Ennodius and the Rhetoric of Roman Identity: Strategies and Traditions in Shaping Roman Identity in the Panegyric for Theoderic the Great, 506 CE

Thijs Kersten, Bé Breij

Rhetorica, Volume 42, Number 1, Winter 2024, pp. 31-61 (Article)

Published by Johns Hopkins University Press
DOI: *https://doi.org/10.1353/rht.2024.a925231*

Thijs Kersten and Bé Breij

Ennodius and the Rhetoric of Roman Identity: Strategies and Traditions in Shaping Roman Identity in the Panegyric for Theoderic the Great, 506 CE[1]

Abstract: Ennodius' panegyric for Theoderic the Great shows the employment of Roman rhetorical tradition and republican-era virtues to legitimise the new Germanic ruler of Italy. After Ennodius' general strategies to depict Theoderic as a Roman are discussed, this paper analyses two specific samples from the speech which show the use of traditional symbols, *exempla*, and even Ciceronian conceptions of tyranny alongside contemporary views of Romans and barbarians. These strategies were used to shape a version of Theoderic that removed the ruler from his Germanic background and reinterpreted him as a Roman ruler.

Keywords: Ennodius, Theoderic, epideictic, panegyric, tyranny, Cicero, Claudian.

Introduction

Greco-Roman epideictic offers us a paradox. It discusses virtue through age-old frames, yet these frames are still malleable. When expectations of the emperor changed in Late

[1] We dedicate this paper to the memory of Marc van der Poel. Though this paper is a result of a research programme of the first (Kersten) under supervision of the second (Breij), the example that Marc has set for both authors as well as his importance during their research on this topic cannot be overstated. He has shown his support up to his final days and his name was, fittingly, the first thought in our heads when we knew this paper was to be published. We hope this may properly honour his memory. Furthermore, we wish to express our thanks to the helpful and insightful comments by the reviewers and the editorial board of *Rhetorica*.

Rhetorica 42.1 (31–61). © 2024 by The International Society for the History of Rhetoric. ISSN: 0734-8584, E-ISSN: 1533-8541.

Antiquity, so did epideictic. The emperor became a distant autocrat and was associated more and more with divinity. Similarly, panegyrics responded by praising the emperor as a distant god and comparing him to celestial bodies.[2] The rise of Christianity shows another shift. Because the norms and values of the Christian community differed from those of pagan society on several points, Christian panegyric focused on other triumphs. For instance, military victory became less important than showing more religious devotion than other devotees.[3] In both cases, this innovation was anchored in a tradition of standard virtues and arguments.

A third shift in epideictic can be seen in the period between 476 and 533 CE.[4] For the first time, the rulers of Italy were kings of Germanic descent. Three authors wrote panegyrics for these kings: Boethius, Cassiodorus, and Ennodius. This essay focusses on the last one. Ennodius wrote the first extant panegyric on a Germanic king of Italy: the Gothic king Theoderic the Great (r. 493–526).

The Eastern Roman emperor Zeno had sent Theoderic to recover Italy from the Germanic general Odoacer. After he had succeeded, the Eastern Romans installed Theoderic as a vassal-king (*rex*), in control of Italy and the Balkans. Theoderic legitimised his authority through inscriptions, letters, and panegyrics. Rhetorical works such as Ennodius's panegyric and Cassiodorus's letters allowed him to present himself as a Roman ruler in everything but name. Eastern Roman authors, though critical of Theoderic, adopt this portrayal. The historian Procopius states in his *Gothic Wars* (5.1.29): ἦν τε ὁ Θευδέριχος λόγῳ μὲν τύραννος, ἔργῳ δὲ βασιλεὺς ἀληθής, "While Theoderic was a usurper in name, in practice he was a true emperor."[5]

---

[2] David S. Levene, "God and Man in the Classical Latin Panegyric," *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society*, ser. 2, 43 (1998): 66–103, https://doi.org/10.1017/S0068673500002157.

[3] James Corke-Webster, "How to Praise a Christian Emperor: The Panegyrical Experiments of Eusebius of Caesarea," in *Imperial Panegyric from Diocletian to Honorius*, ed. Adrastos Omissi and Alan J. Ross, Translated Texts for Historians, Contexts 3 (Liverpool, GB: Liverpool University Press, 2020), 143–165.

[4] All dates in this essay are CE unless indicated otherwise.

[5] Procop. *Goth*. 5.1.29; text in *Procopii Caesariensis opera omnia*, ed. and comm. Jacobus Haury, 3 vols. in 4 (Leipzig, DE: Teubner, 1905–1913); repr. in Procopius, *History of the Wars*, 5 vols., trans. Henry Dewing, Loeb Classical Library 048, 081, 107, 173, 217 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1914–1928). Citations refer to the Harvard edition. The translation is our own. Here and elsewhere, abbreviations for author names and works are drawn from the *Oxford Latin Dictionary*, 2nd ed., repr. with corr., ed. P. G. W. Glare (Oxford, GB: Oxford University Press, 2016); *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, 4th ed., ed. Simon Hornblower, Antony Spawforth, and

Ennodius' panegyric shows how Theoderic wanted to be represented. The panegyrist depicts Theoderic as a senate leader who shows more zeal in fighting for Rome than her most famous heroes from the republican era. The text shows a great sensitivity regarding Theoderic's non-Roman origins. Due to this sensitivity, Ennodius puts great effort to stress the aspects of Theoderic that made him Roman, in order to contrast him with barbarian enemies. In this way, he distances Theoderic from his Gothic descent.

This essay starts with an introduction to Ennodius and his works. After this, we will discuss the aspects of the *genus demonstrativum* which are relevant to the current study. We will then analyse the romanisation of Theoderic in Ennodius' text. An overview of Ennodius' rhetorical strategies is supported by the detailed analysis and discussion of two samples: descriptions of Theoderic's adolescence, and his saving of Rome from the tyrannical Odoacer. We argue that Ennodius's text, like epideictic in general, is conservative and seeks to legitimise innovation, i.e., newcomers such as Theoderic, through a traditional lens. Ennodius looks at Theoderic through conceptions of politics, heroism, and virtue, all linked to the era of the Roman Republic.

Ennodius' Panegyric in its Historical Context

Magnus Felix Ennodius (473/474–521) was born in Arelate (Arles). He entered the Church in 493 and became deacon of Milan in 501.[6] Ennodius wrote several works, including various collections of poetry and letters and a hagiography of his mentor Epiphanius.[7] His rhetorical ability is considerable, and even more apparent in his other works. His *Paraenesis didascalia* is an exhortation to the study of rhetoric reminiscent of Tacitus' *Dialogus*. His *Dictiones*, a collection

---

Esther Eidinow (Oxford, GB: Oxford University Press, 2012); and *A Latin Dictionary founded on Andrews' edition of Freund's Latin Dictionary*, ed. Charlton T. Lewis and Charles Short (Oxford, GB: Clarendon Press, 1879).

[6] Stefanie A. H. Kennell, *Magnus Felix Ennodius: A Gentleman of the Church*, Recentiores: Later Latin Texts & Contexts (Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 2000), 4–42.

[7] See Fridericus Vogel, ed., *Magni Felicis Ennodi Opera*, Monumenta Germaniae historica, Auctorum Antiquissimorum 7 (Berlin, DE: Weidmann, 1885). In his elaborate introduction to Ennodius' works, Vogel discusses the different codices in which Ennodius' works can be found (XXIX–XLVIII).

of mythological, historical, and non-fictional declamations, seem to have been based on the elder Seneca's *Controversiae*.[8] Ennodius wrote his panegyric for Theoderic in late 506, a period in which Ennodius' importance in the Church and at court was increasing. He became bishop of Pavia in 514 and is considered a saint in the Catholic and Eastern Orthodox Churches.[9] Several passages (esp., *Pan*. 4 and 75) imply that Ennodius was unsure about his position at court before the delivery of the panegyric. These passages and his following career would suggest that his career improved significantly due to the success of his speech.[10]

Ennodius and his works have seen a renewed interest. After work on his hagiography by Cook (1942), research has been published on his life (Kennell 2000), his letter collections (Schröder 2007; Kennell 2017), poetry (Urlacher-Becht 2014; Mulligan 2022), and declamations (Raschieri 2022).[11]

His panegyric has received scholarly attention as well. Haase (1991) provides a translation and historical overview of the text.[12] More substantial is Rohr's edition and commentary from 1995.[13] Trojar (2008) provides an analysis of the panegyric's *dispositio* and

---

[8] Margaret R. Finn, "The *Dictiones* of Ennodius" (PhD diss., Fordham University, 1941), 13–34, https://research.library.fordham.edu/dissertations/AAI28404285.

[9] The most recent edition of Ennodius' works is Vogel, *Magni Felicis Ennodi Opera*.

[10] This question is a project for further research.

[11] Genevieve M. Cook, *The Life of Saint Epiphanius by Ennodius: A Translation with an Introduction and Commentary*, The Catholic University of America Studies in Medieval and Renaissance Latin Language and Literature 14 (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1942); Kennell, *Ennodius: A Gentleman of the Church*; Bianca-Jeanette Schröder, *Bildung und Briefe im 6. Jahrhundert: Studien zum Mailänder Diakon Magnus Felix Ennodius*, Millennium-Studien zu Kultur und Geschichte des ersten Jahrtausends n. Chr. 15 (Berlin, DE: De Gruyter, 2007); Stephanie A. H. Kennell, "The Letter Collection of Ennodius of Pavia," in *Late Antique Letter Collections: A Critical Introduction and Reference Guide*, ed. Cristina Sogno, Bradley K. Storin, and Edward J. Watts (Oakland, CA: University of California Press, 2017), 369–383; Céline Urlacher-Becht, *Ennode de Pavie, chantre officiel de l'Église de Milan* (Paris, FR: Institut d'Études Augustiniennes, 2014); Bret Mulligan, *The Poetry of Ennodius: Translated with an Introduction and Notes* (London, GB: Routledge, 2022); Amedeo A. Raschieri, "Esempi animali e *pietas* filiale nella *Dictio* 17 di Ennodio," *ACME-Annali della Facoltà di Studi Unanistici dell'Università degli Studi di Milano* 75, no. 1 (2022): 57–78, http://dx.doi.org/10.54103/2282–0035/19883.

[12] Barbara S. Haase, "Ennodius' Panegyric to Theoderic the Great: A Translation and Commentary" (master's thesis, University of Ottawa, 1991).

