2017

Shifting Ethnic Identities in Spain and Gaul, 500-700: From Romans to Goths and Franks

Erica Buchberger
The University of Texas Rio Grande Valley, erica.buchberger@utrgv.edu

Recommended Citation

Shifting Ethnic Identities in Spain and Gaul, 500-700: From Romans to Goths and Franks

Erica Buchberger

Contents

Acknowledgements

Introduction

Within the first few centuries after the collapse of the western Roman Empire, the majority of those westerners once considered Romans adopted the identities of their barbarian rulers. They came to be identified as Franks or Goths or Saxons, and people called 'Romans' disappeared almost entirely from the written record.

How this happened is a matter of some controversy. Much progress has been made in recent years in understanding this process, but it has been hampered by a continued tendency to use terms like Goth, Roman, and Frank in a mutually exclusive manner, as if 'Frank' could mean only one thing at any given place and time. Thus historians have argued that, for example, the increasing use of 'Goth' in mid-seventh-century Spain to refer to all the king's subjects must mean that these subjects had all become ethnic Goths, or, as Herwig Wolfram has suggested, that 'Goth' had ceased to have any ethnic meaning in favour of a wider, more inclusive political one.[1] The reality, though, is far more complicated. A person can have multiple identities or affiliations simultaneously. Someone living in the seventh-century Visigothic kingdom could be a Roman by descent and a Goth politically, for example. When all of these aspects of identity are conflated, historians see what seem like inexplicable contradictions or paradoxes in our sources, or sometimes instantaneous or nonsensical changes to these identities. However, when the existence of multiple layers is acknowledged and examined more closely, suddenly they become both understandable and crucial witnesses to the ways these various layers could be renegotiated to effect shifts in ethnic identities over the long term.

This book is an attempt to offer a new model for discussing the multi-layered nature of early medieval identities and for using the evidence of these layers to better understand the mechanisms by which such identity shifts occurred. By distinguishing between the political, religious, and descent overtones with which the ethnonyms Goth, Frank, and Roman were used in Visigothic Iberia and Merovingian Gaul, this study will shed light on the complex ways they interacted to shape contemporary society. It also, by addressing both Iberia and Gaul, will illuminate the common mechanisms operating across both societies and the differences in the ways identity shifts played out based on the unique histories and concerns of each kingdom.

Scholarly Tradition

The stereotypical view of ethnic identities is that they are inherited and permanent, that something in a person's blood makes him or her German or French, Gothic or Frankish. This essentialist model is common in nationalist thought and the popular imagination and can be traced as far back as the ancient Greek distinction between Greeks and barbarians[2]. In ancient Rome, Romans imagined themselves as a constitutional people, united by adherence to Roman law, but others as biological peoples, linked by a common birth.[3] Throughout antiquity and the Middle Ages, the biological vision of community proved a useful tool to legitimize rulers, unify populations, demonize others, and lay claim to heritage and territory traced back to a supposed primordial origin point.[4] The Franks and Visigoths certainly included it in their strategies of identification, and we will see examples throughout the course of this book.

Early modern thinkers turned these ideas into scholarly theories.[5] In the 1720s, French aristocrats like Henri de Boulainvilliers argued that the French aristocracy originated with the Franks who conquered Gaul in the fifth and sixth centuries, and thus held historic rights and privileges from this conquest which the monarchy needed to grant them. Their opponents, including Montesquieu, either objected that, being invaders, the aristocracy themselves should be ousted and the 'oppressed' Gallic people restored to power, or that the Roman Empire had conceded the territory gradually through diplomatic rather than military means, giving the Franks no absolute right to domination.[6] During the French Revolution, most revolutionaries preferred to focus on deeds rather than birth as a criterion for membership in a 'people', but some, like the Abbé Emmanuel-Joseph Sieyès, justified revolution by claiming that, indeed, the aristocracy was Frankish and therefore foreign and should be ousted.[7]

