and its implied values), requires a thorough understanding of why that anterior form was originally conceived. Such a focus allows a discussion which explores what societal factors contributed to the systems' continued use. It will also provide an opportunity to understand how changes to those factors changed the nature of the education system itself – what demands and problems it was responding to and how this contributed to its evolution. In approaching the problem thus, we will see the innovative ways in which the traditional educational outlets and practices were used, and present a picture which provides an overview of the complexity of the relationship between the education of the elite in Ostrogothic Italy and their education in the wider late antique and classical world.

Sources

This investigation will approach these questions by examining the writings and activities of some prominent individuals in Italy whose writings and opinions actively and passively condition society and culture. As I have said in the introduction, this is a thesis aimed at examining how Roman opinion formers understood their own universe and wanted others to understand it. Naturally, it is through their words that we can see the process of this dialogue most clearly. Specifically literary methods are the most direct route to understanding this dialogue. Therefore, works of individual members of this Roman elite will provide the focus of this investigation.

My main sources will be: Magnus Felix Ennodius and his northern associates (including Arator - later to become a poet of some repute - and others who feature

prominently in his letters relating to education), Magnus Aurelius Cassiodorus Senator, and Anicius Manlius Severinus Boethius.[21] As I have indicated, the discussion will attempt to locate each author within their own historical context. In order to achieve this, there will be continual, parallel discussion which evaluates the cultural impact made by both early imperial and late imperial writers upon the education of the Roman elite. Their approaches to education greatly inform attitudes towards education prevalent in Ostrogothic Rome and Italy and the wider late-antique world. Although among their collective works there is no definitive presentation of the late fifth- early sixth-century Italian curriculum, there is enough evidence scattered throughout their writings to help us provide the necessary overview outlined above. To sum up, then, I intend to approach each author and his evidence to discover: what they can tell us about the nature of a Roman elite education in Ostrogothic Rome and Italy; what factors contributed to the form it takes in our period; and finally, what this tells us about where the Roman elite located themselves within the wider contours of both the education system and the cultural landscape of Late Antiquity.

Structure of the Argument

I shall examine each author in turn and subject the examination to the rules outlined above. In the case of Ennodius and his northern associates,[22] I will examine what his writings tell us about the composition of the education system in his youth, as he writes, and its possible future. It is important to understand the education which Ennodius himself was subject to. For the span of Ennodius' life is in itself a bridge between imperial and post-Imperial Italy. What the nature of his writings (the form, content, style, allusions) imply about his own education also direct us toward an understanding of a liminal education, Janus-like, pointing to the past and also to the future. References in his letters and writings to what he deems to be the best practices and the most useful methods will be examined because they are indicative of a contemporary education. Also, I shall examine what his writings tell us about the formal outlines of the traditional institutions of the Roman education system, as they

---

[21] These authors have been chosen as a representative section of individuals from within Italy who are in a position to affect the political, cultural, and religious landscape of Roman civilization in Late Antiquity. They are by any definition an 'elite' within a Roman context. As we shall see, there are different levels of interaction with, and an evolving concept of Roman historical elite identity.

[22] For his northern associates see above.

are descriptive of the same period. These findings will be filtered through a more general prosopographical examination of Ennodius' Northern associates, as we chart their journey through the education system. This will allow us then to place what Ennodius tells us within the confines of a discussion on the generic late antique education *and* within the confines of the nascent post-imperial discourses of education.

I shall adopt a similar approach towards Cassiodorus but with more of a focus on a prosopographical examination of the results of this type of education. He has a body of work that provides not only explicit evidence of the students of Italian Late Antiquity interacting with the formal structures of an education system, like Ennodius, but also implicit evidence of the importance of an upbringing within a recognisably traditional educational. Cassiodorus provides an opportunity to locate the education system in our period within a very specific cultural tradition. His work facilitates an instructive comparison and contrast with a generic picture of late imperial political structures which place the post-imperial structures of Italy in their proper historical context. As we shall see, his work can be understood as the creation of an author working within the confines of a continuous and well-established tradition which stretches back into a classical past, and through into a more general late antique landscape. Importantly, his later work (which, although falling outwith the chronological and cultural remit of this thesis, provides an instructive contrast with what went before) points towards a very different type of education system for the Roman elite. A brief look at this work emphasises the extent to which his earlier output forms parts of a discourse which can be understood as speaking to and from within a recognisably traditional educational landscape.   His work is instructive in locating the education of post-imperial Italy in its proper cultural context.

Boethius is, paradoxically (given his output), an altogether more problematic figure. His writings betray a culturally Graeco-Roman, bilingual, sometimes secular education which is increasingly rare in this period. His work raises a number of

questions about the nature of the literary elite.[23] In investigating his activities, we shall come to understand that the educational tradition Boethius represents, although inhabiting the same cultural universe as Ennodius, Cassiodorus et al, betrays different cultural, religious, and political priorities. Also, we know for certain that members of Ennodius' associates moved to Rome as a normal, natural progression in their education.[24] Ennodius himself describes Rome as the birthplace of learning.[25] Therefore, it will be necessary to provide a representative overview of the education Boethius interacts with. His input will provide both a validation and elaboration of some of the trends and conclusions of the much more wide-ranging prosopographical surveys contained in Ennodius and Cassiodorus, and introduce us to a group of individuals whose cultural leanings marked them out from the other members of Roman society. Both sought to create, develop, and maintain discourses designed to meet ideological goals. The divergences in educational practice and experience mirror the differences in ideology. Examining their education will lead us to a better understanding of their cultural, religious, and political activities.

The Argument: Institutions and Education in Northern Italy: Magnus Felix Ennodius
A Rhetorical Education

I shall begin by turning to our authors - beginning with Magnus Felix Ennodius. Unfortunately, he only made the most indirect allusions to his own education.[26] However, the nature of the *opera* and their composition provide valuable clues which can be used to recreate something approaching an understanding of the education he had. For M. Reyellet part of Ennodius' canon of work is undoubtedly the product of a long, ancient educational tradition: 'Le dieci *Controversiae* presenti nella raccolta [of Ennodius] danno un'idea del conservatorismo della scuola antica; vi si ritrovano

---

[23] For example, how typical Boethius' Hellenist education was is difficult to say. Pace Courcelle, 275 (who gives numerous examples of Greek learning), Chadwick, 16, argues that his congratulating a senator on knowing Greek is evidence of its dwindling popularity. Boethius and his friends represent 'a higher order of aristocracy, intellect, and literary talent', Everett (2003), 26. Courcelle, 270-332, also discusses the place Boethius and his peers at Rome enjoy as the preeminent representatives of the literary elite in Ostrogothic Italy.

[24] Cassiodorus *Variae*, VIII, 12. Ennodius *passim*.

[25] Ennodius, *Epistularum liber VI, XV*: *Simplicianus…adulescens nobilissimus natalem scientiae sedem Romam conatus expetere…*

[26] *Adulescentiae meae memini me legisse temporibus de quodam dictum:…*Ennodius then quotes at length from Seneca's *Medea*. From: *Libellus pro Synodo*, 38. As Riché says, 24, note 44, this quote, along with a few even more obsure and brief comments, is all he says directly about his education.

infatti gli identici temi, spesso assurdi, il più delle volte inverosimili, che Seneca il Vecchio dava da trattare ai suoi allievi'.[27] Henri Marrou, in his wide-ranging investigation into education in Antiquity, produces Ennodius, along with Seneca, Quintilian, and Calpurnius Flaccus, as examples of 'the uniformity and longevity of the old teaching practice' which stretched back six hundred years: 'These collections [of Ennodius et al] are spread over six centuries, and yet it is always the same kind of subjects that keep reappearing, and they are the very subjects that we have already come across in Hellenistic schools'[28].

What aspect of ancient education are they referring to? The teaching of rhetoric was a cornerstone of both Greek and Latin education in Antiquity and continued to be so in Late Antiquity.[29] The *Controversiae* Reyellet discusses belong to a long-standing educational practice. The *Controversiae* were a component of the *Declamatio,* a rhetorical exercise in which a pupil was encouraged to prepare a speech on a topic set by the teacher, and which, after having been thoroughly memorised, would be delivered in public.[30] The *Controversiae* were a vehicle for developing the ability to compose speeches devoted to the rhetoric of the law court. So the exercises often concerned themselves with pleading for or against some situation or occurrence that could be the subject of a legal ruling. The other component of the two-fold *Declamatio* was the *Suasoria*. This discipline required the student to discuss the pros and cons of some mythological or historic political problem. We shall have more to say about this latter discipline later in this chapter.

Conditions of Production

As we can infer from the strong emphasis on the young pupil's ability to speak publicly, these traditional aspects of education provided a function within the society in which they developed. As Quintilian says (X.V.14), these speeches will prove

---

[27] *Dizionario Biografico Degli Italiani*, 42, p694. J. Sirmond, when editing Ennodius' *opera*, 1611, gives the classical name *Controversiae* to the 10 *Dictiones*.

[28] Marrou, 286

[29] CAH, vol. XIV 855-884, and vol. XIII, 655-680; Marrou, 280-290

[30] *Declamationes uero, quales in scholis rhetorum dicuntur…sunt utilissimae.* Quintilian, X.V.14. *consuetudo classium certis diebus audiendarum, nonnihil etiam persuasio patrum numerantium potius declamationes quam aestimantium* Ibid., X.V.21

useful when the students go to into the world of litigation and legal argumentation. This world characterised the daily cut and thrust of elite interaction in the Roman world. This type of education is thus responding to the demands of Roman society. It is the product of the world in which it was created. The guiding principle of this aspect of the education system, its underlying determinant, was primarily shaped by the world around it rather than the other way about.

Evolution of the Elite and its Education

However, this shaping of the education system to reflect the concerns of the Roman forum and the political world outside of the school halls seems to have undergone a change in the later Roman period and Late Antiquity generally: "late-antique schools of grammar and rhetoric were soundproof against the outside world, their methods and their status largely untouched by the profound political and religious changes that had taken place around them".[31] This appraisal has profound implications for our study. It implies that a fossilised education system, which had been created in the soft mud of early Roman cultural practice in the forum, now shaped the outside world around its contours. If this is so, then surely we should be able to see some jarring incongruity, some redundant contours protruding from an ill-fitting framework when the Roman elite educational product (the person trained in this unchanging way) interacts with a political and social culture for which it was not designed. Looking now in detail at Ennodius' work provides an opportunity to see how the Roman elite responded to these trends.

Ennodius' *Dictiones* contain numerous examples of the influence of the *Declamatio*. The precise circumstances surrounding the composition of the rhetorical *Dictiones* are not revealed by the author, so it is difficult to say with any certainty whether or not they were designed for formal recitation or merely 'games' for his own amusement.[32] Regardless, an examination of the themes and content show that Ennodius himself was the product of an education which was informed by traditional Roman education. They also show that he was producing work which could be intended for the

---

[31] Kaster, ix.

[32] Kennell, 51, attempts to provide some possibilities.

consumption of those aspiring to an education in Ostrogothic Italy. They can be understood as pointing to both the past and to the present. *Dictio* XXI[33] presents an example of this sort of traditional theme employed in the construction of the *Controversia*. It is possible to place this *Dictio* within an educational continuum, as it converses with an extant pre-late antique antecedent. Ennodius begins the *Dictio* by presenting the facts of the matter in typically[34] rhetorical form. The legal issue is introduced in the first sentence: *Liberi parentes aut alant aut uinciantur*. Having presented the topic of 'sons should either support their parents or be imprisoned', Ennodius proceeds to introduce the specific argument at hand. It is a son who refuses to look after his father because of perceived previous negligence towards him on the father's part. During the argument we learn that he will argue against Quintilian (*Ille* [Quintilian] *enim patrem tuetur, nos* [Ennodius] *filium*).[35] Quintilian's Major Declamations provide the template: *Liberi parentes in egestate aut alant aut vinciantur* (V.1). Clearly Ennodius' *Dictio* should be understood as interacting at some level with a tradition stretching back to Quintilian.

Looking at the slight changes in emphasis and phraseology in these accounts draws our attention towards the present and alerts us to the changes which have taken place since the conditions of production present at the origins of the tradition. For both approaches contain culture-specific markers which clearly mark out the contours of the different cultural/social landscapes from which each was created. S. A. H. Kennell rightly draws attention to the dialogue Ennodius is having in this text with a contemporary subject of increasing importance: the evolving appreciation of an increasingly Christian understanding of the relationship between father and son[36]. Kennell posits the idea that Ennodius superimposes a distinctly Christian message on top of the "static legal mythology", which Quintilian's original now represents.

---

[33] While accepting that the MGH AA edition represents a more faithful ordering of Ennodius' *opera* in manuscript tradition, I nevertheless follow the more thematically structured CSEL numbering of Ennodius' work.

[34] See Sussman's introduction (ii-v) for a useful synopsis of standard ancient *Controversiae* formal introductory structure.

[35] The authorship of the *Declamationes Minores et Maiores* has long been a matter of dispute. Sussman (v) provides a brief overview of the arguments. The important fact for our argument is that Ennodius believed he was following Quintilian and the tradition he stood for.

[36] Kennell, 157

Quoting from this *Dictio* directly, Kennell draws attention to the underlying similarity of moral message between the sentiments as espoused by the father of the passage in Ennodius and the message of the parable of the prodigal son. Any case for an assertion of Christian moral superimposition cannot be proven via direct verbal comparison. Qunitilian's passage relies upon the "traditional paradigm of father-son relations expressed through static legal mythology"[37] for its implied cultural backdrop. Ennodius' *dictio* infuses his father-son relations with the ideas of redeemed errant son and the communality of familial possessions familiar from the parable of the prodigal son. The dramatic change in moral emphasis in the passage, combined with the circumstantial evidence (ubiquity of Christian discourse in this period), makes this conclusion based upon an exegetical approach extremely attractive. We shall examine in detail later on some more changes in moral emphasis which characterise Ennodius' manipulation of his classical templates. However, for the moment, we will turn to concentrate on the change in external political circumstances which can be understood from the texts.

There is another, more overtly political, dialogue in this *Dictio*, which has implications for our understanding of the changed emphasis of educational practice in our period. The imagined audience for these declamations provide an extremely useful indication of the utility of the skills which the education seeks to hone. The audience can show us what political demands the skill is attempting to interact with. In Quintilian, the intended audience for his young pupils is clear. The declamation will appeal to the *iudices*[38]. This exhortation confirms that Quintilian's work is in dialogue with an educational ethos which sees the function of his exercises as a response to the world outside the school hall. The *iudices* are, of course, the jurors of an appeal case, which locates the speaker of the declamation in the forum as the advocate honing his forensic skills. The educational purpose of this exercise is to create a skill which will be useful in the Roman legal system, with its jurors and plaintiffs, and its own legal peculiarities.

---

[37] Ibid

[38] Quintilian *Declamationes Maiores v.i et passim.*

Ennodius' treatment of the subject matter shows a change in the use of terminology which signals a new focus. In Quintilian, the jurors are introduced and then hidden behind the advancement and elaboration of the argument. The content of the arguments is front and centre. Therefore the function of the exercise (the training of young members of the elite for duty in the courts) is of central concern. Ennodius' 'exercise' seems keen to pack proceedings with as many togas and Roman officials as possible. The simple appeal to the judges/jurors is replaced by a series of invocations to people laden with the golden weight of traditional Roman nomenclature. The initial *iudices* of Quintilian give way to *cognitores amplissimi*. The parenthetical *iudices* who permeate the text of Quintilian are still there in Ennodius[39], but they are joined by a procession of others. Ennodius introduces the problems of his rhetorical exercise by addressing the *principes viri*. These are a set of individuals whose core semantic signification as an elite is also surely augmented by association with the now redundant *principes* of the classical world. He finishes it with an invocation once again to the *cognitores*, this time adding the epithet *sanctissimi*.[40]

This sort of accretion can easily be dismissed as evidence of what many see as Ennodius' turgid floridity. However, there are reasons why each phrase carefully shines upon the narrative the ennobling light of a Rome before the so-called Dominate's violent autocracy diluted the concentration of power among the Roman elite.[41] The triumph of style over content is an acknowledgment that the world outside the school room has changed. Striving to appear classical is an acknowledgment of the very unclassical world which Ennodius inhabits. The old Principate system, where the ruler was still conceived of as *primus inter pares*, understood the problems of the outside world in a way which reflected its own structures. The future advocate or governor of a province interacted with his elite peers in language which at once marked them out to each other. The evolution of the post-Principate Roman Empire

---

[39] XXI. 9, 12, 18

[40] XXI. 3, 4, 33

[41] The evolution of the Principate into a different political and social system did happen, but establishing a definitive beginning is a problem. The position of the Roman elite was changing long before the reforms of Diocletian. When discussing the changed nature of the Roman state after Diocletian's major reforms, I shall not exclude those factors I deem significant, but which fall outside the arbitrary chronological parameters of the Dominate's periodisation.

saw the creation of a political and cultural space between the traditional activities of the elite and the structures of the new military men who populated the new Imperial government[42]. Local elites became detached from their former peers in central government. The concern in Ennodius to gild the form can be understood as an acceptance that the former function of the exercise has changed. The language use could imply that the education which Ennodius had and which he seeks to propagate is slightly less responsive to the political and vocational reality of the world outside of academia than that of Quintilian. Peter Heather, in his work on literacy in the successor states,[43] asserts how unresponsive the education system was to the political reality outside of the classroom. Asserting that this kind of education was requisite for employment in Imperial service, Heather says that it did not actually seem to cater for it. This approach implies a new purpose for the education of the Roman elite - a purpose which sees style and appearance increasingly subverting the importance of substance.

What is happening here? Is it less responsive or can we understand this change in another way? I think that there are two processes which to a large extent can shed light upon what is informing these changes. Firstly there is a process of formation and adoption of a discourse designed to give definition to, and provide an identity for, the Roman elite. The fossilisation process was a departure from the more responsive education system of the Principate (with its ability to absorb 'new' poets and writers into an increasing canon), whose willingness to embrace innovation was a sign of a healthy, confident culture.[44] Secondly, the result of this formation process enables the Roman elite to create a wider discourse through which they could continue to exercise power. These changes are not specific to the Ostrogothic period, but can be seen as developments of the later Roman Empire. They have, however, specific implications for the period in which Ennodius is writing.

---

[42]Brown, (1971), 27-34. See also, Jones, (1964) 1-76 and 321-365 for more comprehensive account of changes. Both provide instructive overview of the changes brought on by the collapse of the structures of the Principate.

[43]Heather (1994) *Literacy and Power in the Migration Period*, 183-185.

[44] "Q. Caecilius Epirota had the hardihood to choose 'Virgil and other new poets' as the authors he would deal with…as long as the ancient schools lasted – that is to say, until darkness descended over Europe with the barbarians – the programme remained unchanged" Marrou, 252.

Let us examine this idea of a discourse designed to accentuate and protect a distinct identity. Ennodius, in the above example, is not simply expressing his linguistic dexterity. Extreme courtesy is implied by his use of the superlative adjectives and other platitudinous adjectives employed to describe his imagined audience. By directing the student to use traditional concision (plain *iudices*) and then expansively populate this term with culturally loaded baroque accretions (adjectives and nouns: *sanctissimi, amplissimi; principes*), Ennodius is encouraging an expansion and contraction of language in the way that the trainer teaches the swimmer the importance of expanding and contracting the diaphragm. As we said above, the words themselves are more florid decoration than meaningful descriptors. Their power lies in their ability to use the standard and frankly dull customary *iudices* as a vehicle to achieve a very particular educational end. An understanding of the semantic connotations embedded in this type of language allowed one to partake in a social waltz, designed to provide evidence for the social breeding and thus special status of the elite in Late Antiquity: "The grammarian's instruction was shaped at least as much by social as by intellectual considerations". The context is a "social system where what mattered [was] eloquence amid a population…illiterate". As Kaster forcefully and convincingly further points out: "the grammarian's school did one thing superbly, providing the language…through which a social and political elite recognized its members"[45]. Ennodius' language is pointing back towards a generic classical past through the lens of the schools of Late Antiquity. His exercises (and thus the exercises he imagined would be beneficial to the sons of his friends) encourage an engagement with a stilted and fossilised language of social status. He is speaking from within a tradition which has begun to see the form of their rhetoric as a defining characteristic in the development and articulation of their own elite identity. Just as we recognise the Olympic swimmer from his mastery of his breathing routine, the Roman elite could recognise each other from their ability to manipulate their very specific vocabulary to meet the demands of the moment.

---

[45] Kaster (1988), 12-14

The second idea, that of an identity which empowers the elite, provides equally exciting interpretative possibilities. We can see in this passage the outlines of some of the issues that Peter Brown has highlighted in his discussion on *Paideia* and Power[46]. Brown posits the idea that, in order to counteract the deleterious effects of an increasingly violent autocracy, the Roman elite responded by using the education system to forge a discourse designed to empower them in an uncertain world. Within the confines of this discourse the elite organised rules, defined parameters and promulgated unwritten, informal conventions which bound the governing class together with the elite. The purpose was to safeguard the elite against the arbitrary violence and injustices of the state. Eunapius, writing at the beginning of the 5th century, tells a story which draws attention to the ability of rhetoric to placate and manipulate the average late imperial governor (the governor in question bows to the eloquence and erudition of a man of *Paideia*)[47]. The episode is used to emphasize that "the stories that late Roman enthusiasts for education treasured most were those that showed masters of the art of rhetoric exercising their spell on the most refractory of all possible subjects – a 'stern and implacable' imperial governor"[48]. As Brown argues, this story should be understood as part of the wider discourse, where the Roman elite are using their education to control an increasingly distant and coercive state. The governor, Brown says, in giving way to the arguments put forward by the speaker, was in fact working with an agreed discursive context which obliged a degree of reciprocity amenable to both sides. "To give way to such persuasion, indeed, heightened his [the governor's] authority in Athens. For *Paideia* was not simply a skill in persuasive speech; it was a school of courtesy. Verbal decorum assumed, and fostered, an equally exacting sense of decorum in personal relations"[49].

Ennodius' approach to a rhetorical education, as well as providing the future pupil with an elite identity, also can be understood in light of this idea articulated by Brown.

---

[46] Brown (1992), 35-70

[47] *Philostratus and* Eunapius, edited and translated Wright (1952), 468. Translation and original text also found in Blockley (1981-83). Brown (1992), 44-45 discusses the episode in detail. I shall return to some other implications of this episode later in this chapter. For Eunapius see OCD, 568-569;

[48] Brown (1992), 44.

[49] Ibid, 45

The excessive deference implied by the superlatives directed towards the audience in Ennodius' above passage take on a more functional quality in light of this idea. We can see it as more than mere redundant and vacuous wordplay[50] and something more approaching an interaction with a changed world outside of the schoolroom. The emphasis Ennodius places upon encouraging the adoption of, at worst, redundant and, at best, bloated (out of proportion to their contemporary semantic significance) terminology can be re-evaluated and injected with renewed vigour. The terminology becomes a mechanism by which the future member of the Roman elite bends the will of the potentate whose hegemony impacts upon the future concerns of the elite. The distance between the imagined audience (the exerciser of power) and the speaker is negated in two ways. Firstly, a mutual identity is implied by the speaker's terminology. By encouraging the projection of loaded terminology, which alludes to both the religious world of Late Antiquity and the classical world generally, Ennodius is encouraging his students to admit their audience into a very specific cultural and moral framework. The appellation *sanctissimi*, although still respecting the pre-Christian reverence which should be accorded to the audience, now, because of its liberal use in the Vulgate in a Christian context, was infused with a further meaning.[51] The use of *principes* initiates the audience into the space reserved for the great and the good of the historical Roman Empire. Secondly, the adoption of this identity obliges the imagined audience to behave in a way traditionally expected of those working within its confines. The adoption of these identities obliges the audience to behave in the manner recognised and propagated by its members. The result is the 'taming' of the stern adjudicator and the increased autonomy of the speaker. This is an idea which, because it helps make sense of what is happening in Roman educational trends in our period, we will return to several times before this chapter is finished.

The development of these two strands is, as we have seen, in large part attributable to the changed nature of the Roman state since the time of Quintilian (though rhetoric in

---

[50] Kennell, 154, sees Ennodius' language in this *Dictio* as indicative of an approach which attempts to outdo Quintilian simply in rhetorical style and verbal elaboration for its own sake.

[51] *Genesis* 2.3; *Psalms*, 30.24., 21.4.; *Exodus*, 26.34., 40.11. among many examples. The use of the word and its compounds in an overtly Christian context in the works of prominent Christians from the late antique period, attest the rise of this aspect of the word: Tertullian, *de Oratione 3;* Prudentius, *Cathemerina*, 3.15.

Quintilian's day was not immune from the criticism of being removed from everyday life. He responds to criticism that rhetoric is a source of triviality in education by placing rhetoric in its proper context[52]. However, the fact that the criticism was even made suggests that people in Quintilian's day still thought that it should be serving a purpose and were voicing concerns that it was not executing its traditional role). The Roman elite had to find new ways of marking out their identity. The Roman elite sought to mark out this identity in order to use it as a means of exercising individual autonomy in an increasingly hostile environment. As this argument progresses through further evidence of elite education, we will see these two ideas playing a prominent role.

As we saw above, a re-interpretation of a (pseudo) Quintilianic exercise provides evidence to show that Ennodius studied work which he thought was by the man most associated with classical Latin education. Irrespective of the adoption of more elaborate language, this provides evidence that Ennodius sees himself, and the education he understands, as belonging to a continuum stretching back to Classical Antiquity. Thus far, we can see no major objection to Kaster's statement that late-antique schools interact with deeply conservative, unchanging material. Although we can now see that assuming that the whole approach to education was unchanging is problematic. We should, however, go a bit further in order to examine the nature of the link between Ennodius and his classical antecedents. Establishing and examining the close relationship that Ennodius has with Quintilian and his contemporaries, helps to do two things. Firstly, it re-emphasises the idea that Ennodius himself would have agreed with the statement of Kaster. Secondly, and importantly, we re-engage with the idea explored above that, although Ennodius may have entertained the idea that he was part of an unchanging tradition, he was in fact departing from his classical predecessor in several important respects. This departure reveals more about what changes the outside world forced upon the education system.

More Change (Moral)

---

[52] *Insitutiones*, I.4.5.

An examination of some other *Dictiones* does indeed highlight that, yet again, not only was Ennodius familiar with some examples of the genre, but that he had an intimate familiarity which betrays an upbringing within the tradition. However, they provide evidence of the sort of change we saw above. Let us look at one example of Ennodius' work engaging with a traditional theme and emphasising its continuity. It is found in both *Declamationes Maiores et Minores* and other ancient authors (Seneca the Elder and Calpurnius Flaccus), whose rhetorical exercises were much used: the rights of a hero to name his prize. In *Declamationes Maiores* 4, we have the example of a conflict between a war hero's rights and that of ancient Roman *mores*. A soldier, who wants to commit suicide, wants his wish, as a hero, to be honoured. We find numerous *Declamationes Minores* with exactly the same topos being exploited.[53] *Declamatio* 249 deals with a man who has contravened Roman sexual *mores* by committing adultery. The case deals with the rights of a hero to have the charges against him dropped as his reward (*Petit praemii nomine iudicii abolitionem; impetrauit* – 249.4-5) and is an example of the 'hero' type *declamatio*. The formal construction for the reward in law (in the name of a prize) for the hero is the standard: *Diues proditionis accusatus fortiter fecit. Petit praemii nomine accusatoris mortem* (294.1-2). *Dictio* XVI employs the same motif of the hero as demander of legal rights, and employs the same, standard formula for the type. Here, Ennodius introduces (with the familiar introductory appeal to the *iudices*) the case of a war hero who wishes to take as his prize a Vestal virgin (the case is titled in the manuscript: *in eum qui praemii nomine uestalis uirginis nuptias postulauit*). The close relationship Ennodius' work has with the classical tradition in rhetorical education is unmistakable.

There is a definite change of emphasis here, though. This time, rather than focusing on the stylistic changes and their political implications, I will return to the change in the attitude towards the moral element contained in treatment of the topos. Like the changed emphasis on the relationship between father and son discussed above, the discourse informing the moral of Ennodius' reworking of this standard rhetorical theme in *Dictio* XVI is Christian. In Quintilian it is a standard rhetorical exercise designed to stretch the forensic skills of the student. He must have sufficient

---

[53]Kennell, 76, n. 144, for examples from Seneca and Calpurnius Flaccus. Quintilian *Declamationes Minores*: 249, 258, 287, 294, 303, 304, 315, 371, 375, 387.

knowledge of the legal system to work within the tight confines of the law, and he must also possess a convincing declamatory style. This style is geared towards manipulating the minds of the audience towards his interpretation of the issue within the context of the law. The skills learned can thus be applied and reapplied to any given situation when the call of the forum reaches the ears of the graduate. The emphasis in Ennodius' case shows a subtle but significant shift. As Kennell says of Ennodius' use of this case in his version, there is something strange about a Christian of the 5th to 6th century using the defence of an overtly pagan victim like a Vestal virgin as an educational tool[54]. Kennell tentatively offers the possibility that, in the minds of the then intended audience, the Vestal virgin represented a consecrated virgin. The grounds for such a suggestion are, in my opinion, sound.

This passage would be feeding directly into a live and fraught discourse circulating at both secular and ecclesiastical level. In 509 A.D., Pope Symmachus (about whom we will say much more in chapter 2) sent a letter to the bishop of Arles, one Caesarius. It reads thus: *Raptores igitur viduarum vel virginum ob immanitatem tanti facinoris detestamur illos vehementius persequendo qui sacras virgines vel volentes vel invitas matrimonio suo sociare temptaverint. Quos pro ea nefandissimi criminis atrocitate a communione suspendi precipimus.[55]* The outrages perpetrated by members of the roving military bands who were bringing their unwanted attentions into the towns and villages of the increasingly fragmented western provinces were a live issue. The message of this letter is in itself repeated with Imperial force in the Justinian code published after his reincorporation of Italy into the empire (or rather, the annexation of Italy by the increasingly alien Eastern Empire).[56] Even before these decrees (post-476 A.D.) were sent forth, emperors of the West (and unified empire), Constantine and Constantius, had codified responses to the abduction of virgins and widows (with very grim punishments)[57]. In short, the adoption of this example, with

---

[54] Ibid, 76-77.

[55] *PL*. 62. 53

[56] *Codex Justinianus* 9.13.1: *De Raptu Virginum seu viduarum.*

[57] *Codex Theodosianus* 9.24-25. (dated 326 A.D) Molten lead would be poured into the mouth of any accomplices (of servile origin). Even more shocking to modern sensibilities is that the victim also shared in the rapists' punishment - only having her punishment reduced (to disinheritance) if she screamed out loud during the original sexual assault.

its perhaps, in a Christian context, unusual emphasis on the abduction of a vestal, is actually the result of an engagement with a much wider debate in Late Antiquity in general and the successor states in particular. The secular examples, in phraseology and intent, are obviously the ancestors of the Christian discourse now circling in the letters of Pope Symmachus. Ennodius' interaction with the issue of vestals here is not odd at all in this light. He is adopting and adapting pagan templates to reflect issues articulated by the creators of the wider late-antique, Christian discourse (the papacy as the main creators and disseminators of discourse).

Dictio XIV (against a legate who betrays the fatherland to the enemy), XV (against mother-in-law who, unable to persuade his daughter to hate her husband, poisons them both), XXIII (a disgruntled son who has been disinherited) are further examples which have a recognisable place among the rhetorical exercises of classical Latin tradition[58]. These examples are very much part of that tradition and it is understandable how some say that they show little signs of interacting with any really contemporary concerns. However, as we have seen so far from the example discussed, it is clear that changes had taken place. Kennell's forcefully argued emphasis on the deeper dialogue with a prevailing discourse on the relationship between father and son in Christian philosophy is clearly reflected in the above example. Christian morality informs the choice of words and the overall emphasis of the *Dictio*. These examples demonstrate that, notwithstanding the discussion on how these classical templates have been adopted and adapted, Ennodius' conception of education is rooted in the classical world. However, as we have witnessed, there is a process of adaption which hints at a different cultural and political landscape in which the Roman elite were now working.

Conclusion: Rhetorical Education is Conservative but not Unchanging
To sum up, then, this section on Ennodius and the changes in the rhetorical education of the Roman elite: a detailed survey of what Reyellet called Ennodius'

---

[58] See Kennel 159-164 an in depth discussion on their antecedents.

Controversiae, reveals that he was the product of an education which had been informed by a close adherence to a system focused on the teaching of the *Declamatio* as a means of achieving eloquence. Moreover, this system of education was using recognisably classical templates, which were seen, certainly by Ennodius - as we can seen in his use of pseudo-Quintilian – as part of a living tradition. However, there is no doubt that there have been some moral and stylistic changes. These changes have been informed by the evolution of the classical world into the world of Late Antiquity. In large part the changing role of the state, the way that it interacts with the groups who make up its populations, has transformed the relationship it has with education. Consequently, it has transformed the focus of education. The words, structure and philosophy which characterise the teaching of rhetoric in Classical Antiquity may have been adopted by the Roman elite in our period (going by the evidence of Ennodius). However, in adapting these words, structure and philosophy to the needs of a political world characterised by an increasingly distant violent and autocratic state curtailing elite individual autonomy, the system had changed.

Grammatical Education and its Implications

Virgil

Moving on we will now examine the ancient literary figures Ennodius is familiar with and determine what his work here can tell us about Roman elite education and the world to which it was responding. A brief look at what use Ennodius makes of these authors in his work provides ample evidence that he had been well-versed in those classical writers who would have been familiar to generations of classically-trained Roman pupils. Indeed, given the numerous instances of classical literary reminiscences and allusions, this subject deserves much greater attention, and a more focused wide-ranging study.[59]

The pre-eminent influence of Virgil is unquestionable. In *Carmen* I.7 Ennodius composes a song which he uses as a vehicle to extol the virtues of poetry to Faustus.[60] The poem provides Ennodius with an opportunity to display his skills as a wordsmith

---

[59] Vogel's *Index Scriptorum* is a good starting point (331-333).

[60] PLRE II. 451

and composer of clever wordplay. He conjures up striking paradoxes and antithetical ideas such as thirst from drinking and fire from water. Ennodius weaves numerous passages of Virgil into the text. In *Eclogue* 1 Virgil composes a series of impossibilities and inserts them into the mouth of Tityrus: *ante leues ergo pascentur in aethere cerui, et freta destituent nudos in litore piscis[61]*. It is from this passage that Ennodius finds material to complement his own wordplay. The idea of the stag grazing in the air and the fish out of water is picked up and incorporated into Ennodius' argument: *Piscis in aetherio quem portas uertice tranet: Si iubeas uersu, marmora ceruus amat* (I.7.27-28). The same song incorporates two further images from Virgil before its end, both from the *Aeneid*. The first (*Aeneid*, 6.414) is taken from an image of Aeneas' ship's decent to Hades (*gemuit sub pondere cumba / sutilis et multam accepit rimosa plaudem*). The attributes of the ship (it is a *cumba,* and is *rimosa,*) are superimposed upon Ennodius' more humble vessel (*nomenque dedit… phaseli): sutilis ad tumidas rapitur mea cumba procellas, / Hibernos passura notos, quam nauita pauper / Rimosam tenui fingens de cortice puppim / Conposuit nomenque dedit sine laude phaseli[62]*. The final image is taken from book 5.158 of the *Aeneid*: *et longa sulcat vada salsa carina.* From here Ennodius the competing prows of the ships *Centaurus* and *Pristis* ploughing the saltwater, are merged into one - that of the Muse of poetry as she ploughs the vast sea with her keel: *sulcat immensum pelagus carina[63]*.

Ennodius' relationship with the *Aeneid* is worth exploring further. Unsurprisingly, as Virgil is such a seminal influence, the *Aeneid* is a work which he frequently utilises. Of all the secular individual works he seems to use, the *Aeneid* is easily, if not his preferred option, the one with which he shows most familiarity. In all there are at least 50 recognisable instances in the *opera* where Ennodius is clearly repackaging ideas and phrases from the *Aeneid.* From book one, we find Ennodius transferring the cries of Aeneas (*O terque quaterque beati…*1.94-95) at the fate of the Trojans into the mouths of those whom Theoderic has freed from fear of martial outrage (*terque et*

---

[61] Virgil *Eclogue* 1. 59-60

[62] *Carmen* I.VII, 33-36

[63] Ibid., 53

quater beatos…)[64]. A letter addressed to Peter (*Ennodius Petro, Epistle* V. VIII) appropriates the steering power of wings that *Aeneid* I.300-301 imparts to Mercury (*uolat ille per aera magnum / remigio alarum*), reproducing it in a rhetorical phrase which attributes the power of the wings to an aspect of his friend's literary capabilities (*illam ipsam mille **alarum** fabricatam **remigiis** scriptionis tuae aestimabam pedibus potuisse superari*). These are two of several instances where Ennodius employs book 1.[65] In book II, 281 of the *Aeneid* Aeneas describes how he meets Hector in a dream and upon seeing him addresses him thus: *o **lux** Dardaniae, **spes** o **fidissima** Teucrum.* Ennodius begins *Carmen* II. DXXXVIII with a variation on the theme: *tu **lux** certa tuis, **spes** tu **fidissima** rerum, uatis apostolici tu, Theodore, uigor*. In *Dictiones* VII (a piece of work about which I shall have more to say later in relation to our evidence of institutional education) we find the utterances of Helenus' prophecy to Aeneas from book III, 461, (***haec sunt, quae nostra liceat** te **uoce moneri***) dropped into a piece in which Ennodius is praising the dedication of an educational establishment: ***haec sunt, nostris quae** a uobis **licuit uocibus admoneri**.*[66] There are many other references to the *Aeneid* scattered throughout Ennodius extant work.

There is at least one quotation from every book of Virgil's work[67] - in the case of book six there are over half a dozen alone. The nature, as outlined above, and the scale of Ennodius' interaction with the *Aeneid* clearly demonstrates that Ennodius' knowledge of the work was not inconsiderable. The use he makes of the work also suggests that it was a knowledge imparted at a very young age into his mind: he instinctively employs a phrase half-remembered (or which, given the sometimes precise rendering of the quotation, may be the result of the book being to hand for consultation) which he thinks would suit the flow of his argument or the construction of a pleasing literary flourish. What sort of education would have developed such an emphasis on retaining as much detail as possible from texts?

---

[64] *Panegyricus Dictus Theoderico*, 67-68

[65] Vogel, 333, finds six. The connection Vogel makes between *Aeneid* 1.26 and *Carmen* I. XVII.10 is not entirely convincing, though.

[66] *Dictiones* VII. 9

[67] See Vogel's preliminary study in MGH AA VII, 332, 333. It is useful, but prone to omission and error: there is a tendency to omit references from the compilations which have been cited in the main text.

I will now look a little more closely at some of the evidence from the period in order to answer the above question. Having established the close relationship Ennodius has with Virgil, there is something to say about the educational implications of this relationship. The relationship the pupil had with Virgil throughout Classical Antiquity and on into Late Antiquity (not to mention the mediaeval period) is not a straightforward one. The nature and function of Virgil as an educational tool in antiquity is a complex issue. It has been argued that Virgil, progressively (from the 2nd to the 6th century), became a sort of fossilised educational tool imparting a very limited and limiting understanding of the world to its student[68]. Virgil was introduced into the Roman (Latin) educational system by Qunitus Caecilius Epirota in or around 26 B.C., and "from then on, as long as the ancient schools lasted…the programme remained unchanged…an educated Roman was a man who knew his Virgil."[69] Five humdred years later and Priscian, writing in Latin around the same time as Ennodius (though not in Italy) devoted the whole of a considerably sized work to explaining how Virgil ought to be taught to the pupils. It laid out a line by line explication of the *Aeneid*, paying particular attention to two strands: the *verborum interpretatio* and the *historiarum cognitio.*[70] The first part, the *interpretatio*, was the investigation of what in modern discourse analysis would be the signifier - that is, the word. It was investigated for its morphological peculiarities. The second part, the *cognitio,* was not, as one might expect, concerned with the historical matter at hand, but simply with, to reemploy the language of discourse analysis, the signified – the actual thing indicated by the signifier. Surveying such a constrained way of interacting with literary texts makes one sympathise with the suggestion that "For most schoolchildren the school day must have contained large stretches of numbing boredom."[71] However, the line-by-line exposition of a text in the schools would have encouraged the mind to instinctively remember the phrases and lines so laboriously dwelt upon in the grammar class.

---

[68] Browning, CAH, XIV, 859. Kaster (1988), 169-197

[69] Marrou, 252.

[70] Ibid, 279

[71] Browning, CAH, XIV, 856.

We must not be too hasty, though, to dismiss Ennodius' experience with Virgil as contributing nothing to his ability to engage with the world outside in Late Antiquity and, more specifically, in the cultural landscape of Ostrogothic Italy. Undoubtedly Virgil's utility can easily be understood in its place within a system designed "to teach correct classical diction, and also to instil appreciation of the form and content of classical literature, and finally, and most important by far, to inculcate the rules of rhetoric, and thus train its subjects to compose and deliver elegant and flowery orations"[72]. The cultivation of such a deeply embedded and extensive vocabulary would contribute greatly to Ennodius' abilities in creating and composing rhetoric. It would have done more than this, however. It would ensure that this much more elaborate and potentially winning rhetoric had the vocal equivalent of genetic markers which indicated one's social class.

Let us return to the idea of identity construction discussed already in relation to the *Dictiones*. There we discussed briefly how Ennodius' rhetorical exercises could encourage the potential student to adopt certain words which were redolent of a classical past and thus indicative of a Roman elite identity. Virgil had such an incredibly wide range of sophisticated and powerful verbal reserves from which to draw that it was only natural that the Roman elite gravitated towards it. Its sophistication and 'perfection' marked its language out as a linguistic badge of excellence; its antiquity and ideological implications marked it out as a signifier of Roman continuity. Its language signified both elite and Roman. Virgil "not only never made a mistake, but had never written a line that was not admirable".[73] Using Virgil advertised a connection between the user and educational excellence. As Peter Brown has argued in his magisterial biography of Augustine of Hippo, the 'narrow limits' of an education almost totally devoted to the adoration of Virgil was not in itself

---

[72] A.H.M. Jones, 1003.

[73] Augustine *de utilitate. credendi.* vi.13. Translated by Brown (2000), 25. Augustine's relationship with Virgil is complex and both reflects and foreshadows a wider Christian reinterpretation of the author, and a broader redefinition of what it was to be 'Roman'. As with his call to appropriate from the pagans what is useful (which we discuss below), Augustine reinterprets and refasfions both Virgilian scholarship and the message of the text itself. As Lim (2004), 112-124, has demonstrated, Augustine sought to incorporate the methodologies of the Virgilian grammarian into scriptural reading practice. MacCormack (1998), 36-40, highlights how Augustine and Ambrose, like Lactantius before them, draw from Virgil universal Christian truths lying latent in the text.

necessarily a handicap. A close relationship with Virgil intimated a close relationship with a very particular type of education and advertized a very particular belonging. The education and belonging marked out the individual as a member of the Roman elite, "a part of a caste of their own".[74] Virgil was one of the mechanisms through which the grammarians of the late-antique world "created and maintained a totally artificial language…by which the ruling elite could recognise one another".[75] Ennodius is thus part of a very exclusive club. His use of Virgil here clearly betrays an ability to conjure up the appropriate Virgilian line to meet the moment. This places his own education within the confines of a system which that great towering figure of Late Antiquity, Augustine, would have been familiar with himself. A contemporary of Augustine himself would have recognised a kindred spirit in Ennodius: "a friend of Augustine knew all of Virgil…by heart"[76]. Ennodius is very much a product of Late Antiquity.

Other Authors and their Significance

Virgil is not the only classical author Ennodius betrays a familiarity with. A brief survey of other authors used by Ennodius produces a picture which shows that his literary diet was similar to that fed to generations of Roman schoolboys from the classical period into the late-antique period. As we have seen, if Ennodius' education did follow the contours of the generic late-antique model, he would have interacted with a system which had a very narrow remit. Once again we must turn to look at the evidence to see if the same authors who appear in the texts of the classical and late-antique period appear in Ennodius. Then we shall discuss what the original purpose of the inclusions of those authors were and what this implied about the world outside of the classroom (if anything at all). Finally, we will look again at the world which

---

[74] Brown (2000), 25. The depth of this association is well documented: *Augustine and the Latin Classics*, Hagendahl (1976). *The Shadows of Poetry*, by MacCormack (1998) is an examination of the complex relationship the 4th and 5th century Roman (often with Augustine as the representative member of the Roman literary elite) had with Virgil. See *Memento Romane* (2004), ed. Rees, for a collection of essays on all the areas of literary activities in Late Antiquity (secular and Christian) which were subjected to Virgil's influence in a fundamental and pervasive fashion.

[75] Heather (1994), 183. Virgil's continuing power as a civilzing force in this period is underscored by an anecdote from Sidonius, where the King of the Visigoths is presented as claiming that he was tamed by the poet. Sidonius *Carmen* VII.496-500

[76] *de anim*. iv.7.9. Translated in Brown (2000), 24

existed in Ennodius' time and ask to what extent the education which Ennodius is extolling would have had any real practical application in this world.

In a letter (*Epistle* VI. III) to Euprepia (his sister), Ennodius, while extolling the virtues of the mind over the body, and imparting an aspect of divinity to the mind (*mens parente deo conlata*), turns to Sallust (Crispus, as Ennodius calls him) to help make his point: *hinc Crispus adseruit aliud nobis cum dis, aliud cum beluis esse commune.*[77] The line is taken from Sallust's *Bellum Catilinae*, where he produces the juxtaposition of the body and the divine mind in order to associate the writing of history (his, of course) with the latter: *animi imperio, corporis servitio magis utimur; alterum nobis cum dis, alterum cum beluis commune est.*[78] In the same letter to Euprepia, towards the end (VI. III. 5-6), Ennodius adopts (and adapts) a phrase from the same work of Sallust (*...idem uolle atque idem nolle...BC*, XX. 4) to polish off a point he makes in relation to scripture (*...unum uolle et unum nolle...*). That this could simply be a stock phrase or cliché is possible. Given, however, Ennodius' appropriation of both an idea and the accompanying words from *Bellum Catilinae* earlier, it is probable that he was still thinking of Sallust.

In a further discussion on theology we find another classical author, in this case Terence, and his work employed. The discussion, which is contained in a letter to a Bishop Constantius[79], concerns the interaction between free will and divine grace, and which takes precedence as a means of salvation. Having adumbrated his own view of a balanced universe which places considerable weight on both, Ennodius concludes with a reminder not to discount one's own free will: *fac apud te ut sies* (II, XIX, 17). This phrase is found in Terence's *Andria* where Pamphilius' slave, Davos, is instructing his master to beware his father's machination: *fac apud te ut sies*[80]. Given the obvious attractions such a phrase would have for those teaching grammar (facere + ut combined with the present subjunctive is found in Roman comedy often), its

---

[77] VI, III, 2-3

[78] *Bellum Catilinae*, I, 2-3

[79] *Epistle* II, XIX

[80] *Andria*, 408. The archaic form of *esse* betraying its origins.

seemingly misplaced use here (I doubt Ennodius would want his weighty theological argument undermined by his readership chuckling as they remember the scene from *Andria*) would appear to be another instance of Ennodius, perhaps subconsciously, but certainly instinctively turning to his old school books for a fitting phrase.

The use of Sallust and Terence is significant. The Latin-speaking half of the Roman Empire had developed a system in which a collection of authors were given canonical status in terms of their usefulness as exemplars of good writing practice. A selection of the authors' works was produced for the student to use as templates for learning. The educational process of interacting with these exemplars has been described thus: 'an exacting grind of memorising rules and writing exercises, and then…going though classical authors line by line'[81]. The four authors were Sallust, Terence, Virgil, and Cicero. We have concrete evidence from the 4th century writer Arusianus Messius that these four writers had taken on canonical status.[82] His work was titled: *exempla elocutionum ex Vergilio Sallustio Terentio Cicerone digesta per litteras*. As we have already seen, Ennodius betrays an ability to remember Terence and Sallust similar to the one he displays in relation to Virgil. With regard to Virgil we have seen how Ennodius repackages a half-remembered phrase and idea to add grace and create striking imagery in his own poetry. The same process is surely underway here. Ennodius' use of juxtaposition for effect in his letter to his sister, and his use of a complex grammatical clause as a vehicle for a message to his friend the Bishop tell us two things. Firstly, it tells us that his interaction with Terence and Sallust inspires a usage which is almost exclusively focused on the form and not the content. The clear implication is that Terence and Sallust have been educational tools devoted to developing the student Ennodius within the context of the grammarian's educational philosophy. Secondly, it tells us that Ennodius was selling his ideas to his fellow members of the elite by using the shared language of a traditional Roman education.

We have witnessed how Ennodius' familiarity with the lines and self-contained grammatical phrases of Terence and Sallust inform his letter writing, and how

---

[81] Jones, 1003

[82] *GLK,* 7.449-514. See discussion on Cassiodorus below p...

pervasive the influence of Virgil is, but little mention has been made of the fourth member of this *quadriga*, Cicero. Indeed, like his comparatively sparing use of Terence and Sallust, Ennodius does not have the same intimate relationship with Cicero that he has with Virgil. That Cicero is not as all-pervasive as Virgil is surprising, perhaps, given the rhetorical focus of Ennodius' education. Perhaps it is not so surprising, however, given St Jerome's famous dream. In a letter to an associate's daughter, Eustochium, on virginity, Jerome tells the story that, close to death, and suffering from a life-threatening fever, he saw in a vision himself judged by God as not a Christian but a 'Ciceronian'. He had been condemned, according to Jerome, because he had treasured the works of the pagan more than works devoted to God. The implication of the story is that one cannot be both Christian and a devotee of Cicero (or indeed a devotee of pagan literature in general).[83] How much this view of Cicero directly influenced Ennodius is difficult to assert with any confidence given the lack of evidence. However, we can see from Ennodius' writings that Jerome is someone whom Ennodius and the education system he has grown up within recognises as a substantial and extraordinarily influential figure. In a letter to Lupicinus, about which we shall have much more to say in relation to the institutional structures of education, Ennodius refers to Jerome as *Hieronymus noster*[84]. This reference to Jerome takes place within a discussion on education. Jerome is 'ours', the companion of the adult Ennodius. Therefore, we must assume that Ennodius' views had been formed by the same sort of social and cultural factors which had encouraged Jerome to renounce his Ciceronian tendencies. And yet, Ennodius was, like Jerome, still apparently acquainted with Cicero. He would, as we shall see, use him in a manner which suggests a close relationship with the author.

When Cicero is used he does seem to provide the same function as Terence – who, along with Sallust, suffers from the same relative scarcity of use. In a letter to Faustus (I.III), Ennodius decides to introduce a correlative clause into the sentence: *alia fori uis, alia triclinii* (I.III, 37). This phrase is found in Cicero's *Pro Caelio*, XXVIII.67:

---

[83] Jerome, *Epistle* 20.30.

[84] LXIX.14

alia fori uis est, alia triclinii. Cicero's other appearances[85] in the *opera* are similarly context-free appropriations for stylistic purposes.[86] Like the use of Sallust and Terence, we must conclude that Cicero has simply been an educational tool from which Ennodius has forged his compositional style. The young Ennodius had obviously 'coveted the treasures' of Cicero at an early age; and yet he also, from the evidence of his letters, viewed Jerome as a man of like mind, as one of his own. The comparative lack of use of Cicero may be explained by Jerome's influence, but it is clear that, when he does use Cicero, it is from the position of a close familiarity with his work at a school level. So what is happening here?

A look at the views of another towering literary and religious figure from Late Antiquity is instructive. In book II of his *De Doctrina Christiana*, Augustine exhorts his audience to make use of the traditions of the pagan Roman world: *Sicut enim Aegyptii non tantum idola habebant et onera gravia quae populus Israel detestaretur et fugeret sed etiam vasa atque ornamenta de auro et de argento et vestem, quae ille populus exiens Aegypto sibi potius tamquam ad usum meliorem clanculo vindicavit.* The referential '*sicut*' concerns Neo-Platonism, which is the Egyptian treasure which must be plundered by the Christians. Augustine continues: *Quod eorum tamquam aurum et argentum...debet ab eis auferre Christianus ad usum iustum.*[87] This idea of stripping what is useful away from what is otherwise profane and antithetical to Christian life is developed in the *DDC* with specific reference to Cicero. In book IV, Augustine, in order to demonstrate how best the Christian can use a classical education, quotes directly from Cicero: *Dixit enim quidam eloquens, et verum dixit, ita dicere debere eloquentem ut doceat, ut delectet, ut flectat.*[88]

---

[85] Four according to Vogel's *Index Profani Auctores*, but we may assume more: the definite use of *Philippic* X, 9, 18 is omitted from the *index*

[86] See MGH AA VII.332. As Ennodius' laconic use (38.31) of Cicero *De Oratore* (1.24.112) betrays a familiarity with Cicero's work on the ideal orator, it is tempting to assume that he is intimately familiar with the ideas contained in the work. Frustratingly, though, he does not deal with it in any depth; and, perhaps tellingly, quotes what could have been a commonly known saying about the silliness of talking about talking.