[13] Christian Rohr, *Der Theoderich-Panegyricus des Ennodius*, Monumenta Germaniae historica, Studien und Texte 12 (Hannover, DE: Hahn, 1995).

discusses its stylistic features in detail.[14] Though it does not discuss Ennodius' text in detail, J. J. Arnold's book on Theoderic's political ideology is instrumental to understand the mechanics of Ennodius' praise.[15] Of great importance is the larger body of work by Simona Rota, who has published several articles (1998, 2001) and a large commentary on the text (2002).[16] A detailed rhetorical analysis of the work, which discusses not only specific passages, but also the strategies of the work at large, remains to be published. The present paper intends to provide a step towards such an analysis.

Ennodius was a toddler when the usurper-general Odoacer (r. 476–493) came to power, and lived his adult life under Theoderic's rule (r. 493–526). The Eastern Roman Empire was still strong and was ruled from the city of Constantinople by emperors Zeno (r. 474–475, 476–491) and Anastasius (r. 491–518). Zeno had made Theoderic king over Italy and the Gothic general was thus a vassal of the Eastern Romans.[17] Still, Theoderic is presented in the panegyric as "preeminent among the kings" (*praecipue regum*).[18] This refers to

---

[14] Monika Deželak Trojar, "Enodijev panegirik na čast kralju Teoderiku ali kako retorika piše zgodovino," *Keria: Studia Latina et Graeca* 10, no. 2 (Summer 2008): 43–81, https://doi.org/10.4312/keria.10.2.43–81.

[15] Jonathan J. Arnold, *Theoderic and the Roman Imperial Restoration* (New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 2014).

[16] Simona Rota, "Su un passo del panegirico a Teoderico di Ennodio di Pavia: il tema del 'princeps et sacerdos' (§ 80)," in *Incontri di popoli e culture tra V e IX secolo, Atti delle V giornate di studio sull'età romanobarbarica, Benevento, 9–11 giugno 1997*, ed. Marcello Rotili (Napoli, IT: Arte tipografica, 1998), 139–146; Simona Rota, "Catone l'Uticense e Teodorico," in *Società multiculturali nei secoli V-IX: scontri, convivenza, integrazione nel Mediterraneo occidentale, Atti delle VII giornate di studio sull'età romanobarbarica, Benevento, 31 maggio-2 giugno 1999*, ed. Marcello Rotili (Napoli, IT: Arte Tipografica, 2001), 81–89; Simona Rota, "Teoderico il grande fra *Graecia* e *Ausonia*: La rappresentazione del re ostrogotico nel *Panegyricus* di Ennodio," *Mélanges de l'École française de Rome: Moyen Âge* 113, no. 1 (2001): 201–243; Simona Rota, ed., *Magno Felice Ennodio, Panegirico del clementissimo re Teoderico*, opusc. 1, Biblioteca di cultura romanobarbarica 6 (Roma, IT: Herder, 2002).

[17] Arnold H. M. Jones, "The Constitutional Position of Odoacer and Theoderic," *Journal of Roman Studies* 52, nos. 1–2 (November 1962): 126–130; https://doi.org/10.2307/297883.

[18] Ennod., *Pan.* 50: *Servavit te, regum praecipue, quod abiecisti sacramenti confidentia cautionem*, "The fact that you, preeminent one among the kings, have thrown away caution out of faith in their sacramental oath saved you." The section discusses Theoderic's betrayal by and subsequent defeat of several petty kings. Theoderic's interaction with these kings is discussed by Marco Cristini, "Diplomacy at the End of the World: Theoderic's Letters to the Warni and Hesti," *Klio* 103, no. 1 (Summer 2021): 270–296. See also Jonathan J. Arnold, *Theoderic and the Roman Imperial Restoration* (New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 2014), 262–271.

the several Germanic kings who ruled the territory of the former Western Roman Empire, whose last emperor had been ousted by Odoacer. Theoderic's superiority over these Germanic kings is interpreted through norms, values, and ideals from the era of the Roman Republic. This effectively portrays Theoderic not as a vassal, but as a Roman emperor. His authority is set out in Ennodius' panegyric, which documents Theoderic's rise to power and early rule.

In his *exordium*, Ennodius introduces Theoderic's character (*Pan*. 1–10). Theoderic's achievements in adolescence are discussed. These introduce his mission to take over Italy (*Pan*. 11–22). The march takes up a large part of the text and discusses Theoderic's battles against Odoacer (*Pan*. 23–27; 36–55) and the Germanic Gepids (28–35). Ennodius then moves on to Theoderic's rule over Italy, including his rule of the region (*Pan*. 56–59), tensions with the Eastern Roman Empire (*Pan*. 60–69), and peaceful domination over other nations (*Pan*. 70–77). The *argumentatio* closes with a large-scale comparison between Theoderic and other rulers (*Pan*. 78–81). Ennodius ends his *peroratio* with a prayer for Theoderic's health and a recapitulation of his superiority over the entire world (*Pan*. 82–93). The text is clearly indebted to Menander Rhetor's blueprint for panegyric.[19]

There is uncertainty, and concomitant debate, about the occasion and delivery of the panegyric. The speech itself does not include clear references to its delivery in any shape or form. Nor does Ennodius discuss the occasion of the speech, usually part of the *exordium*. Although this has given rise to the suggestion that the speech was not delivered at all, this would have meant following exception rather than rule. The surviving panegyrics of Pliny, Symmachus, Claudian, and Sidonius Apollinaris, as well as the mostly anonymous *Panegyrici Latini* and the fragmentary verses of Flavius Merobaudes, have not been questioned in a similar way.[20] Pliny's

[19] See William H. Race, ed. and trans., *Menander Rhetor, Dionysius of Halicarnasus, Ars Rhetorica*, Loeb Classical Library 539 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2019). Menander Rhetor offers the most extensive account of the structure of a panegyric.

[20] For *Panegyrici Latini*, see Pliny the Younger, *Panegyricus*, ed. R. A. B. Mynors, in *XII Panegyrici Latini*, Oxford Classical Texts (Oxford, GB: Clarendon Press, 1964), trans. Betty Radice, in *Letters, Books VIII–X and Panegyricus*, Loeb Classical Library 59 (Harvard, MA: Harvard University Press, 1969); *In Praise of Later Roman Emperors: The Panegyrici Latini*, text in Mynors, *XII Panegyrici Latini*, intro., trans., and comm., C. E. V. Nixon and Barbara Saylor Robers, The Transformation of the Classical Heritage 21 (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1994). For Symmachus, see *Symmaque, Discours—Rapports*, ed. and trans. Jean-Pierre Callu, Collection des Universités de France Série latine—Collection Budé 394 (Paris, FR: Belles lettres, 2009). For Claudian, see Claudien, *Œuvres. Tomes II–III*, ed. and trans. Jean-Louis Charlet,

panegyric was revised at a later point, but was delivered first. Another example is Merobaudes' *Panegyricus I*. The speech lacks a clear occasion, but is still accepted as a delivered work.[21] This stands to reason, simply, because panegyric as a genre is built upon ceremony and physical delivery. It is safe to assume that Ennodius' work, similarly, was delivered on some occasion.[22]

Its references to the city of Rome may bring us closer to that delivery. In *Pan.* 56, Ennodius mentions that the city where he is delivering his speech has been restored, including the *palatina . . . tecta,* "the Palatine roofs"—a reference to Rome's Palatine hill.[23] This restoration is compared to Romulus' foundation of Rome.[24] Moreover, Ennodius states in *Pan.* 85 that Theoderic has found a suitable alternative for the gladiatorial games that were practised in the city.[25] As Ravenna, another important city for Theoderic's reign, did not possess an amphitheatre, this will have been a reference to the Roman Colosseum.

Like the occasion, so too the date of the speech is uncertain. Its military focus can be tied to political tensions in late 506. Letters written by Theoderic dated between late 506 and early 507 tell us of

---

Collection des universités de France Série latine—Collection Budé 358, 415, (Paris, FR: Belles lettres, 2000–2017). For Sidonius, see Sidoine Apollinaire, *Tome I: Poèmes*, ed and trans. A. Loyen, Collection des universités de France Série latine—Collection Budé 161 (Paris: FR: Belles lettres, 1961).

[21] Frank M. Clover, "Flavius Merobaudes: A Translation and Historical Commentary," *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society* 61, no. 1 (Spring 1971): 1–78, https://doi.org/10.2307/1006125.

[22] In *Panegirico del clementissimo re Teoderico*, 31–35, Rota argues that Ennodius did deliver his speech. She bases herself on Ennodius' phrasing in *Pan.* 22: *Cursim multa transcendo, ne pigrioris stili vitio serus advenias, ne Romanae fax curiae diu in umbram coacta tardius elucescat,* "I skip many things speedily, so that you will not arrive late through the fault of my lazy pen, so that the torch of the Roman senate will not light itself too late, after it had been forced into shadows for so long." She argues that this comment means that Ennodius had to skip certain parts during his delivery. It is an attractive thought, but we must add that these words, comparable to a comment in *Pan.* 35, can just as easily be seen as rhetorical flourish.

[23] Rota, *Panegirico del clementissimo re Teoderico*, 366 takes the term *palatina* to refer to palaces—which Theoderic also had in Ravenna. However, this does not take into account the reference to the (re)construction of the city of Rome that directly follows the term.

[24] Ennod., *Pan.* 56: *Date veniam, Lupercalis genii sacra rudimenta: plus est occasum repellere quam dedisse principia,* "Grant forgiveness, sacred foundations of the Lupercal's spirit; it is better to repel ruin, than to give beginnings."

[25] Ennod., *Pan.* 85: *inter secundas res didicit inbellium animus quid timeret*, "amongst prosperity, the mind of the unwarlike learns what it should fear." The sentence is part of a discussion of the cruelty of the earlier gladiatorial events held in the same location.

a conflict between the Ostrogoth and the Frankish king Clovis, with both sides being supported by several Germanic kings.[26] A large diplomatic mission sent by Theoderic in the summer of 506 was meant to put a stop to this conflict. As the panegyric ends with discussions of diplomacy and the incorporation of the Alamanni in Italy—which is mentioned in the letters sent along with the mission—it is quite likely that the return of this mission to Rome in late 506 served as the setting for the panegyric's production.[27] This is why we propose that the delivery of the speech is related to this event.

