

Anastasiia Morozova

***Gratia non debet occumbere cum dilectis: Love, Affection, and
Affective Ties at the Ostrogothic Court in Cassiodorus's *Variae****

MA Thesis in Late Antique, Medieval and Early Modern Studies

Central European University

Vienna

September 2024

***GRATIA NON DEBET OCCUMBERE CUM DILECTIS: LOVE, AFFECTION,
AND AFFECTIVE TIES AT THE OSTROGOTHIC COURT IN CASSIODORUS'S
VARIAE***

by

Anastasiia Morozova

(Ukraine)

Thesis submitted to the Department of Medieval Studies,
Central European University, Budapest, in partial fulfillment of the requirements
of the Master of Arts degree in Late Antique, Medieval and Early Modern Studies.

Accepted in conformance with the standards of the CEU.

Chair, Examination Committee

Thesis Supervisor

Examiner

Examiner

Vienna
September 2024

***GRATIA NON DEBET OCCUMBERE CUM DILECTIS: LOVE, AFFECTION,
AND AFFECTIVE TIES AT THE OSTROGOTHIC COURT IN CASSIODORUS'S
VARIAE***

by

Anastasiia Morozova

(Ukraine)

Thesis submitted to the Department of Medieval Studies,
Central European University, Budapest, in partial fulfillment of the requirements
of the Master of Arts degree in Late Antique, Medieval and Early Modern Studies.

Accepted in conformance with the standards of the CEU.

Michael Shane Bjornlie

External Reader

Vienna
September 2024

***GRATIA NON DEBET OCCUMBERE CUM DILECTIS: LOVE,
AFFECTION, AND AFFECTIVE TIES AT THE OSTROGOTHIC COURT IN
CASSIODORUS'S VARIAE***

by

Anastasiia Morozova

(Ukraine)

Thesis submitted to the Department of Medieval Studies,
Central European University, Budapest, in partial fulfillment of the requirements
of the Master of Arts degree in Late Antique, Medieval and Early Modern Studies.

Accepted in conformance with the standards of the CEU.

External Supervisor

Vienna
September 2024

I, the undersigned, **Anastasiia Morozova**, candidate for the MA degree in Late Antique, Medieval and Early Modern Studies, declare herewith that the present thesis is exclusively my own work, based on my research and only such external information as properly credited in notes and bibliography. I declare that no unidentified and illegitimate use was made of the work of others, and no part of the thesis infringes on any person's or institution's copyright. I also declare that no part of the thesis has been submitted in this form to any other institution of higher education for an academic degree.

Vienna, 30 September 2024

Signature

Abstract

This thesis is an analysis of the language and rhetoric of the love of the *Variae* of Cassiodorus, a sixth-century Italo-Roman intellectual, member of the late-Roman elite and high official at the Ostrogothic court. This thesis examines the socially dictated, affective and connotative dimensions of love in various interactions between Ostrogothic social actors as presented in the *Variae*. Several questions are the focus of the thesis: what social interactions sparked the professions of affection? What vocabulary of love was used or predominantly associated with certain actors? How does the rhetorical and literary design of the text with three different narrative voices and voices of different royal personalities influence the expression of affection? And, finally, how does Cassiodorus appropriate and adapt already existent emotive codes? By answering these questions, I aim to provide an understanding of the social and rhetorical functionality of love in Cassiodorus's *Variae* and the Ostrogothic kingdom. I will argue in this thesis that Cassiodorus's main focus is the regnal affection towards subordinates and civic affection between officials and the public. This preference is based on the statistical appearances of love and the rhetorical framework of the *Variae* that primarily intends to provide a mirror of Ostrogothic virtuous government as well as ethical and rhetorical models for the Italo-Roman elite. When we consider the *Variae* in the historical post-Roman context, it is also clear that Cassiodorus pursues two goals, which are to portray love as a prerequisite for effective social and affective bonds and stability of the existent social structures and to adapt the late-imperial emotive codes to Ostrogothic royal personalities, thus, making them a main affective figure and a primary vehicle behind the socially constructive affection.

Acknowledgements

Many people deserve my immense gratitude for the completion of this seemingly endless thesis. Firstly, I would like to thank my supervisors: Cristian Gaşpar and Volker Menze not only for extensive and productive consultations, literature recommendations and valuable insights as well as inspiring and meticulous feedback but also for their emotional and psychological support and understanding of the disastrous impact the launch of the Russian full-scale invasion and occupation of my hometown during the latest stage of the Russo-Ukrainian war has exerted upon me since 24th February 2022. I also cannot stress enough my gratitude to the faculty and staff of the Medieval Department at CEU for their understanding, encouragement and support throughout these tremendously arduous years. I owe thanks in particular to those professors whose courses continued to inspire and motivate me to work on my methodologically insidious topic despite the continuing issues with my health and war-related concerns: along with my supervisors, Eloise Adde and Baukje van den Berg assisted me in my ceaseless reflections upon my thesis and broadened my theoretical and methodological horizons as well as supported me throughout the way. I am also forever grateful to Prof. Sif Ríkharðsdóttir whom I had the pleasure to meet personally during the Summer School in Iceland and who, as a specialist in the history of emotions whose works rekindled my passion back in 2022 and who has become my inspirational *exemplum* in the field since then, shared with me her latest theoretical navigations regarding the emotion of love. I owe my thanks to Nicole Demarchi, another fellow historian of emotions, whose comments on my conceptual framework have been the most useful in continuing my research. Last but not least I owe thanks to my scientific supervisor from Ukraine Oleksandr Okhrimenko – without your advice, inspiration and attentive eyes I would not have been there in the first place.

I would like to thank my colleagues in the MA and PhD programs for making these years of preparation of the final version of the work stimulating and encouraging. In particular, I owe thanks to Tara Merrigan, Karsten Schuil, a fellow historian of emotions, Anja Božič, Olha Stasiuk, and Osman Özdemir – we might not have interacted that much, still, our shared reflections upon the pitfalls and perspectives of humanities and literary studies helped me to grow significantly. I also want to thank my colleagues whom I had the luck to meet at the Leeds conference in 2024 and those participants whose presentations tacitly taught me how to communicate the results of my research better. I would also like to

note Daniela Munteanu whose genuine interest and thoughtful questions at the conference in Cluj motivated me enormously throughout this year. Finally, I would also like to thank my friends back in Ukraine whose constant ironical remarks as well as unimaginable support made this last-breath effort possible: special thanks to my dearest Anna Zahorodnia and Andrii Poloz who listened to my perpetual health and academic complaints, assisted me and stayed by my side.

Finally, I would like to thank separately Eloise Adde, Baukje van den Berg and Jessica Knowles for being so patient with me and coming up with the solution on the best ways in which I could complete my unfinished MA thesis. Without your support, forbearance and readiness to understand I do not think I could ever finish this work.

Table of contents

Introduction.....	1
Methodology, Conceptual Framework, and Limitations	10
Chapter 1: <i>Omnia Superavit Affectus</i> : Love and Affection in the Royal Correspondence of the <i>Variae</i>	16
The <i>Princeps</i> and Subjects: Intimate Love and Paternal Affection	16
Regnal Love Scripts of the Affectionate Ostrogothic Rulers	17
Divergence from the Script: the case of Theodahad and Witigis	29
Making Diplomatic Ties: Roman and non-Roman Scripts.....	32
Frankish, Vandal, Burgundian, and other Germanic Kings and Their Script(s).....	33
Emotive Performativity in the Royal Communication with the Imperial Court.....	39
Familial, Matrimonial Affection and Gendered Love Expression.....	44
Chapter 2: <i>Unam in Omnibus Aequabiliter Caritatem</i> : Love and Affection in the <i>formulae</i> .50	
Regnal Affection and Love	52
Civic Sentiments: Civic Affection, Civic Devotion and Public <i>Exempla</i>	55
Roman-Gothic Affection: Constructing the Emotive Script.....	59
Chapter 3: <i>Natura Rerum Est Amare Collegam</i> : Love and Affection in the Praetorian Letters	62
Sentiments of Palatine Service: Collegial Love, Civic Devotion, and Local Patriotism.....	62
Ecclesiastical Love: (Imitation of) Divine Love and Clerical Patronage	73
Public Love to the Ruler: “What Affection You Should Have for the One Ruling”	78
Conclusion	82
Bibliography	85
Appendices.....	91
Appendix 1: Royal Narrative Voice and Professions of Love/Affection	91

Appendix 2: Formulaic Narrative Voice and Professions of Love/Affection	121
Appendix 3: Praetorian Cassiodorus's Narrative Voice and Professions of Love/Affection	124

List of Abbreviations

*AE=L'Année Épigraphique. Revue des publications épigraphiques
relatives à l'antiquité Romaine*

CIL=Corpus Inscriptionum Latinorum

*Eph. Epig.=Ephemeris Epigraphica, Corporis Inscriptionum Latinorum
Supplementum*

Introduction

Cassiodorus (ca. 485-580 CE)¹ was a member of the late-Roman noble elite, who was born to the family of the eastern imperial origin that in the mid-fifth century became the owner of large property in Calabria, southern Italy. Since the ruling of Valentinian III (425-455) his family had a long-standing profile in the imperial bureaucracy, and even after Valentinian III's death Cassiodorus's father had a secure place in the administration of Italy, holding a succession of governorships and palatine offices first under Odoacer (476–89) and then under Theodoric (493-526).² Cassiodorus first caught the attention of Theodoric, while he was working as *consiliarius* to his father in the office of the praetorian prefect of Italy, and had an opportunity to perform a panegyric in honour of Theodoric. By the time of his father's retirement, Cassiodorus received an appointment as *Quaestor* and held responsibility for official royal correspondence circa 507-511. In the meantime before a next significant office of *Magister Officiorum*, which he held approximately from 524 to 528, Cassiodorus engaged in the various civic and literary activities, benefitting the Amal court's political and cultural standing in Italy, such as offered a panegyric to Theodoric's son-in-law on the occasion of Eutharic's consulship (519) and composed a history of the Goths at Theodoric's request. As Michael Shane Bjornlie states, Cassiodorus's particular affinity with the Amal court continued after the end of his office. Particularly, Cassiodorus abandoned his literary activities, when the southern coast of Italy was threatened, perhaps, by the Vandals, and took charge of the military mobilization of the region and provisioned Gothic soldiers from his own resources.

The period of subsequent Cassiodorus's tenure as a praetorian prefect (533-540) witnessed a rapid progression of changes of royal personalities. After Theodoric had died in 526, his daughter Amalasuntha assumed a regent position over the governmental affairs for her young son Athalaric, whose premature death in 534 forced Amalasuntha to appoint her kinsman Theodahad as a co-ruler. Internal feuding between Gothic families and Theodahad's ambitions led to Amalasuntha's death in 535, which, as Bjornlie suggests, may have precipitated Justinian's attempt to conquer Italy since she advocated for rehabilitation of the

¹ From now and onwards, I will be providing the dates with an assumption that they all refer to the Common Era (CE), if not specified otherwise.

² Cassiodorus, *The Variae: The Complete Translation*, trans. Michael Shane Bjornlie (Oakland: University of California Press, 2019), 6.

relationship between the Amals and the Roman Senate.³ In 536, Belisarius initiated the Gothic war, and, shortly afterwards, Gothic soldiers assassinated Theodahad on suspicion of his betrayal of Italy and elevated Witigis as a next Ostrogothic king. Apart from the swiftly changing rulers, a range of legal, administrative, and diplomatic duties to which Cassiodorus attended in his offices as *Quaestor*, *Magister Officiorum*, and *Praefectus Praetorium* remained similar, as a lack of differentiation of topics in the letters of *Variae* indicate.⁴ Cassiodorus in all likelihood continued to serve as *Praefectus Praetorium* until the very capture of Ravenna in 540, when Belisarius, eventually, transported Witigis and the Amal court to Constantinople, including Cassiodorus.

Apparently, as later sources from Cassiodorus signify, to quote Bjornlie: “the Gothic War represented a dramatic rupture in the social and political realities to which a generation of palatine elite had become accustomed.”⁵ In the *Institutiones*, Cassiodorus reminisced of how the peaceful existence was abandoned for the sake of “raging wars and turbulent struggles in the Italic kingdom.”⁶ After the events of the fall of Ravenna, over the years, Cassiodorus might have abandoned the political aspirations for the restoration of the bureaucratic elite under the Eastern Roman Empire and dedicated himself to a religious scholarship, which brought him a reputation of a Christian exegete that, especially in the Middle Ages, essentially outshone such a period of political urgency and post-Roman attempts at preservation of the way of life of the Italo-Roman⁷ palatine elite. Cassiodorus’s biographical profile, thus, is representative of the Christianised Roman bureaucratic or civic (rather than senatorial) elite who endorsed and reinforced a sense of collaborative social identity predicated on the institutionalised palatine service, the learned culture acquired through a similar educational and intellectual background along with the inculcated deference to the ancient traditions and imperial court ceremonial.

The *Variae*, as a record of Ostrogothic administration, testifies to the self-identification, practices and established perceptions of their administrative service by this

³ Cassiodorus, *The Variae: The Complete Translation*, 7.

⁴ Cassiodorus, *The Variae: The Complete Translation*, 9.

⁵ Cassiodorus, *The Variae: The Complete Translation*, 7.

⁶ Cassiodorus, *Institut. praefatio*, 1.1. Cassiodorus, *Cassiodorus: Institutions of Divine and Secular Learning and On the Soul*, trans. James W. Halporn (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2003), 105.

⁷ Find this term used in: Brian Swain, “Goths and Gothic Identity in the Ostrogothic Kingdom,” in *A Companion to Ostrogothic Italy*, ed. Jonathan J. Arnold, Michael Shane Bjornlie, and Kristina Sessa (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2016), 203–33. Also in: Jonathan J. Arnold, *Theoderic and the Roman Imperial Restoration* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2014). In late-antique studies, the terms “Italo-Romans”, and “Italo-Roman elites/population” are applied to differentiate the native Roman population from the arrived Goths in the Ostrogothic kingdom and also designate and emphasize the specific Italian form of the Roman identity, similarly to “Romano-African(s)” in Vandal kingdom and “Gallo-Roman(s)” in the Frankish kingdom.

Italo-Roman civic elite. The *Variae*, Cassiodorus's most studied work in modern historiography, is a compilation of 468 official letters, penned by him during his public service, which combine the generic features of learned late-antique epistolography and formalised administrative style. There has been an intense scholarly speculation on the date, place, and the audience for which such a collection might have been arranged. Most researchers come to a consensus that the collection must have been compiled in an interval between 538, i.e., the year of Cassiodorus's latest datable letter composed in Ravenna,⁸ and the 540s, the years that chronologically follow the date of the capture of Ravenna by an eastern imperial army (540) and would indicate Constantinople as the place for assembling the final edition of the text.⁹ The main issue that arises out of the uncertainty regarding the collection's publication date concerns the audience and the auctorial intentions of the work. It was suggested by Bjornlie that the *Variae* might have had a purpose of an epistolary "apologetic for the bureaucratic elite of the Ostrogothic regime" in order to "make the governmental elite of Ravenna appear suitable [for Constantinople] for return to office after the conclusion of the Gothic War."¹⁰ However, Andrew Gillett has claimed that the true motives behind the elaboration of the work more likely coincide with Cassiodorus's explicit statements in the two prefaces placed at the beginning of the first and eleventh books: the *Variae* was a tool for cultivating of *amicitia* within the Italo-Roman senior bureaucratic elite as well as a testimony to the author's literary talents as well as a literary enterprise meant to provide stylistic models for his successors in the bureaucratic offices.¹¹ In the context of this debate and my thesis, I consider it plausible that Cassiodorus addressed a rather broadly defined Roman educated audience, including members of the Italo-Roman elite, while, as Bjornlie fairly suggested, intending to represent a common virtuous persona of the Ostrogothic officials.¹² It is also crucial, as Martin Devecka noted, not to neglect

8As suggested by Michael Shane Bjornlie. On this, see: Michael Shane Bjornlie, "Amicitia and the Epistolary Tradition: The Case of Cassiodorus' *Variae*," in *De Amicitia: Friendship and Social Networks in Antiquity and the Middle Ages*, ed. Katariina Mustakallio and Christian Krötz (Rome, 2010), 148.

9Michael Shane Bjornlie, *Politics and Tradition between Rome, Ravenna and Constantinople: A Study of Cassiodorus and the Variae 527-554* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 11–33. Michael Shane Bjornlie, "The Letter Collection of Cassiodorus," in Cristiana Sogno (ed.), *Late Antique Letter Collections: A Critical Introduction and Reference Guide* (Oakland: University of California Press, 2017), 433–448, especially p. 436.

¹⁰ Bjornlie, "Amicitia and the Epistolary Tradition," 149–150; Bjornlie, *Politics and Tradition*, 331–332. For the Constantinopolitan debates around legitimacy and tradition, see Bjornlie, *Politics and Tradition*.

¹¹On this interpretation, see: Andrew Gillett, "Diplomatic Correspondence in the *Variae* of Cassiodorus," in *Envoys and Political Communication in the Late Antique West, 411–533* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 176.

¹² Bjornlie, "Amicitia and the Epistolary Tradition," 136–42.

‘contemporary’ readings of the *Variae*,¹³ something that is especially pertinent for the diplomatic correspondence, the one that could have been directed at concrete addressees, i.e., the Roman elites employed in the administration of neighbouring post-Roman polities such as the Frankish, the Burgundian, and the Vandal kingdoms and the Eastern Roman imperial elite.¹⁴

The *Variae* is a rhetorically, thematically and structurally complex work. Within its twelve books, it comprises three distinct voices: the letters written by Cassiodorus on behalf of different Ostrogothic rulers, i.e., the letters written in the name of more successful rulers such as Theodoric (the first five books), Athalaric and Amalasuntha (books 8 and 9), and the ones written for Theodahad and Witigis (book 10); then, the letters written in Cassiodorus’s name as praetorian prefect (books 11 and 12); and, finally, the *formulae* offered as stylistic models for official pronouncements and appointments to public office (books 6 and 7). Although the *Variae* is frequently misconstrued as essentially a documentary source given its preoccupation with the diplomatic, administrative, and legal activities of the Ostrogoths, in recent years, its highly rhetorical and literary nature has benefited from increased scholarly attention.¹⁵ As Bjornlie noted, for Cassiodorus, letter collections had the same “moral imperative” as classical historiography in providing ethical *exempla*, and, thus, Cassiodorus’s narrative strategy was to depict governmental virtue, both of Amals and of their officials, through the portrayal of Ostrogothic public office and exercise of power.¹⁶ It is this governmental virtue which for Cassiodorus legitimised the Ostrogothic government as a model, one informed by the values of *paideia*, moral discernment (*pura conscientia*), and *reverentia antiquitatis*, i.e., the institutional continuity and upholding of the Roman traditions.¹⁷ Finally, the very rhetorical arrangement of the books reflects the idea of Cassiodorus’s discernment between virtuous and inferior government based on such idea of the continuity. The positioning of book 10 between Cassiodorus’s appointment to the praetorian prefecture (*Var.* 9.24-25) and his acceptance of the office (*Var.* 11.1-3) conveys a subtle rupture in the virtuous government, the reign of Theodahad and Witigis, which is

¹³Martin Devecka, “White Elephant Gifts: Classicism in Ostrogothic Policy and in *Variae* 10.30,” *Journal of Late Antiquity* 9, no. 1 (2016): 198.

¹⁴Marco Cristini, “Diplomacy at the End of the World: Theoderic’s Letters to the Warni and Hesti,” *Klio* 103, no. 1 (2021): 283–85. Devecka, “White Elephant,” 209.

¹⁵For more on the literary characteristics of the *Variae*, see: Christina Kakridi, *Cassiodorus ‘Variae’: Literatur und Politik im Ostgotischen Italien* (München: K. G. Saur, 2005), 16-142.

¹⁶Bjornlie, “The Letter Collection of Cassiodorus,” 440–442.

¹⁷For the importance of demonstration of *paidea* and ideological implications of encyclopaedic knowledge in the *Variae*, see Bjornlie, *Politics and Tradition*, 199–207, 269–79.

synchronized with the political destabilisation caused by the outburst of the Gothic war.¹⁸ Indeed, in the *Variae*, Cassiodorus silenced any discourse on the actions potentially harmful to Theodoric's positive image, such as the condemnation of some members of the Roman senatorial elite, for obvious reasons, but also because, according to the logic of narrative at least, these acts did not endanger directly the social balance and the institutionalised continuity of Romanness. Alternatively, Theodahad and Witigis were the failed rulers whose flawed kingship Cassiodorus evidently blamed as the reason of the Ostrogothic internal and external instability, unlike the civic elite who managed to preserve the governmental virtue irrespective of two unideal kings, which Cassiodorus made apparent in books 11 and 12.¹⁹

In this Cassiodorus's rhetorical framework that intends to construe through the official epistolography, similarly to Demetrius's conceptualisation of a letter as a "mirror of the soul," a mirror of governmental virtue or a mirror of virtuous government, language and rhetoric of love/affection plays a central role in the discursive representation of successful social functioning and effective inter-personal relationships. However, Cassiodorus's rhetoric of love in the *Variae* as well as emotions and emotional vocabulary, which offer a fertile bedrock for further inquiry into the emotionality of the Italo-Roman elite, have almost entirely escaped scholarly attention. Scholarship on Cassiodorus has been mainly focused on his political career (Giardina,²⁰ Kakridi),²¹ political and literary studies of *Variae* (Barnish,²² Bjornlie,²³ Gillet),²⁴ and linguistic studies (Fridh,²⁵ Skahill,²⁶ Vidén).²⁷ In their wide literary studies of Cassiodorus's *Variae*, James O'Donnell²⁸ and John W. Leopold²⁹ briefly touched upon the emotional qualities of Cassiodorus's writing, noting his discourse on several emotions. However, considering the frequency and emphasis on emotionally loaded vocabulary in Cassiodorus's texts, these studies did not address this trait or made an attempt

¹⁸ Bjornlie, "The Letter Collection of Cassiodorus," 441–442.

¹⁹ For digressions in natural history in the moral characterisation of Theodahad's reign, see Bjornlie, "Amicitia and the Epistolary Tradition," 150–154.

²⁰ Andrea Giardina, *Cassiodoro Politico* (Roma: 'L'Erma' di Bretschneider, 2006).

²¹ Christina Kakridi, *Cassiodorus' Variae*.

²² Samuel J. B. Barnish, "Sacred Texts of the Secular: Writing, Hearing and Reading Cassiodorus' *Variae*", *Studia Patristica* 38 (2001): 362–70.

²³ Michael Shane Bjornlie, *Politics and Tradition*.

²⁴ Andrew Gillett, "Diplomatic Correspondence," 174–85; Andrew Gillett, "The Purposes of Cassiodorus' *Variae*," in *After Rome's Fall: Narrators and Sources of Early Medieval History Essays Presented to Walter Goffart*, by Alexander Callander Murray (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1998), 37–51.

²⁵ Eke Fridh, *Etudes Critique et Syntaxiques Sur Les Variae de Cassiodore* (Göteborg: Elanders, 1950).

²⁶ Bernard Skahill, *The Syntax of the Variae* (Washington: Catholic University of America, 1934).

²⁷ Gunhild Vidén, *The Roman Chancery Tradition: Studies in the Language of Codex Theodosianus and Cassiodorus' Variae* (Göteborg: Acta universitatis Gothoburgensis, 1984).

²⁸ James Joseph O'Donnell, *Cassiodorus* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1979).

²⁹ John W. Leopold, "Consolando per Edicta: Cassiodorus, 'Variae,' 4, 50 and Imperial Consolations for Natural Catastrophes," *Latomus* 45, 4 (1986): 816–36.

to historicize his conceptualization of emotions in the framework of a Roman cultural tradition.

For Cassiodorus's *Variae*, several studies are of critical importance. Kakridi's *Cassiodorus "Variae": Literatur und Politik im Ostgotischen Italien* provides a particularly valuable account of the *Variae* as a meticulous literary and rhetorical enterprise embedded in the contemporary rhetorical conventions of wide-spread literary forms, such as the epistolography of friendship, imperial chancery, and legal documents, as well as in the aesthetical literary tastes of the Italo-Roman societal elite.³⁰ Bjornlie's *Politics and Tradition between Rome, Ravenna and Constantinople: A Study of Cassiodorus and The Variae 527-554* gives some valuable details about the probable local audience of Cassiodorus's work, which would be the bureaucratic Italo-Roman elite, the rhetorical purposes of the work, and the influence of late-antique chancery while at the same time pointing to an overarching underlying ideological image of Roman continuity behind this collection.³¹ However, neither of authors addressed Cassiodorus's emotive discourse or touched upon his usage of emotional conventions imported from other literary forms than epistolography, chancery, and encyclopaedic literature. Patrick Amory in his *People and identity in Ostrogothic Italy, 489-554* filled in this gap by examining the discourse of affection and love as a prescribed unifying feeling for Italo-Romans and Ostrogoths in regard with Ostrogothic and Roman identities,³² and so far it has been the only notable scholarly attempt to engage with the emotive content of Cassiodorus's work.

In my opinion, love/affection in the *Variae* deserves its own scholarly pursuit due to several factors. First, throughout the text of the *Variae*, emotive words that could be grouped into the Latin lexical-semantic field³³ of love/affection conspicuously outnumber others, which could signal a cultural preference for this feeling in sixth-century Italo-Roman emotionality and its significance for Cassiodorus as a socially bonding feeling (317 terms). Considering that Cassiodorus conceived of the *Variae* as a repository of the stylistic models, the love vocabulary was meant to be part and parcel of a process of production and reproduction of underlying exemplary patterns of comportment as well as culturally meaningful social and affective bonds through language.

³⁰ Kakridi, *Cassiodorus 'Variae'*.

³¹ Bjornlie, *Politics and Tradition*.

³² Patrick Amory, *People and Identity in Ostrogothic Italy, 489-554* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997).

³³ Ingrid Kasten, "Einleitung: Forschungsfeld Emotionalität," in *Codierungen von Emotionen im Mittelalter*, ed. C. Stephen Jaeger and Ingrid Kasten, *Trends in Medieval Philology* 1, ed. Ingrid Kasten, Niklaus Largier and Mireille Schnyder (Berlin and New York: De Gruyter, 2003), xviii.

Second, such favouring of love language and vocabulary on a quantitative level is mirrored in a sociocultural (or socially dictated) dimension. Cassiodorus depicts the kings, the officials, the senators, the Italo-Romans, the Goths as being exhorted or exhorting to maintain reciprocity and ancient virtues in their intersubjective relationship.³⁴ In this system, the rhetoric of love and affection is omnipresent and pervasive as the sentiment of love plays the role of a vehicle for conveying different personal, inter-personal and community-based behavioural codes and values of the Italo-Roman elite, starting from regnal (ruler's fair government and concern for the common good, generosity, clemency, and just distribution of favours) and civic virtues (personal public munificence, administrative integrity and faithful fulfilment of civic duties by the palatine and municipal officials, corporative professional solidarity of the palatine elite, communal loyalty to and cooperation with the government as well as peaceful consensual co-existence of Goths and Italo-Romans, and local patriotism) and ending with ideals of peace and concord with other polities, love for Christians and God, elite friendship and bonds of *amicitia*, and, finally, matrimonial and familial ties. The unifying trait of all this extensive repertoire of love is its exclusively positive conceptualisation. The other intrinsic components of Roman love discourse, that is, erotic passion (irrelevant of gender), illicit desires (adultery, seduction, and others) or misplaced love (excessive desire for ephemeral things), even if mentioned in the text, are not construed and expressly labelled as love.³⁵ Certainly, it is important to stress that expressing love, in Cassiodorus's narrative at least, is an admittedly praiseworthy and socially encouraged way of behaviour which is unlikely to receive his negative judgment, however, the specific performance that violates acknowledged Roman sensibilities could be marked as a sign of deviation.³⁶

³⁴ For language of reciprocity and idiom of patronage as crucial traits of Roman society with its openly acknowledged hierarchical relation, see: David Konstan, *Friendship in the Classical World* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005); David Konstan, *In the Orbit of Love: Affection in Ancient Greece and Rome* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2018).

³⁵ Although there are several cases of adultery represented in the collection, the illicit connection is never conceptualised as any form of love. There is the only one mention of the verb "love" and the noun "money" in one context: "It furthermore constituted a penalty for one who attempted to undertake such a crime, not with injury, since when money is not loved (*cum pecunia non amatur*), then it is the merit of the candidate that is truly sought." Cassiodorus, *Var.* 9.16.1. Cassiodorus, *The Variae: The Complete Translation*, 374, from here and onwards: *Var.* 9.16.1 (trans. Bjornlie, 374). However, considering the broad applicability of the verbal derivative of *amor*, which in the speech genre of letters, as Williams renders it, should be rather understood as an equivalent of English much less charged English phrase "have a liking for" or "like," it does not really undermine the overall positive connotative penumbra of "love," especially since the phrase is not formulated in a prescriptive manner. Craig Arthur Williams, *Reading Roman Friendship* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012), 174-258.

³⁶ *Var.* 1.30.4 (Bjornlie, 63) presents a case of public disturbances during the pantomime performances at the chariot races, which were allegedly caused by the members of the senatorial households, who responded in this way to various indignities to which senators were exposed during the games: "Let it therefore be decided

Thirdly, love/affection occupied a prominent place in Graeco-Roman and Christian literary and philosophical discourse. On the one hand, in his treatise on the art of rhetoric, Aristotle defined love (*philia*) as “wishing for someone the things that he deems good, for the sake of that person and not oneself, and the accomplishment of these things to the best of one’s ability.”³⁷ As David Konstan notes, he also famously described a friend, that is, someone bound by mutual love or *philia*, as “another self,” and another ancient author told that when Aristotle was asked, “What is a friend?” he replied: “One soul dwelling in two bodies,” among other things implying a relationship between two equals (ethically and, ideally, socially).³⁸ However, as Konstan continues, other passages in Aristotle’s treatment of *philia* discuss the kind of debts that favours of friend may incur, there is thus a tension in Aristotle’s analysis between altruism (or sincerity) and reciprocity, which, however, reappears in classical treatments of other values such as loyalty and gratitude, and “constitutes a strain in the ideology of ancient Greece and Rome.”³⁹ Under the Roman Empire, this strain persisted, as the vertical relation between nobility became even more openly hierarchical, which provoked a more radical sense of moral egalitarianism between friends and a new interest in sincerity.⁴⁰ The latter found its sociocultural culmination in the late-antique ‘genre’ of *amicitia*-letter or epistolography of friendship that asserted a friendly relationship and a sentiment of equality between correspondents, despite sometimes formally or informally binding relations of reciprocity and ostensible social distance.⁴¹ On the other hand, love was also at the core of the Christian ethics and theology. Jerome (345-420), an intellectual, ascetic, and an author of Latin translation of the Bible known as Vulgate, translating one of the fundamental maxims for the Christian worldview, “God is love” (*Θεὸς ἀγάπη ἐστίν*), used the word *caritas*: *Deus caritas est* (1 John 4:8.16). In addition to love as an attribute of God, love was also understood as the quintessence of a Christian’s ethical code: it is the love one feels for God, but it is also the love by which one serves others (Gal. 5:13); such love is “patient (*benigna est*),” “does not envy (*non aemulatur*),” “it is not self-seeking (*non quaerit quae sua sunt*),” “is not easily angered (*non irritatur*)” (1 Corinthians 13:4-6);

between your splendid reputation and more base habits: avoid such servants as would be the bearers of injury, who would strive to ascribe to their love for you (*amori vestro*) [i.e., love to the senators] what they commit in crime.”

³⁷ Arist. *Rhet.* 2.4. 1380b36-86a1.

³⁸ Diogenes Laertius, 5.1.20. Konstan, *In the Orbit of Love*, 8.

³⁹ Konstan, *In the Orbit of Love*, 9.

⁴⁰ Konstan, *Friendship*, 148.

⁴¹ Suzanne L. Abram, “Latin Letters and Their Commonplaces in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages,” PhD diss., Indiana University, 1994, 72-73.

love, along with hope and faith, entered the canonical triad of theological virtues (1 Corinthians 13:13).

Taking into account the aforementioned considerations about the source and a variety of social actors involved in profession and performance of love, my thesis intends to investigate the social, emotional, and connotative dimensions of the lexical-semantic field of love and affection as used in Cassiodorus's *Variae* in depicting different social scenarios between various social actors (officials, rulers, Italo-Romans, Goths). My primary focus would be on the love vocabulary, emotive scripts,⁴² and emotional rhetoric used by Cassiodorus to elicit specific emotions in his readership/audience throughout the text.⁴³ I am to analyse the object of my study by answering the following research questions:

- (1) What social scenarios are eliciting the expression of affection, what social actors are entitled to express affection in these scenarios and how such expression differs from one actor to another?
- (2) What terms of love are employed to communicate the expressions of affection and emotive scripts of love in the *Variae*, and whether there is a difference between their uses in three different narrative voices (royal, formulaic, Cassiodorus's praetorian)?
- (3) Are certain emotive scripts or words predominantly or exclusively linked with certain social actors or narrative voices, and if so, what does it say about behavioural codes Cassiodorus could have been willing to represent and/or introduce?
- (4) How differences between emotive personas of 'virtuous' and 'flawed' kings contribute to Cassiodorus's view of normative and divergent expressions of love?
- (5) How Cassiodorus appropriates and adapts already existent emotive codes (or scripts) to an audience of the sixth-century Italo-Roman (or Roman) elite?

In the following section of introduction, I will provide the theory and methodology on which I rely, describe the conceptual framework of my thesis and inevitable limitations due to its modest scope. Chapter 1 will provide an analysis of the three most frequent types of love in the royal communication written by Cassiodorus and their emotive scripts such as 'ruler's love to his subordinates/officials,' 'affection in diplomatic communication,' and

⁴² The concept will be explained later in the section devoted to the methodology.

⁴³ Although mentions of emotions in classical and late-antique texts used to be frequently disregarded as mere rhetoric and stylistic *topoi*, the last twenty years of scholarship on the history of emotions have shown that one cannot separate emotions and rhetoric from their social and cultural context. For more on emotions and history of emotions, see: Jan Plamper and Keith Tribe, *The History of Emotions: An Introduction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015).

‘familial love.’ I will discuss how a broad range of regnal love vocabulary reflected Cassiodorus’s reception and adaptation of the existent late Roman emotive tradition and intended to solidify the claim of the Italo-Roman elite to Romanness. This chapter will also argue that the expression of love by ‘flawed’ Theodahad diverged from the normative expression in two aspects, a lack of self-restraint or a lack of affective or perceived as emotional dimension. Chapter 2 will focus on Cassiodorus’s formulas and discuss how they provided an emotive blueprint for most frequently mentioned ‘ruler’s affection’ and ‘civic affection.’ This part will also argue that difference in expression of the mentioned affections between narrative voices depends on the social context in which they were applied but also on Cassiodorus’s auctorial evaluation of royal personalities or self-fashioning in his own letters. In my final chapter, I will discuss the three most numerous types of love in the praetorian letters of Cassiodorus, that is, ‘civic affection,’ ‘love in ecclesiastical context,’ and ‘public love to rulers.’ This chapter will consider a lack of particular scripts, present in the royal communication, and how Cassiodorus’s emotive persona meant to provide an administrative *exemplum* for the Italo-Roman civic elite. This chapter will also argue that the emotive of scripts of love in the praetorian correspondence put an emphasis on the social and ethical dimension of love much more than an affective one, contrarily to the royal communication.

Methodology, Conceptual Framework, and Limitations

Due to specificity of the topic, my thesis is an interdisciplinary study, in which I will apply theories and approaches from several disciplinary fields such as history of emotions (already includes sociological and anthropological methods), linguistics, rhetorical and literary studies, and, to some extent, gender studies.

Referring to the conceptual apparatus of Felix Lummer and Katrin Lisa L. Mikaelssdóttir in their linguistic study of emotions in the Icelandic saga, one can also state that Cassiodorus’s *Variae* offers a variety of modes for expressing emotions, including but not limited to body language, biochemical changes, sensory stimuli, physical appearance, performance, actions, cognitive processes, attitudes and beliefs shaped by religious, philosophical, and literary discourses, social codes of conduct, imagery and symbolism,

environmental cues, landscapes and physical spaces, and others.⁴⁴ However, my thesis specifically focuses on emotions that are explicitly manifested in the text through words and expressions, that is, “(1) observations, descriptions, and expressions of emotions by characters and narrators [...]; (2) vocalizations, actions, and gestures that communicate emotions.”⁴⁵ Considering the space limitations, I will not be conducting an analysis of all modes for expressing love and its somatic signs (if such appear) in the *Variae*, which would require their separate thorough investigation. However, the importance of emotional language should not be underestimated, since, as Lummer and Mikaelisdóttir state, “language itself serves as a crucial tool to reflect cultural and societal changes and provide insights into knowledge and understanding of emotions.”⁴⁶ As Asifa Majid points out, “Language is at the nexus of cognition, on the one hand, and culture on the other. It is private, so intertwined with thought as to seem inseparable; yet it is also public, being the medium of communication. Language, then, is the ideal forum to examine the relationship between culture and cognition.”⁴⁷ To avoid anachronistic terminology or projection of modern conceptualisations, my research also employs Barbara Rosenwein’s historicising approach to textual and lexicological analysis in tracing historically valid emotional terminology which is indispensable for grouping the lexical-semantic field of love/affection in Cassiodorus’s *Variae*. Under an umbrella term of “lexical-semantic field of love,” I understand the words derived from the classical Latin emotive tradition as represented by nouns such as *affectus*, *affectio*, *amor*, *dilectio*, verbs *amare*⁴⁸ and *diligere* and their grammatical variations, adjectives such as *carus*, *dilectus* and their superlative forms, metaphorically used terms of kinship (“brother,” “sister,” “father,” “mother,” etc.) and others, which co-exist with the intimately associated with the Christian discourse notion of *caritas*. This approach will also allow me to employ quantitative analysis to quantify the frequency of discernible emotive words of love, establishing their relative importance. I will address the frequent and/or contextually emphasized words using

⁴⁴ Felix Lummer and Katrín Líska Mikaelisdóttir, “Supernatural Sentiments: The Language of Emotions in the *fornaldarsögur*,” in *Emotions on the Fringes. Feelings of the Marginalised from Late Antique to Early Modern Literature*, ed. Felix Lummer (Budapest: Trivent Publishing, 2024), 78–81.

⁴⁵ Ann Marie Rasmussen, “Emotions, Gender, and Lordship in Medieval Literature,” in *Codierungen*, ed. C. Jagger and Kasten, 175.

⁴⁶ Felix Lummer and Katrín Líska Mikaelisdóttir, “Supernatural,” 74.

⁴⁷ Asifa Majid, “Current Emotion Research in the Language Sciences,” *Emotion Review*, no. 4 (2012): 432.

⁴⁸ In the Roman literary and philosophical discourse, to which Cassiodorus consciously adhered, it was a highly emotionally loaded and yet flexible term, which could cover a wide spectrum of meanings, ranging from the sentiments of intimacy to politically connoted friendship or political affiliation (even in these cases, rhetorically manipulated to preserve a hint at intimacy). Sandra Citroni Marchetti, “I Could Not Love Caesar More”: Roman Friendship and the Beginning of the Principate,” *The Classical Journal* 99, no. 3 (2004): 287; P. A. Brunt, “*Amicitia*” in the Late Roman Republic,” *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 11 (1965): 1–20.

philological methods, such as lexical analysis, grammatical function analysis, and rhetorical analysis based on late-antique rhetorical conventions and theory.

Along with this, I will also rely on several lexicographical concepts, offered by Sif Ríkharðsdóttir in her article on secular love in the saga literature of medieval Iceland. As Ríkharðsdóttir states, apart from the signifying instability of emotions terms, “equally important is the variability of words *in situ*, i.e., the contextualised meaning of words as used in any given text. While the semantic content for all intents and purposes remain the same in such instances, there are subtle shifts in their *signifying potential and connotative associations* [the cursive is mine – A. M.] that can have a profound impact on how we perceive their function – both textually, in terms of their utilisation within a particular text, and semantically, in terms of the presumed perception of the meaning of the word by the authors and audiences of those texts.” Furthermore, as Ríkharðsdóttir explains, the love terms “had both a moral (or socially dictated) and affective dimension that both came into play when the terms were used to indicate relations between characters.”⁴⁹ Thus, I will occasionally analyse the very same words in different emotive scripts or emotive personas, narrative voices, or social contexts, prioritising a qualitative, contextualised analysis of love vocabulary over a quantitative in the cases when these shifts in signifying potential of words changes a perception of social, affective or connotative dimensions of the word.

It is worth noting that, due to the absence of alternative sources, the vast majority of the letters in the *Variae* appear as a decontextualized, self-contained narratives in which most of available contextual information could be self-referentially gleaned from the text itself. The analysis of such a source requires the additional methodological approach of emotive and emotional scripts, the former conveniently differentiates between experienced emotions and the discursive and literary representations of emotional behaviour.⁵⁰ Ríkharðsdóttir, who coined a concept of *emotive script*, suggests to focus on “emotionality produced by the medieval mind,” which emotive scripts are part of and, as she points out, “dictate the rules of emotional behaviour within any given text, utilising narrative structures, verbal and behavioural cues and context to convey those rules to the reader.” In literary texts, these scripts can include “emotional words [...] narrative arrangement, scene construction, gestures, somatic indicia [...] narrative silences [...] verbal coding and a repertoire of actions

⁴⁹ I would like to express my immense gratitude to prof. Ríkharðsdóttir for providing an early access to her upcoming article as well as invaluable theoretical and methodological insights contained within. Sif Ríkharðsdóttir, “Secular Love – ást,” in *Saga Emotions: A Handbook*, eds. Gareth Lloyd Evans, Carolyne Larrington and Brynja Þorgeirsdóttir (Manchester: Manchester University Press, forthcoming).

⁵⁰ Sif Ríkharðsdóttir, *Emotion in Old Norse Literature: Translations, Voices, Contexts* (Woodsbridge: D. S. Brewer, 2017), 28.

associated with emotional responses.”⁵¹ In other words, by transcending the limitations of the sheer lexicographic analysis, emotive script as an analytical tool additionally allows to read silences of not explicitly mentioned emotions and access them relying on both careful formal analysis and the meta-textual framework: societal expectations or, as Ríkharðsdóttir calls it, *horizon of feeling*, which “indicates the pre-established readerly expectations of emotional behavior”⁵² and historical, social, cultural, and literary contexts through which scripts could dictate how the audience receives and interprets the representations of emotions. According to Ríkharðsdóttir, “emotive scripts can be both descriptive – in the sense that they reflect communally held values and conventionalized emotional behaviours –, or prescriptive – in the sense that they introduce or institute new behavioural patterns or mentalities into their respective reading communities.”⁵³ As for Cassiodorus, in my opinion, it is almost counter-productive to define whether Cassiodorus reflected the already present emotive codes (descriptive emotive scripts) or attempted to introduce them to the emotive setting of the Ostrogothic court (prescriptive scripts): emotive expression in the *Variae* is profoundly relational where the power of the royal chancery made such expression socially prescriptive, but it still needed to be ‘realistic,’ persuasive and decipherable for the elite audience, meaning, it had to preserve a connection with the Italo-Roman emotionality.

In addition to Ríkharðsdóttir’s literary-focused conceptualisation, another constitutive component of emotive scripts should be emphasised. Robert Kaster, who was among the first scholars to effectively introduce the concept of emotive scripts into his analysis of restraint in Roman culture, conceived of these scripts as first and foremost “the little scenarios that we play out, as sequences of cause and effect, of perception, evaluation, and response – when we experience any emotion.”⁵⁴ Building on Kaster’s definition and Ed Sanders’ script approach, according to which a single emotional concept can be manifested through multiple scenarios, Martin Hinterberger articulated the theory that assumes some emotions as requiring a more elaborate intellectual input from their actors since they are “based on various judgements and on a thorough evaluation of social constellations.”⁵⁵ Although I do not concur with this dichotomy of complex and simple emotions, which has attracted the fair criticism due to its

⁵¹Ibid., 12, 28.

⁵²Sif Ríkharðsdóttir, *Emotion in Old Norse Literature*, 18–19.

⁵³Ibid., 29.

⁵⁴Robert Kaster, *Emotion, Restraint, and Community in Ancient Rome* (Oxford ; New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), 29.