Napoleon's conquests of the early nineteenth century inspired a wave of German nationalism as the people he conquered fought back with their own narratives of long-held identity.[8] Johann Gottlieb Fichte, for example, wrote in 'To the German Nation' about the *Volkstum* that was based on language and an inseparable whole by nature, equating the ancient Romans with the contemporary French and encouraging German speakers to unite against this foreign conquest.[9] The Grimm brothers, folklorists and linguists, were influenced by Johann Gottfried von Herder, who declared in 1784 that geography influenced each people's

inborn characteristics and culture, to search for tales that reflected authentic German culture and landscape. In 1848, drawing on the new discipline of philology, Jacob Grimm argued for Prussia's annexation of Schleswig-Holstein based on a perception that its residents were descended from the early Germanic peoples. Ernst Moritz Arndt argued the same for Alsace-Lorraine, Belgium, and the Netherlands, and Theodor Mommsen argued throughout the second half of the nineteenth century for Prussian takeover of regions historically settled by 'Germans' based on historical use of a 'Germanic' language and early medieval sources on migrations.[10]

War between the French and Germans pushed the rhetoric further. After the Franco-Prussian War of 1870, and formal German unification the following year, Numa Denis Fustel de Coulanges fought back by criticizing the Germanists' paradigm. He reminded historians that past and present 'Germans' were not one and the same and attacked the language-based methods German scholars, particularly Mommsen, used to analyse and present their evidence. While he did not refer to contemporary events in his writing, he was still seen as a French patriot.[11] Ernest Renan, who had admired German scholarship until Prussian invasion led to destruction in his homeland of France, spoke at the Sorbonne on 11 March 1882 against essentialist, biologically-centred views held by nationalists, arguing instead that nationhood was a conscious choice to live together, on the ancient Roman model.[12] These objections did not, however, stem growing nationalist sentiment. In 1870, the historian Felix Dahn distributed a pamphlet supporting the war on similar grounds to Mommsen.[13]

When Germany invaded Belgium at the beginning of World War I, Karl Lamprecht defended the incursion, arguing that the Flemish were ethnically German and resented the dominance of French Walloons in Belgium, and emphasizing the idea that cultural traits were really distinguishing national characteristics inherited upon birth. This takeover directly influenced the work of Henri Pirenne, a Belgian who had worked with Lamprecht at Leipzig and had previously admired him.[14] Pirenne was arrested in 1916 by the occupying Germans for dissent against their occupation. His 1937 *Mohammed and Charlemagne* removed 'Germanic' barbarians from the story of Rome's fall entirely, arguing instead that the rise of Islam disrupted Mediterranean trade and led to the end of antiquity; the 'Germanic' invaders barely made a dent in the cultural landscape.[15] Certainly not all German-language scholars argued for

substantial continuity and prominence of Germanic peoples—the Austrian Alfons Dopsch, for example, supported the ideas of Fustel de Coulanges and Pirenne—but the trend during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries was definitely toward the alignment of scholarly stances with contemporary political and linguistic boundaries.[16]

A similar national sentiment also rose in Spain during this period.[17] This Spanish grand narrative centred around the legitimacy of the Catholic Reconquest of Iberia from the Muslims. It depended on the belief that the Visigoths who had ruled the peninsula in the sixth and seventh centuries had survived to continue their rule in the northern kingdom of Asturias and ultimately led the push south. According to this narrative, the 'real' Spanish nation originated with these Goths and Muslim rule and influence should be ignored as illegitimate. Construction of this 'Gothic myth', as J. N. Hillgarth calls it, began within a few centuries of the Arab conquest in 711. The legend of Pelayo, first king of Asturias, as the rightful heir of the Visigoths and of a Gothic Christian manifest destiny to control the Iberian peninsula appears in the ninth- and early tenth-century *Chronicle of Albelda* and *Chronicle of Alfonso III*.[18] It served as justification and inspiration for Christians to fight for what was not, to them, an invasion of long-held Muslim al-Andalus but a reconquest of lands that rightfully belonged to them.

