

SACRED TEXTS OF THE SECULAR: WRITING, HEARING, AND READING  
CASSIODORUS' VARIAE

[p.362]

Several years ago, when introducing a translated selection from the *Variae* of Cassiodorus<sup>1</sup>, I suggested that the more elaborate might be read as chants of a liturgy of secular government; I compared the glittering figures which they laud and idealise to the processions of saints in S.Apollinare Nuovo at Ravenna<sup>2</sup>. I will now take as my starting-point the mosaic of St.Matthew in S.Vitale: the evangelist is depicted as a scribe, seated at his writing-stand, with a codex on his knees and a *capsa* full of scrolls nearby; pen on page, he looks up at the hand of God emerging from Heaven to direct him<sup>3</sup>. Late antiquity tended to see earthly rule as an image of heavenly, and monarchy had a sacral aura; can we use this portrait of an evangelist to illuminate the work of that official draftsman, the Quaestor of the Sacred Palace, and his relation to king or emperor?

Ten books of the *Variae* (including the *formulae* in VI-VII) were produced by Cassiodorus either in office as Quaestor, or as the Quaestor's substitute<sup>4</sup>. The Quaestor's documents, though despatched under the monarch's name, were largely of his own composition, his *dictatio*, and bore the marks of his personal style and learning<sup>5</sup>. At the same time, they were expected not only to embody the ruler's laws or directives, but to reflect and do honour to his character<sup>6</sup>; they might even follow quite closely, while reshaping, his *ipsissima verba*<sup>7</sup>. In

[p.363]

this, they correspond to the view of Holy Scripture which is expressed in Cassiodorus' own commentary on the Psalms: the psalmist is inspired by God, but his eloquence follows Jewish conventions, and can be praised as his own, though ultimately of divine origin<sup>8</sup>. The Quaestor's compositions depend on his constant personal reading in law and the classics - a point stressed by Cassiodorus in his second preface to the *Variae*<sup>9</sup>; Matthew in the S.Vitale mosaic has his stock of scrolls to refer to<sup>10</sup>. Again, as Cassiodorus remarks in his first preface, such compositions can serve purposes that go beyond the occasions of their production, acting as models of composition, and "correcting evil morals by the king's authority, shattering the audacity of the transgressor, restoring terror to the laws."<sup>11</sup> As he says in the quaestor's appointment formula, "How much more eloquent must be he who is known to admonish the people with their prince's voice that they should love the right, hate the wrong, praise good men without ceasing, and zealously denounce the evil."<sup>12</sup> So too, like other commentators, Cassiodorus draws from the Psalms their wider significance through prophetic typology and moral tropology<sup>13</sup>.

The analogy of scripture, though, has its limitations. The work of ruler and Quaestor is less the production of a secular scripture than the textualising, application, and glossing of divine, but non-scriptural testimonies given by the moral laws displayed in the human and natural world, the work of an exegete, rather than an evangelist<sup>14</sup>. Following a governmental tradition which goes back to Plato, the *Variae* deduce their decrees from general moral values<sup>15</sup>; they also repeatedly illustrate them by a tropology of plants and animals. When Cassiodorus came to compile them, he reinforced and Christianised this feature by appending his treatise on the nature of the soul<sup>16</sup>.  
Convergence between

[p.364]

the pre-Christian tradition and the world of the sixth century should perhaps be sought in a genre familiar to most subjects of the Ostrogoths (at least in towns), whatever their race or education, more familiar, I suppose, than official documents from Ravenna: the bishop's sermon, which Averil Cameron has called "the hidden ice-berg of Christian discourse"<sup>17</sup>. Like the *Variae* when compiled for administrators, the sermon collections of such noted preachers as Augustine or Caesarius gave models of eloquence to colleagues and successors. In its reiterated exposition and application of familiar scriptural texts, festivals, and martyrdoms, the sermon seems comparable to the quaestor's restatements of familiar principles of social order, and his encomia on the servants of secular society: both seem to form, or reinforce a community around texts<sup>18</sup>. Constantine, who established the office of quaestor of the palace, had called himself "bishop of those outside the Church", and Cassiodorus wrote for king Theodahad, "our decrees give *sermones* - the word can be translated as both "sermons" and "topics of conversation" - to cities and provinces; even those who obey our commands can judge us"<sup>19</sup>.