⁵⁵Martin Hinterberger, “The Neighbour’s Unbearable Wellbeing: Phthonos/Envy from the Classical to the Modern Greek World,” in *Managing Emotion in Byzantium: Passions, Affects and Imaginings*, eds. Margaret Mullett and Susan Ashbrook Harvey (New York: Routledge, 2023), 60–89, especially pp. 61–64.

universalistic assumptions,⁵⁶ Hinterberger rightly observes that emotions heavily depend on the social and intellectual structures in which they function, hierarchies of power, and social positioning of their actors. Even more important is that emotions might have several or multiple distinct scenarios differentiated on the basis of social and political preconditions and social identity of the actors involved. Thus, the emotional script of a particular feeling, being the “abstract pattern resulting from the analysis of specific emotional scenarios,”⁵⁷ captures a specific social configuration between socially positioned actors which the author or the audience of the author, even if emotion is not named explicitly, are capable to construe or decipher as containing that emotion. Finally, as articulated by Piroska Nagy, emotional script also perceives emotions as a sequence of actions or performances, which attain their meaning exclusively through a rhetorical framework which connects them into narrative and inform the interpretation of script.⁵⁸ Emotive-emotional script, as defined above, will allow me to properly differentiate between different context-dependent sets of affective rules within the same types of social interactions and read into the silences of the text as well. Due to the spatial limitations, I have to restrain myself mostly to the textual and rhetorical analysis of emotive scripts without an attempt to reconstruct a context of ‘actual’ historical performance and social functioning of emotive manifestations.

Finally, in the context of dichotomy of virtuous and flawed rulers in Cassiodorus’s *Variae* as well as a narrative voice of the praetorian correspondence in which Cassiodorus creates a specific persona, I suggest to use the term *emotive persona*, that is, a construed public image which is associated with particular patterns of emotive expression or absence of such expression and which acquires its function in historical, cultural, social, and literary context through a perception by a textual audience.

Last but not least, my research methodology also includes various methods of textual analysis: discourse-analysis, narratology, and interpretative analysis. Considering the literary nature of Cassiodorus’s texts, their literariness can be observed not only in the emotional conventions he reproduces and/or introduces but also in their violation in the episodes of his deliberate rhetorical fashioning of the public persona of characters and speakers negatively marked by himself, such as Theodahad. I also aim to apply gender approaches, relying on

⁵⁶ In his distinction between basic and complex emotions, Hinterberger relies on the work of Paul Ekman, a critical assessment of whose concept of basic emotions is provided by Jan Plamper and Keith Tribe, “Paul Ekman and Basic Emotions,” in *The History of Emotions*, eds. Plamper and Tribe, 147-162.

⁵⁷ Hinterberger, “The Neighbour’s,” 62.

⁵⁸ Piroska Nagy and Xavier Biron-Ouellet, “A Collective Emotion in Medieval Italy: The Flagellant Movement of 1260,” *Emotion Review* 12, no. 3 (2020): 135–45.

modern definitions of gender⁵⁹ and on intersectional analysis. This implies that I perceive gender as “a constitutive element of social relationships based on perceived differences between sexes” and “a primary way of signifying relationships of power.”⁶⁰ Thus, I will regard gender through the lens of late-antique relationships of power given that in the late Roman world, emotional constructs and manifestation of emotions were inherently gendered by the discourse of moral philosophy and public discourse, i.e., the inability to master emotional impulses was by definition considered feminine, weak and not appropriate for/incompatible with participation in the public sphere.⁶¹ Secondly, I will consciously approach gender as a gender/sex spectrum, rather than a strictly binary dichotomy of male/female,⁶² in order to carefully address the specific cases in which women could be attributed conventionally masculine traits (the queen regent Amalasuntha), and vice versa.

⁵⁹Susan Kingsley Kent, “The Road to “Gender,” in *Gender and History* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012), 49-65.

⁶⁰Joan W. Scott, “Gender: A Useful Category of Historical Analysis.” *The American Historical Review* 91, no. 5 (1986): 1067.

⁶¹ Mati Meyer, “Towards an Approach to Gendered Emotions in Byzantine Culture: An Introduction,” in *Emotions and Gender in Byzantine Culture*, ed. Mati Meyer and Stavroula Constantinou (New York: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2018), 3–15.

⁶² Jacqueline Murray, “One Flesh, Two Sexes, Three Genders?,” in *Gender and Christianity in Medieval Europe*, ed. Lisa M. Beitel and Felice Lifshitz (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2008).

Chapter 1: *Omnia Superavit Affectus*: Love and Affection in the Royal Correspondence of the *Variae*

The royal correspondence comprises a variety of usual types of documents: diplomatic letters, certificates of appointment (*codicilli* or *probatoriae*), announcements of appointments to the Senate (*Var.1.4*; *Var.1.13*; *Var.1.43*; *Var.2.3*; *Var.2.16*; *Var.3.6*; *Var.3.12*; *Var. 4.4*; *Var.4.16*; *Var.5.4*; *Var.5.22*; *Var.5.41*; *Var.8.10*; *Var.8.14*; *Var.8.17*; *Var.8.19*; *Var.8.22*; *Var.9.23*; *Var.9.25*; *Var.10.7*; *Var.10.12*), or to the *populous* (*Var.1.44*; *Var.3.17*; *Var.3.24*; *Var.3.34*; *Var.4.49*; *Var.9.9*), formal invitations to visit the court (*evocatoriae*) (*Var. 3.22*; *Var.3.28*; *Var.5.28*), permissions to claim the *cursus publicus* (the *tractoriae* addressed to travellers and the *evectiones* addressed to local officials (*Var.10.35*)), edicts, official instructions and a wealth of rescripts.⁶³ As a result, the love rhetoric in the royal letters covers an entire spectrum of the social interactions, enumeration of which I provide in the Appendix 1. Out of all these letters, I intend to focus on those that either contain the most statistically frequent professions of affection such as the letters dedicated to the relationship between a royal personality and subordinates (67 terms) and diplomatic letters (60 terms) or provide emotive scripts and codes for other modes of affection such as the letters treating familial matters (14 terms).

The *Princeps* and Subjects: Intimate Love and Paternal Affection⁶⁴

Most of essential insights into the relationship between the *princeps* and the members of Roman or Gothic elite and, particularly, the role of affection and love can be deduced from Cassiodorus' letters of appointment and introduction of the newly installed candidates to the Senate.⁶⁵ According to Kakridi, these eulogistic letters, at least those ones addressed to the Senate, share some common features with the ancient letters of

⁶³ Kakridi, *Cassiodorus' Variae*, 59.

⁶⁴ The materials of this sub-chapter are slightly re-purposed for the following upcoming article: Morozova, Anastasiia. "Our Affection Contrived to Detain You": Royal Love Scripts, Favours and Romanness in Cassiodorus's *Variae*." [coming 2025, in English].

⁶⁵ In Cassiodorus's collection, the conferral to the office significant in the social hierarchy of honorary or actual services was usually supported by two adjacent letters: the first one, addressed directly to the receiver, and the second one, formally seeking the Senate's assent to the appointment.

recommendation,⁶⁶ which themselves being composed in accordance to the conventions of classical epideictic oratory routinely harbored love vocabulary (*amor*) and tropes of friendship (*amicitia*) as a means of positive characterization.⁶⁷ Two other tentative sources for Cassiodorus's rhetorical fashioning of personal feelings between the king and his subjects might be the Western imperial chancellery and generally Roman philosophical and literary emotional tradition. Furthermore, I argue that Cassiodorus could have appropriated already established emotive codes of affection that signaled certain generic affiliations and employ them to new actors and settings, either reflecting or attempting to institute new patterns of expression into the Italo-Roman elite emotional community.

With his service as a high-ranking official for various periods roughly between 507 and 540, Cassiodorus witnessed and functioned as a royal spokesman of four rulers: Theodoric (books 1-5), Athalaric (under Amalasuntha's regency) (books 8-9), Theodahad and Witigis (book 10). As Bjornlie points out, in the collection Cassiodorus made a clear-cut structural divide between the deeply flawed kings, Theodahad and Witigis, whose letters are separately located in the tenth book, and those capable of maintaining continuity of ancient mores, i.e., Theodoric and Athalaric.⁶⁸ In this part of the chapter, I will argue that Cassiodorus construes two different emotive personas for virtuous and flawed kings while adapting late-imperial emotive codes for affection to produce a socially differentiated system of expressing affection, which the inter-personal relationship between royal personalities and officials will illustrate most vividly.

Regnal Love Scripts of the Affectionate Ostrogothic Rulers

Based on love vocabulary and Italo-Roman discursive tradition, I managed to identify five different scripts of regnal love and affection within these letters: 'ceremonialised regnal affection,' 'intimate/friendly love,' 'love combined with esteem,' 'love credited in recognition of service,' and 'love of virtues.'

⁶⁶ Kakridi, *Cassiodorus 'Variae'*, 62.

⁶⁷ Ruth Morello and A. D. Morrison, eds., *Ancient Letters: Classical and Late Antique Epistolography* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), 156–64.

⁶⁸ Michael Shane Bjornlie, *Politics and Tradition*, 310–11.

The first important point is that the social, hierarchical distinction and the distinction in the level of perceived emotional interiority⁶⁹ towards other officials was the most apparent between the scripts of ceremonialised affection and intimate/friendly love. As for *ceremonialised affection*, it was frequently signified with words *affectio/affectus* (later just *affectus*) and in king's case, marked a disposition or attitude of favouring or holding in favour someone hierarchically inferior who deserves it by nobility of birth, actions, quality of service or virtues.⁷⁰ As a feeling, it was intertwined with the idea of not just having affectionate disposition towards a member of elite, that is, a dispositional value, but actually performing it by enacting as concrete "favour" (*gratia*)⁷¹ or "benefits" (*beneficia*).⁷² The very act of its performance was also a social action of allocating not only real material rewards and offices but social status and symbolic public honour. Cassiodorus's use of the Latin term *gratia*, which is firmly embedded in Roman ethics of obligation, also points out to the fact that this affection is used to designate relationship that are less than private friendship but more a part of culture of reciprocity and patronage and the late-Roman ceremonial of the court.⁷³ However, I suggest that the explicit use of affective language, such as the term *affectus* and *amor*, marked a visible departure in the discursive representation of the asymmetrical relationship of the rulers and their palatine subordinates.

Although much of the late-imperial rhetoric, dating back to fourth-fifth centuries, regarding the court officials has been lost, either due to redaction processes in the preparation of legal compilations (such as the Theodosian Code), or due to the specificity of the surviving sources, there is a unique example of the imperial legislation preserved in a virtually original un-edited state, the Sirmondian Constitutions. There the following addresses to officials can be found:

"dearest and most beloved father" (*parens karissime atque amantissime*),

"dearest and sweetest" (*carissime ac iucundissime*),

⁶⁹ Here I use the term "emotive interiority" in the meaning introduced by Ríkharðsdóttir by which she understands a presumed internal experiencing of emotion, which could be enacted through emotive performativity (an action performed), emotive expressivity (an explicit narrative discourse around the emotion), and emotive subtext ("the narrative configuration and the built-in emotional signposts"). Ríkharðsdóttir, *Emotion in Old Norse Literature*, 71.

⁷⁰ Although these motives are co-present in these letters to some extent, some of them are more emphasised: nobility of birth in Cassiodorus, *Var.* 2.2-3, 3.11; actions and quality of service in *Var.* 2.2-3, 9.8; virtues in *Var.* 1.42-43, 2.2-3.

⁷¹ Cassiodorus *Var.* 1.43.2 (trans. Bjornlie, 73).

⁷² Cassiodorus, *Var.* 2.2.2 (trans. Bjornlie, 81). The relation between *affectus* and its manifestation in the social reality of the Roman emotional community is even more explicit, if we quote the sentence from the letter of the king Theodoric to Felix in full: "Our affection (*noster affectus*) awaits you; the hand fills with advantages (*beneficiis*) and causes what you sought from our imperium to be vowed."

⁷³ Konstan, *Friendship*, 123.

"dearest father" (*parens carissime*).⁷⁴

All of them have a distinct formulaic character, as they always accompany the name of the official and are used exclusively in the vocative case. Although the role of the variation in vocabulary and titles is yet to be explored, these conventionalised affectionate addresses might well have connected to and reflected the actual hierarchical and social stratification among the officials in the later Roman Empire depending on the degree of interiority implied in each term. While Cassiodorus preserves the link between the social status and the performativity of ruler's affection, he adapts this rhetoric to the social and cultural context of the sixth century where the relevance of the strict formalism of the imperial chancery specifically developed to manage the functioning of the imperial geographically- and culturally-varied vast bureaucratic apparatus vanishes. Instead, Cassiodorus, while catering to his Italo-Roman elite audience in the Ostrogothic kingdom, shows a preference to the non-formulaic, more emotional and personalised representation of love and affection and substantively expands on the emotive vocabulary and implied interiority.

The very use of the term 'affection' (*affectus*) should have communicated to the audience a multi-layered underlying emotional meaning. The latter was conjointly informed by the Latin philosophical emotional tradition, a set of culturally significant Christian and classical texts and epistolary codes. They created a common intertextual *horizon of feelings* of the Italo-Roman elite attributing *affectus* as a feeling primarily to parental/familial, amorous/matrimonial and friends' relationships. Such a normative horizon of *affectus* is attested in the imperial fifth-century legislation, where it covers both matrimonial and parental/filial relationships.⁷⁵ *Affectus* also appears as one of the parental sentiments in the

⁷⁴ Although most of the imperial rhetoric towards the court elite is, unfortunately, lost either due to the editorial processes during the preparation of legal compilations such as the Theodosian Code or due to the specifics of the source preservation, the Sirmondian Constitutions, a unique example of the imperial legislation preserved in its initial state, luckily provide an access to some of the phrases, which could be used in such addresses, among which we could find: *parens karissime atque amantissime* (*Constitutiones Sirmonianae*, 1), *parens carissime at(d)que amantissime* (*Constitutiones Sirmonianae*, 2, 7, 9, 12, 14, 16), *carissime ac iucundissime* (*Constitutiones Sirmonianae*, 3, 8), *parens carissime* (*Constitutiones Sirmonianae*, 4). Theodor Mommsen et al., eds., *Code Théodosien. [Livre] I-XV: Code Justinien, Constitutions Sirmondiennes* (Paris: Cerf, 2009), 470-539. Admittedly, all of them share an expressly formulaic nature, considering that they consistently accompany the name of the official and are used throughout the collection exclusively in vocative case. What differentiates Cassiodorus's use of affectionate terminology from such imperial instances is its relatively non-formulaic positioning within the narrative which does not possess any easily identifiable patterns and usually complements the argumentative or encomiastic parts of the letters.

⁷⁵ Matrimonial: CTh.7.13.6; filial: CTh.9.15.1: "If any person should hasten the fate of a parent or a son or any person at all of such degree of kinship (*omnino affectionis*) that killing him is included under the title of parricide...". Although *affectio* can mean "relation" of some sort, its emotive content should not be completely disregarded considering its choice as opposed to other existing verbal alternatives: homicide of *affectio*, framed as a father-son relationship, was similarly a grave crime, immoral for Roman traditional values, so the use of *affectio*, does not seem completely accidental as it might have had a rhetorical function as well in emphasising

texts, which could be used in late-antique classrooms for reading Vergil, especially by the Italo-Roman elite residing in Rome, such as Servius's commentary on the *Aeneid*.⁷⁶ Servius acknowledges the emotional sentiment coming from father to son, Aeneas' paternal affection (*adfectus patris*) to Ascanius, when Aeneas quickly sends the messenger to fetch his son to accept Dido's hospitality, which is synonymous with the Vergilian "paternal love" (*patrius amor*) mentioned a couple of lines before.⁷⁷ Finally, this vocabulary was apparently pertinent to Italo-Roman epistolary culture as well, to generic conventions of which Cassiodorus adapted the royal proclamations generously using the language of friendship and ties of patronage.⁷⁸ Thus, while embedding the language of regnal affection in the Italo-Roman cultural context, Cassiodorus brings an emotional motivation to the ruler's decision to bestow favours upon his subordinates, the motivation, connotatively associated with the late Roman familial emotional world.

In the appointment letter to Argolicus, Cassiodorus explicitly fashions Theodoric as a distributor of equal "paternal affection" (*patrio affectu*) to everyone.⁷⁹ Apart from the paternal (and, sometimes, friendly) associations mentioned above, it is worth noting that this idea is culturally reminiscent of the Roman metaphor of the emperor's love as a fatherly love, which is, for example, present in the fourth-century epistolography addressed to the imperial chancery. In his letter to the emperors Theodosius and Arcadius, Symmachus, a fourth-century Roman intellectual and holder of high offices, persuades the emperors that they

the gravity of going against the bonds of paternal affection. Clyde Pharr et al., eds., *The Theodosian Code and Novels and the Sirmondian Constitutions* (Union: Lawbook Exchange, 2010), 170, 237.

⁷⁶ Servius lived and worked as a *grammaticus*, a teacher of the 'second' stage of Roman education, in Rome around 354-430 CE. Frances Foster, "Reconstructing Virgil in the Classroom in Late Antiquity," *History of Education*, 43/3 (2014): 285-303.

⁷⁷ Servius, 1.644, *Commentarius in Vergilii Aeneidos* ['*Servius Auctus*'], eds. Georg Thilo and Hermann Hagen (Leipzig: B. G. Teubner Verlag, 1881), vol. 1, 186: "RAPIDVM [...] non praemittit, nec enim sequitur ipse, sed praerapidum, quod ex *adfectu patris*, [[id est eius qui mittit,]] intellegendum est, non ex Achatae velocitate." Vergil's passage, *Aen.*, 1.643-644: "neque enim *patrius* consistere mentem passus *amor*."

⁷⁸ In his letter to Ausonius, an imperial bureaucrat and his senior close friend, Symmachus reproaches Ausonius for remaining silent, although his own old affection for him (*amoris veteris*) stays unaltered, and it is because, as he writes, "the more tender [i.e., his] affection (*tenerior affectio*), the readier the complaint." I quote Symmachus's text and the English translation from the edition: Symmachus, *The Letters of Symmachus*, trans. Michele Renee and Salzman Michael John Roberts (Atlanta: Society of Biblical literature, 2011). Symmachus, *Ep.* 1.34 (trans. Salzman and Roberts, 78-79). The words *adfectio/adfectus* make infrequent appearances throughout the corpus of Symmachus's letters. Overall, he showed a conscious preference for other verbal expressions of love and affection in epistolary friendship: specifically, *amor* (Symmachus, *Ep.* 1.14, 1.15, 1.16, etc.) along with *dilectio* and its variants (1.31, 1.34, 1.41, etc.).

⁷⁹ Cassiodorus, *Var.* 3.11.1 (trans. Bjornlie, 129). Kamil Cyprian Choda, Maurits Sterk de Leeuw and Fabian Schulz, *Gaining and Losing Imperial Favour in Late Antiquity: Representation and Reality* (Leiden: Brill, 2020), 174. Furthermore, this affectionate language is already present in the early-second-century principate historiographical discourse of Suetonius's *Life of Titus*: "In the face of calamities of such magnitude, Titus offered not just the concern of an emperor but the love which only a parent can provide (*parentis affectum*), giving consolation in his edicts and as much practical help as his resources allowed." Suetonius, *Titus* 8. Suetonius, *Lives of the Caesars*, trans. Catharine Edwards (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 278.

“occupy the secret recesses of all hearts [of their subjects], those places reserved for noble family affections (*adfectio*) wherein dwells the love of children for parents and of parents for children.”⁸⁰ I presume that in his letters of appointments, Cassiodorus thus reveals an auctorial manipulation of the existing emotive codes of affection from several Roman discursive contexts as a means of engendering a paternal royal persona, for what he must have expected the educated Italo-Roman elite to be capable of deciphering the underlying emotive content of the royal letters. Such a ceremonial script of paternal affection also aligns with Theodoric the Great's ideology of political self-representation, which modelled itself upon the principate, that is, the period of the Early Roman Empire, when the emperor was perceived as the first among others and the "father figure" for the *populus Romanus*.⁸¹ The complex social performativity of this script as imperial generosity, on the one hand, and Roman-like loving fatherhood, on the other hand, reinforced the ideological pretention of the Ostrogothic kingdom to the legacy of the principate.

However, suggested emotive interiority of the paternal feelings did not signify the factual emotional intimacy and proximity to the ruler. *The script of intimate type of love* was conventionally marked with the word *amor* and its derivatives and emphasised physical (and not symbolical) closeness to the Ostrogothic court. Thus, in the letter to the Senate, Theodoric emphasises that Artemidorus, a relative to the emperor Zeno (474-475, 476-491) by marriage, demonstrated that he deserved “our love” (*amorem nostrum*) because not only he abandoned the career perspectives at the Eastern court and performed his duties, but also:

This man, beyond this exceptional fidelity (*eximiam fidem*), has shared with us the comfort (*solacia*) of his conversation, so that he would sometimes disperse with the sweetness (*suavitate*) of his speech the stormy cares (*curas*) of the republic, which we undertake according to the necessity of emerging affairs ... This man has made himself famous by the great purity of his intentions (*qui tanta se animi puritate clarificavit*) [the bold font is mine – A. M.], so that when he deserved from us the dignities of court, he satisfied himself with the pleasant duty of arranging the spectacles, so much that he seemed to willingly prefer serving under the guise of pleasure, even to the extent of withholding himself from duties, but estranging himself from us in no portion. For even as a cheerful dinner companion, he has

⁸⁰ I quote Symmachus's text and the English translation from Symmachus, *Prefect and Emperor: The Relationes of Symmachus A. D. 384*, trans. Reginald Haynes Barrow (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1973). *Relatio* 9.4 (trans. Barrow, 68-69).

⁸¹ Arnold, *Theoderic*, 72–77.

adorned the royal table, here striving to attach himself to us (*se nobis studens iungere*), where we are most able to take pleasure (*gaudere*).⁸²

In his letter to Artemidorus, Theodoric explicitly refers to their connection as “consecrated friendship” (*sacrae amicitiae*), however, this explicit conceptualization of their relationship is absent from the quoted letter to the Senate. Instead, the king's emotional behavior is rhetorically constructed to maximize emotional impact or empathically involve the audience in his feelings and enable the decoding of this inscribed code of friendship, given the common cultural background of the Italo-Roman elite and several narrative signs.⁸³ First, a sort of cumulative structure, with anaphoras (*qui...*, *ut...*), emotive words, and an argumentative sequence of personal features, typical for recommendation letters, however, quite personalised and attached to the person of Theodoric in our case, conveys a sort of emotive intensity even without much of the love vocabulary involved. Second, the sensibility of the Italo-Roman elite would be also informed by the classical ways of thinking about love between friends as a shared activity, which originated from Aristotle and offered a perception of friendship as a matter “manifested through a flow of acts of affection that continually reaffirm and sustain the love,”⁸⁴ at which Cassiodorus hints with the tropes of friendship. There are also other popular Roman tropes of friendship interwoven into the letters surrounding the appointment of Artemidorus: appeal to the benefits (*fructus*) and shared pleasures (*gaudere*), fidelity (*fides*), and the motif of the union in life (“...but estranging himself from us in no portion”).⁸⁵ It is also important that in this panegyric to Artemidorus, Cassiodorus purposefully omitted the description of the moral virtues of Artemidorus, except *puritas animi* “purity of his rational soul,” the existence of which, in my view, could have appeared evident for the audience through the intimate king’s love and friendship as far as the ancient ideal of friendship founded itself on the idea of “union by regard of virtue.”⁸⁶ In this

⁸² Var. 1.43.2-4 (trans. Bjornlie, 73): “*Qui* super hanc eximiam fidem solacia nobis suae confabulationis adiecit, *ut* asperas non numquam rei publicae curas, quas emergentium rerum necessitate suscipimus, sermonis suavitate deliniret. blandus alloquio, supplicantium fidelis patronus, accusare nesciens, commendare praesumens. *qui* tanta se animi puritate clarificavit, *ut* cum apud nos mereretur aulicas dignitates, spectaculorum ordinationem laetissimam sibi militiam vindicaret, quatenus sub specie voluptatis libere videretur velle servire, a laboribus quidem temperans, sed in nulla se nobis parte dissocians. Regalem quin etiam mensam conviva geniatus ornavit, ibi se nobis studens iungere, ubi nos certum est posse gaudere.”

⁸³ I gained this expression from Ríkharðsdóttir, and I understand it like the specific narrative or discursive indicators that guide the reader’s interpretation.

⁸⁴ Konstan, *In the Orbit of Love*, 46–47.

⁸⁵ Benefits: Cassiodorus, Var. 1.42.1; pleasure: Var. 1.43.3; fidelity: Var. 1.42.4; 1.43.3 (twice), the motif of the union in life: Var. 1.42.2, 1.43.3 (trans. Bjornlie, 72-73). For the analysis of Roman tropes of friendship, see: Williams, *Reading Roman Friendship*.

⁸⁶ Cassiodorus, in fact, uses the rhetorical device of *praeteritio*: “But what more must be said concerning his morals, which suffice to thoroughly demonstrate that he has always deserved our affection (*amorem nostrum*)?”. Var. 1.43.4 (trans. Bjornlie, 73). For more on friendship as a union by virtue, see: Konstan, *In the Orbit of Love*,

fragment, as in the case with ceremonilised affection, one can also see that the emotional motivation of the king, his love, supplants the ethical arguments for the social advancement of the desired candidate, which stands out from the late Roman imperial emotional codes.

Certainly, Artemidorus is rather a notable exception, but such a script of regnal intimate love also implied the constant intimacy underlying such a relationship. For example, Senarius, an official with long proximity to Amals, is said to have “locked away our secrets with the probity of good morals (*bonarum iussiorum*), being privy to many things.”⁸⁷ The long-term trustworthy service combined with particular characteristics of the court official also served as a precondition to prove being worthy of *amor*.⁸⁸ The crucial element for the establishment of these bonds was also the virtue of fidelity (*fides*) to the Ostrogothic king. Characteristically, such high moral standards were not a prerequisite for receiving ceremonilised affection: Liberius, a patrician and former partisan of Odoacer, could have “feigned hatred” (*odium*) for his master to “procure the affection of another” (*affectus alterius*), that is, the Ostrogothic king Theodoric. The fidelity to the king could be performed through either civil service or manifestations of male *virtus*, as in the case of Tuluin, a Gothic heroic general, who performed his love for the devout king (*amor piissimi regis*) when he risked his life re-entering the stormy sea in order to rescue Theodoric.⁸⁹ The last vital component for intimate love, unsurprisingly, was a social rank of a ‘beloved’ official. While the ruler could address with ceremonilised affection an official of minor rank such as Osuin who is mentioned as comes,⁹⁰ the professions of intimate or friendly love were left solely to the men of an *illustris* rank. The concept of emotive script also allows to access not explicitly articulated but rather implicated emotion in the text: when passing the office from the deceased Decoratus to his brother, Theodoric expresses his praise to Decoratus in the terms and emotional valuations that could have communicated his intimacy and love for the

64; C. Stephen Jaeger, *Ennobling Love: In Search of a Lost Sensibility* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1999), 27–28.

⁸⁷ Cassiodorus, *Var.* 4.3.3 (trans. Bjornlie, 168).

⁸⁸ Cassiodorus, *Var.* 3.28.1 (trans. Bjornlie, 142).

⁸⁹ Fidelity in civil service: Cassiodorus, *Var.* 4.4.2: “...which he knows that public servants (*servientes*) please us. This fidelity (*fides*) in former years promises blessings he will produce in the future”; the episode with Tuluin is described in *Var.* 8.10.9–10. Although there are no explicit verbal mentions of Athalaric’s affectionate sentiments to Tuluin or his fidelity, he enjoyed specific proximity to the king being a royal page in his youth and, then, retained a sufficient affinity to the Amal court due to his kinship with Amal dynasty. Cassiodorus, *Var.* 8.9.8; 8.10.3 (trans. Bjornlie, 269, 325).

⁹⁰ Cassiodorus, *Var.* 9.8.2 (trans. Bjornlie, 365): “For our intention justly indulges the obedient and to those whom we know to be mindful of your good works, we offer your affection (*affectum*) without hesitation a second time.”

official: he concealed the royal secrets, was loyal, alleviated the cares from the king's soul, etc. – the script of intimate love is quite possible.⁹¹

Cassiodorus's *emotive persona* for another virtuous king, *Athalaric* under Amalasuntha's regency, in eighth and ninth books, shares some common emotive codes of behavior with his predecessor. Athalaric's expression of the *affectus* parallels the way in which it was expressed as an enacted disposition manifested through Theodoric's favors. He reappoints a Gothic *comes* to his position that he embraced previously under the reign of Theodoric in the provincial command, while offering him "affection (*affectum*) without hesitation a second time."⁹²

Love, in the form of *amor*, was perceived through the lenses of several contextual frameworks valid and ideologically important specifically for Athalaric's reign. Firstly, love helps to cement the social concord between the Senate and king newly ascended to the throne, serving as an indispensable affective element of the concluded oath of loyalty. On the one hand, it is fitting (*constat*) that the *Principis*, among whom the grandfather of Athalaric is implied, constituted this social alliance with princes' love (*amor principum*), displaying such love through distribution of benefits (*beneficia*) to *rem publicam* and favors (*priora munera*) to the senators.⁹³ On the other hand, Cassiodorus encourages the Senate to reciprocate this regnal love and received favors, the point he recognizes as conventionalized and accepted emotional response by reiterating the expression "it is fitting" (*constat*):

We doubt not that you would follow this example [i.e., of Romans and Goths making an oath] at a distance, but **not by affection** (*amore*); for you are able to commence what we would anticipate from a distance. Indeed, it is fitting (*constat*) that the most outstanding senators are able to show **so much more respect** (*diligere*) because they are known to have received distinction greater than other ranks.

It is worthy to note that although the "love (*amor*) of the Senate" towards the ruler was occasionally used as a rhetorical convention since the late-imperial period,⁹⁴ with the

⁹¹ Cassiodorus, *Var.* 5.3.3 (trans. Bjornlie, 205-6): "Decoratus, therefore, was thoroughly demarcated in such a way; chosen, I say, and having been praised in our judgment, he associated with palatine offices, claiming that dignity which we are accustomed to give to the wise, clearly obtaining what he was able to achieve beyond others subsequently chosen. He was indeed bold under the scrutiny of our patronage, but he stood reverently at our side, silent when appropriate, fully spoken in need, a distinguished comfort to our cares (*curarum nostrarum*), and he would have been enriched by the indulgence of our authority, except that, contented more with praise of character, he counted himself among ordinary men. He lives among us in the recollection of good men, since the fidelity (*fides*) of men knows not how to fail with death. He concealed our secret counsels (*secreta nostra occultit*) as though he had forgotten them."

⁹² Cassiodorus, *Var.* 9.8.2 (trans. Bjornlie, 365).

⁹³ Cassiodorus, *Var.* 8.2.5-6 (trans. Bjornlie, 315).

⁹⁴ Pacatus, *Panegyricus Theodosio* 1.2 (trans. Mynors, 449): "Not only is it difficult to satisfy it with regard to you because of the love (*pro amore*) it has for you, it is even more difficult, because of its inborn and hereditary

subsequent extension of the trope to Theodoric's emotive persona as well,⁹⁵ in Athalaric's letters, it ostensibly overlaps with concepts of reciprocity and fidelity inherent in love emotive scripts of the Italo-Roman elite, as it was mentioned above.⁹⁶ It is also heavily attempted to be naturalized and normalized with the grammatical usage of the expression "it is fitting." In my opinion, a subtle rhetorical phrasing was manipulated to portray the audience's internalized sense of gratitude, the virtue implicated in the classical love discourse,⁹⁷ and subjective affective attitude rather than an external duty or obligatory return for received favors as a desired primary motivation behind the Senate's oath of loyalty.

Secondly, "love of the devout king" (*amor piissimi regis*) was invoked as a reason for Tuluin, a Gothic heroic general, to risk his life for the sake of Theodoric's rescue, thus, reflecting the self-sacrificial dimension of the feelings of love. Tuluin, this brave man (*forti viro*), reentered the waters of the storming sea immediately after he had just survived the shipwreck to prevent the danger for the king remaining on the shore, as "danger to the king terrified (*formidavit*) one who knows not how to fear (*timere nescivit*) for his own safety."⁹⁸ It is important to note that emotional performativity of love for Goths and Romans aligns with the way in which contemporary writers conceived of Gothic and Italo-Roman identities as defined by manly military *virtus* and civilian virtues respectively⁹⁹. Tuluin had wounds, "language of bravery of its own" (*propria lingua virtutis*)¹⁰⁰ and gained significant military glory, thus, it was a culturally prescribed performance for him in a social role of the loyal subject to manifest love through the acts of bravery and fearlessness rather than Roman-loaded civil service and intimate interactions.

Apparently, the last three scripts played a much less prominent and strictly circumscribed role in the emotive codes of the royal behaviour, at least quantitatively,

gift of eloquence, not to induce in it a feeling of distaste for the crude and uncultivated roughness of this, my Transalpine mode of speech—all the more so since it may seem an absurd and perverse arrogance to make a display of rhetoric before these men when they are the very font from which it flows and only a recent side channel has made it available for use among us as well." C. E. V. Nixon and Barbara Saylor Rodgers, eds., *In Praise of Later Roman Emperors: The Panegyrici Latini: Introduction, Translation, and Historical Commentary, with the Latin Text of R.A.B. Mynors* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994).

⁹⁵ Cassiodorus, *Var.* 1.13.1 (trans. Bjornlie, 49): "But we recall by beholding your affection (*amoris vestri*) how much is said in your assembly which is appraised on the basis of the celebrated virtues".

⁹⁶ There is an explicit invocation of fidelity in the letter: "And therefore, you now ought to extend the fidelity (*fidem*) of your noble order with greater enthusiasm, such that it would appear that former gifts had been conferred upon the deserving and that without hesitation we may bestow future gifts on those whom we feel to be the most mindful of past events". Cassiodorus, *Var.* 8.2.6 (trans. Bjornlie, 315).

⁹⁷ Konstan, *In the Orbit of Love*, 95–128.

⁹⁸ Cassiodorus, *Var.* 8.10.9-10 (trans. Bjornlie, 325).

⁹⁹ David Alan Parnell, Conor Whately, and Michael Edward Stewart, *The Routledge Handbook on Identity in Byzantium* (London: Taylor & Francis, 2022), 163–80; Arnold, *Theoderic*, 117–41.

¹⁰⁰ Cassiodorus, *Var.* 8.10.7 (trans. Bjornlie, 324).

nevertheless, substantially complemented the performative range of regnal affection. Although *love credited in recognition of service* makes only two proper appearances, both cases portray the appointments of the officials who, lacking in proximity to the royal court, still required a separate script less devoid of emotional content than mere affection. Thus, Cassiodorus describes the virtues of Liberius, who is mentioned above as a servant unwaveringly loyal to Odoacer until his undeniable defeat – ironically, as Bjornlie suggests – but who quickly shifted his fidelity to Amals with the symptomatic for the period malleability of loyalties in pursue of the benefits for his palatine service.¹⁰¹ Despite Liberius’s duplicity, Theodoric, in Cassiodorus’s quill, rather explicitly states that Liberius’s faithfulness to Odoacer is precisely an activity, which gained him Theodoric’s respect and loving disposition:

Indeed, you recall, conscript fathers, the patrician Liberius had been praiseworthy even in his rivalry with us (*in aduersitate nostra laudabilem*), when he thus offered unwavering (*integerrimis*) service to Odoacer, so that after he was known to accomplish so much against us as an enemy, he was even more worthy **of our esteem** (*dilectione nostra*).¹⁰²

It is worth noting that the royal attachment is primarily signified by the noun *dilectio*, which is a weaker, less passionate and less intimate equivalent of *amor*.¹⁰³ Irrespective of whether we interpret this fragment ironically or literally, the emphasised intensity and seeming effectiveness of Liberius’s service seems to be crucial in attaining Theodoric’s *dilectio*, which is conflated with his political loyalty. This complex hermeneutics of fidelity and committed service reappear in other central themes in this script, that is, the virtue of integrity (*integritas*) and extreme dedication to the public service, an inherent value of the traditional Roman elite. Thus, Liberius “increased the fisc and advanced public weal without loss to private concerns.”¹⁰⁴ The second example, Athalaric’s letter of appointment for Cassiodorus as praetorian prefect (ironically, penned by Cassiodorus himself) contains the same elements, although, unsurprisingly, it is twice as longer and contains an elaborate

¹⁰¹ Bjornlie, *Politics and Tradition*, 167-168.

¹⁰² Cassiodorus, *Var.* 2.16.2 (trans. Bjornlie, 93).

¹⁰³ For *amor* as the stronger affectionate word compared to *dilectio*, see: TLL 1.1967.48-1973.77.

¹⁰⁴ Integrity: Cassiodorus, *Var.* 2.16.2 (twice); 2.16.4; public service: *Var.* 2.16.4-5 (trans. Bjornlie, 93-94). Apart from increasing the public finances, Liberius was also in charge of successful division of the land and settlement of Gothic army on Italian property. For the dedication to public service as a defining quality for the Roman elite’s way of life see: Laurens Ernst Tacoma, *Roman Political Culture: Seven Studies of the Senate and City Councils of Italy from the First to the Sixth Century AD* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2020); Jeroen W. P. Wijnendaele (ed.), *Late Roman Italy: Imperium to Regnum* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2023).

encomiastic account.¹⁰⁵ Therefore, per se this script marks a relationship based on ruler's recognition and honouring of the official's actions that contributed to the public welfare or direct services provided to the ruler, the relationship, which is manifested, similar to intimate and ceremonialised affection in concrete favours: the favours provided to the son of Liberius, in the first case, and Cassiodorus's promotion under the new ruler, in the second.

Unlike the three affectionate scripts mentioned above, which were mainly addressed to individuals, the addressed actors concerned with *the script of esteemed love* were commonly a collective body of royal subjects or a particular social class. The script's underlying emotive meaning of reverence came from the traditional Roman terminology, specifically, the word *caritas*. In late-republican Rome, love in the form of *caritas* was considered one of the main virtues on which social life was grounded. Cicero associated this feeling with the respectful disposition towards parents, fatherland and people, prominent in wisdom or power.¹⁰⁶ With the gradual adoption of Christianity in the Roman Empire and Latin translation of biblical textual canon, *caritas* as a feeling was re-conceptualised within patristic literature as an equivalent of Greek *agape*, love of God and charitable love to the neighbour.¹⁰⁷ However sparse is Cassiodorus's use of *caritas* in the association with the *princeps* in the context of his relationship with his subjects, for Theodoric's emotive persona, it seems to neglect the layer of biblical Christian hermeneutics by reviving the Roman emotive code and applying it to the contexts involving the Senate to signify a subjective attitude of respect, "esteem," a sentiment of appreciation, not necessarily requiring exact actions.¹⁰⁸ However, for Athalaric's emotive persona, Cassiodorus's use of *caritas* assumes the distinctive Christian connotations. While referring to people and regnum as an addressee of such respectful love, Cassiodorus playfully blurred the boundaries between Christian and traditional Roman understandings of *caritas*, and he could have expected his audience to decode subtle narrative signs, such as positioning of *caritas* between two consequent mentions of God:

¹⁰⁵ Integrity: Cassiodorus, *Var.* 9.24.7; 9.25.12; public service: "May heavenly powers witness his arrangements, so that one whose wisdom we have tested by long association shall be found fortunate in his own affairs, most faithful to us (*fidelissimus nobis*) and useful to the republic (*utilis rei publicae*)."*Var.* 9.25.12; and, most importantly, *dilectio*: "Hence it is that you [Cassiodorus] used to be publicly associated with the affection of the most gloriously just Princeps [Theodoric] (*principi gloriosa dilectione*), because you were separated from vices by a known reserve". *Var.* 9.24.4 (trans. Bjornlie, 386, 389).

¹⁰⁶ Cicero, *Partitiones Oratoriae*, 88.12 (Teubner: W. Friedrich, 1907), 410.

¹⁰⁷ Carter Lindberg, *Love: A Brief History through Western Christianity* (Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 2008), 51–65.

¹⁰⁸ In the letters to the Senate concerning the appointment of Artemidorus, Theodoric displays his special *caritas* to the Senate (*caritatem vestri praecipuam*) by the fact that he does not disregard its admonitions regarding the civil disturbances in Rome and shows his concern by the very same cares (*ex ipsa cura*) when he appoints his confidant to the urban prefecture. Cassiodorus, *Var.* 1.44.1 (trans. Bjornlie, 74).

Now, rouse your courage (*animos*) and with God's grace (*deo propitio*) always choose better things, so that, just as we have commenced upon royal power with affection (*caritate potestatem regiam*), thus by God (*deo*) will we pursue peaceful tranquility in following years [the bold font is mine – A.M.].¹⁰⁹

Finally, as Graeco-Roman tradition treated love in any public discourse as an ethical subject,¹¹⁰ the script for *love of virtues* served as a tool for voicing and performing the moral values prescribed for the Ostrogothic *princeps*. Cassiodorus described the ruler's attachment to any appointee almost exceptionally with nouns, thus, generalising the emotion and depersonalising the relationships.¹¹¹ However, he used verbs to further emphasize the *princeps'* passion as a distributor of rewards or lover of virtues, and thus personalised emotion as an action generated and experienced by the subject.¹¹² For example, Theodoric writes that "we cherish" (*amamus*) "exceptional dignities" bestowed from his liberality (*benignitas*)¹¹³ or duplication of "our favors" (*beneficia nostra*).¹¹⁴ Apart from playing the role of a benefactor, Theodoric also fashions himself as a virtuous model for his subordinates, who "are able to love (*sola diligere*) only in that in which you also know us to love (*amare*)."¹¹⁵ It is in this script that Cassiodorus most expressly glorifies the emotive behaviour of the king as it attests to the governmental virtue of both ruler, who promotes worthy members of the civil elite, and of these members, who are exhorted to support stability and the ruler's virtuous rule. Such manner of affectionate and morally superior distribution of favours reinforced the image of *imitatio imperii* and specifically uninterrupted continuity of late Roman imperial practices of liberality.¹¹⁶ Last but not least, Athalaric's love for virtues and, thus, use of the verb *amare* differs from Theodoric in the aspect that he occasionally applies them to personalise his affection towards his subjects. In the letter to *comes* of Syracuse, Athalaric demanded him to correct his abuses of power, for which he had become infamous, explicitly associating the *comes* with the group of people whom the

¹⁰⁹ Cassiodorus, *Var.* 8.3.5 (trans. Bjornlie, 317).

¹¹⁰ Jaeger, *Ennobling Love*, 28.

¹¹¹ Peter Brown, *Power and Persuasion in Late Antiquity: Towards a Christian Empire* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1992), 58–61.

¹¹² Ríkharðsdóttir, *Emotion in Old Norse Literature*, 50.

¹¹³ Cassiodorus, *Var.* 3.12.1 (trans. Bjornlie, 130).

¹¹⁴ Cassiodorus, *Var.* 2.2.1 (trans. Bjornlie, 80).

¹¹⁵ Brown, *Power and Persuasion*, 58. Cassiodorus, *Var.* 4.37.1 (trans. Bjornlie, 190). It is important to note that addressing the letter to Theodogunda, an *illustris* woman, responsible for closing the litigation between two persons, Cassiodorus also subtly extends these principally masculine emotive codes to the noble females.

¹¹⁶ Choda, Leeuw, Schulz, *Gaining and Losing*, 84; Cristini, "Diplomacy at the End," 270–296; Carlos F. Noreña, *Imperial Ideals in the Roman West: Representation, Circulation, Power* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 82–92.

princeps loves: “we do not want those whom we love (*quos...amamus*) to transgress.”¹¹⁷ Despite the persistent usage of the first-person plural forms, Athalaric’s emotive persona seems to be slightly more emotionally expressive in its explicitly verbalised encouragement of reciprocity and personalised use of *amare* than Theodoric’s one.

What are the reasons for the emergence or representation of such emotionality of the king? First, they have a rhetorical function in Cassiodorus's narrative, which focuses on the depiction of governmental virtue: the king is the ultimate representation of imperial virtues and Roman continuity, and his love conveys a connection to the Italo-Roman tradition, the performance of the imperial virtue of generosity and the distribution of favors, therefore, the heightened emotionality, expressive affection, and love are not related to or necessarily translated into the actual feelings of the king, but are intended to emphasize his quasi-imperial status and virtue of clemency, as well as claims to Roman cultural inheritance.

Second, the relevance of late-imperial norms of formulaic affection vanishes in the new Ostrogothic post-Roman context. During the fifth century, the imperial power and authority was effectively fading away in the unremitting struggles for the control of the Western Roman Empire followed by Odoacer’s twenty-year dissolution of western Roman emperors. The Ostrogothic king was already less sacred, powerful, and symbolically as well as physically distant than a late Roman emperor, and his power was mainly corroborated by a social consensus in which the Italo-Roman elite took charge of the maintenance of the local bureaucratic apparatus and the Goths performed military duties. In such social context, different identifiable regnal love scripts performed a function of reproducing the imperial patterns of behavior with its socially stratified system of favours and culture of patronage in its wider sense. In the narrower sense, however, the Roman principate self-fashioning and adaptation of the late-imperial and late Roman codes engendered a more affectionate persona of the king with emotive interiority that was embedded in the notion of Romanitas integral for the social identity of the sixth-century Italo-Roman elite.