This narrative continued to pervade scholarship even after Reconquest had been completed.[19] In the nineteenth century, Marcelino Menéndez Pelayo depicted an unbroken inheritance from the Visigoths to contemporary Spaniards. He equated Spanish identity with Gothic Catholic identity and used it to justify the exclusion of Jews and Muslims from the country.[20] Some scholars began to question the idea by the end of the century, but under Franco and the Nationalists it was revived with official approval in the 1930s. Claudio Sánchez-Albornoz traced Spain's origins to Pelayo and the remnants of the Visigoths in Christian Asturias and insisted that Spain and the Christian faith were intrinsically linked.[21] Ramón Menéndez Pidal wrote in the 1950s that Spanish national sentiment was born at Gothic unification in the seventh century.[22]

Early criticism came from Américo Castro, who argued that Visigoths and Spaniards were not the same and instead emphasized the role of *convivencia* of Christians, Jews, and Muslims in Islamic-ruled Spain. Modern Spain was thus impossible without the destruction of

the Visigothic kingdom to make way for Arab influences.[23] Support for Castro's view was limited until the mid-1970s when democratization after Franco's death freed scholars to question the official narrative more directly.[24] The myth has not yet disappeared completely, however. Armando Besga Marroquín argued for a Visigothic-based central rulership in Asturias in a book published in 2000.[25]

In central Europe, the essentialist view also reached its peak under fascism. The Nazis' concept of the pure, superior Aryan race stemmed directly from earlier nationalist constructions of ethnicity. In the 1930s, Otto Höfler promoted the ideas of Germanic sacral kingship as a way to view the contemporary German Reich without resorting to analogies to imperial Rome, and Karl Theodor Strasser portrayed successive waves of naturally adventurous, migrating 'Germans' reinvigorating a geriatric, stagnant Roman Empire with strong German blood, as Herder had done a century and a half earlier. This *Volksgeschichte* imagined peoples as organic units, both homogeneous and unchanged over time. It also appealed to German speakers who lived outside the redrawn borders of post-World War I Germany as a way to see themselves as still part of a wider German community.[26] Archaeologists' theories of 'ethnic ascription'—that is, the assumption that material finds correlated directly with specific peoples migrating into or historically settled in a region—also bolstered German nationalist ambitions. German archaeologists in the 1930s and 1940s drew on the technique developed by Gustav Kossinna in 1910 to justify the identification of burials and artefacts as 'Germanic' and mark wide swaths of Europe as historically German-settled.[27] Row-grave cemeteries, being different in nature from the typical Roman style of burial, especially served to 'prove' migration of Germanic-speaking peoples into northern Gaul and Spain.[28] SS leader Heinrich Himmler was particularly interested in Germanic antiquity and incorporated much of these scholars' work into plans for German expansion.[29] The map for 'reconquest' of territories supposedly settled by early medieval 'Germans' was based on these scholars' interpretations of the texts and archaeological record, and the persecution of Jews and others by 'race' was in part justified by the narrative of German racial superiority these scholars helped bolster with their studies.

All of these nationalist visions looked to the early Middle Ages for the origins of their nation-states and equated modern peoples with historical counterparts. Thus the Germans

could claim rights to much of Europe on the basis that they were the direct descendants of ancient speakers of Germanic languages and their rightful heirs to the territory these ancestors had inhabited. They used an essentialist model of identity that argued for some 'natural' biological component that could be passed down over generations without change—despite the millennium and a half of evolving culture, language, and interactions—to legitimize their cleansing of impure genes from the population of this 'rightfully German' territory. Christian Spaniards could assert their right to dominate the Iberian peninsula and exclude both religious minorities and separatist movements by Basques and others based on the idea that their Visigothic 'ancestors' were divinely ordained to rule Iberia. The French could imagine their resistance against German occupation as descendants of ancient Gallo-Romans defending their lands against a new barbarian takeover.[30]

After World War II, the prevailing nationalist conception of ethnic identities fell rapidly into disfavour. Given the horrors perpetrated under the nationalist/essentialist paradigm, it comes as no surprise that the war prompted historians, social scientists, and archaeologists to find less racially-oriented ways of evaluating and discussing the subject of ethnicity—and that debates on the topic can sometimes become contentious and personal.[31] Among the most influential initial approaches among early medievalists was 'ethnogenesis' theory, promoted in different ways by Reinhard Wenskus and Herwig Wolfram. This approach argues that all identities are created and that examining the origin stories and 'kernels of tradition (*Traditionskerne*)' around which they coalesced would allow historians to study ethnic and other groups as formed by social processes, not as eternal and never-changing. Wenskus and Wolfram thus defined a 'people' by cultural markers rather than bloodlines.[32]