This comparison, however, raises two interlocking questions, of genre and audience. How far can a letter dictated and written down apparently for private reading, like most of the *Variae*, parallel an oration preached, often extempore, to a responsive, interacting congregation<sup>20</sup> And how could the quaestor, writing in a manner calculated to impress a small educated, elite, hope to reach and influence the bulk of his ruler's subjects?

The classical epistolary genre was highly flexible. While never fully part of the rhetorical techniques of the ancient world, by late antiquity it had earned a chapter in the Latin rhetorical handbook of Julius Victor, and had long incorporated many of the themes and methods of the rhetorician: consolation, encomium, reproach, informal illustrative discursions (*laliai*), apology, moral counsel and exhortation, exposition of intellectual themes; it was as well

[p.365]

adapted to Christian as to secular discourse<sup>21</sup> Julius Victor sees *negotiales epistulae* as particularly close to rhetoric in their requirement of weighty *sententiae*, sparkling vocabulary, and remarkable *figurae*; but, for many like Synesius, even private correspondence was composed "for display and emulation"<sup>22</sup>. In his recent study of Basil of Caesarea, Philip Rousseau treats the bishop's sermons and letters very much on a par as evidence for his ideas and outreach<sup>23</sup>. Like many imperial letters, episcopal letters were often addressed pastorally to whole communities; and even the private letters of such masters as Synesius or Libanius were often really public, destined to be read to gatherings of friends, or even to wider assemblies of provincial notables<sup>24</sup>. Even a recipient alone in his study would have read his letter aloud, hearing and savouring word and trope, as if listening to a speech; so too an idler, an anxious tax-payer, or a conscientious lawyer, scrutinising an official poster in a portico. The recording by stenographers of a sermon during delivery is paralleled by the frequent dictation of letters; this shared orality may be displayed in the frequent *anacoloutha* of the *Variae* and imperial laws<sup>25</sup>. In both techniques and audience, there is, then, some overlap between the epistolographic and homiletic genres.

Even where a royal letter is directed to a single addressee, a wider audience is often stated or implied. Thus, IX.15, regulating papal elections, also takes in archiepiscopal elections, though addressed to the Pope alone. XII.15, while inspired by local problems, and sent to a single governor, lays down general rules for the demands of judges travelling on circuit. XII.25, to the deputy praetorian prefect is plainly intended to reassure provincials in general as to a mysterious

darkening of the sun, and consequent bad harvests. When Theoderic ordered two officials to give protection to a man harassed by a praetorian prefect, Cassiodorus ended the letter, "Behold a deed which will immediately restrain and chasten all men of power... Hence let all appreciate the love of justice that delights us, since it is our will to diminish even the power of our magistrates"<sup>26</sup>. Surely this measure and sentiment required wide publicity? Indeed, much of the governmental technique displayed in the *Variae* is

[p.366]

one of control by honour, by naming-and-praising, or naming-and-shaming; in both cases this will have worked only if letters could count on circulation<sup>27</sup>. Thus, when controlling the land-grabbing of his nephew Theodahad, Theoderic wrote to him "We are therefore correcting you by the stimulus of publicity (per *incitamenta praeconii*) in a matter in which we should not, as yet, be severe"<sup>28</sup>. Although many of the *Variae*, with their digressions and ecphrases, often look like the private correspondence of educated friends (and this was an important element in the honour they conveyed), they are not true *commercium epistolare*, to use Ennodius' phrase: when Theoderic writes to someone like Boethius "it is our delight to discourse with learned men"<sup>29</sup>, he does not invite a reply in kind. Any *commercium* is one of public honour: the reputation of the king (or, in books XI-XII) of his praetorian prefect, rests, we are told, on that of his ministers<sup>30</sup>; theirs on the honour received from the king. Official praise for a minister produces action, leading to honour for the king, and further honour for the subject. Publicity is the essence of such exchange.

We should envisage a court in which royal letters conferring shame or honour, or of wide administrative application, were given public recitation before despatch to the individual, and from which copies might be distributed to the provinces<sup>31</sup>. Panegyric appointment letters were probably published by the honorand<sup>32</sup>. Moreover, even where directives to magistrates did not take the form of a public edict, the recipient might be expected, or overtly required to publish them. Thus, to a governor of Campania, Theoderic writes "Therefore, your Distinction, understanding the force of our [earlier] edict, must bring this to the public attention"<sup>33</sup>. A letter to an individual might thus beget an edict, and the edict's oral promulgation would then generate the kind of mass response aroused by the Christian sermon<sup>34</sup>. Thus, in 419, during the Eulalian schism, the Prefect of Rome described to the emperor how he had recited

[p.367]

*statuta caelestia* to the people, and appended a record of their acclamations. "Such assent and joy arose from the whole city that all bear witness by fitting approval that both religion has been restored to them, and the security of peace bestowed."<sup>35</sup> When, during the Altar of Victory controversy, Symmachus, as Prefect of Rome, had to read out an edict rebuking him, we may imagine the humiliating chanted phrases of disapproval<sup>36</sup>. Like homiletic orations, the letters of the secular state were inter-active.