Divergence from the Script: the case of Theodahad and Witigis

In this last subdivision, I will briefly describe how the generic parameters of official correspondence written in the name of the ruling king still left vacant space for representing

¹¹⁷ Cassiodorus, *Var.* 9.14.10 (trans. Bjornlie, 371-372).

divergence from the regnal scripts of love by looking at the example of the letters issued in the name of Theodahad. As I have tried to show above, the emotive scripts introduced earlier were a part of normative nuanced system of regnal behavioural codes, which were recognised by the Italo-Roman elite. Theodahad's letters, however, diverge from these in several minor at first sight but crucial aspects, considering the generic limitations.

First, Cassiodorus introduced a prescriptive element to the bestowal of regnal ceremonialised affection and explicitly articulated expectations of reciprocity. While the previously mentioned regnal affection explored the role of the Ostrogothic king as a benefactor and feeling subject, Theodahad reversed the actors, making officials a feeling subject, who were demanded reciprocity in an almost jussive manner.¹¹⁸ The assassination of Amalasuntha (535) puts all of his letters into a wider historical context, where his political position seemed unstable, so Theodahad attempted to secure it with installing a Gothic garrison in Rome, which prompted the Senate to request an oath of security from him, which he eventually took. Thus, in the letter to the Senate, Theodahad writes that for his display of regnal affection he expects *affectus* in return: “demonstrate (*monstrate*) good faith for the assurance you have obtained, since after such a thing, affection (*affectus*) ought to be returned (*redditur*) for our clemency (*nostrae clementiae*), rather than promised (*offertur*).”¹¹⁹

Other three vital points are Theodahad's grammatical individualisation of ceremonialised affection, imperative constructions, and heightened emotionality, all of which could be vividly illustrated with one concrete example. In the letter to the Senate, which elevated Maximus, a member of leading senatorial families, to the rank of *primicerius*, Theodahad also attempted to represent Maximus's announced marriage to a woman of Amal family as the one that cemented the union of Amal dynasty with the Senate and the Roman people:

But we add to his honorable distinctions, conscript fathers, so that the shining grace of your order may be commingled in lofty kinship with us. Indeed, it is not possible for only one man to assume to claim for himself the glory that we are granting to the Roman name. Return (*reddite*) the **fullest regard** (*plenissimam caritatem*) for **my affection** (*affectui meo*). A subject who is worthy enough that his master bestows kinship upon him **must be loved more** (*plus est amandus*) ... How could entreaties demand of me what my heart has granted of its

¹¹⁸ According to Vidén, Cassiodorus frequently resorted to imperative as a polite, soft command with only imaginary jussive sense that functioned as a stylistic feature. Consequently, Cassiodorus's use of *praesens imperfecti* might be an attempt to articulate another type of command making it slightly stricter. Vidén, *The Roman Chancery*, 65–68.

¹¹⁹ Cassiodorus, *Var.* 10.16.2 (trans. Bjornlie, 405).

own accord (*meus animus spontanea deliberatione*), so that the men of your order whom we are truly able to call fathers should be bound to us with the distinction of kinship?¹²⁰

Here Cassiodorus uses for the first and for the last time a possessive first-person singular adjective “*meus*” instead of plural “*noster*,” as was the norm for kings that represented governmental virtue, thus, he extraordinarily individualises the affection manifested through Theodahad’s royal favour. The discursive arrangement also implies that respective *caritas* has to be returned specifically to Theodahad as a person currently possessing the power of the king rather than an institutionally and symbolically entitled ruler. It creates the effect of Theodahad’s actual and symbolical dissociation from the embraced role of the *princeps*, as he essentially steps out of the royal public persona to demand public love. Then, the gerundive *amandus* in the expression *plus est amandus* is used in its imperative meaning as an attempt to prescribe and impose feelings of personal attachment towards his current protégé. Third, an emphasis on “my rational soul” (*meus animus*), which classical writers largely considered as one of the main seats of emotions,¹²¹ as a vehicle for making a decision for granting a favour, as opposed to abstract imperial virtues such as generosity and love of virtues, sheds an unfavorable light on Theodahad’s allegedly heightened emotionality.

Overall, though Cassiodorus never explicitly indicated the excessive expression of emotions in Theodahad’s rhetoric or bodily gestures, all these literary and discursive means in the official public discourse convey the subtle breach with normative emotive conventions implied by the Roman ideal of self-control and self-restraint.¹²² Cassiodorus’s subtle criticism targeted this deviation from the traditions of antiquity, which, eventually, further exacerbated the internal conflicts between the civil elite and Theodahad, leaving the Ostrogothic *regnum* vulnerable to external attacks.

¹²⁰ Cassiodorus, *Var.* 10.12.3–4 (trans. Bjornlie, 402).

¹²¹ Barbara H. Rosenwein, *Generations of Feeling: A History of Emotions, 600–1700* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016), 52–63.

¹²² Constantinou, Meyer, *Emotions and Gender*, 4.

Making Diplomatic Ties: Roman and non-Roman Scripts¹²³

The diplomatic correspondence in the *Variae* comprises thirty-two letters, i.e., less than a tenth of the *Variae*'s 468 letters, but, as Gillett states, it is Cassiodorus's arrangement that assigns them a particular importance within the collection.¹²⁴ It has long been observed that the nineteen letters to imperial addressees and thirteen to the Frankish, Vandal, and other Germanic kings are located in the most distinguishing places of the *Variae*: each book, with the exception of the two books of *formulae* and the two books written in Cassiodorus's name, opens with a diplomatic letter to either the imperial or to a western royal court, and the first, second, fifth books close with such letters while the tenth book presents a variation, closing with a series of letters to the Eastern Roman emperor and his senior officials.¹²⁵ This diplomatic epistolography played a significant part in the Cassiodorus's overall rhetorical strategy, that is, the depiction of governmental virtue of both the Amal rulers and of their officials, manifested in two main qualities, which are the values of classical Graeco-Roman *paideia* and *reverentia antiquitatis*, i.e., the pretense of continuity and the preservation of the Roman traditions, as argued by Bjornlie.¹²⁶ Along with the ecumenical rhetoric and diffusing of Roman *nomorum* as well as the *imitatio* of early Roman principate, the representations of which are already well-researched in the diplomatic communication,¹²⁷ I think that the rhetoric of affection towards foreign addressees is also indissolubly tied to the self-(re)presentation of the Italo-Roman elites as legitimate Roman successors. Furthermore, at least from the perspective of the auctorial intention, Cassiodorus's diplomatic letters could have aimed to introduce and, to some extent, offer as models new behavioural patterns into their readership. According to Gillett, the individual and personalised letters to the post-Roman rulers were perceived as rhetorical models themselves, as there could be no actual formulas for highly context-dependent diplomatic correspondence in the way in which the books of *formulae* could present formulaic blueprints for letters of appointments.¹²⁸ The high style of their composition suggests that diplomatic letters also stylistically belonged rather to

¹²³ The materials of this sub-chapter are slightly repurposed for the following article: Morozova, Anastasiia. "The Love of a King and the Love of an Emperor: the Scripts and Rhetoric of Affection in the Diplomatic Correspondence of Cassiodorus's *Variae*." [upcoming, in English].

¹²⁴ For a more detailed explanation, see: Gillett, "Diplomatic Correspondence," 174-190.

¹²⁵ For this analysis and a more detailed description, see: Gillett, *Envoys*, 177-8.

¹²⁶ Bjornlie, "The Letter Collection of Cassiodorus," 440-42. For the importance of Cassiodorus's demonstration of *paideia* in the *Variae*, see: Bjornlie, *Politics and Tradition*, 269-79. For the "Romainising propaganda" of the Ostrogoths, see: Devecka, "White Elephant Gifts," 195-217.

¹²⁷ For more on the Ostrogothic diplomatic communication, see and the bibliography provided: Cristini, "Diplomacy at the End."

¹²⁸ Gillett, *Envoys*, 185.

the tradition of cultured epistolography of friendship than to the chancellery style, as Gillett suggests,¹²⁹ the generic conventions of which Cassiodorus could have perceived as decipherable for a classically educated late Roman elite, considering the importance of the rhetorical education for composing them. Kakridi's analysis also corroborates such a statement by pointing out how the diplomatic communication out of all *Variae*'s letters mostly clearly follows the epistolographic conventions and structure.¹³⁰

Frankish, Vandal, Burgundian, and other Germanic Kings and Their Script(s)

The letters to these kings profess affection towards different rulers by words such as *affectus*, *affectio*, *amor* (and its variants), *caritas* and *carus*, which taken together constitute one of the greatest part of emotional vocabulary appearing in the diplomatic correspondence, i.e., sixteen occurrences in seven out of the thirteen letters. It should be also noted that the *Variae* contain no letters to post-Roman rulers issued in the names of Theodahad and Witigis, except the customary correspondence with the Eastern Roman emperor and empress. Although these letters definitely do not represent the entirety of the Ostrogothic political communication, which was most likely penned by different *quaestores* at different periods of time, in my view, at least three scripts applicable to the different Germanic kings who ruled over the territories of the former Roman Empire could be identified. These are:

1. Ritualised affection or affection of greeting (*affectus salutationis*): ceremonialised affection, which accompanies mostly the reception and dispatch of the embassies, frequently together with the exchange of gifts;¹³¹
2. Familial affection: affection mostly towards the indirect relatives of Theodoric, which accompanies the diplomatic exchanges and attempts at diplomatic / familial resolution of conflicts;
3. Love / affection in friendship: affection, which is felt between two post-Roman rulers based on their similarity in virtue within ties of patronage that imply a social distance camouflaged by the late Roman language of friendship.

First, in the letters to the Germanic kings of the Franks, the Warni, the Vandals, and the Haesti, Cassiodorus speaks of *affection of the salutation* (*affectum salutationis*) or the

¹²⁹Gillett, *Envoys*, 181.

¹³⁰Kakridi, *Cassiodorus 'Variae'*, 62.

¹³¹Gillett, *Envoys*, 256–57.

affectionate greeting (*affectuosam salutationem*), with which Theodoric either sends his envoys¹³² and receives envoys from other kings¹³³ or reciprocates a diplomatic visit by sending his own embassy or sending back his royal correspondent's envoys.¹³⁴ In all these diplomatic circumstances, the embassies professed affection, complementing it with the offer of a material gift or a fulfilled request. For instance, Theodoric dispatched a cithara player requested by Clovis (481-511)¹³⁵ or accepted the amber generously proffered to him by the nation of Haesti.¹³⁶ Cassiodorus's use of the phrase *affectus salutationis* in the sense of a sentiment of benevolence sustaining the relations between the two parties in the diplomatic correspondence with the Germanic kings and, as it will be shown below, in the imperial diplomatic letters, generally echoes the contemporary conventions of epistolography of friendship. Ennodius (474-521) in his answer to a letter by Eugenius, a high ranking Ostrogothic official and a member of elite, explained his epistolary silence and concluded the letter with the expression "returning the affection of due greeting" (*redo debendae salutationis affectum*).¹³⁷ In Cassiodorus's case, this emotive script of affectionate greeting serves to establish or sustain the private friendship between two rulers, distant or close, which Cassiodorus could have expected, at least for some part of Italo-Roman elite, to be able to decode as an attempted construction of an Ostrogothic network of reciprocity and patronage through ritualised utterances of affection.

Second, although Theodoric's political communication with the Germanic kings did not harbour many instances of love-related vocabulary and, on the whole, allowed less space for vivid emotivity than the royal letters for an internal Ostrogothic audience, Cassiodorus employs the specific *familial script* towards royal relatives and, occasionally, other Germanic kings, which contains familial affectionate terminology. Cassiodorus, to a certain degree, follows the default tradition of fraternal metaphorical salutations between all of the Germanic kings,¹³⁸ as, for instance, the letter to the king of the Varni shows.¹³⁹ In this letter, Theodoric

132Cassiodorus, *Var.* 2.41.3 (trans. Bjornlie, 117-118): "Wherefore, greeting you with respect and good will (*salutantes affectione*), for which it is appropriate that we have sent to your excellence [i.e., the king of the Franks] with the usual affection our legates ille and ille."

133Cassiodorus, *Var.* 5.2.1 (trans. Bjornlie, 204): "[...] being desirous of the amber that you have sent with carriers, we acknowledge you with affectionate greetings (*affectuosa salutatione*)."

134Cassiodorus, *Var.* 5.1.3 (trans. Bjornlie, 204): "[...] through our envoys, *ille* and *ille*, who repay you the affection of an owed greeting (*affectum salutationis*)"; *Var.* 5.44.4 (trans. Bjornlie, 243-244): "[...] we have extended the fullest affection of salutation (*salutationis affectum*) by returning your envoys".

135Cassiodorus, *Var.* 2.41.3 (trans. Bjornlie, 113-114).

136Cassiodorus, *Var.* 5.2.1 (trans. Bjornlie, 204).

¹³⁷ Ennodius, *Ep.* 4.30.

138Such tendency has been noted by Franz Dölger, for more details, see: Franz Dölger, *Die „Familie der Könige“ im Mittelalter*, in *Byzanz und die europäische Staatenwelt: ausgewählte Vorträge und Aufsätze* (Darmstadt: Wiss. Buchges, 1976), 51–52.

addresses the king of the Varni as “your fraternity” (*vestra fraternitas*), which, as Marco Cristini argues, could have been a “*captatio benevolentiae* towards a sovereign who was clearly less illustrious than the sender, or an implicit claim to a degree of authority which has not yet been fully accepted by the addressee.”¹⁴⁰ However, more frequently Cassiodorus reserves the metaphors of kinship for Theodoric’s kinsmen attached to him through a range of dynastic marriages. As with the epistolary standards of friendship shaping the horizon of feelings of the Italo-Roman elite, the terminology of kinship was also meant to indicate close relationship.¹⁴¹ Throughout the correspondence produced in 506/507 in the vain attempt to prevent the conflict between the Goths of Toulouse and the Franks,¹⁴² Cassiodorus wrote the letters for a series of diplomatic exchanges immediately prior the conflict, attempting to prevent it. In the letter to the king of the Visigoths Alaric II (484-507), Theodoric in Cassiodorus’s pen employed a paternalistic tone to convince Alaric to restrain the Visigoths from involving in conflict with the Franks and, although Alaric was, apparently, an older king, Theodoric coherently applied the phrase “our son, king Alaric” (*filius noster rex Alaric*),¹⁴³ since the latter was Theodoric’s younger kinsman, having married one of Theodoric’s daughters, thus, Theodoric was rhetorically using his parental authority obtained through a matrimonial arrangement. Contrarily, in the letter to Gundobad (473-516), a king of Burgundy, whose help in the mediation of the conflict Theodoric attempted to win, he referred to him as “our brother Gundobad” (*frater noster Gundobad*)¹⁴⁴ along with “your fraternity” (*fraternitas vestra*),¹⁴⁵ since Gundobad’s son was married to another one of Theodoric’s daughters, thus making Gundobad a senior and equal in status to the Ostrogothic ruler himself, so the rhetoric mirrored this matrimonial equality. Furthermore, some expressions of affection, such as the epithet “dear” (*carus*), were also exclusively performed in regard to those who acquired a blood or marital membership in Theodoric’s royal family.¹⁴⁶ Thus, in the letter to Gundobad, when Theodoric attempted to subtly persuade him into mediating the conflict between the Visigoths and the Franks, he complained about how

¹³⁹ Cassiodorus, *Var.* 5.1.1 (trans. Bjornlie, 203): “With the pitch-black furs and slave boys glowing with foreign fairness, your fraternity (*fraternitas vestra*) has sent us swords of iron, more precious than the cost of gold, that cleave even armor.”

¹⁴⁰ Marco Cristini, “Cassiodorus’ *Variae* in the 9th Century,” in *Reti Medievali*, ed. Fabrizio Oppedisano (Florence: Firenze University Press, 2022), 114.

¹⁴¹ Symmachus, *The Letters of Symmachus*, 51.

¹⁴² Gillett, *Envoys*, 180–81.

¹⁴³ Cassiodorus, *Var.* 3.2.3 (trans. Bjornlie, 121); *Var.* 4.4.2 (trans. Bjornlie, 168-169); *Var.* 4.4.4 (trans. Bjornlie, 169).

¹⁴⁴ Cassiodorus, *Var.* 3.1.4 (trans. Bjornlie, 120); *Var.* 3.3.2 (trans. Bjornlie, 122).

¹⁴⁵ Cassiodorus, *Var.* 3.2.3 (trans. Bjornlie, 121); *Var.* 3.2.4 (trans. Bjornlie, 121).

¹⁴⁶ Cassiodorus, *Var.* 3.2.1 (trans. Bjornlie, 120); *Var.* 4.1.1 (trans. Bjornlie, 165); *Var.* 4.4.3 (trans. Bjornlie, 243).

frustrated for him it was to see “hostile intentions between royal persons dear to us” (*caras regiasque personas*),¹⁴⁷ i.e., Alaric and Clovis, to whose sister Theodoric was married.

Third, the most Romanising *script of love of friendship* receives a vivid expression in the letter to Thrasamund, the king of Vandals, which sheds further light on the system of gradation in terms of emotive performativity towards different post-Roman rulers. As Richard Miles states, the Vandal kingdom in North Africa was largely built on cooperation, rather than opposition, between the Vandal kings and the Romano-African lay elites, who, as well as the Italo-Roman civic elites, supplied many of the senior government officials to the Vandal kingdom. Furthermore, the reign of Thrasamund (496-523), an addressee of Theodoric, in particular, witnessed an extraordinary peak of non-religious literary activity, with the production of poetry, epics, rhetorical exercises, and treatises, which have been largely made up by the Romano-African elite, who as well as the Italo-Roman elite profited from classical education and culture, the period which some scholars even termed as the “Vandal Renaissance”.¹⁴⁸ For this reason, in the mentioned letter, as Thrasamund offered an apology to the Ostrogothic kingdom after the defeat of Gesalic, a candidate to the Visigothic throne unfavourable to Theodoric and briefly supported by Vandals in 511, an apology, motivated by his “honor” (*honoris*) and “nobility” (*nobilitatis*),¹⁴⁹ Cassiodorus emphasised the inherent similarity of the Vandal and Ostrogothic rulers and their shared Roman emotive mentalities when it comes to love of virtues: “You have shown, most prudent king, that advice from wise men can be of assistance after error has been committed, and that you love not the fault of obstinacy (*amare...vitium pertinaciae*), which is known to take hold in brutish men (*brutis hominibus*).”¹⁵⁰ With the term *bruti homines* being essentially a synonym for *barbari homines*,¹⁵¹ Cassiodorus, thus, reinforces the sense of the shared Roman emotive identity and intrinsic Romanness by emphasising the Roman ethical superiority as well as an idea of barbarian as an identitarian and affective Other, prominent in the ideology of both realms. Apart from the shared love for virtues and capacity to acknowledge faults as a feature

147Cassiodorus, *Var.* 3.2.1 (trans. Bjornlie, 120).

¹⁴⁸ Richard Miles, “Vandal North Africa and the Fourth Punic War,” *Classical Philology* 112, no. 3 (2017): 399.

149Cassiodorus, *Var.* 5.44.2 (trans. Bjornlie, 243).

150Cassiodorus, *Var.* 5.44.1 (trans. Bjornlie, 243). Lat. *vitium* “vice” was used an explicit antonym to *virtus* “virtue” in Roman ethical discourse or, at least, served as a constant antonymic point of reference. Rebecca Langlands, “Roman *Exempla* and Situation Ethics: Valerius Maximus and Cicero *de Officiis*,” *Journal of Roman Studies* 101 (2011): 100–122. Thus, for example, in Cassiodorus, *Var.* 2.3.4 (trans. Bjornlie, 83), in the letter of Theodoric to the Senate regarding the appointment of Felix, a representative of a noble family from Gaul, as consul, Cassiodorus emphasises his moral probity by comparing him to Cato: “he knew that ignorance was blown all the more by the airs of pride, which expels empty winds because it grasps not the root of virtues (*radicibus virtutum*). He was indeed the Cato of our times (*nostrorum Cato*), who by abstaining from vices (*vitiis*), educated others by his example.”

151Arnold, *Theodoric*, 168.

of Romanness which stands in contrast to the behaviour of barbarians, the central theme of this script is also the shared behavioural ideal of the restraint towards specific emotions such as “greed” (*avaritia*), as the self-control was a fundamental virtue of the Roman emotive mentality:¹⁵² “Let kinsmen know there were such men who were incapable of being roused out of a desire for avarice (*studio avaritiae*).”¹⁵³

Furthermore, the “dedication for affection” (*studio amoris*), conceptualised as emotively charged *amor*, is framed as a reason for the reconciliation of the two rulers, who prioritised *amor* and virtue over personal greed and persistence in error. Here, Cassiodorus’s use of the noun *amor*, construed as the motivation for virtuous action, signals the deeper emotive suggestiveness of the scene, which Cassiodorus could have expected his Roman audience to be able to decode based on several narrative signs. The entire sequence and context are reminiscent of the way in which Greek and Roman philosophers conceptualized manifestations of sincere friendship as an inherently virtuous gesture motivated by love.¹⁵⁴ Furthermore, this dual association of Thrasamund’s affection with altruistic friendly love and a stimulus for virtuous action for the benefit of a friend is immediately enhanced by the use of another affectionate noun, *affectus*. The affection in the form of *amor* is intermingled and almost synonymic to the affection expressed by *affectus*, while the prolonged and sophisticated moral justification for the restoration of peace between the Ostrogothic and Vandal kings, which extends for almost three quarters of letter, is eventually summarised with a characteristic phrase: “Affection has indeed prevailed over everything” (*omnia siquidem superavit affectus*).¹⁵⁵ This may echo Vergil (*Ecl.* 10.69: *omnia vincit amor*), whom Cassiodorus apparently read and occasionally referred to.¹⁵⁶ In Vergil’s poem, one of the characters, the shepherd Gallus, is tormented by his emotional experience of love towards a girl, which he repeatedly attempts to overcome with his “toil,” but eventually, decides to yield to it, which might mirror, in my view, Thrasamund’s laborious attempts to depart politically from Theodoric, that is, to tip the scales of power in the Visigothic kingdom; this ends up in his defeat and yielding to the Ostrogothic loyalties with the restoration of peace. In this way, Cassiodorus might have rhetorically equalled the Vandal king to a narrative position

152On self-control and self-restraint as a gendered virtue in Roman culture, see Mati Meyer, “Towards an Approach to Gendered Emotions in Byzantine Culture: An Introduction,” in *Emotions and Gender*, Meyer and Constantinou, 3–15. See also with bibliographic references: caterina Lung, “Procopius of Caesarea’s “History of Wars” and the Expression of Emotions in Early Byzantium,” *Hiperborea Journal. Journal of History* 5, no. 2 (2018): 5–24.

153Cassiodorus, *Var.* 5.44.4 (trans. Bjornlie, 243–244).

154Konstan, *In the Orbit of Love*, 12.

155Cassiodorus, *Var.* 5.44.4 (trans. Bjornlie, 243–244).

156For example, see: Cassiodorus, *Institut.* 1.4.2 (trans. Halporn, 120). Vergil, *Eclogues* 9.36.

of a lover in Vergil's poem, that is, in the language more appropriate for the situation, a Theodoric's admirer or loving friend. Thus, as far as the auctorial intention can be surmised, the explicit emotive performativity is modelled upon the codes of private friendship in its vocabulary (the use of *affectus* and *amor* as synonyms in epistolography¹⁵⁷), but an underlying emotive subtext reveals that Cassiodorus could have manipulated the philosophical discourse and intertextual references, recognisable to classically educated elite, as 'situational' emotive signifiers to convey an emotive interiority of Theodoric, which the audience could have been able to interpret based on their own emotive interior and imbue Theodoric's relationship with Thrasamund with a profundity of intimate friendship. The socially significant coding of intimate friendly love imposed a series of specific social obligations, among which was a type of fidelity almost as binding as marital, apparently expected from Thrasamund from the reconciliation onwards.¹⁵⁸ Even more, despite these egalitarian affective connotations of intimate friendship and emphasis on shared Romanness, the higher position in social hierarchy is reserved for Theodoric even on the level of emotional self-control as he displays moderation and modesty by returning Thrasamund's reconciliation gift, made in gold.¹⁵⁹

To briefly summarise, it can be concluded that all these three emotive scripts reflected a social performativity that utilised familial, ritualised/conventionalised, and Roman characteristics of various diplomatic actors in order to adapt to the political and sociocultural reality of the Ostrogothic diplomatic communication. While the Frankish or Visigothic kingdoms were not addressed with a specific Roman emotive coding, except that of ritualised affection, the addresses to the Vandal king made use of a shared Roman emotive mentality as a useful pool for more nuanced, socially binding and culturally embedded scripts of affection with construed emotive interiority if needed. The same thing, as we will see below, was relevant for the Eastern Roman Empire.

157In his letter to Ausonius, an imperial bureaucrat and his senior close friend, Symmachus reproaches Ausonius for remaining silent, although his own old affection for him (*amoris veteris*) stays unaltered, and it is because, as he writes, "the more tender [i.e., his] affection (*tenerior affectio*), the readier the complaint." Symmachus, *Ep.* 1.34 (trans. Salzman and Roberts, 78-79).

158For more on friendship and its obligations, see: Konstan, *Friendship*; Williams, *Reading Roman Friendship*. Again, what is notable, as well as in the royal communication addressed to the king's officials, as I have shown in the first subchapter, is the replacement of moral arguments for the restoration of peace between the Ostrogothic kingdom and the Vandals by an emotional argument of the restoration of affection between two rulers, particularly, the change of heart of Thrasamund.

159Cassiodorus, *Var.* 5.44.3 (trans. Bjornlie, 243): "For which, we accept your sincere apologies with pure intention, returning a change of heart (*sinceram purgationem pura mente*) inasmuch as we are able. But we have not retained the gift of gold sent to us, so that you may know our cause was motivated by justice, which no venality may realize. We have both acted in royal fashion: we have thus prevailed over the tyranny of greed (*tyrannicam cupiditatem*), just as you have clearly conquered error." On moderation as an ethically superior gesture in the diplomatic communication, see Gillett, *Envoys*, 159-60.

Emotive Performativity in the Royal Communication with the Imperial Court

The political communication with the eastern imperial court could boast of the widest spectrum of emotional words used to profess affection, i.e., *amor*, *dilectio* and their variants, *caritas* and *carus*, *affectus/affectio*, the latter quite expectedly, makes the most frequent appearances. Overall, forty various love-coded words are distributed unevenly throughout sixteen out of the nineteen letters with an imperial addressee (for the diplomatic letters addressed to kings the ratio of average usage of emotional words in one letter is slightly lower). The correspondence directed towards the Eastern Roman Emperor, thus, could be viewed as a script in itself with an explicit emotive vocabulary and performativity consisting of specific components,¹⁶⁰ or as a spectrum of different scripts, which are:

1. Public affection (*dilectio*): public transpersonal relationship, maintained between two direct successors of the Roman Empire, expressed in concord between them;
2. Ritualised affection or *affectus salutationis*;
3. Love/affection combined with patronage: a variation of the affection expressed for Germanic kings but even more hierarchical and ceremonialised than that, accompanied by favours (*gratia*) and expectations of, customarily, obligatory reciprocity;
4. Dispositional affection: public affection manifested as a sign of approval at the ascension of the new ruler to the throne;¹⁶¹
5. Spiritual and Christian love (*caritas*): affection, usually associated with concord, which provides the affective dimension to this public emotionless friendship;
6. Personal love (*amor*): love, which is suggested and perceived as felt by an emperor or empress personally outside of their public imperial persona.

¹⁶⁰This conceptualisation would rely on the components of scripts, such as the articulated specific concepts of love and their discursive arrangement, which were not necessarily used simultaneously, but were selected from an arsenal provided by the script itself and applied for a specific situational context. Thus, the extent of performativity and the nature of emotive display would perform the function of differentiation rather than a specific scenario, which is also within the conceptual umbrella of the emotive script.

¹⁶¹This is the most quantitatively insignificant, however, symbolically crucial script, the one, which I am forced to omit due to the spatial limitation. This script or component of the script of the correspondence with imperial addressees was marked with the noun *affectus* to denote the amiable disposition towards the specific rulers or their kingship generally. Cassiodorus, *Var.* 10.2.3 (trans. Bjornlie, 391-392). Thus, Cassiodorus speaks of “affection of a foreign princeps” (*affectum principis externi*) as something that by custom publicly legitimised the ascension of new kings among the nations, specifically when discussing Theodahad’s elevation. Cassiodorus, *Var.* 10.2.1 (trans. Bjornlie, 391).

To begin with, it is worth noting that the *public affection* is reserved exclusively for the imperial correspondence: with this feeling in regards to the eastern emperors Cassiodorus mostly signifies public friendship, a sort of state of concord and natural relation of two separate Roman polities of the once united Roman Empire. Such relationship suggests not an activity or proper feeling, but rather a naturalized self-subsisting entity mostly beyond what individuals think or feel. In the letter to Anastasius (491-518), meant to persuade him to re-establish peace between Ravenna and Constantinople, Theodoric emphasises the appropriateness of “easy affection” (*otiosa dilectione*) between two *res publicae* not only due to the obvious advantages of peaceful relations, but also because discord (*discordiae*) would be in contradiction with their past co-existence as a single entity under the ancient *principes* (*sub antiquis principibus*).¹⁶² Theodahad, asking for the imperial acknowledgment of his co-rulership with Amalasuntha, also implies the transpersonal nature of *dilectio* which is embedded in the long tradition of a shared Roman imperial past and in the identity of two reigns. Thus, this type of love forms the basis of the public friendship (*amicitiae*) between the dynasty of the Amals and the eastern emperors:

Indeed, this affection (*ista dilectio*) is not new (*nova*), for if you recollect the deeds of her predecessors, you know that the Amals have always considered friendship with that imperium to be a kind of law custom, which is just as certain as it is ancient (*tantum certior quantum vetustior*), since what has been warded over the long centuries is not easily changed.¹⁶³

However, in the case of Theodahad’s letters, who is a ruler presented unfavourably in Cassiodorus’s collection,¹⁶⁴ the noun *dilectio*, usually associated with the script of public friendship, is almost conflated with affection in patronal ties as a sentiment owed in return for a favour granted. Thus, Theodahad sends Justinian’s theological letters to the Roman Pope around 535 on Justinian’s behalf and reminds the emperor of “the affection that ought to be returned” (*ad reddendam dilectionem*) if this favour has served him in any way.¹⁶⁵

Second, while the *ritualised affection* does not have any particular differences from the addresses to the Germanic kings, *affection combined with patronage* presents a more interesting case. Cassiodorus followed the prescriptions of emotive codes for ceremonialised

¹⁶²Cassiodorus, *Var.* 1.1.4-5 (trans. Bjornlie, 35-36).

¹⁶³Cassiodorus, *Var.* 10.2.3 (trans. Bjornlie, 391-392).

¹⁶⁴As argued by Bjornlie, the positioning of book 10 between Cassiodorus’s appointment to the praetorian prefecture (*Var.* 9.24-25) and his acceptance of the office (*Var.* 11.1-3) conveys a subtle rupture in the virtuous government represented by Theodoric and Athalaric, that is, the reign of Theodahad and Witigis, which is synchronized with the political destabilisation caused by the outburst of the Gothic war. Bjornlie, “The Letter Collection of Cassiodorus,” 441-442.

¹⁶⁵Cassiodorus, *Var.* 10.25.2 (trans. Bjornlie, 413).

affection described in the personal relationship between the *princeps* and his officials, which, itself, Cassiodorus models upon the late Roman imperial emotive codes as well as the late Roman epistolary discourse of friendship and parental or paternal rhetoric. Thus, I suggest that Cassiodorus, while expecting the Eastern Roman and Italo-Roman audiences to be capable of recognising this emotive coding of an affectionate, but inherently hierarchical relationship, introduces this script of affection to a patronal setting that involves the Eastern Roman Emperor and the Ostrogothic king, the setting, where such script could be utilised to reinforce a sense of shared Roman educational and cultural background and, from an angle of the social dimension, establish a reciprocal and patron-client-like relation. In his letter to Emperor Justin I (518-527), dated by 526, right after the death of Theodoric, Athalaric, Theodoric's grandson, who was elevated as a next Ostrogothic king, speaks of the need to relocate imperial affection in the line of kinship (*in parentelae locum vester affectus*), i.e., transfer it from Theodoric, "your [i.e., Emperor's] son" (*filio vestro*), as Theodoric had been formerly adopted in arms by an Eastern Roman emperor Zeno, to his grandson, Athalaric (*nepotis*).¹⁶⁶ Though Cassiodorus's emphasis on the familial attachment in Athalaric's emotive verbalisation echoes the parental affection of the Ostrogothic *princeps* towards his subordinates, for Theodahad and Witigis, considered flawed kings by Cassiodorus, the focus of *affectus* is shifted onto the concept of affection as the benevolent attitude or disposition either manifested or attained through the actions of "favour" (*gratia*) and "liberality" (*benignitas*). In a series of letters attempting to find a solution for the international crises in which Ostrogothic kings became involved with the Eastern imperial court after the assassination of Amalasuntha (535), *affectus* is routinely combined with the idea of receiving an imperial "favour" (*gratia*) in the sense of the emperor's guarantee to preserve peace between the two *regna*.¹⁶⁷ As Konstan notes, in the socially powerful Roman culture of reciprocity, *gratia*, which was considered to be a part of language of patronage, could semantically refer to the return for the service one has received.¹⁶⁸ This aligns with the way in which Witigis wrote about his expectations of affection from Justinian I (527-565) for overthrowing Theodahad and revenging Amalasuntha's murder: "it is not difficult (*non est difficile*) to retain the affection (*affectum retinere*) of one who is known to longingly seek

¹⁶⁶Cassiodorus, *Var.* 8.1.3-4 (trans. Bjornlie, 314).

¹⁶⁷Cassiodorus, *Var.* 10.24.2 (trans. Bjornlie, 412-413); *Var.* 10.32.3 (trans. Bjornlie, 421). Thus, the queen Gudeliva writes to Theodora the next words: "...he may bring delight regarding the preservation of peace and he may cause us to rejoice in celebration of a secured favor (*gratiae*). For by such an advantage both the order of affairs is well disposed and the twin affection (*geminata affectio*) of your tranquility is increased".

¹⁶⁸Konstan, *Friendship*, 123.

your favor (*gratiam*).”¹⁶⁹ Similarly, Cassiodorus invokes the commitment with “sincere affection” (*pura affectione*) as a valid reason for receiving Justinian’s benevolence: “Bestow, therefore, the example of your kindness (*benignitas*) on the whole world, so that one who commends himself to you with sincere affection [i.e., Theodahad] should be known by how much he may be advanced.”¹⁷⁰ The reciprocity of such affection also was approached in another way: in a letter to Theodora, an eastern empress, trying to secure Theodora’s patronage in the ratification of a treaty between the Eastern Roman Empire and the Ostrogoths, Theodahad implies that such conferred favour could make the beneficiary, that is, Theodahad, to “begin holding” (*coepimus habere*) affection (*affectum*) as a morally and socially obligatory feeling, which could increase with the continuous flow of imperial favours provided that Theodora continued intervening to advocate the peace treaties between the Empire and Ostrogoths.¹⁷¹

Third, while the patronal affection with its mostly evacuated affective content instituted the relationship of patronage between the emperor and the king and the public affection served as a sentiment of transpersonal concord between two polities, Cassiodorus’s *spiritual / Christian love* symbolised a type of spiritual love between the two rulers which could be actually perceived as affective. As Pétré argues, in the Christianized Roman Empire, *caritas* customarily meant a spiritual love,¹⁷² the meaning which in the letters with imperial addressees, shares at least some common features with Cassiodorus’s seemingly Christianised usage of *caritas* striped of Roman emotive coding. Thus, in a letter to Theodora, asking for some vaguely formulated favour, Amalasuntha presents *caritas* as a complementing sentiment to concord, which spiritually deepens their bond in the written communication: “Concord (*concordia*) is not only had in immediate presence, for on the contrary, those who conjoin themselves with the affection of the rational soul (*caritate animi*) behold each other more truly.”¹⁷³ It is important to note that Cassiodorus explicitly claimed *animus*, i.e., rational soul, as the seat of *caritas*. *Animus* in Roman philosophical discourse was traditionally regarded as one of the parts of mental apparatus where emotional movements as such were generated and experienced.¹⁷⁴ It should also be noted that Cassiodorus’s use of the noun *caritas* was frequently inextricably associated with and

169Cassiodorus, *Var.* 10.32.3 (trans. Bjornlie, 421).

170Cassiodorus, *Var.* 10.19.1 (trans. Bjornlie, 408).

171Cassiodorus, *Var.* 10.23.3 (trans. Bjornlie, 412).

172Hélène Pétré, *Caritas. Etude Sur Le Vocabulaire Latin de La Charité Chrétienne* (Louvain: Louvain Spicilegium Sacrum Lovaniense, 1948), 200-239.

173Cassiodorus, *Var.* 10.10.1 (trans. Bjornlie, 400).

174Barbara H. Rosenwein, *Generations of Feeling*, 62-63, 68.

complementary to the concept of “concord” between two sovereigns, not only in the above mentioned example, but also when Theodahad, concerned with the preservation of peace, made mention of “praiseworthy love” (*praedicabili caritate*) as the solid foundation for establishing shared concord between himself and the emperor.¹⁷⁵ According to Cristini, in Cassiodorus’s diplomatic letters concord meant public friendship, i.e., friendship between two nations or kingdoms,¹⁷⁶ *caritas* this indicated an affective and private dimension of this friendship that, if it was not private per se, was perceived as more private with its emphasis on the spiritual bond. Furthermore, in Cassiodorus’s perspective, the *caritas* of the rulers was a personal feeling of bond that could condition the alliance of two *regna*. In the same letter to Theodora, in which Theodahad asks her to advocate on a treaty between the Eastern Roman Empire and the Ostrogoths, Cassiodorus assumes that the emperor’s public acknowledgment of the grace of peace (*gratia pacis*), conferred upon Theodahad, would certify that their alliance (*foedus*) is caused by their “great bond of love” (*per tale vinculum caritatis*).¹⁷⁷ Occasionally, the script of spiritual love possesses an explicit Christian connotation associated with religious affairs or care for spiritual well-being of one’s neighbour. For example, in a letter to Justinian (535), Theodahad, after receiving the imperial letter pertaining to the theological matters and – most importantly – sending his reply with the same imperial envoy, Heracleianus, who is identified as a priest in the text of the letter, specifies that his response is composed “with as much affection as we are able” (*quanta valemus caritate*) in hopes to enjoy such sweet conversation with Emperor in future as well.¹⁷⁸

Fourth, although *the personal love* is most apparent in the gendering of emotions, a topic that I will address below, there are also some prominent examples of its use in the relationship between male royal figures. For this type, Cassiodorus employs the noun *amor*, applying it to the cases when like-mindedness and a degree of intimacy between actors were indicated, suggested or intended to be perceived: firmly established private friendship and / or moral similarity, as the one between Theodoric and Anastasius¹⁷⁹ and Justin and

175Cassiodorus, *Var.* 10.19.2 (trans. Bjornlie, 408). In the letter to Justinian, Cassiodorus as Theodahad’s mouthpiece articulated this idea in the following way: “Indeed, we need not mention the blessings of your concord (*concordiae*). Whatever will be shared with you in praiseworthy affection is considered entirely distinguished”.

176Marco Cristini, “Concordia Theodericiana,” *Latomus*, no. 2 (2019): 325-326.

177Cassiodorus, *Var.* 10.23.2 (trans. Bjornlie, 412).

178Cassiodorus, *Var.* 10.25.1 (trans. Bjornlie, 413).

179Cassiodorus, *Var.* 1.1.2 (trans. Bjornlie, 35); Cristini, “Concordia Theodericiana,” 324–25.

Theodoric,¹⁸⁰ or personal acquaintance, as in the case of Justinian and Witigis, who had served as an envoy of Athalaric to the eastern court of Justin before his elevation in 536.¹⁸¹

Overall, all these scripts display a broad range of emotive performativity, which is both embedded in the understanding of a shared intellectual and political (in case of public affection) culture and emotive mentalities (similar conceptualisations in the case of Christian love and Roman emotive discourses of friendship as well as patronage). It is also apparent that the so-called flawed Ostrogothic kings both disrupt and reinforce the emotive norms of expressing affection.

Familial, Matrimonial Affection and Gendered Love Expression

Variae's letters covering the familial affairs comprise only eleven letters in the royal correspondence, however, as I have shown above, the familial sentiments were ostensibly underlying cultural and literary conventions of the Italo-Roman elite for expressing emotions of love in certain situations and types of love. The love vocabulary to depict the familial relations espoused both a variety of love terms such as *affectus/affectio*, *dilectio*, and *caritas* and a notable absence of the most intensively affectively suggesting terminology of *amor*¹⁸² and the verbs *amare/diligere*. As I argue, considering the contextualised signifying potential of *amor* as used in the *Variae*, its meaning as an intimate form of love based on homo-social friendship and/or moral similarity might not have been always applicable to the contexts of family, which, first and foremost, the Italo-Roman elite conceived as a socially constitutive unit, the protection and upholding of which was vital for dictating the stability of household and community in general. Overall, the larger category of 'familial love' can be divided into the smaller sub-categories, which does not own distinct scripts, but rather present certain modes within a familial script, such as 'parental love,' 'fraternal love,' and 'matrimonial

180Cassiodorus, *Var.* 8.1.2 (trans. Bjornlie, 314). Thus, king Athalaric wrote to emperor Justin in the following words: "But as it concerns the reputation of your duty to cherish (*diligere*) those whose fathers you have loved (*amasse*)—for nobody is believed to have devoted pure kindness to the elders of a family unless he is shown to regard the offspring as his own—let animosity be buried with the deceased."

181Cassiodorus, *Var.* 10.32.3 (trans. Bjornlie, 421).

¹⁸² Used only once *amor* appears to rather portray matrimonial and gendered ideals rather than a relationship between two spouses: "we order you released from the exile that you had been sentenced to, since for a married man to draw steel on behalf of his **love of chastity** (*amore pudicitiae*) is not to trample the laws under foot, but to honor them [the letter addresses the issue of an honour killing and absolves the accused from the previously imposed exile provided that he can demonstrate adultery as a cause of the murder." Cassiodorus, *Var.* 1.37.3 (trans. Bjornlie, 69).

love' – as I have stressed, the heterosexual passionate love has never made an appearance in the *Variae*.

Parental love explicitly features only in two places showing both father's and mother's love. In the letter to Symmachus, conspicuously known as an adopted father of Boethius, Theodoric appoints him to investigate the case of possible parricide, using the term *affectus* customarily recognised, as I have indicated, for the paternal connotative associations to specify expected filial love:

Oh, the grief (*pro dolor*)! Do we not deserve the **affectio of those for whom we would not refuse to undergo utter ruin** [i.e., the affection of the children] (*affectus eorum*)? The cares of a father (*genitoris cura*) do not flee from the very ocean when it is stirred by savage storms, so that he might attain through foreign commerce what he may leave behind for his offspring.¹⁸³

Notably, the rhetorical expressiveness of the entire paragraph such as a rhetorical exclamation *pro dolor*, explicitly emotional language (*affectus*, *cura*), and a metaphor of stormy ocean shows an intended conceptualisation of a fatherly bond as primarily affective and only secondarily, as based on a pragmatic concern for inheritance issues. The similar emotional profundity underpins Cassiodorus's comparison of the public commitment of the praetorian prefect, who allegedly completed the construction of the Ostrogothic fleet, with a maternal love of an Egyptian goddess Isis, who found an impossible cure for Horus's disease: "Thus, while **maternal affection** (*maternal caritas*) hastened her [i.e., Isis, who searched for her son Horus] to fulfill her desire, she was seen to reveal something unknown to the world."¹⁸⁴ Overall, considering a special attention Cassiodorus renders to a ruler's paternal disposition and the emotive expressiveness of parental love, it seems that for him, love between parents and children, despite a pragmatic social dimension, entailed affective feelings as well, which could be recognizable for the sixth-century Italo-Roman elite educated on the moral *exempla* of paternal *pietas* and dedication towards children.¹⁸⁵

¹⁸³ Cassiodorus, *Var.* 2.14.2 (trans. Bjornlie, 90).

¹⁸⁴ Cassiodorus, *Var.* 5.17.4 (trans. Bjornlie, 219). In this case, *caritas* was likely used to indicate the stronger degree of love, given that the connotative associations of *amor* would have implicated feelings of friendship and the word *affectus* would have marked a normative, i.e., socially dictated, commitment to the children, which is not the case.

