



The Ethnology of Germany.-Part VI. The Varini, Varangians, and Franks.-Section II.

Author(s): Henry H. Howorth

Source: *The Journal of the Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland*, Vol. 13 (1884), pp. 213-237

Published by: [Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2841727>

Accessed: 15/06/2014 04:27

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Journal of the Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

²⁶ *Op. cit.*, vol. ii, pp. 4 and 66.

²⁷ "Nuance jaunâtre de la peau" (*op. cit.*, p. 517).

²⁸ "M. Aug. Saint-Hilaire raconte que les Botocudos qui rencontrent des Chinois dans les ports du Brésil, frappés de leur ressemblance avec eux, les désignent comme leurs oncles" (Hollard, "L'Homme," p. 197). A parallel case is that of the Bashkir soldiers of Orenburg, who formed part of the Russian army sent to put down the Hungarian revolt of 1848, and who recognised their Ugrian kinsmen in the Zeklars and other Magyars now settled in the Danube basin.

²⁹ "Vues des Cordilléras," vol. x, p. 7.

³⁰ "Geology and Physical Geography of Brazil" (Boston, 1870), pp. 577-606.

³¹ Prince Maximilian, vol. i, p. 333.

³² A similar linguistic faculty has been developed amongst the women of the Zulu Kafir tribes, who often invent new words on the impulse of the moment, these words afterwards becoming adopted as current forms.

³³ Compare the expressions "father-toe," "mother-toe," "baby-toe," &c., of English nurses.

³⁴ "Novos Estudos Craniológicos sobre os Botocuds" (Rio Janeiro, 1882).

³⁵ But here often confounded with the Bugres of that region.

³⁶ "Algumas tribus d'estes Indios furão o beijo inferior como os Botocudos" (Milliet, *op. cit.*, vol. i, p. 175).

The ETHNOLOGY of GERMANY.—PART VI.

THE VARINI, VARANGIANS, AND FRANKS.—SECTION II.

By HENRY H. HOWORTH, Esq., F.S.A.

[Section I. of Part VI. appeared in the *Journal for May, 1883, Vol. XII., p. 525.*]

THE first undoubted mention of the Franks in history is during the reign of the Emperor Gordian III (238-244). Vopiscus, in his "Life of Aurelian," tells us that being the tribune of the 6th or Gallican Legion at Mayence, Aurelian so punished the Franks, who had been harrying throughout Gaul (quum vagarentur per totam Galliam), that 700 of them were killed and 300 made captive and sold *sub corona*—(i.e., with crowns of flowers about their heads in the usual fashion, Vopiscus, ch. vii). This was about the year 238 A.D. In 241, on the occasion of the victories won over the Persians, this defeat of the Franks was celebrated in a triumphant song, of which Vopiscus has preserved some phrases: "Mille Francos, mille Sarmatas semel et semel occidimus: mille, mille, mille, mille, mille, Persas quærimus." This notice, it will be seen, puts the Franks close to Mayence, and therefore near the outlet of the Maine into the Rhine; and they were therefore probably Ripuarians. A few years later, when Gallienus had mounted the throne, we read how the Franks,

having ravaged Gaul, invaded Spain, and having devastated and nearly destroyed the town of Taragona, a portion of them went even as far as Africa (Victor de Cæsaribus, xxxiii; Eutropius, ix, 7). The passage clearly shows the Franks were not unacquainted with navigation, and in fact it has been suggested that their route was along the coasts of Gaul and Spain, and thus through the Straits of Gibraltar to Africa, and not through central Gaul and Spain at all—a view which is not impossible. Zonaras tells us Gallienus fought with the Franks (*op. cit.*, xii, 24). Shortly after we find Postumus, who commanded the barbarians in Gaul, raising the standard of revolt against Gallienus, and employing Celts and Franks in his army (Treb. Poll., in vit. trig. tyrann., 3). Aurelian, having mounted the throne, drove the Germans out of Gaul. In the short reign of Tacitus they once more crossed the Rhine, but were driven out again by Probus. Zosimus tells us (i, 76) how he fought against the Franks in the year 277, and Vopiscus refers to his victories over them in inflated phrases: “testes Franci inviis paludibus, testes Germani et Alemanni, longe a Rheno submoti littoribus” (Vopiscus, in Prob., 12). Vopiscus says he re-conquered sixty cities (!) from the Germans, which they had taken; killed 400,000 men (!!), and captured 16,000 prisoners; forced nine of their kings to be suppliants on their knees for his pardon; built forts, and placed garrisons among them, and compelled them to give hostages, or rather to make over troops, whom he distributed as frontier guards. No doubt among the Germans thus conquered by Probus were many Franks. These triumphs he reported in letters he addressed to the Roman Senate, which are preserved by Vopiscus (Dom Bouquet, i, 540, 576).

The Franks afterwards asked the emperor to find them settlements. He accordingly planted a body of them on the Pontus, (? about Varna, which apparently preserves the name of the Varini). A portion of them having collected a great fleet, they devastated the greater part of the coasts of Greece and Asia Minor; then sailed westwards, ravaged the coasts of Sicily, and captured Syracuse; then went over to Africa, and having visited Carthage, returned again (Zosimus, Dom Bouquet, i, 576; Eumenius Paneg., ch. 18; Dom Bouquet, i, 714). This was assuredly an astounding expedition, worthy to rank with the famous campaign of the Norsemen against the Moors in the ninth century. It is surely incredible that any but a maritime nation could have compassed such a feat, which was especially worthy of the Varings.

In the year 280 two usurpers rose in Gaul against Probus—Bonosus and Proculus. The latter claimed to be of Frank origin, and fled to the Franks for refuge; but he was betrayed by them,

“ipsis prodentibus Francis, quibus familiare est ridendo fidem frangere” (Vopiscus, *op. cit.*; Dom Bouquet, i, 541). Here, as has been remarked, we already find a Frank in a position of importance in the Roman service.

We now come to the time of Carausius, of whom we read in Eutropius that he was of the humblest birth, but rose on account of his military talents, and was appointed to the command of the maritime tract of Belgica and Armorica, with his headquarters at Bononia, in order to protect those coasts from the incursions of the Franks and Saxons. He captured many of them, but as he remitted no booty to headquarters, nor yet restored it to those from whom it had been plundered, it began to be suspected that he was in league with the invaders, and shortly after, Maximian having ordered him to be killed, he assumed the purple (Eutropius, *sub ann.* 280; Dom Bouquet, i, 573). Here again we have a piratical maritime nation, assailing the borders of Gaul in company with the Saxons, the very next neighbours of the Varini, in their quarters at home beyond the Elbe.

Mamertinus, in his panegyric on Maximianus Hercules, tells us how the Franks went to him with their king, seeking peace. This was about 288 A.D. (Dom Bouquet, i, 711). Valesius calls this king Atech, attributing to this event another passage of Mamertinus as follows: “Per te regnum recepit Genoboudes: Atech vero munus accepit. Quid enim aliud ille expetivit, in conspectum tuum cum omni sua gente veniendo, nisi ut tum demum integra auctoritate regnaret quum te, Maximiane placasset (*id.*, note *e*).

Eumenius extols Maximian for having pacified the Læti (*vide infra*) and Franci: “Sicut postea tuo, Maximiane Auguste, suctu Nerviorum et Trevirorum arva jacentia Lætus postliminio restitutus, et receptus in leges Francus excoluit” (*id.*, 714). This is dated by the Benedictines in the year 291.

