Theodoric the Great stood at the head of the Germanic kings of Europe and has attracted scholarly attention for generations. The standard modern biography, Wilhelm Ensslin’s *Theoderich der Grosse*, was first published in 1947 and revised in 1959. Although Ensslin’s work has long been regarded as a classic, much new information on the Germanic successor states has come to light during the last two decades. This study aims to elaborate on the basic forces at work among the Ostrogoths, particularly as they affected the monarchy, and to assess the conceptual world of Theodoric anew. Against a broad background of late Roman society and the world of the Goths, still restless after their migrations, three episodes in Theodoric’s reign emerge as especially significant: his triumphal procession into Rome in 500; the consulship of Eutharic and Justin in 519; and the death of Boethius in 525. They represent stages in Theodoric’s attempt to reconcile Gothic experience with Roman norms.

Theodoric entered Rome both as a symbolic act of reverence for Roman forms and ideals and as a demonstration of his desire to restore imperial symbolism to Roman soil, thereby strengthening allegiance to his rule among the Romans. The marriage of Eutharic Cilliga and Theodoric’s daughter Amalasuintha reunited the blood lines of the Amali descended from the great Ermanaric. The subsequent consulship of Eutharic and the Emperor Justin marked the culmination of his vision of a controlled merging of races and traditions under his dynasty and the aegis of Rome. The royal family was to lead the way, with the Gothic nobility and lower classes far behind. Hence, Amalasuintha and her son, the youthful heir Athalaric, received a thorough Roman education, for which they were later rebuked by the nobility, whereas Theodoric forbade the Goths to attend the Roman schools he himself financed. The fact that the Goths had for centuries owed much to Rome and now, despite occasional outbursts of anti-Roman sentiment, were unwilling and unable to refrain from accepting more, went unacknowledged. Theodoric placed the nobility on villa-estates and gave them titles of Roman dignity but wanted them to remain an independent political and ethnic force. In the end, Theodoric’s vision fell victim to the same obstacle which has frustrated countless others: the fact that no culture is ever entirely successful in picking and choosing which aspects of another culture to welcome and which to reject. The death of Boethius demonstrated the failure of Theodoric’s program of selective borrowing and structured sharing, which even in the best imaginable circumstances was beyond realization in one man’s lifetime.

During his own life, and for decades thereafter, Romans saw in Theodoric the best and worst qualities of Valentinian I. Ennodius, praising him in panegyric in early 507, repeatedly drew from Quintus A. Symmachus on Valentinian I.
too, the popular *Gesta de Xysti purgatione* during the Symmachian schism casts Theodoric in the role of a demented Valentinian. An anonymous source written in Byzantine-controlled Ravenna in the 540's went so far as to claim that Theodoric deliberately modeled his rule on Valentinian's reign. Consciously or unconsciously, Theodoric did emulate the great warrior-emperor of the fourth century, for their worlds were similar and in many ways linked. An important feature of both reigns was the obstinate, often frustrating, but nonetheless crucial presence of the Roman senatorial aristocracy. Many, indeed most, of the great Roman clans of the early sixth century traced their family's rise to prominence directly to the late fourth century. Ties of *amicitia* still penetrated deep into the fabric of religion and politics. Cleavages within Christendom had replaced the celebrated last stands of paganism, but the exchange of literary anecdotes and tediously arcane letters flourished still. Perhaps only the brisk exchange of scholarly offprints today truly echoes the demands of late ancient *amicitia* for recognition and reaffirmation.

The parallels between Valentinian and Theodoric went far beyond mimicry and reveal the great debt Theodoric and many other barbarian kings owed to syntheses produced within Roman society during its Indian summer from Julian through Theodosius the Great. This was true for several reasons, and foremost among them was the need for effective and vigorous military command resting upon a renewed participation in the government by the upper classes in conjunction with a more efficient bureaucracy. As a result of the continuance of these demands, never of course realized, the role of the senatorial elite had not changed appreciably, particularly the importance of the great propertied families in and around Rome. Following time-honored patterns, stately leisure was punctuated by the holding of public honors leading to the urban and praetorian prefectures. When in office, the pace of their political lives quickened. Old friends turned to them for assistance, and substantive issues more frequently punctuated the letters of *amicitia*. Out of office their concerns remained essentially the same, focused perhaps even more intently on the world of their estates and the cultural envelope gradually blending *Romanitas* and *Christianitas* and clearly defining their class. Of course, to secure their diminished but still impressive 'domestic habits', they, in their turn, looked to the centers of power—Ravenna, Rome and Constantinople. Expressions of friendship addressed to them at leisure reverted to the vacuous effusions typical of the day. As self-centered and short-sighted as this elite remained, the government of Italy, and after 509 Provence, found them indispensable. Men like Boethius, Ennodius, Faustus, Festus and Symmachus provided a sustaining ruling class intimately concerned with the swirl of events affecting their estates and the centers of culture. Their frequent interactions as a group and around Rome converged on the Senate, particularly the area around Trajan's forum where many may have studied as youths, and where their own protégés now labored over the fine points of Latin. A new center had emerged at St. Peter's, accompanying the papal entourage. The import of their discussions was conveyed to Theodoric formally, informally, and
even surreptitiously by the still menacing *agentes in rebus* and by his own men, especially the *saiones* and *defensores civitatis*. 9 Through such channels he was able to monitor the ecclesiastical manoeuvring which finally led to a rapprochement with the East, as well as the upper class's attitude to his own policies.