Earlier research has proposed a date of early 507.[28] These conclusions build upon a letter in Cassiodorus' collection, sent by Theoderic to citizens of Noricum in early 507. The letter discusses trade with Alamanni settlers.[29] However, as we have discussed above, the integration of the Alamanni had started as early as the summer of 506 and the discussion of trade is by no means a sign of the start of Alamanni settlement. Moreover, the return of Theoderic's diplomatic mission seems to be the likely occasion for the panegyric's production, while no alternative is offered by previous scholars.[30]

Despite earlier suggestions,[31] the text was most likely not ordered by or in any sense related to the Church. The focus placed

---

[26] These letters were included in Cassiodorus's large letter collection, known as the *Variae*; text in *Cassiodori Senatoris Variae*, ed. Theodorus Mommsen, *Accedunt: I. Epistulae theodericianeae variae,* edidit Th. Mommsen, *II. Acta synhodorum habitarum Romae a. CCCCXCVIIII. DI. DII.*, edidit Th. Mommsen, *III. Cassiodori Orationum reliquiae*, edidit Lud. Traube, *Accedunt tabulae duae*, *Monumenta Germaniae historica*, Auctorum antiquissimorum tomus 11 (Berlin, DE: Weidmann, 1894), trans. M. Shane Bjorlie, in *Cassiodorus, The Variae: The Complete Translation* (Oakland, CA: University of California Press, 2019). Tension was present in letter 2.41, dated to summer 506. Later letters (3.1–3.4) were likely delivered by the diplomatic mission of late 506. These letters appeal to Clovis' moderation and propose peaceful mediation of conflict.

[27] The mission is discussed in detail in chapter 5, "Cassiodorus and Senarius," of Andrew Gillett, *Envoys and Political Communication in the Late Antique West, 411–533* (Cambridge, GB: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 172–219.

[28] For instance, see Rota, *Panegirico del clementissimo re Teoderico*, 22–25.

[29] The letter in question is *Variae* 3.50.

[30] In her commentary on the text, which is both the most recent and most detailed, Rota (*Panegirico del clementissimo re Teoderico*, 25–31), subscribes to Rohr's earlier commentary and connects the text to the reinstatement of Flavius Faustus Iunior by Theoderic. This would be a sign of forgiveness (*clementia*), which is not a clear theme in the text. The exception is *Pan.* 75, where Ennodius mentions that Theoderic forgives, "We enjoy the fruits found in the footsteps of our elders, and yet we do not fear punishments for their mistakes," *Habemus de maiorum obsequiis fructum, et tamen de excessibus supplicia non timemus.* As we discussed above, this and a related comment in *Pan.* 4 likely refer to Ennodius himself, not the unnamed Faustus.

[31] Haase, "Ennodius' Panegyric to Theoderic the Great," 4–7, discusses several previous suggestions, among which that the text was ordered by the Church. This

by Ennodius on traditional Roman values, practice, and symbols, aligns much more neatly with a political purpose. Ennodius likely wrote the speech on behalf of the senatorial circle in the city of Rome. Ennodius' correspondence shows a wide network of senators, from Italy and Gaul.[32] He, or perhaps his circle at large, sought to assert Theoderic's supremacy in relation to his adoption of traditional policies. After a brief discussion of the relevant aspects of epideictic rhetoric, an analysis of this praise by republican standards, including the detailed discussion of two samples from the text, will follow.

Panegyric and Persuasion

Epideictic has long been regarded as a *genus* with little practical purpose, a lack of actual arguments, and a passive audience.[33] Due to epideictic's frequent appeals to the commonplaces and cliches of moral consensus, its audience is a spectator of rhetorical ability (περὶ τῆς δυνάμεως θεωρός) rather than a judge of arguments (κριτής). Spectators should, accordingly, be entertained and impressed instead of convinced.[34] Recently, scholars including Beale (1978), Hauser (1999), Pepe (2013; 2017) and Pernot (2015) have developed a more nuanced view of epideictic.[35] Epideictic, as they argue convincingly, re-evaluates and confirms morality by placing the subject in a value system. This conceptualisation of epideictic has influenced contemporary

---

does not seem likely, as the Church is mentioned only once and the focus of the text is overtly military and political.

[32] Kennell, "Letter Collection," 369–83.

[33] Especially vehement is, e.g., Edward M. Cope, *An Introduction to Aristotle's Rhetoric with Analysis, Notes, and Appendices* (London, GB: Macmillan, 1867), 121; Cope states: "The third branch is inferior to the two preceding in extent, importance, and interest . . . [meant] to amuse an audience . . . who are therefore *theoroi* rather than *kritai*, like spectators at a theatre, or a contest for a prize . . . rather than any serious interest or real issue at stake."

[34] Terms used by Aristotle in *Rhetoric* 1.1358b2–8.

[35] Walter Beale, "Rhetorical Performative Discourse: A New Theory of Epideictic," *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 11, no. 4 (Fall 1978): 221–246, https://www.jstor.org/stable/40237084; Gerard A. Hauser, "Aristotle on Epideictic: The Formation of Public Morality," *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 29, no. 1 (Winter 1999): 5–23, https://www.jstor.org/stable/3886389; Cristina Pepe, *The Genres of Rhetorical Speeches in Greek and Roman Antiquity*, International Studies in the History of Rhetoric 5 (Leiden, NL: Brill, 2013); Cristina Pepe, "(Re)discovering a Rhetorical Genre: Epideictic in Greek and Roman Antiquity," *Res Rhetorica* 4, no. 1 (Spring 2017): 17–31; Laurent Pernot, *Epideictic Rhetoric: Questioning the Stakes of Ancient Praise* (Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 2015).

research on panegyrics and has put more focus on the ways in which orators help support the ruler and the status quo.[36] In a similar vein, the nature of the θεωρός is under review. Kraus (1905; 1907), Mirhady (1995) and Rapp (2002) have argued that the θεωρός does not limit his observation to the orator's rhetorical δύναμις and showmanship.[37] Though style and form are important to judge the ability of the orator, the audience also judges the ability of the orator's subject to achieve his good actions and prove, i.e., display, his virtues. This different approach has put more agency with both the orator and the audience.

The second objection to the genre—that it was devoid of argumentation—was countered in Roman antiquity already. Quintilian (*Inst.* 3.7.6) discusses the need for arguments through an example of a speech about Hercules. Though the subject is considered brave, the orator still needs to deliver arguments that prove this bravery and defend the subject against potential counter-arguments.[38] Another example of actual argumentation can be found in the panegyrics for Diocletian. His tetrarchy—a rule of four emperors—was normalised by likening it to two separate sets of co-rulers, which Rome had seen before. The tetrarchy is thus argued to be a normal part of Roman politics.[39] It was up to the audience to cast a verdict or form an opinion. If the audience disagreed with the arguments of the speech and these were regarded as untruthful, the speech's goal of asserting the status quo would have failed.

As its virtue-based arguments needed to be acceptable for the entire audience, epideictic leans to conservatism. An audience could be easily alienated by unusual statements. For instance, a panegyrist

---

[36] *Inter alii* Barbara S. Rodgers and Charles Nixon, *In Praise of Later Roman Emperors: The* Panegyrici Latini (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1994); Roger Rees, *Imperial Ideology in Latin Panegyric, 289–298* (St. Andrews, GB: University of St. Andrews 1997); Roger Rees, *Layers of Loyalty in Latin Panegyric, AD 289–307* (Oxford, GB: Oxford University Press, 2002); and Mary Whitby, ed., *The Propaganda of Power: The Role of Panegyric in Late Antiquity* (Leiden, NL: Brill, 1998).

[37] Oskar Kraus, *Über eine altüberlieferte Missdeutung der epideiktischen Redegattung bei Aristoteles* (Halle, DE: Niemeyer, 1905); Oskar Kraus, *Neue Studien zur aristotelischen Rhetorik, insbesondere über das* γένος ἐπιδεικτικόν (Halle, DE: Niemeyer, 1907); David C. Mirhady, "A Note on Aristotle 'Rhetoric' 1.3 1358b5–6," *Philosophy & Rhetoric* 28, no. 4 (1995): 405–409, https://www.jstor.org/stable/40237874; *Werke in deutscher Übersetzung.* Aristotles: *Rhetorik*, übersetzt und erläutert von Christof Rapp, Bd. 4, Halbbd.1 (Berlin, DE: Akademie Verlag, 2002).

[38] Considering Quintilian's comments on Hercules, one could imagine the demigod's subordinance to Omphale to be such a counter-argument. See also Quint., *Inst.* 3.7.5.

[39] Rees, *Imperial Ideology*, 116–124.

of the emperor Augustus, who presented himself as a senate leader (*princeps*) rather than a king or emperor, could not praise the emperor for his sole rule. Instead, Augustus had better be praised for his bravery or justice, for which he just happened to claim the credits—by himself.

Because of this tendency towards conservatism, Greco-Roman panegyric consistently used the same virtues.[40] This allowed panegyrists to appeal to even the staunchest conservatives.[41] Other aspects of panegyric, such as *exempla* bore evidence of the same conservatism. For instance, the panegyrist Pliny referred to Scipio Africanus, Gaius Fabricius, and Camillus, to fit Trajan's virtues in a traditional framework and compare these virtues to known *exempla* of bravery and rectitude.[42]

Panegyric's use of arguments and its tendency towards conservatism are a clear constituent of the longer tradition of which Ennodius was a part. This starts with Pliny's panegyric. Pliny had depicted Trajan as a ruler with republican virtues and argued that Trajan's adoption was, in fact, an election to the position of emperor.[43] In a similar vein, the new political system of the tetrarchy was normalised by the 3rd- and 4th-century panegyrics known as the *Panegyrici Latini*. Panegyrists compared the form of government to earlier forms of co-rulership going back to the "co-rulers" Romulus and Remus.[44] Likewise, the late 4th- and early 5th-century panegyrists Claudian, Sidonius, and Merobaudes used traditional models—such as republican-era heroes and virtues—to praise Roman emperors and their generals. Claudian had faced a similar challenge to Ennodius: he made Germanic figures, such as Claudian's hero Stilicho, appear less Germanic and more Roman by using

[40] Menander Rhetor, 2.1.21: ἀρεταὶ δὲ τέσσαρές εἰσιν, ἀνδρεία, δικαιοσύνη, σωφροσύνη, φρόνησις, "There are four virtues: courage, justice, moderation, and intelligence."