[87] *De Doctrina Christiana* II.144-145

[88] Ibid, IV.74

Cicero has something important to teach the budding Christian about the presentation of his message. He can help him understand how to package his content in a way which will instruct, delight, and move his audience. For, as Augustine says, the benefits of a rhetorical education should be in the way that they reveal the truth of the Christian message to people for whom the message was hidden.[89] The focus here is very much on the cultivation of a specific type of technical knowhow, a style, which can be employed in this service of 'revealing' the Christian message. At the beginning of book IV, Augustine clearly spells out the type of man to whom this type of education will be useful: *bono viro*. The 'good man', is of course, in this case the Christian. The understanding here is also that the bad man could misuse this skill. In short, Augustine advocates the teaching of pagan writers in so far as they can help illuminate the Christian message. The rhetorical skills afforded by interaction with Cicero are acceptable as long as the person is 'good'; that is, does not see the moral and cultural content (those idols of the Egyptian Gods) of the literature of Cicero and the pagan writers as the aim of the education, but sees the technical skills as a vehicle for an already established goal: the propagation of Christianity.

We must be aware, however, that throughout his work, Ennodius also betrays a familiarity with classical authors outwith the traditional gang of four. It is worth mentioning these other authors because, although it is less clear how they were used in an educational sense, their use nevertheless allows us to perceive the outlines of a significant substratum of Ennodius' education lurking beneath more prominent authors like Virgil. Their use is significant for several reasons. Firstly, the nature of their employment thoughout his work reinforces the evidence we have seen up-till-now of an adoption and adaption process which illuminates the contours of the late antique world – and thus, by examining the perpetuation process of this education (as we shall currently see), we can locate education in Ostrogoth Italy within the the confines of an educational periodization which one can safely term 'late antique'. Secondly, it helps to emphasize the nature of Ennodius' social and cultural position among his contemporaries. For, although Ennodius is clearly projecting the image of a man operating within a Roman tradition, in some way, as we shall see, he represents a

---

[89] Ibid, IV.72

new stratum of the Roman elite.The experiences of this member of the Roman elite provides a standard against which we can compare the experience of other members of the Roman elite. Looking briefly at these authors provides a wider frame of reference with which to examine the nature of the tradition which Ennodius inhabits and propagates.

It is clear from frequency of use, that there are three authors with whom Ennodius possessed an unmistakable familiarity: Horace; Lucan; and Ovid.[90] Ennodius has an understanding of these authors which indicates a fundamental interaction with them at some level. When and how they are employed suggests that this relationship may have developed along similar lines to his relationship with Virgil. His use of the poetry of Horace, like his use of Vergil's poetry, demonstrates that the imagery and verbal echoes dominate the intertexual relationship. However, Ennodius is more at ease when interacting with the themes of Horace's poetry than he is with Virgil.[91] The philosophical and moral (Aeneas' personal piety a prominent example) tone of Virgil's poem has to be approached cautiously by the Christian.[92] Naturally, Ennodius' intertextual encomia to his literary friends find no theological objections in Horace's often metaphorical and avowedly literary relationship with the pagan divinities. As with Horace so with Ovid, as the poet's lines and sentiments are adopted from their cultural milieu and adapted into a subordinate position in a new context (the use of both *Amores and Met.* at *Carmen* 1.4 is a classic example).[93] Perhaps more interesting is his relationship with Lucan. Although nowhere nearly as pervasive as Virgil, the nature of the use of Lucan indicates a relationship which is strikingly similar to the one Ennodius has with Virgil. Like Virgil, Lucan is used at once casually (the

---

[90] Works cited or alluded to: Horace *A. P.*, *Carm*., Sat.,; Lucan *Phars*.,; Ovid *Fast*., *Met*., *Am*., *AA*., *Her*., *Trist*. Horace's *Carm*., Lucan's *Phars.,* and Ovid's *Met*., are used on numerous occasions throughout his letters and poems. See Sirmond 332-333 and Hartel 612-613 for a useful, if not always reliable, guide to the use made of the three authors.

[91] Ennod. *Carmen* 1.7 appropriates the imagery and theme of Hor. *Carm.* II.1.12,, where Horace is highlighting the literary skills of an acquaintance. Also, Ennod. *Carmen* 1.5 appropriates both word and theme for his Christ-protected version of the pessimistic view of travel articulated by Horace in *Carm.* 1.3.18.

[92] Lactantius' *Divine Institutes* has many examples of Christian disapproval of Aeneas' moral code: V. 10.1-9

[93] *Carmen* 1.4 is an example of the revived and developed *epithalamia* of the late antique West. In Gaul Ausonius (*cento Nuptialis*) and Sidonius Apollinaris (*Carm.* XI and XV) are proponents, while Claudian (*Epithalamium Palladio et Celerinae*) and Ennodius provide examples from Italy.

paraphrase of a half-remembered sentiment) and also much more specifically (quoted verbatim).[94] As we shall see in relation to both Arator and Boethius (and Memmius Symmachus) later, the use of these authors implies that a much wider range of literature was still influencing the education of the elite in this period – and that these authors, although standing outside the *quadriga*, were employed often enough, and in such a way, to suggest that knowledge of them intimated that the possessors were part of an similar educational tradition.

Conclusions

Let us return to the significance of the *quadriga*, however For it is significant that we are made aware by Ennodius himself that he is fully versed in Virgil - especially the *Aeneid* – that he knows how to adopt an idea from Sallust, and that he can turn to Terence and, in the same way, Cicero when looking to introduce an appropriate syntactical construction. To underline the point, in another letter to his friend Florianus, we should look at Ennodius' intention when he specifically mentions three of these authors: *adhibita credo aduersus me fuisset Tulliani profunditas gurgitis, Crispi proprietas, Maronis elegentia.*[95] As the letter is praising Florianus for his general command of the language, perhaps it is only natural that Ennodius compares Florianus' Latin with that of Cicero, Sallust, and Virgil, who had informed his own education, and no doubt that of Florianus, and the school in general. From this it is clear that Ennodius was actively exhibiting his familiarity with an education in grammar which contained the elements of classical schooling which AHM Jones describes above, and with which generations of Roman school children would have been familiar. There is little doubt that Ennodius consciously inhabits this cultural continuum.

Ennodius is aware that this education occupies a distinct place within the late antique educational landscape. According to Augustine, Virgil, the ubiquitous and pervasive influence in Ennodius' work, should be viewed as the perfect model through which

---

[94] *Carmen* 1.7.25-50 sees Ennodius literally construct his message out of alternate lines of Virgil and Lucan. There is both paraphrase and verbatim appropriation for Books 3 and 8 of *Phars*.

[95] The manuscript traditions diverge on the citation of Virgil. Sirmond's text of 1611 provides *Varronis elegentia* from one tradition; the MGH edition of Vogel supplies *Maronis elegentia*. Both Sirmond XXVII) and Vogel (XIX-).

the budding Roman could perfect and augment his vocabulary and diction.[96] This view of Virgil as the master wordsmith obviously permeated the halls of the educational establishments Ennodius was in contact with. Ennodius' work shows a continuing and close relationship with Virgil, the nature of which can only really be understood in terms of an early and fundamental interaction with him along the lines articulated by Priscian. His letter-writing also advertises a level of intimacy with the other three writers of the *quadriga* which should be understood in terms of a close relationship with a specific type of grammatical instruction. As we have seen above, this type of grammatical instruction was the product of the peculiar conditions prevalent in late-antique society. The content of Cicero's works was looked upon with great suspicion by Jerome, and the skills inculcated by a rhetorical education in general were viewed with similar scepticism by Augustine. Both, however, understood that in order to disseminate their message more widely the 'good man' should be permitted to interact with those aspects of traditional learning which met the needs of the Christian message.[97] Ennodius' education, stripped of an emotional intimacy with the content of the works he knows so well, is the natural product of the philosophy of teaching the classics which both Jerome and Augustine champion. He has a functional, mechanical relationship with these authors which marks the education he had received as that of a member of an elite within the society of Late Antiquity In Ostrogothic Italy. Ennodius is projecting a self-identity which invokes authors from a classical canon (as understood in Late Antiquity) as witnesses of its elite status.

All of which now brings us to a significant point regarding Ennodius' interaction with these authors. Looking closely at the examples from Virgil, Sallust, Terence, and Cicero, we can locate this later Roman education within the discussion which we have up to now noticed in relation to the formation of an empowering identity. The two different approaches to teaching Virgil on the one hand, and Terence, Sallust, and Cicero on the other reveal two approaches to cultivating this character which can be,

---

[96] Augustine *de util. cred.* vi.13

[97] Jerome, *Epistula* LXX.21.6., somewhat confusingly given his dream (see above, 41), in a letter to a grammarian advises that the letters of the gentiles should be read because they can be used to inspire Christian learning.

at one and the same time, both identity marker and a source of empowerment in an increasingly fragmented world. As we argued above, the language and diction which Virgil imparted to Ennodius would have marked him out as a man of a particular class to his peers. Likewise, the understanding which Ennodius gleaned from his interaction with the other authors would have imparted a similar identity marker. In their case, given, as we have seen, the peculiar nature of the use Ennodius makes of Sallust, Terence, and Cicero, Ennodius is able to articulate his thoughts via sentence constructions made out of the educational staple of rhetorical figures. Anaphoric clauses (*aliud…aliud*) in his letters, or the internal assonantal symmetry of certain clauses (*velle…nolle*) pepper his works. His expansive Virgilian vocabulary, his use of elaborate Virgilian metaphors, allied to his Ciceronian/Sallustian/Terentian phraseology gave Ennodius' literary character a very specific elite status. It was through this identity that he could mark out himself to his peers and political masters and indicate to them that they should play by the rules understood by both - empowering himself in the way that Peter Brown and Libanius envisaged above.

Formal Education in Ostrogothic Italy

Having examined what Ennodius' writings tell us about his own past education (rhetorical and literary), I shall now move on to discuss what we can learn from them about the nature and workings of institutions[98] in contemporary Italy and Rome in the late fifth- and early sixth-century. In this regard Ennodius' writings provide us with many valuable insights. *Dictio* VII, whose relationship with the *Aeneid* we have just discussed, introduces the reader to the world of formal education in contemporary Italy.[99] The main motivation for writing this *Dictio* is, as the title suggests, to celebrate the move of the *Auditorium* to the forum at Milan: *Dictio…in dedicatione auditorii quando ad forum translatio facta est*. What he sees as the function of the *Auditoria*, which were attested repositories of learning in the ancient world,[100] is something

---

[98] Of course 'institution' implies something very different to the modern reader. Here I use the term to indicate the collection of formal stages (administered through various teaching options: slaves, home tutors, and public teachers) in education through which the student would pass in his journey through education (elements - literature and grammar - rhetoric). See Kaster. Marrou, and Riché passim.

[99] F. Ermini (*La scuola in Roma nel VI. Secolo* in *Archivum Romanicum* 18, 1934) has argued that this *Dictio* refers to what was happening in Rome. Riché, n.50, p25, soundly refutes this.

[100] Quintilian refers to the *auditorium* as place of teaching (10.I.36). See OLD for numerous ancient comments on the nature of the classical *auditoria*.

which Ennodius is keen to stress in the opening lines: *ut campus militem, mare nauitas, fora causidicum sollicitant…ita linguas auditoria exercent. Nam quae, malum, ratio suadebit silentium in loco, in quo sunt praemia constiuta verborum?* (VII. 1-2). The final flourish provided by the rhetorical question is appropriated from Cicero (*Philippics* X.9.18). Ennodius then reminds the reader that this place of learning had had a long and illustrious association with the tuition of generations of Roman school children (VII. 3-4).

Did the curriculum have elements of the sort of traditional educational practices Ennodius himself seems to have undergone? As the introduction (cited above) indicates, rhetoric was certainly a subject which was a core element of the education. Indeed, Ennodius frames the introduction to imply that the school is as concerned with the art of rhetoric (the exercise of the tongue) as the sailor is with the sea, the soldier with the battlefield, the advocate with the courts. There is also the evidence of the preoccupations of the head of the school, Deuterius. Ennodius describes him as the outstanding teacher of eloquence and suggests that the pupils will have an outstanding teacher, educated in the art of speech: *Habetis* [*discipuli*] *praeuium eloquentiae…doctorem.*[101] This confirms Ennodius' assertion regarding the pre-eminence of rhetoric as an educational tool. Also, it confirms that Deuterius' school is, as Ennodius suggests, following in the tradition of teaching rhetoric which stretched back to Quintilian. We find in *Dictio* XXIV an example of what Reyellet identifies as 'Le *Declamationes ethicae*',[102] whose concentration on exploring issues through the prism of mythological examples instantly reminds one of the second element of the *Declamatio*: the *suasoriae*. This is a *Dictio*, Ennodius says, which: *ipse Deuterius iniunxit*. That is, it seems to be a *Dictio* which he contributed to (joined in) in some way.

Evidence from the students
Arator

---

[101] VII. 8.

[102] DBI, 694

We should consider the future careers and activities of those who graduated from this school. In so doing we will come to a better understanding of the works which informed their learning and which made up the curriculum. One case in point is that of Arator, a name familiar not only from many of Ennodius' writings, but also as a writer in his own right. We have several sources (including himself) able to shed some light upon his education. In many of the above examples, which were intended to highlight Ennodius' familiarity with the *Declamatio*, Arator is the addressee (XVII, XVIII, and XXII). The date and actual circumstances surrounding them are unknown, so we cannot know at what stage of his education Arator received these letters. We do know, though, that Arator was educated at the *Auditorium* of Deuterius in Milan. Ennodius introduces *Dictio* IX as: *Praefatio Quando Arator Auditorium ingressus est*. When he enters the *Auditorium*, Ennodius informs Arator,[103] he will find Deuterius. Ennodius draws Arator's attention toward the type of education he will receive: an education which will be informed by a teacher who, when he goes to him, will reward his efforts in the field of rhetoric: *qui ubertate linguarum germina tibi multiplicatis seminibus et sudorem remuneretur inpensum* (IX.5). That oratory will play a major part is left in no doubt: the term *oratio* features several times in the letter, accompanied by forms of *lingua* and *dicere* in participle form. This education must have stood him in good stead for later life. For much later Arator gave a public recitation of his works in Rome which was so well received that further recitations had to be arranged in order to meet public demand.[104] That he had indeed reached a praiseworthy level of proficiency in rhetoric is attested by Ennodius, once again, in *Dictio* XII, where Arator's expertise is the focus of an encomium.

Evidence of a rhetorical element in their education is something which both Ennodius and Arator share. Does Arator's familiarity with classical authors betray an acquaintance with a similar canon to that of Ennodius? There is certainly evidence which seems to suggest that Virgil has an influence upon Arator, and which shows that

---

[103] IX, 5: *inuenies illic Deuterium*

[104] Green, 251-252, gives the general circumstances of the event, and the unusual circumstances surrounding the survival of the report.

he was as well-versed in Virgil as Ennodius[105]. To introduce his discussion on what formed the early moral code of the Christian church, Arator calls on Virgil: *Hinc canere incipiam*[106]. This phrase is appropriated from *Georgics* I.V, where Virgil introduces the theme of his own work. The beginning (first line) of another work, this time the *Aeneid*, provides Arator with terminology which informs his sentence structure on more than one occasion.[107] Again in the *Historia Apostolica*, when attributing serpentine qualities to Judaism (I.730-735), Arator turns to book II. 203-205 of the *Aeneid*, weaving the description of the two serpents sent by Minerva to kill Laocoön into his depiction of the perfidious Jewish church. The use Arator makes in these two instances is typical of his general approach when employing Virgil. Like Ennodius, it seems to be the case that a phrase is often cut from its context and represented in a different one. There is, as we can see from the above examples, less of a concentration on Vergilian lines as grammatical decorations. Although taken out of context, they are embedded in the text in order to link concepts and introduce themes. And, as we have also seen, Arator is not averse to employing the poetic drama of a Vergilian scene in order to enliven his own narrative. He does not, however, seem to infuse the themes of the *Aeneid* into his work. As Roger Green notes,[108] it is possible to say that Arator does employ Virgil whenever an occasion arises, 'but not that his poem is essentially Vergilian in conception'.

Arator too has a significant familiarity with the other authors outwith the *quadriga* discussed above in relation to Ennodius. Again what is noteworthy is the frequency with which Arator interacts with the work of these authors. The copious references made to Horace, Lucan, and Ovid point to an intimate knowledge of all three. It is unsurprising that the author of an epic poem, usually referred to as the *Historia*

---

[105] CCSL *index auctorum* list over 700 references and allusions to the *Aeneid* alone. Green, 321-350, undertakes a detailed study of the effect epic in general has upon Arator's writings; also providing an exhaustive index, 419-423. Although arguing that Lucan is perhaps more of a general influence, Green does point out that, statistically speaking, the Virgilian material is 3 to 2 more in evidence (321).

[106] *Historia Apostolica*, 1.220. CCSL CXXX.

[107] Ibid., 2.290, 2.446.

[108] Green, 328

Apostolica,[109] betrays knowledge of both Lucan and Ovid. In over five hundred citations and allusions to the *Pharsalia* in his poem, every book of Lucan's great work provides imagery and content for Arator.[110] The influence of Ovid is equally as pervasive, as once again every book of Ovid's epic *Metamorphoses* provides Arator with material to construct his own epic. Imagery from Ovid's other works are employed copiously throughout the epic, providing both stricking imagery and linguistic clarity.[111] Also unsurprisingly is the comparatively lesser use of Horace. However, with nearly two hundred instances of Horace's direct influence upon the construction of the epic, taken from all of Horace's known works, it is clear that Arator had a close and abiding relationship with the poet.[112] How did these authors impact upon his education? The similar relationship the deployment of each author (especially Lucan and Ovid) has with the deployment of Virgil raises the tantalizing possibility that Latin Epic in general is metonymically represented when references to Virgil in the schoolroom are made. Indeed Sidonius Apollinaris clearly states that it was common practice among reading groups to study authors together who had the same style and diction (if not the same *topoi*).[113]

Before leaving the other authors with whom Arator was familiar, there is one further piece of consideration which perhaps gives us another piece of evidence about which authors were used in formal education. We remember from above that Ennodius provides that tantalizingly brief description of a piece of Seneca which he remembered from the schoolroom (*Adulescentiae meae memini me legisse temporibus de quodam dictum* – note 23 above). The passage which Ennodius quotes from is taken from Medea's set piece rhetorical invective when she confronts Jason (Seneca *Med.* 447-490). When Arator is relating the positions of Saint Paul and Peter in

---

[109] Green (2006), 251, n.2, provides the general circumstances attending the scholarly adoption of this title.

[110] *CCSL* CXXX, 506-511.

[111] Ibid, 526-531 for uses of *Met.* 519-532 for references to all other works.

[112] Ibid, 496 to 498.

[113] *Licet quaepiam volumina quorumpiam auctorum servarent in causis disparibus dicendi parilitatem: nam similis scientiae viri, hinc Augustinus hinc Varro, hinc Horatius hinc Prudentius lectitabantur.* Sidonius *Ep* II.9.4-5.

relation to baptism, he includes a quote from this set-piece speech of Seneca.[114] It is tempting to see this set-piece speech as part of the formal process (rhetorical) of education. Once again the length of the reminiscence is too brief, and the context too distant from the original to provide definitive evidence that it was indeed part of both men's education. However it is clear that both men were inhabiting an educational tradition and continuum with very similar boundaries.

To return to his relationship with Virgil, it is worth reemphasizing the fact that he uses Virgil so extensively in his work, yet Virgil does not inspire Arator to fuse Virgilian themes and *topoi* into the *Historia*. This surely suggest that he had been educated to treat Virgil as merely a text book for dramatic colour, eloquence, and the written word. Ennodius' attitude, which can be detected in one of his *Dictiones* to Arator's teacher, Deuterius, helps illustrate the mindset which would have cultivated this sort of attitude in the schools. In the summation of *Dictio* VIII, when reminding Deuterius that his successful pupils will help impart his fame abroad, Ennodius refers to Virgil as *Maro uester*. He then proceeds, in the next line, to refer to Jerome as *Hieronymus noster*. Ennodius thus places Virgil firmly in the schoolhouse; and he places the writings of Christian philosophers in the adult world. Arator's use of Virgil outside the *Auditorium* merely reflects this attitude. As we noted above[115], the idea that Virgil should be in the schoolhouse and Jerome in the world of the adults, is something which emanated from the prevalent discourse on the potential utility of the classics in Late Antiquity. In Augustine's *De Doctrina Christiana* the rationale behind such a philosophy is meticulously laid out. Ennodius' education - its philosophy, its curriculum, and its textbooks – can very much be viewed as a close relative of the education which Arator is receiving. There is some sort of continuity in educational philosophy from early Imperial Rome, to the Rome of the later Empire, and onto the Rome of the Ostrogothic period. In a letter to Pathenius, Arator is quite cear about what he thinks of the nature of the pagan authors who shaped his early education: *cantabas placido dulcique lepore poetas, / In quibus ars fallax, pompa superba fuit.*[116]

---

[114] *Cur membra secet…*(*Historia Apostolica* 2.251). From Seneca *...secare membra non revicturi senis.* (*Med.* 476)

[115] 41

[116] *Ep. Ad Parth.* 41-42.

Arator strips off the context and theme from the epic poetry of his youth, and replaces it with the sentiments of a new, more certain, less vain and haughty milieu.

There is one interesting aside, though, which, although not dealing directly with our period, does shed some light upon the continuities which existed in it and which, seemingly, were abandoned not long after. Ennodius was born under the old Imperial system, and his education was, as we have been discussing, closely informed by the political demands of that old system. The Ostrogothic government, which now controlled the political structures of the empire, made similar demands of the Roman elite. Italy under the Ostrogoths was still a political capital with a seat of power. As such, the seat of power could be petitioned by various members of the Roman elite in order to court good grace on some individual matter or simply to ingratiate oneself more generally into Royal/Imperial favour. This fact made the rhetorical skills the Roman elite had mastered in the schools all the more relevant and, in many circumstances, vital. Ennodius, Cassiodorus, and no doubt many others[117] composed panegyrics on the King; compositions which conformed to the latter reason for petitioning power. Ostrogothic Italy provided similar opportunities for the Roman elite to put their rhetorical skills at the call of the state for diplomatic purposes. The phenomenon of rhetoricians practising their skills on embassies has a long and illustrious (if not always praiseworthy) pedigree. There is the example of the Athenian embassy to Rome in 155 B.C., where the Athenian delegates shocked the Roman elite of the day with a display of the amoral power of rhetoric.[118] This use of rhetoric in the service of a court is carried on by Arator himself not long after leaving the schools.[119] He impresses Theoderic with his eloquence during a Dalmatian embassy to the King. His subsequent career path shows that Arator's education provided a function for him

---

[117] It is quite probable that Theoderic, on his triumphal entry to Rome to celebrate in tricennalia (*Anonymus Valesianus* 66-67), was the recipient of many verbal decorations. Cassiodorus' panegyric to Theoderic is now lost as is Boethius'.

[118] Cicero *Res Publica* III.XII.21, and Lactantius *Institutiones*, V.XVI.2-4. The embassy argued one day for justice and then next day for injustice.

[119] There is continued debate about the precise date of the embassy. Green, 256, thinks it early in Arator's career, Hillier,7, thinks it earlier.

and the state which fulfilled a long-standing understanding of the role of a rhetorical education[120].

However, in the chaos which accompanied the Gothic wars, where the Roman elite were confronted with a situation where the seat of power was hotly and violently contested, the more prudent members of the elite naturally avoided such political encomia. The traditional outlets for exercising the skills which the elite had learned in the rhetoric schools were vanishing. Arator retired from public life to Rome, perhaps exercising the sort of caution the prudent are wont to in times of confusion and danger[121]. It is perhaps in an unusual and unlikely place that we see the place in which his rhetorical skills sought refuge. In 544, in front of the steps of San Pietro ad Vincula in Rome Arator gave a performance which has been described as 'remarkable'[122]. He gave an oral recitation of his latest poem. He dedicated the poem to Pope Vigilius, and introduced it with a quasi-encomium to the Pope. As we shall discuss in Chapter 2, the Popes had increasingly tried to present themselves as the true keepers of the traditional power and autonomy of Rome. So perhaps it is not surprising that Arator directs this new outlet for his education, a new form of rhetorical expression towards the papacy. It was presenting itself as the true cultural and social power in Rome and rhetoric had been designed to interact with that power.

Lupicinus

As one of the more illustrious alumni of the *Auditorium* - whose later works (as well as his connections with Ennodius) present a comparatively rich source of material - we have a relative abundance of evidence for Arator's education. We also - thanks once again to Ennodius - have information pertaining to others students, which helps to confirm some of the findings we have made above. Lupicinus, the son[123] of Ennodius' sister, Euprepia (whom we mentioned above), was a student of the

---

[120] Green, 256-257, charts some of the contours of his political career after he left school.

[121] Ibid, 257-258, posits several potential reasons for the move to Rome. There is a suggestion that the political world is the implied antithesis of the anodyne and bucolic nirvana of Arator's desired Rome - this gives his ideal Rome definition.

[122] Ibid, 251.

[123] Ennodius, *Epistle* II.XXIII.3: *Lupicinum Euprepiae nostrae filium loquor*. Also mentioned as Euprepia's son in *Epistle* II.XV.24.

Auditorium. *Dictio* VIII, which is of the type that we have encountered in relation to Arator and his entry into education, provides the information. It begins by explaining its purpose, for Lupicinus when he was entrusted to Deuterius in the Auditorum: *Praefatio dicta Lupicino quando in Auditorio traditus est Deuterio*. As with the *Dictio* commemorating Arator's entry to the *Auditorium*, aspects of the envisaged education are discussed. Here Ennodius again draws attention to the importance of learning the rhetorical skills necessary for the successful execution of winning oratory, and assures Lupicinus that he need not have a lack of confidence in his own abilities to deliver it: *si themati obsequium praestat **oratio**, ab ipso suscipit dignitatem. Proprii ergo macie non tuberis ingenii, quando eloquii uilitas pretio **susceptae dictionis** eleuatur[124]*. The focus here is very much on the benefits or otherwise of a rhetorical education. Ennodius' letter reveals in no uncertain terms what all should expect from instruction in Deuterius' school: an education with rhetoric at its core.

This statement also reveals a little of what Ennodius understood the role of rhetoric to be in the society and establishment of which he was a part. As we can see from the passage, Ennodius' reassurances to Lupicinus would seem to reinforce the view explored above that the Roman elite still understood rhetoric as a device which could, in the wrong hands, be used to further the cause of a worthless argument. This is rhetoric as essentially a neutral devise which does not in itself possess an understanding of right or wrong. The right and wrong come from the theme (*themati obsequium praestat oratio*). The theme which is presented, with its own internal morality, provides oratory with its moral worth (*dignitatem*). This is an attitude which, as we have discussed, seems to inform Ennodius' entire approach to education and rhetoric.[125] Ennodius is at pains here to remind Lupicinus of the need to understand that the rhetorical education which he receives is not a useful skill in and of itself. It must be combined with another element (a moral element) to give it real power. Traditional elements of this education, divorced from their original context, which can be seen from the very particular use Ennodius makes of his classical forbearers we

---

[124] *Dictio* VIII.13-15, 446

[125] See Kennell, 50-52, for a general discussion on the 'amoral' nature of Ennodius' rhetoric.

witnessed in above, are to be subjected to a new context, and filled with the content of a new world view: that of Late Antiquity.

Of course, we have already met *Dictio* VIII. Above, while exploring the relationship between Arator and Virgil, we touched upon the final lines of the *Dictio* where Ennodius, reminding Deuterius - who will be Lupicinus' teacher - that his successful students will increase his renown,[126] refers to Virgil explicitly: *Maro uester tantis instiutiones suos commendauit, quantis ipse notus est: et certe illos per merita sua fama non prodidit.* With regard to a literary education, therefore, we must conclude that this teacher, for whom Virgil is described as 'your', and with whom a man so well-versed in Virgil as Ennodius is apparently helping compose exercises, runs a school where the reading of Virgil plays a seminal part, It should be added, however, that the 'your' 'our' distinction made by Ennodius also reflects the attitude in Late Antiquity that Virgil, like other pagan writers whose only purpose was seen as feeding human vanity with a grand style detached from contemplation of God, was seen by an authority like Augustine[127] as vain. It is safe for the frivolity of the playground; not for serious men. Regardless, the *Auditorium* is, and will be, in Ennodius' eyes, an institution where Virgil should be regarded as an authority of particular concern in the education of the pupils.

An interesting footnote to our discussion on the literary aspect of Lupicinus' education concerns an activity we know he undertook in later life. Although it is true that he is not as familiar a name as Arator, he does not completely disappear from history after his appearance in the *Dictiones* and *Epistles*. Thanks to his Uncle Ennodius, we know his grandparents (mentioned as: *Firminus et Licerius – Dictio* VIII.6-7) and so he can be identified with the editor of book II of Caesar's *de Bello Gallico.*[128] Caesar is an author who does not seem to feature in any of Ennodius' works, but there is an interesting example of discussion on him in an educational

---

[126] *Dictio* VIII, p449-450

[127] An idea propagated by Augustine in his Confessions VIII.2.5, where he condemns human vanity for seeing the attainment of style as the only worthy end of education. In *DDC*, IV.9-10, Augustine unfavourably juxtaposes the 'substance' of Christian writers with the implied 'grandeloquence' of the pagan poets. A similar attitude pervades *de Ciuitate Dei*, and the *Institutiones Diuinae* of Lactantius.

[128] Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire II, 694.

context in Ostrogothic Italy. It comes from none other than Ennodius' nephew and star rhetorician and epic poet, Arator. In a letter to one Parthenius, Arator remembers how he once used to read Caesar's 'histories' with him in Ravenna when he was a student: *Caesaris historias ibi primum, te duce, legi*[129]. So it would seem that Lupicinus was later to become a preserver of the literature which his close associates and fellow recipients of a Roman education had closely studied at some point. Unfortunately we do not know the vocational career path of Lupicinus before this and after school. It is tempting, if unjustified because of the lack of evidence, to imagine his efforts here as a sign of a similar retreat from the traditional outlets of educational expression (the political world) as that possibly undertaken by Arator himself. Regardless, this evidence would seem to suggest that all of these students are in some sort of dialogue with an education which speaks not only within the evolving parameters of Late Antiquity, but also more generally to an illustrious classical past.

Anonymous, Paterius and Severus

Ennodius composes two *Dictiones* on the theme of education which have the academic potential of another group of budding students as the theme. Unlike the letters to Arator and Lupicinus, the *Auditorium* is not explicitly mentioned as the place where the education will take place. Two students, Paterius and Severus, receive a joint *Dictio* (XIII) which Ennodius uses as both a celebration of their first steps into education (*eruditionem originariam in ipsis uitae praestolantur exordiis – Dictio* XIII. 14-15) and as a platform for a prolonged metaphor marrying education and patriotic duty in war (throughout the *Dictio* Ennodius uses martial language – *pugnate… bellantes*[130]). The *Dictio* also informs us that both young men are the offspring of noble families: *ecce Paterius et Seuerus, ornamenta curulium…*(XIII. 13); and whose families have also held high office: *quorum…familia meruerit scipiones et trabeas*

---

[129] *Epistula ad Parthenium*, 39 & 40, *PL* LXVIII, 250. Arator himself appears not to have cited, alluded to, or mentioned Caesar (other than here) in any of his works. Not suprising, perhaps, given that little of poetic or lyrical value would be available for Arator to use. One possibility is that a more mature Arator read Caesar with Parthenius at Ravenna when both had left formal education (the school of the rhetor – or in Deuterius' case, the school of both rhetor and grammaticus). Perhaps in a reading group of the type Sidonius describes in his letter to Donidius (*Ep* II.9.4-6); where a member of the elite's villa is a centre for lively literary investigation.

[130] 7-8. Other examples passim

(XIII.21-22). Although we do not have the means of firmly planting them within the walls of the *Auditorium*, it is noteworthy that Ennodius revisits the same description of the common relationship between the needs of the sailor for the sea, soldier for war, and place of study for a scholar wishing to study rhetoric that he introduced in his opening lines commemorating the translation of the *Auditorium* to the forum in Milan (*Dictio* VII). The two concepts of the soldier on the battlefield and in the *Auditoria* exercising their linguistic abilities are merged: *Si nauta secundis flatibus feliciter humidi directum transit itineris, si bellatorem ducit successus melior ad triumphum, si **per rhetoricos campos litterarum miles** iudicis fit fauore sublimior* (XIII. 1-4). Attributes which he has already associated with the *Auditorium* clearly informed Ennodius' thinking when composing this, but we need not make the conclusion that both men were to attend that institution to make our point: the fact that the study of rhetoric is shorthand for the education envisaged for these two men is sufficient to demonstrate that it would be a seminal influence upon their schooling in Northern Italy.

The second *Dictio* (XI) provides us with less information about the identity of the student than XIII. It does, however, confirm once again that Ennodius' views on education are predicated upon a conception of society where the teaching of rhetoric is of fundamental importance. Unfortunately, the *Dictio* does not reveal the name of the student it is addressed to. However, like the previous *Dictio* to Paterius and Severus, we find out that the father of the prospective student (*Eusebi filius*) is a man of some standing: *Eusebius nobilissimus genitor* (XI. 2, 460). Furthermore, unlike XIII, where the manuscript tradition is lacking the introductory title that is common to not just the *Dictiones*, but the *Epistles*, *Carmina*, and the *Opusucla Miscella*[131], XI tells us the issue of the *Dictio* in the first line: *Dictio quae dicta est quando Eusebi filius traditus est ad studia*. Again, like XIII, the *Auditorium* is not explicitly mentioned. What we do have, however, is Ennodius' familiar emphasis on the importance of acquiring an education firmly grounded in rhetoric. In an extended passage exploring the potential an education in rhetoric can provide (and the potentially bad effects should one not have its advantages), Ennodius returns to the

---

[131] Sirmond, in his edition of 1611, adds his own title to XIII based upon the content.

familiar example of the sailor and the sea as an appropriate analogy for the budding student: *Educatus in puppibus aequor liquidum sine terrore nauta perlustrat* (XI. 10-11, 459). There follows a rhetorical embellishment of the *topos* (XI. 9-16, 459) which concludes with a reminder that inactivity is not the natural condition of a potential advocate: *ergo sicut artium in suo quaeque opere inuenitur mater instantia, ita nouerca eruditionis est neglegentia* (XI. 14-16, 459). The importance of the training thus adumbrated, Ennodius moves on to discuss the skills an education in rhetoric can provide: *quid faciat sermo peritiae splendore dotatus, ubi causa etiam sine insinuatricis linguae placet officio?* (XI. 22-24, 459).

The utility of this education is then addressed. The education which Ennodius envisages for this young student places an emphasis on the need to cultivate the *insinuatrix lingua* as that which he envisages for his other students. The reference to the *causa* and the *causidius*, the lawsuit and the advocate (*cessante frequentia probati obmutescunt ora causidici* – XI. 9-10, 459) provides us with a clue to what Ennodius imagined the future career of the young man could be. As we have seen with Arator above, the possible career paths open to the student in post-imperial, Ostrogothic Italy was quite traditional in Late Antiquity. He could, like Arator, become an advocate should he wish. And, also like Arator, he could plead the case for the state in front of a foreign potentate. So once again we see the education system which Ennodius' letters reveal very much pointing towards an education system which both served the state and facilitated the maintenance and definition of a traditional Roman elite identity.

Parthenius and Ambrosius

There are two further students from Northern Italy whose education we know something of. One is Parthenius[132], the son of another of Ennodius' sisters, the other Ambrosius, a future leading member of the Italian government. Parthenius' family background is confirmed in three separate epistles from book V. In the first, Ennodius describes him thus: *Partenius noster germanae filius* (*Epistle* V. IX. 4-5, 133). The description of him is repeated in *Epistle* V. X. 5-6, 134: *Partenius…germanae filius*;

---

[132] The identification of this Parthenius with the senior administrator in the Gothic government, and also the addressee of Arator's epistles, is in dispute. PRLE has two different entries. See Green, 254-255, for further interesting, although inconclusive, discussion on the problem.

and again in V. XI. 24, 134 - where Ennodius adds the possessive adjective for extra clarity: *Partenio germanae meae filio…conuenit*. The final reference to his familial links occurs at V. XII. 26, 135: *Partenius sororis meae filius*. Unlike Lupicinus, his mother is not explicitly named, nor survives there any correspondence – as with Euprepia, Lupicinus' mother – with her. We know little of Ambrosius' background other than he was from Northern Italy. In *Epistle* IX.III, Ennodius encourages a certain Meribaudus (of whom we know nothing, other than the probability - given the nature of the letter - that he was a prominent Roman[133]), to look after Ambrosius while he is in Rome. The letter sets out the reasons why someone of Ambrosius' character is coming to Rome, and in so doing, reveals his origins: *aestimans quod sanguis eius, quod prudentia, quod census intra Liguriae angusta delitesceret et artis fama nobilis artaretur obstaculis: alieno praesidio claritatem suam in Romanam lucem putat erumpere*.[134] The narrow confines, whether geographical or societal and cultural (or both), of Liguria present a less fitting stage for his attributes than Rome.

Firstly we shall turn to Parthenius. What do we know of his education? Luckily, but not unexpectedly, Ennodius, his uncle, composed a series of *Epistles* and *Dictiones* which provide evidence for the young man's formative years. *Dictio* X is written as an act of thanks to a teacher from Ennodius, on the occasion of Parthenius attaining a praiseworthy level of education. The title suggests that Parthenius had passed an oral examination (a thank you note to the grammaticus when Parthenius recited well): *Gratiarum actio grammatico quando Partenius bene recitauit*. The oral examination, or public recital was a feature of education in antiquity, the nature of which is attested by numerous sources. We have witnessed (n.27, above) how Quintilian scorns the anxious parents of pupils busily counting the numbers of public recitals a student gives, as they (to Quintilian's obvious disapproval) subjugate quality to quantity. Persius, too, in Satire III, while revealing what tactics of evasion he would employ to avoid having to recite, tells us something of the make-up of the audience for the recitals: *Saepe oculos, memini, tangebam paruus oliuo, / grandia si nollem morituri uerba Catonis / dicere non sano multum laudanda magistro, / quae pater adductis*

---

[133] Possibly of Frankish decent: see PLRE II, 756.

[134] *Epistle* IX. III, 12-16, 230.

sudans audiret amicis.[135] Of Parthenius' view of his teacher, we have no information. Ennodius, though, is more favourably disposed towards Parthenius' teacher than Persius was to his. Throughout the *Dictio* the *grammaticus* is described in glowing terms: *optime magister…doctor eruditissime…emendatissime hominum*[136] The terminology employed in the praise of the *grammaticus* (most erudite doctor, most learned of men) is used by Ennodius of Deuterius, when that teacher is explicitly named. We should, therefore, reasonably conclude[137] that, even though he is not named in the text, Deuterius is the probable *grammaticus* and *rhetor*. Even if not, however, the teacher obviously conforms to the ideals Ennodius hopes and believes Deuterius practises. Therefore, we should imagine Parthenius receiving an education not far removed from the education both Ennodius himself and his protégés interacted with.

We are given a much firmer idea of the content and general nature of the rhetoric Ennodius envisaged would be taught by the *grammaticus*,[138] and which would have informed Parthenius' recital. In the introduction to the *gratiarum actio* of *Dictio* X, Ennodius sets out what he sees as some defining characteristics of the art: *uno quidem tyranni laudationes et bonorum principum ore celebrantur.* (X.3-4, 456). This sentiment reflects the position which we encountered earlier in *Dictio* VIII, when Ennodius was describing the sort of education he envisaged for his other nephew, Lupicinus. There he outlines his philosophy that rhetoric gains its sense of moral justification from the topic it interacts with. Here, in this passage, he once again expounds this theory, by drawing attention to the fact that the budding rhetorician will assume the moral character of the subject of his talk: *nec est aliqua inter eius qui meretur praeconia diuersitas et illius qui usurpat.* (X.4-5, 456). So, there is no moral difference between the person who delivers the encomium and his subject. The implication of this statement is two-fold: 1) that the rhetorician's art, which at this

---

[135] Persius *Satires* III. 44-45.

[136] *Dictio* X.13, 456; X.10, 457; X.17, 457.

[137] As Kennell has - without circumspection (51-55).

[138] The lack of distinction between the formerly separate roles of *grammaticus* and *rhetor* in relation to Deuterius is interesting, though not surprising. As Green (2006), 323, has noted, the effectiveness of the rhetoric of one of his pupils, Arator, is in part attributable to Arator's use of the language of the poets (especially epic poets).

moment Parthenius is being taught, is a powerful, but amoral device; and 2) that the rhetorician must have a suitably centred moral character, which will prevent him from misusing his powers in a way which would reflect badly upon his own character. Parthenius' education in rhetoric should have, according to his uncle, a moral element.

Before moving on to discuss our final student, we should examine the implications for our understanding of Late Antiquity of this type of education. To what extent this philosophy is a reflection of Late Antiquity's attitudes towards rhetoric is a question which deserves some further attention. We have already looked briefly at the Christian view of the need for the good man to practice rhetoric. Now we shall examine the evolution of this idea through Antiquity to our period. It is possible to discern the influence of Cato's philosophy of the art of speaking, which was to be used by the learned good man to help guide the state: *sit ergo orator quem constituimus is qui a M. Catone finitur **uir bonus dicendi peritus**, uerum, id quod et ille posuit prius et ipsa natura potius ac maius est, utique uir bonus*[139]. This is a view found among other learned men of Classical Antiquity[140]. This moral element was always emphasized, however. Cicero, *de Oratore* 2.85, provides an outline of the ways in which oratory can instil moral character into a subject, whether that subject has it or not. Cicero highlights rhetoric's ability to win a case via its power of presenting virtues to a public receptive to those virtues. This rhetoric does not require a good man skilled in the art of speaking. Although Cicero is extolling the virtues of appearing virtuous, the emphasis is on the utility for one's argument of the projection and appearance (to the public) of moral worth: *Gratissima autem laus eorum factorum habetur quae suscepta **uidentur** a uiris fortibus sine emolumento ac praemio*. Rhetoric has a power to make virtues *seem* and this power can be used. This formula is basically morally neutral: it does not stipulate that the rhetorician need be a man of sound moral character (although it does not preclude this possibility).

Of course, as we said above, Ennodius' conception of amoral rhetoric and the need for the rhetorician to be of sound moral character (the *uir bonus dicendi peritus*) was

---

[139] Quoted in Quintilian 12.1.1. We have already come across this concept in our discussions on the influence of Augustine and Cicero upon Ennodius: above, 42-43.

[140] Seneca *Controversiae*, 1.9, also cites the line (also attributing it to Cato).

informed by the writings of Augustine of Hippo. Book IV of his *de Doctrina Christiana* sets forth Augustine' opinion of the rhetorical education. Augustine recognises the power of the morally neutral oratory Cicero described: *facultas eloquii, quae persuadenda seu praua seu recta ualet plurimum[141]*. The tyrant or the good prince could both benefit from it. Although deeply sceptical about the art of rhetoric (he refuses to discuss the subject in detail[142]), he makes it clear that it could be taught to Christians provided they were of good moral character: *si quid habent* [rules of rhetoric] *seorsum* [from Christian teaching] *discendum est, si cui fortassis bono uiro etiam haec uacat discere* (IV.3). So if it has any use, it should be learned (but separately), and it should be by the sort of good man Cato envisaged. Augustine's attitude here seems somewhat contradictory – not unlike that of Jerome seen above.[143] He is dismissive of the art (it could be learned if a good man has some free time to do it), but at the same time is frustrated that more good Christians do not learn it in order to fight the good fight: *cur non bonorum studio camparatur ut militet ueritati, si eam mali ad obtinendas peruersas uanasque causas in usus iniquitatis et erroris usurpant?* (IV.5). Ennodius' generally enthusiastic appreciation of rhetoric seems to be tempered by an acceptance of Augustine's warnings. Rhetoric requires that the speaker be just to guarantee the subject is. The bad *causa* reflects badly upon the speaker's character.

Should we see this attitude towards moral rhetoric as simply a dutiful response to the historical development of a Christian morality? It is possible to go further and see it as part of that wider trend of identity formation and elite empowerment discussed above. By adopting this Christian moral framework, the Roman elite could enhance their rhetorical skills in a way that was not possible within a non-Christian context, where the idea of the 'good man' lacked the energy and dynamism of religious fervour. The power of the word of God is within their statements. The words of Gregory of Nyssa show that something else was being added to the debate on the potential power of the spoken and written word: "the human voice was fashioned for one reason alone – to

---

[141] *De Doctrina Christiana* IV.5

[142] *Primo itaque esxpectationem legentium, qui forte me putant rhetorica daturum esse praecepta quae in scholis saecularibus et didici et docui, ista praelocutione cohibeo atque ut a me non exspectentur admoneo.* IV. 3

[143] See note 66.

be the threshold through which the sentiments of the heart, inspired by the Holy Spirit, might be translated into the Word itself".[144] This presents a new framework within which all could work. It provides a potentially more potent and coercive mechanism than that imagined by Brown in 'Paideia and Power'. Within this framework the pious King or the stern, but devout governor must, to appropriate Brown's language, play by the rules. However, whereas before they would only risk the worldly censure of elite and court etiquette, here, by standing outside the compelling boundaries of this Christian discourse, they would risk hellfire. Ostrogothic Italy was part of a wider late antique discursive landscape, where a newly invigorated moral rhetoric was being used as a vehicle for individual automony. This aspect of elite rhetoric in Ostrogothic Italy was a product of the fusion of innovation and tradition characteristic of Late Antiquity.

Ambrosius

I shall now move on to examine the last of the significant - from an educational point of view - associates of Ennodius from Northern Italy, Ambrosius. Tracking the education and career of Ambrosius enables us to see further examples of what practical uses the rhetorical education were put in our period. Also, the evidence for Ambrosius' education provides further examples of the late antique nature of the educational system of Ostrogothic Italy. The Italian education system reflected this nature: from the Augustinian influence over attitudes to traditional learning which we discussed above, to the political concerns peculiar to the late Roman, post-imperial world in the West.

To deal with the latter first, I shall discuss the significance of a prosimetric work of Ennodius, which Sirmond labels *Paraenesis didascalia ad Ambrosium et Beatum*[145]. As Sirmond's title suggests, this is an instructive epistle, intended to make Ambrosius and Beatus[146] aware of those aspects of life and education Ennodius thought both

---

[144] Commentary on Song of Songs, VII.IX.33. Translated by Cameron (1991).

[145] CSEL 6, 401. In CSEL it is *Opusculum* VI and in the MGH edition CDLII.

[146] This is another young noble (*nobilissimus adulescens – epistle* VIII.39 19-20, 225) who received correspondence from Ennodius recommending him to prominent Roman citizens (VII.21, 28-29; VIII. 38 & 39; IX.6). We know nothing of his later life. See PRLE II, 222.

should be cognisant of. The main concern of the work is to impart an appreciation of the Christian values of modesty, chastity, and faith, while also giving education its place. Ennodius sets his argument out as a lesson in the ancestry of these virtues in a 'genealogical progression',[147] which consists of a brief prose introduction of the virtue, followed by a verse composition under the heading of that virtue. Ambrosius and Beatus are informed that head of this 'family' is *uerecundia*, modesty: *matrem bonorum operum amate* [Ambrosius and Beatus] *uerecundiam* (VI. 8-9, 403). *Castitas*, chastity, follows (VI. 5-27, 404), and then *fides*, faith (VI. 1, 405). The relationship Ennodius presents between these three virtues and the following two *grammatica et rhetorica* is interesting. They are not blood relations, but, rather, servants to them, nursemaids: *nutricem ceterarum* [*Castitas, uerecundia, fides*]. Though the subservience of rhetoric and grammar to the others, as Kennell says, means that they are 'insufficient for [Christian] salvation',[148] they are still presented as a necessary part of the extended household of divine virtues: they train the good men, men of modesty, chastity, and faith, to speak well. Rather than simply viewing this as "the future edifice of Christian virtue",[149] which it undoubtedly is, we should view this as a component part of a much wider Roman identity. We must view this living, breathing Roman identity as not simply as a facet of a future Christian identity, nor investigate it solely as fossilised relic of a classical past: it is both. This Roman identity still requires an introspective, backward-looking (in time) focus for its definition and its relevancy. The language and imagery of Virgil and the contours of the grammatical character of the elite's speech and literacy mark them out as potentially useful citizens *and* potentially useful Christians. It gives them power and agency in the way that Augustine describes, but it also enables power and agency within the existing structures of the Ostrogothic state (as it had previous generations of Romans). The Virgilian language identity marker is fused with the ideological concerns of Christianity to create a Roman elite discourse with recognisable educational features. The education system envisaged by Ennodius is the sum of the

---

[147] Kennell, 163.

[148] Ibid., 164.

[149] Ibid.

changes and continuities demanded by the late antique world, of which Ostrogothic Italy was part.

The Evidence from the State: Cassiodorus

The Offices of State and the School-Leaver

If Ennodius sheds light on the institutions and their workings, then Cassiodorus can let us see the extent to which that education was relevant to the world outside of the classroom. His letters and correspondences with other members of the Roman elite and other state leaders let us see the how well equipped (or otherwise) the graduates of the schooling system were to deal with the complexities of Ostrogothic Italy. It also provides an opportunity to see the extent to which the institutions of the state facilitated the demands of Roman elite identity and Roman elite empowerment through an education system responding to state demands: in short we can begin to see the continuities and changes the state cultivated in the education sector. We will look again at some of Ennodius' pupils and see what Cassiodorus' work tells us about the world outside and how the educations of Ennodius' pupils equipped them for that world.

Evidence from Ambrosius and Arator

We can see this secular utility manifest in Ambrosius' education. Unfortunately, the *Paraenesis didascalia* is the only work of Ennodius which sets out the type of education envisaged for Ambrosius. There is no extant congratulation upon entering the *Auditorium*, nor a letter commending a good public recital. What we do have, however, to supplement the evidence form the *PD*, is the evidence of his years in Rome and his later secular career in the service of the Ostrogoths. We have several letters addressed to Ambrosius contained within the *Variae* of Cassiodorus[150]. All reveal how far up the political and administrative ladder Ambrosius had climbed. What are of particular interest to us are posts he held that would have required an education of the kind discussed above. The type of training his fellow members of the Italian elite, and acquaintances of Ennodius, had benefited from, and in which he, as a

---

[150] 4 letters in total are addressed to him (VIII.13; XI.4 & 5; XII.25) and a fifth, addressed to the Roman senate, mentions him (VIII.14). Cassiodorus' *Variae* are a collection of letters composed by Cassiodorus on behalf of various Italian (Roman, Gothic) worthies.

product of that environment, must have shared, was responding to the demands of the outside world. The young man from Northern Italy, whose talents were too great for the confines of Liguria, did burst into the Roman light, as Ennodius predicted (see above, 55) and his skills acquired in the educational establishments of Ostrogothic Italy facilitated that move. Letter XI.4 is addressed to him in his capacity as *Agens uices Praefecti Praetorio.* By the time of the late empire the post of the praetorian prefect was wholly administrative (Constantine abolished its military function). They were effectively chief finance ministers and also the most senior judges of appeal. It is in that legal capacity that Ambrosius is here addressed.[151]

Does the elevation to this lofty political post owe anything to the education which Ambrosius received in the schools described by Ennodius? Peter Heather[152] sees the education of the type adumbrated above as largely fashioning the world outside it rather than the other way about. Virgil "is not an obvious qualification" for a job in the imperial bureaucracy. Vocationally, he only is useful for construction and maintenance of the sort of identity marker previously discussed. The employment of the type of classical diction and painfully precise phraseology encouraged by the late antique study of Virgil serves as an indicator of someone who is from within the acceptable (vocationally) Roman elite. As Heather says, "a shared literacy, the key to élite status and rewarding careers, was thus the cornerstone of the social fabric of the late empire."[153] This view sees little role for the education of the Roman elite in this period beyond this narrow function. Of course there is a difficulty in the context of Ostrogothic Italy with this hypothesis. One antithesis which allows the Roman elite to clearly define themselves in this way is, says Heather, provided by the barbarians. Their crude backwardness is the 'antithesis of their [Romans'] cultural tradition'. One of the many quirks of historical progress, perhaps, is that this metaphorical defence wall, functioning as a barrier to the encroachment of barbarians in the late Imperial period, in our period now acts like a prison wall, attempting to contain and direct the behaviour of the 'other'. For as we have seen above, the skills taught to the students

---

[151] Jones (1966), 141

[152] Heather (1994)

[153] Ibid, 185

74

of post-imperial Italy are employed in an attempt to constrain the behaviour of the violent autocrat (be that the stern military governor of the ethnically Germanic type or of the Mediterranean type) within the walls of an approved discourse; a discourse designed to coerce and tame. The identity marker is still relevant and necessary in our period, but it is not sufficient to explain all of the variables which constitute the vocational potential of this education.

There is still something more happening here, I think, than such a focus on the simple creation of identity would allow. In his letter to Ambrosius, Cassiodorus commends him for his previous exploits in the field of law and advocacy: *in aduocationis studio iustitiae claritate fulsistis[154]*. This, Cassiodorus says, is the basis for his elevation to the rank of deputy praetorian prefect. He re-emphasises this point by reminding Ambrosius of the coalface at which he once worked and its necessity as a stage in his progression: *ornentur ergo subsellia cuius ore fora tonuerunt[155]*. In this context, it is clear that the education which was designed to, and allowed Ambrosius to, shine forth (the polished diction, clever phraseology, and its concomitant persuasive powers) in the forum, has also allowed him to make a significant step up the late-antique *cursus honorum*. The nature of the Praetorian prefect's office in the period after the reforms of Constantine meant that its office holders and their immediate subordinates were at the very head of the state bureaucracy. Ambrosius' education had allowed him to be not only one of the chief trial judges in the state, but also a chief treasury minister with great power over vast swathes of governmental business. Admittedly, by this time, the office had lost some of its power (funding the state arms factory and levying money for troops), but it still possessed so many of the powers enjoyed by previous holders of the office under imperial direction.[156]

Firmly establishing this link between his rise to top office and his education is not problematic given the evidence which we have. The previous career which was responsible for Ambrosius' fame for just advocacy is attested by some further

---

[154] *Variae* XI.4.1

[155] Ibid. *Subsellia* standing here for the courts (law).