While in office, many prominent aristocrats rose to the challenge of the active life and, particularly in emergencies, shouldered burdens far beyond those traditional to their office. Especially at these critical moments they worked with the professional bureaucratic cadre and the principal members of the Gothic nobility. Thus there were very compelling practical considerations for Theodoric to further their class and the literary culture that distinguished it. His patronage of education and the schools was in the best traditions of Gratian and found permanent record in the *Codex Justinianus*. 10 But these and other formal actions were only the most prominent features of a subtle program that sought to restore Roman cultural and religious traditions (which were seldom readily distinguishable) and focus them anew on Rome. Simultaneously, he attempted to sustain the gradual merging of Goth and Roman in a careful and crafty program of settlement and administration designed to achieve both cooperation and separation. He soon learned that the major opposition to the program did not come from the Roman elite, but from the Ostrogothic nobility.

Many members of this nobility could look back on traditions of proud and independent leadership. The followers of Alatheus and Saphrax (perhaps an Alan) had settled with their young Amalian King, Videric, in northern Pannonia after the battle of Adrianople, but now their successors too looked towards Theodoric. 11 Even a few Huns joined the Ostrogoths in the decades after their crushing defeat at Nedao in 454. 12 The settlement in Italy, conducted under the rules of *Hospitalitas*, territorialized the power of the nobility. 13 A few leaders like Bessas refused to submit to the Amali line and remained in the Balkans. Bessas even took service with the Byzantines against his fellow Goths in the Justinianic War. 14 The process of tribe building, more precisely the structuring of the Ostrogothic confederacy, incorporated numerous groups of Gothic speakers and non-Goths from the time of the great Ermanaric, their forlorn king at the time of the original Hunnic confrontations before the battle of Adrianople. 15 The gradual accretion of peoples culminated under Theodoric with the inclusion of various elements of Rugians, Gepids, and several rival lines of Ostrogoths into his group during its wanderings across Moesia, Pannonia, and into Italy. All these diverse groups had a personal bond with the Ostrogoths through Theodoric, but the allegiance to his line was far less durable. 16 Indeed, even within Italy Theodoric had to keep an ever watchful eye on his nobility, and even his own family, as witness the brash Theodahad. Thus, Theodoric like Alaric and a host of other kings of his era searched for greater security and authority over their own peoples by invoking the idea of the hierarchy of Christian Rome with its titular elevations and ranks delineated in dress and court ceremonial. Many barbarian kings were quick to perceive the potential for dynastic continuity in associating themselves with the institutional strengths of Roman tradition and the special role of the
monarchy in Christendom. In part this explains Theodoric's desire for such Roman denotations of power as the praenomen Flavius, the title *patricius*, the consulship, the rank of *magister militum praesentalis*, and his efforts to have his regal position in Italy recognized in Constantinople. However, his kingship began among his own people.

On three separate occasions Theodoric employed carefully prepared public ceremonies to build his following and consolidate his kingship. Considered together, they mark stages in his development from a royal prince to a king of Italy. When the young Theodoric assembled a following to raid the Sarmatians, ca. 470, he set about to recruit others into his small band. His father Thiudmir aided by giving him several of his most trusted attendants, thereby transferring the supports of kingship itself among the Goths and clearly designating his son as heir. In 471 the dying Thiudmir hailed Theodoric king in the presence of the assembled Goths. Finally, Theodoric himself went through another ceremony of kingship in 493 to declare his position over Italy, especially over the followers of the slain Odovacar, and to reaffirm his rule over other Goths, Rugians, and scattered peoples following him to Italy. Thus it was to the Germanic nobility that he first turned for the definitions of kingship. Yet even among the Goths themselves the simple kingship as reflected in Tacitus' *Germania* had succumbed long ago to the demands of warbands and the martial challenge of the Romans and Huns for tighter command structures.

Theodoric spent most of his youth, from the age of seven to eighteen, as a hostage of the imperial court in Constantinople, where, according to his panegyrist Ennodius, he was deeply impressed by the pomp and splendor but repelled by the tyranny. Ennodius, of course, celebrated in the traditional style of the imperial court Theodoric's visit to Rome in 500—a visit which was meant to, and did, personify the imperial visions of rulership of the Gothic king. This is not to say that Theodoric courted the idea of supplanting the emperor, but like a host of other barbarian kings, whose coins reflected the imperial design for generations, Theodoric saw his rule over Romans as a discrete aspect of imperial government to be enshrined in the appropriate and traditional iconography. His carefully arranged entry into Rome will require our recollection and analysis; but, to return to the events of his youth, Theodoric must have received the usual basic education given to the *iuvenes*, with some reading of Latin and Greek interspersed with the equestrian and martial activities more suitable to a warrior. Like many neophytes in a foreign language, Theodoric apparently lost his struggle to master Latin sufficiently well to write in the language. Indeed, his later use of a stencil to sign his edicts was perhaps due to a lingering fear of rebuke for not forming his letters correctly. Or perhaps our decidedly Byzantine source, writing from recently reconquered Ravenna ca. 540–550, simply invented the entire episode in order to tarnish Theodoric's already heroic image. If so, he failed. Theodoric later manifested his personal appreciation for classical education when he had his daughter and grandson, Athalaric, instructed in the Roman tradition. No Germanic educational system could rival the Christian/Roman schools of late
antiquity until long after the Ostrogoths had ceased to exist. This in itself imposed an overwhelming handicap upon the evolution of a distinctly Germanic concept of kingship and society, unless that vision could be limited to warfare and family. Despite a few forays in this direction during the Justinianic War by the Gothic nobility, their efforts were feeble and never again won general support, even among the nobles themselves.