To turn, now, to our second question, that of comprehension by the audience, this is a problem for the sermon, as well as the letter. Ramsay MacMullen, in a well-known article, attacked the homiletic of the period, as a genre composed by and for the educated élite<sup>37</sup> - a paradox, in view of the bishop's role as a crowd-controller<sup>38</sup>. Preachers, like Augustine or Caesarius, were often aware of this, and tried to remedy it. Cassiodorus may similarly have felt it a problem for the Quaestor. In the first preface to the *Variae*, he lays claim to the three Ciceronian modes of oratory,

humble, middle, and high. And, where Cicero had seen each as to be chosen to accord mainly with the subject matter, or Augustine with the preacher's purpose, Cassiodorus explicitly relates them to the differing levels of the audience's education<sup>39</sup>. Such stylistic variation was so important to him that it gave the *Variae* their title. However, in practice, his distinction proves rather elusive<sup>40</sup>. It does seem, though, that, while many Romans of high status got (though not always) relatively simple letters, very few *humiles*, and few Goths got ones in the high style. The most learned letters, moreover, tend to be directed to Romans of known learning, like Boethius, while biblical allusions tend to occur in letters to, or on behalf of, men of known religious interests, like Theodahad. There is, then, some attempt at adaptation to the audience, but it usually breaks down when we encounter edicts, or letters that might serve as the basis for edicts, to be addressed to all social levels: there, the style is often high. Thus, VIII.33, to a provincial governor who is required to read it to the people (*relegantur populis et proponantur*), enforcing order at a rustic fair, is a long, subtle, and elaborate piece of craftsmanship; it must have been almost incomprehensible to the peasantry. We should, however, bear in mind that rhetoric was a performance art. Most of us, attending a production of *Hamlet*, would not expect to follow

[p.368]

every word, but would still extract enjoyment, and something more. On Roman panegyric, Donald Russell has recently asked whether "these elaborate mosaics of allusion" were fully understood by their audience, and how far it mattered<sup>41</sup>. Furthermore, as Tony Honor, has remarked on the grandiloquence of Tribonian's legal style, to achieve consensus among Justinian's subjects "it was essential to make them conscious of the greatness of the age in which they were living."<sup>42</sup> With such an aim, comprehension comes second to grandeur.

We should also note that there is evidence (though scanty, and from the fifth century) that imperial edicts and letters might be published in simplified form by the magistrate concerned, perhaps together with the original document<sup>43</sup>. On sermons, moreover, Philip Rousseau has attacked MacMullen's position by arguing that Basil, at least, "constantly strove to inspire [the élite] with his own ideals, so that they became coworkers in a Christian enterprise... he turned the attention of the more sophisticated outwards, to face (as he did himself) the needs of their less cultivated fellows."<sup>44</sup> Can we apply this to the *Variae*? Was the élite expected to interpret and transmit not just their detailed instructions, but their social moralising, by exhortation, as well as conduct, to the general public<sup>45</sup>? Not a question to which we can hope to give a definite answer. I would suggest, though, that the *Variae* do take a new, rather tentative departure in official rhetoric: onto the traditional values of the Roman upper-class, onto honour and noblesse oblige, they graft a certain amount of Christian morality and allusion of a kind increasingly familiar and accessible to all social levels<sup>46</sup>. Thus, when Theoderic authorises the dubious practice of official plundering of ancient graves, he starts with a justifying allusion to the Parable of the Talents<sup>47</sup>. XI.40, Cassiodorus' prefectural amnesty for prisoners on Easter day is reinforced by a range of biblical, as well as Vergilian allusion, in contrast to the 8th Sirmondian Constitution of 386, on the same theme. In V.40, the *venationes* of the arena are upheld on traditional grounds, but also

[p.369]

condemned on Christian (with allusions to Prudentius). Were the senators who would probably have been the wider public for this letter to the Consul of the day, expected to take the message to

heart, and wean the plebs away from their amusements? (Maybe the letter should be read beside Pope Gelasius on the Lupercalia.) As to VIII.33, I have recently argued that the document contains a subtext, suggesting to the gentry of southern Italy a duty to Christianise their peasantry, and lead them into the new Israel<sup>48</sup>.