[156] Jones (1964), 448-462, for a comprehensive account of the office in the later empire; Cassiodorus, *Variae* book XI for a list of the responsibilities executed by the prefect under the Ostrogoths.

correspondence from the *Variae*. This evidence does not directly discuss Ambrosius' own career, but the career of the generic advocate. Looking at this evidence tells us two things about Ambrosius' career. It informs us of the possible career paths open to him. Furthermore, it informs us of the educational implications of the specific demands the social context made of the advocate and his career ambitions. The evidence in question is a letter to one Arator. It is not too adventurous to assume that this Arator is the Arator we encountered above,[157] and thus we can see reinforced some of the conclusions about Arator's education we discussed above. Writing under the guise of Theoderic's successor, Athalaric, Cassiodorus delineates the characteristics the advocate should have. Reading between the lines of Cassiodorus' praise, we can see the outlines of those characteristics. Cassiodorus states: ***advocationis*** *te* ***campos*** *exercuit: te* ***iudicii*** *nostri culmen elegit.*[158] Arator has been chosen for high office because of his ability as an advocate. The language Cassiodorus employs when describing the role of the advocate is strongly reminiscent of the language Ennodius employs when describing the utility which the education of the school of Deuterius imparts to the young Roman member of the elite: *Si nauta secundis flatibus feliciter humidi directum transit itineris, si bellatorem ducit successus melior ad triumphum, si **per rhetoricos campos** litterarum miles **iudicis** fit fauore sublimior* (XIII. 1-4). More strikingly, immediately before this sentence, Cassiodorus firmly connects Arator's ability in advocacy to the schoolroom: *nam ita intra te fuit quamvis ampla professio litterarum, ut tuum ibi consenescere non pateremur ingenium.*[159] Arator's acts as an advocate are here praised as recognition of his literary education. His words and eloquence are the reason for his successful career.

Something else, Cassiodorus reveals, must be added to this rhetorical ability in order to make the next step in one's career. *quamvis traheret te eloquentia pro defensione*

---

[157] Green, 256, in attributing the Dalmatian embassy to Arator, assumes as much. Barnish (1992), 103, however, is not entirely convinced.

[158] *Variae* VIII.XII.2

[159] Ibid. Arator's formal legal training – and therefore that of Ambrose and others who follow similar vocational paths – is impossible to locate in the Auditorium (for want of evidence). However, there is some tantalizing evidence from Rome (see below, 76 ff.) which provides some possibilities for elite education in law.

dicere, suadebat tamen aequitas iudicanda proferre.[160] The step from the schoolroom to the forum by this reckoning was not a large one. The education which Arator, Ambrosius, and the other Ennodian students received was sufficient for the practice of the advocate in the forum. The practice of the advocate in the forum was necessary for the graduation to a position where the former student now publicly oversaw cases to be judged. It was not sufficient, however, as Cassiodorus indicates. To make this move upwards, the member of the Roman elite must be in a dialogue with that idea which we discussed above: a late-antique understanding of the moral obligations of man. The *aequitas* which Cassiodorus/Athalaric ascribes to Arator allows him to move from the advocate's position to that of the judge. Without this quality the education which Arator received is of dubious utility: *probatum est, quid utilitatis habeat moribus armata facundia. nam sicut perniciosum est doctos prava suadere, sic salutare munus est, cum veritatis terminos disertitudo nescit excedere.*[161] These are sentiments with which both Jerome and Augustine would have wholeheartedly agreed. As we saw in *De Doctrina Christiana*, Augustine was so moved by the neutral nature of rhetoric that he set aside his antipathy towards it, and encouraged the 'good' men of Christ to learn it in order to reject the lies of others.[162] The educational discourse of Christian morality, which we detected in the school system from Ennodius' letters above, would have allowed Arator (and Ambrosius) to make that graduation from amoral eloquence to judicious fairness with little effort. The above praise for the inability of Arator's eloquence to exceed the bounds of truth both compliment his eloquence (and draw attention to its potency), and confirm him in the role of *vir bonus dicendi peritus* - with its added Augustinian, late-antique meaning. He conforms to the ideal Roman as understood from the education which he has received. That education recommends him intellectually, technically, and morally for

---

[160] Ibid

[161] Ibid. The understanding of *aequitas* is, of course, not subject to a strictly Christian interpretation. Ulpian asserts a close association between it and law itself: 'law is the art of the good and fair (*aequi*)' – Ulpian *Institues* 1.1.1. See P. Honoré, *Ulpian: Pioneer of Human Rights* (2002). Boethius' use of Ulpian (which we shall examine below) suggests that the elite in this period were still familiar with this pre-Christian understanding of the concept. However, from the religious and legal reforms of Constantine onwards, an unstable and haphazardly regulated boundary existed between secular competency and religious jurisdiction - see Harries (1999), 196-197. In such circumstances morally-charged terms like 'fairness' naturally respond to ascendant moral frameworks – Christianity – while also honouring precedent.

[162] *DDC,* IV.4

the vocational opportunities which would have available to him within the structures of the Imperial state. It still does so within the structures of the Ostrogothic state.

Let us now look at other offices Ambrosius held. Ambrosius was, as letter VIII.13 shows, a quaestor under Theoderic's grandson and successor, Athalaric: *Ambrosio V. I. Quaestori Athalaricus Rex*. This letter confirms his appointment (*per quintam feliciter indictionem quaesturae tibi insignia deo praestante concedimus* [Athalaric] (VIII.13. 47-48)). The office of the quaestor was effectively the office of chief legal advisor to the King (and, before him, the emperor – though the quaestor under the Ostrogothic regime could not draft laws as the imperial quaestor could[163]). Cassiodorus himself had held the post some 20 years before Ambrosius' appointment in 526 (the year of the fifth indiction mentioned above), and he provides evidence of the nature of the post. It required the office holder to have knowledge of legal procedure, as many letters from his period in the office attest (I.18; III.13 & 36; IV.10; V.29). It also required the holder of the office to defend the independence of legal procedure and justice: *nos* [Cassiodorus as quaestor], *quorum est proprium inter pares ac dispares aequabilem iustitiam custodire…* (V.29.3).

Thanks to Cassiodorus and others, there is evidence of quaestors from this period exercising their official duties. Indeed, one case involves him exercising the skills one would have learned in the types of educational establishments exemplified by the auditorium. Often the quaestor would have to argue any case on behalf of the king. One such example involves the case of King Theoderic's general order - in the wake of his final defeat of Odovacer in 493 - to deprive all of his opponents of their civic rights. The king relents in face of protests from bishops at the inequity of his command, granting pardon to all. The then quaestor, one Urbicus[164], was called upon to execute the king's will by decree. He was called upon to take the case before the people and promulgate its merits: *his praecellentissimus rex dictis uirum inlustrissimum Vrbicum acciri iubet, qui uniuersa palatii eius onera sustentans* **Ciceronem eloquentia, Catonem aequitate** *praecesserat: cui praecepit ut generalis*

---

[163] See Jones (1966), 140. Barnish (1992), xli, discusses the political peculiarities responsible for the lack of power to draft legislation in Italy at this time.

[164] PLRE II, 1191.

indulgentiae pragmaticum promulgaret; quod ille ad omnem benignitatem paratissimus ilico tanta breuitate et luce contexuit, ut et illa culparum genera cognoscerentur abolita, quae putabantur fuisse reservata.[165] The office of quaestor required of the holder not only a great deal of expertise in articulating regal decrees, but also an understanding of the law which could frame the sentiments of the monarch within confines of legal discourse.

The language used in praising the skills of this quaestor brings us back again to the two ideal characteristics envisioned for the product of the late antique schooling system. Previously, we have seen again and again the importance placed upon the cultivation of those skills which allow the speaker to craft his argument in a winning and convincing fashion. The qualities attributed to the quaestor, and which he is praised for bringing to the execution of his duties, tell us that eloquence, the art of speaking well, is crucial to the successful execution of those duties. His language skills are an integral and crucial part of the job. Likewise, the other element of the education seen above is that which has evolved from Seneca, through to Quintilian and on to meet its full elaboration in Augustine: the morally good man. In the above passage Cato is that 'good man', with whom the quaestor must be measured. He is the original classical exemplar of the good man in Seneca and Quintilian[166]; and it is surely from this example contained within these educational works that the traditionally educated Augustine begins his Christianisation of the type. The ideal quaestor is thus imagined as the perfect fusion of a rhetorical education and a dutiful instruction in responsible and socially accepted norms. He is the type of person the letters of Ennodius suggest the schools of Ostrogothic Italy are intent on producing.

Furthermore, identifying the speaker's eloquence with the eloquence of Cicero provides that function which Peter Heather and others have discussed: the identity marker. The above passage describing Urbicus says that this man, this quaestor is a direct descendent of the cream of the Roman elite. It allocates a place for him among the pantheon of traditionally revered Romans. It is within the confines of the

---

[165] Ennodius, *Vita Epifani* (*Opusculum* III), 135.

[166] Seneca, *Controversiae* I.9; Quintilian, *Institutiones* XII.I.1.

discourse and language of this 'traditional' identity that the elite attempt to frame the behaviour of the King. Looking at this way, we can see the quaestor is a man bridging that gap between the autocrat of Late Antiquity and the elite who labour under them. In the context of Ostrogothic Italy, the King's decree could easily be packaged via literary conceit as the whim of a capricious barbarian – and could have been easily seen as one by the Roman elite.[167] However, we can seen that here the King's wishes are subject to the cleansing power of the quaestor's office. The quaestor's eloquence sells the idea to the Roman elite (many of whom would have been on the wrong side of the decree) on their own terms. The state, in the person of the King, is also described as being in the hands of this office (…*qui uniuersa palatii eius onera sustentans…*). Therefore, the King's affairs, the state itself, are to be understood as subject not to the whim of an arbitrary and capricious ruler, but to the careful and educated tones of a Cicero, and the justice and equity of a Cato. An elite, educated in a reassuringly familiar way, and existing within a reconizably traditional cultural continuum, still excert power.

The King, the autocrat at this stage in Rome's political evolution, is subject to this discourse. The twin frameworks of a discourse of Roman etiquette and a Christian morality provide the context for all of the dealings which the King has with the Roman elite – we shall see this no where more clearly than in our final-chapter case study, *Anonymus Valesianus*. In the present example, the case of the unfortunate losers in his war with Odoacer, he deals with the moral argument as put forward by Bishop Epiphanius. Theoderic's resultant decision is obviously framed to respond to the traditionalists among the Roman elite who want to see the state acting in a time-honoured fashion. He has been swayed by the arguments of the bishop. These arguments appeal to the clement and wise King of both biblical tradition and Imperial biography[168]. The bishop appeals to the Christian in him through the language of the

---

[167] As we have seen (n.71 above), the ability and willingness of the Roman elite in other parts of the West to construct - and define themselves in relation to that construction – a crude image of Gothic leaders demonstrates how easy this would have been. (See Sidonius, *Carmen* VII.496-500). Evidence from the *Liber Pontificalis* shows that, in Italy, the king was also subject to this process. (See chapter 2 passim for numerous examples).

[168] Much more will be said in the final chapter about the predilection in elite discourse of this period to fuse the literary traditions of pagan historiography and Christian scripture.

education halls: *culpas dimittere caeleste est, vindicare terrenum[169]*. This perfectly balanced aphorism recalls the very similar sayings of Cicero and Seneca. In this case, however, the Christian element is to the fore. The king must respond to this exhortation in kind – in the same way the Imperial governor imagined by Libanius must respond. The language and 'code' of Ostrogothic/late antique discourse is embedded in a Christian and traditionally-educated identity. The violent autocracy through which the education system's contours had acquired their character endured. The education to which a quaestor was subject made sure that the Roman elite still responded to the world around it with a degree of autonomy.

Tempting though it is to see the learning of Deuterius and the *Auditorium* in Ambrosius' later fame for eloquence, there is no hard evidence to corroborate such a view. It could be that Ambrosius learned his art as he practised in Rome. However, given Ennodius' exhortations to him and Beatus to cultivate rhetoric and grammar as a tool for nurturing good, and given that most of the education of his compatriots from Northern Italy was so informed by the public recital and *Declamatio*, it would be too cautious not to concede the possibility that Ambrosius' later career benefited from the type of education the *Auditorium* afforded. Indeed, as we can see above, the offices for which Ambrosius was eventually picked out required of him the sort of education which the school of Deuterius taught.

The ruling military elite of the Ostrogothic state accepted the discourse which allowed men like Ambrosius and Arator to operate within the confines of the traditional Roman *cursus honorum*.[170] The structures of the Ostrogothic state now work within its parameters and continue to facilitate its existence. Theoderic, Athalaric, and Cassiodorus, who speaks on their behalf, direct the discourse of state business from

---

[169] Ennodius, *Vita Epifani*, 130. This remarkable statement precedes Alexander Pope's more famous reworking of Seneca and Cicero by over a thousand years.

[170] Evidence from Cassiodorus suggests that Goths were consciously presenting themselves as traditional members of the Roman world (Cassiodorus, *Ep*, III.23). Cassiodorus' reference surely relates to the Goths who crossed over into Roman territory in the late 4th century A.D. However, that he articulates this Romano-Gothic narrative in the name of Theoderic demonstrates the desire of the Ostrogoths to present themselves as part of the Roman world (even though the Amals, from whom Theoderic descends, were Goths under Hunnic domination - Jordanes, *Getica*, 246-250). Theoderic's 10 years as a hostage in Constantinople surely imparted knowledge of court etiquette and Roman mores (Jordanes, 271; Ensslin, 14 ff.). Wolfram (1987), Chapter 5, provides an overview of the nature of the Hunnic Goths in relation to the Roman Goths.

the unmistakable foundations of a discourse cultivated over the period covered by the later Roman Empire. The rise of a Christian moral framework, the relative disempowerment of the traditional Roman elite, and the resultant need to respond to a militaristic autocracy, all had their hand in creating a discourse which sought to define the behaviour of both the meek and the powerful. The characteristics of the ideal bureaucrat in Ostrogothic Italy are determined not by a factitious, alien set of criteria, but by an organically-grown, homemade rubric. The education which Ambrosius and Arator have had is thus the product of a dialogue with the world around it. Moreover neither is it static, nor irrelevant: it is responsive and still-living.

Evidence from Rome

Boethius and Cassiodorus

Both Parthenius and Ambrosius left Northern Italy for Rome. As we have seen above in relation to Ambrosius, it is reasonable to assume that the city played a part in their further education. Therefore, we shall, at this point, examine what we can find out about the state of education at Rome. Unfortunately, in Rome, we do not have the sort of hard evidence for the type of *grammaticus* that we find in the person of Deuterius in Northern Italy. Our main source for the *grammaticus* in Northern Italy, Ennodius, although - as his letters of recommendation suggest - in close contact with many of the prominent nobles, and therefore surely familiar with what type of educational culture he was sending his young associates to encounter, does not provide us with a Roman Deuterius. His only mention of teachers in relation to Rome comes at the end of his letter of recommendation for Ambrosius to Meribaudus. Here he mentions the ancient *praeceptores*, but neither elaborates upon their place in contemporary Roman society nor their nature.[171] There is, though, the *Variae* of Cassiodorus, which contains information which demonstrates that not only was there still a teaching community, but also that the state was committed to supporting it. However, the same work also suggests that teaching in Rome was in a comparatively (to what had been, and to what we see happening in the North) declining state of health.

---

[171] *Epistle* VIII.3.24-25, 230.

Cassiodorus' letter from King Athalaric to the senate demonstrates that the state was still funding education and teaching: *Qua de re, patres conscripti, hanc uobis curam, hanc auctoritatem propitia diuinitate largimur, ut successor scholae liberalium litterarum tam grammaticus quam orator nec non iuris expositor commoda sui decessoris...percipiat.*[172] Although this letter does demonstrate support for education in Rome, the exhortation to the senate to provide it confirms that there were difficulties with the efforts to maintain educational standards and traditions at Rome. This letter is an attack by the King, upon the senate, for failing to support the education system at Rome: *cognouimus doctores eloquentiae Romanae laboris sui constituta praemia non habere et aliquorum nundinatione fieri, ut scholarum magistris deputata summa uideatur imminui.*[173] Athalaric, through Cassiodorus, describes his astonishment that Roman senators could be so negligent toward Roman education, which is the birth right of the senators and their sons (IX.21.1). The education which said to be neglected is recognisably similar to the picture of education in general in Italy which we have seen emerging up till now. There is a focus on the grammatical (the *grammaticus* is mentioned – though, admittedly, instruction in grammar was but one of his duties) and on instruction in rhetoric (the teacher specifically designated to impart the rules of rhetoric, the *rhetor*, is also mentioned – the two separate roles which were taught together by Deuterius in Northern Italy).

Contrasting the evidence of a healthy Northern Italian system from Ennodius, with the evidence from this letter would suggest that the teaching profession at Rome, whether of rhetoric, or grammar, was suffering from relative indifference and neglect by those traditionally supportive of it. However, closer examination suggests a somewhat more positive picture. Firstly, looking at he teaching of rhetoric tells us that it was still of seminal importance. We can see this no where more clearly than when we examine the activities of one Patricius, an acquaintance of the Roman aristocrat, senator, and polymath Boethius. Boethius begins his commentary on Cicero[174] by conceding that

---

[172] *Variae* IX.21.5. At this time, the title *orator* had come to be used interchangeably with *rhetor*. Riché, 28, comments on this definition of *orator* in relation to Maximianus.

[173] *Variae* IX.21.1-2

[174] *In topica Ciceronis commentariorum*. In *Patrologiae Latinae* 64.II, 1039.

the work was undertaken at the behest of his friend: *Exhortatione tua, Patrici rhetorum peritissime, quae honestati praesentis propositi et futurae aetatis utilitati coniuncta est, nihil antiquius existimaui* (I.1). Perhaps it is no surprise that a *rhetor* is the man exhorting Boethius to write a work on Cicero. We also encounter Patricius in the *Variae*, where we learn more about his own education: *hic est enim Patricius… cuius affluentem facundiam studia Romana genuerunt…ibi defaectus sermo Latinus est: ibi discuntur uerba toto nitore lucentia. Aliae regiones uiua balsama et olentia tura transmittant: Roma tradit eloquium, quo suauius nil sit auditum* (X.7.2). This paints a much more positive image of the state of education in Rome in the late fifth-early sixth-century. Here Rome is presented as *the* centre of learning for rhetoric, as the fountainhead of true eloquence. Patricius owes much of his current eloquence to the nurturing he received in Rome.

The evidence of education from Rome presents us with some anomalies and contradictions which make it difficult to present as coherent a picture as that found in the North of Italy. A brief overview of the activities of Boethius, the man who dedicates his work to Patricius above, highlights the problem.[175] Firstly let us look at those elements of Boethius education which share obvious similarities with the type of education we have already witnessed emerging. As we have seen, the writings of Ennodius and Arator are full of allusion to, and direct citation of authors with whom both have a deep and intimate relationship. From the *quadriga* Virgil is the most pervasive influence in both. Epic poetry is an indisputable element of the education which both received, and Lucan also features significantly in their works.[176] The same is unsurprisingly true for Boethius. However, where Arator and Ennodius either populate a Virgilian scene with late antique *mores* (Arator and Christian attitudes to Judaism instantly spring to mind – 50-51 above) or build a pleasing rhetorical flourish (see Ennodius, 36-37 above), the intertextual relationship between Boethius and Virgil is more complex (but no less intimate). Boethius' *Consolatio*, his *magnum opus*, a

---

[175] Examining evidence of Boethius' education often provides more questions than answers. Many arguments centre on the nature of his Hellenism and how it was cultivated. Courcelle, 273-330, devotes considerable energy to proving that Boethius' later work shows that he received a Greek education (philosophy, rhetoric, literature). Chadwick (1981) 20, advises caution in accepting this view.

[176] Ovid and Horace are both used too in the work (see *CSEL* 67, 130-131), as are Cicero and Sallust. It is his use of both Virgil and Lucan, however, which most clearly indicates the interrelated nature of the education of Boethius and that of the graduates of Deuterius' school.

prosimetric account of his encounter with a personification of *Philosophia* in his prison cell,[177] provides an instructive example of Boethius betraying the same proclivity as Arator and Ennodius to call upon a timely phrase or idea from Virgil. When instructing her subject in the ways of divine providence, *Philosophia* delivers her message in the language of Virgil: *Nam ut pauca quae ratio valet humana de divina profunditate perstringam, de hoc quem tu* **iustissimum et aequi servantissimum** *putas omnia scienti providentiae diversum videtur.*[178] The man who seems to be the fairest and most just to Boethius need not be to God. The phrasing of the idea is taken from Virgil *Aeneid* II.425-427: *…cadit et Rhipeus,* **iustissimus** *unus / qui fuit in Teucris* **et servantissimus aequi** */ (dis aliter visum).* Just as we have witnessed Arator's appropriating Virgilian language and imagery into a new cultural context (Christianity), so too Boethius transports the language and the imagery into a new cultural context. In the Virgilian example the most brave and just of the Trojans succumbs to the will of the partial and capricious Gods of the pantheon. In Boethius' version, capricious and arbitrary divine intervention is replaced by the intervention of a Christian God, the well-intentioned wisdom of whose actions escape our limited intellect. The moral here is that the providential actions of a benevolent God bring hope to the good man who suffers - even though he may not under stand it. Boethius' use of Virgil here demonstrates that, although undoubtedly carrying more emotional and theological depth than either the literary games of Ennodius, or the crude anti-semitism of Arator, the architecture of the *Aeneid* was likewise so firmly embedded in Boethius' mind, that it often provided the foundation upon which he built his emotional responses to the outside world.

This instinctive use of Virgil illustrates that Boethius too had a deep relationship with the poet who played such a seminal, and continuing role in the education of the elite in Late Antiquity. Examining the extent to which Boethius used other poets allows one to appreciate his breadth of learning - and the close relationship it has with the educational background we have witnessed emerging in the Italy in this period. Let us turn again to the *Consolatio* for evidence. Whilst constructing his contemplations on

---

[177] This work has produced a vast array of secondary literature. A good current overview of all the issues surrounding it can be found in Marenbon (2009), 179-301.

[178] *Con. Phil.* IV.6.126-129.

the nature of God's providence with Virgilian language, Boethius populated his reflections with content from another familiar author: Lucan. We need not enumerate the instance of Lucan's employment and its nature throughout the *Consolatio* (as we have with Arator) to make the point that this author, with whom Arator was so familiar, was someone whom Boethius knew intimately. Let us look at just one example of the employment of Lucan, the occurrence of which takes place during the above discussion on providence: *et victricem quidem causam dis, victam vero Catoni placuisse* **familiaris noster Lucanus admonuit**.[179] The personal and attributive adjectives, allied with the semantic implications of the verbal action provide evidence that Boethius was both intimately familiar with Lucan, and that this familiarity was developed in a pedagogical context. That Lucan and Virgil should be employed symbiotically to facilitate the construction of an idea should not surprise us. The evidence from both Sidonius' reading parties and the curriculum of the *grammaticus* in Italy (in northern Italy certainly) indicate that epic poetry was approached as a conceptual whole in an educational context, and that it was the bedrock upon which the character of the elite was formed. *Noster Lucanus* and *Noster Maro* help Boethius characterise the world around him because they were the foundation upon which his cultural identity was constructed.

Boethius' interaction with these classical authors suggests that he too was interacting with a canon of work the parameters of which conditioned the intellectual and emotional responses made by the Roman elite to the world around them. It is evident that the formation of the canon was conditioned by the cultural and vocational demands of the time.[180] Boethius' education and its interaction with the canon of classical and late-antique writers can be firmly located within the cultural milieu in which Ennodius and Arator existed. However, Boethius' education at Rome presents us with other evidence, which suggests a less uniform educational experience among

---

[179] *Con. Phil.* IV.6.129-130. Taken from Lucan, *Phars.* I.128.

[180] The formation of the *quadriga* can itself be traced back to Classical Antiquity and the attempts by various groups and individuals to create canons which were designed to facilitate certain educational outcomes. Quintilian, *Inst.* 10.1.1, 44, 59, articulates a number of authors who are deemed appropriate for the cultivation of the level of diction and linguistic alacrity necessary for winning rhetoric. His design in canonizing certain authors (Cicero, Sallust, and Terence) is revealed in his rather forced attempts to present his Latin authors as equal (or simply not inferior) to the familiar canons of the Greeks. Vardi (2003), 147. Thus both cultural necessity and vocational demands shaped the content of the canon.

the elite in Ostrogothic Italy. Before examining evidence of the uneven nature of elite education, Boethius learning experience as a creature of this period in Roman history must be re-emphasized. We have just witnessed that his use of Lucan and Virgil suggests the intensely comprehensive and methodical approach to textual criticism which ingrained the literary landscape of epic poetry into the minds of Deuterius' students.[181]   A close examination of Boethius' work, especially the *Consolatio*, suggests a further similarity with the educational experience of contemporaries, which reveals the contours of another aspect of their collective educational experience.

Editing, translating, and commentating upon canons of texts formed a significant part of the literary preoccupations of the Roman elite in Late Antiquity. The commentary tradition which flourished in Late Antiquity provided Boethius with a genre which framed his responses to both rhetorical and philosophical enquiry.[182] Boethius' contact with the cultural traditions in these fields was filtered through the late-antique editing, translating, and commentary tradition. His use of Marius Victornius' commentary on Cicero's *Topica* is a case in point.[183]   Boethius' work on Cicero (*In Ciceronis Topica* - abbreviated to *ICT* henceforth) is a response to Victorinus' commentary on the same work. At the beginning of the *ICT*, Boethius marks out the position his work will have within the commentary tradition associated with Cicero's *Topica*.[184] It is clear that Boethius' relationship with the *Topica* of Cicero, rather than a direct response to it, was, in fact, a response to what he perceived to be the inadequacies of Victorinus' commentary. Hadot has demonstrated that Boethius' knowledge of Victorinus' now lost work provided the frame within which Boethius interacted with Cicero's

---

[181] For the nature of that 'exacting approach', see note 79 above.

[182] See, Ibbsen, 34-50 for a critical analysis of Boethius' many philosophical commentaries, and also Moorhead, 25-27, for a useful narrative overview of the tradition in Late Antiquity - and Boethius' place within it (both in Marenbon, 2009). See also D'Ancona Costa (2002), 201-204, and Chadwick (1981), 16 for the role of Alexander of Aphrodisias in the development of the commentary tradition from the 3rd century A.D. onwards.

[183] Marius Victornius was a 4th century A.D. rhetorician, Neoplatonist, and theologian. For further reading see: Hadot (1971); *CCSL* CXXXII.

[184]*PL* 64.II: 1039

Topica.[185]   It is significant that Boethius dealt with subjects, and employed terminology in the *ICT*, which are not found in Cicero's work. The significance of this becomes clearer when we consider that the same subjects and terminologies are found in other responses to Cicero's *Topica* in the work of more members of the educated Roman elite of this period. The language, structure, and philosophical awareness of the *Institutes* of Cassiodorus and the *De Nuptiis Philologiae et Mercurii* of Martianus Capella betray a fundamental relationship with a source commentary. As Hadot has forcefully argued, Victorinus is the common source.[186] Boethius' own understanding of the issues at stake in the *Topica* was expressed in the same language as Martianus, and from within the same philosophical parameters.[187] Cassiodorus,[188] another member of the educated Italian elite, was closely tied to this triumvirate of writers, as he had also clearly come to understand the issues within Cicero's *Topica* from a common source-commentary: 'Il est donec légitime de supposer que Cassiodore et Martianus Capella ont eu une source commune, à savoir le commentaire de Victorinus, puisque nous savons par Cassiodore lui-même qu'il a écrit son oeuvre sans connâitre directement celle de Martianus Capella.'[189] From the translations of Porphyry, to the commentary on Cicero, Victorinus' work (and the commentary tradition in general) provided the Roman elite (in Italy and, as we have seen, also in North Africa) with an intellectual space within which they responded to their shared philosophical, rhetorical, and educational traditions.

However, this is not to say that Boethius' cultural preoccupations were completely conditioned by the cultural traditions within which he was working. While it is clear that Boethius, Cassiodorus, and Martianus Capella often relied on an understanding of

---

[185]Hadot (1971), 115-125, especially. Boethius reliance on Victorinus' work went beyond the commentary tradition. He also informs us that he employed Victorinus' translation of Porphyry, when writing a commentary on the *Isagoge*. Boethius, *In Isagogen*, 4.10. Augustine, too, had used Victorinus' translation when reading Porphyry: *Conf.* VIII.II.

[186] Ibid, 123. Martianus Capella was a *Vir Clarissimus* from North Africa, who, like Boethius, composed prosimetric work with Neoplatonic overtones. Martianus Capella, Budé (2003); Stahl/ Johnson (1971).

[187] Les brèves notations de Martianus Capella ont la même structure que les longs développements de Boèce. Leur source commune pourrait donc être Victorinus. Hadot (1971), 123.

[188] See note x below.

[189] Hadot (1971), 125. See note 59 and 62, 125 for relevant sections from the *Institutes*.

Cicero (and Porphyry) filtered through the translation and commentary tradition (essentially inhabiting the restricted intellectual space individuals like Victorinus created), nevertheless Boethius clearly stepped outside those confines.[190] At the beginning of *ICT*, he asserts that he is only undertaking the task of a commentary on Cicero because Victorinus' work is lacking: *Sed cum in M. Tullii Topica Marius Victorinus rhetor plurimae in disserendi arte notitiae commenta conscripserit, non me oportuisset melioribus forsitan attemptata contingere nisi esset aliquid quo se noster quoque labor exercere atque parere potuisset.*[191] Boethius was not concerned here with the mere enumeration of canonised authorities who would back his reading of Cicero. He applied his own logic to critically assess Victorinus' reading of Cicero.[192] Victorinus' translations also, which Boethius had relied on, commented upon, and which Martianus read, were subject to Boethius' disapprobation. Unlike Cassiodorus and Martianus, however, Boethius could correct the inadequacies of Victorinus and other Latin commentators and translators.[193] In an attempt to address the failings of Victorinus, Boethius composed his first translation of a philosophical work: Porphyry's *Isagoge*.[194] He then proceded to pen a new commentary which followed the translation which Boethius himself had just completed. Boethius was able to step outwith the increasingly Latino-centric confines of an educational medium which limited the intellectual horizons of the Roman elite in Italy. We can surmise from Ennodius' vituperative dismissal of Hellenic culture (and Greeks in general), Cassiodorus' own unwillingness and inability to question his 'authorities', not to

---

[190] Both Cassiodorus and Martianus Capella present the opinions of Victorinus uncritically. Martianus relies on Victorinus' Ciceronian commentary in Book V of his *De Nuptiis Philologiae et Mercurii* (see Hadot, 125ff; Stahl/Johnson (1971), 118), and also on Victorinus' patchy translation of Porphyry in his haphazard and disjointed interaction with Platonic and Aristotelian thought (Stahl/Johnson, 113-114). Cassiodorus throughout his *Institutes* (I.7.1; II.2.14; II.3.18) presents Victorinus as an unquestioned authority on rhetorical, scriptural, and philosophical matters.

[191] *PL* 64.II. 1039.

[192] Chadwick (1981), 118, provides a lively account of the 'special scorn' which Boethius reserved for large parts of Victorinus' work.

[193] There is no evidence of Cassiodorus ever having translated anything from Greek to Latin. His voluminous *Variae* contain only three solitary references to Homer. O'Donnell (1979), 91. As O'Donnell has remarked (143), even Cassiodorus' desire to encourage the translation of Greek Patristic writing at his Vivarium could have been an attempt to build a linguistic and cultural bridge which he himself was unable to do. Martianus in North Africa also betrays limited understanding of Greek language and thus literature: Courcelle (1969), 209-223.

[194] For the circumstances surrounding the decision to translate Porphyry, see: Ebbesen (in Marenbon 2009), 37; and Chardwick (1981), 134-135.

mention the lack of any understanding of Greek betrayed by Arator, that the sort of education Boethius had (and had access to) was not uniformly shared among the Roman elite in Italy.[195]

However, despite having had access to an educational experience which both associates him with, and sets him apart from his compatriots in Ostrogothic Italy, Boethius' intellectual capabilities and proclivities were not exceptional. We can locate his education within a stratum of the Roman elite which had access to, and gravitated towards a cultural tradition which was receding in Ostrogothic Italy. We can add Quintus Aurelius Memmius Symmachus (also known as the junior Symmachus)[196] to Boethius and Cassiodorus as further proof that the educational utility of the commentary tradition was alive and well in Ostrgothic Italy. Thanks to subscription on the manuscript tradition associated with Macrobius' *Commentary on Scipio's Dream* (a commentary on the sixth book of Cicero's *De Re Publica*) we know that Symmachus edited it at some point.[197] Symmachus' activities in this instance provide evidence of him maintaining the fabric of the Latin commentary tradition which not only Boethius but also Cassiodorus and others like him looked to for instruction. Symmachus, however, wanted to ensure that the widened educational horizons from which his son-in-law, Boethius, and no doubt himself, had benefitted, would play an increasingly prominent role in the Italian educational experience. To ensure that this came to pass, Symmachus commissioned a Latin grammarian, Priscan, resident at Constantinople, to create a series of works which would reintroduce Hellenic culture to the schools (no doubt to schools like that of Deuterius which were producing individuals like Arator, who had little or no Greek, and which were looked upon favourably by the likes of Ennodius, who had little or no time for Greek literature).[198]

---

[195] Ennodius' dismissal of Greek culture: Vogel edition *MGH, Auct., Ant.* 7, p. 301, 40; his use of the term Greek pejoratively: *MGH, Auct., Ant.* 7, p. 90, 36. Arator's lack of reading in Greek culture: Green (2006), 307.

[196] The father-in-law of Boethius and great-grandson of the Q. Aurelius Symmachus, who petitioned the emperor (unsuccessfully) to have the Altar of Victory restored to the Senate House. Ambrosius, *Ep.* 17.10.

[197] His co-editor was Macrobius Plotinus Eudoxius, a *vir clarissimus*, and probable relation of Macrobius himself. Chadwick (1981), 7.

[198] Priscan, *Institutio de arte grammatica* (Keil, II, p.1, 6); *de figuris numerorum* (Keil, III, p.405, 9). For Ennodius' disapproval, see note 193 above.

The word 'reintroduce' is used advisedly. For the educational endeavours of Symmachus, Boethius, and the Roman elite which they represented, signaled a reengagement with tradition than a departure from it.[199] The endeavour itself must have had the backing of the circle of Symmachus and Boethius. The reading parties of Sidonius, which, as remember, the elite of Gallo-Roman used as arenas of educational discourse, did have a continuing role in Italy as well.[200] Thanks to our friend Ennodius, we have a list of the senators and other luminaries of the section of the Roman elite which Boethius and Symmachus represented.[201] It is too cautious not to assume, therefore, that Symmachus and his circle inhabited the alternative educational tradition which Boethius' writings reveal. Boethius and his friends could, because of their broader educational horizons, consult a wider variety of writers, thinkers, and doctrines.[202] This section within the Roman elite wanted to halt the declining fortunes of a pluralistic education at Rome by reconstituting an educational tradition, which could offer a broader learning experience. Despite the ability of the city of Rome to provide the budding student with the materials necessary for a decent grounding in a bilingual education, the political, religious, and cultural microclimate of an increasingly anti-Greek Ostrogothic Italy ensured that the efforts of Boethius, Symmachus, Macrobius Plotinus, Festus, Probinus, Cethegus, Agapitus, Faustus Niger, and Probus, would end in failure.[203] Although it could act as a facilitator for the continued maintenance of educational traditions which had evolved in the Later Roman Empire (rhetorical schools feeding the political need for officers of state, ambassadors, and diplomats, all in a discernibly Christian context), the Ostrogothic

---

[199] Macrobius had attempted to institute a parallel Latin/Greek grammar, but his efforts met, unsurprisingly, with the indifference of the Latin-grammar community. Courcelle, 323.

[200] See above, 62, note 127. A wonderful passage from Macrobius provides evidence of the Roman elite in Italy (Symmachus' great-grandfather, no less) at such a gathering: Macrobius, *Saturnalia*, I.4.

[201] Ennodius, *Paraenesis didascalia,* ed. Vogel, 310-315. The names are: Symmachus, Boethius, Festus, Probinus, Cethegus, Agapitus, Faustus Niger, and Probus. Interestingly, as we shall see in chapter 2, Festus is one of the prime movers in attempts to have the hostile Western religious elite (which included Ennodius) accept the Greek Henotikon (terms of religious union).

[202] It is worth emphasizing, though, that Boethius' interaction with Aristotelian and Platonic philosophy was not by any means broad and comprehensive. He is intimately familiar with the Greek commentary tradition, but this familiarity seems to be channelled through only two writers: Porphyry and Ammonius. See Courcelle, 280-291.

[203] We shall see in chapter 2 the political, religious, and cultural context which conspired against those advocating closer ties with the East.

state (actively and passively, as we shall see in chapter 2) created a climate which made enthusiastic participation with perceived Greek cultural traditions undesirable.

Our investigation into the health of education at Rome must also pay due attention to evidence of formal training in law. As we have seen with those students of Deuterius whom we witnessed displaying evidence of their education above, training in rhetoric was a key factor in their success as advocates. However, Ennodius only allowed us to see the outlines of the forensic aptitude which they would have developed in the Auditorium. Knowledge of the *mores* and *leges*, and the procedures which facilitated their function in law, is missing from Ennodius' accounts of Deuterius' school. We know, however, that Ostrogothic Italy required men who had an intimate knowledge of law and an ability to interpret it.[204] Ostrogothic Italy required an arena in which to practice the finer points of legal culture. Turning again to Boethius (especially the work on Cicero - and devoted to Patricius) we can see that it was still possible in the late fifth century for a member of the Roman elite to access an education in law within Italy. Let us return to the *ICT*, Boethius' commentary on Cicero's treatment of Aristotle's *Topics*. As we have seen, the late antique commentary tradition continued to form a central part of the learning experience in Ostrogothic Italy. [205] Certain authors and schools of thought were canonised, and their works became the focus for discussion and explication. Cicero's original work on the topics was an attempt to mine material from Aristotle's *Topics*, in order to reuse it in the law courts (the work was intended to help one Trebatius, a lawyer). Fittingly, Boethius devotes his commentary on Cicero to a rhetorician, Patricius, who would eventually, as we shall see, become involved in law at Rome and in Ostrgothic Italy.[206] The nature of this work offers the possibility that it was actually designed as a reading tool for either the schoolroom or for private study (perhaps of the type Sidonius describes – see n.124).

---

[204] Cassiodorus *Variae*, XII.21, bear witness that legal codes and charters still remained the life blood of the legal system (and, as laws could not be drafted in Ostrogothic Italy, the interpretation, and promulgation of these documents became a central concern). Everett (2003), 210, draws our attention to the fact that this situation changed immediately after the fall of the Ostrogoths. Everett also provides an excellent examination of the sub-literate traditions which continued in law and legal practice in Italy under the Lombards (163-234). For the offices associated with the writing, emendation, and preservation of legal codes see Jones (1964) Vol. I, 515-516.

[205] See note 180.

[206] Below, 92.

We witnessed above that knowledge of certain philosophical traditions was a clear result of interaction with the commentary tradition. At Rome in the third century A.D., we have firm evidence of the commentary tradition informing the learning experience in the schoolroom. In his *Life of Plotinus* Porphyry mentions that Plotinus (who taught at Rome)[207] often began his lessons with an examination of commentaries on great authors.[208] Ally this to the evidence we have from Boethius, Victorinus, Cassiodorus, and Martianus Capella, not to mention those private educational functions, and we may easily conclude that Boethius' work was indeed intended for the consumption of those wishing to interact with an educational process which imparted instructive detail about how to characterise and approach phenomena within a legal context.[209] The choice of Patricius as inspiration for the composition would therefore have been particularly apposite.

However, there has been a not unreasonable argument put forward that the detailed articulation of legal process and act in Boethius' work is evidence that many aspects of the legal nature of Cicero's work were by now somehow irrelevant or incomprehensible to the intended audience of Boethius' work.[210] This consideration need not undermine an emerging picture of a still-living educational tradition in law. No doubt many of the institutions and practices which inform Cicero's legal landscape had fallen into disuse. Nevertheless, Cicero's text is itself concerned with appropriating explanatory frameworks of logic (definition and category) and applying them to legal contexts. A commentary on the cultivation of this transferable skill would have transcendent applicability. As we know, Late Antiquity was a period in which laws were being reinterpreted with a new religious focus in an evolving political context. The role of quaestor was as important as ever under the Ostrogoths (is not more so than in previous generations). Boethius' *ICT* did not represent a retreat

---

[207] Porphyry *Plot.* 7-9.

[208] Ibid 14

[209] As seen above, Marius Victorinus wrote a commentary on this in the 4th century. Boethius and Cassiodorus had a deep and complex relationship with Victorinus which betrays a fundamental interaction with him at some point. (See Hadot, 196-197, and 313 ff. for the extensive use Cassiodorus especially makes of him). This is further evidence that the commentary tradition was still of fundamental importance to the educational experience in this period.

[210] Stump, introduction to Boethius *In Ciceronis Topica*, 11.

from the law. The existence of this textbook, at this time, and in this place, demonstrates that law at Rome was a subject for study into which the Romans were still investing their time. One need only look at the writers in this text with whom Boethius betrays familiarity to see that Roman researchers and students of the law had at their disposal texts which could help to develop their comprehension of law. In the *ICT* Boethius shows familiarity with three prominent Roman jurists: Gaius, Ulpian, and Julius Paulus.[211] They are all used to help to explicate to the reader various aspects of the law which might not at first seem apparent. The fact that Boethius can do this, be it intuitively, or actively referencing, is evidence enough that Rome could still offer the student of law many opportunities to develop their skills – be that informally at reading parties, formally in school while reading commentaries, or while actively practising or researching.

Taking this into consideration, when we now look at Ennodius' many references to Rome as *the* place of learning (his letters to Ambrosius and letters VII and VIII) a less pessimistic picture does emerge. Ennodius' own views about the nature of education, which we have discerned from his letters, demand a certain type of emphasis (literary, moral, technical). We can be fairly sure that Rome did satisfy Ennodius' expectations and requirements for a good education (the type of which he praised in the *Auditorium*). Letter X.7 of the *Variae* of Cassiodorus further confirms Ennodius' optimistic picture of education at Rome, while also containing details of the type of nurturing - the nature of the education - with which Rome had provided Patricius. It was, as one would expect of a future *rhetor*, one that focused on the art of speaking in a legal forum, and which employed the public recital and the *declamatio*: *Sic bonis artibus eruditus mox est forensibus aptatus excubiis, ut oratores, quos longa meditatione perceperat, consimili declamatione monstraret* (X.7.2-3). Interestingly, the letter also tells us what rank Patricius, the man who inspired Boethius to write his commentary on Cicero, will now attain under the Ostrogoths: he is to be quaestor. This is the office whose duties the Italian education system seemed designed to prepare one for and which Rome, with its still-flourishing educational opportunities to the student of law, functioned as its finishing class.

---

[211] *PL* 64.II: 1095 (Gaius); 1071 (Ulpian); 1075-1076 (Julius Paulus). See Chadwick (1981), 119; and Stump (1988), 11.

Of course it is significant that we find Patricius doing this in his later career. As Cassiodorus tells us, Patricius graduated from the lecture hall to high office within the Ostrogothic administration. He held the same position, that of quaestor, under Athalaric's successor, Theodahad[212], as Ambrosius had under Athalaric some 8 years before. Letter X.6 of the *Variae* addresses him directly as the quaestor: *Patricio V.I. Quaestori Theodahadus Rex*. X.7, the letter to the senate - which we discussed above, in our examination of the type of education Patricius had received at Rome - is King Theodahad's endorsement of Patricius to the senate. Cassiodorus' extended description of Patricius' education is born from a desire to present Patricius to the senate as the perfect embodiment of what his regime envisages for the role of quaestor. According to Cassiodorus (as the voice of the King) training in rhetoric is a prerequisite for this post, since the eloquence that a rhetorical education imparts allows the quaestor to execute two functions seminal to the role: *Quaestor enim eloquens rei publicae decus est, qui et uota nostra optime uideatur edicere et antiquorum iura firmo consilio custodire*. (X.7.1-2). This is significant for two reasons. First, it emphasises just how relevant and important this type of education was when seeking high office in the Italian government; and secondly, it confirms that, anyone wishing to aspire to such a prominent position in administration would have to have been, if not as proficient a *rhetor* as Patricius, then at least a keen pupil of the *oratores* and *rhetores*. This reinforces the point, then, that someone like Ambrosius, in order to meet these requirements for the position of quaestor, would have had to have been in possession of the skills demanded of Patricius – skill which Patricius, like the pupils of Deuterius in Milan, learned in the debates of the forum. The nature of government at this time meant that the education system would be required to produce individuals who benefited from a tradition that stretched back to classical antiquity.

Finally we shall now move on to examine what Cassiodorus can tell us about formal education. By contrasting the picture Cassiodorus gives us with what we ave already seen, it is possible to perceive some of the substantial continuities which existed. We

---

[212] PRLE II, 1067-68. Theodahad came to the throne after Athalaric's death in 534.

have discussed the type of education Ennodius describes and applauds in Northern Italy (and to a lesser extent in Rome), so we must examine what Cassiodorus, one of the main players in the Ostrogothic government for much of its existence (he served under several influential Ostrogothic Kings: Theoderic, Athalaric, and Theodahad), saw as the desirable nature of education. In book II of his *Institutiones*, Cassiodorus sets out what he sees as the function of teaching grammar: *grammatica uero est peritia pulchre loquendi ex poetis illustribus auctoribusque collecta; officium eius est sine uitio dictionem prosalem metricamque componere.*[213] This description corroborates the evidence from Ennodius, where the schoolhouse seems to have been secularised, where the famous writers and poets of antiquity were the model, and they were arranged into paradigmatic forms for consumption. Indeed, we need not simply assume that this is the implication of *poetis illustribus auctoribusque*, for Cassiodorus later mentions the teachers. That the material the masters of the schoolhouse use is not religious in nature, but wholly secular, we can see from this description of them: *magistri…saecularium litterarum*[214]. However, Cassiodorus does, in fact, mention several late antique writers as possible models for good grammar (the many works of Donatus[215] - Jerome's *grammaticus*; and also, Augustine and his *de Grammatica*). The fact that he deems Donatus only suitable for children and beginners (*pueris specialiter aptus et tyronibus* – II.I.10-11), and Augustine's *de Grammatica*[216] for simple churchmen (*simplicitatem fratrum* – II.I.14), is perhaps yet more evidence that he believes the secular letters of the schoolhouse are the best models to follow.

As we would perhaps expect from a former quaestor and praetorian prefect, Cassiodorus has much to say on rhetoric and its value in education. We find out that rhetoric, like grammar, is also taught by the masters of secular learning in the schools: *ars autem rhetorica est, sicut magistri tradunt saecularium litterarum, bene dicendi scientia in ciuilibus quaestionibus.* (II.II.1). Although this definition of the art of

---

[213] *Institutiones* II.I.1-2. At book I.1-2, Cassiodorus sets out his reasons for writing the book: firstly to encourage an enthusiasm for a Christian learning experience (along the lines he says the secular experience benefits from); and secondly, to integrate the finer points of classical learning with that of Christian learning.

[214] Ibid., II.II.1

[215] See Kaster 52, 275-279.

[216] This obscure and disputed work is contained in *CLP* 1557.

rhetoric follows that of Ammonius,[217] there is ample evidence, as the part of the *Institutiones* from which this quote comes demonstrates, that eloquence in the law courts and civil administration was still required at this time. This quotation comes from the part of the work where Cassiodorus attempts to directly connect the art of speaking well with the technical skills needed to successfully pursue a career in the courts. In an extremely technical discussion, he refers to many different authors, both old and new. We can see here that Cassiodorus' definition is not an anachronistic classicism, but an admission that this tradition of the classical world still mattered in 5th- and 6th-century Ostrogothic Italy. Chapter II of book II devotes itself to exploring the issue of rhetoric almost exclusively from the point of view of potential application in the courtroom and legal disputes. Interestingly, we find in Cassiodorus' discussion on rhetoric a familiarity - and willingness to deal with – Cicero which we failed to detect in the work of Ennodius above. The technical aspect of the art is conveyed via examples from several works of Cicero: *ipse se Cicero emendans in libris 'de Oratore' dicit*…(II.II.4); *ceterum secundum 'Rhetoricos' Tullii XVIIII reperiuntur…* (II.II.6); *omnis controuersia, sicut ait Cicero, aut simplex est aut iuncta* (II.II.7); *haec licet Cicero, Latinae eloquentiae lumen eximium, per uaria uulumina*…(II.II.10).[218]

However, despite what I am sure Augustine would have viewed as an inappropriate preoccupation with discussing the technicalities of the art, Cassiodorus' discussion does involve that attitude towards the character of the potential rhetorician which we witnessed in Ennodius. Cassiodorus stipulates the type of person suitable for *ciuiles quaestiones*: *orator igitur est uir bonus dicendi peritus, ut dictum est, in ciuilibus quaestionibus*. (II.II.1. 9-10). Once again we can perhaps detect the shadow of Augustine hovering over Cassiodorus as he writes this. Like Augustine's brief appearance at the beginning of Ennodius' discussion on grammar,[219] where the great

---

[217] Probably via Victorinus' translation. Of course, this is the same Ammonius with whom Boethius was so intimately familiar (above, note 200). Ammonius' original comments are preserved in Porphyry's *Isagoge* I.14-15: ῥητορική ἐστι δύναμις τηχνικὴ πιθανοῦ λόγου ἐν πράγματι πολιτικῷ τέλος ἔχουσα τὸ εὖ λέγειν.

[218] In these passages Cassiodorus borrows heavily from Cicero's *de Inuentione*. For more on the specific passages and arguments, see 178-188 in Halporn's modern translation of the *Institutiones*. Cassiororus' baroque rhetorical style in his *Variae* is clearly a legacy of his rhetorical education. O'Donnell (1979), 55-100, and Barnish (1992), xx-xxvii, for discussion on the implications of the *Variae*.

[219] *Epistle* I.4.

man was mentioned and then disappeared, so at the outset of this discussion Cassiodorus, mindful of the moral dimension, mentions it briefly and then proceeds to use the classical model as the rule which should be followed.

While the Roman elite could still interact with the institutions of the state that allowed them to gravitate towards their old vocational traditions, they could still maintain and inhabit an education system which responded to those traditions. This system was flexible enough to adapt and incorporate elements of the new philosophical outlook of Late Antiquity (a Christian morality). The interface between the old and new did not need to be a jarringly discontinuous process. However, when conditions changed dramatically (which did not seem to happen in Ostrogothic Italy from the evidence we have seen), the system and the time-honoured philosophy which informed it came crashing down. We can see this nowhere more clearly than in the marked change in attitude in the writings on the purpose of education in Cassiodorus. His *Institutiones* begin with an explanation of why he is writing such a work: *Cum studia saecularium litterarum magno desiderio fervere cognoscerem, ita ut multa pars hominum per ipsam se mundi prudentiam crederet adipisci, gravissimo sum (fateor) dolore permotus, quod Scripturis divinis magistri publici deessent, cum mundani auctores celeberrima procul dubio traditione pollerent.*[220] The event written about here occurred just ten years before the retreat (intellectually and physically) of Arator to Rome and the steps of San Pietro. Yet the world which this dialogue inhabits, with its confidence in the continuity of its secular educational traditions, and the strength of those traditions, sees the secular schools as areas of strength which the religious must aspire to. The rhetoric and eloquence of old Rome seems far from beating a retreat into the church.

Yet it is from the words of Cassiodorus himself that we apprehend the final break from that long, continuously evolving educational discourse which had been adapted and adopted by so many generations of the Roman elite. The vocational ambitions which the school of Deuterius catered for were a distant memory by the time Cassiodorus came to write his final work, *De Orthographia*. Robert Markus

---

[220] Cassiodorus, *Institutiones*, I.1

poignantly sum up the times which informed the nature of this work: "the Italian Church was divided by schism; his [Cassiodorus'] desire to found an institution for Christian higher learning was frustrated by the upheavals of war and its sequel. The old order was gone, its remnants transferred to Constantinople, with his senatorial friends who had migrated there. Italy was a new world indeed, what Cassiodorus called 'modern'"[221]. The opening lines and the work's conclusion betray the now emaciated and almost unrecognisable face of elite education. Cassiodorus says that he will leave out of this narrow utilitarian work all that is useless in this present age: *qui praesenti saeculo videtur inutilis*. The conclusion tells us that he has taught the monks spelling and punctuation so that they may read the scriptures.[222] The limited ambition and alien nature of this work makes a powerful contrast with the vibrancy and familiarity of the educational philosophy understood from the letters of Ennodius, the political works of Cassiodorus, and the correspondence of Boethius. The barren educational landscape implied by Cassiodorus' comments brings into sharp focus the close relationship the education system in post-imperial Italy had with that of the Italy of the Later Roman Empire. In the juxtaposition between the traditional education still actively propagated by Cassiodorus, Arator, Ennodius, Boethius, Symmachus, and the other members of Ostrogothic Italy's Roman elite, and the education formulated by Cassiodorus here, we see how a fundamental change in the cultural milieu (post-war fatigue, elite flight to imperial capital, and elite retreat into the offices and cultural spaces of a now preeminent bishopric of Rome) had changed the audience and thus changed the contours of the education system.