For a Gothic prince raised in Constantinople during the turbulent 460's and early 70's, the man to revere was Aspar. This Gothic noble, as magister militum praesentalis, was the power behind the throne until his assassination by palace eunuchs in 471. The emperors Leo (457–75) and Zeno (474–91) consistently sought to contain their Germanic soldiers, who were clearly perceived as an internal threat to the Empire. The leaders of the Gothic troops after Aspar’s assassination eagerly sought his powers over the Goths as well as the Roman court. The confused events of the decade following Aspar’s death reveal a hesitant but consistent imperial policy of pitting our Theodoric, who soon took over the command of the Goths settled in Pannonia and then Macedonia under his father Thibdmir, against the head of the principal rival branch of Goths. This rival leader was, alas, also named Theodoric. He was also known as Strabo (the squinter) and was the son of Triarius, a relative of Aspar and, after 473, magister militum praesentalis. Except for a brief accord between the two Theodorics early in Zeno’s reign (an unintended result of the emperor’s botched scheme to manoeuver them into battle with each other), the two Gothic leaders saw each other as deadly enemies. The very name they shared was a mutual affront, for there could only be one true ‘prince of the people’ (Theodoric = Thibdwr reiks).

Not until 483, two years after the death of Theodoric son of Triarius, were the Goths combined under the leadership of one king, Theodoric, in that year made magister militum praesentalis and consul designate for 484. In order to keep him at a distance, Zeno awarded him the command of a large section of the Danubian frontier including Dacia Ripensis and Moesia Inferior, centered on Novae. The next five years witnessed a desperate struggle to contain Theodoric, re-establish the federate system in the Balkans, and organize effective defenses of the Haemus and Rhodope Ranges to protect Constantinople itself. Events in Italy seemed far removed until Odovacar began to exploit the chaos in the East by invading Pannonia. Finally in 489, Zeno, perhaps at Theodoric’s urging, decided to send the Ostrogoths against Odovacar, himself patricius, magister militum praesentalis in the West, and de facto rex in Italy.

The concepts of power implicit in the lives of the great Germanic magistri of the fifth century, including Aspar, Odovacar and Theodoric, are magnificently illustrated in the burial of Childeric at Tournai and closely paralleled by contemporary princely burials beyond the imperial frontiers in present-day Romania. Childeric’s tomb was discovered by chance in 1653 and fortunately was recorded with drawings and casts before it was looted from the Imperial Art Gallery in Paris in 1831. The gold signet ring bearing Childerici Regis leaves no doubt as to its identity; its wealth remains unrivalled. The splendid portrait on the
ring stands only a few steps removed from the famous figure of Theodoric seen on his ceremonial triple-solidus, probably issued to commemorate his entry into Rome in 500. The armour and appearance of both are essentially that of a *magister militum*. Childeric, carefully grasping the spear of power, shares little with the anonymous Frankish burials of the contemporary Reihengrabfelder, themselves subtly influenced by contact with the Roman frontier with its distinctive dress styles and the increasingly visible features of Christianity. The numerous examples of polychrome jewelry, among the earliest examples in Francia, reveal even more clearly his conceptual world and those of the great Gothic kings.

The polychrome style evolved in the Gothic lands above the Danube and in south Russia under complex stimuli radiating from Rome and Persia and from among the Goths themselves. By the end of the fourth century it had emerged as the favourite ornamentation of the Gothic nobility. Under Hunnic subjugation the Gothic elite prospered as overlords ruling for their Hunnic masters over the indigenous peoples from the Hungarian plain eastward across the Transdanubian area into the Ukraine. Within the context of a subordinate but commanding elite the Ostrogothic and Gepid nobilities, in particular, refined the imagery and conceptualization of power by combining important symbols of rank derived from the Hunnic court and the polychrome style of the traditional Gothic nobility. The clearest examples are the diadem and the elaborate representations of menacing eagles. Less spectacular perhaps, but symbolically at least as significant, was the spear or ceremonial standard, sometimes sheathed in gold, that graphically represented the absolute powers entrusted to the Gothic chiefs by the Hunnic court.

Several finds dated to the fifth century in Romania attest to the burial of Germanic princes (possibly Ostrogothic or Gepid). The three most important are two princely graves discovered in central Romania and near Apahida, and the famous treasure from Pietroasa, now ‘dated’ to the first half of the fifth century rather than the traditional dating and association with Athanaric in the late fourth. As Hunnic control ebbed north of the Danube, East Roman and Christian concepts and imagery rapidly replaced the most brazen Hunnish symbolism. This is especially apparent at Cluj-Someseni, dating to the last half of the fifth century. The polychrome style still dominated the construction of even the finger rings and pendants executed in the shape of a cross, implying Christian influence. However, collars and arm rings with pagan motifs still held their allure, evidence of the competition with Christian/Roman symbols that was to last throughout Ostrogothic history.