We next read of the Emperor Constantius, who was appointed Emperor of all Gaul in 292, attacking the Franks who had wandered into and occupied the Batavian island. Eumenius tells us how they had done so under the auspices of a former native of the island (“sub ipso quondam alumno suo”), *i.e.*, no doubt, as every one is agreed, of Carausius. We saw in the former paper how he settled the Saxons along the southern shores of Britain. It would seem, therefore, that on either side of the Channel he was the means by which the Teutonic invaders began to be colonised within the borders of the empire. Eumenius goes on to say that the invaders were defeated by Constantius, who transported them within the borders of the empire and settled them down within its limits: “ipsas in Romanas trans-

tulit nationes ut non solum arma sed etiam peritatem ponere cogèrent” (Dom Bouquet, i, 715). Ammianus Marcellinus says they were settled in the district of Toxandria (*vide infra*); there they were settled, no doubt, in the same way that the Saxons were in Britain, as military colonists (“*milites limitanei et riparii*”), the Liti and Læti of subsequent writers.

Constantius had also encountered a body of Franks beyond the Channel. They were mercenaries, who were in garrison in London, and had doubtless been in the service of Carausius and Allectus. Constantius defeated and drove them away, much to the joy of the Londoners. The words of Eumenius are: “*Quid ex mercenaria illa multitudine barbarorum proelio superfuerat, cum direpta civitate fugam capesse cogitarent, passim tota urbe confecerint; et non solam provincialibus vestris in cæde hostium dederint salutem, sed etiam in spectaculo voluptatem. O victoria multijuga et innumerabilem triumphorum, qua Britannia restitutæ, qua gentes Francorum penitus excisæ*” (Eum. Pan., Constant., xvii; Dom Bouquet, i, 714).

From these notices it will be seen that the Franks were already divided into two well-marked bodies—one of them settled on the Lower Rhine, near the Batavian island, and doubtless largely recruiting the freebooters in the English Channel; the other body on the Upper Rhine, near Mayence.

The victory of Constantius over the Franks on the Batavian island is referred to by Eumenius in two other passages, in which he praises the deeds of Constantine his son. In one he refers to his father's doings thus:—“*Multa ille (Constantius) Francorum millia, qui Bataviam aliasque cis Rhenum terras invaserant, interfecit, depulit, cepit, abduxit*” (Eum., c, 4; Dom Bouquet, i, 714). Again, in a later chapter he says: “*Quid loquar rursus intimas Francia nationes non jam ab his locis, quæ olim Romani invaserant sed a propriis ex origine suis sedibus, atque ab ultimis barbariæ litoribus avulsas, ut in desertis Gallia regionibus collocatæ et pacem Romani imperii cultu juvent et arma dilectu?*” (Dom Bouquet, i, 715.) This is the first mention known to me of the term *Francia*, as a territorial name. The editor of the work, already so often cited, on the *Historians of France*, says that the term would appear at this time, from a poem of Ausonius, composed in the year 379, to have referred to a district east of the Rhine:—

“*Jane veni, novus anne veni, renovate veni sol,
Hostibus edomitis, qua Francia juncta Suevis
Certat ad obsequium Latiis ut militet armis.*”

Also, in another poem on the Moselle:—

“*Accident vires, qua Francia, quasque Camaves,
Germanique tremant.*”—(Dom Bouquet, i, 715, note *δ*.)

Constantine the Great laid a heavy hand on the Franks. Eutropius tells us how he killed many of them and of the Alemanni, captured their kings, and cast them to the wild beasts in the circus: "Captisque eorum regibus, quos etiam bestiis cum magnificum spectaculum muneris parasset, objecit" (Eutropius, x, 2). This was in his first year, *i.e.*, 306. Eumenius refers to this in fulsome terms. He tells us the two kings who were exposed in the circus at Trèves were called Ascaric and Merogaisus. (So Zeuss reads the very corrupt sentence in which the names occur. The MSS. read as follows:—"Asacari cinere gaisique, Asacari cumero geasique, Assaccari cymero craisique, Asacari cymero gaisique." Zeuss, 339, note). Of their subjects who were captured, those whom perfidy made unfit for soldiers, and their ferocity for slavery, were made a spectacle of, and wearied the ravening hearts by their multitude. By these means Constantine pacified the valley of the Rhine, and converted it into an Arcadia. Listen to his praises. Speaking of the Franks he says: "Ubi nunc est illa ferocia? Ubi semper insida mobilitas? Jam ne procul quidem Rhenum audetis accollere, et vix securi flumina interiora potatis. Contra hinc per intervalla disposita magis ornant limitem castella, quam protegant: arat illam terribilem aliquando ripam inermis agricola, et toto nostri greges flumina bicorni mersantur. Hæc est tua, Constantine, de Ascarici Regaisique supplicio quotidiana atque aeterna victoria, omnibus quondam secundis præliis anteponenda" (Eumenius, "Paneg. de Const.," xi; Dom Bouquet, 715).

Twenty years later the victories of Constantine inspired the panegyrist Nazarius, who spoke of them in fulsome terms:—"Tu ferocissimis regibus Ascarico et comite suo captis, tanta laude res bellicas auspicatus est, ut jam inauditæ magnitudinis obsidem teneremus" (Dom Bouquet, i, 721).

Constantine also made a bridge over the Rhine, on which he placed a flotilla to overawe the Franks, *i.e.*, no doubt, the Ripuarians (Eumenius, Dom Bouquet, i, 715).

The Franks were not, however, entirely crushed, for in the year 309, on the rebellion of Maximian, when Constantine had to leave the Rhine and march against him, we are told the Franks again broke out; but he speedily returned, and they were as speedily penitent (Eumenius, Dom Bouquet, i, 716).

This secured peace with them for the rest of his reign. After his death they again began to be turbulent; we read how, in 341, his son Constans fought against them with varying success, while the following year he defeated them, and peace was made with them (*ex* "Chron. Hieron. Presby. de Gallis." Idacius, in the "Fasti Consulares," says the same, Dom Bouquet, i, 610).

Libanius, the rhetorician, in lauding the deeds of Constans, says the Franks received overseers; *arkhontes* he calls them (Perry, "Franks," 53, note 2).

In 351, the usurper Magnentius, who was of German descent, and perhaps a Frank, was assisted by the Franks and Saxons, who lived, we are told, beyond the Rhine and the Western Sea; meanwhile the Gallic towns and the fortresses on the Rhine were left defenceless (Julian, *ex* Oration. 1, in Constantium; Dom Bouquet, i, 723). Zosimus tells us Magnentius was sprung from the barbarians, and lived among the *Læti*, whom he calls a Gallic nation (*op. cit.*, ed. Oxon., 1679, p. 134).

We now reach a time when many of the principal offices in the administration of Gaul began to be filled by the barbarian chiefs. Thus we read how, about the year 355, a Frank named Silvanus, who was in command of the infantry, was sent by the Emperor Constans into Gaul, to repress the disorders there, and to make head against the barbarians who were overrunning it. Silvanus became the victim of a crafty officer named Dynamius, who forged some letters compromising him with the emperor. In vain Malarich, who is called the commander of the Gentiles—that is, of the foreign levies in the imperial service—and who was also a Frank, pleaded for the innocence of his countrymen. Fresh letters, compromising both Silvanus and Malarich, were duly prepared by Dynamius. Malarich called round him the Franks, of whom we are told there were then a very great number in the palace, and in resolute language laid open and proved the falsehoods of the machinations by which their lives were threatened, and was loud in his complaints. Meanwhile a commission of inquiry was appointed to make investigation; but Silvanus, knowing how impressible the emperor was, and fearing that he might be convicted although innocent, began to think of trusting himself to the good faith of the barbarians. From this he was dissuaded by Laniogaisus, who was himself a Frank, and who told him the Franks would readily put him to death or betray him for a bribe. Driven into a corner, he determined to rebel, and having won over the principal officers of the legions, he tore the purple silk from the standards and assumed the title of emperor. When news of this reached Constans, he despatched a force, of which Ammianus says he was one, to suppress the revolt. This had spread very much, but having tampered with some Gallic soldiers in the service of Silvanus, a body of them slew the sentinels and penetrated into the palace: they dragged Silvanus out of a little chapel in which he had taken refuge, and killed him. Silvanus, we are otherwise told, was the son of Bonitus, who was of Frankish extraction. Both names prove that they had virtually adopted

Roman names, and abandoned their Teutonic ones (Ammianus Marcellinus, xv, 5). The murder of Silvanus took place at Agrippina, that is, Cologne; with him were also killed Lutto and Mandio, both of them counts, and both, also, in all probability, Franks (Dom Bouquet, i, 543). These executions were apparently revenged immediately by his countrymen, who captured Cologne. Zosimus tells us that, in conjunction with the Saxons and Alemanni, they devastated forty towns on the Rhine (Dom Bouquet, i, 577).