[41] They are set out for the first time in Plato's *Politeia* 4.426–435 and have since then found their way into later Greek and Roman literature—especially in political contexts.

[42] Gregory O. Hutchinson, "Politics and the Sublime in the *Panegyricus*," in *Pliny's Praise: The "Panegyricus" in the Roman World,* ed. Paul Roche (Cambridge, GB: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 125–141. These catalogues were also used by Claudian in his panegyric for Stilicho. See Álvaro Sánchez-Ostiz, "Claudian's Stilicho at the *Urbs*: Roman Legitimacy for the Half-Barbarian Regent," in *Imagining Emperors in the Later Roman Empire*, ed. Diederik W. P. Burgersdijk and Alan J. Ross, Cultural Interactions in the Mediterranean 1 (Leiden, NL: Brill, 2018), 310–330.

[43] Hutchinson, *Politics and the Sublime,* 125–141.

[44] Rees, *Imperial Ideology*, 116–124.

conservative models. These models helped the audience to accept a Germanic general as a member of the Roman elite.[45] Ennodius' panegyric, too, praises a Germanic sole ruler. Hence, it comes as no surprise that Ennodius alludes to Claudian several times. Panegyric thus uses tradition to accommodate change.

Praising Theoderic by Republican Standards

The conservatism of epideictic is omnipresent. Pliny praised Trajan by republican ideals, fourth century-panegyrists compared their rulers to the Five Good Emperors of the 2nd century, the list goes on.[46] Ennodius, likewise, used conservative ideas, virtues, and *exempla* to portray Theoderic as a Roman. The Roman Republic (510 BCE–27 BCE) continued to serve as inspiration for praise. Its assumed simplicity, democracy, and political freedom were often glorified by authors from the imperial age, who believed that their own governments were marred by greed, fraud, and oppression.[47] This started in the Early Empire and served as such a prominent *topos* that even Ennodius used it in the 6th century CE.

This section discusses the strategies Ennodius uses to present Theoderic according to Roman republican standards. It first addresses clear comparisons to republican-era Romans, moving on to the application of republican political concepts, the idealised practice of Roman politics, and Theoderic's adoption of Roman *mores*. The discussion of these strategies will show that Ennodius actually, if implicitly, argued that Theoderic was a Roman ruler, instead of simply following genre-specific *topoi* for praise. His arguments are, with few exceptions, based on republican virtues, ideals, and figures.

The tendency to only refer to republican figures is unique. Previous panegyrists did find famous emperors a suitable matter for

---

[45] Scott Kennedy, "Winter is Coming: The Barbarization of Roman Leaders in Imperial Panegyric from A.D. 446–68," *Classical Quarterly* 69, no. 1 (May 2019): 422–434, https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838819000351.

[46] On Pliny, see Davis W. Houck, "Enacting the Roman Republic: Reading Pliny's Panegyric Rhetorically," *Advances in the History of Rhetoric* 3, no. 1 (Spring 2000): 34–43, https://doi.org/10.1080/15362426.1998.10500517; on later panegyrists, see Dennis Jussen, "Leading by Example: Historical Exemplarity in Fourth-Century Panegyric," in *Facing the Roman Emperor in Late Antiquity: Contemporary Expectations of Political Leadership in Imperial Panegyric, 284–395,* ed. Dennis Jussen (Nijmegen, NL: Radboud University, 2022), 95–118.

[47] See Sam Wilkinson, *Republicanism during the Early Roman Empire* (London, GB: Continuum, 2012).

praise.[48] But, when he discusses the emperors once at the end of his speech, Ennodius states that the unnecessary "flatteries" they required "waged war against the truth."[49] The one *exemplum* Ennodius shares with his predecessors, is Alexander the Great—a figure who appears in panegyrics frequently as a symbol of virtue. Ennodius criticises the Macedonian king for his desire for unnecessary praise in *Pan.* 78.[50] Early Roman figures are far more useful to Ennodius. Theoderic is compared to, among others, the consul Serranus on account of his work ethic (*Pan.* 17), to the founder of Rome, king Romulus, due to great service in rebuilding the city (*Pan.* 56), and the consuls Rutilius and Manlius for providing a non-lethal and thus morally superior alternative to the gladiatorial games (*Pan.* 85).[51]

Ennodius' most notable comparison, however, is not with any of the *exempla* mentioned above. In *Pan.* 30, Theoderic is compared to Cato Uticensis. Cato was an important opponent of Julius Caesar, who saw Caesar's sole rule as a threat to the Roman Republic. He fought against Caesar until he suffered great losses near the city of Utica, where he lost his troops to a host of snakes. Since he found himself unable to defend the Roman Republic against Caesar's dictatorship, Cato decided that it was better to die in the Republic than

---

[48] Jussen, "Leading by Example," 95–118, provides an overview of the *exempla* used in fourth-century panegyric. Catherine Ware does the same for Claudian in *Claudian and the Roman Epic Tradition* (Cambridge, GB: Cambridge University Press, 2012).

[49] Ennod., *Pan.* 81: *veritati militant blandimenta maiorum.*

[50] Ennod., *Pan.* 17: *Eat nunc et coturnatis relationibus Alexandrum iactet antiquitas, cui famae opulentiam peperit dos loquentium, ut per adiutricem facundiam videatur crescere rebus mendica laudatio,* "May antiquity now go and boast of Alexander in stage stories, for whom the gift of good speakers has brought forth a richness of fame, so that praise, lacking subjects to discuss, seems to grow with eloquence as its helper."

[51] Ennod., *Pan.* 17 for Serranus: *Serranum scipionibus aratra pepererunt, qui dum grandia sulcis semina commendaret, honorum ei messis oborta est. Sed minus diligo prospera, quae sumunt a desperatione principium,* "The ploughs brought forth Serranus for the consular staffs and, while he entrusted large seeds to the furrows, a harvest of honours came up to him. But I don't like prosperities that are founded on desperation."; *Pan.* 56 for Romulus: *Date veniam, Lupercalis genii sacra rudimenta: plus est occasum repellere quam dedisse principia,* "Grant forgiveness, sacred foundations of the Lupercal's spirit; it is better to repel ruin, than to give beginnings"; *Pan.* 85 for Rutilius and Manlius: *Rutilium et Manlium conperimus gladiatorium conflictum magistrante populis providentia contulisse . . . sed tunc feriatis manibus frustra sociae mortes ingerebantur aspectui,* "We learn that Rutilius and Manlius brought the gladiatorial games to the people, while foresight directed them . . . but then the deaths of allies were brought to show for no reason to groups of people enjoying their holiday." The *Lupercal* to which Ennodius refers in *Pan.* 56 is the site where Romulus and Remus were raised by the she-wolf and which was in use as a site for religious and other cultural celebrations until at least 494 CE, but likely—seeing this positive reference to the site—after.

live under Caesar's rule, and he committed suicide. His devotion to the Republic made Cato a symbol of republicanism and virtue in following centuries, as the one figure who would die rather than forego the ideals of the republic.[52] While it is clear how Theoderic is militarily superior to Cato—the latter lost to Caesar, after all—Ennodius also states that Theoderic fought for a cause more beneficial to Rome than Cato's.[53] The republican hero was incited to fight by the "fury of civil war," while "Rome, the mistress of the world, demanded that [Theoderic] come to repair her condition."[54] Theoderic's recovery of Italy from Odoacer is depicted as more important for Rome than the recovery of the Roman Republic from Caesar. Ennodius actually argues that Theoderic's actions are better for Rome than those of Cato. Theoderic displays an active opposition to tyranny, like Cato, but because he is, in fact, able to stop the tyranny of Odoacer, Theoderic actually trumps Cato.

A similar argument can be found at the end of *Pan.* 32. Theoderic exhorts his soldiers to fight by stating *qui in hostili acie viam desiderat, me sequatur* ("whoever desires a way into the enemy line, follow me"). The quote imitates one found in the main supplier of *exempla*, the 1st-century author Valerius Maximus (3.2.17): *qui rem publicam salvam esse volunt, me sequantur* ("whoever wish the state to be safe, follow me").[55] The original *exemplum* refers to Scipio Nasica, a consul who, like Cato, sought to rescue Roman Republic from tyranny.[56] By comparison, Theoderic, too, is presented as a defender of the state.

Theoderic's respect for the Republic and its ideals is made clear by Ennodius throughout the text. Theoderic's dominion is dubbed a *respublica*, both in the case of Italy (*Pan.* 5; 40; 58) and his consulate in the Eastern Empire (*Pan.* 14; 16). Whenever Ennodius uses different terminology, the regions under Theoderic's rule are explicitly described as Roman or Latin (*Pan.* 69: *Romana regna,* "the Roman

---

[52] This is discussed extensively by Fred K. Drogula, *Cato the Younger: Life and Death at the End of the Roman Republic* (Oxford, GB: Oxford University Press, 2019).

[53] Rota, "Catone L'Uticense," sets out the military superiority of Theoderic over Cato in much detail. Rota touches upon the importance of Theoderic's mission for Rome, but does not discuss this aspect in Ennodius' speech at large and the other arguments that connect Theoderic to a republican value system.

[54] Ennod., *Pan.* 30: *Illum civilis belli furor agitabat, te orbis domina ad status sui reparationem Roma poscebat,* "Him the fury of civil war incited, while Rome, the mistress of the world, demanded that you come to repair her condition."

[55] Variations of the quote are used in Cic., *Tusc.* 23.51, Vell. 2.3.1. It is copied (from Valerius) in Serv., *A.* 7.614.