We should, however, be cautious in such readings. The bulk of scriptural allusions in the *Variae* are, I suspect, like the classical, concealed - to be detected, and then, perhaps, interpreted only by those who had developed an ear for such things<sup>49</sup>; some may even have been made unconsciously. Hence, they may not have been essential to understanding the documents. Thus, in IV.34 (cited above), the allusion to the Parable of the Talents is not explicit, and introduces a justification on the grounds of general morality: biblical authority is the handmaid, not the master of natural law. Nonetheless, I believe that Cassiodorus' hearers and readers, schooled by the sermons and readings of the Church, and perhaps by private Bible study, would often have been enthusiastically alert to such allusions and implications<sup>50</sup> - more so, perhaps, than they now were to concealed classical allusions.

Paradoxically, while the values of the *Variae* are largely those of the "empire of honour", as John Lendon has called it<sup>51</sup>, while Cassiodorus compiled them for his own honour and that of his fellow senators<sup>52</sup>, these secular sermons also contain a Christian ethic of government. Knowledge of the Bible, as well as the classics, implies the official virtues<sup>53</sup>. Kings and their ministers are expected to practise a kind of lay priesthood<sup>54</sup>, aristocrats to show humility in their station<sup>55</sup>, Praetorian Prefects to model themselves on Joseph<sup>56</sup>. Indeed, in the *De Anima*, that 13th book of the *Variae*, humility becomes the root virtue<sup>57</sup>. As I have argued elsewhere, the *Variae* foreshadow the ethics

[p.370]

of Gregory the Great's *Cura Pastoralis*; indeed, in XII.28, the closing letter, scriptural allusion is subtly used to criticise the values of the state<sup>58</sup>: Cassiodorus ends his secular career as the scribe looking to God, not to his royal master<sup>59</sup>.

[p.362]

1. This work is a compilation of state letters and other official documents from Ostrogothic Italy, drafted between c.512 and c.536.

2. Cassiodorus, *Variae*, tr. S.J.B. Barnish (Liverpool, 1992), xx, xxv, xxixf. I am now working on a complete translation and commentary; this paper gives some further thoughts.

3. Compare the miniature of Ezra in the Codex Amiatinus, very possibly derived from a Vivarian original; cf. G. Henderson in *The Age of Migrating Ideas*, ed. R. Spearman & J. Higgitt (Edinburgh & Stroud, 1993), ch.9. The 6th c. Rossano and Rabbula Gospels have similar illustrations.

4. XI-XII were drafted in *propria persona*, when he held the quasi-regal office of Praetorian Prefect of Italy.

5. Cf. J.D. Harries, "The Roman Imperial Quaestor from Constantine to Theodosius II", *JRS* 78 (1988), 148-72, *Law & Empire in Late Antiquity* (Cambridge, 1999), 42-7; T. Honoré, *Law in the Crisis of Empire, 379-455 AD* (Oxford, 1998), 11-15.

6. Cf. Var. VI.5, esp. Talem denique oportet esse quaestorem, qualem portare principis decet imaginem.

7. In the *Acta Synhodorum Habitarum Romae* (ed. Th. Mommsen, MGH AA XII), compare document 4, *Praeceptio Regis*, with 5, *Anagnosticum Regis*, on which it is based; cf. Barnish, xxviii. Cf. Lactantius, *De MP* 46.4ff.: rediction to a notarius of a prayer dictated by an angel.

[p.363]

8. EPs, prae.15, and 44.2 (based on Jerome, Ep.65). Ps.44 is the psalmist's own composition (*opusculum*), but "so that none would think that he was saying anything which he himself had willed, he compared his tongue to a scrivener's pen... We ought to interpret this scrivener rather as a stenographer who speedily understands words, and more speedily transcribes what he has heard" (tr. P.G. Walsh). In Ps.17, Cassiodorus distinguishes the words of the psalmist, Christ, and the Church. Cf. R. Schlieben, *Cassiodors Psalmenexegese* (Tübingen, 1970), 38-41. Augustine, in *De Doc.Chr.* IV, treats the eloquence of St.Paul and Amos similarly.

9. XI, prae.4, 8.

10. They should probably be seen as containing Old Testament testimoniae to Christ. Echoes in the *Variae* of sacred and secular texts have not yet been properly investigated, but they are certainly far more numerous and recondite than is indicated by the index to Frith's CCSL edition.