In the next year, that is, in 356, Julian marched to the Rhine, and having defeated the Alemanni took possession of Cologne; nor, as we are told, did he leave it before the Frank kings began, through fear of him, to abate in their fury, when he made peace with them, and put the city into a very complete state of defence. The words of Ammianus are: "Igitur Agrippinam ingressus, non ante motus est exinde, quam Francorum regibus furore mitescente perterritis, pacem firmaret reipublicae interim profuturam et urbem reciperet munitissimam" (Ammianus Marcellinus, xvi, 3).

In the year 357, Julian, after defeating the Alemanni in a terrible struggle, returned to his winter quarters. As Severus, who commanded the cavalry, was on his way to Rheims, through Cologne and Juliers, he fell in with 600 light armed Franks, who were laying waste those places not defended by garrisons, and who had taken advantage of Julian's absence among the Alemanni. Now that he returned they occupied two fortresses, which had been long abandoned, and defended themselves as long as they could. Julian ordered the forts to be blockaded. The Meuse, we are told, flowed beneath them, and the blockade continued for fifty-four days, through nearly all December and January, the enemy keeping up a brave resistance. The river was frozen, and Julian ordered a number of light boats to move up and down it, so as prevent the enemy from crossing it over the ice. This manœuvre was successful, and the Franks, driven to despair, and exhausted by hunger and watching, sent to offer to surrender. They were accordingly sent on to the emperor, whereupon a great number of Franks, who had gone to assist their compatriots, hearing they were made prisoners, returned home again (*op. cit.*, xvii, 2). Libanius speaks of 1,000 Franks who were sent by Julian to Constans, who distributed gifts among them and enrolled them among his troops, deeming them to be towers among his other soldiers (Dom Bouquet, i, 733). These Franks, against whom Julian fought, were doubtless Ripuarians from the river Maine. We now find him in contact with their brethren on the Lower Rhine. This was in 358. We are told that he marched against the Franks, that is, against

that tribe of them usually called Salii, who, some time before, had ventured with great boldness to fix their habitations on the Roman soil, near Toxandria. But when he had reached Tongres ("cum Tungros venisset") he was met by an embassy from this tribe, who expected still to find him in his winter quarters, offering him peace on condition of his leaving them unattacked and unmolested, as if the ground they had seized were rightfully their own. Julian comprehended the whole affair, and having given the ambassadors an ambiguous reply, and also some presents, sent them back again, leaving them to suppose he would remain in the same place till they returned.

But the moment they had departed he followed them, sending Severus along the bank of the river, and suddenly came upon the whole settlement like a thunderbolt; and availing himself of his victory to make a reasonable exhibition of clemency, as indeed they met him rather with entreaties than with resistance, he received the submission of them and their children (*op. cit.*, Bohns tr., xvii, 8). Julian then attacked the Chamavi, and, as I have remarked, it is interesting to find Ammianus, in this notice, making a clear distinction between the Franks and the Chamavi. In a letter of Julian which is extant, we find him speaking of his having marched against the Salian Franks, and the Chamavi, and that the gods having been propitious he had subdued the Salians and expelled the Chamavi.

In reference to these events, in which the Franks seem to have crossed the Rhine in considerable numbers, Zosimus has a very curious and interesting passage, which has been too little considered. He says, speaking of the year 358 A.D., that the Saxons were deemed the most powerful in bodily and mental vigour of all the barbarians inhabiting those regions, *i.e.*, the neighbourhood of the Rhine. They sent out a portion of their stock, namely, the Kuadi, into the territory occupied by the Romans; but the neighbouring Franks prohibited them crossing for fear the emperor might have just cause for again entering their borders. Having built some ships, they passed by the district subject to the Franks, and reached that subject to the Roman jurisdiction. Their ships at length reached the Batavian island and drove out the Salii, a branch of the Franks who had sought refuge there from their attack. Previous to this the island had been subject to the Romans. When Julian heard of this he attacked the Kuadi. He ordered his people, however not to molest the Salii, since they had not invaded the Roman borders as enemies, but only when compelled by the Kuadi. Julian showed them even greater consideration, for he permitted one section of them, with their king, to cross within the Roman territory. Others sought shelter on the frontier

("ad limites," says the translation before me. Bouquet translates "ad montes," but there are no mountains on the Lower Rhine). They all at their own instance put themselves and their property at his service. Julian now began to take measures for the defence of the frontier. Feeling that the barbarians were not capable of great efforts in war, but only given to predatory attacks, he was fearful that the borders of the empire would suffer accordingly, but was doubtful what policy to adopt to counteract them. Zosimus tells us there was at this time a gigantic barbarian named Khariettus, who had immense vigour. He had left his own people and joined the Romans, and taken up his residence at Trèves, when he noticed that the barbarians were in the habit of attacking the towns beyond the Rhine and plundering them. These attacks began about the same time as Julian's authority. As he could not adopt the plan he would have liked, inasmuch as there was no law permitting him to do so, he adopted another course. Hiding himself in the thick woods, he awaited the attacks of the enemy, and, falling upon them when overcome with sleep, he cut off as many heads as he pleased, with which he returned and showed them to his co-citizens. As this happened frequently it caused considerable dread to the barbarians, who did not know whence the blow came, and who yet saw their numbers daily decreasing. Presently a band of robbers collected round him, which increased in numbers considerably, whereupon Khariettus informed Julian about the whole matter. He, conscious that it was impossible to follow up the forays of the enemy with a regular army, and that the only way of effectually meeting the freebooters was with another set of freebooters, determined to take Khariettus and his band into his service, and having joined a large number of Salians to them, he sent them out at night against the Kuadi. This he supplemented by a series of military posts, which made the escape of the robbers difficult. He did not relax his efforts until the Kuadi were at length so harassed that they submitted with their king to Julian, who by his tactics had secured an immense number of prisoners, including the king's son, who had been captured by Khariettus. Having punished them severely, Julian insisted upon their giving hostages from the noblest among them, including the king's son. Julian gave way about the last, in response to the king's tears. Peace was now made, and we are told that the Sali Kuadi and certain of the inhabitants of Batavia were enlisted in the legions (Dom Bouquet, i, 579-80).

The story is told in a different way, without mention of the Salians or Franks, by Eunapius (*id.*, 567-8). He enables us to correct the Kuadi of Zosimus (who have been apparently confused by the editors with the Kuadi, who were a Sarmatic people)

into Chamavi, for this is the form of the name in Eunapius. This is very interesting, since we see what a sharp contrast there was between the Chamavi, who are called Saxons, by Zosimus, and the Franks whom they actually drove out of their old seats.

In the year 360 Ammianus tells us how Julian, who had meanwhile been saluted as emperor at Paris, crossed the Rhine and entered the district belonging to a Frank tribe called the Attuarii, whom he describes as men of a turbulent character, who were then licentiously plundering the districts of Gaul. He attacked them suddenly and unawares, for they relied greatly on the ruggedness and difficulty of the roads which led into their country, and which no prince within their recollection had ever penetrated. He put many of them to death, and captured many prisoners, and granted the survivors peace (*id.*, xx, 10).