[56] Nasica opposed the supposed tyrannical aspirations of the popular politician Tiberius Gracchus in the 1st-century BCE.

kingdoms"; *Pan.* 72: *Latiaris imperium,* "the dominion of the Latin one"—a reference to "Latin Jupiter"). Theoderic's dominion is then consistently described as a Roman state.[57]

Representing imperial rule as republican was not Ennodius' invention. The title of *princeps*, which denoted a republican-era leader of the senate, was used for emperors in the Early Empire to simulate republican rule.[58] His subordinance to the Eastern Roman emperor prohibited Theoderic, however, from presenting himself in such a way.[59] He is therefore argued to be a *princeps* through his actions. Theoderic defends the state against dictators, serves as consul, and refuses to take more power—points of praise for republican rulers.[60] Other rulers—kings and emperors—are described as *imperatores*—"generals."[61] *Imperator* had been a victory title for centuries and became an imperial title in the beginning of the empire. Its equation to the Greek titles βασιλεύς and, eventually, αὐτοκράτωρ in the later empire made it lose its original meaning. Instead of signifying an army commander, as it had done for centuries, *imperator* now signified a distant autocrat.[62] To describe Theoderic as a *princeps*/senate leader, but to explicitly denote his colleagues—including the emperor—as *imperatores*/army commanders contains clear judgement regarding the quality of the ruler.[63]

Theoderic's good rulership mostly derives from his support of republican institutions. After discussing his early career in *Pan.* 11–22, Ennodius states that he will move on to Theoderic's campaign in Italy, "so that the torch of the Roman senate will not light itself too late, after it was forced into shadows for so long."[64] Theoderic's mission is tied to the illumination—and, through this, restoration—of the

---

[57] Arnold, *Theoderic and Roman,* 29–30, though we cannot agree with Arnold, when he diminishes the importance of the terms *respublica* and *regnum*, as well as the distinction between them.

[58] Arnold, *Theoderic and Roman*, 174.

[59] Jones, *Constitutional Position*, 126–130.

[60] A well-known example is the republican *dictator* Cincinnatus, who governed the Roman Republic in times of crisis, but who surrendered his power when the republic was stabilised.

[61] Ennod., *Pan.* 11–22. Specifically, *Pan.* 18: *oppono principem meum ita ortum . . . quasi inter imperatores*, "I put in front of you my *princeps*, who has become this way . . . as if he were standing amongst generals." Ennodius mentions the contrast between the terms *princeps* and *imperator* and states that, as a *princeps*, Theoderic stands out.

[62] Arnold, *Theoderic and Roman*, 174. See also Evangelos K. Chrysos, "The Title Βασιλεύς in Early Byzantine International Relations," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 32 (1978): 29–75, https://doi.org/10.2307/1291418.

[63] Rota, *Panegirico del clementissimo re Teoderico*, 283–284.

[64] Ennod. *Pan.* 22: *ne Romanae fax curiae diu in umbram coacta tardius elucescat.*

Roman senate. One of Theoderic's first acts as an established ruler, in *Pan.* 57, is to "envelop the crown (= roof) of the senate-building with innumerable flowers," a clear sign of the senate's importance.[65] Traditional positions, such as the consulate, are also defended by Theoderic. Emperors had increasingly taken over the powers of the consul as leader of the senate, to the extent that the position had essentially become a sinecure. According to Ennodius, Theoderic's actions will allow Rome to "have more consuls than she had previously seen candidates."[66] The collective effect of these measures allows Rome to rejuvenate, a metaphor that appears throughout the speech.[67]

When generals in the Late Republic and emperors in the Early Empire marginalised the senate and consuls, political freedom became an important topic of conversation for the senatorial elite.[68] Tyrannical rule was set off against republican-style rule with, at its core, political freedom and non-domination, called *libertas* in Latin. Through this contrast, *libertas* remained the foundation of good rule in imperial political thought.[69] Theoderic is presented as the defender of *libertas* on multiple occasions (*Pan.* 1; 19) and is contrasted with a tyrant in *Pan.* 12 and 24.[70] This defence of *libertas* is generally depicted as military, with Theoderic's sword dubbed "avenger of *libertas*" in *Pan.* 42.[71] However, the making of just laws, also a marker of *libertas*, is tied to Theoderic as well, in *Pan.* 58 and 69.[72]

---

[65] Ennod., *Pan.* 57: *coronam curiae innumero flore velasti.*

[66] Ennod. *Pan.* 48: *Hic actum est, ut plures habeas consules, quam ante videris candidatos.*

[67] This metaphor is discussed in detail in Rota in "Teoderico il Grande," 224–226.

[68] Valentina Arena, Libertas *and the practice of politics in the late Roman republic* (Cambridge, GB: Cambridge University Press, 2012). Case studies on *libertas* can be found in Catalina Balmaceda, ed., Libertas *and* Res Publica *in the Roman Republic: Ideas of Freedom and Roman Politics* (Leiden, NL: Brill, 2020).

[69] See Henriette van der Blom, "*Res Publica*, *Libertas* and Free Speech in Retrospect: Republican Oratory in Tacitus' *Dialogus*," in Balmaceda, Libertas and Res Publica, 216–238.

[70] Ennod., *Pan.* 1: *armis tuis libertas obnoxia, quod solum potest, hilaritatem didicit,* "*libertas*, indebted to your weapons, has learned happiness, which is the only thing it is able to do"; *Pan.* 19: *libertatem dextera tua adserente,* "while your right hand defended *libertas*"; *Pan.* 42: *dum lateri tuo vindex libertatis gladius aptaretur,* "while your sword, the avenger of *libertas* was fitted to your side"; *Pan.* 12, regarding the tyrant Basiliscus: *nullo adscitus sanguine tyrannus,* "a tyrant who was admitted without bloodshed"; *Pan.* 24, regarding the tyrant Odoacer: *nec micare usquam scintillas famulantum extinctus tyranni fomes indulserat,* "and the extinguished kindle of the tyrant had not allowed the embers of those who served him to shine."

[71] Ennod., *Pan.* 42: *vindex libertatis gladius.*

[72] Arena, *Libertas and Practice*, 244–247. Ennod. *Pan.* 58: *nec replicationibus tuis reperiuntur contraria nec obiectionibus facilis occurit resolutio,* "arguments against your

This section has shown Ennodius arguing to connect Theoderic with heroes, virtues, and institutions of the republican era. His use of *exempla* proves that Theoderic is more beneficent to the idea of the Roman Republic than Cato Uticensis, judging also by Theoderic's focus on the senate, just laws, and the appointment of consuls. Ennodius' use of *libertas*, a loaded political term, underscores this focus on rulership by republican ideals and in opposition of tyranny.

A last aspect remains to be discussed, however. Ennodius deliberately ignores the Roman emperors, as they fall short for his purpose. The reason for this becomes clear in *Pan.* 81. In this reference to contemporary and earlier rulers, Ennodius makes clear that emperors were untruthful and claimed titles they did not deserve. Theoderic, however, is different.

> Quid! Frustra maiores nostri divos et pontifices vocarunt, quibus sceptra conlata sunt. Singulare est actibus implere sanctissimum et veneranda nomina non habere. Rex meus sit iure Alamannicus, dicatur alienus. Ut divus vitam agat ex fructu conscientiae nec requirat pomposae vocabula nuda iactantiae, in cuius moribus veritati militant blandimenta maiorum.
>
> What else! In vain our elders called those whom they entrusted with the sceptres "divine man" and "priest." It is without precedent to fulfil the most holy with actions, and not hold any venerable titles. Let my king be "victor over Alamanni" by right, even though another is named thus. May he live his life as a "divine man" from the fruit of his conscience and not require the undisguised words of extravagant bragging, customs by which the flatteries of our elders wage war against the truth.

Republican-era Romans praised balance and humility. Panegyrists from Pliny onwards opposed unnecessary praise.[73] Similarly, Ennodius states that Theoderic, in contrast to his predecessors, shows his worth not through unnecessary titles, but through his actions. Theoderic shows greater adherence to republican values than earlier Romans and his own contemporaries.[74]

---

sentences are not found, nor is there an easy resolution to your objections." *Pan.* 69: *dictas more veterum praecepta Sermiensibus,* "According to the custom of the elders, you give commands to the inhabitants of Sirmium."

[73] On Pliny: Houck, *Enacting Republic,* 34–43; on later panegyrists: Sabine Mac Cormack, "Latin Prose Panegyrics: Tradition and Discontinuity in the Later Roman Empire" *Revue d'Études Augustiniennes* 22, nos. 1–2 (1976): 1–49.

[74] This shows that Theoderic's power, unlike that of his predecessors and the emperor Anastasius, is actually legitimate. Other rulers hold onto a power derived from titles alone. Rota, "Teoderico il Grande," 203–243. Though this detail lies

Ennodius uses several strategies to present Theoderic as Roman. He uses traditional republican ideas on politics and virtuous behaviour. Furthermore, he contrasts this virtuous behaviour to the behaviour of imperial rulers, with arguments including Theoderic's surpassing of Cato, the defence of *libertas*, and the status of Theoderic as a *princeps*. This active reasoning shows that presentation of Theoderic in a republican frame is not symptomatic of a genre lacking a *telos*, as previous scholars have often suggested for panegyric, but rather shows actual argumentation and effort. This argumentation will now be set out in two samples. We will start with his activities in adolescence, the subject matter of *Pan.* 11–22, and then move on to the conflict between Theoderic and Odoacer in *Pan.* 23–27 and 36–55.

"Greece educated you": Theoderic's Virtues in Adolescence

The qualities exemplified by rulers in their adult lives were thought to be a development of the qualities they were born with. Consequently, if their pastimes or actions (*praxeis*) as a youth were a sign of bravery, said bravery would be even more thoroughly developed in adulthood.[75] This line of reasoning is used by Ennodius as well, starting from the beginning of *Pan.* 11. He states: "Greece educated you in the bosom of civilised society, foretelling of what was to come."[76]

Greece (*Graecia*) is a *totum pro parte* for Constantinople, the capital of the Eastern Roman Empire and heart of the Roman world in the late 5th century. Theoderic spent his youth in the city, until he

---

outside the scope of our current research, the choice of titles is meaningful as well. For the Christian importance of the titles used to describe Theoderic, see Rota, *Passo del panegirico*, 1998.

[75] Regarding pastimes in youth, Menander Rhetor states, regarding pastimes in youth (2.1.16): "τὰ γὰρ ἐπιτηδεύματα ἤθους ἔμφασιν περιέχει, οἷον ὅτι δίκαιος ἐγένετο ἢ σώφρων ἐν τῇ νεότητι, καθάπερ καὶ Ἰσοκράτης ἐποίησεν ἐν τῷ Εὐαγόρᾳ, ἐν οἷς καὶ μικρὸν προελθὼν εἶπεν, 'ἀνδρὶ δὲ γενομένῳ ταῦτά τε πάντα συνηυξήθη καὶ ἄλλα προσεγένετο.'" Race, *Menander Rhetor*, 148: "His activities will have a place for exposition, activities being character traits apart from competitive deeds, for activities entail an indication of character. For example, mention that he was just or moderate in his youth, as Isocrates did in the *Evagoras*, where he went right on to say, 'and when he became a man, all those qualities increased as he matured, while other virtues were added to them.'"