¹⁸⁵ As Richard Saller states, despite the numerous scholarly attempts to construct an evolutionary view on the notion of *pietas* from a mere filial obedience to reciprocal and affective qualities contained in this virtue as the developments of the late Roman republic, there is some scarce evidence in the pre-Cicero times, which suggest that an affective dimension already constituted a part of this virtue. For more on *pietas* and its meaning in the Roman times, see: Richard P. Saller, *Patriarchy, Property, and Death in the Roman Family* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 105–14. Richard Saller also provides an interesting example: "In the rhetorical treatise of his youth Cicero defined *pietas* as "benivolum offidum" (*Inv.* 2.161). The adjective is noteworthy: *pietas* is more than just duty, "officium"; it is "well-wishing duty" - that is, it includes an affective

Matrimonial love is the most common in this larger category, usually appearing with some formulaic phrasing as *coniugalis affectus* (“conjugal affection”)¹⁸⁶ or *affectus matrimonii* (“affection/condition of a marriage”)¹⁸⁷ that serve to indicate a legally protected marital contract. The use of love vocabulary in these cases seems to specify a bond publicly or divinely sanctioned that, thus, acquires a communally recognised and guarded validity, more than it implies love between spouses in the form of desire or passion. As much as the view of this type of love was grounded in an ethical ideal of, primarily, female chastity, Cassiodorus also shows a conventional understanding of marriage as a socially productive contract: “Among other burdens of the human condition, **conjugal affection** (*coniugalis affectus*) provokes its own particular anxiety: and not without merit, since the source of posterity’s renewal deserves to be held in high regard.”¹⁸⁸ Since most of the letters are focused on the legal cases of adultery and seduction, a pragmatic concern about the property rights and inheritance also takes a place of prominence.¹⁸⁹ Despite the implication of spouses engaging in sexual relations or having possible affective relations,¹⁹⁰ Cassiodorus focuses on a social meaning of the marriage as a successful social contract, which would ensure the social and financial stability of the household – any feelings expressed in the marriage were secondary to its social function.

The last mode of *fraternal affection* comes in several forms that feature brothers in a homosocial environment of the civic elite or in a context of familial reciprocity, which perfectly illustrates the duality of such mode. On the one hand, Cassiodorus could regard the

element.” Saller, *Patriarchy*, 113. Considering that Cicero’s rhetorical treatise *De Inventione* (c.89 BCE) was the “mainstay of the rhetorical education” in the Early Middle Ages, the Italo-Roman elite should have had internalised or acquainted with these ideas as well. Rita Copeland, *Emotion and the History of Rhetoric in the Middle Ages* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2021), 3–4.

¹⁸⁶ Cassiodorus, *Var.* 2.11.1 (trans. Bjornlie, 88).

¹⁸⁷ Cassiodorus, *Var.* 3.14.1 (trans. Bjornlie, 132).

¹⁸⁸ Cassiodorus, *Var.* 2.11.1 (trans. Bjornlie, 88).

¹⁸⁹ Cassiodorus, *Var.* 2.11.1; 3.14.1; 4.12.2; 9.18.4 (trans. Bjornlie, 88, 132, 173, 377-78)

¹⁹⁰ For example, in the letter, which addresses the case of a woman who abandoned her husband for another man, and the mother of her previous husband filed suit in order to recover properties claimed by her former daughter-in-law, Cassiodorus refers to Aetheria setting aside *dilectio mariti*, which, given the context, might have signified also the woman’s love to her first husband: “She [the mother] claims that her own daughter-in-law Aetheria, with the **love of her husband** (*mariti dilectione*) set aside, has bound herself in a covenant of marriage to a certain Liberius, and, since she wishes to display her new marriage bed more lavishly, she hastens to ruin the resources of her first husband, claiming herself to be endowed with the inheritance of her sons, for whom it would be more fitting the property remain intact.” Cassiodorus, *Var.* 4.12.2. However, legal nature of all Cassiodorus’s mentions of matrimonial relations makes it almost impossible to define to which extent an affective meaning is suggested in the first place. There is, however, another similarly affective example of use of *dilectio*, which might imply the stronger affective connotations behind this term: “Nevertheless, let the appraisal not be unjust under this circumstance, lest the wretched would be compelled to bemoan the loss of their means in the midst of the bitterness of painful grief, and they would be forced to acts contrary to devotion, either being pressed upon to lose patrimony on behalf of the dead, or, instead, for the grieving to cast a **beloved body** (*dilecta corpora*) into some base pit.” Cassiodorus, *Var.* 3.19.2 (trans. Bjornlie, 135).

brotherly love as a continuation of the homosocial elite friendships that facilitate internalization of the bureaucratic social codes and rules of behaviour: “For you [i.e., Opilio] have learned the requirements of service from praise for your brother [i.e., Cyprianus, the previous *Comes Sacrarum Largitionum*], to whom you are connected with **shared affection** (*mutuo affectu*). You fulfilled kinship with public duties and brotherhood with participation in counsels.”¹⁹¹ On the other hand, a condition of brotherhood, similarly to parental and filial relations, entailed reciprocal obligations of the social support and protection, the violation of which was a social aberration: “And so we have learned through the tearful petition of Venantius, the legal guardian of Plutianus, that his own brother Neoterius, having forgotten the **condition of brotherhood** (*affectum germanitatis*), has attacked the property of this child with hostile madness.”¹⁹²

To briefly summarise, *Variae*’s familial love, apparently, specified an effective inter-personal relationship between the relatives that culturally prescribed affective and social rules of behaviour rooted in the principles of familial reciprocity and, especially, of a social contract in the marriage. Although Cassiodorus’s primary focus remains on the familial love as a means of maintaining the social stability, Cassiodorus’s valuation of parental love shows his perception of such relations as the most affective familial bond, involving strong commitment and devotion.

In a view of the spatial limitations, I will briefly address the last significant element of the royal correspondence – gendered love expression on the example of the diplomatic communication of Amalasuntha and Gudeliva, Theodohad’s royal consort. In three female letters written by Cassiodorus, one between Amalasuntha and Theodora and two other between Gudeliva and Theodora, the affection is professed by a range of words – *amor*, *affectus/affectio* and the adjective *affectuosus* and *caritas* (9 terms) – however, it is Cassiodorus’s use of *amor* in particular, which offers unparalleled insight into feminine codes of expressing affection. This term makes three appearances only in Gudeliva’s letters to Theodora, of which two are of particular interest. In the letter to Theodora, written in hope of securing patronage of the eastern imperial court through her after Amalasuntha’s assassination (535), Cassiodorus evokes Theodora’s love as a special matter to Gudeliva that would demonstrate imperial benevolence and patronage as well as guarantee public recognition of Theodahad and his reign by other *regna*:

¹⁹¹ Cassiodorus, *Var.* 8.16.3 (trans. Bjornlie, 332).

¹⁹² Cassiodorus, *Var.* 1.8.2 (trans. Bjornlie, 45).

For although this [i.e., your favor] may be entirely dear (*carus*) to him [i.e., Theodahad], it is nevertheless known to be a special matter to me, when the **love of such a great matron** (*amor tantae dominae*) is so able to elevate me that I may come to know something greater beyond a regnum...Your favor (*gratia vestra*) commends us through every *regnum*. For you ought to shed brilliance upon us, we who want to shine with your light.¹⁹³

In the second letter, after Theodora's patronage secured the peace treaty with Constantinople, Cassiodorus appeals to the late-antique commonplace from epistolography of friendship of a letter as a substitute for physical presence and a shared dialogue,¹⁹⁴ however, it is not the letter but the "love of your serenity" (*amor vestrae serenitatis*), i.e., the performed favour, that satisfies Gudeliva to the extent "that we count ourselves as having seen you, whose gracious conversation we have shared."¹⁹⁵

It is crucial to note that through using *amor* and epistolary commonplaces Cassiodorus conflated two scripts of diplomatic affection, that is, patronal love/affection expressed through the fulfilled favor and personal love, manifested in the trope from friendship letters that deems correspondence capable of imitating a personal meeting with shared conversation. Though Cassiodorus did not employ *amor* uniquely in the female correspondence, as I have mentioned above, he otherwise applied it to the entirely different cases when like-mindedness and a degree of intimacy between actors were indicated such as firmly established private friendship and/or moral similarity¹⁹⁶ or personal acquaintance.¹⁹⁷ It seems that in the view of a consistent association of women with the excessive expression and high emotionality in the Roman emotive discourse,¹⁹⁸ Cassiodorus could freely apply a blatantly emotive term from the discourse of friendship for Theodora's love and the expressive topoi of epistolography of friendship for Gudeliva's reaction even though there was no evidence of their actual intimacy or a long-standing record of friendship. Furthermore, the potential ambiguity allowed by the varying signifying potential of *amor* – friendly or familial attachment but also erotic desire¹⁹⁹ – might have excluded it from the opposite-sex diplomatic correspondence, such as the letter exchange between Theodora and Theodahad. Due to such gendering of emotivity, the diplomatic etiquette also allowed Cassiodorus to appeal to Theodora's feminine susceptibility to emotions and compassion by a

¹⁹³ Cassiodorus, *Var.* 10.21.1 (trans. Bjornlie, 410).

¹⁹⁴ Abram, "Latin Letters," 17-77, 224-296.

¹⁹⁵ Cassiodorus, *Var.* 10.24.1 (trans. Bjornlie, 412).

¹⁹⁶ Cassiodorus, *Var.* 1.1.2 (trans. Bjornlie, 35); *Var.* 8.1.2 (trans. Bjornlie, 314).

¹⁹⁷ Cassiodorus, *Var.* 10.32.3 (trans. Bjornlie, 421).

¹⁹⁸ Constantinou and Meyer, *Emotions and Gender*, 4-5.

¹⁹⁹ Barbara H. Rosenwein, *Emotional Communities in the Early Middle Ages* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2006), 45-46.

means of the repeated addresses to her *animus*,²⁰⁰ perceived as one of the main seats of emotions, throughout both Gudeliva's letters. Even Amalasuntha, "a manly Goth who happens to be a woman,"²⁰¹ in her letter to Theodora singled out "love of the heart" (*caritate animi*) as the one that helps to behold each other better.²⁰² Thus, although the female diplomatic correspondence helps to perpetuate and reinforce a male normative code of public behavior which is a strictly defined and stratified system of different scripts, referred to above, at the same time, the gendered conventions dictated women to be, basically, 'women,' people who are allowed to be highly emotively expressive and form homosocial friendly relations by definition or quicker and easier than men, especially if such relations, in Cassiodorus's rhetorical framework, aimed to maintain the social order and stability.

²⁰⁰ Cassiodorus, *Var.* 10.21.2 (trans. Bjornlie, 410); *Var.* 10.24.2 (trans. Bjornlie, 412).

²⁰¹ Arnold, *Theoderic*, 171.

²⁰² Cassiodorus, *Var.* 10.10.1 (trans. Bjornlie, 400). There also remains the question of possible literary and textual examples for such an affectively charged female correspondence, which, unfortunately, requires a separate thorough research.

Chapter 2: *Unam in Omnibus Aequabiliter Caritatem*: Love and Affection in the *formulae*

The books six and seven constitute the distinctive narrative voice of the *formulae* in Cassiodorus's *Variae*. While this voice is mainly characterised by Cassiodorus's assuming of the literary *persona* of the king and intentional omission of the particularities about the appointees' personal qualities, it is also crucial that many evidence point to the time between 531/533 and 537 as the most credible date of *formulae*'s composition,²⁰³ which implies that Cassiodorus might have designed these books in hope to serve as blueprints and forms for a still functioning Ostrogothic administration. Thus, Cassiodorus provides templates for an entire range of social and administrative contexts, where the emotive behavioral codes of involved parties constituted not the last part. Book six contains *formulae* for both titular appointments, such as the consulship and the patrician rank, as well as for offices exercising authority over a certain palatine bureau: the praetorian prefecture, the urban prefecture, the quaestorship, *Magister Officium*, and a variety of other high palatine posts. Book seven displays even less homogeneity and includes three types of *formulae*, which are: the *formulae* for minor comes, prefectures of provinces, cities and specific territories, the *formulae* related to the maintenance of services that were constitutive for the late Roman state (mints, aqueducts, arms factories), and, eventually, the *formulae* in regard to various administrative and legal concerns (confirmation of legitimacy, matrimony and ownership rights, notices to collect tax, and others). As Bjornlie argues, Cassiodorus's *formulae* were generally fashioned to show that the Ostrogothic kingdom and its civic elite followed the Roman tradition of public appointments to palatine and other public offices.²⁰⁴ However, as I have already noted, Cassiodorus's agenda should not be confined to political apology alone.²⁰⁵ When describing his motivations for the composition of the *Variae* in the first preface, Cassiodorus wrote: "Then will your work be capable of educating, without offense and by means of *studied eloquence*, those *unlearned men* who must be *prepared for public office* [the cursive is mine – A.M.]". In the first *praefatio*, he separately specifies the intended target audience of the stylistic examples provided in the six and seven books: since he wants to prevent writing

²⁰³ Jan Prostko-Prostynski, "Zur Chronologie Der Bücher VI Und VII Der "Variae" von Cassiodor," *Historia: Zeitschrift Für Alte Geschichte* 53, no. 4 (2004): 503–8.

²⁰⁴ Bjornlie, *Politics and Tradition*, 230–34.

²⁰⁵ Arnold, *Theoderic*, 47.

speeches “hastily and without polish”, he includes formulas in his work, so “however late I might take care for my own reputation, I may assist my successors in the near future.”²⁰⁶

Since Cassiodorus pursued an aim to provide refined rhetorical and stylistic models for administrative writing, which is especially evident in the *formulae*,²⁰⁷ such models were conceived as a constitutive element in effective perpetuation and reinforcement of the Italo-Roman social structures, including the social and affective bonds through the rhetoric of love. Similarly to the royal correspondence, Cassiodorus’s formulas are informed by emotive vocabulary and conventions of late Roman imperial legal writing and the late Roman epistolary codes of affection, which could have met a horizon of feeling of the Italo-Roman elite.^{208 209} However, the two books of formulas, while encompassing all kinds of social interactions, constitute the least ‘emotional’ narrative voice (29 love terms),²¹⁰ despite covering an almost entire range of affectionate vocabulary, except *dilectio*, that is, *amor*, *affectus/affectio*, *caritas*, *amare* with its grammatical variations, and *diligere*. Apart from obvious reasons of a small size – the *formulae* comprise only around 14 percent of the work, – this is an apparent consequence of the decontextualised nature of such templates, which are stripped of specified and individualised senders and recipients and their construed characteristics as well as of reality of politically motivated actions, which Cassiodorus clarifies himself in the *praefatio*: “Thus what I have said concerning past offices applies to future ones, since I have described the suitability, not of the persons, but of the offices that they were deemed fit to hold.”²¹¹ Three types of *formulae* are particularly abundant with love and affection terminology such as the *formulae*, which announce the appointment to the urban offices (Rome, Ravenna, and provincial cities), the *formulae*, which emphasize the intimacy between the office and *princeps*, and the *formulae*, which render legitimate legal and administrative changes. Building on that, I argue that Cassiodorus ascribes to the formulas an especial degree of normativity that, in the case of the regnal affection, simplifies a spectrum of applicable scripts, while, considering the primary audience of the Italo-Roman civic elite, in the case of civic affection, provides several *exempla* of social and affective bonds possible.

²⁰⁶ Cassiodorus, *Var.*, praef. 14 (trans. Bjornlie, 34).

²⁰⁷ Gillett, “The Purposes,” 45–46.

²⁰⁸ Bjornlie, *Politics and Tradition*, 206–15.

²⁰⁹ Vidén, *The Roman Chancery Tradition*, 73–75.

²¹⁰ Overall, out of the seventy-two *formulae* in the *Variae* terms referring to love and affection occur in fifteen.

²¹¹ Cassiodorus, *Var.*, praef. 14 (trans. Bjornlie, 34).

Regnal Affection and Love²¹²

Despite a relatively small quantity of love terms related to the relationship between a ruler and his officials and subordinates (8 terms), it comprises the largest category in the formulas, thus, indicating Cassiodorus's clear priority given to this inter-personal relationship in a successful functioning of the government. Such sociocultural importance projected on the relationship between a king and subjects for Ostrogothic institutional continuity and stability also corresponds to the findings from the previous chapter, where within Cassiodorus's rhetorical framework, Theodahad's miscommunication of regnal affection mirrored his political incapacity and an eventual outburst of Gothic war. In the formulas, only *the script of ceremonialised affection* (*affectus/affectio*) appears with a statistically significant frequency, which, considering the placement in the formulas, apparently, was recognised or Cassiodorus intended to be recognised as a normative code of Ostrogothic ruler's behavior, in Foucault's terms, a sort of "regulatory ideal" for an asymmetrical relationship that still retained the affective connotation, shaped by the Italo-Roman horizon of feeling. In the very same manner, as in the royal correspondence, this affection signifies the favourable attitude of the ruler towards the official manifested in a concrete favour such as appointment, as, for example, states the formula for a *Quaestor*: "if the frequent attention of the ruler demonstrates affection (*affectum*), then no magistrate is able to be more honored than one who has received a share of our deliberations."²¹³ Accordingly, Cassiodorus employs language of reciprocity and patronage while exhorts the *referendarius*, an official responsible of rendering the summaries of ongoing legal disputes before the king, to "cherish (*amate*) what glorifies us:" "We exact a certain peculiar tribute from you, so just as we share intimate conversation with you, thus may our reputation particularly deserve affection from you (*a vobis affectum*)."²¹⁴ In both cases the affection is staged as inherent in intimacy, at a first glance, reminiscent of the script of intimate love since affection either is given as a sign of intimacy or requires an expected reciprocity for the granted by the Ostrogothic king's intimacy, which these two offices as the king's public and court mouthpieces respectively could boast of.²¹⁵ However, in my opinion, this should be understood rather as a means of social differentiation in the formulas, in the first place, than as a separate script because

²¹² Apart from the social scenarios, analysed above, in the formulas, there are also other, less statistically important contexts of love, which I will disregard due to the spatial limitations, but which are enumerated in Appendix 2.

²¹³ Cassiodorus, *Var.* 6.5.1 (trans. Bjornlie, 251).

²¹⁴ Cassiodorus, *Var.*, 6.17.5 (trans. Bjornlie, 267).

²¹⁵ Cassiodorus, *The Complete Translation*, 250–51, 266.

Cassiodorus seems to draw a distinguishing line in emotive performativity between palatine officials such as a *Quaestor* and referendarius, and minor officials, echoing a differentiation between *amor* and *affectus/affectio* in the royal correspondence based on the social rank of an addressee where *amor* was reserved exclusively to *vir illustris*. In the case of generally less esteemed provincial officials or of those more remote from the court such as the praeses,²¹⁶ the focus shifts from intimacy to the moral behaviour of the official, thus, affection is not an inherent part of the office's privileges and reciprocal obligations or a normative manifestation of regnal virtue of generosity and clemency but needs to be deserved through the ethical public service and submission to "royal will in laws:" "Furthermore, we shall not leave unremunerated what we hear you have accomplished in upstanding manner. Fear vice and you will deserve the affection of the *Princeps* (*mereris affectum*)."²¹⁷

Apart from this principle of social discernment in emotive performativity in the formulas, Cassiodorus leaves an opportunity for discerning another affectively charged and personalised type of regnal love, using the signifying potential and connotative associations of *amor*. In the formula by which provincials might be restored to the Senate, the rhetorical formulation of the encouraged ruler's attitude towards the Senate shows a customary perception of an ideal ruler as an affective and compassionate one:

It is certain that we want the curia of the Senate be filled with an ample and natural fertility and that its offspring increase so much that (what is the most troublesome kind of longing) it may be known to fulfill the wishes of the parents. But to seek something less from whence it is possible to increase ranks in number is not a **fuller kind of love** (*minus amantis*).²¹⁸

Cassiodorus also draws a comparison between a farmer's love to his cultivated trees and a *princeps*'s cultivation of the "rustics," i.e., provincials, among the senators to "grow them with good habits:" "A farmer cherishing (*diligens*) the coming shoots assists the heavenly rain and irrigates beforehand the young trees that deserve beneficial rain [...] Thus do we desire to bring the sweetest praise of virtue to bear upon the distinction of Gabinius."²¹⁹ Notably, this letter is the only one in the entire books of the formulas, which does not come decontextualised, having a proper recipient of the favours and, thus, giving an

²¹⁶ A provincial administrative position, devoid of military authority and mostly limited to fiscal matters.

²¹⁷ Cassiodorus, *Var.*, 7.2.3 (trans. Bjornlie, 280). It is also interesting that a specific stylistic feature detectable in such contexts emphasizes if not necessarily the imperative force of this emotional script *stricto sensu*, then the affective and symbolic distance between the ruler and the official. Cassiodorus uses in such cases the verbs in the imperative mood and formulates a direct command for the provincial official (*horre*), while the affection from the referendarius is framed as a subjective polite wish, expressed in the subjunctive mood (*mereatur*). However, it will require a further analysis, since, as Vidén states, imperative mood in the *Variae* serves primarily a stylistic function and does not possess a customarily associated with it jussive connotation.

²¹⁸ Cassiodorus, *Var.*, 6.14.1 (trans. Bjornlie, 264).

²¹⁹ Cassiodorus, *Var.*, 6.14.2 (trans. Bjornlie, 264).

exemplum of empirical implementation of regnal affective rhetoric, which might explain a single appearance of the grammatical variation of *amor* in the formulas with regard to this type of social relations between the ruling person and his public servants. Although the formulas do not provide a full-fledged script of regnal intimate love, they do suggest not only a successful inter-personal relationship but also potentiality of affective relations between the ruler and officials by drawing connotative associations between *amor/amare* as well as high social status and intimacy to the king and a form of regnal affection perceived as more committed and emotionally profound.

Given the possible date of the composition of the formulas, Cassiodorus's use of *caritas* also strikes a familiar chord with the late Ostrogothic royal correspondence when it comes to Athalaric's emotive persona and an appearance of love towards the royal subjects with unequivocal Christian connotations. In the formula for the Comes of the Goths of a particular city, addressed, however, to both the Romans and Goths, the regnal love is specified as a sentiment of ruler's equal appreciation and genuine commitment to all his subordinates, Goths and Romans alike, under the divine blessing:

Thus by the grace of divine authority (*divinitate propitia*) may both people enjoy sweet prosperity and a shared peace. Know, though, that for us there is but **one equal affection for all men** (*nobis in omnibus aequabiliter esse caritatem*); but that man who cherishes the laws (*dilexerit*) with a moderate intention will be able to commend himself more amply to our heart (*animo nostro*).²²⁰

Having a strong sociocultural Christian connotation, this type of regnal love is also heavily dependent on a perception and emotive engagement of an addressed audience, which, in this case, consisted of both Roman and Gothic citizens, who might not have shared many sociocultural and emotive vocabulary and codes, except the Christian ones, but I will return to this issue shortly below.

To summarise, in the formulas, profession of regnal affection clearly marks a successful inter-personal relationship between a ruler and officials and performs a similar function as in the royal correspondence – provides a recognised and expected code of ruler's behaviour and of social as well as of affective bonds. Due to the decontextualised nature of such formulas, unlike in the royal correspondence, Cassiodorus's cannot give his valuations of emotive comportment of the certain kings (Theodoric's and even more Athalaric's affectionate ruling and Theodahad's divergent affection) or praise specific virtues and actions of candidates (Artemidorus's friendship, Senarius's fidelity, Tuluin's love, etc.), which

²²⁰ Cassiodorus, *Var.* 7.3.2 (trans. Bjornlie, 280-281).

essentially minimises the used love vocabulary to *affectus* and *caritas*. The formulas, though, strengthen a sense of normativity behind Cassiodorus's construed script of regnal ceremonialised affection – which retains an association with parental feelings lexically – and reinforce the Christianised signifying potential of *caritas* in the late Ostrogothic context. Simultaneously, formulas are not completely devoid of implications of an existence of perceived profound personal commitment between a king and an official or more empathetic regnal love, which are articulated both semantically, through a specific emphasis on intimacy and proximity (social as well) to the ruler, and lexically, through language of *amare*.

Civic Sentiments: Civic Affection, Civic Devotion and Public *Exempla*

The second largest category of social interactions in the formulas is the civic sentiments, precisely, their public dimension (6 terms), which covers a relatively modest range of love vocabulary, that is, *affectus/affectio*, *amor*, and *amare* with the grammatical variations. All of them could be roughly united under the notion of emotive script of civic affection. For Cassiodorus, such civic affection signifies a cohesive community-based feeling which brings residents of the cities and their officials together but most importantly, it concerns the municipal offices of the main cities of the Ostrogothic kingdom where a public's appreciation and gratitude is most expected in reciprocity to outstanding administrative service of an official. In the two of the *formulae*, transmitted in the *Variae*, one for the *praefectus annonae* in Rome and another for the *praefectus vigilum* of Ravenna, after a lengthy praise of the successful fulfilment of duties and responsibilities by these officials, Cassiodorus wrote about such *ciuitatis affectus* and *affection ciuim*. In the former, Cassiodorus presented the glory and praise of the citizens as a logical consequence of winning their affection, which the official should strive for: "You hasten nourishment to and from the guilds of the millers, you enforce the correct weight and purity of bread, nor do you deem it demeaning why it is that Rome is able to praise you, and rightly so, when the **affection of this city** (*ciuitatis affectus*) is a singular glory."²²¹ In the latter, the affection, ascribed to the citizens, assumes a role of a medium through which official's power is substantiated and fairly legitimized in a social contract between citizens and an official: "O

²²¹ Cassiodorus, *Var.* 6.18.1 (trans. Bjornlie, 268).

what a command to receive with the **great affection of the citizens** (*nimia civium affectione*)! You presume to search for robbers whom the property owner is unable to find for himself and, generous on two accounts, you both obstruct future thefts and you prevent their present occurrence!”²²²

Unlike with the representation of regnal sentiments in the formulas, in the civic context, Cassiodorus uses *amor* and *affectus* as almost synonymous. Thus, in the formula to *praefectus Urbis*, who occupies a venerable position as the head of administrative apparatus of Rome, Cassiodorus puts an emphasis on another crucial component of public service, i.e., administrative integrity, as an subject of public love, while contrasting the official’s public commitment to “desire for [personal] favours” (*studium gratificationis*): “Separate the desire for favors (*studium gratificationis*) from yourself. It is necessary that you have the **love of the public** (*publicum amorem*) if you would promise nothing as a bribe.”²²³

As the books of formulas were perceived as a repository of models for imitation, instead of fashioning an emotive persona, as he does in the royal or praetorian correspondence, Cassiodorus features an extensive historical *exemplum* of Pompey the Great, as a model for civic devotion, who functioned as *praefectus annonae* in 58-53 BCE, years of severe grain shortages:

Pompey attained the summit of public life with foresight for the extent of alimentary resources, since it is rightly the singular desire of a people (*singularis amor populi*) that it will be free from want. Hence that man earned popular applause (*plausum*) and gratitude (*gratificationem*); hence **was he always singularly loved** (*unice semper amatus est*) and, in the gratitude of every citizen, he surpassed the deeds of the greatest men.²²⁴

Additionally, Cassiodorus also suggests that Pompey’s cognomen “the Great” (*Magnus*) was an expression of public love and reciprocal honouring of his public activity rather than of his renowned military victories.²²⁵ The explicit descriptive emotional signifiers and contextual ones, embedded in cultural and literary conventions of late-antique honorary inscriptions, convey an emotional dimension of such public affection, which the Italo-Roman audience could have recognised through interpreting the adverb *unice*, the verb *amare* that personalises the subjects of affection and their agency and, allegedly, the very fact of commemorialisation of Pompey’s eternal public glory in his cognomen.²²⁶ Thus, Pompey’s

²²² Cassiodorus, *Var.* 7.8.2 (trans. Bjornlie, 286).

²²³ Cassiodorus, *Var.* 6.4.4 (trans. Bjornlie, 250).

²²⁴ Cassiodorus, *Var.* 6.18.3 (Bjornlie, 268).

²²⁵ Cassiodorus, *Var.* 6.18.3 (trans. Bjornlie, 268).

²²⁶ An interesting place to look at and compare with Cassiodorus’s rendering would be honorary inscriptions to Pompey, however, it goes outside the scope of the present research.

exemplum casts a strong social and affective bond between the citizens and an official as well as administrative excellence as a more desirable community-based code of behaviour beneficial even in terms of public glory. The latter is even rendered explicit in the formula for the curator of a city with Cassiodorus's remark that the public honour is second only to the distinction of the *princeps*:

Although one who seems to cause the least disquiet for his own city and enjoys great respect among his citizens, for **whom the citizens profess love** (*qui cives se amare professus est*), on this account may be considered respectable, nonetheless, the only indisputable distinction is conferred by our choice, since anything appointed by the authority of a Princeps is considered to be furnished by good planning.²²⁷

Despite the rhetorical juxtaposing of "indisputable distinction" and public appreciation, Cassiodorus acknowledged that the official, "for whom the citizens profess love," may be considered respectable. Though it could be argued that the examples mentioned above deal with two fundamentally different binary distinctions (military/civic, public/regnal), the fact that both of them use the public affection as their point of reference reflects a profound embeddedness of this script in the emotive ideology of the Italo-Roman elite as represented by Cassiodorus. Eventually, such *topoi* of public love that is manifested through abstract, at a first glance, notions of "glory (*gloria*)," "applause (*plausus*)" and "gratitude (*gratificatio*)" ties in with the Roman culture of praise of virtue as a practice both communally and personally beneficial in terms of enhancing the social reputation of the virtuous individual. The civic Italo-Roman elite operated in intensely competitive milieu both at the court and at the administrative service, to which the desire and struggle for glory was a logical extension.²²⁸ Thus, in *De Consolatione Philosophiae*, Boethius, a philosopher and high official contemporary to Cassiodorus, refers to "the desire for glory and the reputation for outstanding achievements in the service of the state" (*gloriae scilicet cupido et optimorum in rem publicam fama meritorum*) as something, which entices even the most outstanding minds.²²⁹

Although Cassiodorus conceives of the civic affection as primarily a sign of successful inter-subjective relations between community and government, he also leaves an open space for suggesting affective inter-personal ties or an emotional motivation, which is

²²⁷ Cassiodorus, *Var.* 7.12.1 (trans. Bjornlie, 289).

²²⁸ Tacoma, *Roman Political Culture*, 205.

²²⁹ Anicius Manlius Severinus Boethius, P. G. Walsh, and Anicius Manlius Severinus Boethius, *The Consolation of Philosophy*, Oxford World's Classics (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 93. Anicius Manlius Severinus Boethius, *De consolatione philosophiae*, ed. Claudio Moreschini, Ed. altera, Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana (Monachii et Lipsiae: Saur, 2005), 50.

strengthened by Cassiodorus's use of *amare*. While Pompey's example above has emotive suggestiveness of a profound public commitment to Pompey that could have been deciphered by the Italo-Roman elite familiarised with epigraphic language of praise, the *formulae* of the *praefectus vigilium* of Ravenna presents an ancient etymology of the word "*praefectus*" that connects this office with a personal official's dedication to entrusted people: "Rightly did wise antiquity select for you the glorious name of praefectus, since it would not have been possible to award such a title, except to **one who loved the citizens more than his own interests** (*qui cives a suis commodis plus amabat*)."²³⁰

Contrarily, in the civic context, the verb *diligere* makes its appearances almost exclusively with the moral values and abstract notions. Among those values and abstractions are the traditional Roman virtues, which are supposed to balance the potential excesses in the performance of official duties: restraint (*continentia*) for *praefectus vigilium*,²³¹ chastity (*castitas*) for *tribunus voluptatum*²³² or the significance of 'loving' the office itself.²³³ Though in all these instances Cassiodorus uses the imperative mood, Vidén points out that his imperative is devoid of imminent jussive significance and mostly expresses admonitions to act according the moral concepts or receive a bestowed honour or office.²³⁴ All these examples seem to point to the conclusion that in the voice of the *formulae*, *diligere* served not as a part of socially prescribed community-based behaviour of an official as opposed to *amare*, but enhanced Cassiodorus's moral discourse in the *Variae*, which, though complementary to his affective rhetoric in social interactions, falls outside the scope of the present research.

To briefly summarise, in the formulas, the script of civic affection appears inextricably tied with the Roman culture of public achievement and praise as well as public expectation of the administrative integrity and faithful fulfillment of public duties. This is an intra-communal feeling, which primarily underscores a sociocultural behavioural code for both community and the official embedded in the culture of reciprocity: an official, as a

²³⁰ Cassiodorus, *Var.* 7.8.3 (trans. Bjornlie, 286).

²³¹ Cassiodorus, *Var.* 7.8.4 (trans. Bjornlie, 286).

²³² Cassiodorus, *Var.* 7.10.3 (trans. Bjornlie, 288). This example presents a particular interest for further emotive studies, so I provide it in full: "Therefore, our preference appoints you *Tribunus Voluptatum* for the present indiction, so that you may conduct everything in such a way that you would associate the wishes of the city with yourself, lest what had been established for delight, in your tenure should be found transformed to blameworthy conduct. Preserve your own good reputation with the infamy of the lowly. One to whom prostitutes are subject must esteem chastity, just as it was said with great praise, "He is a man who pursued the virtues when involved in public spectacles." For we wish that through the governance of something frivolous, you should attain a more serious office."

²³³ Cassiodorus, *Var.*, 6.20.4 (trans. Bjornlie, 272).

²³⁴ Vidén, *The Roman Chancery Tradition*, 66–67.

communal patron, fulfills his duties and a community, as a grateful client, reciprocates his good deeds in honour and public reputation. However, it is notable that the formulas never completely disregard the affective dimension of such public commitment from both sides, framing it with the verb *amare* and the conventions of honorary inscriptions, on which I elaborate in Chapter 3.

Roman-Gothic Affection: Constructing the Emotive Script

The letter with the formula for the Comes of the Goths of a particular city contains a curious example of descriptive-prescriptive emotive script between Romans and Goths. As Ríkharðsdóttir points out, the prescriptive emotive scripts “introduce or institute new behavioral patterns or mentalities into their respective reading communities” or “novel codes of conduct,”²³⁵ while descriptive emotive scripts “reflect communally held values and conventionalized emotional behaviours.” In the case of Cassiodorus’s formulas, it is almost impossible to tell to which extent the emotive performance described prescribed or reflected the conventionalized emotive codes, considering that at the time of composition of formulas the Ostrogothic kingdom already witnessed the decades of Romano-Gothic co-existence as well as a scarcity of narrative sources coming from that region. The emotive code introduced in this Cassiodorus’s formula might have intended to renegotiate as well as solidify the basis of interaction between Italo-Romans and ethnic Other, namely the Goths, encouraging rhetoric of reciprocal love and affection as a fundament of peaceful, yet, clearly, administratively and legally demarcated in separate jurisdictions co-existence.²³⁶

While writing from the perspective of the rhetorical *persona* of the ruler, Cassiodorus distinguishes two different parts of this emotive script, using, while not multiple, but quite intensively located within a space of one letter love terms of *caritas*, *amare* and *diligere*. In accordance with Jonathan Arnold’s analysis, the first part conforms to the Ostrogothic ideology of Roman legal and institutional continuity and self-identification with the tradition of Roman law and, by extension, the Roman way of life, in which the love rhetoric adds an emotional dimension to this self-representation. The king proclaims that he has “one equal love for all people” (*unam in omnibus aequabiliter caritatem*), Christian-connoted love, as I have discussed above, however, true affection and proximity to the king

²³⁵ Sif Ríkharðsdóttir, *Emotion in Old Norse Literature*, 29.

²³⁶ As Bjornlie states, this letter presents the ideology of separate jurisdictions for Romans and Goths, which, however, should be understood as the traditional imperial distinction between the military and civilians. Bjornlie, *The Variae: The Complete Translation*, 280.

one might deserve specifically by performing a classical Roman virtue of moderation: “the man who cherishes (*dilexerit*) the laws with a moderate intention (*moderate voluntate*) will be able to commend himself more amply to our heart.”²³⁷ Elaborating on moderation, the king declares that “we do not love (*amamus*) anything uncivil,” that is, pertaining not to the Roman laws, but to a law of spontaneous violence and chaos, associated with the figure of a barbarian, as we have seen in the diplomatic communication, and eventually, finishes with another statement: “we should not allow anything to increase among you that pertains to hatred (*odium*).”

After *odium*, a usual rhetorical and emotive counterpart of *amor*, in the second part of the script, Cassiodorus follows to explain what kind of relationship should be introduced and navigate a co-living of the Goths and the Italo-Romans, which appears to be mutual affection and love. Both nations are urged to “pay heed to what we [i.e., the king] love (*amamus*);” here the verb form “we love” (*amamus*) most likely is a rhetorical callback and parallel to the above-mentioned dedication to the Roman laws and absence of hatred. Though the two peoples are equally encouraged to love the Roman legal and civic system, Cassiodorus also sets out two distinctively different codes of love for Romans and Goths: “Just as the Romans are neighbors to your [i.e., Gothic] properties (*possessionibus vicini*), so should they also be conjoined to you in affection (*sint et caritate coniuncti*). You, however, O Romans, ought to cherish (*diligere debetis*) with great enthusiasm the Goths, who in peace make you a populous people and who defend the entire republic in wars.”²³⁸

This fragment is generally perceived to be as emblematic as constitutive for the Ostrogothic rhetoric of restoration of the Romanness and a potential mechanism of ‘romanization’ of Goths.²³⁹ Yet the connotative associations behind the two different sets of vocabulary employed are worthy of mention. In case of the Romans, who “ought to cherish (*diligere*)” Goths, the verb *diligere*, unlike the verb *amare*, which in the context of the royal correspondence, has a coherent pattern of being associated with the late Roman imperial virtues or practices, seems to be devoid of such connotative associations with Romanness. Furthermore, in the Roman literary discourse, the verb *diligere* was customarily used to designate an unideal type of love, the one which is performed between people who are not equal or belong to different social groups.²⁴⁰ Thus, the rhetorical and lexical formulation of

²³⁷ Cassiodorus, *Var.* 7.3.2 (trans. Bjornlie, 280).

²³⁸ Cassiodorus, *Var.* 7.3.3 (trans. Bjornlie, 280).

²³⁹ Arnold, *Theoderic*, 126–37. Patrick Amory, *People and Identity*, 51–53. Arnold, Bjornlie, Sessa, *A Companion*, 218–20.

²⁴⁰ See, for example, Cicero explicitly associating *amare* with the sentiment of equality, political solidarity, and belonging: “therefore, as it pleases you, we take care not to offend anyone’s mind, and that **we may be loved** (*diligamur*) even by those who grieve that we are so united to Caesar, but by those who are equal (*aequis*), or

love of the Italo-Romans towards Goths shows a perception of the Romano-Gothic consensual co-living as a social contract between two socioculturally distant parties, in which the Italo-Romans should acknowledge their debt for Goths, who defend the Ostrogothic kingdom in the war times and, thus, follow the Roman laws. Contrarily, for a Gothic audience, Cassiodorus employs the term *caritas* which considering the shared Christian background of the ‘Arian’ Goths to the Nicene Italo-Romans, is strongly reminiscent of Christian love of God and, even more specifically, its first realization, i.e., love of neighbor (*amor proximi*) – the impression intensifies with Cassiodorus’s naming of Romans as “neighbours.”²⁴¹ Thus, Cassiodorus, surprisingly, intends to prescribe for the Goths not a contractual but a Christian charitable understanding of love as a basis for a harmonic co-existence with the Romans. The same term *caritas* used earlier to designate the Christian love for all people without concrete sociocultural and ethnic affiliations gains another Christian overtone too. As Cassiodorus contrasted it with the true proximity to king’s “heart” achieved through conforming to a Roman ethos and laws, it reinforces a link between the Ostrogothic king and his dedication to Romanness.

These two distinct types of love could be also said to reflect the emotive ideology of the dominating emotional ‘community’ of the Italo-Roman elite concerning the Italo-Roman and Gothic normative modes of behaviour. The fact that for both sides the word *amor* was not employed for signifying love ever once implies that the Italo-Roman elite did not imagine the Goths as active actors in the civic life, partakers in the public Romanness, or participants of affective bonds with the Italo-Romans. Furthermore, this formula technically established the separate jurisdiction for the Goths, even though the cases involving the Goths and the Italo-Romans were to be investigated under the Roman laws.²⁴² Though in the reality the dividing line between the Goths and the Italo-Romans was rather blurred, Cassiodorus maintains the discursive distinction between the two peoples through the emotive and social rules of behaviours. Overall, since Cassiodorus intended his *formulae* to be repeatedly used models for the generations to come, this emotive script was the “blueprint for coding emotional behavior,” in Rikhardsdottir’s words,²⁴³ for the Italo-Romans and the Goths to be imitated and emulated.

even inclined in this direction, we are **vehemently adored and loved** (*colamur et amemur*).” (Cic. Q. fr. 2.15.1).

²⁴¹ Carter Lindberg, *Love*, 59.

²⁴² Arnold, *Theoderic*, 128.

²⁴³ Sif Rikhardsdottir, *Emotion in Old Norse Literature*, 27.

Chapter 3: *Natura Rerum Est Amare Collegam*: Love and Affection in the Praetorian Letters

Sentiments of Palatine Service: Collegial Love, Civic Devotion, and Local Patriotism

Given Cassiodorus's rhetorical intent to portray the ideal ethical culture of palatine community in the books 11 and 12, dedicated to his communication on the praetorian service,²⁴⁴ his own emotive persona, which attends to the epistolary tradition of fashioning letter as a "virtual image" or "mirror of the soul,"²⁴⁵ might have acted as the vehicle through which exemplary emotive codes of behaviour were represented and, potentially, set to be emulated, particularly in their affectionate rhetoric. Taken together, the love terms, which explicate Cassiodorus's civic sentiments, comprise the largest part of the amorous vocabulary in his praetorian communication, i.e., nine words on the palatine service and five words for Cassiodorus's dedication to Lucania and Bruttium (14 terms – approx. 27 %, while love for virtues takes approx. 33 %), and cover almost all range of the affectionate concepts, except *dilectio*, such as *amor* and its grammatical variations, *affectus*, *caritas*,²⁴⁶ and the verb *diligere*. In the majority of appearances, these feelings are attributed to or most likely expressed by Cassiodorus (6 terms) or directed at Cassiodorus (3 terms), while the remaining ones are an emotional valuation of Cassiodorus or didactic instructions to his subordinates. Thus, Cassiodorus's adopted emotive persona is dramatically less quantitatively (Theodoric – 32 terms, Athalaric and Amalasuntha – 20 terms, Theodahad and Witigis – 15 terms) and qualitatively affectionate than the ones for the Ostrogothic rulers, that is, unlike the Ostrogothic ruler, Cassiodorus does not fashion himself as a benefactor in the

²⁴⁴ Bjornlie, "Amicitia and the Epistolary Tradition," 153.

²⁴⁵ On the commonplace of letter as a "mirror/image of the soul," see: Abram, "Latin Letters," 78–145; Demetrius, *Περὶ ἐρμηνείας*, 227. Demetrius, "On Style," ed. and trans. Doreen C. Innes, in *Aristotle Poetics, Longinus On the Sublime, Demetrius on Style*, Loeb Classical Library 199 (Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press, 1995), 483.

²⁴⁶ Although the use of *caritas* most likely indicates the honorary addressing of Cassiodorus to Ambrosius, whose honorary title *vir illustris* might have obliged Cassiodorus to refer to him with *caritas vestra*: "I truly trust that you rejoice in these things that we discern **your affection** (*caritatem vestram*) to prefer; for in whatever way the affairs of the one man are performed, the wishes of another are fulfilled." Cassiodorus, Var. 11.5.1 (trans. Bjornlie, 435). The same customary formulation uses Gregory the Great in his letter at the beginning of the seventh century: "'Sed susceptis caritatis vestrae epistulis optato sumus gaudio consolati atque omnipotenti deo gratias egimus, quia et unanimitatem vestram incolumem et animum ad consolationem redisse cognovimus" (But, having received the letters of your Charity, we have been consoled with the joy we hoped for, and we give thanks to Almighty God, for that we now know that your equanimity is unimpaired [that you who are of one mind with us are well] , and that your mind has been restored to comfort)." The text is quoted from Abram, "Latin Letters," 29.

language neither of his personalised affective commitment nor of contractual obligation to his colleagues.²⁴⁷ As for subordinates in a broader sense, he does use a parental metaphor towards himself to specify the ideal type of relationship between a public servant and the Ostrogothic population imagined as a uniform entity of the governed subjects. For instance, in his edict to the provincials, he exhorts them:

Mindful of shame, and with God's blessing, we desire to act according to the mandates we have received from the masters of state. Be dutiful to everything just, so that you would cause me to be a *father to the provinces* [the cursive is mine – A. M.] rather than a judge, since the latter grows even more wrathful the less he is given to deeds of impropriety.²⁴⁸

However, it is important that Cassiodorus avoids the explicit connotative associations between the *princeps'* *amor/affectus* in a public context and his own social responsibility as an official that essentially results in a perceived divorce between the commitment of palatine servants to communal well-being and an affective dimension of their public stance. While *amor/affectus* becomes a motivation for the Ostrogothic ruler to care about his subordinates²⁴⁹ as well as a drive behind private munificence of the wealthy Italo-Roman elite,²⁵⁰ it rarely occurs in a social context of compassionate fulfillment of public duties by an official.²⁵¹ In my opinion, such silence aligns with both the late Roman imperial behavioural and affective rules²⁵² and Cassiodorus's agenda to primarily emphasise an affectionate ruler, who is considered as a sole and supreme benefactor, which also reinforces the undertones of

^{247 247} It is noteworthy since the praetorian correspondence contains the personal letters of appointments (Cassiodorus, *Var.* 11.4; 11.6; 12.6; 12.11; 12.21) as well as the formulas for the appointments under the aegis of the praetorian office (Cassiodorus, *Var.* 11.17-32; 17.34-35 (trans. Bjornlie, 449-456)).