Conclusions

So, what picture emerges from our investigation? That a certain type of tradition was very much a cornerstone of the education system Ennodius and his northern associates passed through. The identity, which was carved out of the granite of the traditional education system, gave them both a refuge in an uncertain and changing cultural and political landscape and a weapon to defend themselves. The authors Ennodius is familiar with are the same authors used at schools throughout the Latin-speaking west

---

[221] Markus (1990), 219

[222]*De Orthographia*: *PL* 70.1241d; *PL* 70.1270b

throughout Late Antiquity and before. Virgil is the staple food fed to the pupils at Deuterius' school. From Ennodius' familiarity with him, and willingness to associate him with the world of education (*uester Maro)*, he is the staple of the school system which reared Ennodius. However, as we witnessed, the prevalent discourse in Late Antiquity in relation to Virgil (suitable for the schoolroom only - not for the mature of mind) produced an appreciation of him that often dispensed with a consideration of the possible wider cultural messages which the topics of the *Aeneid* explore. Instead, the aesthetic beauty of the language and imagery of the work bring to bear the most influence on literature outside the schoolroom. Christian attitudes towards what they perceived to be the vanity of the pagan poets were no doubt a factor in his confinement to the schoolhouse. However, his continued use is evidence of the strong cultural connections the Roman elite still had with him. Like Augustine, they understood that Virgil was an integral and invaluable part of their literary heritage. He provided the building blocks of the language by which each member of the elite recognised each other. There was no word out of place and nothing every written incorrectly.

We have seen that this curriculum which included Virgil's works, also betrayed a close familiarity with other classical models. Along with Virgil, Ennodius had read Terence, Sallust, and, to a lesser extent, Cicero. We witnessed what uses he made of them, and observed how this seemed to demonstrate what part they played in his education. Ennodius and his elite peers could communicate to each other and their masters in the Imperial/post-Imperial world through the polished diction and perfectly weighted phrases which they had developed when reading these authors. The distinctly Roman rhetoric created a discursive context in which the rulers and the elite ruled had defined roles. The imperial governor or the Barbarian king accepted the discourse as a way of communicating effectively with the elite, but also as a way of ennobling themselves in the reflected light of elite etiquette. The elite tamed the often violent and arbitrary actions of the ruler while allowing themselves to continue interacting with a continuously evolving, but recognisably familiar ideal of themselves. The traditional grammatical exercises still informed education and still had relevance to the world outside of the classroom. This last point is worth

emphasizing. Both Robert Browning and A. H. M Jones did not acknowledge these changes. To them, 'education of all kinds was marked by rigid conservatism', and 'remained relatively undisturbed by the social, political, and religious changes of the period.'[223] As we have seen above, this view of education in Late Antiquity, and specifically in Ostrogothic Italy, is difficult to articulate convincingly when all the evidence is evaluated. The forms were still there, as Jones and Browning correctly assert. However, the intended learning outcomes expected of the forms were now conditioned by an audience existing within a different social, cultural, and political context. This required a recalibration in the structures and uses of texts which gave prominence the demands of a Late Antiquity (a new religion

We looked more generally at how the teaching of rhetoric, with its formalised *Declamatio* familiar from the pages of Quintilian, continued to be of relevance. The recitals in front of one's peers and parents would still seem to have been seen as a necessary part of the educational development of pupils. From our subsequent investigation into the future careers of those whom we know had benefited from this type of education in the *Auditorium*, and of those whom we can infer from the evidence had also, we have seen that the political situation in Ostrogothic Italy still required men to carry out the duties of the officials not so distant from what they had understood in the Imperial period. Like then, this meant acquiring a rhetorical education was of vital importance. We can see that from the continuing importance the role of quaestor had under the Ostrogoths (though, as we said above, the nature of the post-imperial regime meant that some responsibilities – legislation – were gone and others gained more importance – interpretation of law and defending those previous, imperially-sanctioned laws) that the bloodless rhetorical battles of the schools prepared the young noble for overseeing, an at times becoming involved in, the petitions of others in the courts. These battles were fought by the *boni uiri dicendi periti*. Their ability to carry out these roles and influence the actions of the violent autocrat was increased by the incorporation into the prevalent educational discourse

---

[223] Browning (2000), 'Education in the Roman Empire' in *CAH, Volume 14*, 855. Jones (1964), in his exposition on the syllabus in Late Antiquity, betrays no awareness that the aims of the system had changed to accommodate new priorities in the evolving world of the Late Roman Empire and post-imperial West.

of the Christian notion of the good man. The King and the state were viewed through these lenses and their actions described by the elite in these terms.

Finally we encountered the evidence from Boethius and his circle of a different sort of educational tradition. The educational experience which Boethius and Symmachus embodied and propagated was firmly rooted, as we saw, in a wider late antique education (Cassiodorus navigated his way through it), which flourished among the pages of the commentary tradition. It was conditioned by a reliance on the fashion for editing and translating canonized authors and philosophical schools of thought. It was while working within this tradition that Boethius sought to provide a useful educational tool for the continuing studies of the newly graduated students from the schools of Deuterius. The students could move to Rome and aspire to a different level of comprehension in the Law. They could interact with the legal traditions which Boethius had access to, and they could likewise benefit from the compendiums and commentaries which he had both read and devised. As have seen, however, that Boethius and Symmachus' education contained some increasingly exceptional elements. They had a long and abiding love for philosophy and Greek literature, which manifested itself in a programme to reincorporate their conception of a full and complete education into the Western mainstream. This increasingly hostile reaction towards this type of education was a result of both a continuing, traditional Western suspicion of Greek culture, but also a nascent national chauvinism which was being fostered, as we shall presently see in chapter 2, by the political and religious situation of the Ostrogothic state.

Ennodius, Deuterius, and Cassiodorus were part of a culture, which Augustine and others less eruditely before him had adopted and adapted to a Christian discourse, and which deemed that one should learn rhetoric in order to fight the good fight. Ennodius recognised this, and in turn reminded Deuterius. Cassiodorus, too, although exploring Ciceronian techniques to further one's rhetorical abilities felt bound to begin such a discussion by reminding his audience of the need for the *bonus uir* to undertake the training. In Northern Italy and Rome we find that the education system has emphasized the need for Christian philosophy in its approach to a classical τέχνη like rhetoric (as Augustine had wished). We also find the education system training in this

τέχνη because the Italian regime under the Ostrogoths required men trained in it. In short, we find an education system that taught the classics because it helped to fine tune those grammatical skills, which, in later life, could not only express and explain pressing theological problems, but also could defend and empower them in an uncertain world. There were changes in the moral aims of education and changes in the social and political status of the elite which were reflected by a specific reinterpretation of the use of the classics. Both of these developments had been initiated in the late antique period and were the result of the rise of a Christian and autocratic discursive landscape. Ostrogothic Italy was part of that landscape. Roman elite education could still interact meaningfully with its past, in order to define its present, and plan for its future. The past was still alive and relevant. However, the political status of the Ostrogothic state was also providing nourishment to those who were hostile to the type of educational experience Boethius, Symmachus, Festus, and other senatorial families enjoyed. We shall now examine how the past continued to be used, as this inter-elite friction manifested itself in the field of religious politics.

Chapter 2
The Power of Tradition in Religious Politics

We shall now examine how the Roman elite within used the past to navigate through the dangerous waters of late 5th and early 6th century religious politics. In a fluid and constantly changing situation, many different voices and narratives sought to interact with the problems and opportunities of these changed times. When attempting to discover something about its nature, deciding what aspect of a society's behaviour to give prominence to can be problematic. From individual responses to social trends, to institutional decrees which attempt to generate discourses designed to positively shape social formation, one is confronted by a multitude of potential variables of varying significance all saying something about a culture. As we have seen in the education chapter, examining the uses made of the past, and the language of the past and tradition, to reflect and project cultural and religious discourse is particularly instructive exercise. Looking at the primary sources, we can discern clusters of narrative strategies and cultural trends which alert us to the ideological concerns of the authors. In short, we have seen how we can reconstruct fundamental aspects of the character of the Roman elite by considering their relationship with the past and tradition. Each narrative has a consistent and recognisably similar linguistic landscape (the words used to depict that landscape and the phrases and symbols employed to populate it) and each speaks to us of the purpose of the narrative and its intended audience. The holds true for elite interaction with the preeminent cultural force in the Later Roman World: religion.

The shared cultural, political, and religious traditions of the Roman elite in the evolving political landscape of late 5th, early 6th century Italy, provided them with the social glue necessary for their continued survival as a coherent group.[224] Those shared traditions, however, were subject to reinterpretation in the 5th century, as the gravitational pull of a new political orbit promised both exciting new possibilities and

---

[224] As we have seen, the development and articulation of elite identity through an understanding of a shared tradition is witnessed no where more clearly than in the realm of education: 'the grammarian's school did one thing superbly, providing the language...through which a social and political elite recognized its members'. Kaster (1988), Guardians of Language, 12-14. See also Brown (1992) Power and Persuasion, 35-70;

reassuring continuity. The theatre of religious politics was one area where this process played out. The circumstances surrounding the publication of the Henotikon and the contested episcopal election between Symmachus and Laurentius, which was a direct result of it, provide numerous examples of these tensions.[225] This chapter will focus on the sources from this period which provide evidence of the Roman elite interacting with their past during these religious battles. Such an approach allows us to witness the creation, maintenance, and progress of those circulating discourses which informed the behavioural patterns of the Roman elite. These discourses were responding to the evolving cultural and social trends of this fascinating period in Roman history. From the active manipulation of shared cultural traditions, to the passive interaction with still-living traditions, the circumstances surrounding the publication of the Henotikon and the contested papal election between Laurentius and Symmachus provide valuable evidence of the power of the past as both sword and shield (attack and defence). Importantly, within each interaction with tradition, it is possible to discern clusters of recurring, ideologically-inspired narratives. These narratives were attempts to control the evolution of the political and cultural landscape not only of the Roman World, but more immediately the cultural and political climate in Ostrogothic Italy.

The institutions of the church at Rome presented the Italian elite of the Late 5th century with a potentially powerful mechanism to gain cultural and social dominance in both the Western Roman World and that of the East. One group from within the Roman elite, who would eventually champion the cause of Pope Symmachus, attempted to exploit the opportunities presented by the constantly evolving political situation in Rome and Italy. The intellectual and theological freedom, which political freedom from the imperial capital in Constantinople provided, encouraged them to shape and develop an independent cultural and religious environment. As they sought to exploit this opportunity, the situation also presented them with some problems. The

---

[225] Full text of the Henotikon can be found in Evagrius, Ecclesiastical History, III.14-15. See also: Townsend (1936), 78-86, for a good overview of the text and its significance. See Eckhard Wirbelauer (1993, *Zwei Päpste in Rom. Der Konflikt zwischen Laurentius und Symmachus (498–514). Studien und Texte.*) for an exhaustive study on manuscript traditions, literary forms, and dating issues of all the relevant documentation from the period. Davis (1989, provides a brief but instructive overview of the main source, *Liber Pontificalis*, (henceforth abbreviated to *LP*), ix-xlviii. The work of Louis Duchesne (1886-1892, *Le Liber Pontificalis, Texte, introduction et commentaire*) endures as the most complete and comprehensive study of the LP, while also providing a good edition of the text.

political masters of late 5th, early 6th century Italy, Odoacer and Theoderic, were non-catholic and non-Roman, and could be easily characterized as heretics and barbarians. [226]The authority of the Roman church, which would have facilitated the exportation of the Roman West's ideas and theological decrees to the wider Roman world, was undermined by this state of affairs. In this volatile and changing environment, tradition and the past became invaluable mechanisms for negotiating a fraught position. The shared traditions of the elite were also employed to facilitate the ideological goals of those who attempted to install Laurentius on the papal throne. These members of the Roman elite believed that those who sought to exploit the evolving political landscape were in fact threatening traditional Roman civilisation and the religious and cultural continuity which preserved it. This group's relationship with the past reflected and projected their naturally conservative ideological concerns. A consciously-inhabited, still-living past helped to defend, and to attack any threats to their interests.

However, this presents only one strand of the complex and varied attitude of the Roman power elite. Divergent political motivations sought to construct other narratives in order to champion a different religious order. There was a more conservative element in Roman elite society which sought religious conformity and political regression. A defining characteristic of this element is its eagerness to value a closer connection to Constantinople above all other considerations. Unsurprisingly, because the language of the past and tradition is used to a very different end, it provides a striking contrast to the other narrative strategy. The two different presentations of religious tradition and cultural continuity tell us much about the pressures on, and predilections of, the Roman elite as they vied for positions of power in this fluid and evolving society. These two approaches saw - and presented -

---

[226]The author of the *Anonymus Valesianus Pars Posterior* (henceforth rendered as *AV*) while attempting to present Theoderic in a positive fashion describes him as: *devotissimus ac si Catholicus* (65). Here Theoderic's lack of orthodoxy makes it difficult to fully embrace him even when praising him. The attempts of Cassiodorus to Romanize the history and political actions of the Goths (in his now lost *Historia*, his *Chronica*, and the *Variae*) provide further evidence of this unease. See O'Donnell (1979), *Cassiodorus*, Chp. 2, for an extended discuss of Cassiodorus' accommodation approach. In Gaul, Sidonius, while articulating the Goths (Theoderic II) as defenders and embracers of Roman culture, is also forced to confront the uncomfortable nature of their Arianism (but, like *AV*, downplays it). Sid. *Ep.* I.2. For a general argument concerning the both Gothic and Roman active manipulation of, and articulation of, common consciousness of religious difference in Gaul a generation before, see Harries (1994), 234-235.

themselves as existing as a part of a Roman continuum and tradition. Though seemingly diametrically opposed, the political goals of these approaches are informed by, and based upon, a direct link with continuity and tradition. In this environment, the language of the past and tradition and its power was an invaluable tool for shaping and articulating winning arguments.

The Henotikon controversy and its offshoots cover the chronological period of the almost 50 year regnum of Odoacer and Theoderic. The Henotikon attempted to form the future direction and development of the church in all parts of the empire. Yet, it is the decrees and demands of the West - that part of the empire where the ruling political elite were heretics – not the Henotikon that emerge to be the driving force behind the formation of a new Christian order. Examining the progress of this controversy presents a perfect opportunity to see how the language of the past was selected and deployed in some of the more prominent narratives and to understand what this can tell us about the current and future ambitions of their authors. I will demonstrate how some attempted to emphasize a past which was responsive to the contemporary problems as they saw them and which looked to a future where those obstacles were overcome. I will concentrate upon sources which reveal consistently recurring narratives constructed by those from within the Roman elite who sought to put forward an opinion on the controversies. By the end of the chapter, we should be able to discern some instructive and illuminating trends. Through them we shall witness how disparate voices from within the Roman elite shaped their shared past, in order to convince each other and themselves of the validity of their differing ideological concerns.

Given the complexity of the religious and political situation in this period, a summary of the relevant religious and political conditions of the late 5th and early 6th century in Italy and the wider Roman world will provide some well-needed clarity. While providing a useful synopsis for the period, the summary will also introduce some of the issues which are presented by the protagonists to assert the primacy of their case. The scene set and the relevant issues introduced, I shall examine the activities of the prominent individuals of the period with regard to the Henotikon and attempt to

establish the wider significance of those activities –what purpose they serve. The main focus of the investigation here will be on how the relevant contemporary individuals express their ideological concerns by interacting with tradition and the past and what their language implies about their position within this ideological battle.

The Henotikon

The Historical Circumstances

To begin, I shall examine some of the factors relevant to the great schism between the churches of the East and West, precipitated by the publication of the Henotikon. The origins of this document can be found in the wider diphysite and monophysite christological battles which raged in the church, with notable violence within the Eastern Church, from the 4th century onwards.[227] Both rival doctrines were most associated in the contemporary mind with two individuals: Nestorius, the Patriarch of Constantinople during the early 5th century; and Eutyches, a contemporary of Nestorius and also an Archimandrite in the Eastern Church. In his early 6th century work, *Contra Eutychen*, a work whose significance will be discussed later in a different context, Boethius, the philosopher, writer, and prominent Roman senator, conveniently summarises the relative positions of both men.[228] Without wishing to become too distracted by the christological intricacies of the doctrine, for the purposes of this argument it will suffice to say that Nestorius' creed was dismissed by moderates and extreme monophysites as coming unacceptably close to dividing Christ into two different people. Eutyches and the monophysites were accused of concentrating far too much on the notion that Christ had only one nature: divine. The unacceptable implication of this doctrine was that God, the divinity, suffered on the cross – a suggestion both diphysite and moderate rejected.

---

[227] Bibliography on the monophysite and diphysite controversy: Kidd (1992), *A History of the Church to 461 A.D.*; Frend (1972), *The Rise of the Monophysite Movement*; Maraval (1997), *Le Christianisme de Constantin à la conquête arabe*. For further reading see Millar (2006), 157-159. Millar 149-168 provides a good overview of the historical context in the East, and Imperial responses to it.

[228] Boethius 5, *PLRE II*, 233. *Nestorius recte tenens duplicem in Christo esse naturam sacrilege confitetur duas esse personas*. Boethius, *Contra Eutychen*, V. 18-20. *Eutyches uero recte credens unam esse personam impie credit unam quoque esse naturam.*
Boethius, *Contra Eutychen*, V. 18-20

In 449, Pope Leo was petitioned by Eutyches, who had been condemned by an Eastern Synod in 448, and was asked for his help in his troubles with the then Patriarch of Constantinople, Flavian. Although Leo initially looked favourably on Eutyches' pleas, having subsequently read the charges brought against him, Leo withdrew his support. Eastern clergy, who were extremely sympathetic to the Alexandrian Monophysite doctrine of 'one nature', at the behest of the emperor Theodosius II (who, while trying to preserve the unity of the church and peace in the eastern churches, saw to it that those who condemned Eutyches were not permitted to vote – a significant move the implications of which will be discussed at length later) called a further council a year later at which Eutyches was reinstated and Flavian and some of his followers condemned. Amid this christological turmoil Leo took decisive action by spelling out his own position in a letter to Flavian (in 449), a letter which has come to be known as the Leo's Tome. Again, without wanting to weigh down the discussion with unnecessary complexity not central to the argument, I will focus on the main thrust of Leo's profession of faith in the document. Dismissing the doctrine of 'one nature', Leo emphasized that there was indeed one Christ, but that he had two natures - God and man. This letter or 'Tome' was the basis for his recommendations at a new council two years later in Chalcedon (in 451),[229] which was organised by the new Eastern Emperor Marcian. Marcian had much more sympathy with the position of Flavian and Leo than Theodosius II and so wished to establish Leo's doctrine as orthodoxy.

The Document

 It was against this backdrop that the Acacian schism divided the churches of the East and Italy. In 482, through the agency of Acacius, Patriarch of Constantinople, the Eastern Emperor, Zeno (474 – 491), published the document known as the Henotikon. As its name suggests, it was an attempt at unity. Primarily it was designed to reconcile the powerful Monophysite faction in Egypt and the East with those who agreed to the creed of the council of Chalcedon. It was also, however, a concession to those who opposed Chalcedon, and who thought that the council was too Nestorian in content

---

[229] *Hic inuenit duas hereses, Eutychiana et Nestoriana. Hic ordinauit praecepta sua auctoritate et misit ad Marcianum Augustum, orthodoxum principem, catholicum, et facta conlatione cum eodem principem collecti sunt episcope et factum est concilium sanctum episcoporum Calcedona…qui exposuerunt fidem catholicam, duas naturas in Christo, Deum et hominum.* **LP**, 47

and leaning. The deteriorating situation in Egypt and the Levantine coast (where riots and violent unrest related to the doctrinal arguments were spiralling out of control) necessitated action by the imperial government. The Henotikon was that action.

Let us now look at the detail of the document. Although the document does put the emphasis on Christ being 'one' - a declaration bound to sound appealing to Monophysite ears - it very much reiterates much of what was affirmed by Leo in his Tome and what was agreed at Chalcedon. For example, it states that God is 'homoousion' (con-substantial) with the Godhead and 'homoousion' with us in humanity.[230] While protesting that it is not setting forth any new form of faith,[231] the document specifically mentions Chalcedon and implies that Imperial power has the power to anathematise what it sees fit arising from that synod. At a council arranged in Rome in 484, Pope Felix excommunicated Acacius, under whose ecclesiastical authority the document was published. Acacius then reciprocated, excommunicating Felix in the same year. The schism which would bear the patriarch's name had begun as had the process which would drive the two bishoprics apart and provide a fertile environment for change.

Roman Response

Various explanations have been put forward to explain the Papal stance. Some see widespread irritation at the attack upon the hard-won unity of Chalcedon as a key factor in Rome's disapproval. Others believe that the Henotikon presented the Pope with a situation where the message and dogmatic decisions of Chalcedon were compromised. Others saw the incursion into ecclesiastic matters of the secular government (in the form of Zeno who issued the Henotikon) as a major factor. Commentators like Thomas Noble and Francis Dvornik[232] have tended to put a greater emphasis on the undermining of the validity of the doctrinal maxims and 'hard-fought' unity of Chalcedon, when discussing the levels of resentment felt by the Papacy at the publication of the Henotikon. To a greater or lesser extent, all no doubt

---

[230] Evagrius, *The Ecclesiastical History,* 3.16 (p113).

[231] Ibid

[232] Noble (1992), Dvornik (1979).

had some impact upon proceedings. It is not difficult to understand why so many opinions exist. It is difficult to argue that there were not any other contributory variables. The sources tell us there were (as we will soon see). What is interesting is why some sources placed so much emphasis on one variable over another, how they did it (how they presented their version), and what this emphasis tells us about their relationship with the past (how they wre using it, and to what purpose).

Firstly, however, it is essential to look at the above argument concerning the secular/ ecclesiastical divide. The publication of the Henotikon aroused great indignation in Rome. While protesting that it is not setting forth any new form of faith, the Henotikon specifically mentions Chalcedon and implies that Imperial power has the power to anathematise what it sees fit arising from that synod. Chalcedon is the *only* synod specifically named in the passage. It does not take a great leap of imagination to conclude that, because Chalcedon is the great victory for Leo and the Roman church in this period, and because it promulgates a religious theory conceived in Rome by the pontiff, the reaction against the Henotikon in Rome is a reaction against an attack upon the authority of the church in Rome. What is particularly interesting, however, was that the rejection of the Henotikon by the popes is framed in language which calls on precedent and tradition to refute its legitimacy.

Pope Felix III, the Pope under whose watch the Henotikon was sent forth, sternly rebukes the Emperor Zeno for his foray into church affairs, advising him to 'try and subject [his] royal will to the priests of God according to God's ordinance and to learn about sacred matters from the bishops rather than to teach them' (*ep.* 8). What Felix is in effect doing here – as well as warning the Imperial tanks off of his lawn – is laying before the emperor a historical process which delineates the role of pope and emperor. Chalcedon was an ecumenical council presided over by the bishops and ratified by them. The Emperor has no jurisdiction here. According to Felix, the imperial edict is effectively undermining the traditional Roman way of ordering religious and secular

life.[233]   The Henotikon may undermine what some in the East saw as the lofty pretentions to empire-wide importance of a Bishopric which covers a barbarian-infested western backwater, but the pope frames his language to ensure that Roman objections are seen as an attempt to uphold the traditional roles of the emperor and the church.

This line of argument from the West has all the disingenuousness of many arguments which purposefully suppress the wealth of existing counter arguments. The pope would have been fully aware of the nature of religious and political discourse which had developed and matured from the time of the Emperor Constantine. Constantine himself had ordered that there be a council at Nicaea in 325 A.D. At this council, by imperial injunction (or 'divine injunction', as Eusebius relayed his words), he compelled all churches in the Empire to obey the findings of the church council (or rather, the words which he himself had formulated, according to Eusebius). As Eusebius recounts, the emperor was responsible for the convocation of this council at which he walked among the bishops (whom he had also invited), gently making sure that unity of message was the focus of all minds.[234] Much later, under the Patriarchate of John Chrysostom, when the famous bishop of Constantinople had incurred the displeasure of the Empress Eudoxia, he was deposed from office and sent into exile by decree of a synod held in Constantinople at the instigation of the empress.[235] Those who questioned the role of the emperor in church affairs were few and, when they did raise their heads, were, like John Chrysostom, dealt with accordingly.

---

[233] *LP* 47.4-5, shows the increasing power of the bishop of Rome - in this case Leo - where we witness the emperor and Empress following the instruction of Leo. Leo's pontificate marks a further consolidation of the new and robustly articulated bishopric in Rome (see Neil (2009), 4-6, and chapter 2 passim, for the enabling power the increasingly aristocratic nature of the papacy provided from the papacy of Damasius onwards). Ambrose, *de Officiis Ministrorum*, provided bishops from the 4th century until the Medieval period with a framework within which to condition the behaviour of Emperors. The work was written at the end of Ambrose's career - a career which witnessed the Bishop of Milan constraining Imperial behaviour and robustly articulating episcopal rights. On this aspect of Ambrose's activities, see Boniface, (1997), 174-180, and McLynn (1994), 291-340.

[234] Eusebius, *The life of Constantine,* III. vi-xxi. Barnes (1981), *Constantine and Eusebius*, 214-270, for Constantine's approach to Nicaea. Drake (2005), in *Cambridge Companion to the Age of Constantine* (ed. Lenski), 111-137 (especially), provides a good introduction (with up-to-date bibliography) on Constantine's relationship with religious assemblies and their constituents.

[235] Sozomen, *The Ecclesiastical History*, VIII. x-xv. John was later recalled by the empress only to be deposed and banished again. See also, Kelly (1998), 145-163, 228-250.

So, if Felix is censuring the emperor from within a political and theological framework which does not exist, what is really happening here? The pope is taking advantage of the lack of political control the emperor has over him while, admittedly, also inadvertently undermining the emperor's attempts to pacify troubled parts of his empire in the East. He is doing this to guarantee the current and future power of the papacy. This is a piece of political opportunism, which could be seen as actually undermining the unity of the empire (both political and religious). However, it is presented as a noble defence of the time-honoured divinely ordained spiritual and temporal Roman Empire. The narrative presents the West as being scrupulously *Roman* and providing its traditional role of leadership. The power the creators of religious discourse at Rome have to export their theological conclusions successfully rests upon two crucial factors: their ability to create policy free from politically expedient Imperial dictate; and their ability to make sure that the independent Western view is perceived as carrying a particular and significant worth. They have the former by consequence of the current political situation. Cultivating the latter, however, required a coherent and convincing approach. A narrative which articulated a particularly and acutely *Roman* Church, anchored in the traditions and power of the past, would be the basis for that approach.

Before proceeding, however, I must emphasize that this should not be considered an unprovoked attempt to take advantage of this situation for the purposes of a power grab. This is important in understanding why the language of tradition and the past becomes so important for the narratives constructed in this environment. The power elite in Rome are responding to political developments in the East (which were weakening the significance of the West's role in church politics) by counter attack. We can see the origins of the slow and steady undermining of Rome's position within the Empire-wide church in 381 A.D. Canon III of the Council of Constantinople states that, because of its political position as the New Rome, Constantinople will have a

bishop (patriarch) who is second in precedence only to the bishop of Rome.[236] Its new position as Imperial capital afforded Constantinople the honour of increased religious significance. Importantly, however, the implication of this statement to some in Rome must have been that "the pope had been honoured for no other reason than the political position of the 'older' Rome."[237] This precedent was built upon in 451 A.D., when, in the absence of the Roman legates, the Council of Chalcedon allotted new powers of jurisdiction to the Patriarchate of the Imperial capital (Canon XXVIII). In effect, the capital was now totally dominant in the East. It was the preeminent seat of ecclesiastical power there. Reflecting upon the reasons why the East engineered this move must have provided the Roman elite with legitimate grounds for concern. The Imperial government was responding to the chaos which the powerful office of the bishop of Alexandria had instigated. The battle for ecclesiastical authority between Constantinople and Alexandria was also a battle between the compromising power of a mediating political capital (Constantinople) and the implacable power of single-minded and righteous religious fervour (Alexandria and its monophysite monks). While admittedly attempting to provide a workable and sustainable framework in which the new Christian world order could exist, Constantinople was still using its proximity and intimacy with the levers of political power to undermine the ecclesiastical authority of an older, more established bishopric.[238]

The West was compelled to - and did - aggressively exploit the political situation in order to counter the enervating effects that the West believed the debates in the East had upon its power and prestige. In part, unlike the changing nature of the structures and philosophy of the education system discussed in chapter one, the increasing weakness of the church derives from the displacement of Italy from the centre of Empire. As shown above, Imperial patronage for a theological viewpoint could ensure

---

[236] Dvornik (1966), 50-57, argues that the powers that be in Rome were not unduly phased by this move. At the time, and prior to the rise of a far more independently robust and powerful bishopric in the mid-5th century (Leo onwards, see note 230 above), the loss of prestige and power was comparatively small. However, regardless of whether the Romans saw the significance of this at the time, this move does represent the beginnings of a general trend which threatened the power of the Roman church. Now that the papacy under Leo (though beginning its ascent under Damasius - note 230) represented a more established and powerful voice, there was more to lose.

[237] Meyendorff (1989), 62.

[238] Chalcedon was arranged by the Emperor Marcian and his wife Pulcheria. It condemned Alexandrian monophysitism and, at the instigation of the Empress, condemned Eutyches' followers.

the empire-wide promulgation of that message (via council edicts). Also, and more importantly, Imperial favour was clearly now almost impossible to court and be bestowed unless there was an overriding political necessity for it. The politicisation of religious debate had matured and developed since the clear implications of the decrees of the council of 381 (political power is the main reason for religious authority). In order to give their pronouncements the *gravitas* required to compete with Imperial diktat, they simply had to counter-act the increasingly and logically inevitable weaknesses in the church's current position within the post-Constantinian Roman world. The papacy and the power-brokers in Italy had to turn what was a weakness to their advantage.

The publication of the Henotikon, and the political environment in which it was received at Rome, gave extra leverage to those who wished to ensure that Roman pre-eminence in religious matters did not suffer the same decline in prestige which it had in secular matters. As we have been discussing, the papacy framed its behaviour within the context of suitable historical precedent to make it appear that it was a defender of tradition, not an innovator in an uncertain and evolving environment. This is a crucial consideration. The detachment from Imperial politics meant that the church in Rome would and could never fully engage with the day to day concerns of the Roman Empire. The tenor of religious debate in the East was determined by Imperial edicts which were increasingly mediating in nature. This left little room for the Imperial, empire-wide sanction (through council and edict) of views which did not pay heed to these concerns. Legitimacy for one's position would therefore have to pay attention to the prevailing discourse of Imperial political and religious unity. Thus the Italian church had one option which could help navigate these choppy waters: emphasize its *Roman* credentials at every available opportunity. It had to sell its message from within the Roman world while actually being outside its political parameters. It is in this spirit that we should consider the dealings with the Imperial capital of both Pope Felix, whom we saw in action above, and his successor, Gelasius, whom we will now discuss.

Roman Supremacy and the Language of the Past

Pope Gelasius (492 – 496), successor of Felix, the Pope who excommunicated Patriarch Acacius, took just as stringent a line with Acacius as his predecessor. Upon hearing of unrest (evils and murders) perpetrated by Acacius and his friends in the Eastern Empire, Gelasius flexed his ecclesiastical muscles. He sent out a demand that Patriarch Acacius should 'repent', adding that should he not penitently bend his knee to the humanity of the church's First See, Rome, Acacius would be condemned for all time.[239] This missive affirms the hegemony of the Bishop of Rome over Eastern Church affairs - something which Leo had made sure was recognised under Imperial supervision at Chalcedon and which Felix had assumed violated by the publication of the Henotikon. Again, however, the ground upon which these members of the elite in the West attempt to build their argument is not as firm as they would have us believe. It is important to remember the varying degrees of success Leo had in exerting his influence. As discussed earlier, Eutyches was reinstated and Patriarch Flavian banished: the power of the Alexandrian and Eastern bishops could, in alliance with an Emperor of a certain religious persuasion, overturn any synod decision. Also, Chalcedon, while affirming Roman primacy, does promote Constantinople to second place by reason of its political significance - thereby providing legitimate and reasonable grounds for any argument which sought to increase its power should political circumstance dictate (a diminution of Roman political influence or an increase of Constantinople – or both, as is clearly happening). The Romans would need more than Chalcedon to fall back upon.

In another letter to the Emperor Anastasius, Zeno's successor, Gelasius attempts to overcome the unpalatable Chalcedonian implications for Rome's religious power of the collapse in Roman political power by articulating another precedent.[240] This was

---

[239] *Huius temporibus iterum uenit relatio de Grecias eo quod multa mala et homicidia fierent a Petro et Acacio Constantinopolim…fecit synodum et misit per tractum Orientis et iterum misit et damnauit in perpetuum Acacium et Petrum, si non penitens…secundum humanitatem primae sedis ecclesiae.* **LP,** 51. For dating issues and the reliability of the text: Davis (1989) with a brief but instructive overview of the main dating issues, ix-xlviii. Eckhard Wirbelauer (1993) op. cit. for a comprehensive examination of the manuscript traditions, literary forms, and dating issues of all the documentation from all sections of the *LP* relevant to the papacy during Theoderic's reign. The work of Louis Duchesne (1886-1892, *Le Liber Pontificalis, Texte, introduction et commentaire*) endures as the most complete and comprehensive study of the *LP*, while also providing a good edition of the text.

[240] *duo sunt quippe, imperator auguste, quibus principaliter mundus hic regitur, auctoritas sacrata pontificum et regalis potestas, in quibus tanto gravius pondus est sacerdotum quanto etiam pro ipsis regibus hominum in divino reddituri sunt examine rationem.* **Epistola VIII, Patrologiae Latinae 59**

literally one of the traditional tropes of the history of the Roman church, employed infrequently and with varying degrees of plausibility over an extended period of time. In the letter Gelasius reminds the emperor that he as Pope has primacy over all churches, both east and west, and that the Emperor must acknowledge the time-honoured divinely ordained universe where priests and only priests can formulate spiritual doctrine. Moreover, the emperor must especially bow down before the authority of the Pope, as must all of the priests in the East. At this point Gelasius moves beyond the bureaucratic language of pre-eminence which implies a politically expedient reason for its structure and invokes the Apostolic tradition of the primacy of St Peter.[241] He reminds the emperor of God's wish to have the Bishop of Rome supreme in all church affairs (*auctoritas sacrata*). He also draws direct comparisons between his office as pope and the role of St Peter: just as St Peter holds the keys to the gates of heaven, so the pope is the man who can facilitate entry to heaven.[242] In effect he is building his argument upon the twin rocks of the Petrine tradition and the traditional authority which Leo had so firmly established in Chalcedon. Here Gelasius is able to do two things. He reaffirms the supremacy of his authority which had been called into question by the Henotikon, and, importantly, attempts to clearly delineate boundaries for his authority which surpass those he had previously. It is inconceivable that he could have been so daring, and clearly defined such a powerful position, had he been subject to the emperor's influence.

We do not need to look too far to find further proof that the political situation encouraged the power players in Rome to exploit this situation. In 449 A.D., a generation before Gelasius' papal administration, the Emperor Theodosius II saw fit not only to interfere with the decisions of councils, but also to see to it that Patriarchs were deposed if they were politically inconvenient. Flavian, the Patriarch of Constantinople, was stripped of his title and exiled by a council whose members Theodosius had hand picked.[243] As with the precedents of Constantine and John

---

[241] For the institution and development of the Petrine tradition, see Kesich, 'Peter's Primacy in the New Testament and the Early Tradition', in Meyendorff (1992), 35-67. For the development of the idea within the church in Rome from the 3rd century onwards, see Ray (1999), 145-160.

[242] Ibid.

[243] Evagrius, I.X. The president of the council, Dioscorus, was bribed into position by one of Theodosius' minions Chrysaphius.

Chrysostom discussed above, this would have been an all-too-fresh reminder for the papacy of the political interference an emperor was willing and able to exert.

The political situation Gelasius found himself in allowed him to pursue such a hard-line. Theoderic who held political power during Gelasius' papacy, showed no inclination to force the papacy into accepting the Henotikon. Theoderic was in part following Odoacer, the Germanic military commander who had assumed command in Italy from 476 to 490. Gelasius was going beyond attempting to protect Chalcedon by reiterating the generally accepted notion that Rome was first among equals as Felix had done. As well as dictating and limiting the parameters of the emperor's office, he was codifying by precedent (apostolicity) and law (council edict) the almost limitless power and authority of his own office. Again we see an opportunistic power grab (or rather an innovative attempt to redefine and bolster an existing role) justified by the power of Roman tradition and historical precedent.

The Challenges to the Roman Supremacy Narrative

I now want to look in more detail at some of the other problems the post-imperial political situation presented to the West in this period. We have already discussed how the inability of the West to involve itself fully in the internal political debates in the East made it difficult for them to lead the debate empire-wide. We have also examined the politicisation of christological debate in the East and how this undermined the authority of the West. In responding to these circumstances, we have witnessed examples of how both Felix and Gelasius used the changed political landscape to enhance the powers of the West. The changed circumstances of the late 5th century allowed them to shape and evolve the discourse freely which determined the perceived power of the papacy. We witnessed them doing so while using the past to present their opportunism as part of a historically sanctioned continuum. However, the power of the arguments that the Romans deployed in response to these dangers was itself undermined by a further consideration, which was a direct consequence of Italy's own internal political status. This further problem endangered the credibility of the message of traditional leadership which the West was trying to articulate.

Those trying to develop a strategy for the supremacy of Rome had an internal problem, which they had to overcome before attempting to counter attack the external threat from Constantinople. They could use the traditions and past glory of Rome to attempt to overpower and undermine any attacks upon its position. However, that approach had to sustain a discursive coherence and moral integrity to maintain the credibility necessary for the message to withstand the force of contemporary theological objections. Although it was clearly deemed necessary, the strength of the past alone was not sufficient to support the weight of the ambitions of the West. In the battle to control the creation and dissemination of religious discourse, one had to allow as little room as possible for one's opponents to move – and, if Rome wished to create a narrative which promulgated a role of moral and religious leadership for itself, it had to create a solid foundation upon which to erect it. A scrupulously orthodox and untainted church was a *sine qua non*. This presented the Romans with a problem. They were compelled to negotiate a *modus vivendi* with the Ostrogoths. The Ostrogoths were heretics. Those sections of the Roman elite which sought to exploit political and ecclesiastical divisions within the Roman World, even with the powerful weapon of constructed 'still-living' tradition at their disposal, would find a wider Imperial Roman world less than sympathetic to its message were it to be charged with tolerating heretics?[244]

The attitude of the Roman elite towards the Arianism of Theoderic, the King of Italy, seems ambiguous to say the least. According to the *LP*,[245] the contemporary papal records, Gelasius composed two books against Arius, the 4th century Alexandrian priest who gave his name to the Ostrogoths' religious denomination. These books, if they ever existed, are now lost – and given the low prominence the *LP* gives them,[246]

---

[244] When institutional integrity or prestige was under threat, articulation of religious difference was often one way in which groups in the late antique West sought to undermine their opponents: in the less fractious environment of Gaul, some Romans defined their opposition to the Goths along religious lines (Sidonius at Clermont). For Gaul's situation see Harries (1994), 233-235. The situation there differed from that in Italy, where religion was actively used by both emperor and King, Pope and Senator to attack and defend political interests - Justin's persecution of the Arians and Theoderic's retaliations, not to mention, as we shall see, Roman religious independence (supremacy) and pro-Greek conciliation.

[245] *LP*, 51.6.

[246] The books are mentioned last in a series of his literary works: *item duos libros adversus Arium [fecit] LP* 51. Even if they are genuine, as they constitute a fraction of his extensive *opera*, it is difficult not to conclude that they would have been little more than a fig leaf covering the Arian elephant in the room.

and the tiny part they play in his overall literary output, it seems clear that fighting Arianism could not have been one of Gelasius' main priorities. Perhaps this is easy enough to understand given that Gelasius did not possess the geographical and political detachment from Theoderic that he did from the Emperors in Constantinople. Furthermore, perhaps the papacy had its eye on the bigger picture. As some commentators have said,[247] those in positions of power in the Roman church would have been more interested in furthering the global reach of Roman policy than concentrating on converting or persecuting a fairly obscure and irrelevant sect such as the Arians. To imagine, however, that Odoacer and Theoderic's Arianism was insignificant to those who sought to make Rome a religious and cultural world-power would be a mistake.

Amory's view, although undoubtedly true, does not take into account the question of credibility. What is remarkable is that Gelasius spent so little time on the Arian controversy – not, as Amory says, that he spent more time on other things (which is understandable given his desire for empire-wide significance for the West). Simply ignoring a heretical sect which had such uneasy proximity to what the papacy wanted to call the pure centre of the Christian world is remarkable in itself. To back his claim that the Arians were insignificant, Amory asserts that perhaps the Arians were not specifically 'Roman' to the Roman mind in the same way that those in the East were Roman heretics. They were "simply blow-ins", who, in Amory's view, would be gone soon enough. Their heresy was not new and therefore not threatening in the same way that a new heresy would be to a Pope trying to stop deviation within the current religious framework. He argues that the West and East were still part of an existing religious union and that a genuine desire on the West's part to maintain this union (within a framework outlined by Rome) caused it to largely ignore what was not central to this concern.

There are several problems with this approach. Firstly, Amory himself argues that there was an indigenous Italian Arian sect which dated back to the time of St

---

[247] "It may seem incredible that Gelasius spent more time and energy fighting distant monophysitism than the Arian heresy right on his doorstep. But the beliefs of a new, local and possibly temporary ruler must have seemed insignificant in the pope's powerful vision of a single catholic 'ecclesiological society'" Amory (1997), 197-198.

Ambrose[248]. If there were still a Roman Arian sect dating to this time, would it not have been consistent and logical to root out this longstanding and indigenous nest of Arians in the same way that other indigenous sects (Manichees) were attacked? Moreover, Ambrose was a vigorous opponent of Arianism. He famously dedicated considerable effort in *de Fide* (2.16.139) to attacking both the barbarian threat and the odious nature of their Arian faith. As the pre-eminent bishop in Italy and an admirer of Ambrose[249] it is difficult to argue that Gelasius would not have been attracted by the idea of a traditional Ambrosian attack upon the barbarians and their creed had he been willing and able. Also, what of the Manichees? They were even more of a non-Roman, temporally detached sect looming large past and present in the Roman mind. Gelasius does not keep his powder dry on them. As we shall see in the discussion relating to this in our final chapter, some Romans were acutely aware of the problem of Arianism and tried to 'launder' it retrospectively by washing it in a language which radiated orthodoxy.[250] We should look at this theological and doctrinal inconsistency as evidence that Western reluctance to interact meaningfully with Arianism was about more than simply not having the time to concern itself with peripheral matters. I think that we must accept that, like its increasingly robust articulation of absolute ecclesiastical supremacy, part of the West's lack of focus on Arianism had much to do with the changed political landscape.

Arianism was on the radar and was a problem. As we have already seen, voices from within the Roman elite were taking advantage of this political situation to bolster the power and prestige of the church and its particular message world-wide. The political situation was a strength there. Now, endeavouring to consolidate the credibility of the message, the church uneasily attempted to ignore the Arian elephant in the room. It was a central concern of the papacy to make sure that the already straining Catholic community did not fragment further. However, at the same time the Romans wished

---

[248] Ibid, 237-240. On the nature of Arianism in Northern Italy, its nature, its interaction with the local Roman population, and its close relationship with Illyrian Arianism, see Humphries (1999), 127-135. McLynn (1994), 104-214, and Williams (1995), 69-104 provide both reaction to and summary of the activities of the Arians in Italy in this period.

[249] *Fecit [Gelasius] et hymnos in modum beati Ambrosii.* LP 51

[250] The presentation of Theoderic's Arianism in the *Anonymus Valesianus* really does highlight this uneasiness. I shall deal with this in detail in the final chapter.

the fallout from the Henotikon, the Acacian schism, to appear the construct of heretics in the east undermining orthodox Chalcedonian faith – the creed which empowered them and their church. Rome, the would-be leader of a newly delineated world order, could lend more credence to this attack by creating a narrative which projected the idea that it was not soft on heretics of all denominations - not just those within the narrow confines of the 'Roman catholic' framework Amory delineates. Such a message would facilitate the moral authority necessary for the sustained attack upon Eastern heresy.

Addressing the Challenge: the Counter Narrative

Once again it is possible to see the outlines of responses from within the elite which attempt to shape the solid, seemingly invariant and unchanging building blocks of tradition to meet the needs of particular ideological goals. Let us return to the *LP*. It has some interesting and alluringly convincing evidence of these narratives. The sections of the *LP* which describe events under the reign of Theoderic almost certainly derive from a contemporary Italian source.[251] It should therefore be understood as a product of the prevailing discourse from the end of the 5th century up until 536 A.D., at the lastest. The lives contained in one edition are not overly sympathetic to those Romans who looked kindly upon either the Henotikon, or upon rapprochement with the Eastern Church on the Henotikon's terms. An instructive example of this tendency can be found in its account of the papacy of Anastasius. It virtually damns the memory of Pope Anastasius because, according to the *LP*, he had attempted to rehabilitate the unfortunate Acacius, author of the Henotikon: *multi clerici et presbiteri se a communione ipsius [Acacii] erigerunt...quia voluit occulte*

---

[251] Mommsen posited the idea that both editions of the *LP* were compiled one hundred years after the schisms caused by the Henotikon (Mommsen (1898), vii-xviii, *Gestorum Pontificum Romanorum pars I: Liber Pontificalis, MGH*). Duchesne's original supposition, that the compliers of both editions were native to the early to mid 6th century (xxxvi-xlviii, 1886), has held the day: Davis (2000), xii-xvi, xlii-xlviii, supports and agrees with Duchesne's arguments. Eckhard Wirbelauer (100-150) in his recent study on the material specifically relevant to the Ostrogothic period, also follows Duchesne, in asserting that the individuals who edited and compiled the two editions of the *LP* were contemporaries of the situation, who were compiling and emending the lives up until 536 A.D., at the latest. Duchesne, Davis, and Wirbelauer all point to several areas of evidence: the familiarity of the author(s) with the events (interestingly, this is one of the reasons why Mommsen thought that the writers were compliers from the 7th century - their thorough presentation of events must have sprung from historical documents rather than a reliance on imperfect recollection); an inaccurate rendering of the life of Vigilius suggesting a new compiler unfamiliar with (and temporally removed from) events; personal bias and partisan emotion filtering into the text (as we shall see in relation to Anastasius). Noble (1985), 347-8 n.3, offers a useful bibliographical overview of discussion relating to all aspects of the *LP*.

revocare Acacium et non potuit (*LP* 52). It does not mention the specifics of what form this clandestine attempt to have Acacius reinstated took, but it is clear that the *LP* does not look favourably upon any attempts to rehabilitate Acacius. In the *LP*, the now dead Anastasius is described as *qui nutu divino percussus est*: "he who was slain by divine command" (*LP* 52). It is unquestionably a voice in acquiescence with the goals and ideas of its favourably portrayed subjects and antithetical to those of its opponents.

Three of the four popes who follow Felix stoutly and resolutely refuse to compromise on the Henotikon – the unfavourably portrayed Anastasius being the exception. In the *LP* they are all praised for their attempts to root out heresy wherever they found it. Gelasius, the *LP* says, was at the forefront of events when a group of dangerous Manicheans were found at Rome. It describes a 5th century bonfire of the Manichean vanities, as Gelasius burned the books of the Manichees before the doors of Santa Maria Maggiore in Rome: *Huius temporibus inventi sunt Manichei in urbe Roma quos exilio deportati praecepit, quorum codices ante fores basilicae sanctae Mariae incendio concremavit* (*LP* 51). The Manichees were, of course, famously and canonically demonized by Augustine of Hippo, who was himself a convert from the sect. They had also been banned by Imperial decree some 100 years before.[252] So theologically and politically they had very much become to the Late Antique mind what Hannibal and the Carthaginians had been to the Late Republican/Early Imperial mind. With rather less left to the imagination, and in much greater depth and colour, Augustine did to the Manichees what Livy had done to the Carthaginians. The act, therefore, of deporting the Manichees from Italy, allied to the spectacular bonfire before the doors of Santa Maria Maggiore, was highly significant. It affirmed that Italy did not tolerate heretics and, moreover, that the Romans in the West had the ability to remove undesirables from their soil forcibly. This act very much presents those in Rome exercising power in the name of orthodoxy and free from any non-Roman political interference.

---

[252] Augustine wrote numerous works against the Manichees (*contra Manicheos*), as well as devoting sections of the *Confessions* (book V especially) to attacking the Manichees and himself for his own weakness in following them. The emperor Theodosius in 381-382 A.D. by imperial decree stripped the Manichees of their rights and then outlawed them on pain of death

The successor of unfortunate Pope Anastasius, Symmachus, also had his hands full with the dreaded Manichean threat. Symmachus was equally as implacable an enemy of the Henotikon as Gelasius – if not more so. The account of Symmachus in the *LP* is extremely interesting. He is a deeply controversial and divisive figure at this time (the details of which we will discuss at length later in the chapter) and the *LP* account goes into some detail when depicting selected aspects of the controversies surrounding him. What is significant for our purposes here is that, after a long introductory passage which effectively attempts to blacken the name of all of Symmachus' opponents while simultaneously presenting Symmachus in the best light possible, the *LP* begins its formal introduction of his many worthy deeds (which are comparatively extensive) with his discovery and treatment of heretics in Rome. The *LP* describes how Symmachus finds some Manichees in Rome and, in a manner which eerily evokes the questionable achievements of Savonarola, burns the pictures and statues of the Manichees as well as, their books: *beatus Symmachus invenit Manicheos in urbe Roma, quorum omnia simulacra vel codices ante fores basilicae Constantinianae incendio concremavit et eos ipsos exilio religavit* (*LP* 53). Symmachus, who, as we will discuss later, is beholden to the Ostrogoths for his position of power, and whose supporters are likewise beholden to the Gothic regime,[253] has a biography which showcases his anti-heretical credentials very prominently. The close relationship the papacy has with an Arian King is undeniable. Those exercising power and shaping policy in the Roman church relied on the ability of the Ostrogothic regime to provide them with the freedom from political interference necessary to develop their powerbase. The emphasis on the anti-heretical nature of Symmachus' activities diverts attention away from the uncomfortable fact that Symmachus is beholden to the Ostrogoths for his individual position and for the increasing power and prestige of his office (especially when considering how the politically expedient worldview of the Imperial capital would have encouraged the opposite trend).

We can see this process just as clearly in the *LP*'s account of Symmachus' successor, Pope Hormisdas. He is the last of the anti-Henotikon popes to be presented as a scourge of the Manicheans. His regime eventually presided over the full capitulation

---

[253] Ennodius, the King's *arbiter Romanitatis*, is a keen follower and apologist for Symmachus.

of the East to the West's demands for total supremacy and full acceptance of Chalcedon – and the renunciation of the Henotikon. He too finds some of them in Rome and burns their books in front of the doors of the *basilica Constantiniana*: *hic invenit Manicheos, quos etiam discussit cum examinatione plagarum, exilio deportavit; quorum codices ante fores basilicae Constantinianae incendio concremavit* (*LP* 54). Like Symmachus, Hormisdas relies on his relationship with Theoderic, King of Italy and Arian heretic, for his position of power. In the passage immediately preceding the above section describing his persecution of the Manichees, the *LP* described how the West had to rely on the advice and authority of the King in its dealings with the East. The King advises (*cum consilio Regis Theodorici LP* 54) and directs the conduct of the Pope (*Hormisdas perrexit ad regem Theodoricum Ravenna et cum consilio misit auctoritatem ad Iustinum*).

If the previous generation of popes had been presented just as enthusiastically anti-Manichean, interpreting the presentation of the post-Imperial Italian popes in the way that I have tried to would, perhaps, have been more problematic. However, in the *LP*, which covers nearly 700 years of papal activity, the Manichees are only mentioned six times. The first three times we come across them is during the 4th century, when the sect was bringing its influence to bear on figures such as Augustine of Hippo. Miltiades (310-314 A.D.) discovers some Manichees in Rome not long after the decrees of Diocletian outlawing them – though the *LP* does not elaborate. The next two discoveries happen under the watches of Siricius and Anastasius I (384-401 A.D.). Both were leaders of the church at the time when Augustine was professor of rhetoric at Milan and was penning many of his anti-Manichean pamphlets.[254] So the prevailing religious discourse was very much being formed by a literary elite, whose theological output cultivated an environment in which attacking the Manichees was a peer-sanctioned holy mission. Of much more direct relevance to our argument, however, we find that the other three references to the Manichees are in the biographies of Gelasius, Symmachus, and Hormisdas. It is only in these three biographies that we find the popes burning the Manichean books and *simulacra*. So, we find only six references to the direct involvement of the elite of the Roman church

---

[254] *Contra Faustum Manichaeum* 397 A.D.; *Contra Felicem Manichaeum* 398 A.D.; *Contra Secundinum Manichaeum* 399 A.D

with the Manichees in the nearly 700 years of papal activity the *LP* covers. The first three are clearly responding to the literary and political concerns of their time. The last three accounts, however, the savagery and violence of which marks them out from the other three, seem to me, at least, to be remarkable for their conveniently distracting timeliness.