[76] Ennod. *Pan.* 11: *Educavit te in gremio civilitatis Graecia praesaga venturi.*

started his march on Italy in 489. By calling the city a bosom (*gremium*), denoting the bosom of a mother or maternal figure, the city is presented as Theoderic's place of birth. This connects the *civilitas* of the city to Theoderic and makes him a born Roman, at least within the panegyric, conveniently allowing Ennodius to draw attention away from Theoderic's Ostrogothic background.[77] Theoderic's "first" birth is omitted, and his "second" birth in Constantinople is put in its place. And since his birth was already Roman, by extension, Theoderic was a Roman during the rest of his life as well. This is set out in Theoderic's *praxeis*.

The first of these *praxeis* details how Theoderic saved the emperor Zeno's rule from a usurper by the name of Basiliscus (*Pan.* 11–14).[78] It is set at the court, in the years 475 and 476, when Theoderic was around 21 years old. Ennodius first describes Theoderic in nature metaphors, which are used to underscore his youth. This youth is then endowed with the contrastive quality of *furor*, a term which denotes rage and fury in earlier Roman literature, but which is used here to highlight Theoderic's strength.

> Adhuc in cano flore degebas adulescentiae nec virtutum messem lacteus ante experimentum culmus attulerat, adhuc blanda erat imago pubescentis nec tingens faciem lanugo vestibat: quando aevi purpura et flosculus supervenientis imperii promittebat sollicitis de gratiae conmutatione terrorem, cum ad probationem roboris et clementiae tuae ruptis vinculis furor emicuit et evisceratas diuturna quiete mentes occasionis pabulo subiugavit. (*Pan.* 11)
>
> You were still living your life in white flower of adolescence and the milky grass had not brought forth its harvest of virtues, before you were tested. Your image of a growing boy was still sweet and a fuzz did not touch or clothe your face: then, the emperor and delicate flower of the coming rule promised terror to those who feared a change in favour, when the chains were ruptured and fury suddenly appeared to prove your strength and clemency and subjugated to nutritious opportunity the minds weakened by long rest.

---

[77] This strategy is familiar and was also used by Pliny. He reinvents Trajan's birth and stresses his adoption by the emperor as a new start to the emperor's life. Houck, *Enacting Republic,* 34–43. Rota, "Teoderico il Grande," discusses the importance of the term *civilitas* within Ennodius' panegyric. Unlike Cassiodorus, who would dub Italy the centre of *civilitas* several years later, Ennodius applies the term to Constantinople as a means to connect it to Theoderic's upbringing. Rota must be right in her suggestion that *civilitas* has, through Theoderic's rule, been translated from Greece to Rome.

[78] The episode is discussed briefly in Rota, "Teoderico il Grande," 226–228.

Ennodius states the intended goal of the section: the *probatio* of Theoderic's strength (*robor*) and clemency (*clementia*). As a way to add praise to Theoderic's ability to defeat the adult usurper and reinstate the adult emperor, Ennodius first stresses Theoderic's youth by a series of nature metaphors (*in cano flore adulescentiae; virtutum messem; lacteus . . . culmus*; *occasionis pabulo*).[79] The term *flos* is multifaceted. It is used to criticise emperor Zeno, who is described as a *flosculus supervenientis imperii*. At the start of the passage, Ennodius uses the term *flos* to describe Theoderic's state of growth. However, the use of the diminutive *flosculus* to denote Zeno refers to another meaning of the word: a pretty, though useless, ornament. The term is applied here to the ruler of the Eastern Roman Empire. By contrast, the release of *furor* is a sign of Theoderic's strength and ability.[80] His *furor* is used to awaken the "minds weakened by long rest" and save the empire from its idleness, in particular, if implicitly, the idleness of the emperor himself.

If Theoderic's strength is shown through his ability to defeat the usurper Basiliscus, his return of the imperial throne to emperor Zeno serves as proof of his clemency. Ennodius argues that Zeno was such a weak emperor, that Theodoric—his subordinate—is in a position to bestow the emperorship onto him. By returning the symbols of power to Zeno, the focus is again put on Theoderic's superior position. As Ennodius stresses, such a noble action is unique in history:

> In ipsis congressionis tuae foribus cessit invasor, cum profugo per te sceptra redderentur de salute dubitanti. Ventilemus historias, interrogentur annales: apud quos constitit refusum exuli, quem cruore suo rex genitus emerat, principatum? (*Pan*. 12–13)
>
> In these doorways of your arrival, the invader gave ground, when the sceptres were returned, with your help, to the fugitive Zeno who was unsure of his safety. Let us fan through the histories, let us examine the annals: does anyone say that the principate, which a born king had earned with his own blood, was returned to an exile?

Ennodius refers to *historias* and *annales* as documentary evidence. This adds support to his claim that Theoderic's action was unique. Furthermore, it shows that Ennodius as an orator had taken care of his

---

[79] The history of natural metaphors in panegyric is discussed in Rota, *Panegirico del clementissimo re Teoderico*, 264–265.

[80] *Furor* was generally seen as a threat to stability. The panegyrics of Claudian, which Ennodius refers to on numerous occasions, reinvent *furor* as a necessity to awaken an idle ruler and save the empire. See Ware, *Claudian and Epic*, 117–124.

inventio.[81] More evidence is presented later, when Zeno is referred to as a "purple [= imperial] witness" (*Pan.* 14: *purpurato teste*) of Theoderic's actions.[82] This proves the king's aid to the state and respect for proper rule, all encapsulated in the *civilitas* that Ennodius started with.[83]

The theme of *civilitas* is picked up by Theoderic's second *praxis,* in *Pan.*15–18, which shows how Theoderic holds the title of consul and rules in the style of a *princeps*. His consulship is connected to several traditional symbols.

> Sed parcus in exigendis praemiis, quasi sufficerent ad vicissitudinem operum tuorum, fasces accepisti, non quo tibi accederet genius de curuli, sed ut de te pretium palmata mereretur. Quis hanc civilitatem credat inter familiares tibi vivere plena executione virtutes? (*Pan.* 15)
>
> But sparing as you are in demanding rewards, you have accepted the fasces, as though they sufficed for your labours, not so that the spirit of the curule seat would come to you, but so that the palm toga earned a reward from you. Who would think that this sense of civilised society lived amongst your personal virtues, in complete development?

Theoderic's position as a traditional consul is supported by several symbols associated with the consul: the *fasces, sella curulis*, and *toga palmata*. These physical objects all indicate Theoderic's *civilitas*. Moreover, Ennodius states that Theoderic is not the one who gains honour from these objects, but rather the objects themselves which are honoured by the fact that Theoderic wears and uses them. So, the "palm toga earned a reward from you."

Now that he had put on the consular robes, Theoderic was able to show his *civilitas* by his good rule. Theoderic's rule is presented as superior to that of Zeno and Basiliscus, because he did not need fear to rule the state.

> Ille annus habuit consulem, qui rempublicam non tam sollicitudine quam opinione tueretur, quo in segmentis posito quae ab hostibus sumpta fuerant arma tremuerunt. (*Pan.* 16)
>
> That year had a consul who guarded the republic not so much with fear as with his reputation, because of whom, when he was placed in the bands of the toga, the weapons his enemies took up trembled.

---

[81] Documentary evidence is connected to the genus of judicial rhetoric, but cf. *Pan. Lat.* 4.30.5.

[82] Witnesses are associated with judicial rhetoric. They appear in panegyric rarely, but cf. *Pan. Lat.* 2.34.1.

[83] Rota, "Teoderico il Grande," 203–243. Rota discusses how the superiority of Theoderic shown in this passage helps to distance his power, which he was given by Zeno, from the Eastern Roman court.

He rules the state (*respublica*) not so much with fear (*sollicitudo*) as with his reputation (*opinio*). If Theoderic was able to rule the state by his reputation alone, one could imagine his potential achievement if he actually took up arms, like Basiliscus had done.[84] The toga worn by Theoderic stresses this, as it was a traditional sign of peace. Even in peace, Theoderic's enemies trembled before him, let alone in war.

A military message is even more apparent in Theoderic's third *praxis,* described in *Pan.* 19–22, where Theoderic's defeat of a Bulgar leader is tied to the defence of *libertas*.

> Stat ante oculos meos Vulgarum ductor libertatem dextera tua adserente prostratus, nec extinctus, ne periret monumentis, nec intactus, ne viveret adrogantiae, in gente indomita domesticus adstipulator superfuturus roboris tui. (*Pan.* 19)
>
> Before my eyes stands the leader of the Bulgars, thrown to the ground, while your right hand defends libertas, neither killed, so that he would be lost to our memories, nor intact, lest he would live in arrogance, but to remain as a courtroom aide to your strength, a tamed man in an untamed people.

The passage starts with the Bulgar leader, who is both standing and thrown to the ground. This strange visualisation appeals to the imagination of the audience and the common image of a barbarian thrown to the ground, which was omnipresent in imperial coinage—the most frequent means of political communication. The term *prostratus* was originally used for cattle and, by extension, for submissive enemies of Rome. This submission allows Theoderic to tame the Bulgar, who is contrasted with his people as an *in gente indomita domesticus*, "a tamed man in an untamed people." Similar to Zeno in the earlier *praxis*, the Bulgar became a witness to support Ennodius' argument, as a "courtroom aide to your strength." He witnesses Theoderic's victory, portrayed as an assertion and support of *libertas*.

The distance between the victorious Theoderic and the defeated Bulgars is increased through a depiction of the Bulgars as barbarians (*Pan.* 20–22). The Bulgars choose their leaders through bloodshed,[85]

---

[84] A similar message is expressed in Ennod., *Pan.* 59, where Ennodius states "his princely reputation guards us instead of weapons" (*Excubat pro armis opinio principalis*).

[85] Ennod., *Pan.* 20: *in qua titulos obtinuit qui emit adversariorum sanguine dignitatem, apud quam campus est vulgator natalium—nam cuius plus rubuerunt tela luctamine, ille putatus est sine ambage sublimior,* "where he who buys dignity with the blood of his adversaries obtains the titles, among whom the open plain is the revealer of

are stereotypical plainsmen,[86] are both militarily capable and overly confident,[87] and regard the milk of their own horses as a delicacy.[88] These stereotypes enable Ennodius to distance Theoderic from his Germanic background, as he had done by presenting *Graecia* as Theoderic's birthplace in *Pan.* 11. Moreover, Theoderic's behaviour, tied to *libertas*, is opposed to the barbaric behaviour of the Bulgars.