The stimuli of Hunnic/Gothic overlordship symbolized in jewelry and dress were an active ingredient shaping the emergence of a new and more narrowly and hierarchically defined elite all along the Roman frontiers during the last half of the fourth century and throughout the fifth. Childeric and those within the matrix of Roman tradition, but still Germanic, shared in some, but not all, of these developments. Moreover, Theodoric was born at the height of the symbiosis...
of Hunnic, Gothic, and Roman concepts of power, but grew up in a world increasingly dominated by Christianity and the great magistri militum. One of his closest peers was Aetius, whose youth was spent as a hostage at the court of Attila and whose virtues found acknowledgement in the panegyric of Flavius Merobaudes. Another, of course, was his archrival Odovacar, who bequeathed to the Ostrogoths a policy of patronage of the senatorial classes completely consistent with the traditions of late imperial rule which flowed from Valentinian I and Gratian. Theodoric looked to the actions and policies of Odovacar in his first attempts to adapt royal power to the novel circumstances of permanent government. Like all the great magistri, Theodoric and Odovacar demanded and received obedience, even if need be from Roman senators.

Odovacar had little choice but to rule as a magister militum over the Romans and as primum inter pares over the various barbarians under his command. Himself a Scirus, he had no large assemblage of his own people but rather an army of mixed veterans. Zeno refused to accept an independent kingdom in Italy under Odovacar as rex. Indeed, until the death of Nepos in 480, at the hands of an assassin, Zeno referred Odovacar’s formal requests for authority, specifically the honour of being made a patricius, to Nepos as his surviving western imperial colleague. Odovacar accepted his position and as magister struck coins accordingly, commemorating in the gold series Nepos and Zeno, and later Zeno alone. In his silver and bronze issues, where custom allowed greater freedom, he stressed the unity of the imperial realm with the traditional imperial portraits and symbols, most frequently the cross, and his special place within it with his own likeness and personal monograms. But even in the use of monograms, expanded under the Ostrogoths, he remained faithful to late imperial tradition; the earliest such monogram dates from Theodosius II (408–50).

Theodoric’s coinage, as that of his successors to the end of the kingdom, falls into line behind the issues of Odovacar. Even Theodoric’s mustache bears a striking resemblance to that of his hated foe. Odovacar, who had risen to power when Orestes refused to settle his troops in Italy, conducted the first large settlement of barbarians there, delegating the onerous task of pairing senators and barbarian leaders to the Roman, Liberius. Here too Theodoric built on Odovacar’s program. Indeed the same Liberius supervised the settlement of the Ostrogoths in Italy and later in Provence but on a much more extensive scale than earlier. Yet Theodoric was able to go far beyond Odovacar’s limited view of rulership as an extension of the office of magister militum, although he never relinquished its right of command.

Once he was established in Italy, the exigencies of circumstance pressed in from all sides, further to mould Theodoric as a leader. The legacies of Odovacar and the magistri militum, the often cruel outbursts of a tested warrior, and the obligations imposed upon the king by his own people in their search for security and sustenance characterized the early years of Theodoric’s rule in Italy. Barbarian kings thrust into positions of rule over disparate populations, men like the Burgundian king Gundobald and Altauph, King of the Visigoths, indeed
Theodoric’s own father Thiudmir, could scarcely avoid first conceiving their role in Romania as an outgrowth of their position as the heads of federate tribes. Their positions were legally defined and found territorial expression throughout the fifth century in the rules of settlement spelled out in the Theodosian Code and known as *Hospitalitas*. The sharing of lands and incomes spelled out in the *Code* (vii, 8.5) was combined with a natural desire to preserve ethnic cohesion so as to yield an early pattern of government in many barbarian kingdoms composed of endeavors of Germans ruled by their chiefs in a landscape still dominated by Romans. Theodor’s vision of a systematic balance of Roman and Goth, allied in competitive co-operation at numerous levels, drew upon this peculiar ‘allied’ status. Once he had elected to stand at the apex of both the Roman and the Gothic hierarchies, his footing could never be fully secure.

In order to maintain a vigorous but peaceful internal harmony among the Roman population, especially the leading elements of the aristocracy, Theodoric supported their efforts at achieving religious re-unification with the East following the Laurentian schism and the Theopaschist heresy. However, Arian Goths were to stand apart, worshipping in their own churches. To make himself more radiant in the reflected glory of Roman traditions he ceremoniously entered Rome, held games in the circus, and demonstrated *dementia* towards the losers of factional struggles. His rebuilding campaign in Rome, still visible in several areas, was also inspired by his hope of refocusing the cultural traditions of the Roman upper classes upon their sacred font—a Rome and Italy under his sway—rather than the East and Constantinople. Thus, to Romans like Cassiodorus his rule was indeed a conscious imitation of imperial rule, specifically, of course, that of the sole remaining emperors in the East. Addressing the Emperor Anastasius in Cassiodorus’ *Variae*, Theodoric stated: ‘regnum nostrum imitatio vestri est’. Of course, it was hardly imitation: Theodoric was also king of the Goths.