In the year 368 we read that the Franks and Saxons assailed the coasts of the Gauls with terrible energy—burning, ravaging, and making prisoners. To oppose them Valentinian went to Bononia and Rutupiaë, and concerted measures there (Ammianus Marcellinus, xxvii). On this passage the editors of Dom Bouquet remark that Hieronymus, who died in 420, in the “Life of Hilarion,” says that Francia was situated between the Saxons and the Alemanni (Dom Bouquet, i, 561, note c). In his Chronicle we read, under the year 373: “Saxones cæsi Deusone in regione Francorum” (Dom Bouquet, 611). This fact is also mentioned by Eusebius, whose words are: “Saxones cæsi Diovione, in regione Francorum considerunt qui superfuerunt” (*id.*, ii, 462, note).

The Franks were now settled in considerable numbers west of the Rhine, and we read of the Romans employing them in repelling the attacks of the other invaders. Thus we find Gratian, in 377, appointing Nannenus to command a force which was to meet an invasion of Germans then impending, and associating with him Mellobaudes, who is called “domesticorum comes” (*i.e.*, count [commander] of the domestic guards) and king of the Franks, and is described as a man of great courage and renown (Ammianus Marcellinus, xxxi, 10). They inflicted a severe defeat on the invaders.

Mellobaudes was no doubt the same person who is mentioned as the tribune of the guard in 353 (Ammianus Marcellinus, xiv, 11), and again as the tribune of the heavy-armed soldiers, and the friend of Silvanus and Malarich (*id.*, xv, 5). From this position as an imperial officer he seems to have easily developed into a king of the Franks.

Under the year 374 we read how Macrianus, the king of the Allemanni, having made peace with the Romans, eventually

died in the country of the Franks, which he had invaded, and which he had ravaged in a most destructive manner, till at last he was cut off by the manœuvres of Mellobaudes, the warlike king of that nation, and slain (*id.*, xxx, 3).

Zosimus tells us, under the year 381, that Julian committed some forces to Baudon and Arbogast, who were Franks and great friends to the Romans, free from avarice and from mercenary motives, very prudent in warlike matters, and very pre-eminent in strength (Dom Bouquet, i, 583). In 388, Arbogast was sent by Theodosius to put down Victor, the son of the usurper Maximus, who had adopted the style of Cæsar. He speedily killed him (*id.*).

Our next authority is Sulpitius Alexander, of whom we only know that he is quoted as an authority by Gregory of Tours. He tells us how during the usurpation of Maximus, who revolted against Valentinian II, at the end of the fourth century, and when the fortunes of Maximus were at a low ebb, and he was sheltering at Aquileia, in Italy, whither he had gone against Valentinian, the Franks invaded Gaul.

They were led by three chiefs, named Gennobaud, Marcomir, and Sunnon, and ravaged the country as far as Cologne. When the news reached Trèves, Nannenius and Quintinus, who had been entrusted with the care of his son and of Gaul by Maximus, marched with an army toward Cologne; but the enemy had already re-crossed the Rhine laden with booty. They left a portion of their army behind, which was attacked and dispersed in the Ardennes by the Romans. The latter now deliberated whether they should cross the river into "Francia" (*i.e.*, the district beyond the river). Nannenius prudently refused to do so, but Quintinus and the rest of the army, being of a different opinion, crossed the Rhine near Neutz, and two days later arrived in a district that was well peopled, and where the towns had been abandoned. The Franks, professing to be frightened, had withdrawn into their forests, and raised abattis of trunks to close the ways. The Romans, having burnt their houses, gave themselves up to security. When they again advanced into the forest after their enemies, they were assailed by showers of poisoned arrows, the cavalry were bogged in the morasses, and only a few of them escaped; among the slain was Heraclius, the tribune of the Jovinians (Gregory of Tours, ii, 9). This was apparently in 388. Presently Nannenius was replaced by Kharietton and Syrus, who opposed the Franks in Germania (*i.e.*, probably in Alsace).

The Franks seem to have carried off some plunder on this occasion, and we read how Arbogast, who belonged to their race, incited the Romans to compel them to return the booty

they had carried off, and to punish those who had violated their troth. The Romans seem to have marched against them: their general had an interview with Marcomir, and the other royal officials of the Franks, from whom he took hostages, and then returned to Trèves. Valentinian II was then reigning, but he was virtually a prisoner in his palace, the military affairs of the empire being controlled by the Franks in his service, while the civil affairs were directed by the faction of Arbogast, another Frank, and none of the soldiers could be depended upon to obey the emperor. Arbogast had had a long feud with Sunnon and Marcomir, the Frank chiefs, against whom he now marched. He arrived at Cologne in midwinter, fancying he could easily penetrate into the Frank country at that season, while the forests were free from leaves, and ambuscades were difficult. As I have argued, the Franks had at this time become the masters of the various tribes who lived on the right bank of the Lower Rhine, and we are told that Arbogast crossed the Rhine at the head of his army, and ravaged the land of the Bructeri, who lived nearest to its bank, as well as the village inhabited by the Chamavi, and was only opposed by a small number of Ampsuarii and of Chatti, commanded by Marcomir, who showed themselves on the neighbouring heights. Eventually Valentinian was killed by Arbogast, who set up Eugenius in his place. This was in 392. We are told that he renewed the treaties with the Alemanni and the Franks (Gregory of Tours, ii, 9).

In the year 394, Theodosius having collected a body of Gauls and Franks, Arbogast ("nexus etiam præcipuo cultu idolorum") succumbed at once (Orosius, vii; Dom Bouquet, i, 597). He withdrew to the mountains, and there committed suicide (Zosimus, iv; Dom Bouquet, i, 584).

Our next authority is the poet Claudian, who, in describing how, in 395, the Vandal Stilicho, who was in the service of Honorius, pacified the Gaul, has these lines:—

"Ante Ducem nostram flavam sparsere Sycambri
Cæsariem, pavidoque orantes murmure Franci
Procubuerè solo."

Claudian, ex. lib de quart. Consul. Hon.
(Dom Bouquet, i, 769).

In other lines, in which he eulogises his favourite hero, he speaks thus:—

". . . Rhenumque minaçem.
Cornibus infractis adeo mitescere cogis,
Ut Salius jam rura colat, flexosque Sycambros,
In falcem curvet gladios, geminasque viator
Cum videat ripas, quæ fit Romana requirat;
* * * * *

“ . . . Provincia missos
 Expellet citius fasces, quam Francia Reges,
 Quos dederis. Acie nec jam pulsare rebelles,
 Sed vinclis punire licet. Sub iudice nostro
 Regia Romanus disquirat crimina carcer.
 Marcomeres Sonnoque docent; quorum alter Etruscum
 Pertulit exilium; cum se promitteret alter
 Exulis ultorem, jacuit mucrone suorum.
 Res avidi concire novas, odioque furentes
 Pacis, et ingenio scelerumque cupidine fratres.”

(Ex lib. de laud., Stil. Dom Bouquet, i, 771.)

From this we see that Marcomir and Sunno, the two Frank kings, were brothers. The former was, about 397, carried off to Honorius, who imprisoned him and afterwards sent him to Etruria, while his brother was killed by his own people.

When, in the year 403, Stilicho marched the legions of Gaul and Britain towards Rome, which was being attacked by Alaric the Goth, the Rhine was left without defence, and various hordes of Vandals, Suevi, Burgundians, and others crossed the river and attacked Gaul. According to Rhenanus Frigeridus, an otherwise unknown author quoted by Gregory of Tours, the Vandals had a terrible struggle with the Franks, in which their king, Godegisel, was killed, and about 20,000 men perished. The Vandals would have been exterminated if the Alans (as Messrs. Taranne and Guadet read it, and not Alemanni, as most of the manuscripts have it) had not gone to their rescue. Jovinus, the usurper in Gaul, had Franks in his army, so had Constantine, who was proclaimed Emperor in 407, and about the year 412 we are told that the Franks pillaged and burnt the city of Trèves, while shortly after Castinus, the commander of the domestic guards, was put at the head of an army and sent into Gaul against the Franks (Gregory of Tours, ii, 9).