²⁴⁸ Cassiodorus, *Var.* 11.8.7 (trans. Bjornlie, 440).

²⁴⁹ The regnal commitment to the public – *amor*: Cassiodorus, *Var.* 1.20.1; 8.20.1; to the city of Rome – *amor*: Cassiodorus, *Var.* 8.30.1; *affectus*: Cassiodorus, *Var.* 1.1.3; 1.44.1; to the Senate – *amor*: Cassiodorus, *Var.* 8.2.5; *affectus*: Cassiodorus, *Var.* 1.44.1; 10.12.3.

²⁵⁰ The use of *amor*: Cassiodorus, *Var.* 2.32.2; 8.29.2; *affectus*: Cassiodorus, *Var.* 2.32.1.

²⁵¹ There are only two verbs that describe the praetorian attitude of Cassiodorus towards his subordinates, who are not officials: *amare* (Cassiodorus, *Var.* 11.8.8 (trans. Bjornlie, 440)) and *diligere* (Cassiodorus, *Var.* 12.2.1 (trans. Bjornlie, 466)). However, they appear either in a context of building a communal identity around shared Roman ethos or a contractual-like obligation, which highlights their relative accidentality in this context. Especially, it is also corroborated by the text's usage of verbs rather than nouns, thereby, the letters personalise the emotions and make Cassiodorus an experiencing subject in this case, the pattern, which, as I have demonstrated in the chapter 1, more likely characterises a feeling subject through their manifested emotions and their rhetorical persona in the Italo-Roman emotionality, as in the case of Athalaric's more affective and Theodahad's excessively affective persona. Another example is contained in the books of formulas (*Var.* 7.8.3), which, however, due to their normative, yet depersonalized content, are meant to provide the models of an excellent administrative service, which might have included the personal motivations such as love to the public or affectionate disposition.

²⁵² As it was specified in the previous chapter, the imperial emotive codes throughout different periods of the Roman Empire's existence implied, even if in the formulaic form, the emperor's personal devotion or affectionate patronage towards his subjects either to a unified entity or to separate individuals. As for the motivations of the private munificence and the appearance of *amor/affectus* in the imperial municipal honorary inscriptions, see: Forbis, 46-50.

imperial ideology behind the benevolent image of the Ostrogothic king.²⁵³ Building on that, I argue that the malleable signifying potential of the love vocabulary allowed Cassiodorus adopt an emotive persona with a strong emphasis on administrative ethics, the one, for whom an expression of love, in the first place, signaled a successful government of community or inter-personal relationship rather than the feelings of the official or social group in question.

The lexical field of love of Cassiodorus's correspondence from his tenure as a praetorian prefect presents the varying connotations of love terms depending on their particular sociocultural context. The emotive scripts underlying them are mostly shaped rather by a social and emotional functionality than tied to specificity of the used vocabulary. In their turn, the scripts under the larger category of 'civic sentiments' can be roughly divided into three subcategories: 'collegial love,' 'civic devotion,' and 'local patriotic love.'

In the case of *collegial love*, it concerns a homosocial bonding and interpersonal interactions between the officials themselves. As Bjornlie argues, throughout the entire *Variae*, Cassiodorus portrayed the network of professional friendships and political patronages established between the elite members of palatine service during the Ostrogothic rule, while appropriating the rhetoric of elite *amicitia* and implied group consensus to describe such a relation.²⁵⁴ Admittedly, Cassiodorus could have intended the eleventh and twelfth books, singularly dedicated to his narrative voice and management of the bureaucratic apparatus, to be a quintessential repository of *exempla* of that group's performance of sociocultural (and political, as well) solidarity, in which the language of *amicitia* could have served as a guideline for audience's emotional interpretation.²⁵⁵ Considering the *Variae*'s literary conventions, this language directly modelled itself upon the epistolary codes of love and friendship derived from the discourse of late Roman private letter-exchange. Its commonplaces are most apparent in the second preface of the *Variae* that introduces Cassiodorus's praetorian letters: friends (*amici*) compelled Cassiodorus "to speak about the substance of the soul and its virtues"²⁵⁶ and the work is addressed to the "learned men" (*diserti*), whom Cassiodorus pleads to "forgive and cherish these imperfect letters."²⁵⁷ In the first preface, Cassiodorus "was unable to resist so much wise reasoning" for the composition

²⁵³ Elizabeth Forbis, *Municipal Virtues in the Roman Empire: The Evidence of Italian Honorary Inscriptions* (Stuttgart: Teubner, 1996), 71–72.

²⁵⁴ Bjornlie, "Amicitia and the Epistolary Tradition," 142–144.

²⁵⁵ For the importance of *exempla* in literary education and moral upbringing of the traditional Roman elite, see: G. Maslakov, "Valerius Maximus and Roman Historiography. A Study of the Exempla Tradition," *Aufstieg Und Niedergang Der Römischen Welt* 32, no. 1 (1984): 437–96; R. G. Mayer, "Roman Historical Exempla in Seneca," in *Sénèque et La Prose Latine*, ed. P. Grimal (Geneva, 1991), 141–76.

²⁵⁶ Cassiodorus, *Var. praef. 2.7* (trans. Bjornlie, 426).

²⁵⁷ Cassiodorus, *Var. praef. 2.8* (trans. Bjornlie, 426).

of the *Variae* from his friends (*amici*), when he saw himself “reproved out of [their] affection” (*ex affectione*).²⁵⁸

Despite a framework narrative so strongly imbued with an ethos of elite friendship, in the letters, Cassiodorus mentions collegial love only once in his address of gratitude to the Senate for an appointment as a praetorian prefect. Honoured by the “commendation of such great men,” Cassiodorus naturalises the collegial affection of the members of the Senate towards the palatine officials: “It is in the nature of things to love a colleague (*natura rerum est amare collegam*). But truly, you exalt your own reputation, if you applaud an honor that has been given to a Senator.”²⁵⁹ It is difficult to glean an exact intertextual reference in such an uncharacteristically laconic formulation for Cassiodorus, but, except the Christian sources,²⁶⁰ the formulation ‘love of colleague’ (*amor collegae*) could have also appeared in the third-century honorary epigraphy of the city of Rome, although in the preserved state the inscription makes the precise meaning ambiguous. If one presumes the editorial reconstruction credible, Cassiodorus might have used a reference to the materially present in the urban space of Rome collocation *amor collegae*, which, in turn, could have been recognized by the members of the Senate as part of customary vocabulary of praise and patronage.²⁶¹ The use of *amor collegae* in this context implicates a social alliance and patron-client or benefactor-beneficiary relations between the Senate and Cassiodorus, which ties in with the public gratitude and mutual respect expressed in Cassiodorus’s address earlier that are expected in such relationship. The possible textual allusions aside, the formulation *amare collegam* in this context itself echoes a standardised language for Roman elite friendship, here played out as patronage of more influential and socially superior benefactors, i.e., the

²⁵⁸ Cassiodorus, *Var. praef.* 1.12 (trans. Bjornlie, 33).

²⁵⁹ Cassiodorus, *Var.* 11.1.1 (trans. Bjornlie, 427).

²⁶⁰ Rufinus, *Eusebii Caesariensis Historia ecclesiastica*, 11.9. Theodor Mommsen, ed., “Eusebii Caesariensis Historia Ecclesiastica, Rufini Continuatio,” in *Eusebios, Werke II 2*, Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller Der Ersten Jahrhunderte 9.2 (Berlin, 1908), 1014.

²⁶¹ CIL 06, 41296 = CIL 06, 01648: “[p]roc(uratori) famil(iarum) / [glad(iatoriarum) per] Ital(iam) proc(uratori) Mini/[ciae et m]acell(i) magni et / [frumenti(?) p]opuli proc(uratori) / [mon(etae?) scri]b(ae) aedil(ium) cur(ulium) / [ob insignem erg]a se amorem [c]oll(egae) et / [patron(o) optim(o?) c]urant(e) Crepereio / [3] ar<c=K>(ario).” The inscription originates from the city of Rome and is dated roughly between 201 and 300. As it can be seen, much of the text is the historical reconstruction of the scholarly editors, since the only preserved piece of the word *collegae*, i.e., “*oll*,” might have signified “association” (*collegium*) in several grammatical cases as well, which would make it an honorary table from the *collegium* to their patron. However, it is not entirely clear when the inscription became that decrepit, which should not necessarily exclude Cassiodorus’s times considering there was a late Roman trend in Italy as for the elements of the forum complex falling into disrepair or being repurposed from the fourth century onwards, which despite the renovation works under the Ostrogothic regnum, also affected the Roman Forum. On the trend of the late Roman forum deterioration, see: Neil Christie, “Cities and Urban Life in Late Roman Italy: Transformations of the Old, Impositions of the New,” in *Late Roman Italy*, Wijnendaele, 304–38, especially 306–307. On the state of the Roman forum under the Ostrogoths, see: Arnold, Bjornlie, and Sessa, *A Companion*, 241–42.

Senat, and the prescribed emotions expected to be felt towards a protégé. Furthermore, while relying on the signifying potential of *amare* as a term from a vocabulary of personal loyalty and devotion as well as other narrative signs (the word “colleague” itself and a semi-ironic pun on an equal social standing of Cassiodorus and the Senators (“an honor that has been given to a Senator”)), the Italo-Roman audience could construe the collegial relations of Cassiodorus as mainly horizontal and grounded in the sentiment of equality, a characteristic *topoi* of late Roman friendship. Thus, in the praetorian correspondence, the verb *amare*, as we will see below, could intensify an underlying egalitarian connotation in a professional bureaucratic setting. This is also substantiated by the fact that the royal correspondence openly features more personal and hierarchical bonds among the Ostrogothic civic elite: Theodoric praises and encourages Felix, a member of the Gallic nobility, for his gain of “affection of the patrician Paulinus” (*patricii Paulini affectu*)²⁶² regardless of an obvious social distance between a Gallic and Roman aristocrat – the silence about such cases in Cassiodorus’s praetorian letters of appointments or orders, even if incidental, makes a cumulative impression of their insignificance. Cassiodorus’s emotive persona is of one who promotes an image of rather egalitarian corporative solidarity and successful inter-personal relationships between the civic Ostrogothic elite with an emotional profundity of friendship than of a network of asymmetric ties of reciprocity and patronage embedded in the post-Roman social structures.

Civic devotion appears in different forms but most frequently this script is specified as the general public’s appreciation of and contentment with responsible fulfilment of magisterial duties, particularly in the context of the grain and food supply (3 out of 8 letters). In his address to Peter, an official in charge of distribution of preserved foods, Cassiodorus writes about the importance of sustaining the civic love (*amor civicus*) as an indispensable component of successful public service under his authority:

Therefore, we grant to you, by divine grace, the preserved foods that must be distributed to the Roman people from this indiction, so that what the royal court has generously promised could be attained without any obstruction. Beware, lest some other person take what the people deserve, rendering you a stranger to our gratitude if you should **lapse in civic affection** (*civico amore*).²⁶³

²⁶² Cassiodorus, *Var.* 2.3.5-6 (trans. Bjornlie, 83).

²⁶³ Cassiodorus, *Var.* 12.11.3 (trans. Bjornlie, 477).

In the letter to his agent in Rome, Ambrosius, in which Cassiodorus directs him to acquire grain for Rome, the two terms for the civic affection, already mentioned *amor* and *affectus*, are used in such a way that no semantic distinction can be made between them:

Therefore, it must be provided, whatever confidence you may have, whatever great hesitation may appear, since what procures the **affectio of those citizens** for me (*affectum illorum*) is truly to our advantage. [...] Act now, so that **this very love** (*amor iste*) should continue with God's assistance, since I fully intend to achieve in return what they thought they had begun auspiciously with me.²⁶⁴

Civic devotion makes appearance also in another context associated with administrative integrity in public office, the one of the fair tax collection, which must not be blemished by governors' contemptible practices (*vile*) or avarice (*cupidum*), that is, their prevalence of private interests over public affairs, as constantly underscored throughout the *Variae*.²⁶⁵ The magistrates could be *affectuosi iudices*, 'loving judges,'²⁶⁶ towards the taxpayers only provided that they follow Cassiodorus's instruction: "I confess the longing of my desire (*aviditatem desiderii mei*): I want (*cupio*) myself to be seen in you," that is, pursue justice (*iustitia*) and be on the path of good conduct (*morum gradus*) in order to be decorated with praise (*decoratur laude*) and public glory (*gloria*).²⁶⁷ In the narrative context, the rhetorical formulation of the relationship between the governors and their subordinates shows a customary perception of ideal public service as a successful social contract: "We have considered in every situation what we ought to esteem (*diligere*) in our servants: we shall acquire the most complete distinction, should they rediscover **loving magistrates** (*affectuosus iudices*)."²⁶⁸ The same contractual logic and ethical responsibility governs admiration and affection received from the people, as it is stated later in the edict to the provincials that with "your [i.e. people's love] love" (*vestro amore*) the practice of bribing the tax officers for receiving a deferment or "favourable conditions" (*suffragia*) for the

²⁶⁴ Cassiodorus, *Var.* 11.5.5-6 (trans. Bjornlie, 435). It is also notable that Cassiodorus does not employ the epithet "civic" when he writes about the affection of citizens towards him, thus, he personalises it, making himself a particular object of the civic affection, which is reflected in the common rhetoric of the letter as well: "since I fully intend to achieve in return what they thought they had begun auspiciously *with me* [cursive is mine – A.M.]." Cassiodorus, *Var.* 11.5.6 (trans. Bjornlie, 435).

²⁶⁵ For more on the commonality of corruption in fiscal practices by allowing the taxpayers to defer payment after a bribe, for example, and others in Ostrogothic Italy, see: Cassiodorus, *The Variae: The Complete Translation*, 457; Flavius Magnus Aurelius Cassiodorus, *Varie. Volume 5, Libri XI-XII*, ed. and comment. Andrea Giardina et al. (Roma: "L' Erma" di Bretschneider, 2015), 180–83.

²⁶⁶ Cassiodorus, *Var.* 12.2.1 (trans. Bjornlie, 466).

²⁶⁷ Cassiodorus, *Var.* 12.2.3-4 (trans. Bjornlie, 466).

²⁶⁸ Cassiodorus, *Var.* 12.2.1 (trans. Bjornlie, 466).

payment managed to be diminished.²⁶⁹ In the praetorian correspondence, civic devotion and affection of both sides have the same social functionality as in Cassiodorus's *formulae*, described in the chapter two, which is, namely, a normative sociocultural code of behaviour to warrant efficient government and social concord. Notably, the narrative voice of *formulae* does not draw distinction between the terms *amor* and *affectus* as well, subsuming them all to the vocabulary of civic affection.

This emotive script, although might have suggested affective bonding or intimate connections, was primarily informed by the sociocultural connotation of the Roman culture of public achievement and *gloria* as well as by the discourse of Italian honorary inscriptions. As Elizabeth Forbis states, the literary tradition of the moral *exempla* with the promise of public recognition and praise for the virtuous behaviour occupied an especially important place in the literary education and moral upbringing of the Italo-Roman elite.²⁷⁰ Occasionally, the Roman authors directly associated the exceptional political and civic virtue with the public acknowledgement in the form of *amor*, like in Cicero's letter to Decimus Brutus:

In fact **the affection** in which your name is held is remarkable (*tui nominis caritatis*), and the **love of all the citizens** for you is unparalleled (*amorque in te singularis omnium civium*). For they rest great hopes in you, and feel confident that as you formerly freed the Republic from a tyrant you will now free it from a tyranny.²⁷¹

Within this environment of *exempla* and encouraged emulation, praise of virtue in the Roman honorary inscriptions played a key role. There, according to Forbis, aristocratic competition for *gloria* intersected with public expectation of fair government, since administrative virtues were a standardised object of praise.²⁷² Although most of the Italian inscriptions praised *amor* and *ad(f)ectus* as a virtue of personal commitment of the honourands themselves,²⁷³ significant number of them provided the emotive codes for the communal gratitude and affection of the beneficiaries as well. In a *tabula patronatus* from Pisaurum, the *collegium fabrum* express their *plena obsequia amoris* ("full obedience of love") for their senatorial patrons or the *ordo* and *populus* of Suessa Aurunca in Campania

²⁶⁹ Cassiodorus, *Var.* 11.8.4 (trans. Bjornlie, 440): "imminuta sunt enim vestro amore suffragia, quae hactenus omnium detrimento crescebant".

²⁷⁰ Forbis, *Municipal Virtues in the Roman Empire*, 4–6.

²⁷¹ Cic. *Fam.* 11.8.1. Cicero, *The Letters of Cicero; the Whole Extant Correspondence in Chronological Order, in Four Volumes*, trans. Evelyn S. Shuckburgh, vol. 4 (London: George Bell and Sons, 1908), accessed 27 September, 2024, <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.02.0022%3Ayear%3D43&force=y>.

²⁷² Forbis, *Municipal Virtues in the Roman Empire*, 6.

²⁷³ For more examples, see: Forbis, *Municipal Virtues in the Roman Empire*, 46–50.

articulate that *amore et beneficiis devincti* (“bound by love and favours”) they erected the statue for their senatorial patron, who “blamelessly (*innocenter*) served in his country.”²⁷⁴ In Puteoli, the local senate grants an honour to a municipal dignitary who earned *adfectum* (“affection”) of people.²⁷⁵

These formulaic, but carefully considered manifestations of public affection,²⁷⁶ which faithfully reciprocated the financial munificence or administrative integrity of the patron, shaped the horizon of feelings of Cassiodorus’s audience of the Italo-Roman elite. As they appealed even to less sophisticatedly educated members of elite by the sheer property of the medium of public inscriptions, i.e., they leaned less into the high-register literary emotionality, compared to the regnal scripts of love,²⁷⁷ Cassiodorus could have efficiently adapted this type of discourse to his communication with the officials of the lower rank. The inscriptions and public monuments were themselves tangible evidence of the glory and love received by a virtuous official from the civic community. For Cassiodorus, the medium of letters required conditioning public affection and glory as a promised consequence of fair public service, but the satisfaction of the king²⁷⁸ or Cassiodorus himself²⁷⁹ were cast as the main motivators, failure to meet the expectations of whom could bring financial and reputational loss. Although the comparison with the imperial dedications to the officials and praised virtues should still become a subject of further research, the emphasis on civic affection in Cassiodorus’s praetorian letters aligns with a collection’s heightened anxiety over public concord and love as well as fashioning a compassionate Ostrogothic regime.²⁸⁰

It is noteworthy that in this civic script, the signifying potential and connotative associations of a dichotomy of the verbs *amare/diligere* rhetorically helped doing and undoing a social distance when it came to the relationship between Cassiodorus and the residents of the *regnum*. Cicero in his letters to Atticus himself draws a sharp distinction

²⁷⁴ *CIL* 11.6335; *CIL* 10.4755.

²⁷⁵ *Eph. Ep.* 8.372. Forbis, *Municipal Virtues in the Roman Empire*, 146, from here onwards: Forbis, 146. There are other examples provided by a magnificent *corpus* of inscriptions of Forbis: *CIL* 14.2947 (Forbis, 127): father of the equestrian rank pays for the cost of the monument to his son erected *pro amore civitatis*; *CIL* 10.1782 (Forbis, 144): a municipal decree states that “quo testator sit erga eum *adfectus/ rei p(ublicae) nostrae*”; *AE* 1968.124 (Forbis, 153): the statue to the patron by collegium is described as *perpetuum amoris munus*; *CIL* 11.5748 and *CIL* 11.5750 (Forbis, 191-192): *collegia* express gratitude for the newly coopted patrons with the term *adfectio*. Also, outside Forbis’s work: *AE* 1983.197: “*ex amore civitatis nostrae*” people of Puteoli rejoice in glory brought to their *ordo* by Acerius.

²⁷⁶ Forbis, *Municipal Virtues in the Roman Empire*, 1-8.

²⁷⁷ Glan Carlo Susine, *The Roman Stonecutter. An Introduction to Latin Epigraphy*, ed. E. Badian, trans. A. M. Dabrowski (Oxford: Blackwell, 1973), 52–53.

²⁷⁸ Cassiodorus, *Var.* 12.11 (trans. Bjornlie, 476-77).

²⁷⁹ Cassiodorus, *Var.* 11.5 (trans. Bjornlie, 435-36); 12.2 (trans. Bjornlie, 466-67).

²⁸⁰ About the concord as a matter of the concern for the Ostrogothic rulers, see: Cristini, “Concordia Theodericana,” 314-333.

between the affective potential of the verbs *amare* and *diligere*, at least, in the discourse of private letter-exchange: “Yet so great an addition has been made that I seem to myself never to have loved (*amare*) before, only to have liked (*dilexisse*).”²⁸¹ He reiterates this idea in a more socio-politically charged context, explicitly associating *amare* with the egalitarian sentiment of either moral likeness beyond a political realm or political solidarity and belonging: “Accordingly, as you wish me to do, I take great pains not to hurt anyone's feelings, and to secure **being liked** (*diligamur*) even by those very men who are vexed at my close friendship with Caesar, while by those who are impartial (*aequis*), or even inclined to this side, I may be **warmly courted and loved** (*colamur et amemur*).”²⁸² Simultaneously, the Christian emotive discourse in the impersonation of Augustine, who informed Cassiodorus's writing as well,²⁸³ took a particular stance on not differentiating the emotional vocabulary of love: “My only point has been to prove that the Scriptures of our religion, whose authority I prefer to all other writings, make no distinction between *amor*, *dilectio*, and *caritas*.”²⁸⁴

More emphatically than in the voice of royal communication, in the praetorian letters, Cassiodorus expanded precisely these tensions inherent in the emotive tradition and encoded different social and emotional functionality in frequently synonymous *amare* and *diligere*. As for the verb *amare*, in his edict to the provinces, intended to be distributed among a broad audience, Cassiodorus exhorts his provincial subordinates to “be dutiful to everything just,” “show obedience to our precepts with equal restraint (*moderatione*)” and “comport one's intentions with reason (*rationabiliter...animus*)” because “the one, who

²⁸¹Cic. Att. 14.17A.5 :”tantum accessit ut mihi nunc denique amare videar, antea dilexisse.” Cicero, *The Letters of Cicero; the Whole Extant Correspondence in Chronological Order, in Four Volumes*, trans. Evelyn S. Shuckburgh, vol. 4 (London: George Bell and Sons, 1908), accessed 27 September, 2024, <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.02.0022%3Ayear%3Dv4%2044&force=y>.

²⁸²Cic. Q. fr. 2.15.1: “Itaque, ut tibi placet, damus operam ne cuius animum offendamus atque ut etiam ab iis ipsis qui nos cum Caesare tam coniunctos dolent diligamur, ab aequis vero aut etiam a propensis in hanc partem vehementer et colamur et amemur.” Cicero, *The Letters of Cicero; the Whole Extant Correspondence in Chronological Order, in Four Volumes*, trans. Evelyn S. Shuckburgh, vol. 4 (London: George Bell and Sons, 1908), accessed 27 September, 2024, <https://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.02.0022%3Atext%3DQ+FR%3Abook%3D2%3Aletter%3D15>. Notably, in Symmachus's *Relationes*, an official correspondence addressed to the Roman emperors, there is a hint that the fourth-century Italo-Roman elite continue to draw a visible semantic distinction between *amare* and *diligere*: “To be loved, to be held in veneration and affection are greater things than to rule” (*amari coli diligi maius imperio est*). Symmachus, *Relatio* 3.2. Symmachus, *Prefect and Emperor: The Relationes of Symmachus A. D. 384*, trans. Reginald Haynes Barrow (Oxford: Clarendon press, 1973), 34–35, from here and onwards: trans. Barrow, 34–35.

²⁸³The particular citation quoted there originates from Augustine's *The City of God*, which Cassiodorus was most definitely acquainted with, considering that he mentioned it in his later work for a monastic education *Institutiones*, see: Cassiodorus, *Institut.* 1.2.10 (Halporn, 117); 1.9.4 (Halporn, 132); 1.16.4 (Halporn, 148).

²⁸⁴Augustine, *De civ.* 14.7. Augustine, *The City of God*, trans. Demetrius B. Zema et al. (Washington: Catholic University of America Press, 2008), 360.

recoils from the just (*iustis*) commands brings hatred (*odium*) upon himself.”²⁸⁵ This paragraph perpetuates the traditional Roman emotive ideology of manly self-control and rationality, projecting them on the legal obedience, thus, playing on the idea of inclusion/exclusion from a Roman identitarian community. Placed right after that instruction, Cassiodorus’s use of the verb *amare* has the sociocultural connotation of partaking in those ethical and social values and rhetorically blurs the social and affective distance in such shared Romanness: “**I will not love** (*amabo*) one whom I have already compelled.”²⁸⁶ Despite the different context of the financial benefaction on behalf of Cassiodorus’s homeland, the dichotomy of ‘love/compulsion’ and an idea of shared identity through the provisional contributions of Lucania and Bruttium to the city of Rome, a previous centre of the Roman Empire, also appear in Cassiodorus’s articulated expectation of reciprocating the patronage to his region and ruler’s generosity with love: “Therefore, let them obey not from any compulsion, but **from love** (*non compulsione..., sed amore*), when I have reduced for them even the amount that was customarily offered.”²⁸⁷ Furthermore, such functionality of *amare* is evident in the script of collegial love: both for the Ostrogothic subjects and for the elite officials the communal Roman or elite professional behavioural codes respectively imbued the relationship marked by the verb *amare* with an emotional profundity of communal solidarity and homosocial affective bonding, which might or might not have suggested actual personal devotion and/or financial patronage. Contrarily to the egalitarianism and a shared socio-ethical system implied in *amare*, Cassiodorus employs *diligere* when the argumentative context requires an emphasis on a hierarchical relationship placed primarily within the social framework. Addressing the governors, a tax-collecting intermediary between the prefect and provincials, Cassiodorus writes that “we have considered in every situation what **we ought to esteem** (*diligere*) in our [people, i.e. taxpayers]: we shall acquire the most complete distinction, should they rediscover loving magistrates.”²⁸⁸

The last *emotive script, local patriotic love*, is perhaps one of the most common variations of civic affection expressed in the framework not of administrative integrity, as in the previous script, but of public expectations of the political, financial, and social patronage

²⁸⁵ Cassiodorus, *Var.* 11.8.7-8 (trans. Bjornlie, 440).

²⁸⁶ Cassiodorus, *Var.* 11.8.8 (trans. Bjornlie, 440).

²⁸⁷ Cassiodorus, *Var.* 11.39.5 (trans. Bjornlie, 461). This particular mention of *amor* is impossible to place only in the broader category of civic sentiments, considering that it also implies the gratitude expressed in love towards the rulers of the Ostrogothic kingdom. Thus, in my Appendix 3 and in the following text, I will regard it as belonging to and characterizing three emotive scripts: the script of civic devotion, local patriotic love, and public love in regard to the rulership.

²⁸⁸ Cassiodorus, *Var.* 12.2.1 (trans. Bjornlie, 466).

from the influential compatriot by the local community.²⁸⁹ Similarly to the regnal ceremonialised affection, Cassiodorus employs the term *affectus* to indicate the association of his commitment to Lucania and Bruttium with the patron-client sense of obligations: he reduces the tax burden for their citizens because “he retained the affection for his homeland” (*retinere affectum patriae*)²⁹⁰ as well as cancels the contribution of Scyllaceum, a city in Bruttium, to the local *cursus publicus* as “his patriotic affection” (*patriotica affectione*) compels to feel attacks against this city more acutely.²⁹¹ As I have already mentioned, such financial and political patronage included the expectation of reciprocity, that is, the loyal obedience of the citizens of Lucania and Bruttium “not out of compulsion, but out of love (*amore*).”²⁹² Of course, Cassiodorus granted the reduction or exemption from taxes or food contributions to other regions or cities also on the ground of natural disasters or environmental specifics,²⁹³ however, language of patronal obligation and patriotic devotion is reserved specifically to Lucania and Bruttium. The script of regnal ceremonialised affection and Cassiodorus’s patriotic love share at least one other common feature – the appeal to the affectively loaded codes of parental love. In the letter to the governor of Lucania and Bruttium, which instructs him on the means to allow landowners to commute to tax credits the supplies seized by the quartered Gothic army, Cassiodorus compares his care about the homeland to the feelings of father:²⁹⁴

For we display modesty before colleagues, we offer reverence to our fathers, we owe common decency to fellow citizens, but a **particular affection to our children** (*affectum filiis singularem*); and the force of this compulsion is so great, that none would judge himself despised, if he learns the offspring of another have been preferred to him... For we are **deemed to love** (*diligere*) those more whom we hasten to deliver from danger.²⁹⁵

In the imperial and late Roman honorary inscriptions, the use of *adfectus/amor* to denote the personal commitment of the patron or its financial beneficiary to the municipal

²⁸⁹ Forbis, *Municipal Virtues in the Roman Empire*, 102.

²⁹⁰ Cassiodorus, *Var.* 11.39.5 (trans. Bjornlie, 461).

²⁹¹ Cassiodorus, *Var.* 12.5.1 (trans. Bjornlie, 470).

²⁹² Cassiodorus, *Var.* 11.39.6 (trans. Bjornlie, 461).

²⁹³ For example, Cassiodorus, *Var.* 12.4 (trans. Bjornlie, 468-70).

²⁹⁴ It is also noteworthy that the verb *diligere*, which Cassiodorus employs there in the context of a paternal love for his homeland, is attested in the sources of the later Roman Empire, that is, the panegyrics publicly delivered to the late Roman emperors, as a denominator of father’s love to his son: “but just as stern fathers are stricter with those sons whom they love most (*seueri patres his quos plus diligunt filiis*), so she harassed you with innumerable wars and the most critical times for the State while she prepared you for imperial power” and “But since, guided by Nature, we almost always love our sons more than ourselves (*Sed cum instituyente Natura plus fere filios quam nosmet ipsos diligamus*).” Pacatus, *Panegyricus Theodosio*, 8.2; 17.2 (trans. Mynors, 458, 467). The further inquiry is to be taken, but it potentially hints at the reception and adaptation of these emotive codes in Italo-Roman emotionality.

²⁹⁵ Cassiodorus, *Var.* 12.5.2 (trans. Bjornlie, 470).

community/homeland is omnipresent and has its formulaic expressions, such as a used by Cassiodorus pairing of *amor/adfectus* with the genitive *patriae*.²⁹⁶ Although appropriating these imperial honorary formulas and sustaining the public expectations of the political and financial patronage from the compatriots, Cassiodorus construes a significantly more affectionate emotive persona through the explicitly articulated associations with the parental types of love that the Italo-Roman elite audience could have interpreted through the prism of the literary conventions of paternal *pietas* and devotion, mentioned in the first chapter.

Thus, Cassiodorus's script of civic devotion comprised a part of the multi-layered affective and sociocultural rules of behaviour of the Italo-Roman civic elite and their subordinates, which still embedded themselves in the traditional Roman ethos of civic loyalty and culture of civic honour but adapted it to the Ostrogothic reality. Although Cassiodorus never denies an affective dimension of civic affection that envelops the inter-personal relations of the civic elite, the relations between the magistrates and public, and the elite's political patronage of the homeland, Cassiodorus's emotive persona visibly prioritises a socially dictated code of adhering to civic virtues for both parties. Emphasising with the verb *amare* shared Romanness and undoing a social distance, Cassiodorus's persona institutes an image of egalitarian professional corporative solidarity of the Italo-Roman civic elite and relations of reciprocity between the public and the administrators. The only exception – Cassiodorus's dedication to Lucania and Bruttium – with the implied affective bonds, potentially, mimics the regnal affectionate devotion to the subordinates, and, thus, shows a clear-cut demarcating line between the symbolic and sociocultural roles of regnal and official's affection in the Ostrogothic kingdom.

Ecclesiastical Love: (Imitation of) Divine Love and Clerical Patronage

The praetorian correspondence comprises only two letters addressed to the Church authorities, the pope at Rome and various bishops, in which, nevertheless, the professions of love constitute the second greatest part in the praetorian letters (7 terms). As Bjornlie notices, although in both letters Cassiodorus requests the spiritual guidance for the performance of his praetorian duties, he does not particularly demonstrate his subordination to spiritual matters,

²⁹⁶ *CIL* 10.5917 (Forbis, 106): “*erga amorem patriae et civium*”; *CIL* 10.5919 (Forbis, 107): “*erga municipes patriamque adfectionem*”; *CIL* 10.5336 (Forbis, 117): “*ob tanto amore quam erga patriam nostram*”; *CIL* 14.2977 (Forbis, 127): “*ob insignem amorem eius erga cives patriamque*”; *CIL* 10.3704 (Forbis, 139): “*parposito amore patriae*”; *AE* 1888.126 (Forbis, 144): “*ob amorem erga patriam*”; *CIL* 9.334 (Forbis, 154): “*ob insignem eius erga patriam ac cives adfectionem*”; *CIL* 10.53 (Forbis, 165): “*ob amorem patriae*”; *CIL* 9.2347 (Forbis, 167): “*ob amorem erga patriam*”; *CIL* 11.386 (Forbis, 214): “*amantissimo patriae*.”

but rather activates his ecclesiastical networks for the maintenance of public affairs.²⁹⁷ Such subjugation and purposeful curbing of the intricacies of religious life and clerical structures to their co-habitation with the socio-cultural affective codes of behavior of the Italo-Roman bureaucratic elite is also transparent in a striking absence of the core Christian value – *caritas*, God’s love of man, man’s love of God, and the love of the neighbor²⁹⁸ – both on a lexical and, to some extent, semantic level. It emphasises, once again, Cassiodorus’s rhetorical framework of a mirror of virtuous government that reflected the relationship with the Roman Nicene Church as far as it concerned the emotional ideology of public service. Notably, the sentiments in the religious context cover heavily ‘secularised’ emotional vocabulary, such as *amor*, *amabilis*, *affectus* and its grammatical variations, and the verb (but not the noun) *diligere*. The varying connotations of love terms in a larger category of ecclesiastical-related love can be roughly and very tentatively, considering the smallness of the selection, divided into two subcategories: the script of ‘divine love’ or its imitation and the script of ‘patronal affection.’

Divine love is, not surprisingly, an emotive script the most informed by the Latin exegetical tradition, appearing across the corpus with several notable terms such as *diligere* and *amor*. It appears as the sentiment with spiritual and sociocultural dimensions that most frequently features in the optative desires of God’s approval or blessing harboured for particular forms of civic life. In the royal communication, divine nature cherishes (*diligunt*) the virtue of fidelity (*fides*) in officials,²⁹⁹ when in the praetorian letters, Cassiodorus through the trope of modesty and humility asserts that he “has not deserved to be loved (*diligi*) by the Lord” himself but through the intercession of the Pope he has received his praetorian appointment as evidence of God’s love.³⁰⁰ However, despite such cross-narrative consistency of *diligere*, Cassiodorus does not employ the noun *dilectio* (or *caritas*), using *amor* instead when he expresses how he longs for God’s love in the office of *praefectus praetorium*: “Let it [Trinity] bestow its love (*amor*), so that, having compassion (*miseratus*), it would forbid an opportunity for sinning (*peccandi ambitum*).”³⁰¹ As I have mentioned above, Cassiodorus was to some extent aware of the inherent tensions in the emotive tradition between *amare* and *diligere*, which, in the strictly theological discourse, had its additional layers. On the one hand, Jerome, when translating the New Testament, attempted to render the Greek terms

²⁹⁷ Cassiodorus, *The Variae: The Complete Translation*, 431-432.

²⁹⁸ W.J. Henderson, "Amor and Related Words in Prudentius," *Acta Patristica et Byzantina* 10, no. 1 (1999): 105.

²⁹⁹ Cassiodorus, *Var.* 5.40.6 (trans. Bjornlie, 238).

³⁰⁰ Cassiodorus, *Var.* 11.2.1 (trans. Bjornlie, 431).

³⁰¹ Cassiodorus, *Var.* 11.3.2 (trans. Bjornlie, 433).

ἀγάπη (“spiritual love”) and ἀγαπάω (“show affection”) as *caritas* and *dilectio* and *diligere* in Latin, purposefully avoiding *amor* and *amare*, which had the sexual and erotic connotations,³⁰² the distinction, which is also present, for example, in Rufinus’s (ca. 344/345–411) translation of Origen’s *Commentary on the Song of Songs*.³⁰³ On the other hand, even in Rufinus’s translation of Origen’s *Commentary on the Song of Songs* the lexical group *amor/amare* frequently rendered the Greek ἀγάπη in the same sense of the spiritual love³⁰⁴ as well as many patristic Latin commentaries on the biblical passages lacked the semantic sensitivity to the differences between *amare* and *diligere*.³⁰⁵ However, such neglect was by no means uniform. Ambrose (ca. 339–397) interpreted *dilectio* as “the love of soul” and *amor* as “some passion of body and the ardour of mind,”³⁰⁶ and Prudentius (ca. 348–405/413), while giving an overwhelming preference to *amor* and *amare*, drew a clear distinction between God’s spiritual love for the earth (*amor*) and God’s love for humans (*dilectio*).³⁰⁷

In this light, knowing his vast classical and Christian education, I assume that Cassiodorus’s cultural preference for *diligere* shows his awareness of the more spiritual, elevated sense attributed to this verb throughout the patristic tradition. Simultaneously, exactly his classical background allowed him to expand on these tensions in emotive tradition and push the boundaries between the ‘secular’/theological presence/absence of difference. Considering Cassiodorus’s primary focus on public service even in his letters to clerics, his

³⁰² Henderson, “*Amor* and Related Words in Prudentius,” 104–5.

³⁰³ Vito Limone states that in Rufinus’s *Commentarius in Canticum Cantorum*, prol. 2.20, the Latin text lists four names of the love: *amor* and *cupido* with regard to the physical love (supposedly, would be the rendering of Origen’s ἀγάπη), and *dilectio* and *caritas* with regard to the spiritual love (supposedly, would be the rendering of Origen’s ἔρω). Vito Limone, “I Nomi Dell’amore: Un’indagine Sulla Traduzione Latina Del Commento al Cantico Dei Cantici Di Origene,” *Zeitschrift Für Antikes Christentum / Journal of Ancient Christianity* 19, no. 3 (2015), 407–428.

³⁰⁴ Limone, “I Nomi Dell’amore,” 428–29.

³⁰⁵ H.A.G. Houghton provides an example of the biblical exchange between Jesus and Peter in John 21:15–17 as a demonstration:

21:15 Jesus: ... do you love (ἀγαπᾷς/diligis in Vulgate) me ...?

Peter: ... you know that I love (φιλῶ/amo in Vulgate) you.

21:16 Jesus: ... do you love (ἀγαπᾷς/diligis in Vulgate) me ...?

Peter: ... you know (οἶδας) that I love (φιλῶ/amo in Vulgate) you.

21:17 Jesus: ... do you love (φιλεῖς/amas in Vulgate) me ...?

Peter: ... you know (οἶδας) everything, you know (γινώσκεις) that I love (φιλῶ/ amo in Vulgate) you.

As Houghton states, the alternation between *amare* and *diligere* was more confused in the patristic material, and the lack of sensitivity to the two terms was also displayed in the Latin translations of various Greek writings, including Chrysostom. Even Augustine’s discussion of 21:17 indicates that he did not treat the variation as significant: “Where it is even shown that *amor* and *dilectio* are one and the same thing. For on the last occasion, the Lord does not say *diligis me?* but *amas me?*” For more on the Latin translations and patristic exegesis of the fragment, see: H.A.G. Houghton, “A Flock of Synonyms? John 21:15–17 in Greek and Latin Tradition,” in *Texts and Traditions: Essays in Honour of J. Keith Elliot*, ed. Peter Doble and Jeffrey Kloha (Leiden: Brill, 2014), 232–37.

³⁰⁶ Ambrose, *Exp. Luc.* 10.176. Houghton, “A Flock of Synonyms,” 235.

³⁰⁷ Henderson, “*Amor* and Related Words in Prudentius,” 114–15.

use of *amor* for the Church audience would be perceived as one of the linguistic variations for naming God's love for humans, while for the secondary audience of the Italo-Roman elite, it could have had the additional connotative association with the regnal script of intimate love, that is, a type of favoritism specifically close to divinity in the context of the letter. Such potential layering of meanings is even more apparent in another example of *diligere*: "For you [the pope of Rome] preside over the shepherds of the Christian people: in the role of a father, **you love** (*diligitis*) all."³⁰⁸ Despite being a flattering syncrisis of the Roman Pope to God himself, this phrase, if read with an idiosyncratic Cassiodorus's dichotomy of *amare/diligere* for his civic affection, also conveys the hierarchical distance and the exceptional humility of the civic service subordinated to the spiritual leadership of the Western Nicene Church. Such an underlying emotive meaning might have even been decipherable to a primary addressee of Cassiodorus, a pope John II (533-535), born Mercurius, who belonged to the Italo-Roman aristocracy and, apparently, received some classical education. Cassiodorus's humbleness ostensibly contradicts the literality of a top-down administrative request coming from the praetorian prefect to the Roman Pope to take responsibility for the Roman populace, however, the letter tries to circumvent it precisely through the auctorial manipulation of rhetorical and emotive content. Thus, Cassiodorus's potential play on the connotative perception of the vocabulary of divine love by 'secular' and ecclesiastical audiences might provide a better view on the *Variae*'s emotionality and Cassiodorus's emotive persona with its exemplary behavioural codes, the persona, I argue, of the official deferential in front of spiritual authorities and God but also hopeful for God's special benevolence.

If the script of divine love explored the spiritual code of behavior of a perfect official, *the script of patronal affection* by Church authorities regarded more a sociocultural dimension. The range of such patronal affection varied from the spiritual and administrative commitment to the urban populace of the pope of Rome to the spiritual, affective, and civic obligations of the bishops. In the letter to the Pope, Cassiodorus exhorts him to have especial manifested 'affection' for the Romans by alluding to reciprocity of client-patron relations in which gratitude for having an apostolic patronage at Rome should be returned to the citizens themselves:

May that [papal] throne, a marvel throughout the world, shield its own cultivators with **that affection** (*affectione*) which, although it may be proffered to the whole world, is known to be more specifically apportioned to us. We hold something particular to the holy apostles

³⁰⁸ Cassiodorus, *Var.* 11.2.4 (trans. Bjornlie, 431).

[i.e. the burial cults of Peter and Paul], may it not be delivered to another by the sundering force of sins, because Rome has more fortunately deserved to possess in her fold those attestations that the world seeks.³⁰⁹

In this case, the manifested affection consisted in fulfilling by John II his municipal obligation to communicate systematically the needs of the citizens of Rome to a praetorian prefect. The language of reciprocity and mutual obligations reappears slightly differently in the letter to the bishops, which needs to be cited extensively:

Therefore, true fathers of the soul, I beseech you in **affectionate and honest petition** (*affectuosa et probabili petitione*), so that you would pray with silent fasting to the Lord, that he may extend the lives of our *Principes* in a flourishing reign, that as a defender he may diminish the enemies of the republic, that he may give peaceful times, and, for the praise of his own name, he may bring prosperity with tranquility in all affairs, so that he may deign to render me **beloved to you** (*reddere amabilem*). But so that your prayer may also be heard more easily, be attentive to those whom we send concerning various affairs. What we do not know should not be incumbent upon us.³¹⁰

Apart from spiritual assistance, Cassiodorus expects the bishops to perform their civic duty of reporting to him the actions and transgressions of the subordinate officials acting on his behalf, which would bring “prosperity and tranquility” to the Ostrogothic *regnum*, including the bishops themselves. Rather than an attempt to reduce bishops to an extension of the public service, I suggest it should be understood as a sort of social contract between two, in which spiritual patronage is assigned to the bishops and the political and social patronage is vaguely promised by Cassiodorus (“...render me beloved to you”). This fact is underscored by the used twice, at the beginning of the plea and at the end of the letter,³¹¹ diplomatic formula ‘affectionate petition’ (*affectuosa petitione*) and ‘affectionate closing’ (*affectuoso fine epistulae*), also attested in the royal diplomatic correspondence as ‘affectionate greeting,’ and by the epistolary language of friendship (Cassiodorus wants to become “beloved to you”). Thus, Cassiodorus’s emotive persona demonstrates a social functionality of affective vocabulary in the relationship with the Roman Church, which primary goal was to create and sustain a network of patron-client-like relationships that reinforced the social structures of the Ostrogothic kingdom.