Walter Pohl, once a student of Wolfram at the University of Vienna, began with this focus on a belief in common origins but moved beyond the single 'kernel of traditions' model to a wider model of varied perceptions, circumstances, and modes of identification.[33] Underlying his model are methodological tools and concepts drawn from sociology, anthropology, and literary theory—such as Benedict Anderson's 'imagined communities' and Fredrick Barth and T. H. Eriksen's description of ethnicity as a 'social construct'. These assert that ethnic or national identities are not objective, biological phenomena but instead are tools used within a social

context to make sense of society, reducing some of the complexities so that peoples can be categorized along neat boundaries.[34] Patrick Geary has added to the model the idea of the 'situational construct', which explains seemingly conflicting information about identities that appear in primary sources as reflecting an ability to claim different identities in different circumstances.[35] For him, the Alamanni, the Goths, and other groups were social constructions which occurred in specific situations for specific purposes. These identities were thus capable of constant transformation as circumstances changed.[36]

From an archaeological standpoint, Siân Jones, among others, introduced new ways to consider ethnicity that do not rely on an unprovable correlation of 'culture provinces' to ethnic groups. Like the historians above, Jones sees ethnic identity as based on a shared culture or common descent—whether real or just assumed. She therefore focuses on what the archaeological record reveals about culture and social relationships as a way to understand how they shaped people's conceptions of themselves. Cultural and material elements of a group identity would be negotiated like any other aspect in different ways according to context.[37] Along the same lines, Florin Curta's work has been highly influential for both archaeology and history. He argues that we can see traces of social practice, which may or may not relate to group identification, and can learn from them about the ways people chose to portray themselves within various social constructions, including ethnic ones.[38] His in-depth study of the Slavs demonstrates the construction of a people through contact with and labelling by Byzantine outsiders, drawing on pre-existing cultural traits.[39] In Iberia, there has been an increase in well-documented excavations in the past decade that have added to our understanding of cultural changes within the peninsula. While some tentatively associate these changes with the arrival of Visigoths and their cultural influence, the focus is increasingly on culture and strategic choices of identification rather than biology.[40]

Not everyone agreed with these new historical and archaeological models, however. The most notable critiques of the 'Vienna school' have come from Walter Goffart and his former students at the University of Toronto. Goffart has criticized Wolfram especially as being too 'Germanist' and, like Pirenne, has continually sought in his work to minimize the significance of Germanic incomers on the Roman world.[41] He is famous for his theory of

accommodation, which states that tribal settlers within Roman territory were not invaders but guests entering on Roman terms.[42] However, in an article from 2008, he removed the legacy of Germanic or barbarian tribes entirely, arguing that because the barbarians settled in Roman provinces and adopted Roman ways at the empire's encouragement, these peoples ceased to be barbarians and became Roman. Thus the successors to the Roman Empire were not Germanic barbarians but Romans, and through them Roman civilization fathered the early medieval kingdoms 'without interruption'.[43] In his 2006 *Barbarian Tides*, Goffart states that his central concern is to 'liberate barbarian history from the German nationalism that has suffused it ever since the sixteenth century,' a goal which he accomplishes in part by using the term 'barbarian' rather than 'Germanic,' thus including tribes which were not Germanic-speaking.

Alexander C. Murray follows his mentor's lead in specifically attacking the concept of *Traditionskern* and the Vienna school, which he sees as both employing bad evidence and, in recent years, reviving ideas of biological kinship which Wenskus had rejected. He (rightly) challenges the existence of source evidence for the use of origin legends as kernels of tradition, and also (less correctly) views the concept of the situational or social construct as 'arbitrary' and merely a way to force contradictory evidence into the Vienna model.[44] Andrew Gillett highlights selective source use by early supporters of *Traditionskern* theories, particularly regarding royal titles. While literary histories employ ethnic titles like 'king of the Goths', fifth- and sixth-century official royal documents do not, leading Gillett to caution against seeing such titles as official bearers of tradition and accepting them without first interrogating the source.[45] The situational construct approach has also been rejected generally as going too far to a nihilist extreme; identity becomes meaningless and arbitrary if it is 'so evanescent as to be a will-o-the-wisp', allowing a person to choose to be a Roman one day and a Goth the next however he wished.[46]