Sozomen, in describing the struggle between Honorius and Constantine, states that the latter sent his commander, Edobich, across the Rhine to get assistance from the Franks and the Alemanni (Sozomen, lib. ix; Dom Bouquet, i, 606).

At this time the Franks were apparently divided into two well-marked sections—those who were free answering in the main to the Ripuarians, who lived east of the Rhine; and those who were in the condition of Læti, or military colonists, who lived west of that river. Marcomir and Sunno, of whom we have written, were doubtless the chief of the Ripuarians; so also probably was Theodomir, the son of Richimir, of whom Gregory of Tours, quoting the “Consular Fasti,” says that he was massacred with his mother, Aschila. He says also that at that time Clodion, equally distinguished among his people for his nobility and merit, was king of the Franks. I take this Clodion to have been the chief of the Læti, or Stipendiary Franks.

In the early genealogy of the Frank kings extracted from a codex at Saint Gallen by Pertz (iii, 307), he heads the list; in others he is made the son of the fabulous Pharamund. Gregory says he lived at Dispargum, in the country of the Tongri.

The site of Dispargum has been much debated. It is called *Castrum Dispargum* by Gregory of Tours; *Castellum Disbargum* by Aimoin; and *Castrum Dispartum* by Trithemius. According to Ortelius and Pontanus, it was Duisburg, between Wesel and Dusseldorf, on the Roer, five leagues from Dusseldorf. According to Du Bos, Duysbourg, between Brussels and Louvain, two leagues and a half from Brussels. Eccard identified it with Disborg, near Smalkald, in the principality of Henneberg, in Franconia; and according to Chifflet, Henschenius, Vredius, Boucher, Mantelius and Wendelin, Diest in Brabant. Diest seems never to have been called Dispargum, but was called Diosta in the sixth century, and in the ninth its dependent district was called the "*Pagus Diestensis*," while the name Dispargum occurs as late as 986 ("*Mémoire sur l'Établissement des Franks dans la Belgique*," 368). Gregory of Tours expressly says that in going from Dispargum to Cambrai the Franks had to cross the Rhine. This seems to limit the sites to Duisburg near Wesel, Disborg in Franconia, Doesburg near Zutphen, or Desenberg in Westphalia, between the claims of which I don't see my way to deciding.

Gregory of Tours tells us, quoting the "*Consular Fasti*," that Clodion, having sent people towards Camaracum (*i.e.*, Cambrai) to explore, followed himself, and, having attacked the Romans, seized the towns of Tournai and Cambrai, after living there awhile he extended his conquests to the Somme (*op. cit.*, ii, 9).

Roricon, a very unsafe authority, says he extended his conquests to Amiens, where he reigned (Dom Bouquet iii, 4); and we have no better source than the "*Gesta Francorum*" for the statement that he reigned for twenty years (Bouquet, ii, 544). The "*Gesta Francorum*" were compiled in the earlier part of the eighth century. The editors of Bouquet date his attack on Cambrai in 445. Prosper of Tyre, under the year 427, has the entry, "*Clodius regnat in Francia*" (*id.*, i, 638).

Sidonius Apollinaris, in his panegyric on Majorian, tells us how Cloio invaded the country of Artois, whereupon Majorian and Ætius marched against him, and surprised him at the village of Helena, which some identify with Lens, while celebrating a marriage. His somewhat inflated lines are as follows:—

“Post tempore parvo
 Pugnatis pariter, Francus qua Cloio patentes
 Atrebatum terras pervaserat. Hic coeuntes
 Claudebaut augusta vias, arcuque subactum.
 Vicum Helenam, flumenque simul sub tramite longo
 Artus suppositis trabibus transmiserat agger.
 Illic te posito, pugnabat ponte sub ipso
 Majorianus eques. Fors ripæ colle propinquo.
 Barbaricus resonabat hymen. Sythicisque choreis
 Nubebat flavo similis nova nupta marito.
 Hos ergo ut perhibent, stravit; crepitabat ad ictus
 Cassis et oppositis hastarum verbera thorax
 Arcebat squamis donec conversa fugatus
 Hostis terga dedit. Plaustris rutilare videres
 Barbarici vaga festa tori, convictaque passim
 Feracula, captivasque dapes, cirroque madente
 Ferre coronatos redolentia ferta lebetas, etc.”

(Dom Bouquet, i, 802.)

The editors of the work just quoted state in a note that this fight has been frequently assigned to the year 428, in which year, according to Prosper of Aquitaine and Cassiodorus, the district near the Rhine held by the Franks was reconquered by Ætius. “Pars Galliarum propinqua Rheno quam Franci possidendam occupaverant Ætii Comitis arma recepta,” says Prosper of Aquitaine (Bouquet, i, 630); but this date is at issue with the chronology of Majorian’s life, as is that of the entry in Iudatus in the year 432: “Superatis per Ætium in certamine Francis et in pace susceptis (*id.*, 617), and they therefore date the event about the year 446.

There is a curious entry in Priscus which refers, probably, to Clodion’s reign. He tells us how Attila fought against the Franks, and caused the death of their king, and how a dispute arose about the succession between his sons, of whom the elder sided with Attila, and the younger with Ætius. The latter Priscus himself saw at Rome, and describes him as a young man just growing his beard, and speaks of his golden locks streaming over his shoulders. He tells us he was adopted by Ætius, and was presented with many gifts by him and by the emperor (*id.*, 607–8). The king, who was thus killed by Attila, apparently about 449 or 450, has been considered by some to be Clodion, but the learned Benedictines argue against this, and suggest he was the chief of the Ripuarians, and not of the Salians, and that his son led the contingent of Franks in the Hunnic service, who came from the river Necker, and who are thus apostrophised by Sidonius Apollinaris, in his panegyric on Avitus:—“Udosa quem vix Nicer abluit unda, Prorumpit Francus” (*id.*, 607–8, note *a*).

It is curious to compare the name Clodius, or Clodio, of the Frank king whom we have here described, with the Roman family name Clodius. We do not know when Clodion died.

Gregory of Tours tells us that the King Meroveus, who had for a son Childeric, was of his stock (*op. cit.*, ii, 9). Fredegar, in his "Epitome," makes Meroveus the son of Clodio, and has the following strange notice:—

"Hæc generatio (*i.e.*, that of the Franks) fanaticis usibus culta est. Fertur super litore maris æstatis tempore Chlodeone cum uxore resedente meridie, uxor ad mare lavatum vadens, terretur a bestia Neptuni, qui Minotauro similis eam ad petisset. Cumque in continuo aut a bestia aut a viro fuisset, concepit, ac peperit filium, Meroveum nomine, a quo Reges Francorum postea Merovingii vocantur" (*id.*, ii, 395-6).

In the "Gesta Regnum Francorum" nothing is said about Meroveus having been the son of Clodion, but there is merely a mention of him as his successor (*id.*, ii, 544). Under the year 448 we have, in Prosper of Tyre, the entry, "Meroveus regnat in Francia" (*id.*, i, 640).