The Goths saw a different Theodoric, a man, perhaps by 500 already more than a man, possessed of Germanic virtues in heroic dimensions. In part, the brutal slaying of Odovacar and his brother Onoulph betrays this side of Theodoric’s character—ferocious wrath. Even Ennodius, whose panegyric ennobled his king, was careful to guide his friends around the jagged rocks in Theodoric’s temperament. In an age of violence and abrupt ends, Theodoric’s inner harshness was respected and accepted as a part of his charisma. As for Theodoric himself, violence was in the final analysis an aspect of justice. Justice listens and weighs and even bends, but ultimately acts. Among the first Romans to feel Theodoric’s justice and witness his wrath were the citizens of Pavia during the first winter of Ostrogothic rule in 490.

Beset by an uncertain military situation and particularly concerned over the recent return of Tufa to his old chief Odovacar, and the naggings of endless streams of Pavians forced to billet his people, Theodoric lashed out at the very heart of Roman society, property transfer through testament. He threatened to exclude from inheritance rights any Roman not already in his camp. Ultimately
reason in the person of Saint Epiphanius prevailed and only the active supporters of Odoacer were so proscribed. Without the smooth and dependable transference of property across the generations the world of the late Roman aristocracy would have crumbled into ruins within a generation and with it the cult of letters.

While the Goths, like the Romans, feared his wrath, they revered his prowess, proven in countless battles, and his love of family. Blood remained at the center of Gothic concepts of power, and, as events following Theodoric’s death were to demonstrate, the Amali line was not as unchallengable as Theodoric himself. No one appreciated this fact as clearly as Theodoric, who set out to raise his line to the loftiest summits of the Germanic elite of Europe. In part this meant uniting all the living heirs of Ermanaric, thus rejuvenating and strengthening the Amali line and its claim to the still vibrant memories of the stand against the Huns, indeed of the very foundation of the Ostrogothic confederacy itself. In another sense, Theodoric sought to use his family, his sister, daughters and grandchildren, to link the great Germanic houses to him as their elder and most powerful leader. With patient skill he spun a web of alliances with the Burgundians, the Franks, the Visigoths, and especially with the still dangerous Vandals to whom he wedded his sister Amalfrida with great pomp. Such feats of diplomacy combined with deeds of valor to earn him his place in saga as Diethrich von Bern.

To return to Roman affairs, Zeno unwittingly contributed greatly to the success of Ostrogothic rule in Italy when, in 482, some seven years before dispatching Theodoric’s people to the West, he issued the Henotikon or Edict of Union. Theologically crafty, too crafty to win universal respect, the decree immediately became a principal focus of political and diplomatic life in Italy. The Chalcedonian formula of 451 agreed, after long harangues, on the wording advanced by Pope Leo I, the famous una persona, duae naturae. The monophysite churches of Jerusalem, Antioch and Alexandria always resented the political encroachment of Constantinople upon the theology of Chalcedon, regarding the ambiguous language of the Henotikon (suggested by the Patriarch Acacius of Constantinople) as a further dilution of the Godhead. In the West, the Pope and the majority of the nobility—spiritual and temporal—rejected the formula entirely, claiming the obvious: that it avoided the whole problem of the nature of Christ through circumlocutions and thus went against Chalcedon. More stridently offensive was the concept of theology as the word of Pharaoh implicit in the Edict. For the first time the Emperor overruled the bishops in cathedra instead of following Constantine and confining the imperial role to ex cathedra concerns. During the fifth century the popes had grown accustomed to the Constantinian understanding and, if anything, had acted as the principal spokesmen of the civil authority within the City and beyond, while the emperors sulked in the shadows of their magistri.

The Acacian schism as it is called was the first official disruption of communion with Christendom and contributed immeasurably to the stability of Odoacer’s regime and the flowering of a symbiosis of Goth and Roman under Theodoric. Like Odoacer, Theodoric had to find a workable coexistence for Romans and Germans within late Roman culture now radiating primarily from Constantinople.
The peculiar balance could be maintained only if and as long as the composite lure of Rome for its legitimate ruler—the Emperor—and its religious heart—the eastern Mediterranean—were somehow divorced from the pervasive and irresistible cultural force conveyed in mental images, dress and the very concept of civilization itself, which accompanied the emperorship. The magnificent grave goods of Cluj-Somușeni (ca. 450–75), with their Byzantine inspiration, clearly manifested the strength of the East well beyond its frontiers, when as early as the third quarter of the fifth century some Eastern Germanic peoples had already silently bent their knees to late Roman civilization in its Christian/Byzantine form. Theodoric sought religious reunification as one aspect of his sincere effort to restore domestic tranquillity in Italy, thereby securing the time needed to harness the constructive talents of his aristocracies, Roman and Gothic. He was willing to exchange religious tolerance for political allegiance. Neither he nor the Romans viewed unity within the Orthodoxy as a threat to his rule. Indeed, except during the fiery pontificate of Gelasius (492–96), Theodoric used the embassies sent to discuss the schism to press the Emperor for official recognition of his title rex.

In 490 Flavius Rufinus Postumus Festus, caput senati (the oldest living consul ordinarius) undertook the delicate tasks without success. In 493, shortly before Gelasius’ temper terminated discussion, Flavius Anicius Probus Faustus, then magister officiorum and later quaestor palatii (a post often recognizing special literary talent), and finally praetorian prefect (509–12), took up the challenge on Theodoric’s behalf. But, against a rising tide of personal animosity towards the new Pope, Faustus too failed. After the death of Gelasius, the next pope, Anastasius II, was quite willing to reopen negotiations and manifested a clear desire to return to the Constantinian compromise. Theodoric lost little time, and quickly Festus returned to Constantinople. This time, with success seemingly at hand, Festus committed himself to persuading the pontiff to accept the main features of the Henotikon. The Emperor Anastasius then and only then recognized Theodoric as king and as the official representative of the imperial authority. Thus our source records that all the symbols of office sent by Odovacar to Constantinople were returned to Italy. Furthermore, there is no hint in these events that Faustus and Festus were members of opposing cliques within the aristocracy—but they were. Theodoric’s kingship transcended petty factionalism.