The defeat of the Bulgars allows Ennodius to move on to Italy. After the ethnographic excursion on the Bulgars, Ennodius states the following: *Cursim multa transcendo, ne pigrioris stili vitio serus advenias, ne Romanae fax curiae diu in umbram coacta tardius elucescat,* "I skip many things speedily, so that you will not arrive late through the fault of my lazy pen, so that the torch of the Roman senate will not light itself too late, after it had been forced into shadows for so long." (*Pan.* 22)

The focus on Italy at the end of the passage shows that the three actions of his adolescence served as a preamble to Theoderic's rescue of Italy. All actions of Theoderic have shown him to be a strong military commander and a defender of republican institutions in his youth. These two aspects are stressed in Theoderic's war against Odoacer as well: Theoderic is a heroic general whose goal it is to save Rome.

Rulers of Italy: Theoderic versus Odoacer

Panegyric, as well as epideictic in general, focuses on virtuous behaviour. Its contrast is equally effective, however, as the criticism of the subject's enemies redounds to the praise of the subject themselves, as the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* stresses.[89] One example

---

births—namely he is thought to be superior, whose weapons are coloured reddest by battle, without further ado."

[86] Ennod., *Pan.* 21: *Hos non montanae strues, non fluminum obiectio, non negati egestas alimenti in artum necessitatis lege continuit,* "Not mountain-chains, not the opposition of rivers, not the denial of food cornered them by some law of necessity."

[87] Ennod. *Pan.* 20: *quam ante dimicationem tuam non contigit agnovisse resistentem, quae prolixis temporibus solo bella consummavit excursu,* "[the nation] that had not been able to meet someone resisting them before your battle, that fought complete wars in a single attack when times were favourable." The military ability of the Bulgars adds to Theoderic's praise, of course.

[88] Ennod. *Pan.* 21: *dum credunt satis esse ad delicias equini pecoris lac potare,* "while they believed that it was enough to drink the milk from the horse's breast as a delicacy."

[89] See *Rhet. Her.* 3.10.

discussed earlier is the contrast between Theoderic and the Bulgars, on the basis of their level of civilisation.

Ennodius creates a more thorough contrast between Theoderic and his predecessor Odoacer, who, like Theoderic, started out as a Germanic general ruling Italy in subordinance to the Eastern Roman emperor—until he fell out of favour with the Eastern Roman court. Rota has already discussed the contrast between proper ruler and *tyrannus* present in the text, where she looks into the aspects of praise.[90] It appears just as fruitful, however, to follow the *Rhetorica ad Herrenium* and consider the other side of the same coin. The criticism of Odoacer present in the text attests to consummate rhetorical technique and intertextuality.

We will discuss two strategies that Ennodius uses to present Odoacer as a foil to Theoderic, where we delve into the criticism of Odoacer that supports Ennodius' praise. First, Ennodius uses the vices Cicero had associated with tyrants to depict Odoacer as a *tyrannus*. Second, the epic poet and panegyrist Claudian's narrative of a Gothic invasion of Italy is inverted to depict Theoderic (the Goth) as a hero coming to save Rome. This shows the use of both republican and late imperial rhetoric to make Theoderic appear more Roman.

Odoacer is first introduced in *Pan.* 23–27. The negative portrayal of his rule is based on traditional allegations against tyrants found in Cicero. Cicero provided standard vices (*vitia*) which became central to the depiction of tyrants in later works.[91] These vices are: *avaritia* (greed), *audacia* (excessive violence), *crudelitas* (cruelty), *invidia* (resentment), *libido* (power abuse), *licentia* (unbounded license), *luxuria* (excessive spending), and *superbia* (pride). The same terms could be used in different contexts and against different opponents. An example of this is Cicero's use of *libido*, which is brought against, among others, Clodius, Marcus Antonius, Ptolemy XII, Verres, and the Roman judges that support Piso.[92] The *vitia* crop up again and again after Cicero. They are used, among others, by Tacitus and Claudian.

These Ciceronian vices lie at the foundation of Ennodius' depiction of Odoacer. Ennodius describes different aspects of Odoacer's

---

[90] Rota, "Teoderico il Grande," 203–243.

[91] Anna Bragova, "Cicero on Vices," *Studia Antiqua et Archaeologica* 24, no. 2 (Spring 2018): 253–277.

[92] On Clodius, inter al. Cic., *Prov.* 24; on Marcus Antonius, inter al. Cic., *Phil.* 3.28, 13.17, on Ptolemy XII, inter al. Cic., *Rab. Post.* 22; on Verres, inter al. Cic., *Ver.* 1.13, 2.1.77–78; on the judges supporting Piso, inter al. Cic., *Pis.* 16, 21.

rule of Italy, starting with his mismanagement of wealth and followed by his oppression of his subjects. In this description, Ennodius relies on the vices described by Cicero. The following passage exemplifies Odoacer's misuse of wealth and shows the vices of *avaritia* and *luxuria*.

> Iam diuturnae quietis dispendio per gubernantium vilitatem potens terra consenuerat, iam attulerat publicis opibus pax intemerata defectum, cum apud nos cottidianae depraedationis auctus successibus intestinus populator egeret, qui suorum prodigus incrementa aerarii non tam poscebat surgere vectigalibus quam rapinis. Saeviente ambitu pauper dominus odia effusione contraxerat, sed nec defrudatis viribus quod minuebat opulentiae iungebatur affectui. (*Pan.* 23)
>
> Already, by the cost of long rest caused by the worthlessness of its governors, the powerful land had grown old, already the undisturbed peace had brought forth a disappearance of public resources, when that intestinal plunderer, after he had grown rich and boastful by the successes of his daily piracy among us, was becoming poor. He was wasteful of his own possessions and demanded the growth of the treasury not so much with taxes, as by means of plunder. While his corruption raged, the impoverished master had incurred hate for his extravagance, but all the wealth he took away from the swindled riches, he did not manage to put towards sympathy.

Odooacer usurps all public resources to better his own position. His rule shows a "disappearance of public resources" and "daily piracy," with the man himself described as an "intestinal plunderer." This shows his *avaritia*. Cicero often presents the vice of *avaritia* along with excessive spending: *luxuria*.[93] Greed and the simultaneous wasting of resources are stressed by Ennodius, when he states that Odoacer does not so much use taxes as plunder to cause "the growth of the treasury," a treasury which he then proceeds to empty. By means of a focus on the desire for wealth, Ennodius reframes Odoacer's ambition (*ambitus*), which is generally focused on the ambition for political power, as raging (*saeviens*) for large expenses instead.

After this criticism of *avaritia* and *luxuria*, Ennodius describes Odoacer's oppression of his subjects. Odoacer refuses to allow his people to excel, simply because he has the power to do so (*licentia*) and begrudges them their honour (*invidia*). Then, he shows that he rules his enemies with excessive pride (*superbia*). This is connected to power abuse (*libido*) and the mistreatment of his armies (*crudelitas*).

---

[93] On Verres, inter al. Cic., *Ver.* 2.2.9 and 2.5.137; on Sulla, inter al. Cic., *Fin.* 3.75; on the connection between *avaritia* and *luxuria*, Cic., *de Orat.* 2.171.

> Tunc enim aulae angustia in artum res privatas agitabat, nec micare usquam scintillas famulantum extinctus tyranni fomes indulserat. Metuebat parentes exercitus, quem meminisse originis suae admonebat honor alienus; nam ire ad nutum suum legiones et remeare pavore algidus imperabat. Suspecta enim est oboedientia quae famulatur indignis, et quotiens praelatos convenit conscientia stirpis ultimae, et illud metuunt, quod timentur. (*Pan.* 24)
>
> Then the poverty of the palace put even private affairs in dire straits, and the extinguished kindle of the tyrant had not allowed the embers of those who served him to shine. He lived in constant fear of the obedient armies, because the honour that did not belong to him often reminded him of its distant origin; shivering with fear, he commanded the legions to come and go with a nod. Suspicious indeed is obedience which serves those who are unworthy of her, and whenever obedience confronts those in higher positions with the knowledge of its final origin, they fear the fact that they are feared.

The vice of *licentia* is described in the first sentence of this passage. Odoacer refuses his people, described in terms of a starting fire (*scintillas*), the opportunity to shine. This oppression is an opposition to the *libertas* for which Theoderic stands. This juxtaposition of *licentia*—the freedom of the tyrant at the cost of his subjects—with *libertas* is not unusual.[94] The *invidia* of Odoacer is an expression of his *licentia*, as he begrudges the *honor* of his armies and treats them poorly because of it.[95] To do this, he places himself above his armies in a show of *superbia*. Ennodius states that Odoacer "commanded his legions to come and go" by his *nutus*. The concept of a nod used to command is originally tied to the supreme god Jupiter, who is known to alter human events with a single nod, denoted either as a *nutus* or a *numen*. The current use of the nod by the human Odoacer shows an abuse of power as well. Odoacer forces his soldiers to come and go at will.[96] Odoacer's domination of his subjects is not a sign of strength, but of fear: the usurper-general oppresses his armies so much that he fears the fact they fear him. This apparent paradox shows the weak foundation of a tyrant's power.[97]

---

[94] Bragova, "Cicero on Vices," 253–277; in Cicero, inter al. Cic., *Dom.* 131. In Cic., *Flac.* 16 *licentia* is described as *immoderata libertas,* "*libertas* without moderation."

[95] Bragova, "Cicero on Vices," 253–277.

[96] See, e.g., Caes., *Gal.* 1.31.12, where the tyranny of the barbarian ruler Ariovistus is described.

[97] The fear of being feared was used to denote a *tyrannus* in earlier literature. See, for example, Sen., *Cl.* 1.12, where the author advises the emperor, in this case Nero, not to reveal this fear, as it was a sign of a bad ruler.