It is curious that Gregory of Tours tells us no facts about Meroveus himself, and I am strongly disposed to agree with Mr. Perry in his suspicions, that he has been created to explain the name of the dynasty, namely, that of the Merovingians, or Mervings, who, as we have seen, bore a name of much older date. It is true that Meroveus occurs as a royal name at a later date. Thus we have one so called who was a son of Chilperic I, and another who was the son of Chlothaire II; but in the notices above quoted, with the legendary air that surrounds them, we seem to be on the traces of a mere eponymous creation. We must remember also that in a genealogical table attached to an old MS. of the Salic Laws, and given by Bouquet, which derives the royal stock from Pharamund, we read that the latter bore Cleno and Cludion, that Chludius bore *Chlodebaud*, who bore Chloderic, the father of Chlovis (*op. cit.*, ii, 696). Meroveus is not named at all in this list, and Chlodebaud takes his place.

Reverting to our story, we find that when Attila invaded Gaul, and was encountered by Ætius, the latter had both Goths and Franks in his army. After defeating the Hunnic king, we are told by Gregory of Tours that he persuaded the Frank king, who had been his ally, to withdraw, by persuading him that if he did not return home some one might seize his throne (Gregory of Tours, *op. cit.*, ii, 7).

Jornandes, who describes the same struggle, enumerates the allies of Ætius thus: Franci, Sarmatæ, Armoritiani, Litiani (*i.e.* Letæ), Burgundiones, Saxones, Riparioli (*i.e.*, Ripuarians), and Ibriones (or Olibriones, who lived east of Lake Constance) (*op. cit.*, ch. 36; Dom Bouquet, ii, 23).

Jornandes further tells us that in this terrible struggle with the Huns, 162,000 were killed on each side, besides 15,000

(some copies say 90,000) Gepidæ and Franks, who killed each other in a struggle the night before the battle—the former fighting for the Huns, and the latter for the Romans.

Sidonius Apollinaris, as we have seen, in his panegyric on Avitus, mentions the Francs from the Necker as aiding Ætius (Dom Bouquet, i, 806).

Gregory of Tours, as we have said, suggests, in a doubtful manner, that Meroveus was the father of Childeric. “De hujus stirpe” (*i.e.*, of Clodion), he says, “quidam Merovechum Regem fuisse adferunt, cujus filius, fuit Childericus” (*op. cit.*, ii, 9). With Childeric we are on firm ground. Gregory tells us he gave himself up to his passions, and dishonoured the daughters of the Franks over whom he reigned. They accordingly drove him out, and he sought refuge in Thuringia (*Thoringiam petiit*), leaving behind him a man whom he could trust (*id.*, xii). Fredegar, in his “Epitome,” calls this man Wiomad, and says Childeric had released him when he was being carried off with his mother by the Huns (Dom Bouquet, ii, 396). In order that the two might have a common sign, Wiomad broke a gold coin in two, and told him that when he sent him a message he would send him the other piece, and if it fitted his own he would know that all was right, and that he might return home again. Childeric repaired to the King of Thuringia, Basin, and to his wife Basina. When he had gone, Gregory tells us that the Franks unanimously elected Ægidius, who sustained—in a small portion of Central Gaul, limited by the Oise, the Maine, and the Seine—the continuity and traditions of the Roman empire.

Wiomad now, according to Fredegar, began to intrigue; he persuaded Ægidius to impose heavy taxes upon the people, and when they were still content to be taxed, rather than trodden under by Childeric, he advised him to break the pride of his new subjects by killing a number of them. Wiomad, having himself counselled this course, turned to the Franks, and denounced him, saying it did not suffice him to tax them so heavily, but he must treat their relatives like cattle, and kill them (Dom Bouquet, ii, 396). At length they were ready, and after Ægidius had reigned over them for eight years, Wiomad sent the half of the gold piece, and Childeric once more returned. According to Fredegar, he was met at the castle of Bar (he does not say which—Bar le Duc, Bar sur Aube, or Bar sur Seine) by his *leudes*. He then relates a story in which Childeric is made to have intercourse with the Emperor Maurice, who lived 100 years after his death, and which is fabulous. Gregory tells us that, after his return, Basina, the wife of his late host, went to him and deserted her husband. In answer to his inquiries why she had gone, she gave what Mr. Perry judiciously calls a naïve answer: “Novi

inquit, utilitatem tuam, quod sis valde strenuus: ideoque veni ut habitem tecum: nam noveris, si in transmarinis partibus aliquem cognovissem utiliozem te, expetissem utique cohabitationem ejus. At ille gaudeus, eam in conjugis copulavit, quæ concipiens peperit filium, vocavitque nomen ejus Chlodovechum. Hic fuit magnus, et pugnator egregius" (*id.*, ii, 168). Such, then, was the origin of the famous Chlovis, who became the founder of the empire of the Franks. Fredegar gives a fantastic account—*suo more*—of his conception (*vide* Dom Bouquet, ii, 397).

We now find Childeric and his Franks in alliance with the Romans. He is found at Orleans, which was apparently menaced by the piratical Saxons, who, under Odoacer, had advanced to Angers. On the death of the Count Ægidius, he was succeeded by his son, Syagrius. We then read of Odoacer taking hostages from Angers and other towns, while the Bretons were driven from Bourges by the Goths (*i.e.*, by the Visigoths of Aquitaine) who killed a great number of them near Deols. The Count Paul, with the Romans and the Franks, fought against the Goths, and took much booty from them. At Angers a strange revolution took place. Odoacer, having arrived there, was followed the next day by Childeric, who killed the Count Paul, and took possession of the town (Gregory of Tours, ii, xviii). This was probably after defeating the Saxons. What Childeric's position was at this time it is hard to say, and it has been argued that he was in fact the generalissimo of the forces which were still controlled by the fragment of the Roman Empire that remained. According to Idatius, Ægidius died on the 19th of November, 464, and was succeeded by his son Syagrius.

That Childeric should have killed the Count Paul himself has seemed so inexplicable to some historians, that they have transferred that feat to Odoacer (Cochet, "Le Tombeau de Childeric," 10, note; Capifigue, "Chlovis et les Mérovingiens," 73).

We, however, next hear of Childeric, in alliance with Odoacer, attacking the barbarians who were assailing Italy. According to some these were Alemanni; others make them Alans. This war apparently terminated about 471. Childeric is mentioned in the "Life of St. Gèneviève," and mentioned as if he had control of the city of Paris (Dom Bouquet, iii, 370).

The death of Childeric has been most probably fixed, although we have no absolute data, about the year 481. Roricon says he died at Amiens. This is, however, uncertain. What is certain is that he was buried at Tournai, perhaps the capital of his kingdom. "Urbs Tornacensis quæ quondam fuit regalis civitas," says St. Ouen in the seventh century, in his "Life of St. Eloi" (Cochet, *op. cit.*, 11, note 5). There his tomb was discovered

in 1653, and some of its famous contents, so interesting in the history of early art, after curiously romantic adventures, were eventually deposited in the Louvre, where they may be still seen. They have been illustrated with singular learning and perseverance in the Abbé Cochet's work above cited, which has become an archæological classic. Childeric was succeeded by his son Chlovis, whose history has been so profusely illustrated, and is so familiar that we need not do more than epitomise the steps by which an empire was created out of the petty kingdom of Tournai. Gaul was at the time of his accession divided into several fragments. Of the old Roman dominion there remained under Syagrius, according to the researches of M. Biet and Lebœuf, Laon, Auxerre, Troyes, Meaux, Rheims, Beauvais, Senlis, Paris, and perhaps Chartres, Rouen, and Orléans: the capital of the whole being Soissons (Cochet, *op. cit.*, 8, note 3).