Before leaving this subject, it may prove useful to quickly refer to the *LP* again to reinforce the point that the role the King played in Roman Church affairs was a topic of discomfort for the Western elite. The biography of Pope Hormisdas which we examined above actually has a fairly interesting and instructive divergent manuscript tradition.[255] In one of the editions all references to the King advising and directing the behaviour of Hormisdas are gone. Indeed, it says that, far from the King proactively helping Hormisdas, he was actually ordered by the 'orthodox' emperor Justin to help the Pope. Both editions, it is generally agreed, do date from after the launch of the Eastern 'reconquest' of Italy.[256] Looking back at a pre-Byzantine Italy, it must have been difficult to depict the regime in the West tolerating an Arian King advising them. They were now the champions of orthodoxy, and the new head of a unified catholic church. The post-Gothic elite were now using the power of the state to enforce orthodoxy (anti-Arian as well as anti-Manichean, not to mention the various other sects whose existence the new orthodoxy was not going to tolerate). Perhaps it is possible to understand this inconsistent manuscript tradition in light of this consideration. The Byzantine Italian elite had to control their past in order to validate their present and ensure their future (free from heresy). Likewise, the Roman elite under the Ostrogoths had to use their past in order to empower themselves in the present and guarantee future primacy.

I should make it clear, though, that I am not passing judgement on whether there actually were 'nests' of Manichees in Rome. In a sense that is irrelevant to the point at hand. We know only too well of recent instances of politically convenient pogroms

---

[255] There were two versions of the text. One, an epitome, which and the other a second version which was augmented with later material and revised. The second version is used throughout this thesis. See Davis (2000), xii onward for the details. The appendix of the epitome is found in both Duchesne and Davis.

[256] See note 251 above.

against those who have been a constant feature of society. The Manichees were the right medicine at the right time for a group of people who were trying to sell the idea of Roman supremacy to the wider world. They provided an opportunity to project the necessary narrative (through action and the sympathetic literary presentation of that action) of the holders of religious power in Rome as the purveyors and guardians of the true, uncontaminated faith. The persecution of the Manicheans provided the Roman Church with a platform from which to showcase their zeal and enthusiasm for the uncovering and punishing of heresy. Furthermore, it enabled them to control the pace and direction of debate – ensuring that the inconvenient Arianism was never high in their constructed and projected hierarchy of heresies. In effect it helped to facilitate Rome's attempts to dominate and control the religious discourse and the direction of future cultural and religious life in a wider Roman world. It was a handy tool for downgrading the significance of any embarrassingly disadvantageous facts - like the church's location in a state controlled by heretics. Consequently it is also very handy for keeping the moral high ground necessary for the maintenance of the preeminent ecclesiastical position so opportunely legitimized with a little help from the past.

Conclusion: This Discourse is Real and is Serving Function in Elite Society

The activities and sympathies of others who wished to champion the case of Rome's primacy and keep Constantinople at arms' length are not difficult to discern. Pope Symmachus, at the synod convened to assess his suitability as Pope, was absolved of all the charges laid at his door[257] by the synod on the grounds that only God and the Pope himself had the ability to judge the incumbent of the Bishopric of Rome, and so managed to confirm his own position. In his defence of Pope Symmachus, Ennodius, the benefactor of so many pupils at Deuterius' school, having listed the reasons why the Pope was innocent of the calumnies directed at him - and also, in familiar rhetorical practice, aiming a few well-directed barbs at those who made them - closes his case for the defence by reiterating the idea that the Pope is indeed above temporal censure.[258] We can see that the political situation in Italy at the time gave the Papacy the freedom to undertake a policy which did not have to pay heed to the political

---

[257] *LP*, 52

[258] *Magni Felicis Ennodi Opera*, ed. Vogel: 49:93.

desires of the Emperor of the day. Once again we recall that the Emperor Theodosius II, under pressure to do something about violent unrest in the eastern churches, was able not only to interfere with the decisions of councils, but also to see to it that Patriarchs were deposed if they were politically inconvenient (Flavian the Patriarch of Constantinople was stripped of his title and exiled by a council whose members Theodosius had hand picked). And adding to this that Theodosius' policy was later reversed by a more Chalcedonian Emperor, Marcian, it is easy to understand the attraction of political independence to Felix, Symmachus, Gelasius, and Hormisdas.

So tradition and precedent provided the Roman elite in Ostrogothic Italy with the armoury to construct a powerful role for itself. This is easy to understand. We have seen above the very real problems that the marked deterioration in the political situation in Rome during Late Antiquity in general presented to the Roman elite in ecclesiastical affairs. From the assault upon the ecclesiastical authority of Rome from the New Rome, which attempted to define Rome's role in relation to its declining political power, to the specific problems caused by Ostrogothic rule in Italy (challenge to Rome's moral authority presented by the accommodation they had reached with heretic Arians) those championing the supremacy of the Roman Church did not have their problems to seek. However, the language of continuity and tradition was employed to take full advantage of the opportunity presented to them by the political situation - facing full-on the external challenge to its authority from outside Italy. In diminishing the importance of a potentially awkward relationship with heresy, voices from within the elite sought to address one of the internal dangers which threatened to undermine the credibility of their claim to orthodox credentials. Managing to carve out a powerful role while adapting and evolving in this changed world was a difficult procedure. This constantly changing political environment provided some within the Roman religious elite with an opportunity to make a difference in empire-wide affairs once again. In this regard, incorporating their actions into a narrative of continuity from a still-living and empowering past, gave them the autonomy to tackle the problems the changed times offered in the present.

An Alternative Roman Response

The papal records from this period also reflect the emerging picture of a plurality of responses from within the elite to the religious issues of the day. Accepting the picture the *LP* present of the progress of the Henotikon controversy could lead one to believe that men like Pope Anastasius and his dangerously conciliatory inclinations were the evil exception. Reading its account, one could be forgiven for thinking that those condemning Acacius while preaching the absolute and unimpeachable supremacy and sanctity of Roman religious hegemony were ubiquitous and that the Roman elite universally saw the Henotikon as a threat. Unsurprisingly, there is evidence of some in Rome who took a much less hard line in relation to an Eastern rapprochement. Indeed, there is evidence which offers an alternative view from within Rome of a significantly divergent stance in relation to the schisms. Once again I will concentrate on the use made of the language of tradition and the past in constructing this counter narrative.

There is an extract from the manuscript known as the Laurentian fragment. This document survives in a single manuscript from the Verona region, but given its similarity to the *LP* in theme and form (but certainly not content), it is appended to most editions of the *LP*. In this extract, Anastasius II and his ecclesiastical writings are instilled with divine authority; their celestially validated sentiments are given as proof that the continuation of the schism is, as the source says, 'quite pointless': *quae [litteras] tanta scribturarum caelestium auctoritate suffulta est, ut qui hanc intenta mente sub divino timore perlegerit, inaniter…tam schisma nefarium perdurare cognoscit.*[259] Not exactly the same Anastasius we meet in the *LP*, who was struck down by God's will for being in league with the excommunicated Acacius. In fact the fragment presents the reader with something more than a divergent view on a single issue (this pope); it presents the reader with an alternative view of the progression of the Acacian schism from the viewpoint of those within Rome, whose lack of

---

[259] Louis Duchesne, (1886-1892) 44; Davis (2000), appendix 2, 103. It is difficult to assert with any confidence which version was produced first. It seems likely that the official *LP* account was produced first by a supporter of Symmachus, and the Laurentian fragment later by a supporter of Laurentius. Wirbelauer op. cit. 142-147, following Duchesne suggests as much, but cautions: 'Über ihr Verhältnis zueinander, abgesehen von der erkennbaren Gegnerschaft, ist nichts weiter bekannt: ich sehe insbesondere keine Möglichkeit, ihre zeitliche Abfolge zu entscheiden'. See commentary in Duchesne (1886-1892) *Le Liber Pontificalis*, XXX/XXXII for discussion on origin and identity of the complier; also introduction in Davis (2000), on potential motivations for the production of the divergent Laurentian fragment.

intransigence towards Constantinople found a champion in a Roman Archpriest named Laurentius.

Before moving directly onto the arguments arranged by the supporters of Laurentius, it will be necessary to discuss the events surrounding the further schism which the Henotikon indirectly inspired: the Laurentian schism. It developed in Rome between those discussed above, who saw the conditions of the Acacian schism as fertile ground on which to exploit the independence and develop the power of the Roman church, and those who valued unity with the Eastern Church above all other considerations. Exactly five days after the death of Pope Anastasius in 498 A.D., two candidates were simultaneously elected Pope.[260] The Sardinian deacon Symmachus was proclaimed pontiff at a ceremony in what the *LP* calls the Constantinian Basilica, that is, the modern *Caput Ecclesiae urbis et mundi,* San Giovanni in Laterano. On the other side of town, the Roman Archpriest Laurentius was proclaimed pope at a ceremony in the equally grand basilica of Santa Maria Maggiore. This began what is known as the Laurentian schism. The conflict was at its most intense during the years 498 to 506 A.D. (when Laurentius finally went into exile in Naples) and dragged on until Pope Symmachus died in 514 A.D.

In the standard *LP*'s version of the Life of Symmachus, the resolution to the immediate problem of who should hold the papacy, both contestants willingly agree to let the King arbitrate. The King sets out sound and fair conditions (who was first ordained and whose faction is the largest for election). We are then informed that Symmachus is duly, and fairly, elected: *hoc constituerunt partes ut ambo ad Ravennam pergerent, ad iudicium Regis Theodorici. Qui dum ambo introissent Ravennam, hoc iudicium aequitatis invenit ut qui primo ordinatus fuisset, vel ubi pars maxima cognoscerentur, ipse sederet in sedem apostolicam. Quod tamen aequitas in Symmachum invenit cognitione veritatis et factus est praesul Symmachus.* There is, unsurprisingly, a startlingly different account given in the Laurentian fragment: *Tunc coguntur utrique, Symmachus scilicet et Laurentius, regium subituri iudicium petere*

---

[260] *AV,* 65. *LP*, 53.

comitatum : ibi Symmachus multis pecuniis optinet, Laurentius ad gubernandam ecclesiam Nucerinam…plurimis coactus minis promissionibusque dirigitur[261].

<u>*Another Elite, Another Past, Serving Another Purpose*</u>

Another Past

There are many levels of difference in both reports which shadow both versions' diametrically opposed descriptions of the nature of Pope Anastasius. Just as the *LP* declares that Anastasius was struck down by God's will, and the Laurentian fragment that his (Anastasius') was a divinely inspired papacy, so the *LP* proclaims the fairness of proceedings, whereas the fragment bitterly laments the lurid, underhand bribery and physical intimidation. What is particularly interesting, though, is the way the role of the King is framed in both narratives. In the pro-Symmachan *LP*, the King is very much presented as the wise and just ruler of Old Testament and Imperial biography[262]. Theoderic wisely sets out two guiding principles (who was ordained first and who has the most support), which are deemed 'fair', and he applies them to the situation in front of him. The result is that Symmachus is the logical choice for the new pope. Both contestants are seemingly happy with the King's decision, with Symmachus going off to be pope and Laurentius becomes bishop of Nuceria.

The Laurentian fragment does not construct a short direct attack upon the King in the way that the *LP* pointedly and laconically lauds him. The criticism is indirect and subtle, drawing on implication and prejudice. Only after this well-crafted message acquires most of its strength, does the author's narrative point directly at Theoderic, gently placing the weak and ineffectual King at the head of proceedings. Firstly, however, the unprecedented nature of proceedings is implied. Both of them (*utrique*) are compelled (*coguntur*) to go to court in order to submit (*subituri*) themselves to royal judgment. Both Symmachus and Laurentius, of course, are members of that group of elite Romans whose input shapes and develops policy for the Church in Italy - and, they hope, the rest of the Imperial world. Highlighting the subjugation of the

---

[261] *LP* 53; *Laurentian Fragment*, Duchesne, 44

[262] See chapter 3 for a fuller account of the contemporary use of religious and secular literary prototypes in the presentation of the King. There are several examples in the *Anonymus Valesianus* of the author creating his favourable version of the King out of the building blocks of Imperial biography and biblical precedent.

office of the papacy to a secular ruler would invite a less than flattering comparison with the thrusting and vigorous stance of Gelasius and Felix. The position Felix and Gelasius took when confronted with the imposition of the offices of secular rulers into ecclesiastical affairs was one of uncompromising attack against the Emperors in Constantinople for their meddling. As we discussed above, the opposition to secular interference in Roman Church affairs was painstakingly and forcefully articulated by Felix and Gelasius, using the power of a still-living past to validate it. The subtext to the presentation of story of the papal election in the Laurentian fragment must surely have fed into this extant discourse. Thus we must see the story as an attack upon the legitimacy of the election because of the untraditional compulsion of the candidates to subject themselves to royal power.

After implying illegitimacy, the Laurentian fragment moves on to depict a royal court which was designed to inspire a particular response in the minds of its Roman audience – pro-Symmachan or pro-Laurentian. The account of the forcible subpoena is accompanied by a description of the nature of the court which they were summoned to. Luxury and corruption win the day: *Symmachus multis pecuniis optinet*. Violence and intimidation are employed to exile Laurentius against his will: *Laurentius ad gubernandam ecclesiam Nucerinam…plurimis coactus minis promissionibusque dirigitur*. At the head of this court, the Laurentian fragment places a passive King quite unlike the decisive and wise King of the *LP*: *Ad hanc insinuationem Regis animus delinitus; patricio Festo praecepta dirigit, admonens ut omnes ecclesiae tituli Symmacho reformentur et unum Romae pateretur esse pontificem* (Duchesne, 46[263]). The decisive King of the *LP* gives way to a King whose weak resolve dissolves in the face of some minor sophistry from an Eastern bishop (the *insinuatio* of the first line). This account of proceedings very much implies that the victory of Symmachus was the product of his fortune at being able to negotiate his way through the corridors of power of an avaricious, violent, and intellectually-challenged administration. This is a narrative which highlights all of those attributes which the Roman mind firmly associates with the traditional archetype of the barbarian. It also, as we shall see in

---

[263] The page numbers of Duchesne's edition will be used as reference markers for all Laurentian fragment citations.

chapter 3, has a close relationship with a characterisation of the King that forms the backbone of the 'bad' Theoderic of the *Anonymus Valesianus*.

Another Elite and Another Purpose

The above attempt to counter the pro-Symmachan narrative of the *LP* presents an obviously very sophisticated and nuanced understanding of the power and the captivating potential of cultivating a response which is susceptible to the allure of traditional characterisations and past customs. This individual response to the crises caused by the Henotikon can, I believe, be placed within a wider discourse which tends towards the same ideological and political goal. So I want to move on to look at some of the individual responses from those who were clearly sympathetic to the same goals and prejudices as the writer of the Laurentian fragment. The focus will be on their use of the past and how it interacts with the theological and political aspirations of the narrative focus in the writings of the fragment. By examining how opposing forces used their shared past to shape their own divergent aims, it is possible to understand something fundamental about who these people were and who they wanted to be.

This section of the chapter will go into the detail of the language used in the argumentation which betrays the common narrative purpose of accommodation with the East and pragmatism over hard-line supremacy. Before plunging straight into that detail, it may help the progression of the argument to sketch an outline of the protagonists' ideological concerns, which an examination of their use of the language of the past will fill in bolder and more striking colour later.

LP 53 provides us with the names of some of those who were actively working against the interests of Symmachus while also trying to further the cause of Laurentius. It also claims in this section that, four years after the election of Symmachus, the schism flared up again owing to the activities of the supporters of Laurentius: *Post annos vero IIII, zelo ducti aliqui ex clero et alii ex senatu, maxime Festus et Probinus, incriminaverunt Symmachum et subornaverunt testes falsos quos miserunt Ravennam ad regem Theodoricum, accusantes beatum Symmachum* (*LP*

53).[264] The Laurentian schism may have 'started up' again at this point. It obviously started with the dual election of the popes. Seeing it in a wider context, John Moorhead[265] sees the Laurentian schism as nothing more or less than the continuation of hostilities in Rome which were still bubbling over, at the very latest, from the activities of Pope Anastasius. However, our concern is not simply the Laurentian schism. We are looking at these individuals' responses to the Henotikon in the context of Theoderic's Italy. As is clear from the progress of my argument to this point, this thesis is predicated upon the assumption that there are distinct elite discourses in Ostrogothic Italy whose direction and momentum (their cohesion) are conditioned by a discernible attachment to certain theological and cultural goals. So within the context of this discussion, we must move beyond the narrow confines of the symptoms of the malaise (such as the 'Laurentian schism'), towards an approach which sees the significance of the individual manifestations of the schism as part of a wider battle, the characteristics of which can be discerned through their shared narrative purpose.

To this end, we must evaluate the evidence for the political inclinations of those involved in the matter. As we will soon see, there is evidence that those who were firm supporters of Laurentius were also very much connected with Pope Anastasius and his efforts to find a compromise with Constantinople. Moreover, there is equally firm evidence that the supporters of Symmachus were also supporters of Roman ecclesiastical supremacy and the freedom from Imperial intervention the Ostrogothic Kingdom gave them in their attempts to achieve it.

Firstly, let us look at those who were connected with Laurentius and provide that preliminary outline of their ideological concerns. As we saw above, the *LP* provides the names of two prominent Roman citizens, Probinus and Festus: *Post annos uero IIII, zelo ducti aliqui ex clero et alii ex senatu, maxime Festus et Probinus, incriminauerunt Symmachum…et occulte revocauerunt Laurentium post libellum Romae factum; et fecerunt schisma, et diuisus est iterum; et alii communicabant*

---

[264] The Laurentian fragment, unsurprisingly, plays down the role of the Laurentians in fermenting unrest while highlighting the sins of Symmachus.

[265] Moorhead (1992), 58-60

Symmacho, alii Laurentio.[266] The Laurentian fragment also confirms that Festus had a particularly close relationship with the Archpriest Laurentius. In a passage which sympathetically describes Laurentius' magnanimous reaction to the final quashing of his hopes to become pontiff, we find out that Laurentius retreated from the world of Roman religious politics to the estate of the patrician Festus.[267]

Festus deserves closer examination. During the papacy of Anastasius, King Theoderic sent this same Festus as his representative to the Emperor of the East, also, confusingly, named Anastasius, to accept the emperor's blessing for his rule - the circumstances surrounding the delay in Imperial recognition (five years) are varied, but as they have a bearing upon the nature of the King's position in relation to the factions, I will deal with them later. Festus' mission must have begun after the accession of Pope Anastasius II in 496 and before his death in 498. This can be determined by the assurances Festus gives to the Emperor Anastasius regarding the future behaviour of the Pope Anastasius, so the event must have happened between 496 and 498 A.D. The source of this information - the Chronographia of the 9th century Byzantine scholar Theophanes of Constantinople – reveals what the nature of these assurances was.[268] If Theophanes' account is accurate, we know that Festus had in fact promised the Emperor Anastasius that he (Festus) could persuade Pope Anastasius to accept the Henotikon of the Emperor Zeno. The account of Festus' visit to Constantinople concludes (perhaps following the pro-Symmachan line of the official mediaeval papal records) with Theophanes describing how Festus returned to Rome to find Anastasius (the pope, not the emperor) dead, whereupon he bribed the local clergy in a bid to have a certain Laurentius elected as Bishop. It is doubtful that Festus would have expended so much energy on the campaign to elect Laurentius had he not been convinced that his election would allow him to fulfil his promise to Anastasius (the emperor) to have the Holy See of Rome accept the Henotikon.

---

[266] *LP,* 53

[267]*Quod ubi Laurentius comperit, urbem noluit iuturna conluctatione uexari, ac sua sponte in praediis memorati patricii Festi sine delatione concessit.* Laurentian fragment, 52. Of course we also remember from chapter 1 that both Festus and Probinus are spoken of in the same breath, so to speak, as Boethius and Symmachus, the two major recipients of, and advocates for a bilingual, pluralistic education (i.e., Greek).

[268]Theophanes*, Chronographia, 5993.*

It is clear, then, that Festus was extremely sympathetic to the cause of accommodation with the East over the issue of the Henotikon. His actions, as presented in the *LP*, show too that he understood that furthering one's political goals in these changed times required the validation of placing them within the framework of precedent and tradition. In the *LP*, in the life of Symmachus, we can see that Festus and Probinus attempt to undermine the position of pope Symmachus. This is achieved through a direct appeal to tradition, which has a philosophical justification based upon distinctly pro-Eastern/Imperial criteria.

Festus made a direct attack upon what he considered to be an innovation which would have endangered the relationship with the East that he and his colleagues wanted. The circumstances can be reconstructed from the two divergent accounts of Symmachus' life. Where the *LP* does not go into any detail, the Laurentian fragment does. The fragment explains what, one day, led the King to order Symmachus to court: *quem [Symmachum] rex sub occasione paschali, quod non cum universitate celebraverat ad comitatum convo[cat], rationem [quasi de] festivitatis dissonantia redditurum, fecit que aput Ariminum* (Laurentian fragment, 44). The key phrase here is *cum universitate*. It undoubtedly refers to the general and received practice of the church in relation to its celebration of Easter. At this time in Rome, Easter was celebrated according to the 'long-used Alexandrian calendar.'[269] In 501 A.D. the old Roman system was out of sync with the now traditional Alexandrian system and it would seem that Pope Symmachus, 'probably to show his contempt for all things Greek',[270] reverted to the old system. As the account in the *LP* makes clear, it was Festus and Probinus who were the main protagonists (*maxime Festus et Probinus*) in alerting the King to the situation. Festus and others were seeking to undermine the position of Symmachus by alerting the King to an innovation which would cause open hostilities in his kingdom. This move was probably an innovation too far for those sympathetic to the Henotikon's cause. Festus and his friends in the clergy were thus allowed to present themselves as the defenders of traditional Roman practice.

---

[269] Noble (1993), 406. See Moorhead (1992), 114f, for a fuller discussion on the computations of the differing Easter dates in this year.

[270] Noble (1993), 406.

There is a further aspect to this attempt which deserves some attention. Festus and Probinus' attempt to undermine the activities of Symmachus also included an articulation of the punishment they felt justified for Symmachus' transgressions over the dates of Easter. Both the *LP* and the Laurentian Fragment provide the valuable details in this regard. According to the *LP*, *Tunc Festus et Probinus miserunt relationem regi et coeperunt agere ut visitatorem daret rex sedi apostolicae* (*LP* 53). Festus and Probinus were effectively trying to depose Symmachus from the papal throne and, in the interim, have an external visitor execute his Episcopal duties. Going by the evidence of the sources, the interim period was to cover the celebration of Easter: *Pro diebus autem paschalibus ab omnibus paene vir venerabilis Petrus, Altinatis episcopus, a rege visitator Ecclesiae Romanae deposcitur* (Laurentian fragment, 45). Whether this was the Easter of 501 (and thus the Alexandrian date which Symmachus ignored) is difficult to determine.[271] Nevertheless, what is significant is that, in attempting to have the King install a 'visitor' in place of Symmachus, Festus and Probinus were not stepping outwith the confines of traditional behaviour. Should both men have needed to convince the King of the legitimacy of this move, there was a clear and very apposite tradition set in the Western Empire which catered for this very occasion. In 419 A.D., during the disputed papal election between Boniface and Eulalius, the Emperor Honorius decreed that the bishop of Spoleto, Achilleus, should take over the celebration of the *sanctae paschae dies*.[272] No doubt what would have made this move all the more attractive was that its inspiration, the Eulalius/Boniface situation, had resulted in the deposition of one Pope and the re-election of his defeated rival.

Attacking Symmachus was about more than simply backing Laurentius. It was about undermining the attempts to put further distance between Rome and the East. Laurentius was a vehicle who would have allowed Festus to implement the Henotikon. However, perhaps more importantly, this situation bought them time to

---

[271] Various scholars have disagreed over the date: 'C'est bien en 502 que Théodoric a suspendu le pape Symmaque et convoqué le synode italien qui devait le juger, et non en 501, comme le croyaient Duchesne et Mommsen: l'argumentation de Pfeilschifter et de Sundwall est solidement établie. Stein (1949), 793

[272] The full text of the imperial letter sent to the bishop of Spoleto is found in *CSEL* 35, p69.

regroup after the setback of Symmachus' election and perhaps undermine the legitimacy of that election. This move allowed Festus and others to do two things. At a micro-level it punished the adoption of a procedure (the adoption of the old Roman date for Easter) which would have undermined attempts at unity. In the grander scheme of things it empowered the pro-Henotikon cause by giving it a powerful and unquestionably Roman voice - one which was tied to a glorious Imperial past and looked forward to a continuing and close relationship with the Empire and its cultural concerns.

The subject of my next inquiry, Quintus Aurelius Memmius Symmachus, was, like Festus, a member of the upper echelons of that part of the Roman elite discussed in the education chapter. As we saw, he was actively cultivating and inhabiting an educational tradition of a different nature to that of Ennodius, Arator, and Cassiodorus.[273] Festus was one of the leading members of the aristocracy: he was the last consul of Rome before the deposition of Romulus Augustulus, and was sent to Constantinople in his capacity as *caput senatus* - proof that his status had not diminished under Ostrogothic hegemony. Symmachus came from the distinguished Symmachi family (no relation to Pope Symmachus) who had dominated Senatorial life for generations. It has been suggested that this Symmachus sided with Pope Symmachus over the schism,[274] but, as Henry Chadwick has demonstrated in his work on Boethius, this is a misreading of a letter Avitus of Vienne sent to the nobleman. As Chadwick says,[275] Avitus is not asking Symmachus to do something he is already committed to doing. He is trying to persuade him to join the Symmachan cause – an interpretation of the letter which moves senator Symmachus firmly out of Pope Symmachus' camp.

It is possible to go further than simply asserting that he was not pro-Symmachan, and place him in the Laurentian camp. There is other evidence from Cassiodorus' *Variae* I. 23. Theoderic, the King, lets it be known that the noble patricians Festus and

---

[273] See 89-91 above for the educational proclivities of Symmachus and his circle.

[274] *PLRE* II, 1045; Eric Caspar (1928), 112.

[275] Chadwick (1981), 9.

Symmachus have brought a case against a third party for wrong done to them – unfortunately we do not know the circumstances of the litigation. I concede that, on its own, a mutual grievance is not proof positive of a closer political association. However the likelihood that senator Symmachus is the target of Magnus Felix Ennodius' censure for supporting the Laurentians, allied with Chadwick's more accurate reading of Avitus' letter as a man trying to convince an opponent to back down, and the fact that Senator Symmachus was a known associate of Festus (the same Festus who promised to get Anastasius to accept the Henotikon, and who was instrumental in trying to get his 'man' Laurentius elected on Anastasius' death) combine to present a picture which makes it difficult to accept the idea that Senator Symmachus was not sympathetic towards the pro-Byzantine, pro-union, Laurentian cause. Of course we know that both Boethius and his father-in-law Symmachus had a strong emotional and intellectual attachment to the Greek culture. We saw how, in chapter 1, they were responsible for a programme of texts which were designed to reintroduce the basic outlines of a bilingual, pluralistic educational culture at Rome (and no doubt in Italy - material for the pupils of Deuterius to expand their cultural horizons).[276]

Unfortunately, there is no direct written evidence of the arguments Symmachus may or may not have deployed in advancing the cause of Eastern rapprochement. There is evidence, however, which reinforces the evidence from the education chapter that Symmachus and his associates cultivated a self-image which implied a certain type of political identity. Unsurprisingly, they place themselves and the offices they hold (and, consequently, the activities they undertake) as contemporary manifestations of a still-living past. In Magnus Felix Ennodius' *Libellus adversus eos qui* **contra** *synodum scribere praesumpserunt* (the pamphlet against those who presume to write against the synod), we have a work dedicated to attacking the members of the Laurentian faction who are trying to undermine the synod at which Pope Symmachus finally asserts the supremacy of his claim. Although Ennodius does not specifically name anyone when censuring those who have presumed to question Pope Symmachus' case, he does provide an account in his description of events which delineates the character

---

[276] above, 90-91.

of the people his comments are aimed at, as they attempt to articulate and project their ideals. He addresses his comments to the possessors of robes and curule chairs, the flowers of Rome, before becoming more specific in description. The senators to whom he is referring are writers of Roman history: *Non derogo vobis de scriptoribus, quorum beneficio contigit ornata ad nos maiorum gesta perduci: sed dei beneficia non tacebo, quia princeps noster rebus superat decora sermonum* (Ennodius*, Libellus pro Synodo*).[277] Cassiodorus in his *Libellus* confirms that senator Symmachus wrote a much admired *Historia Romana* in seven books. So, Symmachus' political and literary activities present a man who conforms to the contemporary and past stereotype of the traditional Roman gentleman.

Indeed, it is very much this consciously cultivated image that the Bishop of Vienne, Avitus, addresses in the letter referred to above. Symmachus, one can reasonably say, is fulfilling the role of the traditional Roman statesman: holding conventional offices of state, writing histories of the state, while also still actively serving that state despite his current predicament (post-Imperial Italy). Taking Chadwick's reading of the letter that stage further, we can see how, through the validating powers of this traditional stereotype, Symmachus represents the credibility and validation of tradition with which the Laurentian cause is in constant dialogue. Letter 34, which is addressed to both Symmachus and a fellow senator Faustus, is an attempt by the Bishop of Vienne to involve himself in the Laurentian affair. The language Avitus, a supporter of Pope Symmachus, uses to appeal to senator Symmachus indicates very strongly that some within the Roman power-elite still saw particular characteristics of the old Roman aristocratic image as an integral part of their identity and sought to legitimize their anti-Symmachan stance from within that discursive context. Avitus writes: *quasi Christianus episcopus obtestor…ut in conspectu vestro non sit Ecclesiae minor quam reipublicae status.*[278] Clearly, Avitus sees a conflict between the views which he represents (pro-Pope Symmachus) and those who would put the interests of traditional Roman concerns before the more immediate concerns of the church (mediating pro-Henotikonists). The traditional Roman concerns are those of the state. As we

---

[277] 315.5 in *CSEL* edition.

[278] Avitus of Vienne, *Epistula* 34, *PL* 59.

witnessed earlier, the prominence of practical political considerations over those of dogmatic religious ones was a prominent attribute of the nascent power of Constantinople.

So, Symmachus would seem, from the evidence of this letter, to be working within the confines of the discourse of the politically-influenced mediation approach which informed the Imperial narratives we encountered earlier. This is even more strongly suggested by the next line of the letter: *nec minus diligatis in Ecclesia vestra sedem Petri, quam in civitate apicem mundi*.[279] This is a very interesting statement. It appeals to the Roman patriot in Symmachus to look upon the church's increasingly vigorous claims for the primacy of St Peter as the natural accompaniment to the belief that the city, Rome, is still the *caput mundi*. As we have seen above, opposition to the Henotikon became increasingly linked to the papal attempt to revive and re-empower Rome through the twin pillars of synod decrees and the politically expedient reinvigorated re-engagement with the Petrine tradition. By aligning this idea of religious supremacy to that of a secular supremacy, Avitus is seeking to decouple any attachment to the Roman secular ideal from that of the New Rome and the Eastern Empire. Avitus is attempting to get Symmachus to withdraw his support from Laurentius and embrace Pope Symmachus' cause because it is the patriotic thing to do for a traditional Roman gentleman. He is selling him the idea on his own terms.

The unfortunate circumstances of senator Symmachus' death would seem to suggest that Avitus understood that Symmachus did indeed equate his own particular Roman identity with loyalty to Empire. Accounts of Symmachus' death are coloured by the bias of the sources available to us. The three main contemporary sources all have a narrative purpose to fulfil which make it difficult to get beyond the immediate message of the narrative. In *Anonymus Valesianus*, the subject of the case study in chapter 3 reports, during its sustained attack upon Theoderic, that Symmachus was put to death by the King on some 'trumped-up charge' (*obiecto crimine* 15.92). Following the *AV*, the *LP,* rather than filling in any detail, uses the execution as a rhetorical set-piece to attack the King: *Theodoricus rex hereticus tenuit duos*

---

[279]*Epistula* 34

praeclaros et exconsules, Symmachum et Boetium, et occidit interficiens gladio (*LP* 55). Like the antithesis carefully wrought by the *LP* author, the only illuminating aspect of Procopius' description of Symmachus' death is the presentation of it, with its foreshadowing of Shakespeare's *Macbeth*, as Symmachus' murder induces guilty hallucinations.[280] What is not in doubt, however, is that Symmachus' downfall had to do with the perception among those in the Gothic regime and those who supported them that he was attempting to bring about some sort of political revolution which would have seen the Eastern Empire incorporate Italy into its political sphere of influence. Regardless of whether this was or was not the case, one must conclude that the way in which Symmachus and his associates positioned themselves within the debate over the Henotikon left them susceptible to any 'trumped-up charges' or closely argued case which sought to characterise them as sympathetic to the political cause of Constantinople.

I will now deal briefly with the activities of another member of the family of Quintus Aurelius Memmius Symmachus. I say briefly, because the amount of literature produced which deals with most aspects of the life of the Roman senator Boethius is vast.[281] I only wish to provide a few of examples of his behaviour which illustrates how he engages with the past and what it tells us about his role in contemporary discourse. Boethius was the adopted son of senator Symmachus and later became his son-in-law when he married Symmachus' daughter. We have also seen how close the educational experience both of them shared was. They gravitated towards the same sort of intellectual activities, both in letters and philosophy. The close connection between the two men is unquestionable. What is more difficult to establish is the role Boethius played in attempts to find a compromise position with the east - especially through his theological works. The arguments are many and varied, but the general consensus, as summed up in Henry Chadwick's position,[282] is that Boethius' main motivation for his intrusion into the controversies arising from Chalcedon and the

---

[280] Procopius *History of the Wars*, V.1.32. Symmachus' head superimposed on a plate of fish replaces Macbeth's dagger.

[281] Obertello (1974), Chadwick (1981), Gibson (1981), O'Daly (1991), Marenbon (2009), among the more prominent.

[282] Chadwick (1981) passim.

publication of the Henotikon was that he simply wished to apply his love of logic to what he believed was an argument which was lacking proper logical definitions. It has to be remembered, however, that any compromise which stopped short of advocating the supremacy of Rome and complete adherence to Leo's tome and the council of Chalcedon would have had one labelled an Acacian, or a Laurentian deviant.

In this climate Boethius produced his work *Contra Eutychen et Nestorium*, also known as tractate five of his theological works. Without wishing to grind this investigation to a standstill by discussing the intricacies of Boethius' arguments, I will simply note that, although Boethius presents this work as a reaffirmation of the Chalcedonian Christology, he does try to find a compromise by including the distinctly Monophysite notion of Christ being of two natures (and thus one) as well as the orthodox Chalcedonian mantra of Christ being *in* two natures.[283] This was the formula that was later adopted by Justinian in his bid to win church unity – and, interestingly, which was also adopted by a monk by the name of Dionysius Exiguus, who had been conducting friendly correspondence with an eminent priest in Rome by the name of Laurentius (there are only two Laurentii in Papal records from this time - Laurentius the archpriest was by far the most prominent. It is therefore especially tempting to see this Laurentius as *the* Laurentius). Therefore, although Boethius wisely gave prominence to Chalcedonian theological conclusions, he articulated a theological doctrine which would later find favour with those who were actively seeking rapprochement with the East.

It is only in his theological tractates that Boethius interacts in any direct way with the problems arising from the Henotikon. The focus in this tractate is very narrow and, superficially, only seems to examine an apparently obscure piece of christological doctrine. It examines the question of the nature of God, positing the idea that Christ consists in and of two natures. What does this have to do with the Henotikon? Well, as we discussed above in relation to the christological reasons for the composition of the Henotikon, arguments over the nature of Christ were a prime motivation in the document's creation. Monophysite monks did not accept the Chalcedonian doctrine

---

[283]*Catholici uero utrumque rationabiliter confitentur, nam et ex utrisque naturis Christum et in utrisque consistere.* **Contra Eutychen**, VI, 100-103.

that Christ consisted *in* two natures (God and man). To them that appeared to be dividing Christ in two. They preferred the term *of* two natures which implied one nature after the fusion. The Henotikon, as we saw above, side-stepped the issue by ignoring the two opposing terms. Instead it emphasized the consubstantiality of Christ with man and God. By engaging with this issue Boethius is trying to do what the Henotikon seems to have failed to do: unite East and West in an understanding of Christ's true nature. In doing so he provides us with an opportunity to see how Boethius' language betrays a discernible engagement with the traditional Roman persona familiar from the qualities which Symmachus projects and Avitus interacted with. An examination of that language also provides some evidence that, although he is seemingly rejecting the confusion arising from the Henotikon, he understands the issues raised by the Henotikon in the same way as Symmachus and Festus.

The beginning of tractate five sees a long preamble which introduces the background to the issues at hand.[284] Here Boethius describes how, at an 'assembly' (*in concilio*), the movers and shakers of Roman civic and religious society had gathered to debate the relative merits of Chalcedonian orthodoxy and Monophysite heresy (Chalcedon is described as *vera fides*). At several points in the introduction individual elements of the narrative reveal a close intimacy with the traditional literary giants of Roman antiquity. Consciously echoing Horace, Boethius describes how he held his silence in debate lest he be seen as an aberrant advocate of sanity among a hoard of madmen: *ne iure viderer insanus, si sanus inter furiosos haberi contenderem.*[285] Moving into the main argument, Boethius turns his attention to constructing an illuminating and instructive definition of 'persons and nature' for the purpose of clarity. He chooses to explain the character of nature and person by recourse to their place within a stratified framework of divisions. Nature is a substratum of person, substances and accidents are substrata of nature, and so on.[286] The discussion of the definition of nature is a fusion of Plato and Aristotle. *Phaedrus* 270d provides Boethius with a definition of nature which refers to nature as that which can either act or be acted upon. This

---

[284] *Tractate* V: 1-60

[285] Horace, *Satire* I.3.82; *Tractate* V.33

[286] *Tractate* V.2.5-15

definition is supplemented by a further definition which draws heavily from Aristotle's *Physics*.[287] We can also see in Boethius' method of *divisio* a close understanding of works by both Cicero and Porphyry. Here Boethius fuses Cicero's discussion on the significance of the division of the rational and irrational with Porphyry's more complex arguments on the community and difference of genus and accident[288]. This is a perfect example of the type of fusion of classical ideas and imagery which is one of the defining characteristics of Boethius' work in general. Henry Chadwick draws attention to this fusion when discussing Boethius *magnum opus*, *Philosophiae Consolatio*: "The various metres, and innumerable literary allusions and reminisces, of thirty nine poems in this work richly illustrate both Boethius' love for the classical tradition in Latin poetry and his own skill and sensitivity as a poet in his own right. Phrases from Vergil, Ovid, Horace, Seneca, Lucan, Statius, Prudentius, and Claudian are woven together to make a fresh and brilliant tapestry".[289] For 'poet' here we could comfortably read 'philosopher', and it would be an equally apt description of what is happening.

The progress of the argument follows the same plan throughout the work. With Boethius repeatedly relying on the subtlety and power of his classical predecessors, each argument is intricately explicated in order to clearly delineate the issues at stake. They provide Boethius with material to construct a narrative of wit and elegance while simultaneously providing the building blocks out of which he creates the substance of his arguments – they provide the main source for both his style and substance. The substance, of course, lest we forget, is related to the affirmation of the progression of a particular goal. That goal is the redundancy of the barriers which prevent the West from fully engaging in the development and consolidation of empire-wide religious activities – the *schisma nefarium* of the pro-Laurentian account of the life of the pro-Henotikon Pope Anastasius. The tractate is an attempt to bring clarity to the discussion, but it is also an attempt to use his own relatively excellent understanding of metaphysics and philosophy in general to seek a lasting

---

[287] See Chadwick (1981), 190-210 for a detailed discussion on the various philosophical schools of thought which Boethius engages with.

[288] Cicero *De Officiis* II.3.11; Porphyry *Isagoge* , I.X

[289] Chadwick (1981), 23.

accommodation between East and West in ecclesiastical matters. This had been the overriding concern which informed the actions of both Festus and Symmachus – not the dogmatic maintenance and development of Roman supremacy.

Like his father-in-law, who makes a few cameo appearances in tractate five,[290] Boethius speaks to and from within a cultural continuum. This cultural continuum is in constant dialogue with a mainly secular idealized concept of traditional Roman culture. Symmachus is the elite historian/statesman, using his erudition and leisure to involve himself in the propagation and veneration of the Roman state. Boethius, following his role model, decides to devote his time and education to a problem of the day. In his case, he applies the tenets and rigors of classical (pagan!) philosophy to solving this question. We can apply the same framework to the behaviour of Festus too. Festus was one of the last Imperial consuls of the Western Roman Empire[291] and had devoted himself to the service of the state before and after the deposition of Romulus Augustulus. He was the 'father of the house' of the Roman senate (*caput senatus*[292]) and used his position as a distinguished Roman senator to champion the cause of the Roman state as he understood it. Boethius, Symmachus, and Festus are all part of a living, breathing discourse which interacts with the world according to its own specific rules. Its words and language have been validated and sanctioned through the authority of the hundreds of years during which the Roman Empire matured and developed. Each avenue of activity that they have been involved in (history writing, statesmanship, philosophical pursuit) has been through this validation process. The state structures of the Eastern Empire still possessed the magnetic fields within which this type of member of the Roman elite could naturally pass along and express themselves[293]. It is therefore no great surprise that people existing within this cultural context employed their skills to this end.

---

[290] *Tractate* V 22-23; 53-54. Chadwick (1981), 181, believes it more probable that Pope Symmachus is the person referred to in lines 22-23. This is conceivable. However, it seems reasonable to think that the man of 53-54 is the same man - the Pope surely cannot be the man to whom Boethius sends all of his works for validation.

[291] *PLRE* II. 467.

[292] Although the energetically illiterate *Anonymus Valesianus*, 11.53 has him as *caput senati* [sic].

[293] I am indebted to Peter Heather for this particular metaphor: *Symbolae Osloenses* 72, 51-52.

The Polyphonic King and the Roman Elite

Briefly, I want to examine how the actions of King Theoderic in relation to the religious factions were portrayed by these differing voices from within the Roman elite. This will provide an informative opportunity to witness some of the trends we have seen up till now directed towards an individual (and a regime) which enabled and inhibited the actions of the different voices from within the Roman elite. During all of the discussions so far the King has been featuring very prominently both in the foreground and the background. However, his position as an enabler and inhibitor has only really surfaced fleetingly on the surface of the accounts we have examined so far. Digging a little bit below that surface reveals how crucial to the success and failure of the goals of the protagonists discussed above the King actually was. Indeed discovering the extent to which the protagonists actually wanted to acknowledge it presents further evidence of the contours of the positions of the Roman elite we have already outlined above. Looking at their accounts of him, their language, and how they frame his behaviour is vital to providing a vivid and striking picture of those contours.

Theoderic had initially been sent to Italy to depose Odoacer in the name of the Emperor Zeno: *Zeno itaque recompensans beneficiis Theodoricum, quem fecit patricium et consulem…mittens eum ad Italiam*[294]. Zeno had died in 491 A.D. not long before Theoderic had claimed victory over Odoacer. So from 492 A.D. onwards, the Ostrogothic King had to deal with the new Emperor Anastasius. The fact that the sources report that he had been sent to Italy by the emperor would have detracted from the impression some in the Roman aristocracy surely must have had about his claims for legitimacy[295]. Let us look more closely, though, at what the sources say about this. The best place to start such an investigation would be the circumstances surrounding the curious delay in recognition of the King as rightful ruler of Italy by the new Emperor Anastasius.

---

[294] *Anonymus Valesianus* 11.49

[295] *Anonymus Valesianus* 11.49; Jordanes *Getica* 290ff.; Procopius *History of the Wars* V.i.x; Theophanes 5977. For more detailed discussion on the possible constitutional position of Theoderic see Jones, A.H.M., 'The constitutional position of Odoacer and Theoderic', *JRS,* 52, 1962, 1-11.

Gelasius was Pope in 492 A.D. when Theoderic had assumed power in Italy, but it was not until after the death of Gelasius (in 496 A.D.) that Theoderic was given the Imperial seal of approval. An extract from the *Anonymus Valesianus* describes the imperial regalia of the Western Emperor being given to Theoderic[296]: *facta pace cum Anastasio imperatore per Festum de praesumptione regni, et omnia ornamenta palatii...remittit.* This was the same imperial regalia which Odoacer had sent to Constantinople after deposing Romulus Augustulus, the so-called last Emperor of the West (*quae Odoacer Constantinopolim transmiserat*). So, according to the *Anonymus Valesianus* Theoderic had been given the seal of approval to rule Italy in place of the Emperor (his obligation to Zeno) and five years afterwards he was confirmed as the rightful ruler of Italy by Anastasius' gesture. During this five year period Theoderic had been refused Imperial approval, and relations had, for whatever reason (there are unfortunately no direct references which describe the nature of the dispute), deteriorated to the point where the Emperor would not even ratify the election of consuls in the west.[297] Theoderic had sent Festus,[298] acting as head of the senate, to petition the Emperor on his behalf after the death of Zeno. This mission was obviously a failure. The *Anonymus Valesianus*, however, says nothing about the success or failure of this visit. Both accounts relating to the King's accession to legitimate rule, first Festus' mission and then his second successful mission five years later, in the *Anonymus* are more revealing for what they leave out than for what they actually say. The *Anonymus* is very keen throughout its first half to paint as positive a picture as possible of Theoderic. The attempts to emphasize the positive relations Theoderic has with the emperor reveals that, as a source, the *Anonymus* sees the office of the emperor (if not necessarily the emperor himself) as a positive, legitimising force.

We need to dig further into the sources to see something of what was being presented as happening during this five year period. As we remember from above, according to Theophanes, it was at a second visit that Festus had promised to see to it that the new

---

[296] *Anonymus Valesianus*, 64

[297] Amory (1991), 8

[298] *Anonymus Valesianus*, 53

Pope Anastasius would accept the Henotikon and bring an end to the Acacian schism. Theophanes, as we witnessed above, is following a historical tradition linked to the pro-Symmachan accounts in the *LP*. The narrative voice in Theophanes would lead us to assume that the dispute between Theoderic and Emperor Anastasius had something to do with the Henotikon. Thus the five year hiatus of illegitimacy is presented as punishment for refusing to order the papacy to follow Imperial edicts concerning the Henotikon. By reporting this incident without context (as the account does) the *Anonymus Valesianus* engages with a narrow historical perspective which downgrades all other variables which could counter or object to this message. Importantly, it excludes the alternative narrative which suggests that, because it was from within Theoderic's kingdom that Gelasius was sending out missives to the east to condemn anyone associated with Acacius, and addressing letters to Anastasius to inform him of his (the emperor's) lesser power before the real authority of the papacy, Anastasius was withholding Imperial sanction because Theoderic was not acting as a general conduit for Imperial decree. It simply presents the idea that the king, reacting against an Emperor who is trying to force heresy upon the Church in Rome, is punished for his sins. From a purely practical point of view, of course, it is entirely understandable why Anastasius took such a dim view of the King's unwillingness to force the Pope to either soften the strident tones of his letters and sermons or accept the Henotikon. The accession of pro-Constantinople Pope Anastasius to the Holy See meant that Theoderic's actions were no longer a bar to Imperial policy. So the reason for the Emperor's refusal to legitimise his rule had gone and he accepted the king as the rightful ruler of Italy. Looking at the King' actions, however, through a pro-Symmachan prism it is easy to understand why the pro-Symmachan *Anonymus Valesianus* would wish to present this period of the King's rule in a positive light. Likewise, Theophanes' account, which relies on a pro-Symmachan tradition, shuns emphasising the King's general refusal to follow Imperial diktat, instead preferring to frame his behaviour within a Rome-protecting, anti-heretical context.

This presentation of the quasi Imperially-sanctioned King as protector of the freedom of Rome is found in other pro-Symmachan sources. Allowing the Papacy the freedom it needed to assert its claim to the supremacy of Rome and reject external challenges

to it may or may not have been the King's design.[299] Positively presenting the King's actions which allowed this freedom as legitimate was a necessity. Formulating, developing, and implementing a religious discourse required a positive statement which validated the process. Framing the King's behaviour, therefore, within a culturally acceptable context must have been a priority. So it is no surprise that those from within the pro-Symmachan camp who were working outwith the confines of the *Romanitas* of Boethius and Symmachus portrayed the King as a guarantor of traditional *Roman* freedom.

A perfect example of this type of interaction with the language of tradition and the past can be found in the writings of Ennodius. We have seen in chapter 1 that he was a central figure in the maintenance and development of traditional Roman culture in the education sphere. However, Ennodius was also a champion of Pope Symmachus' cause and an advocate of Papal pre-eminence. He repeatedly refers to the King as an agent of freedom. In a letter to Eugenes, the recently promoted *quaestor*, Ennodius refers to Eugenes' new boss as *dominus libertatis*. This phrase echoes some of the officially sanctioned nomenclature associated with Theoderic. In one inscription this idea of Theoderic as guardian of freedom is repeated, but, interestingly, framed by language which is overtly encouraging the actions in an Imperial context: *gloriosissimus adque inclytus rex, victor ac triumfator semper Aug., bono reipublicae natus,* **custos libertatis** *et propagator Romani nominis*.[300] As we can see from this inscription, the presentation of the King as a defender of freedom uses language which evokes the validity of Imperial sanction. This type of validation process is found in Ennodius too. When Ennodius describes the extension of the King's rule into Gaul in 510, he tells the King's *Praefectus praetorio Galliarum* that before him (the King's prefect) the people had not tasted Roman liberty.[301] Ennodius wishes to present the extension of the King's hegemony into Gaul as the extension of an imperially

---

[299] This is a vexed question many scholars have wrestled with: Noble (1992); Chadwick (1981); Richards (1979); Moorhead (1992) among many others. The answer to it, although interesting, has no bearing upon the question of how others wished to portray his role.

[300] *CIL* X.6850. An inscription from infrastructure repairs on the Via Appia at Terracina (*CIL*. 10.6850), demonstrates that this narrative of an Imperial Theoderic had permeated down to 'street' level.

[301] *Ante te non contigit saporem de Romana libertate gustare.* Ennodius*, Liber Epistularum* VIIII, XXIII, 5

sanctioned restoration of Roman freedom. So as we can see, the presentation of the King's role with regard to the religious problems thrown up by the Henotikon was feeding into and off of a much wider presentation of the King. This narrative presented the King as a purveyor of freedom and an upholder of Roman traditions.

So we can see that the sources which deal directly with the King's involvement in the religious problems are scant (no doubt one of the major factors contributing to the manifold problems scholars have in reconstructing his 'actual' position). Furthermore, what material there is often avoids directly linking the King to the religious controversy. However, by reading between the lines we can see that some believed that the King upheld the rights of the Papacy to pursue its own policy. Were this a close approximation of what may have happened, then this agreement would have worked both ways: by not forcing the Papacy to toe the imperial line, Theoderic ensured support for his status in Italy from a particular section of the Roman elite, while for the Papacy continued support of Theoderic's regime ensured that they could withstand any compromises which would have undermined their dogmatic position as the church's First See. However, as we have seen, the pro-Symmachan sources understood that what the King was allowing them to do was in itself problematic. Their actions could have been viewed as innovative and lacking a connection with a generally received notion of *Romanitas* (of the type the pro-Laurentian authors and sympathisers understood). They tried to legitimise the actions (or lack thereof) of King in order to legitimise the process which had allowed them to articulate their positions of power. Indeed, the King could simply have been playing a passive role in the whole affair, unwittingly allowing his inactivity to facilitate the environment that some exploited.

The accounts of the behaviour of the King during the negotiations with Constantinople provides some clues that the sources did not always want to present him as determinedly passive and impartial in the squabbles between the Laurentian and Symmachan positions. His treatment of Gelasius during the Acacian schism is not the only example of the king acting in a way which helped those who refused to compromise with Constantinople. Is this passivity though actually sympathy? The

sympathetic treatment that the King's regime receives from pro-Symmachan sources is really about them trying to legitimise the process through which they have gained their power. By passively allowing the right of religious self-expression the King could have facilitated this process. He does not have to have been actively sympathetic to the cause of the pro-Symmachan authors. When the pro-Symmachans required validation for their activities they wove it into their accounts of proceedings. So it is often difficult to tell what it is the King is actually doing. Thomas Noble and others have argued against scholarship which tries to present the King's actions as active sympathy[302]. I think that we can gravitate towards this position without too much trouble. We can also, however, understand why some scholars have gravitated towards another conclusion – the authors they are reading have an agenda which encourages them to take this view.