The controversy, of course, was hardly at an end, but Theodoric seized the opportunity to promote his kingship and the religious rapprochement by means of a magnificent visit to Rome. He first moved to heal the wounds surrounding the Henotikon, the unfortunate result of which was the election of two popes, Symmachus and Laurentius. For the moment, however, Theodoric believed that the affair had been resolved since the clergy itself had affirmed the synodal election of Symmachus and thereby rejected Laurentius and with him the secular faction led by Festus. Of course, he had not heard the last of Laurentius and Festus, but for the moment he could celebrate. The Anonymus Valesianus text is marvellously succinct and evocative:
At that same time a dispute arose in the city of Rome between Symmachus and Laurentius; for both had been consecrated. But through God's ordinance Symmachus, who also deserved it, got the upper hand. After peace was made in the city of the Church, King Theodoric went to Rome and met Saint Peter with as much reverence as if he himself were a Catholic. The Pope Symmachus, and the entire senate and people of Rome amid general rejoicing met him outside the city. Then coming to Rome and entering it, he appeared in the senate, and addressed the people at The Palm, promising that with God's help he would keep inviolate whatever the former Roman emperors had decreed.

In celebration of his tricennalia [read decennalia] he entered the Palace in a triumphal procession for the entertainment of the people, and exhibited games in the Circus for the Romans. To the Roman people and to the poor of the city he gave each year a hundred and twenty thousand measures of grain, and for the restoration of the Palace and the rebuilding of the walls of the city he ordered two hundred pounds to be given each year from the chest that contained the tax on wine.

Beneath the reverence for the outward manifestations of Roman rule, the rebuilding of Rome, and the careful attention to the sacred populus Romanus lay a deep conviction that Rome, not Constantinople, was still the capital. Theodoric hoped to restore her grandeur and refocus the eyes of his Roman aristocracy upon Rome herself. He supported schools and scholarship there, and throughout his reign Rome moved closer to regaining her lost eminence. He may well have chosen the occasion to publish a new clarification of the law for both Goth and Roman. And accordingly many scholars have assigned the Edictum Theoderici to this year, but recent debate casts doubt on the traditional dating. Nevertheless, he was undoubtedly famed for his edicta. For many barbarians written law was the embodiment of Roman government, standing in sharp contrast with their world of family and custom. But Rome without the emperor's presence was beyond revival. The Senate ceased to meet sometime after 603 and the ancient shrines of Roman glory decayed into ruins. Theodoric failed to revitalize Rome and so to redirect the loyalties to the emperor back to himself. For a while, however, the augurs smiled their favor.

The Acacian schism lingered as a barrier to cultural and religious unification until the death of the Emperor Anastasius at the age of 88 in July 515 ushered in the new dynasty of Justin and his nephew Justinian. The bitter fight between Symmachus and Laurentius for the papal tiara began a slow polarization among the Roman aristocracy along lines of influence in the Church of Rome. The ranks were never closed, for even the great families can be seen moving about. For example, the Symmachi were initially proponents of Symmachus but later led the faction originally created around Laurentius and Festus. The loyal supporters of Pope Symmachus, especially the young clergymen promoted during his pontificate and their families and friends, dominated the papacy until after Theodoric's
Naturally they were vigorous supporters of the Ostrogothic monarchy, but so, for that matter, were Festus and the Symmachii. To see these early divisions as anything more than the logical evolution of senatorial politics with all its bickering factionalism from the years of Odoacer and even earlier is to miss the point. No one at the time could distinguish a pro-Gothic or a pro-Roman faction.

In March 519, after just three days of discussion, the Acacian schism ended with the condemnation of Acacius and even of the emperors Zeno and Anastasius. To mark the political accord and recognize the balance of Gothic independence within Roman unity and give both the stamp of destiny, Theodoric nominated his blood relative and son-in-law Eutharic to hold the consulship with Emperor Justin. Eutharic was the presumptive heir to Theodoric and the father of Athalaric and Matasuentha. An Amal, the son of Veteric and in the direct line from Ermanaric, he had lived his life in Spain among the Visigoths to whom his father had fled from the Huns (ca. 430). His marriage to Amalasuintha and elevation to the consulship brought together all the facets of Theodoric’s vision. Joy filled all ranks of society. Cassiodorus, who had already risen to high office from modest beginnings, celebrated it with the publication of his *Chronicon* and praised Theodoric’s vision in panegyric. The euphoria was probably still high when Boethius reentered the active life of politics. Consul in 510, in 523 he served as *magister officiorum*. In 522, Theodoric and Justin nominated Boethius’ two sons, Boethius and Symmachus, as joint-consuls, a truly exceptional mark of distinction usually reserved for the imperial family. In appreciation Boethius delivered an oration in praise of Theodoric before the Senate with both sons presiding. Thus Theodoric gave proof of his deep admiration for one of the last great minds of antiquity, and Boethius in his turn wholeheartedly supported his king.