Many of these are reasonable and valid critiques. Early work by Wenskus and Wolfram did indeed make a number of assumptions that do not stand up under scrutiny.[47] In addition, some more recent work, like that of Peter Heather, claims to support the idea of social construction while continuing to rely on elements of a biological paradigm.[48] Other criticisms, though, descend into polemic.[49] The most stark of these is Murray's superfluous mention of

Otto Höfler and his Nazi patron Heinrich Himmler in an article about Wenskus, which seems to exist only to encourage the reader to associate Wenskus and his followers with the stain of their nationalism.[50] Some of these criticisms, though, are simply mistaken. As both Walter Pohl and Ian Wood have noted, the specific elements used to dismiss the work of those associated with the Vienna school is extremely dated. The field has moved on and few of those writing today can be said to represent the same ethnogenesis theory of forty years ago.[51]

The intent of social constructionists is also misunderstood, in part because early presentations of the theory, at least in English, were unclear. Proponents do not view social construction as arbitrary and infinitely flexible, but as operating within the limits available within one's society.[52] A pale-skinned, blonde American could not legitimately claim African-American identity and be accepted as such by others, for example, but someone with one African-American and one Caucasian parent whose skin and hair colour lay between the two extremes could *potentially* claim either identity depending on the circumstance. Also essential for understanding the situational construct is the fact that no individual need be identified in only one way. There are multiple forms or modes of identification—ethnic, religious, political, gender, citizenship, linguistic—and a person could be labelled according to any or all of these categories. We should consider a person's identity multidimensional, layered, and a composite of various aspects, not flat and static.[53] Within any given aspect of one's identity there are also layers. Christians can be subdivided into Catholics, Protestants, Lutherans, fundamentalists, and evangelists among others. A Charlestonian is also a South Carolinian, and a Southerner, and an American. Some of these layers or modes of identification matter more in a given place, time, or circumstance than others, and the ways people choose to claim (or not claim) an affiliation may depend on this salience. Terms like American or Christian or Roman could also shift in meaning over time, or refer to more than one of these forms or layers at a time.[54] Thus the same person being referred to as a Goth and a Roman in the early medieval sources is not necessarily a contradiction; it is more likely to be a reflection of the varied possible meanings or layers each term could have, the salience of each aspect fluctuating over time, and the ability of that individual to claim each in different ways or in different situations.

The interests of Pohl and of others who draw on his methods (myself included) have indeed moved beyond the early *Traditionskern* model to concentrate more on the processes that underlie ethnic and other forms of identification and the ways these continually transformed group identities.[55] Recent projects have asked how various 'visions of community' were created and reinforced by drawing on available resources from the past for use in the present, and which sorts of visions were deemed most useful for which purposes. Some scholars have made important contributions to our understanding of these visions by examining the Biblical, patristic, and early historiographical sources that authors drew on to tell new stories about who the 'Franks' or the 'Christian people' were.[56] Some have focused in on strategies of identification or distinction that helped people feel a sense of commonality that could strengthen a particular identity or add new nuances to it.[57] Some specifically analyse the repertoires or discourses that determined the limits within which the navigation of a changing social landscape could occur, and the degree of room for manoeuvre (or *Spielräume*, as Helmut Reimitz puts it) afforded as both circumstances and identities shifted.[58] Overall, practitioners of this method, which is fast becoming the new standard, concern themselves with perception and the mechanisms of social change—and identification's role in that process.