³⁰⁹ Cassiodorus, *Var.* 11.2.6 (trans. Bjornlie, 432).

³¹⁰ Cassiodorus, *Var.* 11.3.3-4 (trans. Bjornlie, 433).

³¹¹ Cassiodorus, *Var.* 11.3.7 (trans. Bjornlie, 433).

Public Love to the Ruler: “What Affection You Should Have for the One Ruling”

The third most quantitative category for professions of love in the praetorian letters is love and affection expressed by the rulers and to the rulers by public (6 terms). Much as anything related to the subject of the *princeps*, this script of love used the customary love vocabulary, which we have seen in the royal communication with their officials, such as *amor* and its grammatical variations, *affectus/affectio*, and *caritas*. At the first glance, this small category could be dismissed, granted that the formulaic structures and generalised optative rhetoric show a customary perception of public appreciation as an integral element of social and political loyalty, like in this letter:

Let the **love/longing of all men** (*amor omnium circa dominos felices*) now be stirred for our happy masters, so that, just as we have not wanted to keep any man in suspense with respect to contrary thoughts, thus should they [i.e., provincials] also show themselves loyal in devotion to those ruling.³¹²

However, Cassiodorus essentially perpetuated, while adapting, the late Roman imperial emotive codes from the discourse of the official imperial communication and public panegyrics.

In the late Roman imperial discourse, the public love to the emperor, as vocalized by the members of elite who composed the letters and panegyrics to the rulers, most customarily espoused the common love vocabulary such as *amor/amor publicus*, *caritas*, and, occasionally, *affectus/affectio*. Their signifying potential enabled to describe two slightly distinct sociocultural scenarios. First, in the classicising panegyric of Mamertinus, which is heavily informed by the affective and behavioral conventions of the classical friendship, the portrayal of the public love to an emperor Julian (361-363) is specified in terms of the profound ethical and personalised appreciation and commitment to a virtuous personality of the emperor ingrained in the friendship tropes of “unity in life” and “unity in mind:”

“But **our affection** (*noster affectus*) is one of a true and certain judgment attached to the deepest abodes of our minds (*mentis*), intermingled and united with our spirit (*animus*) and life (*vitae*), which will live with our undying mind even when our bodies have been

³¹² Cassiodorus, *Var.* 11.9.2 (trans. Bjornlie, 441).

dissolved in death. [...] "What need is there for these, when you are surrounded by the firmest of walls, **the citizens' love** (*civici amoris*)?"³¹³

Doubtlessly, this is an exceptional conceptualisation, which shows an expectation of Julian's cultural preference to the classical ideas of friendship and virtue as a model for a dispositional feeling of public affection towards their emperor. After an eloquent ekphrasis of the beauty of Julian's virtues,³¹⁴ Mamertinus proclaims that:

It is no wonder, then, Emperor, that the people are inflamed with **so much genuine love for you** (*amor verus in te civium*); and I do not think that anyone since the birth of the human race has been regarded by mankind with such **ardent admiration** (*dilectum*). **Affection** (*charitates*) for the rest of the kings and Emperors has been rather rare and never long-lived.³¹⁵

However, the regard for the morally virtuous emperor was not the only behavioural code encouraged in the public and encouraging the emperor to emulate his own encomiastic image, since the second type of public love focused on honouring the emperor's social patronage and financial generosity. In the *Relationes*, Symmachus depicts the public love as a sociocultural behavioural code in acknowledgement of public's obligation to reciprocate the emperors' beneficent actions, such as organisation of games, reminiscent of patron-client relations: "Nevertheless it is **affection for your [i.e. Theodosius's and Arcadius's] Perennities** (*amor perennitates vestrae*), not avidity for entertainment, that has whetted the longings of the populace. Give for this moment what is asked of you so that in the future room may be left for all the other things which without limit you will bestow."³¹⁶

³¹³ Mamertinus, *Gratiarum Actio de Consulatu Suo Iuliano Imperatori* 23.3-4. C. E. V. Nixon and Barbara Saylor Rodgers, eds., *In Praise of Later Roman Emperors*, 425-426.

³¹⁴ For example, "There is a story that a noble youth of Etruria wounded his own face to obliterate his beauty since he had aroused the passions of many women because of his uncommon good looks. But it was easy for a young man who thought grace of spirit more important than physical charm to deface his fairness and disfigure the brilliance of his face with deeply marked scars. Does it seem right that Julian have done something of this sort to ward off the citizens' love (*amorem civium*)? But he could not even have done so, unless perhaps we suppose that the virtues beauty can be afflicted with wounds." Mamertinus, *Gratiarum Actio de Consulatu Suo Iuliano Imperatori* 5.4. C. E. V. Nixon and Barbara Saylor Rodgers, eds., *In Praise of Later Roman Emperors*, 401.

³¹⁵ Mamertinus, *Gratiarum Actio de Consulatu Suo Iuliano Imperatori* 24.1-2. C. E. V. Nixon and Barbara Saylor Rodgers, eds., *In Praise of Later Roman Emperors*, 426.

³¹⁶ Symmachus, *Relatio* 6.3 (trans. Barrow, 57). Other examples: Symmachus, *Relatio* 7.3 (trans. Barrow, 59): "It is for us to revere you, to love you (*amamus*)" for the gift received from the emperors by the Roman Senate; Symmachus, *Relatio* 9.4, 5, 8 (trans. Barrow, 69, 71): "With good reason senate and people are loud in your praises, venerate you with all devotion, and enfold you in their love (*amore complectitur*)," "Indeed the people, sated with the 'benefactions' given by imperial generosity, with a swift tilt of the balance have swung strongly in your favour (*amorem vestrum*)," and "accept a preliminary outpouring of the public's affection (*publici amoris*) for you" in expressing public gratitude for the organisation of the games with erecting an equestrian statue for Theodosius; Symmachus, *Relatio* 13.1-3 (trans. Barrow, 83-85): "will never equal the affection (*amoris*) which we freely bestow upon you [i.e. Valentinian]," "In this way [i.e. the Senate discharged its duties to the emperor] its affection (*adfectio*) is demonstrated," "But today our enthusiasm has grown into an

Occasionally, the public affection manifested itself in the form of material signs of honour to the benevolent emperor, such as the equestrian statue of Theodosius I (379-395): “Now is the time for you to gather to yourselves the favour and approbation of senate and people, though I know that there is more in their hearts than is expressed in words; accept a preliminary outpouring of the **public's affection for you** (*publici amori*).”³¹⁷

On a first glance, Cassiodorus ideally preserves untransformed the vocabulary of public love and these two distinct types of its profession. In his address to the Senate regarding his appointment as a praetorian prefect, before giving an extensive panegyric to Amalasuntha, her regnal and manly virtues, and the intelligent political actions, Cassiodorus, similarly to Mamertinus, puts an emphasis on emotive interiority of the public love, which is, though, a response not only to the virtuous character and ruling of Amalasuntha but also to her paternal attitude to people: “O blessed fortune of the age! With the Princeps at leisure, **the favor of the mother** rules (*affectio matris*), through whom everything is accomplished in such a way that the **good will of the public** (*caritas generalis*) may be felt covering us.”³¹⁸ Unlike the first affective type of public love, reserved uniquely for Amalasuntha, the second type features for both a joint reign of Amalasuntha and Theodahad and a reign of Theodahad and customarily uses language of patronage, pointing out the obligation to return public love and loyalty for *regale munus* (“royal gift”) of monetary assistance to Ligurians,³¹⁹ tax reduction of Lucania and Bruttium,³²⁰ or the remission of a half of the taxes for Liguria and Aemilia:

It is fitting to remark what **affection you should have for the one ruling** (*affectus dominantis*), since he first consented to the amount he believed necessary and now he has doubled again what was requested.³²¹

However, Cassiodorus adapts his rhetoric to the literary, social, and cultural context of sixth-century Italy where the significance of the epistolary genre of a direct written correspondence of the officials with the rulers as well as the grandiosity of public honorary dedications to them has, apparently, declined or evolved into the more appropriate forms, which Cassiodorus himself emphasises by not incorporating any of his letters to the Ostrogothic rulers from his palatine service into his collection, as the model epistolary

affection for you (*amorem tuum*),” “you would know what riches your Perennity possesses in public affection (*in publico amore*),” and “for, when generosity is inspired by affection (*amantium largitio*)” for the occasion of the *decennialia* of the emperor, a celebration of the tenth year after the accession of Valentinian II (375-392).

³¹⁷ Symmachus, *Relatio* 9.8 (trans. Barrow, 71).

³¹⁸ Cassiodorus, *Var.* 11.1.4 (trans. Bjornlie, 427).

³¹⁹ Cassiodorus, *Var.* 11.15.1 (trans. Bjornlie, 447).

³²⁰ Cassiodorus, *Var.* 11.39.5 (trans. Bjornlie, 461).

³²¹ Cassiodorus, *Var.* 12.28.9 (trans. Bjornlie, 499).

collections of Pliny the Younger and of Symmachus did.³²² Instead, writing for the Italo-Roman civic elite of the Ostrogothic kingdom, he gives a cultural preference to a social behavioural code of an ideal official, who performs a role of an intermediary between the rulers and the public. Due to his intimacy to a figure of the Ostrogothic rulers less distant socially and symbolically than an emperor, he no longer represents the affective agency of the indebted and loving citizens, but reminds them of their social obligations of the public affection towards a regal person.

To briefly summarise the expression of affection in the narrative voice of the praetorian letters, Cassiodorus focuses on several types of social interactions such as the civic interactions, i.e., the ones within the Italo-Roman civic elite and the ones with the public, ecclesiastical, and public love to the rulers. Unlike the formulaic voice, while describing civic sentiments, Cassiodorus emphasises the ethical and social dimensions of civic affection, the ones that signify a successful performance of the public duties while not necessarily imply the personal feelings of an official or citizens. Cassiodorus's idea of civic affection, consisting of the scripts of collegial love, civic devotion, and local patriotic love, adjusts the cultural and literary conventions of imperial and late Roman honorary inscriptions to a new image of the Ostrogothic professionalised bureaucratic elite, of which Cassiodorus's restrained emotive persona was meant to be an exemplary representative and was to be emulated and imitated as a variation of the normative code for the Italo-Roman civic elite. Other social interactions and their modes of affection fill in the gaps in the Ostrogothic social universe: the scripts of divine love and clerical patronage as well as the script of public love for the rulers complemented a socially prescribed code of behaviour of the virtuous official, who was supposed to sustain a network of patron-client-like relationships with the Roman Nicene Church and secure loyalty of the citizens to the palatine court and Amals. In the end, the idea of Romanness pervaded the entire civic ethos, involving the imitation of the Roman civic virtues immortalised in honorary inscriptions, of late-imperial panegyrics and of the official discourse, and, lastly, the close association of the used verb *amare* with an identitarian sentiment that blurred the social hierarchies by suggesting to be included into the redefined sixth-century Roman way of life.

³²² Bjornlie, "Amicitia and the Epistolary Tradition," 138-141. Even in so-called Amalasuntha's panegyric he never includes the direct addresses to the queen herself.

Conclusion

In this thesis, I have shown the varied signifying potential and socially dictated, emotional, and connotative dimensions of love vocabulary used in Cassiodorus's *Variae*. I have identified the particular sociocultural significance ascribed to the terms *amor* (49 terms) and *affectus/affectio* (76 terms), except the verbs *amare* (86) and *diligere* (66), which had varying connotations depending on particular rhetorical and social context but remained central and preferred terms because of their malleable signifying potential.

The analysis of love vocabulary and rhetoric and different social contexts of its application in the *Variae* has shown that love terminology could have signalled affective and social bonds between varieties of social actors, that is, between family members, husbands and wives, royal personalities and their officials, officials and public, public and royal personalities, kings and kings, Ostrogothic rulers and eastern imperial figures (both male and female), Goths and Italo-Romans, clericals and officials, God and people as well as among specific types of animals. In other words, in the *Variae*, love as a feeling manifested in different forms from bonds of (implied) *amicitia* and parental affection to patron-client-like relations and ties of reciprocity deeply embedded in the late Roman sociocultural structures. The numbered relations not all but some produced several types of emotive scripts of love, with the relationship between royal personalities and officials (5 scripts) and within diplomatic ties (7 scripts) having the most differentiated systems of scripts.

According to my research, the most statistically significant professions of love belonged to the Ostrogothic rulers in their relations with subordinates and diplomatic partners: even Cassiodorus's emotive persona, taking the books 11 and 12, is much less expressive of affection than Athalaric and Amalasuntha in the books 8 and 9 or Theodahad in the book 10. Such results, however, align with Cassiodorus's consistent tendency to construe an affectionate emotive persona of the Ostrogothic rulers, which would, first, in the rhetorical framework of the text, portray them as virtuous and compassionate rulers who are a primary vehicle of socially constructive love, and second, represent their connection with the late-imperial ceremonial and virtues of generosity and clemency. My analysis has also shown that the second most prevalent type of social interaction was the intra-communal or community-based expressions of civic affection, which, unlike the regnal affection, appear throughout all three narrative voices. This also correlates with Cassiodorus's rhetorical framework, since civic affection positioned itself at the core of the Roman culture of public achievement and *gloria*, in which the Italo-Roman elite, a primary audience of the collection, was brought up and educated. Cassiodorus conceived of the service of the Ostrogothic elite as a continuity of late Roman public and imperial bureaucratic service, which was perceived as exemplary, and civic affection could be a visible sign of success or failure to adhere to such civic virtues.

For these textually dominating social scenarios, I have demonstrated the differences between the three narrative voices. For regnal affection, the royal correspondence fashions a nuanced system of social differentiation reflected in affective vocabulary and emotive scripts used, reminiscent of a late-imperial court hierarchy and socially stratified elite, but also these letters contain scripts with implied ruler's interiority and rhetorically articulated suggestiveness of actual emotional intimacy. Contrarily, the formulas lack some affectionate words (*dilectio*) and present a single script of ceremonialised affection that is strongly implicated as a normative behavioural code for both an official and a royal personality, although it preserves a space for suggested closeness. As for civic affection, while the main focus of the praetorian communication is a social dimension of the rhetoric of love aimed at nurturing administrative integrity, in the royal communication and formulas, a suggested affective dimension also comes into play either as elite friendship (royal) or personal commitment of an official (formulas). This illustrates that the formulaic voice was intended as a collection of *exempla* for the Italo-Roman civic elite while Cassiodorus's emotive persona was just a single virtuous *exemplum* with its individual traits.

There is also an observable trend of association between love vocabulary and particular social actors. *Dilectio*, occasionally very close in its meaning to *amor*, was used only by royal personalities and in matrimonial relations, while completely absent in the scripts of civic affection, most likely due to a stronger connotative association between the traditional Roman public love and the terms *amor* and *affectus* through an epigraphic honorary discourse. *Caritas* is also absent from the vocabulary of civic commitment which could be ascribed to the fact that both a classical semantic of respect and esteem for social superiors and a Christianised one of *caritas* were alien to the world of late Roman bureaucratic virtues. Simultaneously, *caritas* performed an important role as an affective bond between Goths and Romans based on their shared Christian identity. Lastly, the varying signifying potential of *amor* made it inapplicable to familial contexts, as in the *Variae*, the latter are presented almost exclusively as inter-personal relations successful or ineffective in maintaining the stability of the household. The case of dichotomy of *amare/diligere* is also vital in revealing the tensions in the existent emotive tradition, which Cassiodorus explored to his benefit in his idiosyncratic usage of *amare/diligere* to rhetorically do and undo a social distance in expressing civic affection, while instrumentalising the sentiment of equality that stood behind an inclusion into Romanness. This distinction, however, never appears in royal communication as the social distance between royal personalities and subordinates might have been perceived as unsurmountable even rhetorically.

Cassiodorus's rhetorical distinction between royal emotive personas also sheds light on normative and divergent (or failed) expressions of affection in sixth-century Italo-Roman emotionality. The subtle transition between Theodoric's and Athalaric's emotive personas with a broadening of signifying potential of *caritas* to the connotations of Christian love could signify a crucial shift in the self-fashioning and self-representation of the Ostrogothic

kingdom, which presents a fruitful field for further research. Even more importantly, Theodahad's emotive persona is a case of a failed performance of affection due to its socially disruptive effects, that is, the violation of an established etiquette of communication between royal personalities and officials/the Roman Senate, the misplaced focus on private affairs rather than common good, and, first and foremost, the violation of the Roman core behavioural ideal of self-restraint and self-control. This case also perfectly exemplifies how Italo-Roman emotionality still retained a sensitivity and related to the classical anxiety over the limits of reciprocity and the extent to which one is allowed to transgress the rhetoric of equality in hierarchically asymmetric relations fashioned as horizontal, especially in such a turbulent relation as the one between an Ostrogothic king and the Roman Senate. Contrarily, the female diplomatic correspondence has shown that *Variae*'s elite women could have higher emotive expressivity and form friendly homosocial connections quicker and easier than men if the performativity of love contributed to the social stability and order.

In the end, what can Cassiodorus's text tell about the emotionality of the sixth-century Italo-Roman elite? For sure, there was the continuity with the late Roman imperial past, and most of the scripts that Cassiodorus construes appropriated and adapted late-imperial emotive codes. The regnal affection adjusts the imperial formulaic expressions to the Ostrogothic ideology and historical reality of a sociocultural standing of the Ostrogothic king who was not divine, far less symbolically distant than a Roman emperor and more dependent on the Italo-Roman civic elite, as a counterweight to the senatorial elite. The shared educational background with post-Roman polities and a sense of belonging to broadly defined Romanness became a rhetorical space for forging affective bonds and political patronages between rulers with *Variae*'s giving an affective priority to 'Roman' polities over Germanic ones. The late Roman honorary inscriptions, the culture of *gloria* and social patronage infused civic affection with a touch of concrete reputational gain through the effective fulfillment of civic duties and administrative integrity.

It is also clear that, as Ríkharðsdóttir states, love vocabulary had both a socially dictated and affective dimension and that they came into play when the terms were used to indicate relations between social actors. The verbal and rhetorical depiction of love was rather an act of social performativity, in which, given *Variae*'s functionality as both an official correspondence and literature, performed affection took part in interactive communication within social circumstances as well as enacted and enforced the Ostrogothic social structures. Cassiodorus's love in personal, public and communal manifestations suggested effective inter-personal relationships that still could have an implied or explicit affective dimension as in the case of regnal friendship and paternal affection to officials, Cassiodorus's local patriotism or genuine public affection to a good official. In the end, all types of love in the *Variae* seem to be strongly embedded in the Roman culture of reciprocity and patron-client-like relations, late-antique ideals of friendship and configurations of other socially significant inter-personal relationships. Despite the Italo-Roman cultural preference for a restrained emotive expression in homosocial settings, *Variae*'s emotionality shows affective rhetoric to be part and parcel of the Ostrogothic sociocultural universe.

Bibliography

Primary Sources:

- Augustine. *The City of God*. Translated by Demetrius B. Zema, Gerald G. Walsh, Étienne Gilson, Grace Monahan, and Daniel J. Honan. Washington: Catholic University of America Press, 2008.
- Boethius, Anicius Manlius Severinus, P. G. Walsh, and Anicius Manlius Severinus Boethius. *The Consolation of Philosophy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Boethius, Anicius Manlius Severinus. *De consolazione philosophiae*. Edited by Claudio Moreschini. Monachii et Lipsiae: Saur, 2005.
- Cassiodorus. *The Variae: The Complete Translation*. Translated by Michael Shane Bjornlie. Oakland: University of California Press, 2019.
- Cassiodorus. *Cassiodorus: Institutions of Divine and Secular Learning and On the Soul*. Translated by James W. Halprin. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2003.
- Cicero. *The Letters of Cicero; the Whole Extant Correspondence in Chronological Order, in Four Volumes*. Translated by Evelyn S. Shuckburgh. Vol. 4. London: George Bell and Sons, 1908.
- Demetrius. "On Style." In *Aristotle Poetics, Longinus On the Sublime, Demetrius on Style*, translated by Doreen C. Innes. Loeb Classical Library 199. Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press, 1995.
- Mommsen, Theodor, ed. "Eusebii Caesariensis Historia Ecclesiastica, Rufini Continuatio." In *Eusebios, Werke II 2*, Vol. 2. Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller Der Ersten Jahrhunderte 9. Berlin, 1908.
- Mommsen, Theodor et al., eds. *Code Théodosien. [Livre] I-XV: Code Justinien, Constitutions Sirmondiennes* (Paris: Cerf, 2009).
- Nixon, C. E. V., and Barbara Saylor Rodgers, eds. *In Praise of Later Roman Emperors: The Panegyrici Latini: Introduction, Translation, and Historical Commentary, with the Latin Text of R.A.B. Mynors*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994.

- Pharr, Clyde, Theresa Sherrer Davidson, Mary Brown Pharr, and C. Dickerman Williams, eds. *The Theodosian Code and Novels and the Sirmondian Constitutions*. Union: Lawbook Exchange, 2010.
- Seruius grammaticus. *Commentarius in Uergilii Aeneidos* ['Seruius Auctus']. Edited by Georg Thilo and Hermann Hagen. Vol. 1-2. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner Verlag, 1881.
- Symmachus. *Prefect and Emperor: The Relationes of Symmachus A. D. 384*. Translated by Reginald Haynes Barrow. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1973.
- Symmachus. *The Letters of Symmachus*. Translated by Michele Renee Salzman and Michael John Roberts. Atlanta: Society of Biblical literature, 2011.

Secondary Sources:

- Abram, Suzanne L. "Latin Letters and Their Commonplaces in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages." Dissertation, Indiana University, 1994.
- Amory, Patrick. *People and Identity in Ostrogothic Italy, 489–554*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Arnold, Jonathan J. *Theoderic and the Roman Imperial Restoration*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2014.
- Bjornlie, Michael Shane. "Amicitia and the Epistolary Tradition: The Case of Cassiodorus' *Variae*." In *De Amicitia: Friendship and Social Networks in Antiquity and the Middle Ages*, edited by Katariina Mustakallio and Christian Krotzel, 135–54. Acti Instituti Romani Finlandiae, 2010.
- . *Politics and Tradition between Rome, Ravenna and Constantinople: A Study of Cassiodorus and the Variae 527-554*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2013.
- . "The Letter Collection of Cassiodorus." In *Late antique letter collections: a critical introduction and reference guide*, edited by Cristiana Sogno, 433–48. Oakland: University of California Press, 2017.
- Brunt, P. A. "'Amicitia' in the Late Roman Republic." *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 11 (1965): 1–20.
- Brody, Leslie R. and Judith A. Hall. "Gender and Emotion in Context." In *Handbook of Emotions*, edited by Michael Lewis, Jeannette M. Haviland-Jones, and Lisa Feldman Barrett, 359–408. New York and London: The Guilford Press, 2008.

- Brown, Peter. *Power and Persuasion in Late Antiquity: Towards a Christian Empire*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1992.
- Cassiodorus, Flavius Magnus Aurelius. *Varie. Volume 5, Libri XI-XII*. Edited by Andrea Giardina, Giovanni Alberto Cecconi, Ignazio Tantillo, Fabrizio Oppedisano, and Istituto italiano per la storia antica. Roma: "L' Erma" di Bretschneider, 2015.
- Cameron, Averil. "Education and Literary Culture." In *The Late Empire, A.D. 337 - 425*, edited by Averil Cameron, 665–708. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2007.
- Choda, Kamil Cyprian, Maurits Sterk de Leeuw, and Fabian Schulz. *Gaining and Losing Imperial Favour in Late Antiquity: Representation and Reality*. Leiden: Brill, 2020.
- Christie, Neil. "Cities and Urban Life in Late Roman Italy: Transformations of the Old, Impositions of the New." In *Late Roman Italy: Imperium to Regnum*, edited by Jeroen W. P. Wijnendaele, 304–38. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2023.
- Constantinou, Stavroula and Mati Meyer. *Emotions and Gender in Byzantine Culture*. New York: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2018.
- Copeland, Rita. *Emotion and the History of Rhetoric in the Middle Ages*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2021.
- Cristini, Marco. "Cassiodorus' *Variae* in the 9th Century." In *Reti Medievali*, edited by Fabrizio Oppedisano: 109–25. Florence: Firenze University Press, 2022.
- . "Concordia Theodericiana." *Latomus*, no. 2 (2019): 314–33.
- . "Diplomacy at the End of the World: Theoderic's Letters to the Warni and Hesti." *Klio* 103, no. 1 (2021): 270–96.
- Demarchi, Nicole. "The *Dolor, Ira* and Vengeance Cycle in Paul the Deacon's *Historia Langobardorum*." *Emotions: History, Culture, Society* (published online ahead of print 2023).
- Devecka, Martin. "White Elephant Gifts: Classicism in Ostrogothic Policy and in *Variae* 10.30." *Journal of Late Antiquity* 9, no. 1 (2016): 195–217.
- Dressler, Alex. *Personification and the Feminine in Roman Philosophy*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2016.
- Forbis, Elizabeth. *Municipal Virtues in the Roman Empire: The Evidence of Italian Honorary Inscriptions*. Stuttgart: Teubner, 1996.
- Foster, Frances. "Reconstructing Virgil in the Classroom in Late Antiquity." *History of Education* 43, no. 3 (2014): 285–303.
- Gillett, Andrew. *Envoys and Political Communication in the Late Antique West, 411 - 533*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

- . “The Purposes of Cassiodorus’ *Variae*.” In *After Rome’s Fall: Narrators and Sources of Early Medieval History Essays Presented to Walter Goffart*, by Alexander Callander Murray, 37–51. Toronto and London: University of Toronto Press, 1998.
- Gunhild Vidén, *The Roman Chancery Tradition: Studies in the Language of the Codex Theodosianus and Cassiodorus’ Variae*. Gøteborg: Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis, 1984.
- Henderson, W.J. “*Amor* and Related Words in Prudentius.” *Acta Patristica et Byzantina* 10, no. 1 (1999): 104–27. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10226486.1999.11745675>.
- Hinterberger, Martin. “The Neighbour’s Unbearable Wellbeing: Phthonos/Envy from the Classical to the Modern Greek World.” In *Managing Emotion in Byzantium: Passions, Affects and Imaginings*, edited by Margaret Mullett and Susan Ashbrook Harvey, 60–89. New York: Routledge, 2023.
- Houghton, H.A.G. “A Flock of Synonyms? John 21:15–17 in Greek and Latin Tradition.” In *Texts and Traditions: Essays in Honour of J. Keith Elliot*, edited by Peter Doble and Jeffrey Kloha, 220–38. Leiden: Brill, 2014.
- Jaeger, Stephen C. *Ennobling Love: In Search of a Lost Sensibility*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1999.
- Kakridi, Christina. *Cassiodorus’ Variae: Literatur und Politik im Ostgotischen Italien*. München: K. G. Saur, 2005.
- Kaster, Robert A. *Emotion, Restraint, and Community in Ancient Rome*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Konstan, David. *In the Orbit of Love: Affection in Ancient Greece and Rome*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2018.
- . *Friendship in the Classical World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Leopold, John W. “*Consolando per Edicta*: Cassiodorus, “*Variae*,” 4, 50 and Imperial Consolations for Natural Catastrophes.” *Latomus* 45, 4 (1986): 816–36.
- Limone, Vito. “I Nomi Dell’amore: Un’indagine Sulla Traduzione Latina Del Commento al Cantico Dei Cantici Di Origene.” *Zeitschrift Für Antikes Christentum / Journal of Ancient Christianity* 19, no. 3 (2015): 407–28. <https://doi.org/10.1515/zac-2015-0034>.
- Lindberg, Carter. *Love: A Brief History through Western Christianity*. Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 2008.

- Lummer, Felix, and Katrín Líska Mikaelssdóttir. "Supernatural Sentiments: The Language of Emotions in the Fornaldarsögur." In *Emotions on the Fringes. Feelings of the Marginalised from Late Antique to Early Modern Literature*, edited by Felix Lummer, 73–114. Budapest: Trivent Publishing, 2024.
- Lung, Ecaterina. "Procopius of Caesarea's "History of Wars" and the Expression of Emotions in Early Byzantium." *Hiperborea Journal. Journal of History* 5, 2 (2018): 5–24.
- Maslakov, G. "Valerius Maximus and Roman Historiography. A Study of the Exempla Tradition." *Aufstieg Und Niedergang Der Römischen Welt* 32, no. 1 (1984): 437–96.
- Mayer, R. G. "Roman Historical Exempla in Seneca." In *Sénèque et La Prose Latine*, edited by P. Grimal, 141–76. Geneva, 1991.
- Meyer, Mati. "Towards an Approach to Gendered Emotions in Byzantine Culture: An Introduction." In *Emotions and Gender in Byzantine Culture*, edited by Mati Meyer and Stavroula Constantinou, 3–15. New York: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2018.
- Miles, Richard. "Vandal North Africa and the Fourth Punic War." *Classical Philology* 112, no. 3 (2017): 384–410.
- Morello, Ruth, and A. D. Morrison, eds. *Ancient Letters: Classical and Late Antique Epistolography*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Mullett, Margaret, and Susan Ashbrook Harvey, eds. *Managing Emotion in Byzantium: Passions, Affects and Imaginings*. New York: Routledge, 2023.
- Murray, Jacqueline. "One Flesh, Two Sexes, Three Genders?" In *Gender and Christianity in Medieval Europe*, edited by Lisa M. Beitel and Felice Lifshitz. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2008.
- Nagy, Piroska, and Xavier Biron-Ouellet. "A Collective Emotion in Medieval Italy: The Flagellant Movement of 1260." *Emotion Review* 12, no. 3 (2020): 135–45.
- Nixon, Charles E. V., Barbara Saylor Rodgers, and R. A. B. Mynors, eds. *In Praise of Later Roman Emperors: the 'Panegyrici Latini'; Introduction, Translation, and Historical Commentary with the Latin Text of R. A. B. Mynors*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994.
- Noreña, Carlos F. *Imperial Ideals in the Roman West: Representation, Circulation, Power*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- Parnell, David Alan, Conor Whately, and Michael Edward Stewart. *The Routledge Handbook on Identity in Byzantium*. New York: Routledge, 2022.

- Pernot, Laurent. *La Rhétorique de L'éloge Dans Le Monde Gréco-Romain*. Vol. 1. Paris: Institut d'Études Augustiniennes, 1993.
- Pétre, Hélène. *Caritas. Etude Sur Le Vocabulaire Latin de La Charité Chrétienne*. Louvain: Louvain Spicilegium Sacrum Lovaniense, 1948.
- Plamper, Jan and Keith Tribe. *The History of Emotions: An Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015.
- Rosenwein, Barbara H. *Emotional Communities in the Early Middle Ages*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2007.
- . *Generations of Feeling: A History of Emotions, 600-1700*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016.
- Ríkharðsdóttir, Sif. *Emotion in Old Norse Literature: Translations, Voices, Contexts*. Woodsbridge: D. S. Brewer, 2017.
- . "Secular Love – ást." In *Saga Emotions: A Handbook*, edited by Gareth Lloyd Evans, Carolyne Larrington and Brynja Þorgeirsdóttir. Manchester: Manchester University Press, forthcoming.
- Saller, Richard P. *Patriarchy, Property, and Death in the Roman Family*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- Susine, Glan Carlo. *The Roman Stonecutter. An Introduction to Latin Epigraphy*. Edited by E. Badian. Translated by A. M. Dabrowski. Oxford: Blackwell, 1973.
- Tacoma, Laurens Ernst. *Roman Political Culture: Seven Studies of the Senate and City Councils of Italy from the First to the Sixth Century AD*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2020.
- Williams, Craig Arthur. *Reading Roman Friendship*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012.

Appendices

Appendix 1: Royal Narrative Voice and Professions of Love/Affection

Social actors / social contexts	Lexemes from the lexical-semantic field of love	Occurrences in the text
The ruler and their subordinates, officials or kingdom as a metaphorical entity to designate people (67)	<i>amor</i> (12)	“...yet nevertheless it is not distasteful to enter upon this topic [of spectacles – A.M.] for the sake of love for the Roman republic (<i>pro amore rei publicae Romanae</i>), since from this we are able to demonstrate what we believe worthy to our way of feeling, especially when the blessing of the times would be the happiness of the people” (1.20.1)
		“what more must be said concerning his morals, which suffice to thoroughly demonstrate that he [i.e., Artemidorus] has always deserved our affection (<i>amorem nostrum</i>)?” (1.43.4)
		“For who would despair of promotion, where it is given in affection (<i>in amore</i>) and to demonstrate purpose?” (2.2.2)
		“When our kindness is known to search out a suitable occasion for munificence and it may sometimes lavish desired gifts on persons less intimate with the affection of our mildness (<i>amore clementiae</i>), how much more it delights to spend on the weal of the republic, where whatever is contributed multiplies the utility of the one giving [the letter orders the <i>Praefectus Praetorio</i> to arrange the <i>annona</i> payment for soldiers stationed along the defensive network of the Alps (Bjornlie, 84)]” (2.5.1)
		“The sight of those who settle in our thoughts with glorious deeds is always pleasing to us, since those who are proven to strive for virtue in our presence have given a lasting surety of their affection (<i>amoris sui</i>) [Theodoric is speaking of Cassiodorus senior – A.M.]” (3.28.1)
		“For it is unusual to preserve modesty under the affection of a Princeps (<i>amore principis</i>), since happiness ever animates pride; for that moderation which is more commonly found in the company of afflictions rarely extends to affluence [the letter announces to the Senate the promotion of Senarius, Vir Illustris, to the office of <i>comes patrimonii</i> – A. M.]” (4.4.4)
		“It is proper [for the Senate – A. M.] to be formed in the affection of Principes (<i>amore principum</i>), as though the fidelity to his likeness had been preserved in a bronze

		sculpture, to the extent that the incumbent offspring would resemble the author who had obligated the republic to himself with many kindnesses” (8.2.5)
		“We doubt not that you would follow this example at a distance, but not by affection (<i>amore</i>); for you are able to commence what we would anticipate from a distance” (8.2.8)
		“Here was the love of a devout king [i.e., of Tuluin] (<i>amor piissimi regis</i>), there was the proven merit of the one hazarding danger” (8.10.10)
		“Thus have we driven off your predecessor [a <i>Praefectus Praetorio</i>] out of a love for the commonality (<i>amore generalitatis</i>), so that you would approach as one bearing healthful assistance” (8.20.1)
		“Indeed, out of love for your city (<i>amore civitatis vestrae</i>) did our lord grandfather [Theodoric] construct an aqueduct of ancient design from royal largesse” (8.30.1)
		“Therefore, return to your former loyalty and let my anxieties, which I bear for the state, be assisted instead by your talent, since it was always customary for you to offer your Principes a pledge of sincerity, nor to obey from the necessity of fear, but rather from love of your ruler (<i>amore dominantis</i>)” (10.13.6)
	<i>affectus/ affectio</i> (11)	“Additionally, there is affection for the city of Rome (<i>Romanae urbis affectio</i>) which must be respected, from which those people who have conjoined themselves in the solidarity of its name cannot be separate” (1.1.3)
		“ Our affection (<i>noster affectus</i>) contrived to detain you [i.e., Artemidorus]” (1.42.2)
		“But much beloved (<i>affectus</i>), he [i.e., Artemidorus] despised all these benefits, so that rightly we should be amazed that so many desirable advantages have been scorned by one man, and it is for us that he is known to have done this” (1.43.2)
		“ Affection (<i>affectum</i>) [towards the Senate and the city of Rome] promotes caution and what we prize most eagerly, we watch over with greater regard” (1.44.1)
		“ Our affection (<i>noster affectus</i>) awaits you [i.e., Felix, vir Illustris]; the hand fills with advantages and causes what you sought from our imperium to be vowed” (2.2.2)
		“For he [i.e., Liberius] neither crossed over to us in the mean state of a deserter, nor feigned hatred for his former master, so that he might procure for himself the affection of another (<i>alterius affectum</i>) [i.e., of Theodoric]” (2.16.2)
		“With this, the ambitious intention of our habits, since we cherish everyone alike with paternal affection (<i>generalitatem patrio affectu</i>), we bestow upon you with abundant generosity the fillets of the urban prefecture for the

		fourth indiction, so that bright succession to familial honors may delight and so that whoever deserves to succeed in our reign should be able to prosper under us” (3.11.1)
		“For our intention justly indulges the obedient and to those whom we know to be mindful of your good works, we offer affection (<i>affectum</i>) without hesitation a second time [Athalaric is speaking of Osuin]” (9.8.2)
		“Indeed, it is not possible for only one man to assume to claim for himself the glory that we are granting to the Roman name. [The members of the Senate,] return the fullest regard for my [Theodahad’s] affection (<i>affectui meo</i>)” (10.12.3)
		“Therefore, demonstrate good faith for the assurance you [i.e., the Senate] have obtained, since after such a thing, affection (<i>affectus</i>) ought to be repaid for our clemency, rather than promised” (10.16.2)
		“Know how much your affection (<i>vester affectus</i>) [i.e., affection of the Roman people] weighs upon us: we who are admonished by sacred literature to preserve oaths, even if only spoken, have been bound to you in faith. Now show your devotion” (10.17.2)
	<i>dilectio</i> (2)	“Indeed, you recall, conscript fathers, the patrician Liberius had been praiseworthy even in his rivalry with us, when he thus offered unwavering service to Odovacer, so that after he was known to accomplish so much against us as an enemy, he was even more worthy of our esteem (<i>nostra dilectione</i>)” (2.16.2)
		“Hence it is that you [i.e., Cassiodorus himself] used to be publicly associated with the affection of the most gloriously just Princeps (<i>aequissimo principi gloriosa dilectione</i>), because you were separated from vices by a known reserve” (9.24.4)
	<i>caritas, carus</i> (6)	“He [i.e., Artemidorus] will also be a commendation for your good will, so that, when you measure esteem (<i>caritatem</i>) with honors, you would spur others to his example” (1.43.5)
		“You [i.e., the Senate] will be able to recognize the special esteem (<i>caritatem praecipuam</i>) that we [i.e., Theodoric] have for you by the very same cares for which we are seen to be so disturbed, that we should permit no admonition to be disregarded” (1.44.1)
		“Now, rouse your [i.e., the Roman people’s] courage and with God’s grace always choose better things, so that, just as we [i.e., Athalaric] have commenced upon royal power with affection (<i>caritate</i>), thus by God will we pursue peaceful tranquility in following years” (8.3.5)
		“Therefore, apply yourself to satisfy this effort by fair decree, and with documents appropriately drafted by your office, transfer the determined sum to his [i.e., Theodahad’s] agents without any delay, so that more amicably he might

		give greater thanks to us for this present gift by his shared affection (<i>caritate sociato</i>)” (8.23.4)
		“Indeed, it is not possible for only one man to assume to claim for himself the glory that we are granting to the Roman name. [The members of the Senate,] return the fullest regard (<i>plenissimam caritatem</i>) for my [i.e., Theodahad’s] affection” (10.12.3)
		“But it is also right, conscript fathers, that such a cherished man (<i>carus</i>) [i.e., Maximus] should be one through whom blessings would extend to you” (10.12.4)
	<i>amare, amans, amabilis</i> (18)	“You [i.e., Artemidorus] have obtained promotion more slowly for the sake of one who cherishes (<i>amantem</i>) you [i.e., Theodoric], so that after a taste of consecrated friendship, you would advance to honors even more adorned” (1.42.2)
		“ We love (<i>amamus</i>) that our favors (<i>beneficia nostra</i>) should double, nor should generosity demonstrate reluctance once conferred” (2.2.1)
		“Just as we desire to demonstrate the righteousness of concord when called upon by entreaties, so too we dislike (<i>non amamus</i>) that offenses to the law should occur through our favors (<i>nostra beneficia</i>), especially in that portion of the laws that we believe concerns divine reverence [here, the offenses to the Jews are implied – A.M.]” (2.27.1)
		“ We cherish (<i>amamus</i>), conscript fathers, the exceptional dignities begotten by our liberality (<i>nostra benignitate</i>)” (3.12.1)
		“For he [i.e., the father of Argolicus] caused the resolve of the Princes both to disregard officials and to love the virtues (<i>amare virtutes</i>)” (3.12.3)
		“ We love (<i>amamus</i>) to involve in public affairs those officials conspicuous for the probity of their habits [the letter addresses Simeon, appointing him to govern the province of Dalmatia – A.M.], so that the increase of utility may grow through the obedience of those faithful to us” (3.25.1)
		“Indeed, the happiness of the one ruling is to love (<i>amare</i>) what liberates the subordinates, when the goal of our intention has been obtained, at the same time that our subjects arrange matters for their own future [the letter is addressing the leading citizens of Catana with a permission to use the materials from an unused amphitheatre to strengthen the city walls – A.M.]” (3.49.1)
		“Therefore, [you, Senarius, who is promoted to the office of <i>comes patrimonii</i>] preserve that amiable character (<i>virtutum amabilem</i>) [the implication here is that it is amiable to Theodoric – A.M.] and that remarkable constancy, and supported by the authority of our household, eagerly seek after a gratitude equal in blessings to the number of offices you consider yourself able to attain”

		(4.3.4)
		“Moreover, we elevate enfeebled wishes with hope, so that, while advancement is sought, eagerness for probity is loved even more (<i>plus amentur</i>) [the letter inducts Argolicus into the senatorial order – A. M.]” (4.22.2)
		“For thus we believe, since, mindful of your birth, you [i.e., Theodagunda] have cast all wrongdoing from yourself and you are able to delight only in that which you also know us to love (<i>nos amare</i>)” (4.37.1)
		“You [i.e., Tuluin] have cherished (<i>amasti</i>) patience in listening and truth in conversing; often you corrected with eager rectitude whatever falsehood had reached him and, what is a rare kind of trust, you sometimes resisted the wishes of the Princeps, but only for his reputation for rectitude” (8.9.6)
		“We do not esteem (<i>non amamus</i>) in other men anything extralegal that we would abhor” [the address to a new <i>quaestor</i> , Ambrosius – A.M.] (8.13.6)
		“It is easy to love these merits (<i>amare eas</i>) by which a learned man is made conspicuous, when he claims each and every glory for himself, lest the heart is able to forget for what reason he was associated with us” [this letter addresses the Senate, informing about the appointment of Fidelis as a <i>quaestor</i> – A.M.] (8.19.4)
		“Listen, O magistrates, to what we cherish (<i>amemus</i>); attempt nothing harmful to the public. For whom would you expect to please with iniquitous policies, when you know that only what can agree with the dictates of justice pleases us?” [the letter appoints a new <i>praefectus praetorio</i> , Avienus – A. M.] (8.20.5)
		“Concerning which, we have ascertained that your sublimity must be reminded in the present ordinances, since we do not want those whom we love (<i>quos amamus</i>) to transgress, lest we should bear” [the letter addresses a <i>comes</i> of Syracuse on the matter of the administrative abuses – A.M.] (9.14.10)
		“For even if they had endured anything unjust or harsh up to this point, let them believe nothing would be denied our clemency, we who grant no leisure to ourselves, so that they may enjoy secure peace and quiet happiness. Let them quickly feel how we are unable to love anyone (<i>nos amare non possumus</i>) whom they fear from their excesses” [the letter grants a pardon to two men imprisoned on allegations of treason during Theodoric’s reign – A.M.] (9.17.5)
		“A subject who is worthy enough that his master bestow kinship upon him [i.e., Maximus] must be loved more (<i>plus est amandus</i>)” (10.12.3)
		“We [i.e., Witigis] who have waged war often know how to cherish brave men (<i>amare viros fortes</i>)[i.e., Goths]” (10.31.1)
	<i>diligere,</i>	“Often you [i.e., the emperor Anastasius] have encouraged