Armorica, including the whole coast from the Seine to the Loire, was independent; the Visigoths held Southern Gaul as far north as the Loire, and as far east as the "Pagus Vellavus" (Auvergne). The Burgundians were bounded on the west by the Visigoths, and towards the Roman fragment by the "Pagus Lingonicus"—the Upper Marne (Perry, "The Franks," 70 and 71). The Franks were divided into two sections, of which the Salians were alone, as yet, subject to Chlovis, the Ripuarians obeying an independent line of princes. These Ripuarians, who, as we have argued, previously lived on the Maine, crossed the Rhine as settlers after the Huns had devastated its borders. It was then, says the very old "Life of St. Remigius," upon which Hincmar founded his biography, that they occupied Cologne and Trèves (Dom Bouquet, iii, 374). They made Cologne their capital, whence Eginhardt speaks of it as "Ripuariæ metropolis." Five years after his accession (*i.e.*, in 486), Chlovis, in alliance with his relative Ragnachar, who ruled over the Franks of Cambrai, proceeded to attack Syagrius, who was speedily beaten and took refuge with Alaric, king of the Visigoths, from whom the victor demanded his surrender. Afraid of the anger of the Franks ("for fear," says the orthodox Gregory of Tours, "is habitual to the Goths," who, it will be remembered, were Arians) they surrendered Syagrius, who was shortly after put to death and his dominions were appropriated (Gregory of Tours, i, 94, 95). Among the booty on this occasion was a vase, remarkable for its size and beauty, which Chlovis wished to take to himself, but a rude soldier smote it with his axe, saying that he must take only what fell to him by lot; he was merely "primus inter pares." Chlovis revenged himself a year later at an inspection of the troops, where he professed to be dissatisfied with the condition in which he had

kept his arms, and clove him to the ground. Five years later (*i.e.*, in 491) Chlovis marched against the Thuringians, and conquered them (*id.*, 95, 96).

The Thuringians were the countrymen of his mother, Basina. In another passage Gregory of Tours recalls some incidents of this war, and makes Theodoric, in inciting the Franks against the Thuringians, recall how the latter had first attacked them, and had cruelly ill-treated the hostages they had given; how they had hung their infants on trees, had dragged their maidens asunder, by tying horses to their arms and then incited them to spring forward with pointed needles; how others of them were nailed to the ground with spikes, while carts were driven over them, their remains being left to the dogs and wild birds (Gregory of Tours, iii, 7).

The Burgundian king, Gonderic, had four sons—Gondebaud, Gondegisel, Chilperic, and Gondomar. Chilperic was drowned by Gondebaud. He left two daughters—Chrona, who took the veil, and Chlotilda, whose beauty had reached the ears of Chlovis. He sent to demand her in marriage, a demand which her uncle was constrained to obey. She presently had a son, Ingomar, whom she insisted upon having baptized. He died in the font, whereupon Chlovis bitterly reproached her, and said it would not have been thus if he had been consecrated in the name of his own gods. She continually urged him to become a Christian, but it was only in the fifteenth year of his reign, *i.e.*, in 496, when in a struggle with the Alemanni, and when the Franks were being beaten, that he appealed to the God of Chlotilda to aid him, promising (if successful) to become a Christian. Thereupon the Alemanni, who had lost their king, gave way and agreed to become his subjects (*id.*, 99, 100). This battle was fought at Tolbiach, the modern Zülpich, near Cologne. The dates of this and preceding events in Chlovis's career depend upon Gregory of Tours. They look suspicious and artificial, each event of importance being separated from the next by an interval of five years.

After the battle the queen is said to have summoned St. Remi, who urged his cause with the Frank king. His only objection was on the ground of the opposition of his people, but this was dissipated when he related what they owed to the God of the Christians. The public squares were shaded with dyed cloths, the churches hung with white curtains, and Chlovis, with 3,000 of his people, and his sister Albofleda, who shortly after died, were baptized. Latechilda, another sister, who was an Arian, was rebaptized. It was on this occasion that Gregory reports the very problematical story of St. Remigius having said, "Bow thy head humbly, Sicamber; adore that which thou hast burnt,

burn that which thou hast adored" (*id.*, 101). According to Hincmar, in his "Life of St. Remigius," many of the Franks now abandoned Chlovis, and joined his relative Ragnachar beyond the Somme ("Acta Sanct.," Oct., i, 94; Perry, "Franks," 80, note).

What he lost in this way Chlovis amply made up in others, for he became the ally of the orthodox clergy everywhere in their struggle with the Arians. Thus, about the year 493, we are told by Procopius, that the Franks made overtures to the Armoricans for an alliance, since they were both Christians. They accordingly made a compact. The next passage in Procopius is singularly curious, and seems to point to Armorica still remaining partly subject to Roman officials. It says that certain Roman soldiers, who were in the stations of the extreme parts of Gaul, since they could not return to Rome (it being in the hands of the Goths), nor did they wish to go over to their Arian enemies, committed themselves, with their standards and the region which they previously guarded as Romans, to the Armoricans and Germans (with Procopius, German=Frank). They retained all their customs, "which their descendants keep to this day" (*sic*): furnishing a regular military contingent and keeping their own laws, and other Roman customs, (Dom Bouquet, ii, 30, 31). This is assuredly very interesting in view of recent discussions about the survival of Roman customs on this side of the Channel. I may add that Gregory of Tours, in his work on the Martyrs, speaks of the Franks, when still pagans, having made an assault upon Nantes, and having been frightened into a retreat by the appearance of a vision (Dom Bouquet, ii, 465).

We now find Chlovis at war with the Burgundians, who then occupied the districts near the Rhone and Saone, and the province of Marseilles. To this war he was incited by Gondegisel, who was at issue with his brother Gondebaud. During the struggle which took place on the river Ouche, Gondegisel deserted with his men. Gondebaud was defeated, and retired to Avignon, and Gondegisel to Vienne. Chlovis does not seem to have pressed his advantage, and accepted the offer made by Gondebaud through his friend Aridius—which he apparently did not keep—to pay tribute. Free from his dangerous enemy, Gondebaud turned upon his brother, forced an entrance into Vienne by a drain, and killed Gondegisel with the Arian bishop (Gregory of Tours, 103–109). Procopius, who describes this war, tells us that the Goths of Theodoric and the Franks had agreed to make a joint campaign. That monarch, who was not sorry to see his neighbours fighting, ordered his men to march slowly, so that they might arrive late. If they heard the Franks were beaten they were to retire; if victorious,

to go on. The Goths took no part, therefore, in the fight; but they shared the spoils, and Burgundy was divided between them and the Franks (Dom Bouquet, ii, 31, 32). This war took place about 500 A.D.

Some of the chroniclers now report a curious story, namely, that on one occasion Chlovis sent an envoy named Paternus to negotiate peace with Alaric, the King of the Visigoths. It was arranged that the two kings, with their followers, should meet, and that Alaric should, after the manner of the ancients, touch the beard of Chlovis, and swear fealty to him. It was agreed that each king should be attended by a few followers, who should go to the meeting unarmed. Paternus returned home, and Chlovis set out for Aquitaine for the trysting-place. He sent Paternus to make inquiries, who found that the Goths, instead of staves, had with them concealed arms. He accordingly accused Alaric of a base fraud, and suggested that they should appeal to Theodoric, the King of the Italian Goths, to settle the penalty. He, wishful to keep the feud between his neighbours alive, suggested that Paternus should ride on horseback into the space before Alaric's palace and hold out his spear, and that the Goths should then pour money upon it till its point was covered (Roricon says the lance was to be thrust into the ground), and this was to be paid over to Chlovis. Alaric refused to carry out this decision. He, however, entertained Paternus at his palace, and showed him his various treasures. According to Fredegar he took up one of the gold pieces, and thrusting it into his pocket, said, "Hos solidos adarrabo ad partem domini mei Chlodovei Regis et Francis." When he returned, Chlovis assembled his notables and made them a warlike speech (Fredegar, Dom Bouquet, ii, 463-4; Roricon, *id.*, iii, 14, 15; Aimoin, *id.*, iii, 41). At this time the Visigoths were masters of the greater part of Spain, and of the country between the Loire and the Rhone, and were governed by Alaric, the son of the famous Euric. We are told that Chlovis professed great distress that so much territory was possessed by Arians—a Pharisaic view endorsed, no doubt, by many orthodox subjects of the Visigoths, and which greatly weakened their cause. He accordingly marched against the latter, and encountered them at Vouglé, near Poitiers. This was in the year 507. We are told the Goths fought with the lance, but the Franks with the pike (*vide*). The Visigoths were defeated, Alaric was killed, and Chlovis, struck on either side by the enemy's weapons, owed his safety to his excellent cuirass and the speed of his horse. Alaric's son Amalaric fled to Spain, where he continued to rule. Chlovis sent his son Theodoric to overrun Auvergne, and we are told he subdued for his father all the district, from the