Even before he became consul Boethius had translated into Latin many Greek works including writings from Pythagoras, Ptolemy, Nicomachus, Euclid, Plato, and Aristotle. His translations won the highest praise from Theodoric himself, who doubtless saw in them the fruits of his own labors at raising the Latin world, centered on Rome, to equality with Constantinople. Recently Boethius had become embroiled in the theological debates engendered by Justinian’s continued yearning to unite the East and force the West into compliance. Boethius lent his pen to the Theopaschist cause as did Dionysius Exiguus, perhaps the nearest rival to Boethius in ability and importance. Theopaschist monks led by John Maxentius offered a new formula, *unus ex trinitate passus carne*, to Pope Hormisdas in late 521. Soon John used Boethius’ *Tractates* in his defense of the new definition against papal opposition. Dionysius helped the monks translate several works by Cyril of Alexandria written in the fifth century against Nestorius and in defense of Christ’s divinity. The changing nature of Christ in Theopaschian theology allowed Him to suffer on the cross as a human in passing, thus protecting the key of salvation, while reaffirming His essential divinity within the Godhead. Symmachus, Albinus and many other senators were deeply troubled by the
debates and rallied their supporters to the side of the innovators. A pro-Eastern faction emerged including perhaps Pope John (523–26) and many old opponents of the Laurentian candidature of 502–06. Perhaps even the aged Faustus entered the lists for one last hurrah. Certain among them flirted with visions of a complete reunification of their cultural, religious and ultimately perhaps their political world under a more direct imperial administration. These may have felt threatened when they looked about and saw relative upstarts, like Cassiodorus, rising to power at court while they slid down the ladder towards who knew what. For them their rivals were the ‘pro-Gothic clique’; their hatreds were signs of despair. Men like Boethius, however, did not abandon Theodoric.

Theodoric remained aloof. Doubtless aware of the brisk exchange of letters between Rome and Constantinople and informed of the occasional embassy, he apparently remained convinced that union would profit all concerned, including the Goths. The singular honor of joint-consulships for the sons of Boethius in 522 attests to his forbearance with the participants in the religious controversy. But the events of 523 caused him concern and sorrow. Deaths in his family, the imprisonment of his sister in North Africa, and the rising oppression of Arians in the eastern Empire, all contributed to a sense of desperation at Ravenna.

Although we shall never know precisely what inspired Theodoric to entertain charges against ex-consul Albinus, we do know that a letter was apparently intercepted in which Albinus betrayed his political sympathies for the imperial rule and against the reign of Theodoric. Cyprianus, referendarius at the royal court, threw up the charges and presented the case before the court, then at Verona. Boethius, magister officiorum and as such a member of the consistory, rushed to defend his friend, saying ‘the charge of Cyprianus is false, but if Albinus did that, so also have I and the whole senate with one accord done it; it is false, my lord King’. Theodoric was in no mood to suffer such arrogance and ordered the charges expanded to include Boethius and apparently referred the matter to the Senate, or more likely to the proper subcommittee, the iudicium quinquevirale. At least he didn’t cut him in half as he did Odovacar, or die in a fit of rage as had Valentinian I over the insolence of the Quadic ambassadors!

When the royal entourage was in residence at Pavia, he summoned Eusebius, prefect of Rome, to communicate the Senate’s judgment. Theodoric rendered sentence upon the guilty without further ado. Probably stripping Boethius of his wealth and honors, he exiled him to the distant estate of Calventia. This was in 523 and Boethius had not yet begun the Philosophiae Consolatio. Theodoric ordered Pope John to Constantinople to settle the problem of the persecution of Arians and to restore those Arians who had lapsed into Orthodoxy. Justinian agreed to stop any persecutions but would not force converts back to Arianism. For Theodoric, John and his mission of Orthodox bishops (Ecclesius of Ravenna, Eusebius of Fanum Fortunae, and Sabinus of Campania) and pro-Eastern senators (Theodorus, Importunus, and Agapitus) failed. Perhaps they did not try hard enough; perhaps their pro-Eastern sympathies had gained the upper hand over loyalty to him. A weak and elderly John quickly succumbed to death in
Theodoric's prison and was immediately hailed as a martyr by 'the senate and people' of Rome. The Consolation of Philosophy would never be finished, since, now convinced of their guilt, Theodoric ordered Boethius and Symmachus to be executed. According to tradition their deaths haunted him throughout the few remaining days of his life. Struggling with visions of their tortured heads, he died of dysentery. Of course, our orthodox sources saw heavenly justice when the champion of Arianism died just as had the founder of his accursed heresy. Tradition is filled with half-truths and simplistic causation. All the events so far associated with the fall of Boethius reflect only Roman characters and Roman plots. Theodoric indeed never saw events as simply Roman. His rage was so uncontrolled that only a mortal insult can account for it. When Theodoric ordered Boethius to be imprisoned, the spirit of the warrior and magister returned. Ultimately Boethius was executed, perhaps with a cord twisted about his head until his eyes began to crack, and then dispatched with a club. Boethius himself gives us a hint at the causes of Theodoric's deep despair and outrage, although he went to his death refusing to admit that his conduct was treasonable.