The use of the term 'ethnic' and the concept of ethnicity to describe identities like Frank, Goth, and Roman has also developed since Wenskus' time. These are particularly controversial because of the wide variety of ways scholars across disciplines have used them. Again, the stereotypical and popular image of ethnicity is linked to biology, envisioning Germanness or Gothicness as inherent in the blood and an unchangeable attribute from birth. This is manifestly untrue, but that does not change the fact that people both in the distant past and today have used the concept to structure their visions of how society is structured and to assign identities to groups and individuals. Fredegar's descriptions of Francia as containing many different peoples, including Franks, Romans, Burgundians, and Saxons, exist regardless of our ability to easily label and understand these ways of thinking about the social landscape.

Walter Pohl has recently written an excellent, explanation of the problems inherent in writing about ethnicity on a scholarly level and of his best practice for attempting to explain ethnic visions of community despite the difficulties, which is the most workable existing

model.[59] Pohl defines ethnic identity as 'a relational mode of social organization among a number of distinctive groups, which are perceived as being constituted by an ingrained common nature'. Ethnicity, then, is this way of imagining and organizing the world, as well as the discourse that gives meaning to it.[60] That is, people talk about German and French identity, or Gothic and Roman identity, *as if* they were inherent in a person's genes even though modern science and social science shows they actually are not. In order to understand how people who thought in this ethnic manner understood their social landscape—how, despite the apparent paradox, the reality of social construction could co-exist with the idea of permanence in people's minds and affect their interactions with each other—we must acknowledge that ethnicity and ethnic discourse could be 'real', 'natural' phenomena in people's minds.

To do this, Pohl has moved away from looking for the 'ideal types' defined by a list of necessary criteria to quantify what 'counted' as an ethnic identity through which Franks could distinguish themselves from Romans and other peoples to instead focus on perception.[61] When did people in the early Middle Ages choose to use ethnic discourse as opposed to other ways of imagining and discussing their society? How did they do so, and for what purposes? What use was ethnicity as a strategy of identification compared with other ways people could identify themselves and others? How did authors use ethnic visions of community (that is, visions of multiple peoples who could be described with ethnonyms) in concert with political, religious, civic, regional, or other identities to both describe and shape their social landscape? Considering these questions is not slipping back into essentialism; it is assessing the ways our authors played on the *idea* of essentialism—or refrained from doing so—to specific effect.[62]

Applying This Method

In this book, I draw directly on this new Vienna methodology to understand the meanings of the ethnonyms Roman, Goth, and Frank in the Merovingian and Visigothic kingdoms of the sixth and seventh centuries, and the ways Romans negotiated their new social landscape—eventually losing their Roman identity in favour of the Gothic or Frankish identity of their rulers. As I will show, the essential mechanism behind this change depends greatly on the ability of these terms to be used in multiple ways in this period, especially with political,

religious, and descent overtones. One could be a Goth or a Frank in a political sense as subjects of the 'kings of the Goths/Franks', as officials serving in their government, or as soldiers fighting for their army. This aspect of a person's identity corresponded to their residence within a specific post-Roman kingdom and, as we shall see, would be most likely to appear in the written sources in international contexts, such as when two armies fought against each other or envoys were sent from one king to another. The most relevant identity to mention in these cases was the one that highlighted the king and kingdom on whose behalf they acted. In Visigothic Spain, one could also be Roman or Gothic by religion. Until 589, when the Visigoths converted from the Arian form of Christianity to the Catholic one, it was regularly assumed (and often true) that people born to Gothic families professed Arian Christianity and those descended from former Roman citizens followed Catholic Christianity. After conversion, the ruling Visigoths deliberately tied their Gothic identity to their new Catholic faith instead, and so 'Gothic religion' came to indicate Catholicism rather than Arianism.[63] We will also see that, in both Gaul and Spain, one could also be a Roman, Goth, or Frank by descent from ancestors who successfully claimed these identities.