frontiers of the Goths to those of the Burgundians. Chlovis himself wintered at Bordeaux, and apparently conquered in person Poitou, Saintonge, and the Bordelais (Aimoin, Dom Bouquet, iii, 42; Capifigue, 95). He carried off the treasures of the Visigothic kings from Toulouse, and marched upon Angouleme, which he captured (Gregory of Tours, 114, 115; Aimoin, *loc. cit.*). The Franks, at this time in conjunction with the Burgundians, also attacked Arles, and ruined a monastery there (*ex. "Vit. S. Cæs. Episc. Aral.,"* Dom Bouquet, iii, 384). This siege of Arles is also mentioned by Cassiodorus in his letters. It took place in 510 (*id.*, note).

Before they defeated Alaric, the Franks, according to Procopius, had laid siege to Carcassonne. After his defeat they renewed their attack upon that town. Meanwhile the Great Theodoric had sent an army to the rescue of his compatriots, which completely defeated the Franks (Procopius, "De Bell Goth"; Dom Bouquet, ii, 32, 33). Jornandes tells us the Gothic commander was called Hibba, and that 30,000 Franks perished in the struggle (Dom Bouquet, 702). The Goths then conquered the part of Gaul from the Rhone to the sea, but as they could not hold it, Theodoric restored it to the Franks. The rest of Gaul he annexed, and having put prefects there, imposed a tribute on it (Procopius, Dom Bouquet, 33; Isidore of Seville, *id.*, 702). After the Frankish defeat it would seem that Chlovis raised the siege of Carcassonne, and returned to Aquitaine, where he capture Angoulême, a portion of whose walls, like those of Jericho, miraculously fell (Capifigue, 95, 96). He now presented some rich gifts at the church of St. Martin at Tours, where he received from Anastasius the purple tunic, the chlamys, and the diadem (Gregory of Tours, 115), *i.e.*, consular honours.

He was not nominated actually Consul, for his name does not occur in the *Consular Fasti* (*id.*, note). Having distributed largess widely he returned to Paris.

He was now virtually master of all Gaul, and yet he was merely the Emperor of the Frank forces. Among the Franks there were other chiefs, independent of himself, and subservient to him, only apparently, for the purposes of war, or some general enterprise. It was to the subjection of them that he now turned. First he attacked Sigebert, the ruler of the Ripuarian Franks, whose capital was Cologne. Sigebert had taken part in the battle of Tolbiac against the Alemanni, and had been wounded in the knee, whence Gregory of Tours refers to him as Sigebert the lame (*id.*, ii, 37).

Mr. Perry says the kingdom of Sigebert extended along both sides of the Rhine, from Mayence to Cologne to the west, along

the Moselle as far as Trèves, and on the east to the river Fulda and the borders of Thuringia (*op. cit.*, 91).

Sigebert's son, Chloderic, took part in the war against the Visigoths (Gregory of Tours, ii, 37). Chlovis now persuaded the young man that by putting away his father he would secure the throne and his own friendship at the same time. Chloderic seems to have eagerly listened to this counsel, and on one occasion, when his father left Cologne and went for an excursion in the Buchonian forest near Fulda, he assassinated him in his tent. He sent to inform Chlovis of what he had done, and asked him to send some messengers to receive some of the spoil. One of these, apparently instructed by his master, took the opportunity, when the young man was stooping, and had his hand buried in his father's treasure-chest, to cleave in his skull with his *francisca*.

Chlovis now went to Cologne, and addressing the people there, said: "While I was sailing on the Scheldt, Chloderic, son of my relative, told his father that I wanted to kill him. When Sigebert fled to the Buchonian forest, he himself sent assassins after him, who killed him, and presently he himself was slain." Chlovis urged that he had had nothing to do with the slaughter of his relatives. He went on to urge them to accept him as their sovereign, which they accordingly did, raising him aloft on a shield. The orthodox Bishop improves the occasion in unctuous language, and attributes Chlovis's continuous successes to his close attention to the duties of religion.

Chlovis next attacked Chararic, who, it would seem, was established with his people near Therouanne. During the war with Syagrius, Chlovis had called him to his aid, but he stood aloof from the fight, with the intention of joining the victor. Chlovis now marched against him, captured him and his son by craft, and made them both accept the tonsure. This cutting off of their locks, so dear to the long-haired race, drew forth from the younger prince an exclamation that the branches were cut off from a young tree which would speedily sprout fresh ones; and he ventured to prophecy the speedy death of Chlovis, whereupon he had them both decapitated, and annexed their kingdom (Gregory of Tours, iii, 41). There still remained another Frank king, named Ragnachar, who, according to Mr. Perry, ruled north of the Somme, in Flanders, and Artois, with his capital at Cambrai (*op. cit.*, 94). He was a dissolute person, and given to the basest crimes, which, together with his attachment to a favourite named Farron, disgusted his subjects. Chlovis corrupted his *leudes*, or immediate friends, with presents of bracelets, and baldrics made of gilt copper, which he passed off upon them for gold. He then marched against him, crossed the

Somme, and defeated him. With his brother Richair he was brought before the conqueror, his hands being tied behind him. Chlovis reproached Ragnachar with having disgraced their common blood by allowing himself to be manacled instead of having sought death, and reproached Richair with having helped him, and he clove them both down with his axe. The *leudes* having complained of the base metal he had palmed on them, he replied that they deserved base coin who so basely betrayed their master, and that they might deem themselves fortunate their lives were spared. A third brother, Rignomar, was put to death in the city of Mans. Chlovis, we are now told, appropriated their kingdoms and treasures, and, having killed several other kings whose rivalry he feared, he extended his dominion over all Gaul. Gregory of Tours speaks of these various kings as his relatives, and makes him hypocritically regret that after their death he was like a traveller among strangers, and without any one to succour him in adversity. He adds that this was a ruse to discover if any relative survived whom he might kill (Gregory of Tours, xxii, 42). The term "relative," with Gregory, probably connotes one belonging to the common sacred stock of the Mervings, or Merovingians.

Chlovis died at Paris on the 27th of November, 511, and was buried there, in the basilica of the Apostles, which he had built. It is not our purpose to carry the history of the Franks any further. We have tried to trace it from its dim and shadowy beginnings to a time when Chlovis had subdued all Gaul, and was virtually master of the country, as far as the Elbe in the east, and the Pyrenees in the west. It will be noted that the Saxons nowhere occur at this time as the occupants of nether Saxony. It was the purpose of two previous papers to show that they were not in fact there until a later date, and first invaded nether Saxony, and settled in it in the reign of Chlovis' sons.

To sum up the general results of this paper. We claim to have shown—(1) that the Franks were not the early dwellers in the Rhine valley under a new name, but that they were a new people, who were otherwise and elsewhere known as Varini and Varings, and who, like the Angles and Saxons, with whom they were so closely associated in early times, were a tribe of low Germans from beyond the Elbe; (2) that when they invaded the borders of the empire, and settled within them, they did so as the Saxons did in South Britain—not as conquerors, but as colonists. Our next paper will deal with the Lombards.