11. Prae.10; cf. Cassiod., *Inst.* I.xxx, on the copyist and the dissemination of religious texts: *audiunt populi unde se a prava voluntate convertant et domino pura mente deserviant.*

12. VI.5.3.

13. Cf. Schlieben, 187ff.

14. Note, however, EPs, prae.1, "Those who have been granted the ability to understand well and to interpret the divine Scriptures are obviously not excluded from the gift of prophecy" (tr. P.G. Walsh).

15. Cf. Barnish, xxiif.; M. Benner, *The Emperor Says. Studies in the Rhetorical Style of Edicts of the Early Empire* (Göteborg, 1975), 1-25.

16. Cf. Barnish, xxivf.

[p.364]

17. *Christianity & the Rhetoric of Empire* (Berkeley & Los Angeles, 1991), 79. But far more of the iceberg is above water than is that of royal or imperial correspondence!

18. Formation of community: cf. B. Stock, *Augustine the Reader* (Cambridge, Mass. & London, 1996), 169, 188ff. Note that the natural history exempla of the *Variae* are frequently derived from or shared with Ambrose's homiletic *Hexaameron*. Zeno of Verona also gives a good Latin homiletic analogue to the *Variae*; cf., esp., *Tract.* I.2. For the principle of reiterated exhortation, cf. Var. XII.2.4 to all provincial governors, *haec nos annuo sermone convenit loqui, quia bonarum rerum nulla satietas est*; cf. Cameron, 79 & 160, on homiletic, Harries, *Law*, 82-8, on imperial laws.

19. X.6.6; cf. *Inst.* I.xxx, *Uno itaque loco situs, operis sui disseminatione per diversas provincias vadit.*

20. Cf., on Augustine's preaching, F. van der Meer, *Augustine the Bishop* (London, 1961), 391-7, ch.15. Note also, on eastern preachers, R. Wilken, *John Chrysostom & the Jews* (Berkeley &

Los Angeles, 1983), 105ff., and, in M. Cunningham & P. Allen (edd.), *Preacher & Audience* (Leiden, 1998), W. Mayer, 129-34, J. Barkhuizen, 189, 197f., Allen, 219f.

[p.365]

21. Cf. J. Reed, in *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period, 330 B.C. - A.D.400*, ed. S. Porter (Leiden, 1997), ch.7; M. Wagner, "A Chapter in Byzantine Epistolography: the Letters of Theoderet of Cyrus", *DOP* 4 (1948), 120-81; S.T. Stower, *Letter Writing in Greco-Roman Antiquity* (Philadelphia, 1986), 94ff., 139. On the preacher's use of metaphor and ecphrasis to refresh and stimulate the audience, cf. Wilken, 107ff.

22. Julius Victor, *Ars Rhetorica*, ed. K. Halm, *Rhetores Latini Minores* (Leipzig, 1863), xxvii; Wagner, 130, citing Synesius, Ep. 53.

23. Basil of Caesarea (Berkeley & Los Angeles, 1994), ch.5, esp. 164-89.

24. Cf. Barnish, xxxff.; Wagner, 134, n.40; A.F. Norman, intro. to *Libanius, Autobiography & Selected Letters* (Cambridge, Mass., 1992), I, 30f.

25. Cf. G. Vid, n, *The Roman Chancery Tradition: Studies in the Language of Codex Theodosianus and Cassiodorus' Variae* (Göteborg, 1984), 61f., 74, 145.

26. III.20.4.

[p.366]

27. In general, on this method of ruling the Roman world, cf. J. Lendon, *Empire of Honour* (Oxford, 1997).

28. IV.39.2.

29. I.10.5; cf. II.40.17, IV.51.5, VIII.12.4. The wider audience, is, in fact, flattered by implied inclusion among the king's learned friends. Note also that, as in I.2, I.35, and V.42, learned discourse could be coupled with humiliating rebuke.

30. Cf. I.4.2, 7, I.12.4, I.22.4, XI.37.3, XI.5.5, XI.6.3-5, XII.1.1-4, XII.2.4. The sentiment seems more conspicuous in prefectural letters; it may have been indiscreet to state often and emphatically that subordinates could disgrace a monarch.

31. Cf. VIII.20.5: into an exhortation to a newly appointed Praetorian Prefect is interjected one to magistrates in general. VII.7 may somehow have been transmitted to Timgad: CIL VIII, 2297 seems to echo it.