	<i>dilectus, diligens</i> (18)	me to esteem the Senate (<i>diligam senatum</i>), to embrace gladly the laws of Principes, so that I might unite all parts of Italy” (1.1.3)
		“We [i.e., Theodoric] are called forth for the improvement of the city from an active zeal for its citizens, since nobody is able to esteem (<i>nemo potest diligere</i>) what he knows the inhabitants do not love [the letter requires to audit the accounts used to fund the workshops at Rome, responsible for providing the materials for the Roman public buildings (Bjornlie, 55)]” (1.21.1)
		“Affection promotes caution and what we prize most eagerly (<i>quae studiosius diligimus</i>), we watch over with greater regard” [the letter informs the Senate about the direct authority, which Artemidorus as a <i>praefectus urbi</i> will take over the public disturbances] (1.44.1)
		“Indeed, you [i.e., Stephanus, who is elevated to the senatorial rank] have managed to please all, since you have ever been a watchman to what is most cherished (<i>diligenda</i>) [the heavy implication of the things that the <i>princeps</i> and <i>regnum</i> cherish – A. M.], a confidant in secrets, effective in legal cases, and constantly at the work of public office” (2.28.2)
		“For thus we believe, since, mindful of your birth, you [i.e., Theodagunda] have cast all wrongdoing from yourself and you are able to delight (<i>diligere</i>) only in that which you also know us to love” (4.37.1)
		“More precious than all praise, fidelity is added to your [i.e., Cyprian’s] merits, which divine providence cherishes (<i>divina diligunt</i>) and human nature venerates [the letter appoints Cyprian, an official with the experience of legal service and a former envoy to the East, to the office of <i>comes sacrarum largitionum</i> , responsible for the royal mint and circulation of money – A. M.]” (5.40.6)
		“Indeed, it is fitting that the most outstanding senators are able to show so much more respect (<i>tanto amplius posse diligere</i>) because they are known to have received distinction greater than other ranks” (8.2.8)
		“For the one who remembers the author of his blessings delights (<i>diligit</i>) the heir most pleasingly” (8.4.3)
		“We would indeed want to relate to you [i.e., the Goths] the joys of our lord grandfather’s lengthy life; but since he has been removed from those cherishing him (<i>diligentibus</i>) by hard circumstance, he has made us the heir to his regnum, by his own decree and according to God, so that, with the succession of his own bloodline, he would make perpetual those benefits conferred upon you by him, while we desire both to protect and increase those things that we recognize were done by him” (8.5.1)
		“Promoted men always delight (<i>diligunt</i>) the author of their own advancement, and those who are not beholden to such

		benefits do not understand the laws of good character” [the letter to Tuluin, who is elevated to the rank of <i>patricius praesentalis</i> , i.e., patrician attending at court – A.M.] (8.9.4)
		“Listen, O magistrates, to what we cherish; attempt nothing harmful to the public. For whom would you expect to please with iniquitous policies, when you know that only what can agree with the dictates of justice pleases us (<i>diligere</i>)? [the letter appoints a new <i>praefectus praetorio</i> , Avienus – A. M.]” (8.20.5)
		“A second consideration for us was to inquire after the flow of your [i.e., Patricius’s] eloquence, which, granted that it delights (<i>diligamus</i>) us particularly, we nonetheless rightly place it after good character [the letter appoints Patricius as a new <i>quaestor</i> – A.M.]” (10.6.3)
		“Although it should be customary for you [i.e., the Roman people] to cherish your masters (<i>diligere dominos vestros</i>) with a clear conscience and to act upon it with obedience, so that you may consider the disposition of the ruler genial, this was, moreover, always characteristic of your ancestors, so that, like limbs to the head, thus would you seem conjoined to your Principes” (10.14.1)
		“And what may he [i.e., Theodahad who speaks in the third person] give in return, he who is defended by the greatest exertion, for whom civic harmony is preserved every day, except that he should esteem (<i>diligat</i>) beyond anything else those through whom he is shown to command the realm” (10.14.1)
		“You have a Princeps [i.e., Theodahad] who desires to find in you that zeal for devotion that delights him (<i>diligat</i>)” (10.14.2)
		“Know, O Quirites, with what firmness your Princeps cherishes you (<i>dilixerit</i>), such that, even tested by harsh behavior, we would not suffer you to be disturbed, nor have we wanted to delay your pledges in the least, which we have always wanted to be celebrated before the great populations of the republic [the letter announces Theodahad’s delivery of the oaths of security to the Roman Senate – A. M.]” (10.17.1)
		“For if the watchful shepherd prevents treachery within the herd, if the father who loves his household (<i>diligens locum</i>) steals the opportunity of theft from burglars, with what precautions do we defend Rome, which is known to be peerless throughout the world? [the letter to the Roman Senate addresses the unrest caused by the stationed Gothic garrison in Rome – A. M.]” (10.18.1)
Diplomatic relationship	<i>amor</i> (8)	“Let the great heights not be cast into ruin because someone who fails to act against adversity is proven to cherish them less (<i>minus diligere</i>)” (10.18.1)
		“And therefore, most dutiful of Principes [i.e., the emperor Anastasius], it is becoming to your power and dignity that

<p>(relationship between the Ostrogothic king and the Byzantine emperor, 'barbarian' kings /kings of the post-Roman polities, relation towards the diplomatic embassies, etc.) (60)</p>	<p>we [i.e., Theodoric] ought to strive for harmony with you, the means by which we have thus far increased in love (<i>amore</i>) [the letter addresses the emperor Anastasius with a request of piece, professing a political ideal of two Roman republics, eastern and western, after the events of the Amal annexation of Sirmium in Pannonia (Bjornlie, 31)]” (1.1.2)</p> <p>“Thence, seek us more often along that route that your desire (<i>amor vester</i>) [i.e. of the Haesti] has opened, since the search for riches always procures harmony among kings, who, while they are comforted by small gifts, always provide greater things in compensation [the diplomatic letter to the Haesti, a people presumably set along the Baltic shore (Bjornlie, 204)]” (5.2.3)</p> <p>“Thus may it happen that what was usually sought in war will be declared contemptible out of an eagerness for affection (<i>amoris studio</i>) [the letter is addressed to Thrasamundus, a king of Vandals, and congratulates the Vandal king on the conditions of peace with the Ostrogothic <i>regnum</i>. The previous rupture in the relations occurred because of Thrasamundus’s support of the unsuitable for the Ostrogothic interests candidate as a next Visigothic ruler after the death of Athalaric, that is, his eldest son Gesalic, whose defeat in Gaul (511), apparently, predicated the restoration of peace in the first place (Bjornlie, 242-243)]” (5.44.1)</p> <p>“For our adornment is to your glory [i.e. Justinian’s], when it becomes known that you have provided what applies to our praise. For it is fitting that the entire Roman world, which the love of your brilliance (<i>amor vestrae serenitatis</i>) illuminates, should gleam with your assistance [the letter by Amalasuntha appeals to the eastern emperor, Justinian, with what, as Bjornlie suggests, might be advice or authorization of some building project (Bjornlie, 398)]” (10.8.2)</p> <p>“For although this may be entirely dear to him [i.e. Theodahad], it is nevertheless known to be a special matter to me [i.e. Theodahad’s wife, Gudeiva], when the love of such a great matron (<i>amor tantae dominae</i>) [i.e. Theodora] is so able to elevate me that I may come to know something greater beyond a regnum [the letter is written by Theodahad’s royal consort, Gudeliva, in hope of securing patronage of the eastern imperial court through Justinian’s wife, Theodora – A. M.]” (10.21.1)</p> <p>“With the arrival of wise Peter, the love of your serenity (<i>amor vestrae serenitatis</i>) [i.e. Theodora] has thus satisfied us [i.e. Gudeliva], so that we count ourselves as having seen you, whose gracious conversation we have shared [the letter from Gudeliva accompanies the letter from Theodahad to Theodora in the hopes to secure her intervention in a ratification of the treaty with the Byzantine Empire with an</p>
---	--

		expectation that she will advocate for less harsh terms – A. M.]” (10.24.1)
		“Therefore, may we [i.e. Theodahad and Gudeliva] receive the goodness of your heart [i.e. Theodora], since it is a truly royal purpose to enjoy the glorious affectio of all people (<i>amore cunctorum</i>) [the letter from Gudeliva accompanies the letter from Theodahad to Theodora in the hopes to secure her intervention in a ratification of the treaty with the Byzantine Empire with an expectation that she will advocate for less harsh terms – A. M.]” (10.24.2)
		“For truly, this ought to stir you [i.e. Justinian], that by wondrous arrangement, divine authority caused us [i.e. Justinian and Witigis] to know each other before the eminence of regnum, so that it bestowed the reason of love (<i>amoris causam</i>) on those whom it had conferred the pleasure of meeting (<i>aspectum gratiam</i>) [in the letter, Witigis addresses Justinian with an appeal at some point of the Gothic war between a siege of Rome (536) and the capitulation of Witigis at Ravenna (540) – A.M.]” (10.32.3)
	affectus, affectio, affectuosus (22)	“Wherefore, greeting (<i>salutantes</i>) you [i.e. Clovis, the king of the Franks] with respect and good will (<i>affectione</i>), for which it is appropriate that we have sent to your excellence with the usual affection our legates ille and ille [the letter from Theodoric to Clovis (507) invokes the ties of marriage between two kingdoms to appeal on behalf of the Alamannic refugees, who fled from the war in Frankish Gaul (Bjornlie, 117)]” (2.41.3)
		“For recall the disposition (<i>affectum</i>) of the elder Euric (466-484) [i.e. the father of Alaric II, the king of Visigoths], with how many gifts he often assisted you, how often he held back from you the looming wars of neighboring nations [the letter addresses the king of the Herules, the king of the Warni, and the king of the Thuringians, all people bordering on the Frankish realm from across the Rhine, in order to obtain their support in opposing the conflict between Alaric II and Clovis (Bjornlie, 121)]” (3.3.3)
		“Let me speak freely what I feel, let me say it pointedly (<i>affectuose</i>): the feeling that stirs arms immediately at the reception of the first embassy is impetuous [the letter addresses the king of the Franks, Clovis, and is the last in a sequence of letters aimed at resolving hostilities in Gaul between the Franks and the Visigoths (Bjornlie, 122)]” (3.4.3)
		“Let divine providence witness your marriage, so that just as the cause of affection (<i>causa affectionis</i>) has bound us, so too may familial regard oblige our posterity [the letter addresses a formation of an alliance with the Thuringians, people north of Italy, with the marriage between the Thuringian king and Theodoric’s niece (Bjornlie, 165)]” (4.1.4)

		<p>“Thence, through our envoys, ille and ille, who repay you the affection of an owed greeting (<i>salutationis affectum</i>), we declare that we have gladly accepted your arms, which have conveyed your concern for the blessings of peace [this letter addresses the king of Warni, a little-known Germanic people of northern or central Europe, to establish the diplomatic ties in order to obtain a local commodity, swords of native manufacture (Bjornlie, 203)]” (5.1.3)</p>
		<p>“[...]being desirous of the amber that you have sent with carriers, we acknowledge you with affectionate greetings (<i>affectuosa salutatione</i>); your gifts have been received with a grateful disposition [the diplomatic letter to the Haesti, a people presumably set along the Baltic shore (Bjornlie, 204)]” (5.2.2)</p>
		<p>“Affection (<i>affectus</i>) has indeed prevailed over everything [the letter is addressed to Thrasamundus, a king of Vandals, and congratulates the Vandal king on the conditions of peace with the Ostrogothic <i>regnum</i>. The previous rupture in the relations occurred because of Thrasamundus’s support of the unsuitable for the Ostrogothic interests candidate as a next Visigothic ruler after the death of Athalaric, that is, his eldest son Gesalic, whose defeat in Gaul (511), apparently, predicated the restoration of peace in the first place (Bjornlie, 242-243)]” (5.44.4)</p>
		<p>“Therefore, we have extended the fullest affection of salutation (<i>plenissime salutationis affectum</i>) by returning your envoys, ille and ille, wishing that divine providence grant your safekeeping, of which we know the strongest sort to be allied intentions [the letter to the king of Vandals, Thrasamundus]” (5.44.4)</p>
		<p>“Friendship (<i>gratia</i>) should not die with the dearly beloved [i.e. Theodoric], but who is found innocent in the quarrels of ruling must be treated more favourably (<i>affectuosius</i>) [the letter addresses the eastern emperor Justin, announcing the elevation of Athalaric – A. M.]” (8.1.2)</p>
		<p>“Your affection (<i>vester affectus</i>) should transfer the parental role (<i>in parentelae locum</i>) now, for by the laws of nature the offspring of your son should not be considered unrelated to you” (8.1.3)</p>
		<p>“It is customary for new kings to announce the joys of their elevation among diverse peoples, so that they may acquire the affection of a foreign Princeps (<i>affectum principis externi</i>) concerning the collegiality of ruling [in this letter, Theodahad announces his elevation to a ruling colleague of Amalasuntha to the eastern emperor Justinian]” (10.2.1)</p>
		<p>“And so, accept with an affectionate disposition (<i>affectiosis mentibus</i>) both our accession and that of our consort sister, to whom you have been singularly devoted, and favor her decision” (10.2.3)</p>
		<p>“Therefore, expressing the most respectful affection of</p>

		<p>greeting (<i>affectum salutationis</i>) to your dominion, we have sent the bearer of these letters, in order to present that for which Calogenitus had been formerly sent, so that, even though his role has been removed from human affairs, with the Lord's blessing, your assistance should nevertheless reach us, lest the desire that we had presumed to be secure should be brought to naught [the letter by Theodahad, which duplicates the subject of Amalasuntha's letter, <i>Variae</i> 10,8]" (10.9.2)</p>
		<p>"And so, rendering the affection of respectful greeting (<i>reverentiae salutationis affectum</i>) to an Augusta [i.e. Theodora], it is my hope that, with the return of those legates whom we have sent to the most clement and glorious Princeps, you would cause us to rejoice concerning your approval, since your prosperity is as pleasing to us as our own and it is essential to obtain that hoped-for approval, which we are known to constantly desire [the letter of salutation from Amalasuntha to Theodora, the matters in question, apparently, were supposed to be conveyed by the envoys in-person – A. M.]" (10.10.1)</p>
		<p>"Bestow, therefore, the example of your kindness on the whole world, so that one who commends himself to you with sincere affection (<i>pura affectione</i>) should be known by how much he may be advanced [the letter from Theodahad to Justinian concerned with the preservation of peace between the Ostrogothic kingdom and the eastern empire, which, as Bjornlie states, might or might not be connected with hostilities initiated by Belisarius (Bjornlie,408)]" (10.19.1)</p>
		<p>"Therefore, sending the respect of salutations to your serenity, with the presumption of affection (<i>affectuosa salutationis</i>), I commend myself to your heart, hoping that your wondrous prudence may arrange all things such that trust, which is committed to us from your heart, may increase more abundantly [the letter is written by Theodahad's royal consort, Gudeliva, in the hopes of securing patronage of the eastern imperial court through Justinian's wife, Theodora – A. M.]" (10.21.2)</p>
		<p>"And now we believe the same attempt must be renewed again through that most blessed man, ille, so that you would judge as true and good-natured (<i>vera atque affectuosa</i>) what you recognize has been sought repeatedly [the letter addresses Justinian in continuation of attempts to reach a diplomatic solution: as Bjornlie states, judging by the tone, the letter is written when the Gothic war already began (Bjornlie, 410)]" (10.22.1)</p>
		<p>"And since nothing begun well ought to be interrupted by mishap, if there is anything so harsh that should not be imposed upon us, let it be mitigated by the moderation of</p>

		<p>your wisdom, so that we may increase with perpetual zeal the affection (<i>studiis affectum</i>) that we have begun to hold for your regnum [the letter from Theodahad to Theodora in the hopes to secure her intervention in a ratification of the treaty with the Byzantine Empire with an expectation that she will advocate for less harsh terms – A. M.]” (10.23.3)</p>
		<p>“For by such an advantage both the order of affairs is well disposed and the twin affection of your tranquility (<i>vestrae tranquillitatis geminate affectio</i>) is increased [the letter from Gudeliva accompanies the letter from Theodahad to Theodora in the hopes to secure her intervention in a ratification of the treaty with the Byzantine Empire with an expectation that she will advocate for less harsh terms – A. M.]” (10.24.2)</p>
		<p>“But even now, you are able to restore everything that has happened, when it is not difficult to retain the affection (<i>in affectum</i>) of one who is known to longingly seek your favour [in this letter, Witigis addresses Justinian with an appeal at some point of the Gothic war between a siege of Rome (536) and the capitulation of Witigis at Ravenna (540) – A.M.]” (10.32.3)</p>
		<p>“It was fitting that, directing our legates ille and ille to that most serene Princeps, we should also extend through them healthful greetings to your magnitude, so that they would deserve your favor in every way, when they convey the affection of our intent (<i>nostrae collocutionis affectum</i>) [this letter is a letter of introduction to the <i>Magister Officiorum</i> at Constantinople, asking him to facilitate an audience with the emperor for Witigis’s legates. As Bjornlie states, the unnamed official may have been the same Peter the Patrician who had served as envoy to Italy (Bjornlie, 422)]” (10.33.1)</p>
	<i>caritas, carus (11)</i>	<p>“We have sent to that most serene Princeps, with God’s favor, our legates ille and ille, men through whom it was important to render the affection of greeting (<i>salutationis affectum</i>) to your magnitude, because it is owed to your distinction and wisdom, so that we may enjoy the grace of conversation with you [this is the final letter in Witigis’s diplomatic mission to Justinian, a letter of introduction meant to facilitate the travel of the envoys from Italy to the eastern court at Constantinople (Bjornlie, 423)]” (10.35.1)</p> <p>“On which account, offering the dignity of a greeting, we ask with humble intention that you [i.e. Anastasius] not suspend the ennobling affection (<i>gloriosissimam caritatem</i>) of your good will, for which we ought to hope, even if it would not seem possible to grant to others [the letter addresses the emperor Anastasius with a request of piece, professing a political ideal of two Roman republics, eastern</p>

		and western, after the events of the Amal annexation of Sirmium in Pannonia (Bjornlie, 31)]” (1.1.6)
		“Wherefore, greeting you with respect and good will, for which it is appropriate that we have sent to your excellence with the usual affection (<i>consueta caritate</i>) our legates ille and ille [the letter from Theodoric to Clovis (507) invokes the ties of marriage between two kingdoms to appeal on behalf of the Alamannic refugees, who fled from the war in Frankish Gaul (Bjornlie, 117)]” (2.41.3)
		“It is grievously wrong to see hostile intentions between royal persons dear to us (<i>caras regiasque personas</i>), and to watch while ignoring that something might arise for the destruction of one [this letter addresses the king of the Burgundians Gundobad with an intent to muster support for mediating the conflict between the Visigoths and the Franks (Bjornlie, 120)]” (3.2.1)
		“Desiring to associate you with our family, we join you, with the blessing of divine authority, by the dear pledge (<i>caro propitia</i>) of our niece, so that you, who have descended from royal stock, may now gleam even further with the brightness of Amal blood [the letter addresses a formation of an alliance with the Thuringians, people north of Italy, with the marriage between the Thuringian king and Theodoric’s niece (Bjornlie, 165)]” (4.1.1)
		“Let such an act now come to pass between our families that a dear kinsman (<i>carum parentem</i>) would not avoid fault and that wounded pride would spurn money [the letter of Theodoric to the king of Vandals, Thrasamundus]” (5.44.3)
		“Concord is not only had in immediate presence, for on the contrary, those who conjoin themselves with the deepest affection (<i>animi caritate</i>) behold each other more truly [the letter of salutation from Amalasuntha to Theodora, the matters in question, apparently, were supposed to be conveyed by the envoys in-person – A. M.]” (10.10.1)
		“Indeed, we need not mention the blessings of your concord. Whatever will be shared with you in praiseworthy affection (<i>praedicabili caritate sociatum</i>) is considered entirely distinguished [the letter from Theodahad to Justinian concerned with the preservation of peace between the Ostrogothic kingdom and the eastern empire, which, as Bjornlie states, might or might not be connected with hostilities initiated by Belisarius (Bjornlie, 408)]” (10.19.2)
		“For although this may be entirely dear (<i>carum</i>) to him, it is nevertheless known to be a special matter to me, when the love of such a great matron is so able to elevate me that I may come to know something greater beyond a regnum [the letter is written by Theodahad’s royal consort, Gudeliva, in the hopes of securing patronage of the eastern imperial court through Justinian’s wife, Theodora – A. M.]” (10.21.1)
		“For what could be more pleasing than that I [i.e. Gudeliva]

		<p>should appear to be a partner in the exchange of affection with your glory (<i>gloriae vestrae caritatis</i>), so that, since you [i.e. Theodora] shine so abundantly, you would gladly share your own splendor with us, when it does not detract from light to bestow its own brilliant illumination on another?” (10.21.1)</p> <p>“[...]the grace of peace should be confirmed by your most serene husband, to the extent that the public may clearly know that we have duly attained the blessing of an alliance through the great bond of love (<i>vinculum caritatis</i>) [the letter from Theodahad to Theodora in the hopes to secure her intervention in a ratification of the treaty with the Byzantine Empire with an expectation that she will advocate for less harsh terms – A. M.]” (10.23.2)</p> <p>“We return our response by him with as much affection (<i>caritate</i>) as we are able, hoping that we may continue to often hear of your well-being and that the happiness of your regnum may ever increase, since it is fitting that we harbor such a desire as would continually extend your glory and health [this letter is a brief note relating to Justinian the fact that Theodahad has forwarded the emperor’s letters to the pope in Rome (Bjornlie, 413)]” (10.25.1)</p>
		<p><i>dilectio</i> (3)</p> <p>“It is not only fitting that these republics be conjoined one to the other with easy affection (<i>otiosa dilectione</i>), but also it is seemly to be supported with shared strength [the letter addresses the emperor Anastasius with a request of piece, professing a political ideal of two Roman republics, eastern and western – A. M.]” (1.1.5)</p> <p>“Indeed, this affection (<i>ista dilectio</i>) is not new, for if you recollect the deeds of her predecessors, you know that the Amals have always considered friendship with that imperium to be a kind of law of custom, which is just as certain as it is ancient, since what has been warded over the long centuries is not easily changed [in this letter, Theodahad announces his elevation to a ruling colleague of Amalasuntha to the eastern emperor Justinian]” (10.2.3)</p> <p>“For it is our wish that opportunities arise, in which we shall be able to obey your desires, since thus do we effectively remind you of returning that affection (<i>dilectionem</i>), if we may serve you in any way [this letter is a brief note relating to Justinian the fact that Theodahad has forwarded the emperor’s letters to the pope in Rome (Bjornlie, 413)]” (10.25.2)</p>
		<p><i>amare, amans</i> (9)</p> <p>“Even by the right of a loving father do I forbid you (<i>iure patris amantis</i>) [the letter addresses the king of the Franks, Clovis, and is the last in a sequence of letters aimed at resolving hostilities in Gaul between the Franks and the Visigoths (Bjornlie, 122)]” (3.4.4)</p> <p>“Enjoy the affection of one now known to you (<i>amate</i></p>

		<p><i>cognitum</i>), whom unknown you sought by wandering course [the diplomatic letter to the Haesti, a people presumably set along the Baltic shore (Bjornlie, 204)]” (5.2.1)</p>
		<p>“You have shown, most prudent king, that advice from wise men can be of assistance after error has been committed, and that you love (<i>amare</i>) not the fault of obstinacy, which is known to take hold in brutish men [the letter of Theodoric to the king of Vandals, Thrasamundus]” (5.44.1)</p>
		<p>“But as it concerns the reputation of Your [i.e., Justin’s] duty to cherish those whose fathers [i.e., Theodoric] you have loved (<i>amasse</i>)—for nobody is believed to have devoted pure kindness to the elders of a family unless he is shown to regard the offspring as his own—let animosity be buried with the deceased [the letter addresses the eastern emperor Justin, announcing the elevation of Athalaric – A. M.]” (8.1.2)</p>
		<p>“The eagerness of the eastern people for seeing our hero increased, when, I know not how, a man considered bellicose (<i>bellicosus</i>) had become more loved for civil honors (<i>civilia plus amantur</i>) [this letter elevates a prominent Gothic <i>comes</i>, Tuluin, to the rank of <i>patricius praesentalis</i>, patrician “attending at court,” who most likely was meant to join a circle of key advisors of Athalaric. The letter also weaves together a biography of an appointee and panegyric to Theodoric (Bjornlie, 321)]” (8.9.3)</p>
		<p>“Until now, we have delayed relating to you, most clement Princeps, the death of our son of glorious memory, lest we should wound the sensitivity of one loving him (<i>amantis</i>) through the grief of those bearing the news; but now, by the blessing of God, who is accustomed to commute harsh accidents into something prosperous, we have decided to bring better news to your attention, concerning which you would be able to rejoice with us in shared celebration [in this letter to Justinian, Amalasuntha announces an elevation of Theodahad as her ruling colleague] ” (10.1.1)</p>
		<p>“For it is fitting for you [i.e., Justinian] to be able to love (<i>amare</i>) one whose attainment of kingly eminence you celebrated [the letter from Theodahad to Justinian concerned with the preservation of peace between the Ostrogothic kingdom and the eastern empire, which, as Bjornlie states, might or might not be connected with hostilities initiated by Belisarius (Bjornlie, 408)]” (10.19.1)</p>
		<p>“You are clearly cherished in your own regnum, most dutiful Imperator; but how much more remarkable is it that you are loved more (<i>plus amaris</i>) in the Italian provinces, whence it is known the Roman name was diffused throughout the compass of the world! [the letter from Theodahad to Justinian concerned with the preservation of peace between the Ostrogothic kingdom and the eastern empire]” (10.19.3)</p>

		<p>“Such indeed is the wish of one who always loves you (<i>semper amantis</i>), that you would want us to act on opportunities of mercy which would be able to commend us to divine power [this letter of Theodahad responds to reports that have reached Justinian concerning the treatment of men and women of religious orders (Bjornlie, 413)]” (10.26.1)</p>
	<i>diligere, dilectus</i> (7)	<p>“But as it concerns the reputation of your duty to cherish (<i>diligere</i>) those whose fathers you have loved—for nobody is believed to have devoted pure kindness to the elders of a family unless he is shown to regard the offspring as his own—let animosity be buried with the deceased [the letter addresses the eastern emperor Justin, announcing the elevation of Athalaric – A. M.]” (8.1.2)</p> <p>“Friendship should not die with the dearly beloved (<i>cum dilectis</i>), but who is found innocent in the quarrels of ruling must be treated more favorably [the letter addresses the eastern emperor Justin, announcing the elevation of Athalaric – A. M.]” (8.1.2)</p> <p>“And so, accept with an affectionate disposition both our accession and that of our consort sister [i.e., Amalasuntha], to whom you have been singularly devoted, and favor her decision. For if you value me similarly (<i>similiter diligitis</i>), in like manner you make me a king in every way [in this letter, Theodahad announces his elevation to a ruling colleague of Amalasuntha to the eastern emperor Justinian]” (10.2.3)</p> <p>“the assistance of your excellence, so that through him you may command us to accomplish, with the Lord’s favor, that for which we had formerly caused Calogenitus to assemble the marbles and other necessary things, so that we may know ourselves to be prized (<i>vera diligi</i>) in a real sense by your devotion, whose entreaties you cause to be answered [the letter by Amalasuntha appeals to the eastern emperor, Justinian, with what, as Bjornlie suggests, might be advice or authorization of some building project (Bjornlie, 398)]” (10.8.2)</p> <p>“You are clearly cherished (<i>diligeris</i>) in your own regnum, most dutiful Imperator; but how much more remarkable is it that you are loved more in the Italian provinces, whence it is known the Roman name was diffused throughout the compass of the world! [the letter from Theodahad to Justinian concerned with the preservation of peace between the Ostrogothic kingdom and the eastern empire, which, as Bjornlie states, might or might not be connected with hostilities initiated by Belisarius (Bjornlie, 408)]” (10.19.3)</p> <p>“You have shown that you [i.e., Theodora] esteem (<i>diligere</i>) whatever obviously pertains to justice, when the desired concord, having been cleansed of any suspicion</p>

		<p>through divine providence, is able to endure [the letter from Theodahad to Theodora in the hopes to secure her intervention in a ratification of the treaty with the Byzantine Empire with an expectation that she will advocate for less harsh terms – A. M.]” (10.23.1)</p> <p>“For if retribution against King Theodahad is sought, I deserve to be cherished (<i>mereor diligi</i>): if the praise of Queen Amalasuntha of divine memory is held before your eyes, her daughter ought to be regarded, whom it would have been proper for the effort of all your agents to restore to the regnum, so that all nations would be able to acknowledge how you returned such a daughter to a change of fortune [in this letter, Witigis addresses Justinian with an appeal at some point of the Gothic war between a siege of Rome (536) and the capitulation of Witigis at Ravenna (540) – A.M.]” (10.32.2)</p>
Familial relationship (paternal, fraternal, matrimonial relationship, relationship with the relatives, etc.) (14)	<i>amor (1)</i>	<p>“And therefore, if you are cheated in the least with respect to the veracity of the petition sent against you and you have washed the blemish on your marriage bed with the blood of the discovered adulterer, lest you toil under the appearance of a bloodstained mind on account of honor, we order you released from the exile that you had been sentenced to, since for a married man to draw steel on behalf of his love of chastity (<i>amore pudicitiae</i>) is not to trample the laws under foot, but to honor them [the letter addresses the issue of an honour killing and absolves the accused from the previously imposed exile provided that he can demonstrate adultery as a cause of the murder (Bjornlie, 68)]” (1.37.3)</p>
	<i>affectus, affectio, affectuosus (9)</i>	<p>“And so we have learned through the tearful petition of Venantius, the legal guardian of Plutianus, that his own brother Neoterius, having forgotten the condition of brotherhood (<i>affectum germanitatis</i>), has attacked the property of this child with hostile madness [this letter handles an inheritance matter]” (1.8.2)</p>
		<p>“Among other burdens of the human condition, conjugal affection (<i>coniugalis affectus</i>) provokes its own particular anxiety: and not without merit, since the source of posterity’s renewal deserves to be held in high regard [the letter addresses the case in which the woman of a senatorial rank had been seduced (or abducted) and thereby induced to alienate property pertaining to her marriage (Bjornlie, 87)]” (2.11.1)</p>
		<p>“Therefore do husbands take such great precautions that the marriage bond be safeguarded either by divine or public sanction, so that it would be a great flaw of character not to respect the [conjugal] affection (<i>affectus</i>) shared between others” (2.11.1)</p> <p>“Oh, the grief! Do we not deserve the affection of those for</p>

		<p>whom we would not refuse to undergo utter ruin [i.e., the affection of the children] (<i>affectus eorum</i>)? The cares of a father do not flee from the very ocean when it is stirred by savage storms, so that he might attain through foreign commerce what he may leave behind for his offspring [the letter assigns Symmachus to investigate the case of possible parricide – A. M.]” (2.14.2)</p>
		<p>“Although we may believe that any wickedness would displease your judgment [of Aurigenes, a bishop], we especially trust that what would assail the condition of legal matrimony (<i>affectum matrimonii genialis</i>) must be condemned by you [the letter responds to a complaint that a bishop’s dependant has assaulted the wife and the property of another man (Bjornlie, 132)]” (3.14.1)</p>
		<p>“But so that we may return to our purpose, you who have not nurtured eloquence in the Roman Forum, must therefore be trusted to extend the talent from your father’s example. O blessed teacher and most fortunate of pupils, who learned from affection (<i>affectuose</i>) what the terror of learned men has violently wrenched from others [this letter appoints a legal advisor and later prominent Christian scholar Arator as <i>Comes Domesticorum</i> in order to act as a civilian counselor for the new <i>patricius</i> Tuluin (Bjornlie, 326)]” (8.12.6)</p>
		<p>“For you [i.e., Opilio] have learned the requirements of service from praise for your brother [i.e., Cyprianus, the previous <i>Comes Sacrarum Largitionum</i>], to whom you are connected with shared affection (<i>mutuo affectu</i>). You fulfilled kinship with public duties and brotherhood with participation in counsels [the letter appoints Opilio, the appointee who has been instrumental in providing evidence against Boethius, to the office <i>Comes Sacrarum Largitionum</i>, attempting to justify the appointment by the noble family, among other arguments (Bjornlie, 332)]” (8.16.3)</p>
		<p>“But if it is not possible to avenged the property of some on account of poverty’s hindrance, let them be bound with the punishment of exile, lest, what is scandalous to say, they may be seen to avoid the menace of public law for the reason that they are known to lie subject to the lowest fortune. But our piety has decreed this concerning the seducers of another’s affection (<i>affectus alieni</i>) [the letter is an edict of Athalaric, which in this fragment, addresses the issue of adultery – A.M.]” (9.18.4)</p>
		<p>“But that most singular author of chastity and mercy, who had deprived us of a young son [i.e., Amalasuntha’s son, Athalaric], retained affection for a mature brother [i.e., Theodahad] (<i>affectum mature fratris</i>) [the letter announces in Amalasuntha’s voice the elevation of Theodahad, who was, in fact, her cousin, but was characterised as a brother considering his place in the male line of succession –</p>

		A.M.]” (10.3.1)
	<i>caritas</i> (2)	<p>“Thus, while maternal affection (<i>maternal caritas</i>) hastened her [i.e., Isis, who searched for her son Horus] to fulfill her desire, she was seen to reveal something unknown to the world [the letter congratulates the praetorian prefect on the completion of a construction of an Ostrogothic fleet and orders him to assemble the fleet in Ravenna. The mythological excursus refers to Isis who has found a cure for the illness of Horus – A. M.]” (5.17.4)</p> <p>“Let a man who strives to divide the marriage of another with punishable seduction have his own marriage bond be declared unlawful, so that the malicious man may feel more for himself what he had attempted to inflict upon another; or if he lacks the dearness of marriage (<i>coniunctionibus caritate</i>), we deny him the right of future matrimony, since one who dared to assault the marriage bed with division does not deserve to find the reward of respectable marriage [the letter is an edict of Athalaric, which in this fragment, addresses the issue of adultery – A.M.]” (9.18.4)</p>
	<i>dilectio, dilectus</i> (2)	<p>“Nevertheless, let the appraisal not be unjust under this circumstance, lest the wretched would be compelled to bemoan the loss of their means in the midst of the bitterness of painful grief, and they would be forced to acts contrary to devotion, either being pressed upon to lose patrimony on behalf of the dead, or, instead, for the grieving to cast a beloved body (<i>dilecta corpora</i>) into some base pit [the letter appoints a craftsman to superintend the production, sale, and disposition of the marble sarcophagi at Ravenna (Bjornlie, 135)]” (3.19.2)</p> <p>“She claims that her own daughter-in-law Aetheria, with the love of her husband (<i>mariti dilectione</i>) set aside, has bound herself in a covenant of marriage to a certain Liberius, and, since she wishes to display her new marriage bed more lavishly, she hastens to ruin the resources of her first husband, claiming herself to be endowed with the inheritance of her sons, for whom it would be more fitting the property remain intact [the letter addresses the case of a woman who abandoned her husband for another man, and the mother of her previous husband filed suit in order to recover properties claimed by her former daughter-in-law (Bjornlie, 173)]” (4.12.2)</p>
Intercommunal relationship (officials to other officials, officials towards the civic community and vice versa, citizens towards	<i>amor</i> (8)	<p>“Let it therefore be decided between your [i.e., the Senators’s] splendid reputation and more base habits: avoid such servants [i.e., such members of your household] as would be the bearers of injury, who would strive to ascribe to their love for you (<i>amori vestro</i>) what they commit in crime, and who, while they desire to exercise their own willfulness, work to entangle your respectability” (1.30 .4)</p> <p>“And so, the grand gentleman and patrician Decius, bound</p>

the city, etc.) (37)		<p>by glorious love for the republic (<i>rem publicam amore</i>), has made a resolution beyond a marvel, which hardly would have been possible to impose under a directive of our authority [i.e., sponsored a project to dry out a swampland in Rome]” (2.32.2)</p> <p>“On the contrary, the anxious concerns of the city hung about them [i.e., the father and uncle of Inportunus, who is elevated to the patrician rank, from the Decii family], public affection (<i>publicus amor</i>) increasing beyond that of private citizens” (3.5.4)</p> <p>“For if love from the few (<i>paucorum amor</i>) is indeed justly glorious, what enthusiasm is able to hold the acclamation of such a city? [the letter continues the praise for the Decii family]” (3.5.4)</p> <p>“You [i.e., the Roman senators] will certainly have what you may grant to yourselves with genuine praise, if you would make this decision publicly binding with your esteem (<i>amore</i>) and if what is thought to be conferred by our commands should be extended on account of natural affection [Cassiodorus refers to Inportunus’s elevation – A. M.]” (3.6.7)</p> <p>“Reflect [i.e., you, Avienus], then, upon the public antipathy for this man and strive for everyone’s love (<i>amorem cunctorum</i>) [this letter appoints Avienus as a new <i>praefectus praetorio</i> after the previous one, who discredited himself with the unspecified corrupt practices – A. M.]” (8.20.2)</p> <p>“For this task, although civic ardor (<i>civicus amor</i>) ought to urge you [i.e., the citizens of Parma], we have directed the spectabilis Genesius to supervise, so that you may inspire us to greater things, if you pleasingly accomplish what we have ordered [this letter mandates the citizens of Parma to restore function to the city sewers – A.M.]” (8.29.2)</p> <p>“For whose favor could those who have earned the displeasure of their own citizens possibly obtain [i.e., the persons, responsible for the condemnation of the two men, whom the letter grants a pardon on allegations of treason, according to Bjornlie (375-376)]? When they could have had a period of public affection (<i>tempus amoris publici</i>), they acted such that they rightly deserved to be despised” (9.17.5)</p>
	<i>affectus,</i> <i>affectio,</i> <i>affectuosus</i> (10)	<p>“This, if it is true, moves us by the very savagery committed, that armed fury should persecute harmless citizens whom civic affection (<i>civicus affectus</i>) ought to cherish [the letter responds to a petition from the Green faction at Rome, which claims that two senior senators have harassed their members (Bjornlie, 60)]” (1.27.3)</p> <p>“And although he [i.e., Felix, a member of the Gallic nobility, appointed as a consul] might have pursued the favors of anyone by indiscriminate selection, since rarely is it possible</p>

	<p>to be chosen from among the great, he nonetheless adorned himself with the affection of the patrician Paulinus (<i>patricii Paulini affectu</i>), so that thence he would give an indication of that remarkable conscientiousness which is known to hasten an excellent man” (2.3.5)</p> <p>“Indeed the coveted friendship of influential men [the above mentioned friendship between Felix and Paulinus is implied – A.M.] confers distinction, which association with good habits teaches by practice, when one strives to be equal to the agreeable affection (<i>affectione concordi</i>) that so delights” (2.3.6)</p> <p>“One law and one fair discipline embraces them [i.e., the Romans and the Goths, between whom Liberius divided the lands]. For it is necessary that sweet affection (<i>suavis affectus</i>) should increase among those who would continuously preserve duly established boundaries” (2.16.5)</p> <p>“For what is more beloved among senators than if one among them [i.e., the senatorial patron, who sponsored a project for reclaiming a Roman swampland] should weigh out affection for the utility of the public (<i>utilitatibus publicis affectum</i>), so that he will be able to work for the betterment of the homeland to which he has been born?” (2.32.1)</p> <p>“For if love from the few is indeed justly glorious, what enthusiasm is able to hold the acclamation of such a city (<i>tantae civitatis affectus</i>)? [the letter addresses the reputation of the father and uncle from the Decii family of Inportunus, who is elevated to the patrician rank]” (3.5.4)</p> <p>“The good will of humanity (<i>humanitatis affectus</i>) has never recalled treachery of this kind; no similar grievance has threatened; it has burdened defenseless children, for whom it is rightly considered to be a loss of decency not to assist [the letter expresses dissatisfaction with the <i>praefectus urbis</i>’s governing, as he seized the theatre places of a dead senator, which by tradition should have passed to his young sons, who were absent from Rome with the mourning duties at the time – A.M.]” (4.42.3)</p> <p>“Do you [i.e., the Roman senators] want to know with what affection (<i>affectione</i>) I [i.e., Tuluin, who is elevated to the rank of <i>patricius praesentalis</i>, i.e., patrician attending at court] shall embrace you (<i>complectar</i>)? Being joined to the royal family, I still want to share your habits” (8.11.4)</p> <p>“Who would not be eager (<i>non affectuosum sit</i>) for exchanging conversation with peers, visiting the forum, observing noble arts, representing one’s own causes with the laws, being occupied occasionally with calculations of Palamedes, going to the baths with companions, arranging dinners with shared preparation? [the letter obliges the governor of Bruttium to encourage the local <i>possessores</i> and <i>curiales</i> to return to their urban residences, simultaneously</p>
--	--

		addressing the urban ethos and the issues of the retention of the leading municipal citizens for civic duties (Bjornlie, 349)]” (8.31.8)
		“Writers of natural history, considering the habits of these birds [i.e., cranes], have noted a certain kind of politic to exist among them, which they recognize to live according to civic affection (<i>civico affectu</i>) [the letter addresses the issue of the welfare and the unjust debts imposed upon the <i>curiales</i> : this particular natural metaphor serves as an <i>exemplum</i> to encourage a communal egalitarian behaviour in the <i>curiales</i> and the citizens – A.M.]” (9.2.5)
	<i>caritas, carus</i> (6)	“But as kindred spirits are always accustomed to prefer each other, he [i.e., the grandfather of Cassiodorus minor] was the greatly cherished associate (<i>magna caritate sociatus</i>) to the patrician Aetius in the governance of the republic, that Aetius whom the ruler of state at that time followed in every matter of advice on account of his wisdom and the glorious labors undertaken on behalf of the republic” (1.4.11)
		“For each person, his own native city is more precious (<i>carior</i>), since, beyond anything else, he seeks safety, where he had lingered from the time of the very cradle [the letter requires to audit the accounts used to fund the workshops at Rome, responsible for providing the materials for the Roman public buildings (Bjornlie, 55)]” (1.21.1)
		“Therefore, the Roman republic owes its tranquility to the aforementioned Liberius, who has transmitted the love of community (<i>caritatis</i>) to such distinguished peoples [i.e., Liberius’s division of the lands between the Italo-Romans and Goths]” (2.16.5)
		“You [i.e., the Roman senators] will certainly have what you may grant to yourselves with genuine praise, if you would make this decision publicly binding with your esteem and if what is thought to be conferred by our commands should be extended on account of natural affection (<i>pro naturae caritate</i>) [Cassiodorus refers to Inportunus’s elevation to the patrician rank – A. M.]” (3.6.7)
		“And so, with the direction of your petition understood, whereby, from civic affection (<i>caritate civica</i>), you [i.e., the leading citizens of Catana] have undertaken the necessity of fortifying the city walls, we grant you unrestrained license in this matter [the letter grants the leading citizens of Catana permission to use the materials from an unused amphitheatre to strengthen the city walls – A.M.]” (3.49.2)
		“An intermediary who draws royal tempests to himself without harm is dear to his superiors (<i>carus summatibus</i>) and always welcome to his colleagues, so that even now it would seem to presage great felicity that he deserved the gratitude of all [in this fragment, the letter describes Tuluin’s service as a royal page at the royal bedchamber of Theodoric in his childhood – A.M.]” (8.10.3)

	<i>amare,</i> <i>amans,</i> <i>amabilis</i> (6)	“We are called forth for the improvement of the city from an active zeal for its citizens, since nobody is able to esteem what he knows the inhabitants do not love (<i>habitatores non amare</i>) [the letter requires to audit the accounts used to fund the workshops at Rome, responsible for providing the materials for the Roman public buildings (Bjornlie, 55)]” (1.21.1)
		“The very birds roaming the sky love (<i>amant</i>) their own nests, the wandering beasts hasten to the thorny den, delightful fish crossing watery fields follow along practiced trails to their own fastnesses, and every kind of animal knows to take itself back where they have been wont to settle for generations [in this fragment, an excursus from natural history serves as a metaphor for the Roman citizens]” (1.21.3)
		“What ought we to say now concerning Rome, which it is even more appropriate for her own children [i.e., the citizens of Rome] to love (<i>amare</i>)?” (1.21.3)
		“You [i.e., the Roman senators] will remember that I [i.e., Tuluin] always honored the assembly of the Senate, but now especially, when I am seen to enter your company. Appointment to the dignity of your order multiplies my gratitude, when I feel that I am among those whom I trust love me (<i>me amari</i>)” (8.11.2)
		“Those birds that are gentle with harmless intention fly in flocks. The melodious thrush loves (<i>amant</i>) the congregation of its own kind; the incessantly noisy starlings similarly attend in armies; murmuring pigeons delight in their own cohorts. Whatever enjoys an honest life does not refuse the pleasantness of association [the letter obliges the governor of Bruttium to encourage the local <i>possessores</i> and <i>curiales</i> to return to their urban residences. The animalistic metaphor naturalizes the culture of urban social life, comparing the citizens to gentle birds – A.M.]” (8.31.2)
		“Long years have taken nothing from you [i.e., Paulinus, a young member of the Decian family, appointed to the consulship]; Rome recognizes the ancient Decii in you, I say those Decii, the honored stock from former centuries, the mainstay of liberty, the grace of the curia, the singular fame of the Roman name, by whom, it is particularly noted in the written record, the endangered standing of the republic escaped an immense host of enemy and who alone was found, among a multitude of such brave men, to have loved his homeland the most (<i>patriam plus amasset</i>)” (9.22.3)
	<i>diligere,</i> <i>dilectus,</i> <i>diligens</i> (7)	“Even if the fickle inclination of the crowd should gravitate in favor of one faction, let the people thus enjoy its enthusiasm in the circus as in the theater, from the faction which it loves (<i>diligit</i>), so that if it presumes to pursue prohibited disturbances, the faction itself may be judged [the letter