Boethius denounced Cyprianus and his other accusers with utter disdain:

But by whose accusations did I receive this blow? By theirs who, long since having put Basilius out of the King's service, compelled him now to accuse me, by the necessity by which he was driven to debt. Opilio likewise and likewise Gaudentius being banished... They were hardly so despicable a lot. Cyprianus, who was after all just doing his job, was promoted to comes sacrarum largitionum in 524 and magister officiorum in 527 under Athanaric. Cyprianus is praised by Cassiodorus for being able to read Gothic. Opilio followed Cyprianus as comes sac. larg. (527–28) and in 534 was addressed by Pope John II as vir inlustris et magnificus. He accompanied Liberius to Constantinople later in 534 to explain the intentions of Theodahad towards Amasuintha. And unlike Liberius, who apparently defected, Opilio defended his king loyally. Opilio was related through his wife to the great Basilian family. Gaudentius was consularis Flaminiae in 517/518 (perhaps 502/03). What is more important is that Boethius linked his Roman accusers with the prominent Goths. Thus he called into question the actions of Cunigast, who was addressed by Cassiodorus (writing for Athalaric in 527) as vir inlustris, and Triguilla, praepositus cubiculi at Ravenna (520–23). Triguilla was also a saio and as such had supervised Faustus' return of some illegally seized property. He also helped Ennodius purchase a villa. Of course, Boethius claimed that he had protected the poor against their avarice. Except for Boethius' bitter counter-allegations, there is scarcely a hint of impropriety surrounding any of his accusers. Nor does Boethius portray them as a pro-Gothic faction, but for most Romans they clearly were.

Boethius' call from his splendid isolation at Claventia had little to do with Theodoric's order of execution, which in fact resulted from Theodoric's own investigations. On the one hand the correspondence of the Roman pro-Eastern
faction betrayed their straightforward hierarchy of political loyalty without reference to Theodoric, disappointing but hardly surprising. On the other, Theodoric witnessed the unabashed emergence of a pro-Gothic party numbering among them some of the most trusted Romans and Goths. The Gothic nobility had immersed itself so deeply into aristocratic Roman life that it could not resist factional politics, with all of its jealousies, hatreds and betrayals. This went against the very heart of Theodoric’s program of separation and co-operation. The very presence of Goths so closely associated with important Roman aristocrats belied any attempt to claim that the correspondence in question was purely religious and cultural, for the Goths were Arians unconcerned with subtleties within the Orthodoxy. The entire exchange of letters stretching between Rome and Constantinople was now suspect. The basic ethos of Theodoric’s kingdom was destroyed. All around him Goths were merging into Italian society with all its imperfections. The Romans had betrayed his trust. He despaired for the future and began to prepare Italy for invasion, ordering the building and manning of 1000 warships. With the Vandals in disarray at home and their fleet probably rotting into disuse, his order was clearly aimed eastward.

Thus during the final years of his reign Theodoric despaired as, one after another, aspects of his dream were washed away. In his sorrow, in his final rage and nightmares, uncontrolled and grotesque, we can still grasp a glimpse of the most complex vision of society since Constantine. Concepts of power as distant and remote as the long-abandoned huts of South Russia clashed with the subtle arrogance of the Roman aristocracy. The hope of controlling the merging of Goth and Roman now appeared unattainable. Standing at the summit of power, Theodoric oversimplified both the Romans and the Goths. On the one hand, he interpreted Roman dissatisfaction with the East as support of his program. On the other, the Ostrogoths were far more complex than even he realized. The ancient yearnings of the leading Goths for independence and power, long muted by his charisma but never erased, poised anew around his dynasty, now destined to struggle under the carefully tutored Amalasuintha and the weak Athalaric. Ultimately the nobility rejected much of Theodoric’s vision and thrust to power Witigis, holding him aloft amid a ceremony of circled swords. Witigis was a warrior without the tutored culture of Romanitas, but he too clung to the legend of Theodoric by marrying his granddaughter Matasuentha. There is still a hint that their marriage was celebrated in traditional Roman panegyric. After his elevation among the Goths, he was ceremonially introduced to them in the formal words of Cassiodorus as the true successor of Theodoric. The circle of swords was no longer enough.

The revolution which Procopius, writing after 542, claimed as the cause of the downfall of Boethius and Symmachus was, in reality, still far from men’s minds in 525. Theodoric alone perceived the destiny of the Ostrogothic Kingdom when he said: ‘Aurum et daemonem qui habet, non eum potest abscondere;’ item ‘Romanus miser imitatur Gothum et utilis Gothus imitatur Romanum.’ The Gothic nobility was becoming too deeply enmeshed in money and Roman
society, while the poor Gothic soldier-farmers were gradually merging into the lower ranks of society. By the time Procopius drafted his chapters a revolution of Roman aristocrats was in full progress. Yet as late as Totila the basic aspirations of rule as developed under Theodoric survived at least as a dim hope. Thus until the very end of the Kingdom (ca. 554) the conception of a balanced society of Goth and Roman, discrete aspects of a united Italy, echoed through the courtyards of Ravenna and later of Pavia. The balance is clear on the coins of almost every Gothic king after Theodoric. In part, they reproduced his themes, indeed his likeness and even his monograms, in order to rest part of their burden upon his shoulders. But also, I believe, Theodoric’s successors came to share his view that if Gothic leadership was to prevail over Roma, there was no alternative to an accommodation which recognized the strengths of both Roman and Gothic cultures.
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