The vice *audacia*, denoting excessive violence, is not shown. This is likely related to the depiction of Odoacer as a weak ruler, unable to show the violence associated with *audacia*. The use of Cicero's traditional vices, based upon republican-era ideas of rulership, displays Odoacer as a foil to Theoderic. Throughout the rest of the panegyric, Theoderic displays all the virtues that oppose Cicero's list of vices.[98]

For his second strategy, Ennodius did not look to Cicero, but rather to the 5th-century panegyrist Claudian. Claudian had also been tasked to praise a Germanic subject: the general Stilicho. In one of his works, a panegyric from 404, Stilicho fights a Gothic invader of Italy: Alaric. The Gothic general had invaded Italy in 403 and managed to sack Rome in 410, which made him into a formidable opponent of Rome.[99] Like Alaric, Theoderic was a Gothic leader who had marched into Italy from the Balkans. However, he came not to destroy Rome, but to save it from the barbarian Odoacer. Ennodius' narrative in *Pan.* 40–46 is built upon Claudian's verses on the conflict between Stilicho and Alaric (*VI Cons. Hon.*, lines 453–460). This intertextuality is used to place Theoderic in the position of Stilicho, the saviour of Italy, and Odoacer in the shoes of the Gothic Alaric, intent on destroying it.[100]

Ennodius' *Pan.* 40 shows Theoderic travelling in sight of Odoacer's camp. There, he sees the campfires "shine red like stars" (*astrorum more rutilantes*) and realises he is in danger.

> Itineris tui permensus intervalla conspexisti ignes hostium astrorum more rutilantes, ut si aliquando tibi fuisset nota formido, in abruptum te pendere didicisses. (*Pan.* 40)
>
> After you had finished your journey, you saw your enemies' fires burn red like stars, so that, if fear had ever been known to you, you would have learned you were in grave danger.

The same had been true for Claudian's Stilicho. He, too, had seen enemy campfires shine like stars (*stellarum more . . . barbaricos ardere focos*), before doubts about the remainder of his attack were set out.

---

[98] These virtues are discussed extensively in Rota, *Panegirico del clementissimo re Teoderico,* 86–99, though not in relation to Odoacer's vices. An example of the contrast set up between Theoderic and Odoacer is that with Odoacer's *avaritia* and *luxuria* in *Pan.* 58. Ennodius states: *Creverunt reipublicae opes cum privatorum profectibus*, "the wealth of the republic grows along with the profit of private persons."

[99] See Peter J. Heather, *Goths and Romans 332–489*, Oxford Historical Monographs (Oxford, GB: Clarendon Press, 1991).

[100] Though Stilicho himself was of barbarian descent, he was consistently presented as Roman in literature and art, similar to Ennodius' representation of Theoderic. See Sánchez-Ostiz, "Claudian's Stilicho at the *Urbs*," 310–330.

nox erat et late stellarum more videbam
barbaricos ardere focos; iam classica primos
excierant vigiles, gelida cum pulcher ab Arcto
adventat Stilicho. medius sed clauserat hostis
inter me socerumque viam pontemque tenebat,
Addua quo scissas spumosior incitat undas.
quid faceret? differret iter? discrimina nullas
nostra dabant adeunda moras. perrumperet agmen?[101]

It was night, and far and wide I saw the barbarian
hearths burn like stars; the trumpet had already
excited the first watchmen, when, from the frozen North,
beautiful Stilicho arrived. But the enemy in the middle had
closed off the road
between me and my father-in-law and held the bridge,[102]
where the Addua increased her cut waves with its foam.
What should he do? Should he change his journey? The quarrels
that we had to confront allowed no delay. Should he break
through the enemy line?[103]

Ennodius first inverts the story. Theoderic, a Roman leader within Ennodius' narrative, entered Italy to save it from a barbarian, while Alaric the barbarian had come to destroy it. Moreover, as Ennodius had done with Cato, Romulus, and other figures, he shows Theoderic able to surpass Stilicho. This not only enables him to distance Theoderic from the image of a Gothic invader like Alaric, but also supports the vision that Theoderic had come to rescue, protect, and take care of Rome.

Another aspect in which Theoderic is able to outperform Stilicho, is his interaction with a river, like the *Addua* (Adda) mentioned by Claudian. Stilicho is forced to cross the wild river, as if it were one of his enemies, but the river supports Theoderic when he is fighting Odoacer's armies and serves him like a soldier. This is shown in an *apostrophe*.

> Qui me veritati nescit obsecutum, Atesis undas videat tua vice opulentas extitisse cadaveribus, et dum tumefaceres gurgites de cruore, in parte alia sistebatur impetus fluentorum. Itaque ne ensibus non

---

[101] Claudian, *Panegyricus de sexto Consolatu Honorii Augustii*, lines 453–460, in *Claudii Claudiani carmina*, ed. Theodorus Birt, *Monumenta germaniae historica*, Auctorum antiquissimorum tomus X (Berlin, DE: Weidmann, 1892), repr. in *Claudian, Volume II*, trans. Maurice Platnauer, Loeb Classical Library 136 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1922). Citation refers to Harvard edition.

[102] The speaker here is the emperor Honorius, a child-emperor to whom Stilicho was custodian. Stilicho had married Honorius's aunt Selena.

[103] The translation is our own.

> sufficeres, pro te et lympha militavit. Salve, fluviorum splendidissime, qui ex maiore parte sordes Italiae diluisti, mundi faecem suscipiens sine dispendio puritatis. (*Pan.* 46)
>
> He who does not know that I follow the truth, may he see that the rich waves of the river Atesis became filled with corpses on your behalf, so that, in another part, you caused the whirpools to swell with blood and the attack of the waves was stopped. And lest you were unable to withstand the swords, even the water became a soldier for you. Greetings, brightest of rivers, you who have for the most part washed away the filth of Italy, taking with you the scum of the earth at no cost to your purity.

Instead of obstructing Theoderic, as the *Addua* had done to Stilicho, the *Atesis* (Adige) helped him fight his enemy.[104] This shows the support of Theoderic's mission by the natural world.[105] Theoderic's focus, the saving of Rome, rounds off the narrative. Ennodius addresses Rome and asks her to come to the *Atesis*. The reason is simple.

> Hic actum est, ut plures habeas consules, quam ante videris candidatos. Agnosce clementiam domini tui: saporem te voluit haurire triumphorum, quam dubia elegit nescire certaminum. (*Pan.* 48)
>
> It has been brought about that you will have more consuls than you had previously seen candidates. Acknowledge the clemency of your master: he wanted you to taste triumphs more than that he wanted you to be unfamiliar with the uncertainty of battle.

This section shows Theoderic give a second wind to Rome, where he will give her more consuls than she had previously seen candidates—over the previous thousand years, we should add. Such an action frames Theoderic as a new founder, similar to Romulus and later Augustus, and can be placed into the rhetoric of renewal and rejuvenation present in the rest of the text.[106] Ennodius ties

---

[104] See Menander Rhetor 2.1.25, where he recommends the use of an *apostrophe* to a river as a moment of relaxation in the midst of a battle narrative. This *apostrophe* uses the Scamander-scene from book 21 of the *Iliad*, lines 217–219. Achilles stuffs the river with the corpses of defeated enemies. Such a comparison will have been recognisable for any audience member familiar with Homeric epic and ties Theoderic to epic heroism.

[105] The natural world assists the ruler in other cases, shown in the *Panegyrici Latini* collection. This *topos* can be seen in, e.g., *Pan. Lat.* 10.12.3–8, 6.13.3, and 2.34.4. Cf. Rota, *Panegirico del clementissimo re Teoderico,* 343–344.

[106] The renewal of imperial power (*renovatio imperii*) was stressed in this work, but also in the letters of Cassiodorus and contemporary historiography, e.g., the *Anonymus Valesianus II* (text in *Anonymi Valesiani pars posterior*, ed. Theororus

the new foundation of Rome, as befits the panegyric as a whole, to battle.[107]

Within this section, it was made clear that Ennodius depicted Odoacer as a tyrant to make him into a dramatic foil. First, republican conceptions of tyranny, set out by Cicero, were used to depict Odoacer as a tyrant and Theoderic as a virtuous ruler. Then, Odoacer was made into a new Alaric, a barbarian enemy of Rome, while Theoderic took on the role of Stilicho, the defender of Rome. The consistent depiction of Odoacer as a foil has allowed Ennodius to praise Theoderic as a powerful hero connected to republican and contemporary rhetoric.

Conclusion

Ennodius' panegyric illustrates the mechanics of praise. The discussion set out in this paper concerning the strategies of persuasion in epideictic in general and Ennodius' panegyric specifically, shows the use of actual, if implicit, argumentation in the genus. This has allowed us to confirm and supplement recent research. The argumentation used in epideictic is conservative in nature. Conservative ideas ensure that the entire audience will be receptive to the panegyric. In the case of Ennodius' work, conservatism was used to present Theoderic as a republican Roman.

Two samples have been set out in detail to demonstrate Ennodius' strategies of praise and persuasion. The first sample shows Theoderic's respect for republican institutions during his adolescence, which laid the foundation for his republican focus in later life. In the second sample, regarding the tyrant Odoacer, Ennodius used Ciceronian conceptions of tyranny and the panegyrical tradition of Claudian to present Theoderic as the Roman antithesis of the

---

Mommsen, *Chronica Minora saec. IV. V. VI. VII.*, vol. 1, Monumenta Germaniae historica, Auctorum antiquissimorum tomus 9 [Berlin: DE: Weidmann, 1892], 306–328; trans. J. C. Rolfe as *The Anonymous Valesianus, Latter Part*, in *Ammianus Marcellinus*, vol. 3, Loeb Classical Library 331 [Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1939], 530–569). See Arnold, *Theoderic and Roman*, 231–94.

[107] See note 80. The recovery of Rome is inherently tied to military action, meant to awaken the city's rulers and inhabitants. The same message can also be found in Ennod., *Pan.* 23: *Iam diuturnae quietis dispendio per gubernantium vilitatem potens terra consenuerat*, "Already, by the cost of long rest caused by the worthlessness of its governors, the powerful land had grown old." Ennodius states that a *diuturna quies*, a "long rest" or "long peace," had been the reason for Italy's poor state.

barbarian Odoacer. Theoderic was made into an improvement upon not just contemporary rulers, but also on heroes from the republican era. Ennodius used his rhetorical ability to reshape Theoderic through several strategies focused on Roman republicanism.

This reading of Ennodius' panegyric has shown how the speech relies on conservative values, but also allows us to look at the mechanics of praise and identity presentation differently: praise, persuasion, and tradition go in hand in hand to accommodate innovation.