		<p>treats the civil disturbances at Rome during the pantomime performances at the chariot races – A.M.]” (1.32.4)</p> <p>“Indeed the coveted friendship of influential men confers distinction [the mentioned friendship between Felix and Paulinus is implied – A.M.], which association with good habits teaches by practice, when one strives to be equal to the agreeable affection that so delights (<i>diligit</i>)” (2.3.6)</p> <p>“For it is right that one who has deserved to be found equal to such offices [i.e., Honoratus, who is elevated to the office of <i>quaestor</i>] should be esteemed (<i>diligi</i>) by you [i.e., the Roman senators]” (5.4.7)</p> <p>“For thus the adornment of freedom shines in them and the necessary support serves our ordinances. It is given for wild creatures to seek woods and fields, but for humanity to cherish (<i>diligere focos patrios</i>) above all their paternal hearths [the letter obliges the governor of Bruttium to encourage the local <i>possessores</i> and <i>curiales</i> to return to their urban residences – A. M.]” (8.31.1)</p> <p>“The melodious thrush loves the congregation of its own kind; the incessantly noisy starlings similarly attend in armies; murmuring pigeons delight (<i>diligunt</i>) in their own cohorts. Whatever enjoys an honest life does not refuse the pleasantness of association [The animalistic metaphor naturalizes the culture of urban social life, comparing the citizens to gentle birds – A.M.]” (8.31.2)</p> <p>“Therefore, do citizens confess that they prefer (<i>diligere</i>) this province only on their own estates (<i>in agris suis</i>), not wanting to dwell in the cities? [the letter obliges the governor of Bruttium to encourage the local <i>possessores</i> and <i>curiales</i> to return to their urban residences. Here is the play with the signifying potential of ‘<i>diligere</i>’ implied: “they choose” and “they love” – A. M.]” (8.31.6)</p> <p>“Consider how much one who taught the people of your Princeps a marvel from antiquity [i.e., Cassiodorus, who wrote the Gothic history] will esteem (<i>dilexerit</i>) you [i.e., the Roman senators] in our praise” (9.25.6)</p>
		<p>“What man is better delegated to the rights of equity than one clothed by the priesthood, who, because of affection for justice (<i>amore iustitiae</i>), knows not how to judge for personal advantage and, delighting in everyone alike, does not abandon a case to deception? [the letter entrusts fifteen hundred solidi to a local bishop to compensate the local property owners for the passage of the Gothic army (508)]” (2.8.1)</p> <p>“Then again, it is not fitting that a man who is known as a lover of equity (<i>amatorem aequitatis</i>) should be defeated in a public court [this letter addresses the case of an undetermined number of citizens from Sarsina taking refuge at the bishop’s property to avoid municipal duties. Theodoric advises the bishop to return the citizens to their</p>
<p>Ecclesiastical contexts (God’s love to humans, bishop’s love to humans and vice versa, bishop’s ideals, relationship between a ruler and bishops, social interactions, in which the religious</p>	<p><i>amor</i> (2)</p>	

dimension mentioned or heavily implied) (8)		allotted duties or to prepare for a legal contest (Bjornlie, 94)]” (2.18.3)
	<i>affectus</i> (2)	<p>“Now, however, he has disavowed worldly hatreds (<i>odia mundana</i>) with the goodwill of a religious mind (<i>affectu religiosae mentis</i>) and, by his own admission, he regrets your predicament [the letter orders the restoration of certain rights that the court physician lost in a legal suit after his accuser retracted his claim following a change of heart (Bjornlie, 193)]” (4.41.1)</p> <p>“We consider the known and acknowledge the unknown alike. But the affection of those seen (<i>visorum affectus</i>) is always greater, when one who is conjoined to us in frequent and pleasing conversation is remembered with gratitude [the letter from Witigis to the bishops]” (10.34.1)</p>
	<i>amabilis</i> (1)	“If we owe respect even to priests unknown to us, how much more do we owe to those whom we have regarded with venerable affection (<i>amabili veneratione</i>)! [the letter from Witigis to the bishops]” (10.34.1)
	<i>diligere</i> (3)	<p>“What man is better delegated to the rights of equity than one clothed by the priesthood, who, because of affection for justice, knows not how to judge for personal advantage and, delighting in everyone alike (<i>diligens cunctos</i>), does not abandon a case to deception? [the letter entrusts fifteen hundred solidi to a local bishop to compensate the local property owners for the passage of the Gothic army (508)]” (2.8.1)</p> <p>“More precious than all praise, fidelity is added to your merits, which divine providence cherishes (<i>divina dilugunt</i>) and human nature venerates [the letter appoints Cyprian to the office of <i>Comes Sacrarum Largitionum</i>, an office with responsibilities over the mint and circulation of currency (Bjornlie, 237)]” (5.40.6)</p> <p>“[...]to the contrary, one who esteems (<i>dilexerit</i>) the bishop with pure intention accomplishes his own [princeps] desire. For what would be the reason for grief, when the defeated party finds in this very appointment from the other faction what it had desired? [this letter to the Senate confirms the appointment of Felix IV as bishop of Rome (526) and seeks to quell the dissatisfaction of the Roman senatorial elite with his appointment after a contentious election (Bjornlie, 331)]” (8.15.2)</p>
	<i>amor</i> (1)	“We are compelled by the love of justice (<i>amore iustitiae</i>) to issue certain commands more strictly, while the precepts of our heart are much more lenient concerning lesser matters [<i>King Theoderic to the Agents of Probinus</i> , Vir Illustris]” (4.40.1)
	<i>affectus</i> (2)	“Our kindness wants to be inclined toward those entreating us and, for the love of devotion (<i>pro affectu pietatis</i>), not even to observe the limits of the law [<i>King Theoderic to Faustus, Praefectus Praetorio</i>]” (2.9.1)
King’s virtues and values (13)		

		<p>“Since we wish to preserve justice in any legal case, because the love of equity (<i>affectus aequitatis</i>) is the distinction of a regnum, in those cases especially that are put forth in the name of our fisc, detestable deceit should in no way attach scandal to those ruling” (4.32.1)</p>
	<i>amare</i> (8)	<p>“It is the royal purpose to relieve those burdened by injustice, just as the punishment of a wicked man should cause justice to be loved more (<i>plus amari iustitiam</i>) [King Theoderic to Speciosus, Vir Devotus and Comitiacus]” (2.10.1)</p> <p>“Just as we desire to demonstrate the righteousness of concord when called upon by entreaties, so too we dislike (<i>non amamus</i>) that offenses to the law should occur through our favors, especially in that portion of the laws that we believe concerns divine reverence [King Theoderic to All Jews Settled at Genoa]” (2.27.1)</p> <p>“Outraged justice (<i>laesa iustitia</i>) is indeed an insult to us, since we rightly take upon ourselves the profaning of those causes that we cherish (<i>amamus</i>)” (3.15.1)</p> <p>“He practices to perfection what we joyfully hope to receive; rapacity cannot be cherished by a restrained Princeps (<i>nec potest amari rapacitas continenti principi</i>) who takes no pleasure in bribery [King Theoderic to All Possessores Living in the Province of Savia]” (5.15.2)</p> <p>““If an heir foreign to imperium had adopted you, perhaps you might hesitate, lest, by discovering that the successor had no love (<i>non amaret</i>) for what the former ruler had esteemed, since by some unknown means, when the successor strove to be praised more fully, he was diminished by the reputation of his predecessor [King Athalaric to the Roman People]” (8.3.1)”</p> <p>“Listen, O magistrates, to what we cherish (<i>amamus</i>); attempt nothing harmful to the public. For whom would you expect to please with iniquitous policies, when you know that only what can agree with the dictates of justice pleases us? [King Athalaric to Avienus, Vir Illustris and Praefectus Praetorio]” (8.20.5)</p> <p>“It is clear that the key to ruling is to love (<i>amare</i>) what unburdens many, since the republic becomes more secure if the capacity of tax payers remains free of injury [King Athalaric to All Romans and Goths]” (9.9.5)</p> <p>“He [i.e., Theoderic] was a man uniquely and nobly fitted for the cares of kingship, so that every Princeps is rightly considered excellent however much he is known to love that man’s examples (<i>amare consilia</i>) [King Witigis to All Goths]” (10.31.5)</p>
	<i>diligere</i> (2)	<p>“If an heir foreign to imperium had adopted you, perhaps you might hesitate, lest, by discovering that the successor had no love for what the former ruler had esteemed (<i>dilexerat</i>), since by some unknown means, when the</p>

<p>Virtues to be emulated (by officials, Italo-Romans, or Goths)/general statements about love and love values (36)</p>		<p>successor strove to be praised more fully, he was diminished by the reputation of his predecessor [King Athalaric to the Roman People]” (8.3.1)</p>
		<p>““Listen, O magistrates, to what we cherish; attempt nothing harmful to the public. For whom would you expect to please with iniquitous policies, when you know that only what can agree with the dictates of justice (<i>iustitiae</i>) pleases us (<i>diligere nos</i>)? [King Athalaric to Avienus, Vir Illustris and Praefectus Praetorio]” (8.20.5)”</p>
	<p><i>amor, amator</i> (8)</p>	<p>“You [i.e., Goths], however, whom nature stirs and love of reputation (<i>amor opinionis</i>) goads, strive to leave behind such sons as your fathers prepared to have in you [King Theoderic to All Goths]” (1.24.3)</p>
		<p>“He has been, as you know, fear-inspiring to public servants, gentle with the provincials, greedy for giving, full of loathing for receiving, a hater of accusations, and a friend to justice (<i>amator aequitatis</i>) [King Theoderic to the Senate of Rome about an elevations of Cassiodorus’s father to the patrician rank]” (1.4.8)</p>
		<p>“The musician brings pleasure to hurtful grief, [...]calls spoilt chastity back from shameful love (<i>turpi amore</i>) to an ardor for honor, restores a weary mind ever adverse to good thoughts, turns pernicious hatred to grateful assistance, and, what is a blessed kind of restoration, expels the maladies of the mind with the sweetest of pleasures [King Theoderic to Boethius, Patrician]” (2.40.3)</p>
		<p>“For this reason, let the Roman Senate restore itself to the discipline of the aforementioned man [i.e., comes Arigernus, who used to manage the affairs in Gaul]and let what is instructed by an affection for peace (<i>amore quietis</i>) be fulfilled in a dutiful spirit, to the extent that leave for corruption is abolished and, what is especially important, no place should be found for feuding” (4.16.2)</p>
		<p>“Although this should pass unpunished by no means, as the love of our own advantage (<i>amor proprii commodi</i>) should suspend the starved pleas of so many people, nonetheless, since it is our nature to relax punishment which we are able to correct with circumspect measures, we have seen fit that the vigorous Catellus and Servandus must be sent [...] [King Theoderic to Liuvirit, Comes, and to Ampelius, Vir Illustris, the letter orders them to exact payment from ship owners under the administration in Spain who have absconded with grain destined for Rome (Bjornlie, 231)]” (5.35.2)</p>
		<p>“We order the crime of homicide to be restrained with the authority of the laws; but, however much more severe the penalty, the inquiry ought to be considered with that much more care, lest the innocent seem to endure harm to life on account of a zeal for punishment (<i>amore vindictae</i>) [King Theoderic to Ampelius, Vir Illustris]” (5.39.4)</p>

		<p>“Moreover, we believe that this must be added (because we do not want to find faults attached to the affection of clemency (<i>amore clementiae</i>), lest being so constrained, we would instead eliminate what we are not able to conceal from sound justice), that, if you have harmed anyone with depraved ambition, you will pay even more in our judgment, since it is proper to correct, and not to cause, what has been left unresolved [King Athalaric to Victor and Witigisclus, Vires Spectabiles]” (9.12.3)</p>
		<p>“Let the love of discipline (<i>amor disciplinae</i>) return to all, by which small affairs increase and the great are preserved [King Athalaric to the Senate of Rome]” (9.19.3)</p>
	<i>affectus</i> (2)	<p>“However rare constancy and respectable inclination may be among performers, it is so much the more valuable, when genuine good will (<i>affectus</i>) is demonstrable among them [King Theoderic to Faustus, Praefectus Praetorio]” (3.51.1)</p>
		<p>“For when would anyone hold anything dear (<i>affectus</i>), if he should be vulnerable to a crime then, when he will have fought for the well-being of all men? [King Theoderic to Wilitancus, Dux]” (5.33.1)</p>
	<i>amare, amabilis</i> (16)	<p>“where it is a kind of virtue not to prize one’s own property (<i>propriam substantiam non amare</i>), where however much one is deprived of resources, so much does one attain reputation [King Theoderic to Felix, Vir Illustris and Consul]” (2, 2, 6)</p>
		<p>“Therefore, by applying yourself to such studies, you will recognize (<i>ama</i>) in yourself a vessel for repayment, so that you too may promote our judgment with your advancement [King Theoderic to Venantius, Vir Illustris]” (2, 15, 4)</p>
		<p>“By that song [i.e., Orpheus’s song], the Tritons came to love (<i>amaverunt</i>) dry earth, Galatea danced on firm land, ambling bears deserted the forests, lions at last abandoned the thicket of reeds as a home, the prey rejoiced beside its own predator [the letter to Boethius]” (2, 40, 6)</p>
		<p>“By that song [i.e., Orpheus’s song], the Tritons came to love dry earth, Galatea danced on firm land, ambling bears deserted the [lovely] (<i>amabiles</i>) forests, lions at last abandoned the thicket of reeds as a home, the prey rejoiced beside its own predator” (2, 40, 6)</p>
		<p>“The long service of your labors and the extensive evidence of tested devotion have led us to this decision, that you, who have restrained your passions, now should be offered for the conduct of others, and that you, who have cherished selfcontrol (<i>amasti continentiam</i>) in private life, should offer discipline to a province [King Theoderic to Sunivodus, Vir Spectabilis]” (3.13.1)</p>
		<p>“Cherish not controversy (<i>turbulenta non ames</i>) and avoid avarice, so that an exhausted province may find you to be</p>

		the kind of judge that it would expect a Roman Princeps to send [King Theoderic to Gemellus, Vir Spectabilis]” (3.16.3)
		“The certitudes of public order are the safety of human life, assistance for the weak and a curb to the powerful. Cherish (<i>amate</i>) these, and security will come and good conscience will prosper [King Theoderic to All the Provincials of Gaul]” (3.17.4)
		“If we command all men to respect and cherish justice (<i>amare iustitiam</i>), how much more fitting is it that those who are glorified by relation to us should conduct everything in praiseworthy fashion, so that they would be capable of demonstrating the brilliance of the royal family? [King Theoderic to Theodahad, Vir Illustris]” (5.12.1)
		“For if the army anticipates a regular assembly, it cannot neglect the love of excellence (<i>amare virtutem</i>) [King Theoderic to Guduin, Saio]” (5.27.2)
		“ Love justice (<i>ama iustitiam</i>) now that you are elevated, just as you delighted in it when serving. Show yourself to be the pupil of one who never labored in vain [King Athalaric to Tuluin, Vir Illustris]” (8.9.7)
		“For when the stricken hearts of subjects mourned the passing of our lord grandfather [i.e., Theodoric] of glorious memory—it is true that a good man is loved more when he is missed (<i>bonum quippe amissum dum quaeritur, plus amatur</i>)—through this the blessings of your security and our commencement were made available [King Athalaric to the Senate of Rome]” (8.14.2)
		“ Unaccustomed goodness is loved more (<i>bonum insolitum plus amatur</i>) and a preceding period of grief confers sweetness upon the rejoicing to follow [King Athalaric to Avienus, Vir Illustris and Praefectus Praetorio]” (8.20.2)
		“For the most sacred laws have not debarred curiales from anything, except that only Principes may free them; that is, that they should find a gift of forbearance where the lord dissents with his own resolution in amiable strife (<i>amabili concertatione</i>), when it is a kind of justice of its own that the one who is called dutiful may be held the least by the strictness of the law [King Athalaric to Abundantius, Praefectus Praetorio]” (9.4.1)
		“It furthermore constituted a penalty for one who attempted to undertake such a crime, not with injury, since when money is not loved (<i>non amatur</i>), then it is the merit of the candidate that is truly sought [King Athalaric to Salventius, Vir Illustris and Praefectus Urbis]” (9.16.1)
		“Above all other virtues, love patience (<i>ama patientiam</i>), handmaiden to the wise: elevated by us, you will be praised for forbearing, rather than for vindicating [King Theodahad to Maximus, Vir Illustris and Domesticus]” (10.11.5)
		“Let gifts granted by divine authority be loved for this

		reason (<i>amentur divinitus</i>) [i.e., the gifts of waters from a spring; this letter grants the <i>comes</i> of Ticinum (Pavia) leave of absence from official duties to recuperate from gout at the otherwise unknown natural springs at Bormio (Bjornlie, 416)]” (10.29.4)
	<i>diligere</i> (10)	<p>“For it is the mark of an unconquered spirit to esteem the advantage of reputation (<i>diligere commodum famae</i>) and to instead despise profit from litigation” (1, 4, 8)</p> <p>“Indeed, the republic has ever increased by right of equitability, and when moderation is prized (<i>temperantia diligitur</i>), benefits swiftly follow [King Theoderic to Faustus, Praefectus Praetorio]” (2, 26, 1)</p> <p>“Indeed, you have managed to please all, since you have ever been a watchman to what is most cherished (<i>diligenda custodis</i>), a confidant in secrets, effective in legal cases, and constantly at the work of public office [King Theoderic to Stephanus, Comes Primi Ordinis and Former Princeps of Our Officium]” (2, 28, 2)</p> <p>“Flee from greed, pursue justice, cherish the moderate path (<i>modesta dilige</i>), and despise the wrathful course [King Theoderic to Argolicus, Vir Illustris and Praefectus Urbis]” (3.11.2)</p> <p>“Necessity does not respect moderation (<i>moderata non diligit</i>), nor is it possible to order the many to preserve what the few cannot protect [King Theoderic to Senarius, Vir Illustris and Comes Privatarum]” (4.13.2)</p> <p>“Love justice now that you are elevated, just as you delighted (<i>diligebas</i>) in it when serving. Show yourself to be the pupil of one who never labored in vain [King Athalaric to Tuluin, Vir Illustris]” (8.9.7)</p> <p>“Cherish justice (<i>iustitiam dilige</i>); apply yourself fittingly to the oppressed; render to your posterity the praise that you have received from your forebears [King Athalaric to Reparatus, Praefectus Urbis]” (9.7.6)</p> <p>“A second consideration for us was to inquire after the flow of your eloquence (<i>eloquentiae tuae</i>), which, granted that it delights us (<i>diligamus</i>) particularly, we nonetheless rightly place it after good character [King Theodahad to Patricius, Vir Illustris and Quaestor]” (10.6.3)</p> <p>“For certainly, we esteem oratory (<i>oratoriam diligimus</i>) among other arts, so that we may confess it to be the jewel of all literary attainments” (10.6.3)</p> <p>“Conquer anger; delight in kindness (<i>dilige benigna</i>); be concerned lest your good fortune may seem greater than your character [King Theodahad to Maximus, Vir Illustris and Domesticus]” (10.11.5)</p>

Appendix 2: Formulaic Narrative Voice and Professions of Love/Affection

Social actors / social contexts	Lexemes from the lexical- semantic field of love	Occurrences in the text
The ruler and their subordinates, officials or kingdom as a metaphorical entity to designate people (5)	<i>affectus</i> (3)	“If offices are more prestigious the more they enjoy our witness, if the frequent attention of the ruler demonstrates affection (<i>dominantis affectum</i>), then no magistrate is able to be more honored than one who has received a share of our deliberations [Formula for the Quaestor]” (6.5.1)
		“We exact a certain peculiar tribute from you, so that just as we share intimate conversation with you, thus may our reputation particularly deserve to be protected (<i>affectum</i>) by you [Formula for the Referendarius]” (6.17.5)
		“Furthermore, we shall not leave unremunerated what we hear you have accomplished in upstanding manner. Fear vice and you will deserve the affection of the Princeps (<i>affectum principis</i>) [Formula for the Praeses]” (7.2.3)
	<i>amare, amans</i> (1)	“But to seek something less from whence it is possible to increase ranks in number is not a fuller kind of love (<i>minus amantis</i>) [Formula for Those Who Must Be Restored to the Senate]” (6.14.1)
	<i>diligere</i> (1)	“A farmer cherishing (<i>Agricola diligens</i>) the coming shoots assists the heavenly rain and irrigates beforehand the young trees that deserve beneficial rain. Moreover, striving to improve the shoots of the trees, he conditions the breeding with diverse seeds, so that he may sow the supply of his own garden with the increased [Formula for Those Who Must Be Restored to the Senate]” (6.14.1)
Intercommunal relationship (officials to other officials, officials towards the civic community and vice versa, citizens towards the city, etc.) (7)	<i>amor</i> (1)	“Separate the desire for favors from yourself. It is necessary that you have the love of the public (<i>publicum amorem</i>) if you would promise nothing as a bribe [Formula for the Praefectus Urbis]” (6.4.4)
	<i>affectus, affectio</i> (2)	<p>“You hasten nourishment to and from the guilds of the millers, you enforce the correct weight and purity of bread, nor do you deem it demeaning why it is that Rome is able to praise you, and rightly so, when the affection of this city (<i>affectus illis civitatis</i>) is a singular glory [Formula for the Praefectus Annonae of Rome]” (6.18.1)</p> <p>“O what a command to receive with the great affection of the citizens (<i>affectioe ciuium</i>)! You presume to search for robbers whom the property owner is unable to find for himself and, generous on two accounts, you both obstruct future thefts and you prevent their present occurrence</p>

		[Formula for the Praefectus Vigilum of Ravenna]" (7.8.2)
	<i>amare</i> (3)	<p>"hence was he [i.e., Pompey] always singularly loved (<i>unice semper amatus</i>) and, in the gratitude of every citizen, he surpassed the deeds of the greatest men. Out of appreciation for this role, he was even called "Great," lest he might be spoken of with any dishonour [Formula for the Praefectus Annonae]" (6.18.3)</p> <p>"Rightly did wise antiquity select for you the glorious name of praefectus, since it would not have been possible to award such a title, except to one who loved the citizens more than his own interests (<i>cives a suis commodis plus amabat</i>) [Formula for the Praefectus Vigilum of Ravenna]" (7.8.3)</p> <p>"Although one who seems to cause the least disquiet for his own city and enjoys great respect among his citizens, for whom the citizens profess love (<i>cives se amare professus est</i>), on this account may be considered respectable, nonetheless, the only indisputable distinction is conferred by our choice, since anything appointed by the authority of a Princeps is considered to be furnished by good planning [Formula for the Curator of a City]" (7.12.1)</p>
	<i>diligere</i> (1)	<p>"You will demonstrate to them, by our order, your agreeableness in managing the annona and your good conduct. For one who has deserved to be sent by us ought to be esteemed (<i>diligi</i>) by you [Formula for the Letter Sent to a Comes for Introducing the Principes]" (7.25.2)</p>
Romano-Gothic script (6)	<i>caritas</i> (2)	<p>"Know, though, that for us there is but one equal affection for all men (<i>omnibus aequabiliter caritatem</i>); but that man who cherishes the laws with a moderate intention will be able to commend himself more amply to our heart [Formula for the Comes of the Goths of a Particular City]" (7.3.2)</p> <p>"Just as the Romans are neighbors to your [i.e., Goths'] properties, so should they also be conjoined to you in affection (<i>caritate coniuncti</i>) [Formula for the Comes of the Goths of a Particular City]" (7.3.3)</p>
	<i>amare</i> (2)	<p>"We have no love for anything uncivil (<i>non amamus aliquid incivile</i>); we condemn wicked arrogance with its authors [Formula for the Comes of the Goths of a Particular City]" (7.3.2)</p> <p>"Let one desire for living embrace you, by which there is permitted one imperium. Let both peoples pay heed to what we cherish (<i>amamus</i>) [Formula for the Comes of the Goths of a Particular City]" (7.3.3)</p>
	<i>diligere</i> (2)	<p>"Know, though, that for us there is but one equal affection for all men; but that man who cherishes (<i>dilexerit</i>) the laws with a moderate intention will be able to commend himself more amply to our heart [Formula for the Comes of the Goths of a Particular City]" (7.3.2)</p> <p>"You, however, O Romans, ought to cherish with great</p>

		enthusiasm the Goths (<i>diligere Gothos</i>), who in peace make you a populous people and who defend the entire republic in wars [Formula for the Comes of the Goths of a Particular City]” (7.3.3)
Virtues to be emulated (by officials, Italo-Romans, or Goths)/general statements about love and love values (10)	<i>amor</i> (1)	“Not without reason it is reported that Pompey attained the summit of public life with foresight for the extent of alimentary resources, since it is rightly the singular desire of a people (<i>singularis amor populi</i>) that it will be free from want [Formula for the Praefectus Annonae]” (6.18.3)
	<i>amare, amatus</i> (5)	“Indeed, the words of men are the mirror of the heart, for it is demonstrated that what accords with good character is itself read in its very actions. The proud man is apparent by his swaggering gait; the wrathful man is declared by the seething of his eyes; a crafty man always prefers the view of the ground (<i>amat terrenum aspectum</i>) [...] [Formula for the Comes Patrimonii]” (6.9.4)
		“ Cherish (<i>amate</i>) what glorifies us. Let your will be what you recognize as our intention [Formula for the Referendarius]” (6.17.5)
		“Consider what you would be able to discover without scandal. Every wise man seeks advice, while that man is easily acknowledged more learned who is shown to be more cautious from frequent inquiry. Indeed, at the very beginning of this practice, oaths consecrate you as though a kind of priest; for you promise your teachers to despise carelessness and to adore purity (<i>amare puritatem</i>) [Formula for the Comes Archiatrorum]” (6.19.5)
		“For thus does he fittingly ascend even to the study of the virtues and the republic is cherished more by good citizens (<i>a bonis civibus res publica plus amatur</i>) [Formula for the Rank Spectabilis]” (7.37.1)
		“Therefore, the goal of the wise man is to love what sets him free (<i>finis ergo sapientis est amare quod expedit</i>); thus one who strives to prosper does not regard the wish of a sick man. Likewise, prudent antiquity did not intend for the estates of curiales to be dissolved easily, so that they might better suffice for public needs if they had the assistance of more property [Formula to the Praefectus Praetorio, So That the Property of Curiales May Be Sold by Decree]” (7.47.1)
	<i>diligere</i> (4)	“I doubt something, I seek it from the Quaestor, who is a treasury of public reputation, the armory of the laws, ever prepared on short notice, and as Tullius, the master of eloquence, has said nothing “seems more remarkable than the ability of speaking to hold the minds of men, to attract their inclinations (<i>ut recta diligent</i>), to impel them to where it wants, and to lead them whence it wills.”[Formula for the Quaestor]” (6.5.3)
		“Therefore, enticed by praise of your reputation, we conjoin

		<p>you to execute the office of the consular in this province for the present indiction, since that which is deemed hostile to the laws would not be acceptable to you. Esteem all the more this office, which the laws of equity commend (<i>dilige iura aequitatis</i>) [Formula for a Consularis]" (6.20.4)</p> <p>"Follow moderation, you who condemn audacity. Prize restraint (<i>continentiam dilige</i>), you who sentence the thief [Formula for the Praefectus Vigilum of Ravenna]" (7.8.4)</p> <p>"One to whom prostitutes are subject must esteem chastity (<i>castitatem dilige</i>), just as it was said with great praise, "He is a man who pursued the virtues when involved in public spectacles." For we wish that through the governance of something frivolous, you should attain a more serious office [Formula for the Tribunus Voluptatum]" (7.10.3)</p>
Familial relationship (paternal, fraternal, matrimonial relationship, relationship with the relatives, etc.) (2)	<i>caritas, carus</i> (1)	"For nature has bestowed sons upon you, but we have caused them to become more precious (<i>carissimos</i>) with this security [Formula for the Confirmation of Matrimony and Granting Legitimacy to Children]" (7.40.3)
	<i>diligere</i> (1)	"And so, this woman who, even though she was legally taken as wife, was not deemed to be equal in reputation, we decree to have become your legitimate wife and we want the sons from the same woman, whether they are now born or will come in the future, to share the rights of inheritance, so that you may cherish (<i>diligas</i>) without any hesitation those whom you know perfectly well to be your future successors [Formula for the Confirmation of Matrimony and Granting Legitimacy to Children]" (7.40.3)

Appendix 3: Praetorian Cassiodorus's Narrative Voice and Professions of Love/Affection

Social actors / social contexts	Lexemes from the lexical-semantic field of love	Occurrences in the text
Intercommunal relationship (officials to other officials, officials towards the civic community and vice versa, citizens towards the city, etc.) (14)	<i>amor</i> (4)	"Act now, so that this very love (<i>amor iste</i>) [i.e., of the citizens of Rome] should continue with God's assistance, since I fully intend to achieve in return what they thought they had begun auspiciously with me [Praefectus Praetorio Senator to Ambrosius, Vir Illustris and Vices Agens]" (11.5.6)
		"For the favors which, up to this point, used to increase to the detriment of all, have diminished with your love (<i>vestro amore</i>) [Edict of Praefectus Praetorio Senator to the Provinces]" (11.8.4)
		"Therefore, let them obey not from any compulsion, but

		<p>from love (<i>non compulsione aliqua, sed amore</i>), when I have reduced for them even the amount that was customarily offered [Praefectus Praetorio Senator to Vitalianus, Vir Clarissimus and Cancellarius of Lucania and Bruttium]” (11.39.5)</p> <p>“Therefore, we grant to you, by divine grace, the preserved foods that must be distributed to the Roman people from this indiction, so that what the royal court has generously promised could be attained without any obstruction. Beware, lest some other person take what the people deserve, rendering you a stranger to our gratitude if you should lapse in civic affection (<i>civico amore</i>) [Praefectus Praetorio Senator to Peter, Vir Clarissimus and Distributor of Preserved Foods]” (12.11.3)</p>
	<i>affectus, affectio</i> (5)	<p>“Therefore, it must be provided, whatever confidence you may have, whatever great hesitation may appear, since what procures the affection of those citizens (<i>affectum illorum</i>) [i.e., of the citizens of Rome] for me is truly to our advantage [Praefectus Praetorio Senator to Ambrosius, Vir Illustris and Vices Agens]” (11.5.5)</p> <p>“[...] that those whom I noticed rejoicing with well-intended adulation at my promotion should acknowledge I retained affection for my homeland (<i>affectum patriae</i>) [Praefectus Praetorio Senator to Vitalianus, Vir Clarissimus and Cancellarius of Lucania and Bruttium]” (11.39.5)</p> <p>“We have considered in every situation what we ought to esteem in our servants: we shall acquire the most complete distinction, should they rediscover loving magistrates (<i>affectuosus iudices</i>) [Praefectus Praetorio Senator to All Governors of the Provinces]” (12.2.1)</p> <p>“For we display modesty before colleagues, we offer reverence to our fathers, we owe common decency to fellow citizens, but a particular affection to our children (<i>affectum filiis</i>); and the force of this compulsion is so great, that none would judge himself despised, if he learns the offspring of another have been preferred to him [Praefectus Praetorio Senator to Valerianus, Vir Spectabilis]” (12.5.2)</p> <p>“It is reported that Scyllaceum, the foremost city of Bruttium, which, it is read, had been founded by Ulysses, the destroyer of Troy, is unreasonably troubled by an excess of unauthorized seizures; it is not fitting that this occur during our tenure, since we are compelled to feel attacks against it more acutely, inasmuch as it obviously affects us with patriotic affection (<i>patriotica affectione</i>) [Praefectus Praetorio Senator to Maximus, Vir Clarissimus and Cancellarius of Lucania and Bruttium]” (12.15.1)</p>
	<i>caritas</i> (1)	<p>“truly trust that you rejoice in these things that we discern your affection (<i>caritatem vestram</i>) [i.e., of Ambrosius] to prefer; for in whatever way the affairs of the one man are performed, the wishes of another are fulfilled [Praefectus</p>

		Praetorio Senator to Ambrosius, Vir Illustris and Vices Agens]” (11.5.1)
	<i>amare</i> (2)	<p>“Indeed, your approval is a premonition for all good things, when no one is able to receive the commendation of such great men, unless divine authority has arranged for him to be advanced. Receive, therefore, my gratitude, even as you exact obedient service. It is in the nature of things to love a colleague (<i>natura rerum est amare collegam</i>) [Praefectus Praetorio Senator to the Senate of Rome]” (11.1.1)</p> <p>“The man who recoils from just commands brings hatred upon himself. I will not love one whom I have already compelled (<i>quem iam coegero, non amabo</i>). Thus do we want to explain everything that must be done, so that we would not cause you to be diminished by anything compulsory [Edict of Praefectus Praetorio Senator to the Provinces]” (11.8.8)</p>
	<i>diligere</i> (2)	<p>“We have considered in every situation what we ought to esteem (<i>diligere</i>) in our servants [i.e., our subordinates from a people]: we shall acquire the most complete distinction, should they rediscover loving magistrates [Praefectus Praetorio Senator to All Governors of the Provinces]” (12.2.1)</p> <p>“For we are deemed to love (<i>diligere</i>) those [i.e., the citizens of Lucania and Bruttium] more whom we hasten to deliver from danger [Praefectus Praetorio Senator to Valerianus, Vir Spectabilis]” (12.5.2)</p>
	<i>amor</i> (1)	“Let it [i.e., Trinity] bestow its love (<i>amorem suum</i>), so that, having compassion, it would forbid an opportunity for sinning [Praefectus Praetorio Senator to Various Bishops]” (11.3.2)
Ecclesiastical contexts (God’s love to humans, bishop’s love to humans and vice versa, bishop’s ideals, relationship between a ruler and bishops, social interactions, in which the religious dimension mentioned or heavily implied) (7)	<i>affectus, affectio, affectuosus</i> (3)	<p>“May that throne [i.e., the chair of the Roman Pope], a marvel throughout the world, shield its own cultivators with that affection (<i>affectione</i>) which, although it may be proffered to the whole world, is known to be more specifically apportioned to us [Praefectus Praetorio Senator to Pope John]” (11.2.6)</p> <p>“Therefore, true fathers of the soul, I beseech you in affectionate and honest petition (<i>affectuosa petitione</i>), so that you would pray with silent fasting to the Lord, that he may extend the lives of our Principes in a flourishing reign, that as a defender he may diminish the enemies of the republic, that he may give peaceful times, and, for the praise of his own name, he may bring prosperity with tranquility in all affairs, so that he may deign to render me beloved to you [Praefectus Praetorio Senator to Various Bishops]” (11.3.3)</p> <p>“Moreover, I fulfill the obligation of honorable greetings to your sanctity and conclude the text of this letter with an affectionate closing (<i>epistulae affectuoso fine</i>), so that sweeter words might abide in your mind, since the soul commends the last words to itself favourably you</p>

		[Praefectus Praetorio Senator to Various Bishops]” (11.3.7)
	<i>amare, amabilis</i> (1)	“Therefore, true fathers of the soul, I beseech you in affectionate and honest petition, so that you would pray with silent fasting to the Lord, that he may extend the lives of our Principes in a flourishing reign, that as a defender he may diminish the enemies of the republic, that he may give peaceful times, and, for the praise of his own name, he may bring prosperity with tranquility in all affairs, so that he may deign to render me beloved to you (<i>amabilem</i>) [Praefectus Praetorio Senator to Various Bishops]” (11.3.3)
	<i>diligere</i> (2)	“For who would doubt that our prosperity must be attributed to your merits, when we, who have not deserved to be loved by the Lord (<i>a domino diligi</i>), attain honor, and in exchange for such things as we have not done, receive the blessings of office? [Praefectus Praetorio Senator to Pope John]” (11.2.1)
		“For you preside over the shepherds of the Christian people: in the role of a father, you love all (<i>vos patris nomine universa diligitis</i>)” (11.2.4)
	<i>amor</i> (2)	“Let the ardor of all men now be stirred for our happy masters (<i>amor omnium circa dominos felices</i>), so that, just as we have not wanted to keep any man in suspense with respect to contrary thoughts, thus should they also show themselves loyal in devotion to those ruling [Praefectus Praetorio Senator to Magistrates of the Provincials]” (11.9.2)
Public love to the ruler (relations between royal personalities and citizens and vice versa) (6)		“Therefore, let them obey not from any compulsion, but from love (<i>non compulsione aliqua, sed amore</i>), when I have reduced for them even the amount that was customarily offered [Praefectus Praetorio Senator to Vitalianus, Vir Clarissimus and Cancellarius of Lucania and Bruttium]” (11.39.5)
	<i>affectus, affectio</i> (2)	“O blessed fortune of the age! With the Princeps at leisure, the favor of the mother [i.e., Amalasuntha] rules (<i>matris affectio</i>), through whom everything is accomplished in such a way that the good will of the public may be felt covering us [Praefectus Praetorio Senator to the Senate of Rome]” (11.1.4)
		“It is fitting to remark what affection you should have for the one ruling (<i>dominantis affectum</i>), since he first consented to the amount he believed necessary and now he has doubled again what was requested [An Edict]” (12.28.9)
	<i>caritas</i> (1)	“O blessed fortune of the age! With the Princeps at leisure, the favor of the mother rules, through whom everything is accomplished in such a way that the good will of the public (<i>caritas generalis</i>) may be felt covering us [Praefectus Praetorio Senator to the Senate of Rome]” (11.1.4)
	<i>amare, amans</i> (1)	“For if it is always the place of a loving citizen (<i>semper amantis</i>) to assist, in what way would you, who have been relieved of duress, be obliged? [Praefectus Praetorio Senator

		to the Ligurians]” (11.15.1)
Familial relationship (paternal, fraternal, matrimonial relationship, relationship with the relatives, etc.) (2)	<i>affectus</i> (2)	<p>“For we display modesty before colleagues, we offer reverence to our fathers, we owe common decency to fellow citizens, but a particular affection to our children (<i>affectum filiis</i>); and the force of this compulsion is so great, that none would judge himself despised, if he learns the offspring of another have been preferred to him [Praefectus Praetorio Senator to Valerianus, Vir Spectabilis]” (12.5.2)</p> <p>“But we consider he has attained this too with great fairness, as one who succeeds to the role of a caretaker would rightly protect his own property in foreign lands with the affection of a father (<i>affectu patris</i>) [Praefectus Praetorio Senator to Paschasius, Praefectus Annonae]” (12.9.4)</p>
	<i>affectus</i> (1)	<p>“It is otherwise a kind of sacrilege to want to rejoice among saddened men and for one who does not attend the grief of others to shun the affection of humanity (<i>affectum humanitatis</i>). It would be much better should he rouse himself on behalf of common happiness, when it is an inducement to great cheer to see so many people rejoicing! [Annual Promotions of the Praetorian Staff, Which Occur on the Birthday of the Lord]” (11.17.1)</p>
Virtues to be emulated (by officials, Italo-Romans, or Goths)/general statements about love and love values (16)	<i>amare, amabilis</i> (11)	<p>“After the Principes, my next concern is to commend myself to you, since we trust that you love what we feel the masters of the state intend (<i>vos amare confidimus, quod et rerum dominos iubere sentimus</i>) [Praefectus Praetorio Senator to the Senate of Rome]” (11.1.2)</p>
		<p>“Pay attention to the good acts of all men and you will know nothing that must be dreaded. Refuse the ardor for illicit presumptions: cherish living peacefully (<i>amate uiuere quieti</i>); always act without harm [Edict of Praefectus Praetorio Senator to the Provinces]” (11.8.2)</p>
		<p>“Cherish justice, which may render you beloved (<i>amabiles</i>) and which, by its very nature, may grant an honored advantage [Praefectus Praetorio Senator to Magistrates of the Provincials]” (11.9.2)</p>
		<p>“For while you [i.e., the Indulgence] may share the grace of heaven with three other sisters and you are bound together in a loving embrace (<i>amabili amplexatione</i>), and although they too are virtues, they honourably yield everything to you when they recognize you to be the salvation of humanity [Indulgentia]” (11.40.2)</p>
		<p>“But most providently, such a sacred service seems to be granted only at certain times, so that the world would receive this blessing more gratefully, because it rejoiced for the unexpectedness of the thing. Therefore, O lictor, refrain from the hated ax, by which it is permitted to commit with impunity what you would see punished in others; love (<i>ama</i>) for a short while steel that is polished, not gory” (11.40.3)</p>
		<p>“How could someone who is sent from the inner counsels of his judge not be considered important, since anyone is</p>

		thought to love justice (<i>plus amare iustitiam</i>) more , in proportion to how often he is known to have audience there? [Praefectus Praetorio Senator to the Various Cancellarii of Individual Provinces]” (12.1.1)
		“Let those whom none have hurled to an uncertain fate [i.e., the landowners of Lucania and Bruttium] love tranquillity (<i>ament quieta</i>) [Praefectus Praetorio Senator to Valerianus, Vir Spectabilis]” (12.5.4)
		“For granted that any fraud is known to be serious, but that which acts against the populace of Rome is rendered unbearable. It is a crowd abiding in peace, a people that is unheard except when celebrating, a clamor without sedition, an uproar lacking fury, whose only contention is to flee poverty while not cherishing wealth (<i>non amare divitias</i>) [Praefectus Praetorio Senator to Peter, Vir Clarissimus and Distributor of Preserved Foods]” (12.11.2)
		“ Let honest profit be loved (<i>amentur honesta lucra</i>), let damnable gains be feared [An Edict]” (12.13.4)
		“ Love justice (<i>ama iustitiam</i>), about which none complain, so that even the wrathful man, who in vain tempts you to deviate, would be able to provide sure testimony [Praefectus Praetorio Senator to Deusdedit, Scriba at Ravenna]” (12.21.5)
		“Moreover, added to the shore is the most beautiful arrangement of islands, which are positioned with lovely utility (<i>amabili utilitate</i>), both warding ships from danger and enriching cultivators with great fertility [Praefectus Praetorio Senator to the Provincials of Istria]” (12.22.5)
	<i>diligere</i> (4)	“ Cherish justice (<i>diligite iustitiam</i>), which may render you beloved and which, by its very nature, may grant an honored advantage [Praefectus Praetorio Senator to Magistrates of the Provincials]” (11.9.2)
		“Brave men are always unassuming in peace and those who have often waged battles cherish justice greatly (<i>diligent iustitiam</i>) [Praefectus Praetorio Senator to All Saiones Who Are Assigned to Cancellarii]” (12.3.3)
		“It would be pleasing if, having returned to your kin, you do not bring with you the scandal of brawls, but that they recognize you to have conducted yourself in such a manner that respected men are known to adopt (<i>quemadmodum diligentes probantur optare</i>)” (12.3.4)
		“ Such a policy whence the republic is seen to be at its strongest must be cherished (<i>diligenda</i>); provided that it is readjusted by a returning census, it is maintained by the firmest vigor of its own condition [A Canonicaria]” (12.16.1)
Diplomatic relationship (relationship between the	<i>caritas, carus</i> (2)	“I am no less in your affection (<i>caritate</i>), if you cause none to rend my limbs [this letter serves as the Senate’s formal request that Justinian recognize Theodahad’s kingship, which the plea from the personification of Rome that

Ostrogothic king and the Byzantine emperor, 'barbarian' kings /kings of the post-Roman polities, relation towards the diplomatic embassies, etc.) (6)		suggests, as Bjornlie states, that it was written after the death of Amalasuntha (535) (Bjornlie, 444)]” (11.13.4)
		“I prize the Amal nourished at my breast, a brave man formed in my association, dear to Romans (<i>carum Romanis</i>) for wisdom, respected among other nations for virtue” (11.13.4)
	<i>dilectio</i> (1)	“Therefore, let your agreement bind tranquillity for Italy, since we are then loved, if promised affection (<i>dilectio votiva</i>) is conjoined through you” (11.13.2)
	<i>amare</i> (2)	“Therefore, let your agreement bind tranquillity for Italy, since we are then loved (<i>amari possumus</i>), if promised affection is conjoined through you” (11.13.2) “If at any time I have been pleasing to you, most dutiful of Principes, love (ama) my protectors ” (11.13.3)
	<i>diligere</i> (1)	“ I prize the Amal (<i>diligo Hamalum</i>) nourished at my breast, a brave man formed in my association, dear to Romans for wisdom, respected among other nations for virtue” (11.13.4)
Cassiodorus's virtues (1)	<i>amor</i> (1)	“We have caused, moreover, from a love of justice (<i>amore iustitiae</i>), what you would want to suggest to us, since, while we are not burdened by furnishing ships, we would not adulterate the price [Praefectus Praetorio Senator to the Provincials of Istria]” (12.22.3)