The example of Pope Hormisdas, the successor of the redoubtable Pope Symmachus, and his two embassies to Constantinople is a case in point. According to the account in the *LP*, the king personally picked those who would negotiate with the still-excommunicated clergy in Byzantium. One of the delegation whose inclusion the king specifically asks for is none other than the pro-Symmachan advocate of Papal infallibility, Magnus Felix Ennodius: *cum consilio Regis Theodorici, [Hormisdas] direxit Ennodium, episcopum Ticinensem…Euntes ad Anastasium Augustum, nihil egerunt. Idem secundo misit Ennodium ipsum et Peregrinum, episcopum Mesenense, portantes…textum libelli[303]*. Sending such an implacably anti-Henotikonite as Ennodius was surely a royal endorsement that this particular person represented the position of the church in Italy. That Ennodius and his embassy achieved nothing (*nihil egerunt*) is no great surprise: Ennodius' strident rhetoric promised as much. However, we must be wary of what message the *LP* is actually trying to advance here. The *LP* has Hormisdas accepting some advice from the King. The presentation of the King is the same which has, in the preceding life of Symmachus, been painted in sympathetic, quasi imperial colours, similar to the wise Kings of the Old Testament and the 'good'

---

[302] Noble (1992) for a summary of this position.

[303] *Liber Pontificalis*, 54

pagan emperors of old. We can take this once again as a validation of an embassy which was still acting outwith the confines of imperial sanction.

The King's Demise

Before concluding this chapter, looking briefly at the events which brought an end to the Acacian Schism will provide an interesting picture of what happened to the different narratives when the circumstances changed again. It is true that it was Pope Hormisdas - the same pope who is presented as asking for and receiving the King's advice - who oversaw the eventual resolution of the schism. And this would therefore seem to undermine any assertions that there was a concerted effort to keep Constantinople at arms' length by the triumphal pro-Symmachan Papacy. But this would be to underestimate the radical nature of the new Eastern Emperor's decision to abandon completely and utterly the previous position of his predecessors and accept everything that the Papacy demanded. Before Justin, the attitude of all Emperors of the East towards the Roman stance in relation to the schism could be summed up by Emperor Anastasius' exasperated response to Hormisdas (this response was given not long before the old Emperor's death and the accession of Justin). *LP* 54 colourfully informs us of the reaction of the Emperor as he has to deal with another posturing and presumptuous Pope, pontificating to him on how he should run his kingdom: *Anastasius contra papa Hormisda…hoc scripsit dicens: 'Nos iubere volumus, non nobis iuberi'.* The change in attitude towards the papacy and its demands is nothing if not startling.

After the rift had been healed, Boethius and friends like John the deacon (the man to whom Tractate five, the theological work with more than a hint of Laurentian compromise, was written) were rewarded with high office. John the deacon is almost certainly the man who was installed as pope on Hormisdas' death[304]. Not long after the union, the abrasive narratives of the Pro-Symmachans had gone and those who were tied to the Laurentian cause were in control of the formation of religious discourse. We can see this nowhere more clearly than in the post-Hormisdas account of the life of Pope John. The indifference bordering on antipathy towards the East is

---

[304]Noble, 411; Although: il n'est pas certain qu' il faille identifier au futur pape, originaire, selon le *Liber Pontificalis*, de *Tuscia* et fils d'un Constantin. *Prosopographie Chrétienne du Bas-Empire II*, 1075.

replaced by an almost slavish adoration of the person of the emperor. The kindly, advising King of the Symmachan, Gelasian, and Hormisdasian accounts is replaced by a bossy, heretical King, whose juxtaposition beside the Emperor of the East provides a less than flattering antithesis: *hic vocatus est a rege Theodorico Ravenna; quem ipse rex rogans misit in legationem Constantinopolim ad Iustinum imperatorem orthodoxum, quia eodem tempore Iustinus imperator, vir religiosus, summo ardoris amore religionis christianae, voluit hereticos extricare...pro hanc causam hereticus rex Theodoricus audiens hoc exarsit et voluit totam Italiam ad gladium extinguere.*[305] The change in tone is quite remarkable. The compliers of the *LP* now inhabit a different cultural universe, and their narratives are directed toward championing the ideological goals of the new post Gothic settlement. As we shall see in the next chapter, the changed circumstances and the pressures it exerted upon the Italian elite led to some jarring historical accounts – the result of which has left scholars questioning the unity of authorship of some texts.[306]

Another interesting aspect of the resolution was that the people whom his liberal policies had empowered did not now surround the King. Ennodius was gone, all four papal supremacy popes were dead, and their supporters dissolved into the night of history. The implied nature of his promise of religious freedom and their reciprocal promise of implied political support (only, as we have seen, on terms which furthered their goals) had gone. Within a year of Pope Hormisdas' death, Quintus Aurelius Memmius Symmachus was condemned on charges of treason, Boethius was imprisoned awaiting execution for suspicion of supporting a senatorial plot to unseat the king, and Pope John was thrown into jail where he later died. An increasingly hostile environment, inspired by the actions of Justin in the East (where he was actively persecuting Arians), and augmented by a succession crisis, and exacerbated by understandable suspicion and hostility toward those actively courting rapprochement with Justin and the East, had conspired to rob the King of the environment necessary for the various sections of the Roman elite to tolerate his

---

[305] *LP*, 55.

[306] From the evidence of our dating discussions above, n.251, it is clear that the compilers of the *LP* lived in a precarious time, straddling the Ostrogoth period and the beginnings of the Byzantine conquest. In our final chapter we shall see the author of the case study wrestling with the same problems, from within a very similar cultural landscape.

existence. The water had passed downstream and he was standing in a very different river now – one which did not agree with his constitution.

Chapter Conclusion

In this chapter we have uncovered some more of those trends which were already discussed in chapter one. There we looked at the relationship between tradition and education. We examined to what extent the contemporary situation had impacted upon attitudes towards traditional education. We sought to understand how much of the contemporary education system was an interaction with a still-living tradition and how much of it was an affectation, detached from any real contact with the day-to-day concerns of the Roman elite. The ways in which tradition was interacted with was the consistent focus. Our investigation in this chapter had the same focus. We set out to examine in which ways the Roman elite used the language and landscape of the past to explain their own attitudes, and inform their own decision-making process, with regard to the politics surrounding the publication of the Henotikon. This investigation did, indeed, reveal that within the context of the two ideological directions of the protagonists examined in this chapter, a still-living tradition and another tradition which *presented* its position as part of a continuum existed side by side. By looking at the language of tradition we highlighted the extent to which tradition is a constantly changing phenomenon which responds to the demands of those who interact with it.

From the discussions on the actions of Felix, Gelasius, Symmachus, and Hormisdas, I believe that I have shown that the desire to further augment attempts to create a preeminent Rome was very real. The way in which this desire was fulfilled highlights how important the past and tradition were to these individuals and the people who supported them. The church in Rome was faced with a challenge to its ecclesiastical authority. In order to fight off this challenge the Church responded by using the language and landscape of the past and tradition to attack the source of the challenge. Some members of the Roman elite in Italy did not wish to see the power of the church threatened by the political capital of the Roman Empire, so they used whatever means they had at their disposal to fight off the threat. They understood that the increased prestige afforded ecclesiastical Constantinople by its proximity to a nascent political

capital meant that they could no longer rely on the preeminent power of the culturally and geographically close Emperor at Rome to look sympathetically upon their pronouncements and ensure their dissemination. In the new political landscape of Ostrogothic Italy they were politically and culturally cut off from the rest of the empire. Their ideas and theological positions were formulated in an environment which was external to the Imperial mainstream. They used the authority of past Imperial synod decrees, especially the decree of Chalcedon, to articulate a position which headed off the threat to the survival of the church's current position. They articulated their message from within the parameters of these precedents thus providing the necessary validation for their claims.

Although the political situation in Ostrogothic Italy did present problems to the Roman elite who were fighting for the freedom from political involvement and the dangers to their position that this brought, it also presented an opportunity. Some within the Roman elite understood that the situation presented the opportunity to take advantage of it. We witnessed how, once again, some within the Roman elite attempted to delineate a role for itself which surpassed that which it had enjoyed previously (from Damasius, through to Leo). Pope Gelasius augmented those appeals to previous practice and precedent, which had provided the cornerstones to the arguments he and others had put forward to head off the Imperial threat, by invoking the sometimes used, sometimes neglected idea of the absolute supremacy of Rome through the Petrine tradition of apostolic pre-eminence. We saw how this particular move would have been very difficult to enact had the Pope been subject to the Emperor. We also discussed how even this move to take advantage of the situation necessitated appeals to the past in order to validate it. The position of the church within a state which was run by heretics was problematic. The Roman elite were trying to formulate and disseminate a discourse which attacked the heresy of the East and championed the divinely ordained orthodoxy of the West. We examined how the Roman elite understood that this would be a particularly difficult thing to do given the status of the Ostrogoths. In an attempt to mitigate the discomfort they felt at this and project the necessary narrative of the champion of orthodoxy and punisher of heretics, the Romans turned to the past. As we saw, the popes and their supporters, who were

most intensely involved in the move to delineate this position of pre-eminent Roman authority, are presented in the sources in a way that advances that goal. The anti-heretical credentials of the Roman elite are framed by a vigorous and aggressive attack upon one of the Roman world's great heretical bogeymen: the Manichees. So, from the threat to the status of their religious structures, to the attempts to delineate a powerful and pre-eminent role for themselves, some within the Roman elite responded by adopting and adapting precedent and tradition to meet these challenges.

However, we saw evidence which shows that neither the ideological concerns of the Roman elite who were wrestling with the implications of the Henotikon, nor the way in which the past was understood and informed responses to these concerns were shared by all within those who could exercise and were exercising their positions of power within Roman Italy. We saw that Festus, senator Symmachus, and Boethius understood the issues raised by the Henotikon in a different way. Festus attempted to reassure the Emperor in Constantinople that he would have a pope and papacy ready and willing to accept the Henotikon. Senator Symmachus, as we saw from our interpretation of his correspondence with Avitus was of the type of senator who gravitated towards accommodation with the Roman state regardless of its implications for the Roman church. Boethius, likewise, was particularly keen to resolve the religious schism.

By looking at the ways in which they interacted with these issues, we understood that they had a very different relationship with the past also – not one simply explained by the manipulation of precedent. Examining how they attempted to achieve these goals revealed that different relationship with the past. Festus, one of the last consuls of the old Imperial state before its collapse in the West, was still working within the ideological confines of that position. He was executing his role as the head of the Roman senate. However, he is not above using precedent to 'sell' his ideas. The emphasis was, as we would expect, on the sanction of imperial precedent. His actions are presented in a distinctly imperial way as he effectively acts as the emperor's envoy to Theoderic and not the other way about. Also, he attempts to undermine the cause of those attacking the Henotikon by appealing to the framework of an imperial

past. His attacks upon pope Symmachus emanate from within the parameters of a tradition in the Western Empire which gave them validity. In a similar way, senator Symmachus' actions and his characterisation in the accounts of his life speak to us of a man working closely within the confines of a Roman elite discourse which attached much greater importance to patriotic affection for the old Roman state. Symmachus' actions betray a man still consciously living and breathing within the old Roman Empire. His education, his politics, and his religious concerns are all understandable from their close association with a still-living tradition. Boethius too falls into this category. His one work that directly addresses some of the concerns at the very heart of the Henotikon problem is notable for its liberal use of the language of the classical world. Like Symmachus and Festus, Boethius speaks to and from within a specific cultural discourse. This discourse is in a constant dialogue with a mainly secular romanticized concept of traditional Roman identity. It is unsurprising that this shared past which they inhabited encouraged them to gravitate more towards the arguments which advanced the interests of a state – the Henotikon being one of them.

Finally, the King. As we have seen, Leo's successors understood that, as they were not subject to imperial diktat, their goals could be helped by a King with a policy of religious tolerance and passivity. Often the sources - especially the official *LP* - which understand this do not wish to present their actions as overt collaboration with a non-Roman heretic King (the compliers of the *LP*, as we have come to see, lived during the time of the King) . Instead these sources frame the King's behaviour in such a way as to present him as 'almost' Roman. His actions are to be equated with the actions of the emperors of old, the wise and just rulers of the Old Testament. But, as I have demonstrated, not all within Rome were as committed to the notion of Papal supremacy and the destruction of the Henotikon. The Roman aristocrats who placed cordial relations with the East above those considerations presented the King in a particularly different light. The archetype which they used to frame the behaviour of the King was one which appealed to that old traditional Roman of the type which Festus, Symmachus and Boethius represent. The King is the archetypal barbarian heretic. He is a bar to union, a perfectly cast villain, who, via antithesis and exaggerated caricature, is the perfect vehicle to explain and attack the opponents of

this particular voice from within the Roman elite. We shall now examine in Chapter 3 how the post-Henotikon *Anonymus Valesianus* manages to reconcile these two alternative views of the King and alternative views of the past.

Chapter 3
A Case Study: *Anonymus Valesianus Pars Posterior.*

Introduction

I have chosen to finish this thesis with a case study. The subject of the case study, the *Anonymus Valesianus*, provides a veritable feast of material which speaks to the purpose of this thesis.[307] The author is clearly an Italian. As will become clear, he presents a voice, a narrative thread and ideological purpose, which emanates from within the Roman literary elite (reflecting and projecting the religious, cultural, and political concerns we have witnessed the elites interacting with in pervious chapters). He has a close relationship with the appropriate language and discourses expected of the elite audience, which we have come to understand from the first two chapters. As we have seen, the political situation in Italy allowed this audience to express themselves within the confines of their traditional (for Late Antiquity) discourses. Their members could benefit from a recognizably traditional education, while also addressing the big issues of the day from a renewed and reinvigorated position. We have also come to understand more clearly the nature of the relationship between the Ostrogothic Roman elite and their past within the wider scope of late antique history by looking at what followed this unique set of political circumstances (the failure of Boethius and Symmachus' educational enterprise, and Cassiodorus on bleak future for education). They were in a position to use the past and tradition to empower themselves, in circumstances recognizably familiar to what had come before, but suited to what they were experiencing now. We have also come to see that Ostrogothic Italy provided an environment in which overlapping discourses could adopt and adapt the past to suit their own political/religious agenda. In our period the competing narratives were jostling for position in relation to the role Rome should play in religious politics. We have seen the often difficult relationship between secular and religious discourses which were employed and which influenced the education of the Roman elite. All of these issues are manifest in the pages of the *AV*.

---

[307] A selection of the main works on the *Anonymus Valesianus Pars Posterior* (henceforth abbreviated to *AV*): Cipolla (1910), 'Le vestigial del frasario officiale presso l' "Anonimo Valesiano II"' *Miscellanea di Studi in Onore di Attilio Hortis*, 919-928. Cessi (1913), *Fragmenta Historica ab Henrico et Hadriano Valesio, Rerum Italicarum Scriptore*s XXIV.4. Tamassia, N. (1913) 'Sulla seconda parte dell'Anonimo Valesiano' *Archivio Storico Italiano* 7, Series 7, 3-23. Adams (1976), *The text and language of a Vulgar Latin chronicle (Anonymus Valesianus II)*. Barnish (1983), 'The Anonymus Valesianus II as a Source for the last Years of Theoderic', *Latomus* 43, 572-596.

Naturally, therefore, it is to its pages that we turn to find echoes of the phenomena which we have witnessed unfolding.

Examinations of the *AV* till now have often tended to focus on either the integrity of the authorial voice, or whether he is a reliable historian. All of these discussions have, in their own way, contributed greatly to the general understanding of the *AV*. This case study will go beyond the issues of reliability (of author and historian) to find echoes of those discourses and their implied conditions of production, which are evident in chapter 1 and 2. I will focus on the discourses circulating in the *AV* which were understood by all who read it. This presents a different, mutually beneficial approach which moves from "reflecting on who wrote a document and what facts can be learned from it, to also considering what discourses it contains, and who gains power from their circulation."[308] This approach is crucial to validating the argument which has up till now been emerging from our previous chapters. The language, identity, and ideology of the Roman elite are evident from their interactions with their religious structures and their education system. The discourses they created, aligned themselves with, and spoke from within, determined their language, reinvented and protected their identity, and sought to further their ideology. I will investigate the *AV* to see what discourses it contains and what they tell us about its author's place within the Roman elite, and the Roman elite's position in post-imperial Italy.

Scholarly Debate on the AV

Much has been said about the so-called problem of consistency between the first and second half of the history of the great Gothic King Theoderic contained in the work now known as the *AV*.[309] Writing of events from the circumstances which led Zeno, Emperor of the east, to send Theoderic to Italy in 474, to the king's death in 526, the anonymous author's work has been subject to discussion on the unity of the work and

---

[308] Brown (2005), 67. That said, though, it will be necessary to have brief discussion on when it was written. This will provide a solid foundation upon which to support the conclusions gleaned from our investigation into how it was written.

[309] The manuscript tradition which has passed down to us the *AV* does include two works published in 1636 by Henricus Valesius (Rolfe, 506). The works have been also collectively termed 'the *Excerpta Valesiana*.' (Mommsen). The second part, the focus of our investigation, is often referred to as the *Theodericiana*. In this thesis the term *AV* will always refer to the second part of the *Excerpta*. The first part, by a different author, concentrates on the life of the Emperor Constantine.

the consistency of its narrative. The inconsistencies seem obvious enough. The presentation of the king in the first half (up to chapter 74 in the text) is both sympathetic portrayal and eulogy. The second half (79 onwards) presents a different picture. The king is here presented to the reader as an enemy of the catholic faith and the civilization which it informs – seemingly the opposite of the person so carefully and sympathetically described at the beginning of the work. The disparity in tone between both halves has naturally led to scholarly disputes over the nature of the work. There have been broadly two approaches to the problem which have found currency among scholars. Both have reached conclusions as far removed from each other as the first and second half of the works they seek to understand. Roberto Cessi is the most prominent advocate of one school of thought. Writing early in the 20th century, Cessi[310] has argued that the two halves are incompatible, that they are, in fact, two different works joined together incongruously - one is from prior to the king's death, while the other was executed after. Seventy years later, Samuel Barnish has rejected this idea, presenting a detailed rebuttal of Cessi's stance with a comprehensive critique of *AV*, which argues forcefully for the unity of authorship[311].

To begin with, I shall examine in a little detail the two arguments put forward by Cessi and Barnish. Cessi was perplexed by the most obvious (to the reader) example in the text of narrative contradiction. Two separate tales of the king's illiteracy (chapter 61 and 79), both using the same language, but diverging wildly in their portrayal of Theoderic, provided Cessi with proof of a problem, which he then sought to explain: "*Come si possano accordare e conciliare nella mente di uno stesso autore questi due apprezzamente, che partendo da un identica constatazione di fatto giungono a conclusioni antitetiche, io non veggo*"[312]. In his article[313], Cessi argues that, before the deviation from panegyric to invective (chapter 79), the *AV* shares undoubted similarities with an unknown source (*ignota fonte*). This source, he argues,

---

[310] R. Cessi, Fragmenta Historica ab Henrico et Hadriano Valesio, *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores XXIV.4* (1913) p. cxix-cxxvi, clxv-clxviii

[311] Barnish (1983). *The Anonymus Valesianus II as a Source for the last Years of Theoderic*, Latomus 43, 572-596

[312] Cessi, R., cxix-cxx

[313] *Ibid.,* lxxvii-clxix

also informed the composition of the histories of Cassiodorus and Marcellinus Comes (and to a lesser extent Jordanes). During a close reading of all four texts, Cessi manages to carefully compile numerous instances of parallels in the text that forcefully suggest some sort of communal relationship. Verbal and thematic similarities abound: *"nell'espressione: 'sicut nec ipse ecclesiae iura servavit' (ben lontano dal 'contra orthodoxorum fidei maiestatem' di Marcellino) non vi è qualche cosa che fa giusto equilibrio a ciò che l'Anonimo dice di Teoderico: 'dum ipse quidem Arrianae sectae esset, tamen nihil contra religionem catholicam temptans'?"*[314] His argument reinforced by Mommsen, who also recognized the *ignota fonte* (cxvii) at work, Cessi proceeds to name who he thinks the source is: *"il Mommsen riconosce che…[i passi] sono di ignota fonte, ma forse non è audace presunzione che questa possa essere Cassiodoro"*[315]. The work of Cassiodorus Cessi refers to is the lost *Historia*. Using evidence from Jordanes's *Historia* - which most now agree is derived from Cassiodorus – Marcellinus, Cassiodorus' *Chronicon* and his letters, and *AV* itself, Cessi argues that all are typically Cassiodoran in theme and content and that this surely points to the *Historia* as the archetype of all works and thus the *AV*: *"E soprattutto l'intima convinzione, che il supposto Anonimo Valesiano, nella parte fin ad ora analizzata* [up to 79]*, non sia altro che un insieme di frammenti derivati dalle 'Storie' [di Cassiodoro]"*[316].

That this is not the case in the second half demonstrates, according to Cessi, that the incongruous departure of consistent narrative attitude towards Theoderic from 79 onwards is evidence that there is a different author at work. Cessi argues that a close reading of the 'second half' (79 onwards) of the text reveals that the author was, unlike before 79, not consciously using the *Historia* (or *ignota fonte*) as the source for the events which were being told. One example is that of the description of Eutharicus provided by the *AV*. In Cassiodorus' *Chronicon* (518), there is a mildly complimentary (the appointment described as *feliciter*), if rather bald statement concerning the elevation of Eutharicus to the consulship. Cessi highlights the marked

---

[314] Ibid, cxviii.

[315] Ibid, cxvii

[316] Ibid, cxix

difference in the account of Eutharicus in the other text: *Il nostro autore è così poco amico del re e della sua corte, che non nasconde il proprio malumore per la nomina di Eutarico: 'qui Eutharicus', scrive ' nimis asper fuit et contra fidem catholicam inimicus'* (cxx). More than simply a departure in tone is evident from the beginning of chapter 80: the similarity of detail, which Cessi does so much to draw attention to in the 'first half' (to 79), is also lacking: "*Nel cap. 25, 80, si parla del consolato di Eutarico e del trionfo di Teoderico a Roma e Ravenna. Iordannes di ciò non parla, e Cassiodoro, che pur nel suo 'Chronicon' discorre del assunzione al consolato di Eutarico e delle grandiose feste celebrate in tale occasione a Roma e a Ravenna, non accena al trionfo teodericiano.*" (cxx). Cessi asserts that, just as the author of the 'second half' reuses phrases and ideas from the first (the dual stories at 61 and 79 of the king's illiteracy), to give the impression of continuity, this non-Cassiodoran section is doing the same. The author of the second half is, at 80, reworking the story of the king's friendly attitude towards the catholic religion at 60, in order to undo the good impression created by that passage. There is a problem, however: "*nè si potrebbe obbietarre che in un caso sui parla Teoderico e nell' altro di Eutarico.*" This is, according to Cessi, can be overcome: "*la sorte di costui era così legata a quella del re congiunto, che il biasimo evidentemente li colpiva ambedue.*" (cxx). The lack of similarity in both the tone and content with the Cassiodoran 'first half' points to *un altro autore*; the similarity of phraseology between both reveals the attempts of the second author to undo the work of the first while erecting a façade of deceitful continuity: "*Il principio della 'Theod.', 24,79...fa pensare all' opera di un continuatore delle 'Storie'.*" (cxxiii).

Sam Barnish[317] realizes that Cessi's argument is based upon the idea that the *AV* is glaringly inconsistent: "Cessi's…literary points gain force basically from his belief that the treatment of Theoderic is absurdly inconsistent." (574). However, Barnish thinks that Cessi's arguments are defective due to their failure to consider the influence of two literary traditions which inform the work. The example of Eutharic, dealt with above, provides Barnish with an example of the first, which points to how the *AV* was influenced not, as Cessi had it, by an author keen to create the illusion of

---

[317] Barnish (1983).

continuity while attacking the King, but by biblical tradition[318]. Here the influence of the devil and Eutharic is the analogue for the influence of the wives of Solomon upon a just and wise monarch: "Both kings ended in a way unworthy of their former glory". (574). The second influence which, according to Barnish, Cessi does not factor in to his argument is that of the biography and its tendency towards *chiaroscuro*[319]. Barnish turns to P.A Brunt to explain: "We have to reckon with a kind of principle of 'chiaroscuro' in ancient literary portraiture, expressly avowed by Philo ('Flacc.,' 6-7) and pervading Suetonian biographies: a man is first praised in order to set his wickedness into higher relief."[320] This tradition encourages the author to first praise the king and then attack – exactly what we see happen in our text. Barnish argues that the Suetonian element in the *Anonymus* is undoubted: "*To this tradition [Suetonian], the 'Anonymus' very clearly belongs. Its gossipy, discursive, anecdotal manner, noting the ruler's 'sententiae' (61), and recording his achievements generically rather than chronologically, is strongly reminiscent of Suetonius.*" (575). The examples of the king's building programmes, his generosity and justice, show this reminiscence clearly - so too the accounts of both Zeno's peculiar anatomy (chapter 40) and Anastasius' dream (chapter 74), and the various stories of comets which appear in Suetonius (*Nero,* 36; *Claudius*, 15). As a rebuttal of Cessi's idea (see above) that the repetition of certain themes was a sign of another author at work, Barnish points to the influence of late Latin biographer Aurelius Victor, whose work had a tendency to repeat certain themes (in the life of Trajan: his virtues, then his vices). That Aurelius Victor was an influence is also confirmed by his use of a description of certain rulers' tombs (life of Severus, 20.30) – just as in *AV* (96).

---

[318] Ibid, 574 and 588 onward for numerous other examples of biblical allusion.

[319] An art analogy, referring to the practice of superimposing white onto a black backcloth to allow the black background to more clearly come to the fore and reveal the outline of the subject. P.A. Brunt (*Historia* 10, 221) utilizes it to describe the use Philo makes of juxtaposing bad with good: Ἴσος δ' ἄν τις εἴποι· "σὺ δ', ὦ οὗτος, ἐγνωκὼς ἀνθρώπου κατηγορεῖν ἔγκλημα μὲν οὐδὲν διεξῆλες, μακροὺς δ' ἐπαίνους συνείρεις· μὴ ἄρα παραπαίεις καὶ μέμηνας;" οὐ μέμηνα, ὦ οὗτος, οὐδ' ἠλίθιός τίς εἰμι, ὡς μὴ δύνασθαι πράγματος ἀκολουθίαν ἰδεῖν. ἐπαινω τὸν Φλάκκον, οὐκ ἐπαιδὴ προσῆκεν ἐχθπὸν ἐγνωμιάζειν, ἀλλ' ἵν' αὐτου μοχθηρίαν ἀριδηλοτέραν παραστήσω· τῷ μὲν γὰρ ἀγνοίᾳ τοῦ κρείττονος διαμαρτάνοντι συγγνώμη δίδοται, ὁ δ' ἐξ ἐπιστήμης ἀδικῶν ἀπολογίαν οὐκ ἔχει προεαλωκὼς ἐν τῷ τοῦ συνειδότος δικαστηπίῳ.

[320] Brunt (1961)

It is my intention in this paper to look once again at the problem. While rejecting Cessi's argument of two separate individual authors, and accepting Barnish's 'lone' author, I shall attempt to add something more to the discussion. I intend to look at the problem from a different perspective from Barnish's genre-based approach (although still accepting and utilizing some of the conclusions both Barnish and Cessi reached). I shall discuss the apparent discontinuities by trying to find some sort of unified 'identity' in the person writing it. I shall concentrate on describing how it is entirely possible for this individual author to be 'one' yet have apparently 'two' different 'voices', and how the divergence can be explained by reference to the prominence circumstances give to one aspect of the writer's value system over another. I shall attempt to show that both halves of the work reveal that the same individual, with the same theological, political, and personal tendencies and beliefs, betrays the very same value system and identity when constructing both seemingly incompatible accounts of the king. I shall argue that the character in the second half of the work departs from the character in the first half in that a new prevalent and pre-eminent discourse, necessitated by a change of events, induced not an actual change of persona, but a realignment of discursive emphasis within a recognizable character. The first half was executed by a narrator attempting to explain Roman elite behaviour by narrating his tale with reference to the prevailing discourse of the period he tries to reanimate. The actions of Theoderic are justified in the language of the prevailing elite discourse of his time. However, they are presented in language which responds to the contemporary idea of the period it tries to reanimate, but still recognizably from within the present which he now inhabits. The second half re-evaluates the king's persona from within the boundaries of a discourse which, although circulating co-temporally with the other, did not find its pre-eminence until the demise of Theoderic. This was done in order to adapt and survive in the new circumstances which the collapse of Gothic rule involved. It both damns and praises Theoderic from within a recognizably familiar Roman discourse.

I will not accept, as does Barnish,[321] that the incongruity can be primarily explained by the *chiaroscuro* tradition within Classical and Biblical literature. As can be understood from my comments above, the demystification of the inconsistencies should be sought within the broader discourses which inform and form identity. I shall tentatively entertain the possibility that the author hoped that this tradition, with which Barnish has powerfully and convincingly argued *AV* was acquainted, would provide him with a stylistic framework which could lend his uneven narrative consistency – even though the intuitive action of employing these sources can tell us more about intellectual consistency and narrative unity than conscious employment. I will accept Cessi's[322] acknowledgment that the inconsistency of tone owes something to the changed circumstances of Italy before and after the fall of Theoderic's regime. Nevertheless, I shall reject the contention that one half was actually written before his death and one after.[323]

To return to the dating issue. It will become increasingly clear as we look at the evidence form the text, this work is the product of a mid-6th century Italian wrestling with the challenges the changing and evolving nature of Ostrogothic Italy presented to his Catholic and Roman identity before and after the fall of Theoderic (problems surely facing many Italians after the fall of the Goths). Clues of the type which led scholars to conclude that the *LP* was a creature of its time can be found in the *AV*.[324] The author's personal bias and partisan emotion seeps into the text in both parts. Granted, it does seem at first glance that the bias and partisanship moves in and out of opposing camps so wildly that such an argument must result in assumption of dual authorship. However, it is the inconsistent articulation of personal effection that reveals the author of the text to be a creature of his time.[325] He obviously supports the deeply divisive papacy of Symmachus, yet also articulates his emotional attachment

---

[321] Barnish (1983), 574-575,

[322] Cessi, cxix-cxxvi, clxv-clxviii

[323] Cessi: *"la prima parte…fu indubbiamente scritta prima della morte di Teoderico"* (clxv).

[324] See note 251.

[325] This one area of the work on which most scholars from both sides of the argument agree: personal bias plays a part. Mommsen (1892), 261; Cessi passim, Bury I.423; Tamassia (1913), 19; Adams (1976), 8.

to rapprochement with the East. This is clear evidence that the author was politically and theologically aware enough during the period 498-519 A.D. to form a strong attachment to the cause of Symmachus. Also, his unsubtle anti-Arian/anti-Gothic sentiments show that he was speaking now from within the confines of a time-period which was safely removed from Ostrogothic Italy. Both of these factors point to authorship of the text in the late 540s or early 550s (the author would have been a keen supporter of Symmachus in his youth; and, given the total destruction of the Ostrogothic state by this time, would have been safe enough to trash the memory of the Goths).[326] As we shall see from our deeper examination of these inconsistencies, they are characteristically consistent behavioural patterns for this time. He exhibits both the attitude of a Cassiodorus and Ennodius (instilling the Barbarians with Roman qualities); that of an anti-Arian pro-Byzantine (justifying the right to force the catholic faith and Imperial government on the Goths – the result of Justin's anti-Arian laws and Justinian's reconquest policy). He is working within literary genres, and within overlapping discourses, which chart the rise and fall of differing ideological concerns. The author inhabits the same cultural universe as Ennodius, Boethius, and Cassiodorus. Evidence of intertextual relations with these authors is not a sign of an emotionally, culturally, and chronologically detached historian cutting and pasting his way toward a reanimation of some distant past. It is evidence that this author had a cultural, religious, and political investment in the time, and his views, opinions and partialities were conditioned by the still-fresh discursive markers which these authors had interacted with and propagated, and which our author shared in as well.

Staying in character while executing this almost impossible task, the author attempts, and manages to honestly reflect both the continuities of elite tradition within Late Antiquity and the necessary changes these times forced upon the Roman elite. The rationale which informed the formation of discourse that we witnessed among the elite is evident from *AV*. Just as the elite tailored an education system to respond to the evolving political and cultural demands of the outside world, so the *AV* betrays a relationship with education which shows that the system is capable of responding to the demands of the changing world while still looking to the past for validation. In

---

[326] Adams (1976), 7-8.

this regard the *AV* is something of a liminal figure. He obviously, as we shall see, had contact with a Roman elite literary tradition which was perpetuated by the schools of Deuterius and a shared elite understanding of the language and traditions of a secular Roman past. Equally as obvious, though, is his familiarity with the kind of elite education which Cassiodorus envisaged for his pupils in a much changed, post-gothic world. What is true in education is also true with regard to the relationship the author has with the religious politics of the day. It is clear that in places the author subscribes to the dominant religious discourse (Symmachan) which sought to excuse both the actions of the elite and the actions of the king in his relations with the East. Also true is that the change necessitated by political transformation brought a further transformation in the language and function of the religious discourse which necessitated a less positive re-evaluation of the king. Using the same tools (language and cultural signifiers) that the Roman elite had employed to mark out not only their independence from, but superiority to Byzantium, this member of the Roman elite signals the superiority and independence of the Roman elite from Theoderic. The narrative may be uneven, but the writer remains in character throughout.

The Evidence from the 'First Half'

A catholic Author

The best place to start this discussion will be with a look at the text itself to locate our author in the so-called first half. Out of which cultural landscape does he emanate? What does the *Anonymus'* attitude towards Theoderic in the first part tell us about the author? The text reveals that he closely associates the king with the catholic faith. The author begins an extended piece of panegyric with the acclamation of the King as: *vir bellicosissimus, fortis* (58)[327]. We are then told: *praeclarus* [Theoderic] *et bonae voluntatis in omnibus* (59)…*nihil enim perperam gessit* (60). Equally praise-worthy, and deemed worthy of inclusion within this passage of Theoderic's positive attributes, is the king's religious background: *mater, Ereriliva dicta Gothica, catholica quidem erat, quae baptismo Eusebia dicta* (58). And although the king is presented as not wholly 'one of us' (*dum ipse quidem Arrianae sectae esset…* - 60), he is nevertheless (…*tamen…* – 60) a wise and tolerant ruler (60). The *AV* highlights the king's familial

---

[327] This slightly unusual praise must be read within the context of the passage; the king's warlike nature is favourably compared within the Gothic military tradition to which he belongs.

association with the catholic faith, paying only passing reference to his Arianism (*dum…tamen*), and pointing to the positive relationship the king had with the catholic religion. All of the king's worthy attributes are thus presented within a framework which esteems the catholic religion, and ennobles the king by placing him within its confines. We are presented with an extended encomium in which the author clearly betrays the parameters of his own religious ideological outlook.

How does the writer avoid any problems in identifying with someone who is not of the catholic faith? It is clear that the differences between the catholic religion and the king's religion present the writer no problems when eulogizing the king. The author simply suppresses the issue by presenting the king: *ac si catholicus*[328]. Just as by birth he was the offspring of a catholic mother, so in manhood he acted in a way that realized the promise of his birth: *ambulavit rex Theodericus Romam, et occurrit Beato Petro devotissimus ac si catholicus* (65). This picture of the king praying 'as if' a catholic among the faithful in the home of St Peter is a powerful one.   The identification of the king as almost catholic (the son of a catholic who acts like a catholic) allows the author to identify with Theoderic on his (the author's) terms - from an orthodox catholic perspective. The positive characterization of King Theoderic is grounded in distinctly catholic terms from a catholic perspective. The Arianism is suppressed and confined to a passing comment. The narrative seeks to divert our attention away from it by encouraging us to focus on those aspects of the king's character which paints the king's actions in a religiously 'accepted' way (within the context of the audience he is now addressing in post-Gothic Italy). Just as Gelasius blinded his audience to the Arian elephant in the room by throwing the sand of the Manichees into their eyes, so the *AV* author is allowing enough darkness to descend into the issue that, only that which he shines his light upon, will be apprehensible to his audience.

This is an example of the writer not simply attempting to paint the king in a manner that will allow the later, contrasting characterisation of him seem all the more

---

[328] For the late Latin replacement of the classical *quasi* by *ac si* see Adams, 78

deplorable.[329] This is an explanation of the actions of the Roman elite in relation to the king in the language of an author preoccupied with validating Roman elite actions within the context of an overtly religious moral framework. Some elements from within the Roman elite had, as we have witnessed in Chapter 2, managed to forge a very strong and independent role for the Church in Italy. It had been facilitated by the political environment which Theoderic's rule had engendered. The orthodoxy which had been championed by the elite was now the orthodoxy of the Imperial Roman world. In 550 this included Italy. The Arians could now - unsurprisingly, given their lack of political power - regain the heretical status Ambrose imparted to them; but which the persuasive powers of Gothic military might had encouraged Gelasius and others[330] to ignore. Imperial Italy now had a separate discourse circulating which was intolerant of all sects equally – but perhaps even more intolerant of potentially threatening (politically and militarily) heretics like the Arians.[331] Thus presenting Theoderic's behaviour in this way is, firstly: a reengagement with the anti-heretical narrative the Roman elite themselves had cultivated in the years they were building their powerbase; and, secondly, a reflection of the post-Gothic inclusion of the Arians in that anti-heretical blacklist – the tolerance of whom had, somewhat ironically, originally necessitated the construction of the narrative of religious intolerance. This example provides evidence of overlapping discourses of, on the one hand, the time that he is trying to represent and, on the other, the time that he is now speaking from. This is how the good catholic Italians 'saw' the king then, *AV* asserts, and it is in this context that contemporary readers should understand the actions of the Romans under his control.

A Roman Author

The attitude in the first half of the work towards the nature of Theoderic's regime in relation to its predecessor governments also reveals more about the author and his notions of who he is as a cultural and historical individual. As we have seen above, the king's positive relationship with Catholicism was not only an indicator of his

---

[329] Barnish (1983) and the *chiaroscuro* tradition.

[330] See Chapter 2 for Gelasius' unconvincing attempts to ignore Arianism.

[331] Justin had set the tone for a renewed attack upon the Arians: *Iustinus imperator, vir religiosus, summo ardoris amore religionis christianae voluit hereticos extricare. LP* 55.1

worth; it also revealed one aspect of the type of discourse the author was interacting with then and now. In the same way, the king's relationship with the previous administrations of the Roman state is both the yardstick the author provides as his own measurement of worth *and* evidence of the author speaking from within two overlapping discourses. It is clearly in this context that *AV* highlights those aspects of Theoderic's administration of the state which the author thought worthy of praise. His building works are singled out for special treatment: …*et ad restaurationem palatii, seu ad recuperationem moeniae [sic] civitatis singulis annis libras ducentas de arca vinaria dari praecepit* (67). As with Augustus, Vespasian, Trajan, Hadrian, and other notable 'building' emperors (whose building exploits are described in other 'imperial' histories. Barnish[332] has shown, as we shall discuss in detail later, the link between *AV* and other Roman historians and it is not too difficult to see the similarities in content and style between them and these descriptions of regeneration) Theoderic does not neglect the *urbs*. The king's love for public building works was not confined to one city, Rome, but spanned the state: *Erat enim amator fabricarum et restaurator civitatum.* (70) Many cities benefited: *Item Veronae thermas et palatium fecit et a porta usque ad palatium porticum addidit…Item Ticino palatium, thermas, amphitheatrum, et alios muros civitatis fecit* (71). The author is presenting us with an administration which has pride in civic architecture and building works, and which looks to the upkeep of the state.

The king's attitude towards the entertainment of his people is presented in similarly glowing terms - and in vocabulary instantly understandable to a Roman citizen. As described above, *AV* relates how the king undertook extensive building works which included baths and theatres. The author's description of how the king utilized these buildings also promotes the idea that the king can be thought of as genuinely Roman in his attitude towards his loyal subjects. He gives games: *exhibens ludos circensium et amphitheatrum…* (60); and to make sure the reader is in no doubt about the intention of this presentation of the king, it continues: …*ut etiam a Romanis Traianus vel Valentinianus, quorum tempora sectatus est, appellaretur* (60). We are thus presented with a King who should be thought a worthy successor to not just any

---

[332] Barnish (1983), 574-575, ad loc. Aurelius Victor, Suetonius two of the most prominent.

Roman administrator, but the best Roman history has to offer. The reference to the Romans in this context is significant. By saying that Theoderic was hailed as one of the great rulers 'even by the Romans' (*etiam a Romanis…appellaretur*), not only is it possible to see that our author is representing Theoderic within Roman tradition, he is also highlighting the widespread acceptance of Theoderic's reign among the Roman populace. Reinforcing this idea in the same passage, the author cites more examples to show why this was the case. The circuses already provided, the anonymous author describes Theoderic's distribution of the bread: *Dona et annonas largitus quamquam aerarium publicum ex toto faeneum invenisset, suo labore recuperavit et opulentum fecit.* (60) Theoderic is thus subject to a presentation which as characterizes him as both economically competent and generous within a recognizably 'Roman' context.

Having thus provided the foundation upon which to represent Theoderic as loved by Romans for his Roman behaviour, the author augments Theoderic's portrait by presenting an unmistakably imperial procession: *per tricennalem triumphans populo ingressus palatium, exhibens Romanis ludos circensium. Donavit populo Romano et pauperibus annonas singulis annis, centum viginti milia modios* (67). The references to the provision of games, leisure activities, the distribution of grain, and the triumph celebrating the *tricennalia* allow the author to leave his contemporary reader in no doubt about the cultural implications of responding positively to such a ruler. The author is speaking, and explaining elite Roman behaviour firmly within a distinctly Roman cultural tradition - the imperial *adventus*.[333] Speaking in the 550s, he is also addressing an audience which inhabits an environment where the toils and horrors of war have surely imparted to the simple and romantic desire for a continued Roman state (the justification for the wars which have ravaged Italy) a fundamentalist and extremist aspect naturally cultivated by the psychological and spiritual need for the justification of that war. The Roman elite within the narrative are presented as conforming to the behaviour of the Roman elite in the past in order to speak to the concerns of the present (or future, from the perspective of those existing within the

---

[333] Humphries (2007), 30, presents a good overview of the contours of the archetypal *adventus* as understood from the works of Ammianus Marcellinus, Claudian, and the Gallic panegyrists - see Humphries note 40 for all the relevant secondary literature on the *adventus* tradition in Late Antiquity.

narrative). It is this same motivation which can be seen, as we shall see, at work later in a religious context.

Responding to Contemporary Concerns: *Imperial and Roman*

Imperial

This section will deal with the circulating discourses in the text which reveal how this catholic Roman uses tradition to justify and explain past and present actions. We should understand this Roman presentation of the king as addressing two issues. One is imperial and universal and one is distinctly Roman and Italian. To deal with the imperial one first, let us examine the implications of the presentation of Theoderic celebrating his *tricennalia*. This, as *AV* says, is the reason for his *adventus*, his entry into the city of Rome: *per tricennalem triumphans populo ingressus palatium* (67).[334] The coherence of these accounts, the detailed and structured description of the procession, as we have said, betrays a close familiarity with the descriptive mechanism used by imperial writers to articulate the outlines of the *adventus*. Eusebius of Caesarea describes how Constantine entered Rome and made sacrifices, offered games, and initiated festivals.[335] Similarly, Ammianus Marcellinus provides one of the most famous and detailed descriptions of the imperial *adventus*. Here, Constantius enters Rome and visits all the main 'tourist' attractions in the city.[336] In *AV*, these two aspects of the Imperial historiography tradition are woven together to present the *Adventus* of Theoderic within the confines of the accepted structures of imperial behaviour. Theoderic is, like Constantine, celebrating his anniversary in the city with games and prayers. Like Constantius he augments the architectural jewels with his own commissions.[337] The striking similarities between the account of Theoderic's *Adventus* and other need not point toward a direct relationship between *AV* and his source material. These similarities should alert us to the fact that the first half of the *AV*, that part which seems so perplexingly dissimilar to the second, is

---

[334] The celebration could be either to mark 30 years of some uncertain event (Moorhead, 1992, 60, thinks a military victory is the more likely), or his 10 years of rule (the manuscript published by Henricus Valesius replaced *tricennalia* with *decennalia*; Richards, 70, and Wickham, 15, follow him)

[335] *Vita Constanini* I.48

[336] Ammianus Marcellinus XVI.X.13-19. The extended nature of the passage in Ammianus owes much to that historian's predilection for dramatic, purple patch prose.

[337] *AV* 67; Ammianus XVI.X.17

presenting its king from within discursive contours which would be remarkably familiar to any member of the Roman literary elite. Indeed, in general this account of the *adventus* would have been familiar to the member of the Roman elite who has simply been aware of the tradition of the *adventus* and imperial 'jubilee' celebrations.

Like the presentation of the king as almost catholic, this account is attempting to place not just the king in an imperial context. The Roman elite, who interacted with him at this incredible event, are also washed in the cleansing waters of the imperial tradition. Their actions are presented in an original context which is shaped in order to justify, retrospectively, their actions to the present. Just as the Romans above can be understood as explaining their actions to a contemporary religious audience by referring to contemporary religious values, thus it is here. In this newly 'reconstituted' Roman Empire, the emphasis is on showing devotion to the Roman Empire (the reason for those long and bloody wars) through the attempt to closely associate sympathetic behaviour towards the Ostrogoths with the exercise of traditional Roman custom in a distinctly imperial fashion. This history of Theoderic shows that the Romans who were present at this event were actually acting in a way which their ancestors for hundreds of years would have. Thus their actions are sanctioned by the time-honoured traditions of Rome and, more especially, by the time-honoured traditions of Imperial Rome – and again even more specifically, the traditions of the late-antique, post-Constantinian Imperial Rome.

How this imperial aspect is further 'sold' to the audience through another cultural register is also worth quick examination. The *adventus* is actually introduced to the reader of the *AV* before the reason for the *adventus* itself – the *tricennalia*. As we remember from chapter 2, the *AV* is complicit, along with the *LP* and Theophanes[338], in the maintenance and distribution of a pro-Symmachan narrative in relation to the Laurentian controversy. It clearly states that Symmachus was ordained pope by God's will and justly (*ordinante deo…et dignus fuit – AV*, 65). This assertion frames the environment at Rome into which Theoderic walks. As we have discussed at length in chapter 2, the sources which gravitated towards the promulgation of pro-Symmachan

---

[338] 118.

literature and language seemed to understand the role of the king in facilitating (actively or passively) the triumph of Roman supremacy.[339] The *AV* then presents the king at 65 as making a personal effort to congratulate Symmachus as soon as Theoderic enters Rome. It is at this point that Theoderic rushes toward the new pope 'as if a catholic'. The narrative here acknowledges what must have been common knowledge and accepted at the time: that the king guaranteed (again, through active or passive means) the defeat of the imperially-sanctioned pro-Henotikon leanings of some voices from within the elite. This, of course, is a course of action which ran directly counter to imperial will at the time. This latter obstacle of the king's actions working against contemporary imperial interest is undermined by the lines immediately preceding 65. At the end of 64 we are informed that the emperor of the East, Anastasius, handed the imperial regalia to Theoderic. Thus the Roman elite and Theoderic are validated and sanctioned, while working within an imperial context

The message of 64 complements 65 and provides the perfect framework for a narrative which attempts to present Theoderic and the actions of the Roman people towards him as impeccably orthodox and unimpeachably loyal to the empire – even though the opposite must have been the case at the time. The *AV*, in his arrangement of the facts, is able to establish that: 1) Theoderic's actions were, if not imperial in themselves (Odoacer, according to *AV*, had sent the imperial regalia to Constantinople because he had deposed the emperor)[340], were sanctioned by imperial endorsement. 2) Theoderic if not catholic, was a defender of Roman supremacy and 'almost a catholic'; and 3) the Romans were acting entirely within the confines of their traditional and time-honoured practice of respecting imperial wishes and defending the true faith. The probability/improbability of these events happening is not something which this thesis is attempting to establish. I am only interested in examining what the *AV* highlights and what it suppresses. In this passage, the author simply presents those facts which are crucial to the flow of his narrative. The narrative deals with some complex and fraught issues which stretch back over a 4 year period (496 to 500 A.D.). The almost cursory mention of a schism which almost split

---

[339] Chapter 2, 103-104. As was discussed, the *LP* has Theoderic taking an active role.

[340] *AV*, 64; Malchus, fragment 14 (in Blockley; fragment 10 in Muller-Dindorf), says that Odoacer explicitly stipulates that he saw no need for two emperors.

the Roman church in two is telling. As is the frustratingly laconic account of the imperial regalia being handed back to Theoderic (if we accept Marcellinus Comes' account of the deposition of the last emperor as an earth-shattering moment, then an account of the emperor in the East apparently re-crowning a new emperor must surely do more than present the bald facts of the matter). The *AV* says only what his narrative needs him to say: Theoderic is endorsed imperially and Theoderic is at the pope's side after Symmachus' victory, venerating his 'God-ordained' assumption of office. Therefore, we should view 64-65 as in effect sanctioning and justifying everything that follows in 65 to 73. This now leaves us with the distinctly Italian Roman issue.

Roman

We have seen above that the author deals with issues which clearly mark out aspects of his character which have been fashioned out of the ancient clay of a generic secular Roman identity. He describes the king's actions with reference to a generic understanding of a classical Roman past, whose traditions stretch back over hundreds of years to the pagan emperors. The significance of this characterization of the king in these terms also lies, like the imperial representation, in its attempts to retrospectively justify elite Italian behaviour in a period which no longer looks kindly upon friendly relations with the Goths. To highlight this issue, let us examine a few more examples of Theoderic's presentation in a 'Roman' context. As we have said above, the text is attempting to construct a narrative which presents a king who is a recognizably traditional figure presenting the reader with a picture of continuity (from recognizable historiographical traditions and more general elite cultural conceptions). Like those before him, he is a prudent ruler, who provides his subjects with typically Roman entertainment. The *AV* augments this picture with a fuller and more rounded account of a worthy successor to Trajan grounded in the traditions of Roman administration. This account includes a description of a character that is able to provide for the more essential elements of the citizens' welfare.

One of the most potent symbols of the excellence of Roman civilization was its engineering prowess. The baths, sanitation, running drinking water – all the things ancient Romans should take for granted - were provided by one such manifestation of

this prowess: the aqueduct. Republican consuls and emperors alike (Claudius in Rome, Valens in Constantinople among the more famous) gave their name to these dominating impositions on the Roman cultural and actual landscape. They are also used by *AV* to impose an identity on Theoderic and his regime which characterized them as following the precedents of ancient Rome. *Hic aquae ductum Ravennae restauravit, quem princeps Traianus fecerat, et post multa tempora aquam introduxit* (71). This story of Theoderic's exploits places him within narrative confines that accords him a place among those who sought to maintain the best achievements of ancient Rome – and thus places him among its greatest men (in this case – once again – Trajan). Other cities too enjoyed the flow of civilization back into their life: *Item Veronae…aquae ductum, quod per multa tempora destructum fuerat, renovavit et aquam intromisit* (71). Significantly, though, the neglect of previous, unworthy emperors is implicit in the phrase above: *post multa tempora…*Theoderic is presented not simply as a symbol of continuity, but as a return to Roman civilization. He is presented as undoing the decline, rolling back the years. The dilapidation, deterioration, and decay are thus arrested and a return to the better conditions enjoyed by their Roman forefathers is promised.

An Arcadian Italy: the Significance

This is significant because it is highlighting something which the author wants us to see. Theoderic's role in the Laurentian affair is clearly understood by the author, yet he only discusses it in the narrowest way (narrative purpose). Likewise, his constitutional position is only addressed in so far as it can facilitate the narrative purpose. However, here, the author goes into comparatively minute detail in his presentation of the king in this context. The attempt to paint Theoderic in these Roman colours is an attempt not to glorify the king (the mistake that many historians make when evaluating the 'inconsistencies' in the *AV* – 'how can he glorify the king and then attack him?') but an attempt to excuse the past actions of the Italian elite in the present. The message from this passage is that Italy had been in ruin, its infrastructure crumbling, before Theoderic. Procopius describes in detail how, after Theoderic's death, the Gothic war reduced Italy to a similar (if not much worse) condition: Γότθοι μὲν οὖν οὕτω ταξάμενοι διεῖλον τοὺς ὀχετοὺς

ἅπαντα, ὅπως δὴ ὕδωρ ὡς ἥκιστα ἐς τὴν πόλιν ἐνθένδε εἰσίοι.[341] The significant thing here is that the aqueducts have been cut. Accepting the date of in or around 550 for the composition of the *AV*, we can see how this event would have been hugely symbolic and massively demoralizing. The memory of a king rebuilding the aqueducts would have been instilled with even deeper significance to those inhabiting the post-Gothic present, with the obvious problems which would have come with the destruction of these fundamental enablers of civic life. That the wars did bring destruction and hardship to the lands of Italy is clear. Also writing in the 550s, Pope Pelagius describes the still ruined and desolate nature of his own lands.[342] The fact that Theoderic did repair these manifestations of Roman civic life and civilization is showcased because it emphasizes that, in ways which they had not before, nor perhaps could now, the Roman elite living under Theoderic were enjoying an existence in their own land which had been the birthright of their ancestors. The good king of the first half is thus, as we have seen so far, a vehicle through which the *AV* would have his modern audience believe the Romans could live like Romans had always traditionally done. It was not 'collaboration' with an enemy, but mutually beneficial co-existence with a cultural facilitator.