32. Cf. John Lydus, *De Magistratibus*, II.29-30, Barnish, xxxi.

33. IV.10.3. More formal instructions for publication: II.35, VIII.33.8, IX.16.3, IX.19.3, IX.20.2.

34. Cf. S. MacCormack, *Art & Ceremony in Late Antiquity* (Berkeley & Los Angeles, 1981), 232f., on the space which Cassiodorus left in his panegyric on Witigis and Matasuentha for acclamations by the army.

[p.367]

35. *Collectio Avellana*, 34.2.

36. *Symm.*, Rel. 21.2.

37. "The Preacher's Audience", *JThS* n.s.40 (1989), 503-11; cf. below, n.44.

38. Cf. P. Brown, *Power & Persuasion in Late Antiquity* (Madison, 1992), 103, 148ff., 152.

39. Prae. 16-17; Cicero, Orator, 69-101; Aug., De Doc. Chr., IV.27-58. On Augustine's alteration to Cicero's principle, cf. E. Auerbach, *Literary Language and its Public in Late Latin Antiquity and in the Middle Ages* (Princeton, 1993), 34f.

40. I have analysed I-IV on this basis (excluding formal appointment letters). The task is made difficult by the fact that far more letters are addressed to men of high status (and presumably some education) than to the lowly, and that the stylistic types are often hard to distinguish. Note that the three styles do not feature in Inst. II.ii, on rhetoric.

[p.368]

41. In M. Whitby (ed.), *The Propaganda of Power: the Role of Panegyric in Late Antiquity* (Leiden, 1998), 44; cf. Barnish, xxxii, on the liturgical analogy to the *Variae*.

42. Tribonian (London, 1978), 244f.

43. Cf. PL 56, c.490-2, 499-500, 896-8; . Fridh, *Terminologie et Formules dans les Variae de Cassiodore* (Stockholm, 1956), 165.

44. Basil of Caesarea, 164f.; cf. 42, n.68. MacMullen has been much criticised, especially for assuming that those specifically addressed by a preacher were the bulk of the congregation; cf., in *Preacher & Audience*, Mayer, 105-37, Barkhuizen, 179-200, Allen, 201-25; Allen, "The Homilist and the Congregation: a Case-Study of Chrysostom's Homilies on Hebrews", *Augustinianum* 36 (1996), 398-421; Mayer, "Female Participation and the Late Fourth Century Preacher's Audience", *ibid.*, 39 (1999), 139-47. Note, also, D. Trout, *Paulinus of Nola* (Berkeley & Los Angeles, 1999), 181f. A. Meredith, in *Preacher & Audience*, 89-104, gives some support to MacMullen.

45. Cf. Barnish, xxxii.

46. Biblical allusion was not part of the tradition of official style; in the document cited above, n.7, Theoderic's then quaestor omitted his master's allusions.

47. IV.34.1.

[p.369]

48. "Town, Countryside, and the Christianisation of Italy in Cassiodorus' *Variae*", read at the Kalamazoo International Medieval Congress, 1999. I also argue that VIII.31-3, read in sequence, mark a progression from natural to Christian social morality.

49. Cf. Russell on panegyrics, cited above.

50. Cf. van der Meer, 427ff.

51. Cited above, n.27.

52. Prae., 9-10.

53. IX.25.11, X.3.5.

54. I.12.5, VI.2.3, VI.3.9, VI.19.5; cf. Ennodius, *Pan. Theoderici*, 81, Socrates, HE VII.42.

55. VI.9.4, VIII.23.3, IX.25.11, X.11.4; cf. Corippus, *In Laudem Iustini II*, IV.311-23, *Socr.*, HE VII.42. Note also XI.2.5, *sum quidem iudex Palatinus, sed vester non desinam esse discipulus* - the Praetorian Prefect seeks the instruction and co-operation of the Pope in devout humility.

56. VI.3.1-2, VIII.20.3, XII.28.7-8.

57. De An. xvii; note the Vergilian adaptation, *ipsa [humilitas] est... debellatrixque superbiae*.



[p.370]

58. "Roman Responses to an Unstable World: Cassiodorus' *Variae* in Context", forthcoming in *Vivarium in Context*, ed. L. Cuppo Csaki (Medieval Institute Publications, Kalamazoo). Note, though, that Cassiodorus is still more concerned with secular than ecclesiastical rhetoric in the *Institutiones*; cf. my "The Work of Cassiodorus after his Conversion", *Latomus* 48 (1989), 157-87, 176ff.