AV gives many more examples of the Gothic king's person as a reminder of a former golden age, which surely would have resonated greatly to the author's Roman contemporaries.[343] He invokes the peace and safety Theoderic has restored to Rome. As we have seen, knowledge both of what preceded his reign and what followed[344] his death and his daughter's expulsion,[345] would have, to the reader in Italy, instilled in *AV's* description of the peaceful disposition of Theoderic's kingdom the same romantic and mystical allure as the peace of the empire under Augustus. The collapse of Roman government in the Western provinces, hyperinflation, breakdown of law and order, and the repeated invasions of the Italian peninsula by various barbarian

---

[341] Procopius *BG* V.xix.13-14; VI.xx; *Anecdota*, xviii.13-14

[342] *Epistle* III. In the *MGH* series, 72-73.

[343] Mid-6th century; see above for dating arguments.

[344] See Procopius, The History of the Wars V-VIII (The Gothic Wars), for an account of the various calamities which befell Italy's towns and cities.

[345] Amalas(i)untha. See Procopius v.iv.13-27 for her downfall.

tribes intent on one form of destruction or another plagued the later stages of the imperial story in Italy. We have already discussed what happened to Italy after his reign. However, the Italy of Theoderic, according to our source, was the sort of neighbourhood where one could leave one's front door open (or city gate): *et hoc per totam Italiam tanto modo augurium habebat, ut nulli civitati portam fecerit: nec in civitate portae claudebantur* (73). The appearance of a saviour of Roman civilization, a man who returns Rome to a golden age after the chaos and destruction of successive wars and martial outrages is significant in an Augustan context. Book VIII of the *Aeneid* deals with just such a scenario. King Evander describes the golden age of Latium under Saturn before the frenzy of war destroyed it.[346] Caesar restores order and peace to the Roman world after many savage wars. He also tames the kings and barbarous nations who had brought an end to the golden age (the procession of conquered kings and goodwill of other nations which forms this scene is replicated in the *AV*).[347]

This is a Roman voice which understands that Italy herself has been and continues to be an area where, because of the civil strife, Theoderic's reign can be understood and presented as a new golden age. The kingdom of Theoderic is the antithesis of the reality before and after his reign. The author of the *AV* further gilds the Augustan lily by framing the king's ability to provide this in auspicious language: *et hoc…augurium habebat*. Like *auspices* and the similarly semantic implication of *secundus*, this word may have lost its original meaning in a post-Constantinian world. The divination process which gave *secundus* its meaning of favourable had been long forgotten in this Christian world. All that was left was the base meaning 'favourable'. The close association of *augurium* with favourable presentations of emperors of old (and their foresight) rendered it still a potentially positive concept to interact with.[348] The contrast between past and present, combined with loaded terminology facilitate the

---

[346] *Aeneid* VIII.320-326

[347] Ibid, VIII.714-729

[348] Massey (2008), 6-7, as well as highlighting the religious implications of 'secundus' and its changed semantic range (from 'second' to 'favourable'), discusses the permutation of divination terms in a Christian context. Suetonius *Augustus* XXXI.4. The passage, interestingly, concentrates on the restorative powers of Augustus.

presentation of the king as a desirable ruler in an Italo-Roman context. Like the great Roman heroes of the past he promises peace throughout Italy.

Further Development of a Pax Theodericana

Not only the cities and surrounding plains of Italy were safe, but the king's wise rule had ensured that the state was surrounded by friendly nations: *sic enim oblectavit vinctas gentes, ut se illi sub foedus darent aliae gentes, sibi eum regem sperantes* (72). From Alaric to Attila, and on to Geiseric[349] Italy's relationship with its neighbouring peoples had not always been a positive one. The recurring threat of military outrage or territorial destruction had been a feature of the late imperial landscape inhabited by the Roman elite. Rutilius Namatianus, in his *De Reditu suo* provides glimpses at the extent of the destruction in 5th century Italy, and provides evidence of a senior member of the Roman elite[350] fleeing the carnage of the imperial heartlands to return to his provincial homeland. In Rutilius' case it had been the neighbouring tribes, the *gentes* threatening Italy's borders, which he bitterly lamented as the cause. Although Rutilius blames a Roman general's (Stilicho) barbarophile tendencies for the lax Roman security which led to the destructions he witnessed, he focuses on the primary cause as the barbarian tribes who flooded through the 'gates' of the Alps and the Apennines.[351] A Christian view from within the Roman elite (which Rutilius' account most certainly did not reflect) provides further evidence of the shock that the invasions had generated among the literary and moneyed class. Augustine's *De Civitate Dei* is a more considered response to the barbarian incursions (specifically the sack of 410 - in Rutilius' case the response was to not only the sack of Rome in 410, but to the destruction of the lands the Goths had perpetrated). In this context, Theoderic's ability to pacify the tribes represents the reversal of the failures of Stilicho. He can and does stop the tribes from flooding into Italy. Theoderic not only addresses the insecurity of the state, but he addresses the causes of insecurity of the state – the barbarians

---

[349] Alaric: *PLRE* II, 43-48; Attila: *PLRE* II, 182-183; Geiseric: *PLRE* II, 496-499

[350] His father Lachanius (*PLRE* I, 595), was a *magister officiorum*, as was he – and *praefectus urbi* (Rome). See *PLRE* II, 770-771

[351] *De Reditu Suo*, II.41-60

The *AV* returns to the characterization of the king in a Roman context when explaining the type of character who can manage this previously impossible task. He draws our attention to the qualities which Theoderic possesses in cultivating the circumstance in which Italy rises from the ashes of failed imperial policy. Theoderic has created an environment where commercial transactions can proceed without fear of brigandage: *negotiantes vero de diversis provinciis ad ipsum concurrebant. Tantae enim **disciplinae** fuit, ut, si quis voluit in agro suo argentum vel aurum dimittere, ac si intra muros civitatis esset ita existimaretur…quivis quod opus habebat faciebat qua hora vellet, ac si in die* (72-73). This is the creation of Theoderic's control and discipline. Like emperors in the Suetonian tradition, who manage and exhibit *disciplina*,[352] the king bends the outside world to his will with the exercise of this quality. The kingdom itself is described as a bastion of tranquility and peace, within whose limits civilized administration permits merchants to travel widely selling their wares. And it is this bastion of tranquility and peace that the neighbouring tribes have bowed their heads down before in the promise of Theoderic bestowing his hegemony over their lands. This characterization is the opposite of what we would expect from genuine imperial historiography from before the collapse of the Western Empire. Namatianus' narrative is filled full of old fur-skinned barbarians, whose characteristic ill-discipline is recognizably familiar to readers of Tacitus. Theoderic is the antithesis of this hackneyed stereotype. The *AV* thus puts as much water between Theoderic and the imperial propagandistic idea of barbarian as possible by locating him in the camp of the Romans themselves. As we can see from the above examples, the exercise of *disciplina* was a highly esteemed character trait within the imperial historiographical tradition. The king is subject to a presentation which has him inhabiting this tradition.

The borders thus safely guaranteed by the kings' wise rule, and the gates of the cities symbolically open, *AV* completes his account of the safety of the kingdom with a narrative which recalls the *Pax Romana*. There is then solid financial proof provided that this '*Pax Theodericana*' did indeed come to pass: *sexaginta modios tritici in*

---

[352] Suetonius, *Caesar* xlviii; *Augustus* lxv. Also a concept Caesar presents himself as having a close relationship with throughout the *Bellum Gallicum*: vi.i; iv.i.9. Cicero refers to it as a quality needed for good governance: *de oratione* i.xxxiv.159; *de republica* i.33, ii.38.

solidum ipsius tempore emerunt, et vinum triginta amphoras in solidum[353]. *AV* tells us that during the upheaval of Zeno's attempts to recapture Italy from Odoacer, one *modius* of wheat cost 6 gold pieces (*solidos*). One gold piece for sixty *modii* presents a revolutionary inflationary reversal. This is the sort of reversal that had occurred before in the Roman Empire. The monetary reforms of Aurelian after the 3rd century military crises were the first of many attempts by the emperor to restore confidence to the Empire through direct action. Theoderic's successful monetary policy can not unjustifiably be seen as an attempt to wash the king in the ennobling waters of imperial monetary policy triumphs.[354] This representation of the king as a restorer of peace is also shaped within another recognizably traditional Roman context. The king is a latter day Augustus, Aurelius or Trajan, whose wise and benevolent rule has made Italy safe for Roman civilization once again. Before leaving the themes of empire and Italo-Roman identity, it will prove useful to look at the literary frameworks and models the author was familiar with and how their use facilitates the narrative purpose we have seen employed so far.

Using the Imperial Biographical Tradition

The relationship the king's portrayal has with imperial biographical tradition is worth exploring a little. The description of Theoderic's building programmes, his cultivation of the people's good wishes, and his prudent management of the public finances, all have a place within the imperial biographical tradition.[355] As S. Barnish has further noted, the accounts of the king's *sententiae* "is strongly reminiscent of Suetonius".[356] One is reminded of *Augustus* 87, where Suetonius recounts several of Augustus' more famous sayings. It is with great pride that *AV* places his subject within this tradition: *tantae sapientiae fuit, ut aliqua, quae locutus est, in vulgo usque nunc pro sententia habeantur;* **unde nos non piget aliqua** *de multis eius in commemoratione posuisse*

---

[353] *AV*, 53

[354] Watson (2007), 127-143

[355] Barnish (1983), 575. Also drawing attention to others who followed in the Suetonian tradition: Aurelius Victor, Philo, etc. Without doubt, though, the strongest historical literary influence upon *AV* comes from the chronicle tradition (see note 384 below). The now lost 'archetype', which informed the writings of so many 5th and 6th century historical works, provided *AV* with the linguistic and literary 'enobling' landscape he places Theoderic within. Mommsen (1892), 260-265.

[356] Ibid

(61). The author closely associates himself with the king, while placing him among the other Roman worthies who have been subject to the praise in this literary tradition. The result is a presentation of the king as someone acceptable to a Roman with an understanding of his literature, history, and culture. It is hard to disagree with Barnish that the "gossipy, discursive, anecdotal manner" of our author is reminiscent of Suetonius. However, as said above, we should reserve judgement on whether the author is actively cultivating a narrative which utilises the *chiaroscuro* principle to accomplish its task (and remember the influence of the Chronicle tradition). The readiness to employ the *chiaroscuro* principle is facilitated by a lack of awareness that the driving force behind the uneven nature of both parts is not an attempt to glorify the king – it is an attempt to excuse the actions of the Roman elite to a contemporary audience. The purpose of placing the king's description within this framework is more understandable in that context.

Although the anonymous author betrays a closer association with the conventions and rules of the genre expounded by 'lost Chronicle' (n.335, above), it does seem to directly appropriate the content from imperial biographies and develop them. Suetonius' account of the life of Claudius includes a story[357] of a woman who would not acknowledge her son to the world. Suetonius' account describes the wise counsel of the 'erratic' Claudius demanding that the woman marry the man if he is not her son. The woman refuses and admits her perjurious culpability. The story is regurgitated by *AV* and greatly embellished. While Suetonius' account is fairly to the point: a woman does not accept someone as her son; Claudius asks her to marry him; problem solved. Our text provides a colourful back-story to the tale (62) before imparting the wisdom of Claudius (stripped of the negative connotations of the Suetonian account) to the king: *et dum maritum se rex non esse facturum sub iusiurando [sic] pollicitus est nisi ipsum, alium non acciperet maritum, tunc confusa est mulier et confessa est suum esse filium* (62). Whether the story was picked up second hand or lifted directly from Suetonius is difficult to ascertain with any certainty, but it emanates from a circulating Roman literary tradition. It is clear that our author is writing his account of Italy under Theoderic from within a distinctly

---

[357] Suetonius, *Lives of the Twelve Caesars: Claudius*, 15. 2-3

Roman tradition. The literary vehicle of imperial biography ennobles Theoderic by containing him within its contours. It also tells us that the author is someone who is familiar with the genre and has read and absorbed many of the defining characteristics of its style. He is saying that he is a Roman and a literary member of the elite *and* that the king deserves a place among those who populate the pages of the tradition. So his purpose is clear: to ennoble the king and excuse the Italian elite. He uses the traditions and the esteemed past of the Roman (Italian) elite to do it.

Conclusions from Favourable Presentation

As we have been saying, the author is consciously creating the text from a distinctly Roman perspective. His descriptions of the king and his rule are seen through the eyes of someone who sees himself and his readership as sharing in an understood and reciprocally accepted Roman religion, history, and culture. The writer is careful to ensure that his representations of the king will be acceptable to the Romans on many different levels. The author is at pains to imbue the king with as much *Romanitas* as possible: he portrays the king as pseudo catholic; he compares him to previous great rulers because of his love for his subjects; and frames him within a literary tradition that presents him as worthy of imperial status. In short, he argues the case for the king's right to rule in the Roman tradition. The author reminds the reader that Theoderic had eastern imperial approval and was invested with offices of the Roman state: *Zeno itaque recompensans beneficiis Theodericum, quem patricium et consulem, donans ei multum et mittens eum ad Italiam* (49). Theoderic is an imperially-endorsed Roman patrician and consul, who was sent to Italy to rule in the name of the emperor and defend Italy for him[358]. Having provided an imperial *raison d'etre* for Theoderic's invasion, we are then reminded that the King received the imperial regalia of the western emperors from the emperor of the east, Anastasius: *facta pace cum Anastasio imperatore per Festum de presumptione regni, et omnia ornamenta palatii, quae Odoacer Constantinopolim transmiserat, remittit.[359]* (64).

---

[358] Although the wording of the phrase *loco eius, dum adveniret [Zeno], tantum praeregnaret* provides more than a hint of confusion as to the actual remit.

[359]As the text says, it was Odoacer, the man Theoderic was sent to vanquish, who had sent the imperial regalia to Byzantium after having deposed the so-called last emperor of the West, Romulus Augustulus.

Theoderic had the right to invade and assume power and he now has the right to rule as a Roman Emperor with all the material manifestations of that office. In the next chapter there is a description of the King in Rome addressing the Senate and the People: *deinde veniens ingressus urbem, venit ad senatum, et ad Palmam populo allocutus, se omnia, deo iuvante, quod retro principes Romani ordinaverunt inviolabiliter servaturum promittit.* (66). Thus by speaking to the Senate and the People, Theoderic symbolically and implicitly represents continuity with a Roman past; and by his word to them in the curia and in front of it, he explicitly stipulates that his rule will be a continuation of what has went before.

What does the text to chapter 79 tell us about the religious prejudices of the writer? We can see that he wishes to closely associate the king with Catholicism – even though the king is an Arian. The author thinks it relevant to mention that the king is the product of a catholic mother. He suppresses the Arianism of the king, paying only passing reference to it, while placing great emphasis on his catholic origins. He also paints a picture of a pious Christian king who acts as if he were a catholic with his holy reverence for St Peter. His praise of the Arian king is so thoroughly framed within a catholic context, that the king's lauded reverence can only be understood as attempt to present Theoderic as anything but a heretic. The author's character as a product of Roman history and culture is also very apparent. The king's love of the people is expressed in terms instantly understandable to the educated Roman. The king, like the Roman emperors before him, puts on games, builds baths and theatres, and distributes bread and grain, placating the populace in the time-honoured fashion. The buildings of the Rome and Italy are repaired and beautified, and the aqueducts which provide running water rebuilt, in order to restore the towns and cities to their former condition under the empire. Through all the praise of his achievements, the king is not only implicitly compared to emperors; he is explicitly compared to specific emperors of great regard among Romans of the present and past. Our author sees and assumes others will see this work from an unmistakably catholic and Roman point of view. The king with whom the Italian elite of his kingdom previously co-existed is thus packaged in a way which explains and justifies their co-existence within the parameters of this catholic and Roman point of view.

Evidence from the 'Second Half'

Evidence of the Same Author at Work

I shall now move to discuss the change in attitude towards the king from 79 onwards. Once again I shall attempt to examine how the author describes his subject, and see what this reveals about the concerns of the author. The negative account of the king, which forms the bulk of the end of the work, clearly begins at chapter 79. Here the author returns to the subject of the king after a brief description of the end of the Emperor Anastasius' life. We find an anecdote which returns the reader to the topic of the king's illiteracy. This passage, however, refocuses and reinterprets some of the negative side-affects of his inability to read or write: *Theodericus illiteratus erat et sic obtuso sensu, ut in decem annos regni sui quattor litteras subscriptionis edicti sui discere nullatenus potuisset* (79). The wisdom, which accompanied the first description (chapter 61: *dum illitteratus esset, tantae sapientiae fuit…*- here the king's illiteracy was no bar to his sagacity), gives way to an account which focuses on the dull comprehension, obtuse mind, which the *AV* implies is the companion to illiteracy. The re-emphasized nature of the depiction of this aspect of the king's illiteracy allows the *AV* to facilitate the beginning of a process which gradually transports the actions of Theoderic from the Roman and catholic to the villainous and heretical. Once again we must understand this process as part of the general attempt by the author to mould a characterization of the king which explains and justifies the actions of the author within a contemporary cultural landscape.

This anecdote precedes an account of the king's dealings with the various religious factions within his kingdom. Theoderic, having heard from his consul, Eutharicus, that the Catholics had forcibly tried to convert the Jews, and that upon failure had taken to burning down synagogues, decided upon punishment: *iussit [Theodericus]… ut omnis populus Romanus Ravennates synagogas, quas incendio concremaverunt, data pecunia restaurarent; qui vero non habuissent unde dare fustati per publicam sub voce praeconia ducerentur.*(82) Preceding, as it does the introductory passage that begins the less positive picture of the king, these dealings would seem to be directly countering the claim of chapter 60 that Theoderic: *nihil contra religionem catholicam*

temptans. We should, as surely the author intended, see this development as part of an action undertaken by the king which must not be viewed particularly sympathetically. It is not difficult to perceive this as bringing his regime into disrepute in the eyes of its catholic and Roman subjects.

However, once again we must not make the mistake, as Cessi does, of seeing in this passage the sort of inconsistencies which would encourage one to take the drastic action of splitting the author in two. Firstly, surprising as it seems, we should not view Theoderic as being explicitly attacked for this action. The narrative voice of the author is remarkably impartial and restrained (especially when compared with the vitriolic attacks later in the text). Looking closely at the text we can see that, in the above passage, *AV* reserves any personal invective for members of the king's government. We can see this when the author uses similar terminology to articulate his dislike for Eutharicus, the king's consul, as he does when articulating his approval of Theoderic in chapter 60: *dato consulatu Eutharico…qui Eutharicus nimis asper fuit et contra fidem catholicam inimicus* (80). Theoderic is only mentioned in this passage as having celebrated triumphs in Rome and Ravenna. The king is not an enemy to the catholic religion, but his advisors are. Cessi's main thesis in relation to this idea is that this passage is a simple contrast with chapter 60, in order to discredit the effect of the praise.[360] However, it is not Theoderic who is *inimicus* here. If he were, Cessi's argument that his 'other author' is feigning continuity may have some point. There are other reasons why this is not a particularly strong argument. It does not take into account the lengths the author goes to from 74 onwards to depart from the secular and highlight the king's particular weakness in religious matters (something which we shall soon turn to). More importantly, however, it fails to recognize that the author is still primarily focused on presenting the Italian elite's relationship with a good but flawed king. The king must have been good for the reasons articulated above. The king must also be flawed, however, because his religion, his tribe, and his successors have been, according to victor's justice, proclaimed the enemy. Cessi's argument that a second author is retrospectively arguing against the presentation of a first author is

---

[360] Cessi, cxx

unsound. The real change is in the political circumstances. All other changes flow from this.

The king of the first half, who did nothing against the Catholic faith, is still doing nothing directly to harm the catholic faith. External factors, like his tribe and his tribe's religion are. The blame is primarily focused on those abstract concepts and not the king. However his overall argument, that this passage is attacking Theoderic through Eutharicus, has some merit when considering the final goal of the *AV*'s narrative: constructing the outlines of an enemy where once there had been a friend. This presentation must be plausible for it to gain any genuine acceptance among the new generation of the Roman elite who now inhabit a cultural context. That cultural context has created a discourse where the language of religious and imperial unity has replaced that of religious and political independence. Brutally attacking the king's character may serve that purpose, but it would reflect badly upon the Roman elite who collaborated with him and his regime for well over quarter of a century. It must be an account which can be both panegyric and invective within the confines of the new discourse.

We can see more evidence of that attempt to both articulate convincingly the king's flaws and excuse them. Although Theoderic issues the final decision to punish the Christians who persecuted the Jews, the writer distances the king once again from the action: *Mox Iudaei currentes Veronam, ubi Rex erat, agente Triwane praeposito cubiculi, et ipse haereticus favens Iudaeis, insinuans regi factum adversus Christianos* (82). Another 'heretic' enemy of the faith is responsible for putting the idea into the king's head (*insinuans*). The effect of this passage is to – and it is surely what the writer intended – highlight that aspect of Theoderic's mental weakness (illiteracy) which has implications for his general intellectual competence (*obtuso sensu*). This character flaw linked to his illiteracy could be exploited. This heroic flaw established, the author then surrounds the king with enemies of the faith, who find a flawed mind which is easy to manipulate, and proceed to do it (*insinuans*). They are consequently able to make a man who was no enemy of the catholic faith take action against the children of God. This turning point in the behaviour of the king is described in the

language of the orthodox catholic who had previously praised the 'almost catholic' Theoderic. It uses the same terminology, employs the same anecdotes, and although, paradoxically, the story is recalibrated to produce a less positive account of the king's intelligence, the actual effect is to present him once again as not being the primary agent of anything which harmed the catholic faith – his advisors did it. It is clearly still the same author, composing the same narrative, with the same narrative purpose. The King's actions are framed in the same catholic context, presented with the same compositional form, and importantly, serving the same goal: a convincing justification of Roman elite behaviour. So, stylistically, theologically, culturally, and crucially politically the *AV* of this 'second half' is the same as the *AV* of the first. Let us now look at what changes have actually taken place what they tell us about the author's intentions.

Evidence of a Catholic and Imperial Author

Catholic Voice

There is a definite change of literary gear after the author has been able to explain the less positive actions of the king. The author's restrained and measured tones of the first half are indicative of an approach which is treading a delicate path. In the second half, inhabiting, as he does, an environment favourable for the expression of a clearly defined form of hard-line, imperially-sanctioned Catholicism, the author's language and narrative break into unrestrained and animated voice. As we have seen from the discussion above, chapters 1 to 79 do tend to concentrate their positive account more on the secular, non-religious aspects of Theoderic's rule (his role as imperial administrator of old is given far more prominence than his *ac si catholicus* praise). Here, however, from 79 onwards, the balance shifts the other way.   The author's Roman identity, with its implications for his historical and religious outlook, which looked back to the emperors and practices of old, is smothered by his Catholicism. From now on it is the author's religious identity that informs the narrative voice as it arranges and presents events in the text. The anecdote in chapter 61 is followed by examples of the king's capabilities and his ability to steer the secular ship of state; following 79 Theoderic's inadequacies and inability to deal with issues of faith are highlighted. From this carefully crafted depiction of him as intellectually weak and

consequently liable to error in spiritual matters, the author proceeds to describe the negative aspects of the king's final years from a more decidedly catholic perspective.

The easily manipulated Theoderic, without the good guidance of the Catholic Church, following advice from heretics and persecuting Catholics, is presented as easy prey for the devil. In his spiritually weakened state, having succumbed to the siren calls of the enemies of God, *AV* has the devil possess the King: *ex eo enim invenit diabolus locum, quem ad modum hominem bene rem publicam sine querella gubernantem subriperet.* (83). The chronological and causal link is clear (*ex eo…*): the devil possessed the king after[361] he capitulated to the heretical machinations of Eutharicus and Triwane. Everything Theoderic is now described as doing is done while possessed by Lucifer; and all his actions are understood through this faith-based prism. Before, when sane, he was the repairer of Roman buildings, now, mad with possession, the author has the king destroying the churches of God: *iussit ad fonticulos in proastio civitatis Veronensis oratorium Santi Stephani, id est altarium subverti.* (83)

The text gives no rationalization for the actions by the king; the story is preceded by his possession and then followed by the strange tale of evil portents. This, as we recognize, is an identical formal structure to that employed in the first half of the text by the author. This passage mirrors the structure of the return of the imperial regalia at 64, which introduced and framed the presentation of the king and the pope in 65, and provided the basis upon which to build up an impressive picture of an imperial Theoderic. The incredibly symbolic act of the king meeting the pope after Symmachus' election provides no background or contextualization; the story is preceded by the empowering act of imperial endorsement, and then followed by a collection of 'Roman' images of the king which could have been furnished from the pages of imperial biography. The king of this presentation is an inversion of the king of the first half, using a similar formal structure: the introduction of a 'type' (possessed or imperial) of king; an exposition of themes (bad possessed ruler or good Roman and catholic ruler); and a development of said themes (evil happenings or traditional munificence).

---

[361] Whether the <*ex eo*> is grammatically causal or temporal is a moot point (Barnish, 579-80); surely we are encouraged to see the events of chapter 83 as both a temporal and consequential sequel to 82.

Augmenting his depiction of the possession, resultant violence of his unholy actions, and the diabolical rage of the king, the author paints a vivid picture of the physical manifestation of the madness of King Theoderic: *Post haec coepit adversus Romanos rex subinde fremere inventa occasione* (85). Theoderic is not calmly plotting against the Romans and the Catholics; he is raging against them with animal-like intensity (*fremere*). The text is encouraging the reader to see events from a catholic point of view and understand the actions of the king from 79 onwards from within this religious discourse. The picture of the king leading up to this characterization has been informed by his relationship with the devil. This has also been framed and contextualized by his relationship with the heretics who surround the king and who advise him on matters of state. Therefore this 'raging' king is very much a product of the language and symbology of a catholic discourse.

It is easy to see why this presentation of the king is seen as incompatible with an even and consistent narrative voice. Barnish attempts to explain the inconsistencies here by following - unsurprisingly given the overly religious nature of the passages – Tamassia's examination of the biblical allusions in the text: *"l'Anomino s'ingegni di mostrarlo [Teoderico] emulo del re ebreo nel giudicare e nel dir motti"*[362] According to Tamassia, both Solomon and his son-in-law are provided as potential analogues in the depiction of the king. Like Solomon, Theoderic was tempted (in his case the devil, in Solomon's women), and "both kings ended in a way unworthy of their former glory."[363] Again, however, we must not forget the role which the author's narrative purpose plays in this. The intensity of the war which followed the demise of Theoderic, the destruction (as we have seen) which Italy was subject to required justification. Imparting diabolic qualities to the king, while simultaneously demonizing his regime and its officers, allows the *AV* do two things. Firstly, it gives the war against the Goths a religious character by replacing the secular king of the first half with a possessed demon in the second. Secondly, it vilifies the Gothic regime in the persons of Theoderic's officers and court officials. Thus the narrative articulates

---

[362] Tamassia (1913), 11; Barnish (1983), 574.

[363] Barnish (1983), 574

an enemy the confrontation of whom should be understood as a defence of the faith *and* a defence of the imperial state – in the same way that the narrative of the first half presented the defence of Theoderic as a defence of the Roman state and of the true faith. Framing the behaviour of the protagonists within the context of prevailing Roman elite discourses is a mechanism through which the *AV* defends the interests of the Roman elite.

A Catholic and Imperial Voice: The State, Boethius, and Religion

The circumstances which surround one of the seminal political decisions of his reign are presented in a similar way. The 'rage' which the author implies is the result of the devil's influence, provides the introductory passage to the actions of the king in this episode. It once again shows him as easily swayed by the captivating words of others. The event in question is the fall of the Roman senator Boethius. The prelude to this affair relates how the king's devil-induced diminished mental state and gullibility influenced his decision making process: *Cyprianus, qui tunc referendarius erat, postea comes sacrarum et magister, actus cupiditate insinuans de Albino patricio, eo quod litteras adversus regnum eius imperatori Iustino misisset.* (85). Cyprianus, fired by his greed, is the primary agent of the charges which begin the chain of events. The king is not the primary agent, he is undone by a combination of his weak and easily manipulated mind and a diabolic rage. The *AV*'s description of the events surrounding the fall of the famous Roman Senator, philosopher, poet, and theologian, provide, along with the writer's version of events in his *De Consolatione Philosophiae*, the material with which historians wrestle in order to gain some sort of insight into what happened to Boethius[364]. I will look at this episode to see what we can learn about the ideas and agendas the author was aligning himself with and championing. Gaining an understanding of the implications of his design is a crucial. Understanding the purpose of the account enables us to see more clearly in what ways this member of the Roman elite manipulates the language and signs of their traditions.

---

[364] Chadwick(1981), 67-68, provides an attractive hypothesis based upon circumstantial evidence. See Chadwick's bibliography for the vast amounts of scholarly debate generated by the question.

Following Cyprianus' intervention, we are treated to Boethius' defense of Albinus.[365] Here the senator refutes all the charges on his fellow senator's behalf, adding that he too is guilty if Albinus is. We are only aware of the king's presence in this section at the prelude to the affair and in the judgement at the end. The way the *AV* structures his presentation of this tale is worth some examination. The prelude is in the aftermath of his diabolic possession where the king is described as looking for an opportunity (*inventa occasione*) to rage (*fremere*) against the Romans. The judgement at the end of the story precedes this description of the king's frame of mind: *sed rex dolum Romanis tenebat et quaerebat quem ad modum eos interficeret; plus credidit falsis testibus quam senatoribus.*(86) Immediately surrounding the report of Albinus' subpoena and Boethius' defence is Cyprianus' false accusation (*actus cupiditate insinuans*) and production of false witnesses (*deducit falsos testes*). The possessed Theoderic's madness frames the action which *AV* describes. At the beginning of the episode we are presented with Theoderic's devilish madness. The *AV* then describes the circumstances as Cyprianus' lies reach the ears of the king. Then the court case begins and the case for the defence is made. Following this we are presented with more of Cyprianus' lies. Finally, the episode is brought to an end with a description of Theoderic's madness. Although Theoderic must have been seminally important in the execution of events, he is not here presented as the primary cause of Boethius' downfall. His rage frames the proceedings, but the narrative focuses on the behaviour of others as they initiate, develop, and pursue with prejudice to the end the persecution of Boethius.

The *AV*'s narrative only concentrates on the possession of the king when depicting Theoderic's behaviour in this affair. The blame is spread around. The themes and their development in this version of events bear striking similarities to those of another overtly religious account of the conduct of the king and his court. There the lies of his courtiers, the avariciousness of his close associates, and the arbitrary and violent predilections of heretics are given prominence. Casting our mind back to chapter 2, we remember the official and unofficial *LP* versions from the manuscript traditions which we discussed in chapter 2. One has come to be called the Laurentian

---

[365] Chapter 85. Boethius also accepts responsibility on behalf of the whole senate.

Fragment.[366] In this fragment we are offered an alternative account of the court of Theoderic presiding over proceedings designed to once and for all solve the problem of the contested Episcopal election of Laurentius and Symmachus. In the pro-Symmachan account we saw a presentation of the king which anticipated many of the positive characterizations of him we have up-till-now been exploring in this chapter. He has both the wisdom of Solomon and the fairness and judiciousness of a Suetonian prince (the account of Theoderic's wisdom in this affair would not be out of place within the biographical tradition represented by the Suetonian presentation of Claudius only recently discussed). The Laurentian Fragment, naturally, flatly contradicts this version of events. It is how it attempts to contradict the official *LP* account which is noteworthy.

The Fragment presents a court which is neither wise nor temperate. Looking above, we see that the *AV* presents four prominent features of its negative account of the court. Firstly, we have the weak-minded king who is susceptible to 'wheedling' (in this we must add the sub-category of the wheedlers themselves). Secondly, there is the heretical nature of the protagonists of this episode (Eutharicus and Triwane), whose initial corruption of the king frames what comes next. Thirdly, there is the greed of the court, represented in this episode by Cyprianus who is inspired by greed to act. Finally, we must consider the implications for the general presentation of the king's court of the violence with which the sentence of the court is in the end executed. These four prominent features all occur in all fragments associated with the *LP* and the official *LP* itself. The final punishment of Boethius, alluded to above, in the *AV*'s account betrays a particular brutality which reflects badly upon the king's regime. At 87 in *AV* Boethius' cranium is gripped in a vice-like hold until his eyes pop out of his head; then he is bludgeoned to death. Although no where near as graphic or brutal, the treatment of Laurentius' supporters by those at court are subject to threats of violence: *Laurentius ad gubernandam ecclesiam Nucerinam…plurimis coactus minis promissionibusque dirigitur*. The Laurentian Fragment's account of the court of Theoderic recounts how pope Symmachus was able to win the day by exploiting the greed of the king's court: *Tunc coguntur utrique, Symmachus scilicet et Laurentius,*

---

[366] See chapter 2 passim.

regium subituri iudicium petere comitatum: ibi Symmachus multis pecuniis optinent (Laurentian Fragment). The weak-minded king of the above passage of the *AV* is also present, as we have seen in chapter 2, in the Fragment: *Ad hanc insinuationem Regis animus delinitus; patricio Festo praecepta dirigit, admonens ut omnes ecclesiae tituli Symmacho reformentur et unum Romae pateretur esse pontificem* (Duchesne, 46). Once again, as in the cases of Eutharicus and Triwane, as well as Cyprianus, an *insinuatio* has led the king astray. The Fragment presents a king with a similar capriciousness and mental inconstancy.

In the Laurentian Fragment, however, we are presented with a weak mind which can be more readily understood in a non-religious sense. The Fragment does not place the king's weak mindedness within the parameters of a theological context. The king's court attempted to present itself as politically neutral.[367] Naturally, any writings emanating from within the kingdom on religious affairs would reflect this by representing the behaviour of Theoderic in a religious-free context. This particular depiction of the king can be more easily recognised as following in the tradition of the secular Roman presentations of the barbarian (we shall discuss other, significance implications of this shortly). The desirability of avoiding a direct attack upon the king in the Laurentian Fragment has been discussed in Chapter 2. The author of the Fragment was presenting the illegality of the proceedings of this court of judgment to his contemporary Roman audience. His attack upon the king and his regime was subtle and indirect, using conventions and allusions which would have been perceptible to his literary peers.

The *AV* is neither constrained by the prevailing religious discourse of the time nor the fear of reprisals the Fragment author may have been subject to. He is speaking from a post-Theoderican perspective. The discourse on religious matters has been firmly established by all the events which had occurred from the death of Theoderic to the final defeat of the Gothic kingdom. A new pejorative epithet had come retrospectively to help summarise the king: heretic. This appellation permeates the accounts of the king after the fall of Boethius and Pope John (whom we shall discuss below). The

---

[367] See Chapter 2 passim for the various arguments concerning the king's putative passivity in religious affairs.

account of the downfall of Boethius in the official *LP* repeatedly refers to Theoderic as a heretic[368] (55.2; 55.4; 55.5; 55.6). This account, which must have been written after the death of Pope John, brings together the two previously diverging voices from within the Roman elite. The critical, yet subtle, anti-Gothic narratives of the Laurentian account are picked up by the former pro-Symmachans after the events which necessitated a realignment of their political partialities. The *topoi*, which facilitate the anti-barbarian subtext of the Laurentian attacks, find voice in the more direct and religiously-charged rhetoric of those who have championed the cause of Roman religious supremacy. The *AV*'s account of the court of Theoderic shares in this fusion of the formerly 'split' voices of the Roman elite. The events after the fall of the king, leading up to the annexation of Italy into the Eastern Roman Empire obliged the Roman elite to unite. In order to do this, both sides accepted elements of the other's mythology and narrative. The *AV* frames the behaviour of the king generally throughout the 'second half' (what we should really call the 'unified' half of the king's story – in that it reflects more than one side of the elite discourse of this period) in stridently religious tones. His actions towards Boethius can only be understood as part of that characterisation.

What is also interesting, however, is that, although the *AV* account does interact with this idea of the king as an agent of inimical actions towards the catholic faith, it follows a historiographical tradition in relation to Boethius' death which does not conform to the tradition the post-Theoderic *LP* attempts to create. It seems paradoxical (as does so much in the *AV*), but the author of our text shies away from fully incorporating the king into a heretical context in the way the *LP* does. The author tries to indirectly blame the conviction on heresy. The author does try to frame the conviction in a religious context as we have seen. The events leading up to and surrounding the trial, as well as the *AV*'s presentation of the individuals who make up Theoderic's court imply religious deviancy as an underlying contributory factor. However, the *AV*'s account of the trial is informed largely by another tradition. As Barnish noted: "…he does not introduce religious motives into his detailed narrative.

---

[368] *Liber* Pontificalis: 55.2; 55.4; 55.5; 55.6. All from the life of Pope John.

Like Boethius, he [*AV*] makes the case one of secular treason…"[369] Focusing as we have been on the circulating discourses here, I do not intend to focus (as Barnish does) on establishing the veracity (the reliability of *AV* as an historian) of this account. Instead, we must ask: why would the *AV* concentrate on this aspect of the trial when it has followed the *LP* tradition in so many other ways?

Perhaps the solution can be found in an examination of the circumstances in which the Italian elite found themselves in the 550s. Those who had suffered for their support for the Eastern Empire were now being sympathetically treated by the conquering Byzantine forces. One example of both the suffering of the pro-Eastern members of the elite under the Goths, and the post-victory Eastern veneration of that elite, can be found in the person of Rusticiana. She was the wife of Boethius and the daughter of Boethius' equally unfortunate step-father, senator Symmachus. Her duty to her dead husband's memory is undoubted. According to Procopius she only narrowly avoided being killed for attacking the statues and portraits of the dead king, Theoderic, whom she blamed, according to Procopius, for Boethius and Symmachus' deaths: Καὶ Γόθοι μὲν Ῥουστικιανὴν κτείνειν ἐν σπουδῇ ἐποιοῦντο, ἐπικαλοῦντες ὅτι δὴ χρήματα προϊεμένη τοῖς τοῦ Ῥωμαίων στρατοῦ ἄρχουσι τὰς θευδερίχου εἰκόνας διαφθείρειε, τοὺς φόνους ἀμυνομένη Συμμάχου τε τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ Βοετίου τοῦ ξυνοικήσαντος.[370] This passage also reveals that she had given money and provided succour to the Byzantine expeditionary force. The sympathetic portrayal of Rusticiana as an old-fashioned Roman heroine in the mould of Turia is unsurprising given Procopius' narrative purpose.[371] That Rusticiana and people like her are now the preeminent voices of influence from within the newly established Byzantine Italian elite is, given the sympathetic attitude of Eastern writers like Procopius, clear. Naturally, Boethius' own version of events - as understood from his *Consolatio* - would have been firmly and repeatedly propagated by such devout and dedicated followers. Although it must be

---

[369] Barnish (1983), 592-593

[370] Procopius, *BG*, VII.XX.27-

[371] The famous *Laudatio Turiae* presents a woman heroically fighting for her husband's good name and interests in often violent and intimidating circumstances. For Procopius' narrative purpose see: Cameron (1985), 192-193

acknowledged that in the *Consolatio Philosophiae*, Boethius asserts that, procedurally, it was the responsibility of the senate to pass judgement on him, *AV* has the king passing judgement on him. This is an understandable departure from the Boethius account: the Roman elite would not want to implicate their own kind in any reconstruction of events. The cultural landscape within which he is now working requires of him two things: a representation of the actions of the Roman elite as more or less consistently orthodox during this affair; and, an antithetical religious framework within which to work which allows that representation.[372] This adds to the emerging impression that the *AV*'s account is being directly influenced by the pressing concerns of the Roman elite in the present. Once again they are using their past to justify their present situation.

As we discussed in chapter 2 when dealing with this episode, the contours of the presentation of the king's court very much conform to the traditional archetype of the barbarian in Roman literary and cultural tradition. The appearance of an elaborate version of an essentially traditional barbarian *topos* within an emerging religious discourse is significant. The presentation of the king within the confines of this familiar *topos* is undoubted. Where and when he is subject to this presentation is significant. Both unflattering presentations of Theoderic in this context come from works devoted to telling the history of this period through the lives of the popes. The various fragments associated with the manuscript tradition of the *LP* are speaking from within a religious literary landscape. The 'when' of their composition and focus of their text show that the issue that the negative accounts have with the king concern the circumstances which led to the deaths of Boethius, Symmachus, Pope John, and the dealings of the king with Justin, emperor of the East, and his advisors (principally the future emperor Justinian). Both of these emperors' policy priorities were directed toward the restoration of the unity of the church broken by various schisms in Late Antiquity. It is no surprise, therefore, that the *AV*'s account of the king towards the end feeds into and off of an emerging discourse which is almost wholly religious in nature. That period in the historiographical landscape of the Roman elite is conditioned by accounts which naturally focus on the bitter religious situation in Italy.

---

[372] *Consolatio Philosophiae*, I.iv.79-81, 130-134

Before departing from this passage on the construction of the 'bad' king at the beginning of the religious half of the *AV*, we should briefly examine the significance in general of the adoption and adaptation of the language of the barbarian by the religious Roman elite. As we have seen above, there is transference of the traditional attributes of the barbarians to the heretics in both the *LP* and the *AV* after Theoderic's fall. It is perhaps not an altogether surprising move. On one level, the increasing numbers of traditional barbarians (Germans, Slavs, Celts, et al) were now firmly encamped literally within the geographical boundaries of the empire and metaphorically within its political and military boundaries. It was simply no longer possible to define oneself against a group with whom it was necessary to co-exist if the state were to be maintained. On another level, the control of the barbarians could take place through the type of discourses which had, as we have seen in chapter 1,[373] been constructed in order to provide the Roman elite with a degree of autonomy within the network of relationships which constituted the increasingly violent autocracy of the Later Roman Empire. The formal contours of this discourse would compel the barbarian to respond to the procedures and dictates of a Roman religion in a particular way which would render their behaviour patterns governable. Like the militarily and politically impotent elite class described in chapter 1, the religious elites could construct for themselves a series of discursive mechanisms through which they could exercise this power. This is a development among the Roman elite operating within the old Western Empire which many scholars are now beginning to investigate.[374]

Conclusion on Changes

Rather than give the king the full treatment he must have deserved in the eyes of many members of the Roman elite who sided with Boethius and Symmachus, the author presents a picture which keeps the king of the first half at a distance from the events of the second. The author still wishes to make the first half of his work

---

[373] See my comments on Brown's development of a 'constraining discourse' in chapter 1, 28-29.

[374] A particularly convincing talk on the conscious development of such a strategy was given recently at the *Classical Association of Scotland Conference 2009*, by Philip Wynn (Notre Dame). Wynn: *Where are the Barbarians? Reframing the 'Enemy' after the Empire's Fall in the 'Vita Germani'*.

credible, because it justifies the actions of the Roman elite. In attempting to execute this task we can perceive the *AV* arranging a structure of events in which the king is present peripherally. The king is presented as subject to external forces, which are themselves the primary agents, with the king not primarily to blame.

The anonymous writer repackages the information given in the first half to chart, in stages, Theoderic's descent into madness. The intellectual blind spot (illiteracy) is revisited for its negative connotations for the king's mental acuity. This lack of cognitive sharpness allows heretics to manipulate him into taking action against Christians. Thus tempted to do wrong, the Devil finds a way to possess the king, provoking him to be even more willing to capitulate to the base accusers of the Romans. Through weakness of mind, and diabolic intervention, Theoderic has *acted* abominably. With innocent Roman and catholic blood on his hands, his sanity gone, and his mind brainwashed the king now resembles a one-dimensional villain, stripped of his former sanity, conditioned by possession, an agent of the devil and an enemy of God: *rediens igitur Ravennam, tractans non ut dei amicus sed legi eius inimicus…* (88). The king has tipped over the edge and now bears little relation to the king of the first half of the text. The language which describes events in this second half is almost entirely conditioned by a close relationship with religion. This carefully wrought image of Theoderic as possessed tyrant has been facilitated by the fusion of the language and discursive markers of two political and religious groups. The implied barbarian *topos* - exploited to such effect in the narratives of the pro-Byzantine elite - is fused with the heretic *topos* found in the narratives of the pro-independence, pro-ascendency Roman elite. The *AV* is a child of both of these discourses. The anti-Gothic rhetoric of the Laurentians and the anti-heretical rhetoric of the Symmachans provide the material from which this tableau is constructed. We should view this change in the *AV* from 79 onwards as an attempt to use the language and accepted discourses of the Byzantine Roman elite to represent a politically significant moment in the birth/development of a new elite order. This new elite represented the fusion of the diverging discourses which previously existed in the polyphonic, liberal, cultural stage which was Theoderic's Italy.

<u>The Heroes of the New Age</u>

We are now encouraged to interpret everything that the king has to say as the product of a mind unfriendly to Catholics and Romans. The tale of Pope John's forced trip to Constantinople provides the *AV* with an opportunity to juxtapose the values and ideals that he now champions with the values and ideals of the antithesis which he has just invented from the discourses circulating in Theoderic's time. The possessed King's antipathy toward the true faith and the Emperor's love for it provide the instructive contrast. The enemy of God is imbued with a degree of the hubris of the tyrant (*credens quod eum pertimesceret Iustinus imperator*) as he demands that the Pope do his bidding: *et [Theodericus] dicit ad eum [Iohannem]: ambula Constantinopolim ad Iustinum imperatorem, et dic ei inter alia, ut reconciliatos in catholica restituat religione* (88).[375]

The writer now sees no reason to excuse the king's actions. He has established that the king has started his descent into madness. Having carefully turned him into the enemy of God, he is presenting the former hero of the state as a villain of the faith. The text then seems to have him confess the injustice of his own case: those whom he wants the emperor to stop forcibly converting and return to their Arian faith, he calls 'reconciled in the catholic faith'. Whatever way we translate *reconciliatus,* whether brought back, or reunited, or unified, one can imagine that the use of *reconciliati* as a term for the Arians would have met with the approval of the emperor. His policy of political and religious 'reunification' sought to make all Romans and Christians *reconciliati* to his church and his state. It would have been strange indeed for Theoderic to employ such terminology. The *AV* has Theoderic articulating arguments which effectively endorse the position of Justin and Justinian and damn his own people. Using his illiteracy as a base, adding diabolic intervention, mixing with the accumulated crimes against God's children, and using the very terminology he had previously used to praise him to describe this process, *AV* transforms the secular hero king into a religious tyrant.

---

[375] A more even-handed treatment would have included a passage explaining the justification for the king's rage: the (arguably) calculated persecution of the Arians by the Eastern Emperor Justin. As it is, the author presents the forced conversion of the Goths in Anatolia as errant sons returning to its mother's bosom: *reconciliatos in catholica…religione*; and Theoderic's reaction as that of a heretic tyrant.

The villain now in place, our author presents the heroes of the holy story. Here too the text reuses imagery and terminology witnessed in the first half to construct the story. On arriving in Constantinople Pope John, having been sent there by Theoderic, is received by the emperor Justin. The tale is an inversion of a previous account from the first half of the work where it is the ruler (Theoderic) who visits the Pope and is received amid great rejoicing: *Rex Theodericus Romam, et occurrit Beato Petro devotissimus ac si catholicus.* (65). The language and content are remarkably similar: *cui Iustinus imperator venienti ita occurrit ac si Beato Petro* (91). There is a slight difference in emphasis in both passages. In Theoderic's case, according to the author the Pope *is* St Peter (*occurrit Beato Petro* - 65), the Pope is the heir to his position, the pre-eminent voice of the catholic world - something which the king should accept, but because of his heretical status cannot. The emperor, Justin, an orthodox catholic, who recently accepted the absolute primacy of Rome as the head of the church, received the Pope as if he were St Peter himself. The language of papal supremacy, which had been articulated so forcibly by the Theoderican Popes, is reused to great effect. Both the presentation of the king and of the emperor show that the author saw the acceptance of the Petrine and Apostolic tradition as an indicator of a ruler's worth. So Anastasius may have been ruler of the Roman Empire, but he represented as being religiously deviant.[376] The familiar representation of Anastasius mirrors, in microcosm, the presentation of Theoderic. The devil has his way with the emperor who dies in a way unworthy of a Roman Emperor. Of course, as we have seen in our chapter on religious politics, Anastasius was singled out for attack by Gelasius especially because did not accept the hegemony of St Peter – or rather, he did not accept the version of the apostolic traditions the pope was propagating. Theoderic himself, although a passive (or active) facilitator of papal supremacy could never unreservedly champion the new Roman orthodoxy in the way Justin could.

This is *AV* painting a symbolic picture of the moment the Emperor of the East accepts the jurisdiction of the Church in Rome over all matters relating to his empire and Christendom. In the eyes of the Roman and Catholic reader, this presentation of the

---

[376] *AV*, 78

emperor's reception of the Pope is deeply symbolic. The emperor himself is a holy warrior on the side of orthodoxy – an orthodoxy which has been created in the political climate of Ostrogothic Italy. The author has this champion of orthodoxy and the Pope speak with one voice. Justin tells the Pope that he will do everything he would ask (*omnia repromisit facturum*) but one: *...praeter reconciliatos, qui se fidei catholicae dederunt, Arrianis restitui nullatenus posse.* (91) But he need not have worried as he and the Pope were of one mind: the Pope had already told the king that he would not carry out his villainous command: *hoc tibi ego non promitto me facturum, nec illi [Iustino] dicturus sum*. (89).[377] The first meeting between Pope and ruler is between the non-catholic (Theoderic) and the faith (Pope); the second meeting is between the champion of orthodoxy (Justin) and the faith (Pope). Theoderic was almost a catholic but not quite. He was a good secular ruler but had mental weaknesses which left him unable to deal with the treachery of his own court. The orthodox Justin promised the Roman elite victory in the religious disputes and reengagement with the political structures of the Roman Empire.

Imperial Voice

Though buried under the language and imagery needed to fulfill the narrative purpose of the second half, the *AV* still does exhibit his close relationship with the literary culture which provided him with the material necessary to construct his 'Roman' Theoderic in the first half. Though a fairly strong argument can be made for the influence of biblical themes upon the *AV*'s narrative, an even stronger case can be made for the author turning to his imperial historiographical traditions – even in the explicitly religious context of the second part of the text. When discussing the use *AV* makes of the formal structures we have seen that it has employed the help of certain literary devices in order to facilitate its narrative. One of these was the imposition of imperial characteristics onto the person of the king. This allowed the king to be presented in a certain way, which the *AV* thought necessary for the particular needs of his narrative at that point. Like Ennodius turning to his old books, perhaps subconsciously, for the *bon mot* our author turns to favourite *topoi* from imperial

---

[377]Even, seemingly, prepared to die first – *quod facturus es, rex, facito citius*

biography to harbinger the advent of portentous events for the Roman and catholic people.

In the second half it is possible to detect the influence of the author's Roman cultural character; we can still see the author utilizing the traditions of Roman antiquity. The 'turning' of Theoderic, although represented as a fundamentally religious occurrence, is nonetheless couched in the terminology of the Suetonian imperial biography encountered in the first half. Following the final extermination of the 'good' Theoderic at the hands of the devil (83), wondrous portents are relayed: *Stella cum facula apparuit, quae dicitur cometes, splendens per dies quindecim.* (84). Suetonius' account of the apotheosis of Julius Caesar recalls the sky lit by a comet for a number of days[378], and, with terminology remarkably similar to *AV,* he also provides details of a celestial portent which prefigured the death of Claudius: *exortus crinitae stellae, quam cometen vocant.*[379] Both of these descriptions are presented in the context of the death of one emperor and the celestial manifestations which mark the occasion. The comet which accompanies Theoderic's possession in the *AV* is followed by earthquakes: *Terrae mota frequenter fuerunt* (84). The earthquake as portent of death also features in Aurelius Victor's account of the death of Trajan: *cum terrae motu gravi...periit*[380] The victory of the devil over Theoderic's soul (83) is the final nail in the coffin of the once great ruler and *AV* utilizes the conventions of the imperial biography to mark the boundary between the complete eclipse of the 'good' Theoderic by the bad - effectively the death of one regime and the beginning of another. Whether using the genre to consciously create an impression of death and rebirth at this point is debatable - if one accepts Cipolla's[381] argument that the writer does not have any abilities save a crude 'cut and paste' technique, then no. Barnish's[382] more rounded appreciation of the author's capabilities would certainly not discount the possibility.

---

[378] *Stella crinita…per septem dies fulsit.* Suetonius, *Julius Caesar*, 88.

[379] Suetonius, *Claudius*, 46.

[380] Aurelius Victor, *Lives of the Caesars*, XIII, 11.

[381] Cipolla, *Bullettino dell'Istituto Storico Italiano* 11, 1892, 82-96.

[382] Barnish (1983), especially 575.

Less uncertainty surely surrounds the use of the conventions of the imperial biography at either a primary or secondary level.[383]

Before leaving the subject of the author's understanding of the biographical traditions, we must say something about the implications of this evidence we have been discussing from the 'first half' and the 'second half'. In both examinations we have seen that the *AV* is familiar with the genre and uses it to inform his presentations throughout the work. What does this tell us about his education? That he was familiar with the gossipy, discursive, imperial biography tradition. In Ennodius (and his associates), Boethius, and Cassiodorus we see an undoubted relationship *between* their style, literary output, cultural bias, and rhetorical abilities *and* the schools of Late Antiquity. The allusions to Virgil, the familiarity with the conventions of Quintilian, all allowed those members of the Roman elite to respond to the world outside the Roman classroom, and allowed them to articulate a position for themselves in the wider social and political landscape. The *AV* author does not betray any sort of close familiarity with the authors with whom Ennodius et al knew so well. As Adams has shown, the *AV*'s literary forbearers were in all probability the chroniclers of the Later Roman Empire: "Parts of II [*AV* II] are written in the chronicle style presented elsewhere, for example, by Cassiodorus' *Chronica*, Marcellinus' *Chronicon* and the *Fasti Vindobonenses*."[384] Adams also adds that some in the literary community think that another annalistic source (now lost), was circulating at this time which may have also influenced the compositional and stylistic ("stylistically unpretentious" is Adams euphemistic description of the putatively lost text) approach of *AV*. This last assumption helps explain why the *AV* is so consistently illiterate and grammatically flawed.[385]

---

[383] See Barnish for a more extensive look at the use made of the genre in the construction of the work. Other examples include the use of the illiteracy of the King as an anecdote in the life of Justin by Procopius.

[384] Adams (1976), 9.

[385] Ibid, 11-12, for a good overview of the *AV*'s unclassical Latin, and clumbsy style.

What has happened in the intervening years between the fall of Theoderic and the emergence of a post-Theoderic Italian elite which has witnessed such a dramatic change in the style and literary scope of the Italian literary elite? As we have see and will continue to examine, the author is arguing from within the ruling class of Italy. His narrative purpose makes that clear. This person's education, however, does not bear any similarities to that of the other chroniclers Adams cites (excepting the lost text, whose date of composition and conditions of production we have no way of knowing) – especially Cassiodorus. Yet Cassiodorus may hold the key to the answer of this question. If we remember from Chapter 1,[386] Cassiodorus reflected (no doubt sorrowfully) upon what was expected of the 'modern' members of the elite literary community. He based the compositional and intellectual intent of his final treatise upon these modern expectations. Writing some 20 years or so before Cassiodorus submits to these modern trends, the author of the *AV* must be considered to be a forerunner of this modernist movement of Late Antiquity. He has only scant understanding of those things of 'antiquarian interest' and has almost certainly been taught grammar and spelling in a 'summary manner'. His focus is on using what the ancient tradition has imparted to him in order to propagate the message of Roman elite religious superiority (Petrine tradition) and Chalcedonian orthodoxy.

Evidence of the Author's Self-Awareness in Executing his Task

From the way in which he structures his argument, then, the author has clearly made a conscious decision to 'transform' the 'new Trajan' he presented so lovingly to us in the first half. He replaces him with a villain, and uses all of the cultural and literary powers he has to make the transformation believable to his audience (and perhaps even himself). The question then is why? As we have been discussing, the motivation to have the king as both hero and villain was driven by the author's desire to reconcile the two traditions circulating among the Italian elite who, on the one hand, supported Theoderic and the Gothic regime (Cassiodorus, Ennodius, and his associates in Northern Italy, even Boethius, though the connection between him and his family was surely broken after his execution, and was strained during the Acacian and Laurentian

---

[386] 74.

schisms) in Italy[387]   and those, on the other, who were actively sympathetic towards the East and the 'empire' before the accession of the Emperor Justin and after (those who followed Pope Anastasius' example of putting good relations with the east before any consideration of the independence of the Roman church or the Gothic state). The evidence of, and a key to understanding, the position of the author in relation to the changing events of Theoderic's final, and Justin's first few years can perhaps be found in the text itself.

As we noted above, the author's religious identity comes out much more strongly in the final part of the text. Clearly chapter 79 does provide the recognisable 'shift' in the tone of narrative presentation of the King. However, the shift to the more overtly 'religious author' actually takes place between chapters 74 and 79. The chapter immediately preceding the change in emphasis heralds the event which necessitated it: *non post multum temporis in lecto suo intra urbem Constantinopolim morbo tentus [Anastasius] extremam clausit diem* (78). With the Death of Anastasius Justin becomes the new emperor of the East, and from chapter 74 onwards the story is told of how the emperor Justin assumed the purple. We are told the extended story of how Anastasius tried to choose his successor by leaving certain letters under pillows on a couch for one to choose, and that all three of his sons failed, leaving the emperor to consider other possibilities. The result of much praying to God resulted in a divine dream (*haec eodem cogitante orante cum ieiunio, quadam noctu vidit hominem, qui ita eum admonuit…*) which revealed to him the criterion which would decide the matter: *Crastinus qui tibi primus intra cubiculum nuntiatus fuerit, ipse accipiet post te regnum tuum* (75). Justin is, of course, the first person to enter the chamber and he is chosen. Rather than letting the reader make the obvious assumption concerning the religious implication of his account of Justin's elevation to the purple, *AV* takes no chances and spells it out: *[Anastasius] coepit gratias deo referre, qui ei dignatus est revelare successorem* (76). The writer makes no mistakes when attempting to get his message across: Justin was chosen by God to rule the empire.

---

[387] Given the decidedly Italo-centric attitude of the writer, it would not be too rash to conclude that he has firm attachment to the peninsula.

The two discernable parts of the narrative meet with the divine endorsement of Justin up to 79 and the beginning of Theoderic's descent into diabolic possession from 79 onward. Whereas up to 74 the work praising Theoderic is presented in predominantly secular tones, 74 onwards, beginning with the accession of Justin, is religious in content. So any theory that tries to discover why a change in emperor should provide such change in emphasis should examine what, if anything, the text says about the religious situation before and after Justin's coronation. As discussed above, Justin welcomed Pope John to Constantinople as the first emperor in generations to unambiguously accept the supremacy of Rome and the recommendations of Pope Leo the Great[388] made at Chalcedon. By accepting the pre-eminent position of Rome, and its view of catholic orthodoxy as set out by Chalcedon, Justin had ended years of religious and political rancour between the east and west. For the ardent Chalcedonians in the west had branded those patriarchs of Constantinople who tried to dilute Chalcedon - or ignore it – as heretics.[389] It also had anathematised the emperors who supported the patriarchs.

Before the accession of Justin there had been many attempts made to force some sort of compromise upon the church in Rome. Patriarch Acacius' *Henotikon* was considered the best vehicle to enforce church unity, but it failed, as we have witnessed. The main reason for this failure was due to the efforts of that faction in Rome who refused to countenance compromise. As we know the election in 498 of two Popes produced two competing narratives: one for the *Henotikon* and one against[390]. The anti-*Henotikon* candidate, Symmachus, having been approved by King Theoderic (with or without the corruption/sagacity), won the election and was installed in St Peter's. He and his successors assured that Roman and Catholic orthodoxy would not be compromised by any heretical creeds from the east. It is not just Justin's role as someone who welcomes Popes 'as if St Peter' which finds a

---

[388] Emperor Marcian was the last emphatic supporter of Leo's so-called Tome.

[389] See Chaper 2 for Acacius, Patriarch during the reign of Zeno, who tried to reconcile the diphysite and monophysite factions by publishing a document called the 'Henotikon' - and whose conciliatory tone sounded too monophysite for the Chalcedonians. He was excommunicated by Rome and condemned as a heretic.

[390] Laurentius who was supported by Festus - the man who promised emperor Anastasius a Pope who would accept the Henotikon – was the representative of those who wanted to adopt the Henotikon.

parallel with Theoderic's meeting with the Pope in Rome, it is also his role as champion of Roman and Catholic orthodoxy which find a parallel. As we have discussed already, Theoderic's entry to Rome 'as if catholic' is introduced by an account of the victory of Symmachus: *eodem tempore contentio orta est in urbe Roma inter Symmachum et Laurentium; consecrati enim fuerant ambo. Ordinante deo, qui et dignus fuit, superavit Symmachus.* (65) According to the *Book of the Pontiffs*[391] Theoderic ensured the victory for the Chalcedonians: *et facta intentione hoc constituerunt partes, ut ambo ad Ravennam pergerent, ad iudicium regis Theodorici. Qui dum ambo introissent Ravennam, hoc iudicium aequitatis invenit ut qui primo ordinates fuisset, vel ubi pars maxima cognoscerentur, ipse sederet in sedem apostolicam. Quod tamen aequitas in Symmachum invenit cognitio veritatis et factus est praesul Symmachus.*[392] Having championed the cause of the Chalcedonians, both Theoderic and Justin are described - in exactly the same language and with the same effuse praise - embracing the Pope. The same political and religious bias is present in the descriptions of both Theoderic and Justin's actions. The author is aware of his narrative goal and is pursuing it in a determined and consistent manner.

Despite Theoderic's competence in administering his earthly kingdom in a manner which the emperors of old would have applauded, the author could only praise him to a point. Political circumstances (Byzantine rule in Italy and the circumstances surrounding the transition of power in Italy from the Goths to the Byzantines) forced the author to choose to whom to devote his literary sympathies when describing an argument between a ruler who was, on the one hand, orthodox, shared his cultural heritage, and on the other, one who was an Arian. For as the text reveals, circumstances forced the Italian catholic, who had supported Theoderic, to choose between the two. The depiction of Theoderic demanding the return of those peacefully reconciled in the true faith (88) does more than provide us with a caricature of the king as a one-dimensional, possessed villain. Presenting the king thus surely allows the author to tackle an issue which provided the Italian catholic with a real dilemma. The issue is the main topic of conversation between John and Justin, and *AV* prevents

---

[391] The *LP*, the records of papal reigns.

[392] *Liber Pontificalis*, 53.

the reader from forgetting it by having both men repeat their positions. John, hero of the true faith, will die before asking the emperor to accede to Theoderic's demand; Justin will do anything but accept it. The issue, of course, is the recent persecution of the Arians in Byzantine lands at the command of Justin. Theoderic, some might say understandably,[393] decided to intervene and speak up for his co-religionists. Although to Theoderic sending a Pope, with all of his authority (especially now that the East accepted his total pre-eminence), may have appeared the best option in terms of convincing the emperor to back down, it would have compromised the Pope's position as head of the newly reunited catholic church to be speaking on behalf of heretics. It is one thing ignoring the Arians like Gelasius; it is another positively acting on their behalf. The changed circumstances would make it impossible for an Italian catholic author to do anything other than present the king's commission in an unfriendly light. The emperor now guarantees the supremacy of St Peter throughout the Eastern Empire; how could that church hope to inspire others to follow its lead in Chalcedon when it champions the cause of Arians, who were now viewed as more heretical than the Monophysites? There were no Manichee straw men to hide behind: the emperor had accepted Chalcedon; the popes were now compelled to work within this new decidedly anti-Arian imperial religious discourse. To do anything other would have been to betray one's religious convictions. A patriotic Roman and a devout catholic presenting a sympathetic portrayal of Theoderic's conduct in this affair was unthinkable.

The treatment of Theoderic in these circumstances is not wholly inconsistent. In the years before 519 Theoderic is the guarantor of the position of the Roman church: for it is not unreasonable to assume that Anastasius withheld imperial recognition for Theoderic's rule until he was assured that the king would make his subjects accept the *Henotikon*. It is no coincidence that *AV* relates the role of Festus (chapter 64) in assuring Imperial approval: according to Theophanes' *Chronographia* he promised the emperor Anastasius on this visit that he would get papal approval for the

---

[393] Edward Gibbon has no doubt that Theoderic was induced by such actions to behave as he did: 'By the bigotry of his subjects and enemies, the most tolerant of princes was driven to the brink of persecution'. *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, XXXIX (Penguin edition, 525-556).

Henotikon[394].   So the account of the king's rule to this point glows with the praise of a genuinely appreciative author. In the years after (the accession of Justin, 519, is the turning point in the narrative[395]) the behaviour of Justin ensured that he had to make a choice between either defending Theoderic's position or John and Justin's. He chose the latter cause – for the same reason that the Pope was forced to. A new ideological and cultural discourse was being created. The Pope John experienced its birth pangs; the *AV* was now firmly embedded within its confines.

The final interaction between Theoderic and John in the text has the author once again going out of his way to highlight the divine in John and the diabolic in Theoderic. The king has the same disposition towards the returning John as he had towards the Romans: *cum dolo suscepit et in offensa sua eum [Iohannem] esse iubet. Qui post pauca dies defunctus est.* (93). The same *dolus*, evil intent, which the devil inspired Theoderic to direct towards the Romans, is now directed toward John. Juxtaposed with the evil intent of the king is the miraculous victory of the Pope over the devil in death. The rest of chapter 93 is devoted to the 'miracle' of John's corpse exorcising the devil from the soul of a conveniently placed passer-by. Symbolically the people and the senate are won over to the cause of John by this miracle: *quod videntes populi et senatores, coeperunt reliquas de veste eius tollere.* (93) The last appearance of the senate and the people was in celebration of the king's visit to Rome after the victory of Symmachus (65-66). There we were encouraged to see the Senate's acceptance of the rule of Theoderic from a distinctly secular, only partially religious perspective. The *AV* carefully imparts to Theoderic the appropriate attributes of someone worthy of Senatorial approval. Theoderic had been introduced to the reader as worthy comparison with the emperor Trajan (60). He has been encased in the ennobling light of the imperial historiographical traditions (62). After the visit the *AV* augments these initial impressions in the reader's mind with further examples of the king's close relationship with the emperors of old (67). The Senate have now, as the author has, passed their allegiance to the camp of Justin and John. The holy victory of John and

---

[394] See chapter 2, 104 of this thesis.

[395] The suppression of events between 519 and 522-23, when Theoderic, John (then the deacon), Boethius, and their supporters had enjoyed the King's favour, allow the author to provide an account that fits his tendentious story. Barnish also concludes that the author is guilty of 'calculated omission, and well-judged compression'. (1983) 595

Justin's cause, the victory of Chalcedon over the east and the victory of Byzantium in Italy have left the author no option but to finish his work with Pope John providing a miracle which proclaims the justice of his case; and with Theoderic ending his days as the Arian enemy of this holy double act: *mox [Theodericus] intulit in eum sententiam Arrii, auctoris religionis eius; fluxum ventris incurrit, et dum intra triduum evacuatus fuisset, eodem die, quo se gaudebat ecclesias invadere simul regnum et animam amisit.* (95).

<u>Case Study Conclusion</u>

Through calculated suppression and omission, the writer of the *Anonymus Valesianus II* has compiled a story which reveals that he had a close relationship with the religious and political problems and dilemmas that Italy faced in this period. The writer in the first half reveals himself to be both a devout catholic and an Italian with a grounding in Roman secular culture, whose world-view is conditioned by these two factors. The description of Theoderic's rule is conditioned by, and seen through the prism of, these identities. The king is a friend to the Roman church, ensuring the 'just' victory of Symmachus and acting toward the Holy See 'as if a catholic', and is also the epitome of the Roman emperor of old. He is compared to Trajan, Valentinianus, whose example he sought out - and is duly praised by the author for doing so. He brought back to Rome the conditions of civilization which were dear to every Roman heart – aqueducts, baths, theatres, bread, wine. The nature, scope and depth of praise devoted to Theoderic in the first part are different from the nature, scope and depth in the second. From the catholic and Roman perspective, Theoderic's reign up to 519 was acceptable and praiseworthy. The praise was focused more on the secular world, but could still highlight and praise his role in church affairs.

Chapter 79 onwards, which condemns him, and which Cessi thought so incompatible with what precedes, does so from a deeply religious perspective. The author does not condemn the king of the second half in the same language as the first; preferring to replace him with a possessed individual whose slight character faults have allowed his mind to be invaded and taken over. Arianism is the ever present enemy of the true faith in the final chapters; and it is the effect of the policies of the emperor Justin

which force the author to vilify those who adhere to it on. The more secular author of the beginning gives way to the more religious writer of the end. Circumstances are the main impetus behind the change in 'narrative voice' – not a change of author halfway through. Nor is it an attempt to present a mainly negative biography of the King in the *chiaroscuro* tradition: the author goes out of his way to present Theoderic in the second half as a good man (*quem ad modum hominem bene rem publicam sine querella gubernantem…*) overcome by diabolic intervention. This is not the action of a writer who wants to set the wickedness of the king in high relief. Supporting the king at one moment is perfectly compatible with being both catholic and Italian (especially when he guarantees the independence needed to secure the supremacy of the church of Rome), and at the next moment supporting Theoderic may be understood as attacking that identity[396] (when he is a block to securing its supremacy). The only thing which actually changed in the text was time and events - the author remained constant.[397]

The *AV* author has used the discourse and narratives which had been generated in this environment to execute his purpose. Like the Roman elite under Theoderic, he attempts to use the culturally evocative language to defend and champion the behaviour of his class in changing circumstances. He represents a development, a progression out of the attitude of his Theoderican elite peers. In the realms of religion and secular learning he represents the maturation of those trends which the circulating discourses of Theoderican Italy betrayed. He is a child of the school of Cassiodorus rather than Deuterius. He is a child of both Symmachus and Laurentius. The evolutionary direction which events have forced upon the Roman elite resulted in something new and radically different from the original variables which constituted and affected the change.

---

[396] '…To be Spanish or Italian may at one moment be perfectly compatible with being European, and at the next moment to claim European identity may be felt as undermining Spanish or Italian national strength'. Kevin Myers, 'English character and identity', in *Social Identities: Multidisciplinary Approaches*, (2004), 146

[397] As we saw with the compliers of the *LP*. There the authors were, as we can see from the dating evidence (notes 251-260), compiling and composing two very different accounts of Ostrogothic religious politics (one before the conquest, one after). The *AV* is surely working within the same cultural framework.

Conclusion

In the main body of this thesis I have examined the subject matter as set out in the introduction. I have looked at the activities of the Roman elite in the immediate aftermath of the collapse of the Imperial government in the West described by Marcellinus Comes. I undertook this examination while attempting to make the argument's underlying methods respond to some of the trends now current in scholarship devoted to Late Antiquity. This encouraged an approach focused on trying to say something about the collapse of the Western Empire from within the confines of a smaller and more concerted piece of enquiry than normally found in broader conventional historiography. The result was a focus on how the Roman elite (the creators and disseminators of cultural discourse) sought to characterise their present, and fashion their future by interacting with the landscape of their past. This limited remit allowed for a discussion which said something interesting about the way in which the Roman elite interacted with their past. Just as importantly, however, we were able to observe the evolutions and transformations forced upon the Roman elite in the changing landscape of Late Antiquity *and* what relationship post-Imperial Italy had with that general picture in Late Antiquity. So from the narrow confines of our limited scope, we were able to discern the broader trends and understand the bigger pressures circulating in the Later Roman Empire and post-Imperial West which influenced the behaviour of our subjects.

Education

In the important field of education we provided an overview of the state of affairs in education as revealed by the writings of some representative members of the Roman elite. In keeping with our purpose we attempted to find out what this overview told us about the Roman elite interacted with its past. We saw that changes in political scene brought about by the collapse of the structures of the empire in the west forced the elite to interact with their conservative education system in a way which responded to these changes. We find innovation in the way in which the elite approached the traditional subject of rhetorical teaching. The exercises which formed the basis of this training were now subject to reinterpretation in order to reflect the new society of Late Antiquity of which it was part. The formerly dry and legalistic declamatory templates

of Quintilian were infused with the vigour and immediacy of the morals and ideology of the new religion (the prodigal son and the rape of virgin but two examples from a new Christian discourse). We witnessed how the elite used the language of their shared literary heritage to a new effect in a new age. The identity-defending properties of the language and phraseology of their rhetorical education and its literary foundations (Virgil, Sallust, Cicero, Terence) were important in an age when the avenues to express one's elite status were becoming less clear (due to a distance between the ruling class and the traditional elite which grew up from the 'Dominate' and found its nadir in the complete dislocation which accompanied the collapse of the imperial bureaucracy in the west). This language in itself was not only a form of identity protection in an uncertain world, but also a vehicle for personal autonomy in a world where the Roman elite inhabited a dangerously volatile political environment. Allied with the Christian discourse now influencing the schools, the language of the Roman elite could be used to empower their class.

Of course, scholars who maintain that the education system was deeply conservative are right: there was a huge degree of continuity. Cicero was still used – although his value is often brought into question by both Jerome and Augustine (two figures of great importance in the creation of a late antique educational philosophy), whose contradictory attitude towards him perhaps contributes to his relatively infrequent employment by figures like Ennodius. Virgil was of seminal importance. He provided the Roman elite with a pool of language and vocabulary that allowed them to express themselves with the metaphors and analogies which generations of previous Roman elite school children had employed. The same is true of Terence and Sallust. There was also a continuity of sorts evident from the activities of Boethius and Symmachus. Here both men provide evidence that there were still individuals from within the Roman elite who had enjoyed a education which looked beyond the Latin language to a more pluralistic, bilingual and broader experience. We discovered what this may mean for our view of a homogenous educational experience among the elite. We perceived that education in Ostrogothic Italy was still largely mirroring the trends which had begun in the later Imperial period (anti-Greek sentiment, increasingly monolingual interaction with Greek philosophical material). Of course, as with

attempts to reunify the Greek and Latin worlds in religion, so the Ostrogothic state proved equally infertile ground from the attempted reintroduction of Greek education.

That said, the close association between the education system of Ostrogothic Italy and Imperial Italy can be strikingly observed in the contrast between the outlines of the education system of Ostrogothic Italy and the education system which followed the collapse of Ostrogothic power. The world which Cassiodorus' *de Orthographia* envisages is far removed from that of the Later Roman Empire and Ostrogothic Italy. The complex and elaborate contours of traditional education were no longer needed in Cassiodorus' new world of limited ambition. The Christian discourse, which had lightly tweaked the edges of the old rhetorical teaching exercises, was all that mattered. We witnessed the beginnings of the retreat from the past in the collapse of the political institutions of Ostrogothic Italy, which before had continued to support the offices and institutions of the old Roman state. When, before, Arator's recognisably traditional education was designed to feed the traditional offices of state, now it was increasingly put to use in the service of Christianity - providing the unusual results witnessed in his oration in Rome. Much the same fate must have befell the other students of Ennodius' little literary circle. Cassiodorus' final work presents the final, sad collapse of the old system which had gradually evolved and developed to meet the needs of successive generations of the Roman elite. Ostrogothic Italy allowed the Roman elite to continue to use the landscape and traditions of its educational past in order to continue to meet the challenges of a changing state. The collapse of Ostrogothic Italy saw a break with the past which did not provide the Roman elite with the opportunity to interact with its traditional education system. The full array of traditions passed down through the centuries of the Roman state were no longer as relevant or as potentially useful as they had been.

Religion

In the realm of religious politics, the Ostrogothic state also provided the elite with opportunities to use the past. The changed political landscape of post-imperial Italy provided the Roman elite with the potential to renegotiate a position of power for the Church in Rome. Some within the Roman elite took the opportunity to renegotiate the

position of the church in order to enhance the power and prestige of Rome. We looked at the progression of a pan-Roman religious controversy to see what effect the changed political circumstances had upon the behaviour of the Italian elite. By evaluating a controversy that affected East and West Romans alike, we saw more clearly those divergences in approach which were facilitated by the different political regimes. The past was used to justify the innovative renegotiation of the relationship between what remained of the imperial Roman state (the East) and the Bishopric of Rome. The radically powerful position which the elite sought to create for Rome was facilitated by the changed political landscape. Any discomfort the elite might have felt at exploiting the opportunities presented by the Goths was hidden under the rhetoric of continuity and the language of tradition. Putting greater emphasis on one tradition (apostolic) while suppressing others (allegiance to a catholic empire) facilitated a new order.

There were also problems, however, for the elite who wished to take advantage of the situation. Trying to lead the religious world (Roman) necessitated a position which was free from accusations of collusion with heretical sects. The freedom which they exploited to articulate their position of power relied upon Arian heretics. The Roman elite turned to their past to extricate themselves from a potentially tricky situation, by constructing a counter narrative which spoke to the wider Roman world of their commitment to attacking Rome's traditional heretical enemies (Manichees).

The changed political landscape also motivated other voices from within the elite to action. The past that this group looked to defend their interests was a still-living tradition which encouraged a more conciliatory, mediating approach to the controversy. This group were very much products of an organically evolving elite culture. The state offices which they had worked within, the education system which had developed them, and the shared philosophy and history were employed by this group in an attempt to maintain the unity of Roman culture in a post-Imperial world. They used their shared past to attempt to re-establish an interrupted (by the collapse of the Roman West) continuity.

Case Study

In the final chapter case study we looked at a controversial piece of historiography. Its controversial nature is due to its putative inconsistencies in the attitude of the narrator towards Theoderic, King of Italy. Through an examination of the type of language used by the author, and the cultural landscape (and temporal space) this language implied we came to a better understanding of the work. It was clear that the author of the *AV* was articulating his message in a way which was consistent with the discourses which were circulating in Ostrogothic Italy. The language, identity, and ideology of the author are the product of those prevalent discourses. The social, cultural, political, and religious landscape which informs the work can only really be understood as part of that evolving and transforming process the Roman elite had been undergoing in the other chapters which we have examined in the thesis. The strategies the Roman elite employed in their battle for survival (or rather the survival of what they perceived to be the defining characteristic of their vision of the Roman elite) became part of the cultural landscape of Rome. The fusion of the victorious Symmachan narratives for Roman supremacy with the Laurentian narratives of unity provide one example of how firmly embedded in the language and mindset of Italy the discourses of Ostrogothic Italy had become. The *AV* is the culmination of the battles the Roman elite used to defend themselves (using the power of the past) in a changing environment. Interestingly, he also defends his various political and religious positions in the same manner those positions were articulated and disseminated: through the validating power of the past. The *AV* demonstrates that the past was a weapon and device which the Roman elite instinctively turned to when they needed to defend their interests. Looking at the *AV* in this way helps us better understand the so-called inconsistencies in the narrative. More importantly, of course, we have been able to provide evidence of the behavioural trends and cultural activities of the Roman elite in post-Imperial Italy.

Throughout this investigation we have seen again and again the power that the past, and the articulation of continuity, had in the changed political landscape of Ostrogothic Italy. In education and the evolving religious discourse the past enabled the elite to make arguments and bolster ideological positions. Discourses and cultural

trends were formed by the validating powers of previous custom. The Roman elite of Ostrogothic Italy interacted with the reinvigorated education system which the new world of Late Antiquity, with its new Christian moral framework, had passed down. They also defined and empowered themselves in a volatile political climate, slightly adopting and adapting the approach its elite ancestors had cultivated when they were confronted by political change (Dominate). They fought theological battles for the body and soul of Rome and what type of future (supremacy or unity) that Rome would have. We examined the activities of the two visions as we witnessed them battling for the soul of Rome. As a result, we came to a better understanding of the nature of the society which produced these differing views by placing the activities in their situations (the heretic purge the result of a life among heretics; the supremacy of the See of Rome only successfully articulated because of the collapse of the Roman Empire). We also witnessed in our final chapter that what we had come to understand about the Roman elite was reflected in the discourses circulating at the time and just after the collapse of Ostrogothic Italy. The fusion of the competing voices from within the Roman elite (Laurentian and Symmachan; supremacy and conciliation; secular and religious) find expression in the *AV*. It is only as a product of a changing and evolving body politic that we can understand the Roman elite in this period (and the *AV* as a product of that). The ways in which they were able to, and sought to, hold fast to their past and their shared traditions reveal to us the pace and logic of that change. In Ostrogothic Italy the Roman elite were able to continue to use their past to define themselves and shape the world around them. This mix of innovation and tradition was in keeping with the slow evolutions of the late antique period. Byzantine Italy was the real harbinger of fundamental change. Ostrogothic Italy provides evidence that the Roman elite who lived in it inhabited part of a recognisable continuum, where the past was not a foreign country and the future was up for grabs.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Ammianus Marcellinus, *History.* Rolfe, J. C. (Ed.) Loeb classical library; London
(1935).

Anonymus Valesianus, *Fragmenta Historica ab Henrico et Hadriano Valesio* Cessi,
R. & Muratori, L. A. (Eds.) Rerum Italicarum scriptores : raccolta degli storici
Italiani dal cinquecento al millecinquecento. Tomo XXIV - Parte IV Nuova ed.
Cittá di Castello, Lapi (1900).

Arator, *Aratoris Subdiaconi Historia apostolica*. Corpus Christianorum. Series
Latina; 130, 130A. Turnhout, Brepols (2006).

Augustine, *Augustine De doctrina Christiana*. Green, R. P. H. (Ed.) Oxford early
Christian texts. Oxford, Clarendon Press (1995).

Blockley, R. C., *The fragmentary classicising historians of the later Roman Empire:
Eunapius, Olympiodorus, Priscus, and Malchus. 2, Text, translation and
historiographical notes.* ARCA, classical and medieval texts, papers, and
monographs; 10. Cairns, Liverpool (1983).

Boethius, *In Ciceronis Topica*. Migne, J-P. (Ed.) *Patrologiae Latinae* LXIV

--------*In Isagogen Porphyrii Commenta*. Brand, S. (Ed.) Corpus scriptorum
ecclesiasticorum latinorum; v. 48. Vienna, Leipzig (1906).

--------*Philosophiae Consolatio*. Corpus Christianorum. Series Latina; 94. Turnhout,
Brepols (1958).

--------*The theological tractates*. Henderson, J. (Ed.) The Loeb classical library;
London (1973).

-------- *De topicis differentiis*. Stump, E. (Ed.) Ithaca, N.Y.; Cornell University Press,
London (1978).

Calpurnius Flaccus. *Calpurnii Flacci Declamationes*. Lehnert, G. (Ed.) Bibliotheca
scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana. Lipsiae, In aedibus B.G.
Teubneri (1903).

Cassiodorus, *Cassiodori Senatoris Institutiones.* Mynors, R. A. B. (Ed.) Clarendon
Press, Oxford (1937).

-------- *Magni Aurelii Cassiodori Senatoris opera*. Fridh, J., Halporn, J. W. & Adriaen, M. (Eds.) *Corpus Christianorum. Series Latina ; 96-98.* Turnholti, Brepols (1958).

Chronica Minora II, Mommsen, Theodor. MGH AA 11, Berlin (1894)

Cicero, Marcus Tullius, *De oratore.* Sutton, E. W. & Rackham, H. (Eds.) The Loeb classical library. London (1942).

Ennodius, Magnus Felix, *Magni Felicis Ennodii Opera omnia*. Hartel, W. A. (Ed.) Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum latinorum; v. 6. Vienna, Apud C. Geroldi Filium (1882).

-------- *Magni Felicis Ennodii Opera omnia*. Vogel, F. (Ed.) *MGH AA 7.* Berlin (1885).

Eugippius, *Eugippii Vita Severini*. Mommsen, T. (Ed.) Monumenta Germaniae historica, Munich (1978).

Evagrius, *The ecclesiastical history of Evagrius, with the scholia*. Byzantine texts, Bidez, Joseph; Parmentier, Léon (Eds.) London, Methuen (1898).

Libanius, *Selected works. vols. 1-2*. A.F. Norman. (Ed.) The Loeb classical library; London, (1969).

Le Liber pontificalis. Duchesne, L. & Vogel (Eds.), C. Bibliothèque des Écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome. Thorin, Paris (1886).

Macrobius, *Ambrosii Theodosii Macrobii Saturnalia / apparatu critico instruxit, In somnium Scipionis commentarios selecta varietate lectionis ornavit Iacobus Willis*, Lipsiae, Teubner (1963).

Malalas, J. *Ioannis Antiocheni Fragmenta Ex Historia Chronica*. Roberto, U. (Ed.) Texte Und Untersuchungen Zur Geschichte Der Altchristlichen Literatur; Bd. 154. Berlin ; New York, N.Y., De Gruyter (2005).

Martianus Capella, *Les noces de Philologie et de Mercure,* texte établi et traduit par Michel Ferré. Paris, Les Belles Lettres (2007).

Migne, J. P. *Patrologiae Cursus Completus*, Series Latina. Parisiis, Apud Garnieri Fratres, Editores Et J.-P. Migne Successores (1844).

Philo, *Philonis Alexandrini In Flaccum*. Box, H. (Ed.) Oxford University Press, London (1939).

Procopius, *Books V-VIII (the Gothic War)*. Dewing, H. B. & Downey, G. (Eds.), The Loeb classical library; London (1914).

Quintilian, *The orator's education vols. 1-5*. Donald Russell. (Ed.) Loeb classical library; Cambridge, Mass.; London, Harvard University Press (2001).

-------- *The lesser declamations vols. 1-2*. Bailey, D. R. S. (Ed.) The Loeb classical library; Cambridge, Mass.; London, Harvard University Press (2006).

Sallust, *Opera Omnia.* Rolfe, J. C. (Ed.) The Loeb classical library; London (1921).

Seneca, The Elder, *Declamations.* The Loeb classical library; Winterbottom, Michael (Ed.) Cambridge, Mass. London, Harvard University Press (1974).

Sextus Aurelius Victor, *Sexti Aurelii Victoris Liber de Caesaribus. Praecedunt Origo gentis Romanae et Liber de viris illustribus urbis Romae, subsequitur Epitome de Caesaribus*. Pichlmayr, F. (Ed.) Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana. Editio stereotypa correctior editionis primae / ed. Leipzig, In aedibus B.G. Teubneri (1966).

Sidonius, Apollinaris. *Poems and letters.* Rolfe, JohnCarew(Ed.)The Loeb classical library;   London (1936).

Suetonius, *Vitae*, Rolfe, J. C. (Ed.) The Loeb classical library; London (1914).

-------- *Opera.* Ihm, M. & Roth, K. L. (Eds.) Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana. Leipzig, [s.n.] (1924).

Terence, *Terence.* Sargeaunt, J. (Ed.) The Loeb classical library; London (1912).

Virgil, *Opera Omnia*. Loeb classical library; Goold, G. P. (Ed.) Cambridge, Mass.; London, Harvard University Press (1999).

-------- *Opera omnia.* Löfstedt, B. (Ed.) Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana. Munich, K.G. Saur (2003).

Zosimus, *Histoire nouvelle*. Paschoud, F. (Ed.) Collection des universités de France. Les Belles Lettres, Paris (1971).

Translated Works

Boethius, (1988) *In Ciceronis Topica,* Stump, E. (Trans.) Ithica and London, Cornell University Press.

Cassiodorus (1992) *The Variae of Magnus Aurelius Cassiodorus Senator: being documents of the Kingdom of the Ostrogoths in Italy,* Barnish, S. (Trans.), Liverpool, Liverpool University Press.

Cassiodorus (2004) *Cassiodorus : Institutions of divine and secular learning and On the soul,* Halporn, J. P. (Trans.), Liverpool, Liverpool University Press.

Liber Pontificalis (1989) *The book of pontiffs (Liber Pontificalis): the ancient biographies of the first ninety Roman bishops to AD 715,* Davis, R. (Trans.), Liverpool, Liverpool University Press.

Marcellinus, (1995) *The chronicle of Marcellinus : a translation and commentary* (with a reproduction of Mommsen's edition of the text), Croke, B. & Mommsen, T. (Trans. et Eds.) Sydney, Australian Association for Byzantine Studies.

Orosius, (1964) *The seven books of history against the pagans,* Deferrari, R. J. (Trans.) Washington, Catholic University of America Press.

Theophanes (1997) *The chronicle of Theophanes Confessor : Byzantine and Near Eastern history, A.D. 284-813,* Mango, C & Scott, R. (Trans.), Oxford, Clarendon Press.

Secondary works

 (1993) *Teoderico il grande e i goti d'Italia : atti del XIII Congresso internazionale di studi sull'alto Medioeveo, Milano, 2-6 novembre 1992,* Spoleto, Centro italiano di studi sull'alto Medioevo.

Adams, J. N. (1976) *The text and language of a Vulgar Latin chronicle (Anonymus Valesianus II),* London, University of London, Institute of Classical Studies.

Althusser, L. (1977) *Lenin and philosophy and other essays,* London, NLB.

Amory, P. (1997) *People and identity in Ostrogothic Italy, 489-554,* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Auerbach, E. (1965) *Literary language and its public in Latin antiquity and in the Middle Ages*, London : Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Barnes, T. (1975) '"Patricii under Valentinian III' *Phoenix 29 n.2*.

Barnish, S. (1983) 'The Anonymus Valesianus II as a Source for the last Years of Theoderic.' *Latomus: revue d'études latines 43***,** 572-596.

---------(2003) 'Liberty And Advocacy In Ennodius Of Pavia: The Significance of Rhetorical Education in Late Antique Italy' *Hommages à Carl Deroux, V: Christianisme et Moyen Age Néo-latin et survivance de la latinité. Collection Latomus, 279*, 20-28. Editions Latomus, Brussels.

Barnish, S. J. B., Marazzi, F. (2007) *The Ostrogoths from the migration period to the sixth century: an ethnographic perspective,* Woodbridge, Suffolk, Boydell Press.

Barnwell, P. S. (1992) *Emperor, prefects & kings: the Roman west, 395-565,* London, Duckworth.

Baycroft, T. (2004) 'European identity' *Social Identities: Multidisciplinary Approaches*, 145-162

Bentley, M. (1997) *Companion to historiography,* London, Routledge.

Bierbrauer, V. (1975) *Die ostgotischen Grab- und Schatzfunde in Italien,* Spoleto, Centro Italiano di Studi sull'Alto Medioevo.

Bonner, S. F. (1977) *Education in ancient Rome: from the elder Cato to the younger Pliny,* London, Methuen.

Bowersock, G. W., Brown, P. R. L. & Grabar, O. (1999) *Late antiquity : a guide to the postclassical world,* Cambridge, Mass.; London, Belknap Press.

Bowman, A. K. & Woolf, G. (1994) *Literacy and power in the ancient world,* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Brown, C. G. (2005) *Postmodernism for historians,* Harlow, Pearson Education/ Longman.

Brown, G. & Yule, G. (1983) *Discourse analysis,* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Brown, P. R. L. (1961) 'Aspects of the Christianisation of the Roman Aristocracy' *The Journal of Roman Studies Vol. 52*, 1-11

--------(1971) *The world of late antiquity: from Marcus Aurelius to Muhammad,* London, Thames and Hudson.

-------- (1992) *Power and persuasion in late antiquity: towards a Christian empire,* Madison, Wis., University of Wisconsin Press.

--------(1997) 'The World of late Antiquity Revisited' *Symbolae Osloenses 72*, 5-80

-------- (2000) *Augustine of Hippo: a biography,* Berkeley, Calif., University of California Press.

-------- (2003) *The rise of Western Christendom: triumph and diversity, AD 200-1000,* Oxford, Blackwell Publishing.

Brunt, P. A. (1961) 'Charges of provincial maladministration under the early Principate', *Historia 10,* 189-223.

Burns, T. S. (1984) *A history of the Ostrogoths,* Bloomington, Indiana University Press.

Cameron, Alan., Long, J. & Sherry, L. (1993) *Barbarians and politics at the Court of Arcadius,* Oxford; Berkeley, University of California Press.

Cameron, Alan. (1970) *Claudian: poetry and propaganda at the court of Honorius,* Oxford: Clarendon.

Cameron, Averil., Ward-Perkins, B., Whitby, M. (2000) *The Cambridge ancient history, Volume 14,* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Cameron, Averil. (1985) *Procopius and the sixth century,* London, Duckworth.

-------- (1989) *History as text: the writing of ancient history,* London, Duckworth.

-------- (1991) *Christianity and the rhetoric of empire: the development of Christian discourse,* Berkeley ; Oxford, University of California Press.

-------- (1993) *The Mediterranean World in Late Antiquity: AD 395-600,* London, Routledge.

--------(1998) 'The perception of crisis' *Morfologie sociali e culturali in Europa fra tarda antichità e alto medioevo (Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull'alto Medioevo 45) vol. 1 (Spoleto)*, 9-31

Chadwick, H. (1981) *Boethius: the consolations of music, logic, theology and philosophy,* Oxford, Clarendon.

Cipolla, C. (1910) 'Le vestigial del frasario officiale presso l' "Anonimo Valesiano II'' *Miscellanea di Studi in Onore di Attilio Hortis*, 919-928, Trieste.

Clover, F. M. & Humphreys, R. S. (1989) *Tradition and innovation in late antiquity: Seminar entitled "Cultural change in the Mediterranean world and the Near East in late antiquity": Revised papers,* Madison, Wis., University of Wisconsin Press.

Collins, R. (1999) *Early medieval Europe: 300-1000,* Basingstoke, Palgrave.

Courcelle, P. P. (1969) *Late Latin writers and their Greek sources,* Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press.

-------- (1963) *Les Confessions de Saint Augustin dans la tradition littéraire: antécédents et postérité*, Paris, Etudes Augustiniennes.

Cracco Ruggini, L., Carrié, J.-M. & Lizzi Testa, R. (2002) *Humana sapit: études d'Antiquité tardive offertes à Lellia Cracco Ruggini,* Turnhout, Belgium, Brepols.

Curtius, E. R. (1973) *Europäische Literatur und lateinisches Mittelalter,* Bern, Francke.

D'Ancona Costa, C. (2002) "Commenting on Aristotle: From Late Antiquity to the Arab Aristotelianism," in *Der Kommentar in Antike und Mittelalter: Beiträge zu einer Erforschung*, ed. by Wilhelm Geerlings & Christian Schulze. Leiden, Brill. 201-51.

Demougeot, À. (1951) *De l'unité à la division de l'Empire romain, 395-410 : essai sur le gouvernement impérial,* Paris, Adrien-Maisonneuve.

Drake, H.A (2006) 'The Impact of Constantine on Christianity', *The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Constantine*, Edited by Lenski, N. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Dvornik, F. (1966) *Byzantium and the Roman primacy,* New York, Fordham U.P.

Elton, H. (1996) *Warfare in Roman Europe, AD 350-425,* Oxford; New York, Clarendon Press;Oxford University Press.

Ensslin, W. (1959) *Theoderich der Grosse,* Munich, Bruckmann.

Everett, N. (2003) *Literacy in Lombard Italy, c. 568-774*, Cambridge; New York, Cambridge University Press.

Frend, W.H.C. (1972) *The rise of the Monophysite movement : chapters in the history of the Church in the fifth and six centuries*, London, Cambridge University Press.

Ghisalberti, A. M. (1960) *Dizionario biografico degli Italiani. Vol. 42,* Roma, Istituto della Enciclopedia italiana.

Gibbon, E. (1994) *The history of the decline and fall of the Roman Empire,* Womersley, D. (Ed), London, Allen Lane.

Goffart, W. A. (1980) *Barbarians and Romans A.D. 418-584: the techniques of accommodation,* Princeton, N.J.; Guildford, Princeton University Press.

-------- (1988) *The narrators of Barbarian history (A.D. 550-800): Jordanes, Gregory of Tours, Bede, and Paul the Deacon,* Princeton, N.J., Princeton University Press.

Graff, H. J. (1981) *Literacy and social development in the West: a reader,* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Grant, M. (1974) *The army of the Caesars,* London, Weidenfeld and Nicolson.

Green, R. (2006) *Latin epics of the New Testament : Juvencus, Sedulius, Arator,* Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Gwynn, A. (1926) *Roman education from Cicero to Quintilian,* Oxford, Clarendon Press.

Hadot, P. (1971) *Marius Victorinus,* Paris, Études Augustiniennes.

-------- (1969) *Porphyre et Victorinus.* Paris, Études Augustiniennes.

Heather, P. J. (1991) *Goths and Romans, 332-489,* Oxford, Clarendon Press.

-------- (1994) 'Literacy and Power in the Migration Period' *Literacy and power in the ancient world*, Bowman & Woolf (eds.), 177-197

-------- (1996) *The Goths,* Oxford, Blackwell Publishers.

-------- (2005) *The fall of the Roman Empire,* London, Macmillan.

Harries, J (1994) *Sidonius Appollinaris and the fall of Rome, AD 407-485*, Oxford, Clarendon Press.

---------- (1999) *Law and empire in late antiquity*, Cambridge, UK; New York, Cambridge University Press.

Hillier, R. (1993) *Arator on the Acts of the Apostles: a baptismal commentary,* Oxford, Clarendon Press.

Hobsbawm, E. J. & Ranger, T. O. (1983) *The invention of tradition,* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Hodgkin, T. (1880) *Italy and her invaders,* Oxford, Clarendon.

-------- (1886) *The letters of Cassiodorus: being a condensed translation of the Variae epistolae of Magnus Aurelius Cassiodorus Senator,* London, H. Frowde.

-------- (1909) *Theodoric the Goth: the barbarian champion of civilisation,* New York; London, Putnam.

Hornblower, S. & Spawforth, A. (1996) *The Oxford Classical Dictionary,* Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Humphries, M (1999) *Communities of the blessed : social environment and religious change in northern Italy, AD 200-400*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

---------- (1997) 'From Emperor to Pope? Ceremonial, space, and authority in Rome from Constantine to Gregory the Great', in K. Cooper and J. Hillner (eds) *Religion, Dynasty, and Patronage in Early Christian Rome, 300-900*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press. 21-58.

Jones, A. H. M. (1962) 'The Constitutional Position of Odoacer and Theoderic' *Journal of Roman Studies 52*, 126-130

-------- (1964) *The later Roman Empire, 284-602: a social, economic and administrative survey,* Oxford, Blackwell.

-------- (1966) *The Decline of the Ancient World*, London, Longmans.

Kaster, R. A. (1988) *Guardians of language: the grammarian and society in late antiquity,* Berkeley ; London, University of California Press.

Kelly, J.N.D (1998) *Golden Mouth: The Story of John Chrysostom-Ascetic, Preacher, Bishop*, London, Duckworth.

Kennedy, G. A. (1980) *Classical rhetoric and its Christian and secular tradition from ancient to modern times,* London, Croom Helm.

Kennell, S. A. H. (2000) *Magnus Felix Ennodius: a gentleman of the church,* Ann Arbor, University of Michigan Press.

Kesich, V (1992) 'Peter's Primacy in the New Testament and the Early Tradition', *The Primacy of Peter: Essays in Ecclesiology and the Early Church.* Edited by Meyendorff, J. St Vladimirs Seminary Pr.

Kidd, B.J. (1976) *A history of the Church to A.D. 461*, Oxford, Clarendon Press.

Lee, A. D. (2007) *War in late antiquity: a social history,* Oxford, Blackwell.

Liebeschuetz, J. H. W. G. (1990) *Barbarians and bishops: army, church and state in the reign of Arcadius,* Oxford, Clarendon.

Maas, M. (2005) *The Cambridge companion to the Age of Justinian,* Cambridge; New York, N.Y., Cambridge University Press.

MacCormack, S (1998) *The shadows of poetry : Vergil in the mind of Augustine*, Berkeley; London, University of California Press.

Macgeorge, P. (2002) *Late Roman warlords,* Oxford; New York, Oxford University
Press.

Maenchen-Helfen, O. & Knight, M. (1973) *The world of the Huns: studies in their
history and culture,* Berkeley, University of California Press.

Mandouze, A., Pietri, C. & Pietri, L. (1982) *Prosopographie chrétienne du Bas-
Empire,* Paris, Éditions du Centre national de la recherche scientifique.

Maraval, P. (1997) *Le Christianisme de Constantin à la conquête arabe*, Paris, P.U.F.

Marcone, A. (2008) 'A Long Late Antiquity? Considerations on a Controversial
Periodization' *Journal of Late Antiquity 1:1*, 4-19

Marenbon, J. (ed). (2009) *The Cambridge Companion to Boethius*, Cambridge,
Cambridge University Press.

Marincola, J. (1997) *Authority and tradition in ancient historiography,* Cambridge,
Cambridge University Press.

Markus, R. A. (1990) *The end of ancient Christianity,* Cambridge, Cambridge
University Press.

Marrou, H. I. (1938) *A Saint Augustin et la fin de la culture antique,* Paris,
Bibliothèque des écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome.

-------- (1956) *A history of education in antiquity,* London, Sheed & Ward.

Marshall, J. (1996) *Michel Foucault: personal autonomy and education,* Dordrecht;
London, Kluwer Academic.

Martin, A. H. M., Martindale, J. R. & Morris, J. (1971) *The Prosopography of the
later Roman Empire. Vol. 1,* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Martindale, J. R. (1980) *The Prosopography of the later Roman Empire. Vol. 2,*
Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Massey, K. (2008) 'A Second Look at Latin Secundus = Favorable' *Pomoerium 5*,
27-38

Matthews, J. (1975) *Western aristocracies and imperial court, AD 365-425,* Oxford,
Clarendon Press.

-------- (1985) *Political life and culture in late Roman society,* London, Variorum
Reprints.

Mazzarino, S. (1942) *Stilicone: la crisi imperiale dopo Teodosio,* Roma, A. Signorelli.

McKitterick, R. (1990) *The uses of literacy in early mediaeval Europe,* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Mclynn, N. (1994) *Ambrose of Milan : church and court in a Christian capital*, Berkeley; London, University of California Press.

Meyendorff, J. (1988) *Imperial unity and Christian divisions: the Church 450-680 A.D,* Crestwood, N.Y., St. Vladimir's Seminary Press.

---------- (1989) *Imperial unity and Christian divisions : the Church 450-680 A.D.*, Crestwood, N.Y., St. Vladimir's Seminary Press.

Mierow, C. C. (1915) *The Gothic history of Jordanes,* Princeton, N.J. London: Princeton University Press; Oxford University Press.

Millar, F. (2006) *A Greek Roman Empire : power and belief under Theodosius II (408-450)*, Berkeley, California; London, University of California Press

Momigliano, A. (1960) *Secondo contributo alla storia degli studi classici,* Roma, Edizioni di storia e letteratura.

Mommsen, T. (1905) *Gesammelte Schriften. Abt. 1,* Berlin, Weidmann.

Moorhead, J. (1992) *Theoderic in Italy,* Oxford, New York: Clarendon Press; Oxford University Press.

-------. (1994) *Justinian,* London, Longman.

Murray, A. C. & Goffart, W. A. (1998) *After Rome's fall: narrators and sources of early medieval history: essays presented to Walter Goffart,* Toronto, Ont. ; London, Toronto University Press.

Neil, B. (2009) *Leo the Great*, London; New York, Routledge.

Noble, T. (1993) 'Theoderic and the Papacy' *Atti de XIII Congresso internazionale di studi sull'Alto Medioevo, Tomo Primo*, 395-425

Norwich, J. J. (1997) *A short history of Byzantium,* London, Viking.

O'Daly, G. J. P. (1991) *The poetry of Boethius,* London, Duckworth.

O'Donnell, J. J. (1979) *Cassiodorus,* Berkeley, Calif.; London, University of California Press.

O'Flynn, J. M. (1983) *Generalissimos of the Western Roman Empire,* Edmonton, Alta., University of Alberta Press.

Pharr, C., Davidson, T. S. & Pharr, M. B. (1952) *The Theodosian Code and Novels and the Sirmondian Constitutions: a translation,* Princeton, Princeton University Press.

Pirenne, H. (1937) *Mahomet et Charlemagne,* Paris.

Ramsey, B. (1997) *Ambrose,* London; New York, Routledge

Rees, R. (2004) *Romane memento: Vergil in the fourth century,* London, Duckworth.

Richards, J. (1979) *The popes and the Papacy in the early Middle Ages, 476-752,* London, Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Riché, P. (1975) *Education and culture in the barbarian West, sixth through eighth centuries,* Columbia, University of South Carolina Press.

Roberts, M. (1989) *The jeweled style: poetry and poetics in late antiquity,* Ithaca; London, Cornell University Press.

Smith, J. M. H. (2005) *Europe after Rome: a new cultural history 500-1000,* Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Southgate, B. C. (2001) *History, what and why?: ancient, modern, and postmodern perspectives,* London, Routledge.

Stahl, W. H. (1971) *The quadrivium of Martianus Capella : Latin traditions in the mathematicaal sciences, 50 B.C.-A.D. 1250 / by William Harris Stahl ; with a study of the allegory and the verbal disciplines by Richard Johnson, with E. L. Burge. Two Volumes.* New York : Columbia University Press

Stein, E. (1949) *Histoire du Bas-Empire,* Paris, Desclée de Brouwer.

Stump, E. (1978) *Boethius's De topicis differentiis,* Ithaca, N.Y. ; London : Cornell University Press.

---------- (1988) *Boethius's In Ciceronis Topica,* Ithaca, N.Y. ; London : Cornell University Press.

Sussman, L. A. (1987) *The major declamations ascribed to Quintilian: a translation,* Frankfurt am Main, P. Lang.

Tamassia, N. (1913) 'Sulla seconda parte dell'Anonimo Valesiano' *Archivio Storico Italiano 7, Series 7,* 3-23

Taylor, G. & Spencer, S. (2004) *Social identities: multidisciplinary approaches,* London, Routledge.

Townsend, W.T. (1936) 'The Henotikon Schism and the Roman Church' *The Journal of Religion Vol. 16*, 78-86

Ullmann, W. (1960) 'Leo I and the Theme of Papal Supremacy' *The Journal of Theological Studies 11*, 25-51

Vardi, A. (2003) 'Canons of Literary Texts at Rome', *Homer, the Bible, and beyond : literary and religious canons in the ancient world*, edited by Margalit Finkelberg & Guy G. Stroumsa. Leiden; Boston, Brill.

Wacher, J. (1987) *The Roman world,* London, Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Ward-Perkins, B. (2005) *The fall of Rome: and the end of civilization,* Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Whitby, M. (2002) *Rome at war: AD 293-696,* Oxford, Osprey.

Wickham, C. (1981) *Early medieval Italy: central power and local society, 400-1000,* London, Macmillan.

Williams, D.H. (1995) *Ambrose of Milan and the End of the Nicene-Arian Conflicts*, Oxford, Clarendon Press; New York, Oxford University Press.

Wirbelauer, E. (1993) *Zwei Päpste in Rom. Der Konflikt zwischen Laurentius und Symmachus (498–514). Studien und Texte* , Munich, Quellen und Forschungen zur Antiken Welt 16.

Wolfram, H. (1987) *History of the Goths,* Berkeley; London, University of California Press.

Wood, I. (1992), 'Continuity or calamity?: the constraints of literary models' *Fifth-century Gaul: a crisis of identity?*, eds. John Drinkwater and Hugh Elton (Cambridge), 9-18.