All three of these aspects of identity—political, religious, and descent—could overlap, and the ways they did so can tell us a great deal about shifting scripts of identity—that is, changes in the ways people thought and wrote about being Roman or Gothic or Frankish as they found themselves in new circumstances. For example, Gregory of Tours, writing in sixth-century Gaul, could have claimed to be Roman by descent and Catholic by faith, a Frank politically as a loyal subject of Merovingian kings, and also a variety of other identities not associated with these ethnonyms, like senatorial social status, residence of the city of Tours, and descent from a prominent religious family that provided many bishops and clergymen. He did not claim all of these explicitly, but they were all among the repertoire of possible choices he had to place himself within a contemporary social context. Gregory chose to emphasize those layers of his identity that mattered most to him and served his particular strategies when writing his *Histories* and accounts of saints' lives. These included numerous references to important family members whose status as senators, bishops, and good Catholics he emphasized. In the process, he implied all these things about himself as well.[64] Other authors,

like Venantius Fortunatus, made different choices within the same social landscape, accentuating noble social status and Romanness in many forms. Isidore of Seville was instrumental in shaping a vision of a unified Gothic Catholic Spain, in part by playing on the intersections of religious, political, and descent scripts of Gothicness.[65] Fredegar envisioned a diverse Frankish kingdom along ethnic lines—as comprised of multiple 'peoples' labelled with ethnonyms rather than other types of identifiers like Gregory's social status or city labels.[66] His strategy of identification thus allowed ethnic diversity to coexist with political unity by acknowledging that these affiliations were compatible rather than contradictory aspects of his contemporaries' identities. Individuals' identities were not monolithic but composite, not mutually exclusive but overlapping and interacting, and each of these authors provides a different lens through which to view these identities in context.

As historians, we have a glimpse into the social world of the past through the different types of descriptions authors left behind, and these descriptions bear the marks of their authors' motives, experiences, and identities—themselves marked by the society around them. By examining the choices each author made, historians can thus see beyond the authors themselves to the shifting meanings of these identities within their societies and the ways they and their contemporaries drew on these to negotiate their place within a world that was rapidly changing. These authors provide hints as to which identities mattered most, how they were constructed, and what the consequences of their importance were in specific times and places. We will see in the chapters that follow that a decline in identification as Roman in Visigothic Iberia corresponds directly to an increase in political and religious aspects of Gothic identity. Hispano-Romans who came to feel Gothic through political loyalties and a common Catholic faith gradually ceased to connect with their Roman ancestry at all. In Merovingian Gaul, the dominance of classical ways of identifying people—such as by noble social status, city of residence, and well-known relatives— makes way by the mid-seventh century to an increase in individuals identified as Roman who now appear to be exceptions to an increasingly Frankish norm. Parallel to this development is, like in Spain, an increase in phrases that associate Frankishness with political affiliation—kings of the Franks, armies of the Franks, and 'the Franks' as a unit for collective action. Through an analysis of historical, hagiographical, and legal

sources from both the Visigothic and Merovingian kingdoms, this study will trace the developments of these identity shifts and illuminate the reasons for differences in experience between the two kingdoms.

Chapter Breakdown

Part one of this book will address Iberia under Visigothic rule. Chapter one begins with the sixth century, which culminated in the conversion of the Goths to Catholicism. It demonstrates that the Visigothic kings Leovigild and Reccared intended to provide a common religious identity for Romans and Goths, both before and during the conversion. While an exact correlation of Goths with Arianism and Romans with Catholicism is too simplistic, and there were important exceptions who were Goths by birth and Catholic by faith (or Romans by birth and Arian by faith), the common assumption that descent and religious affiliations mapped precisely onto one another was an ideological barrier to kingdom-wide unity. It needed to be eliminated from the collective imagination before unity could progress. So integral to people's mindsets was the idea that John of Biclar's *Chronicle* ends with the story of the conversion as the culmination of the Goths' journey to salvation. He presents their conquest of the Iberian peninsula as an essential part of the unification that allowed the Goths to bring everyone within the region together in a harmonious, Catholic community. Isidore of Seville's *History of the Goths* also depicts the Visigoths as divinely ordained to unify the peninsula, in part through their conversion. Records of the Third Church Council of Toledo at which Reccared made the conversion official are full of language linking the Gothic 'people' with Catholic orthodoxy and showing explicit official intent to shape the social discourse to accommodate both Goths and Romans in a single community. Finally, in the *Lives of the Fathers of Mérida*, a source written in the 630s about events in the late sixth century, a Catholic Goth and a Catholic Roman are shown cooperating against a common Arian enemy, emphasizing that Iberia's divide should not be along ethnic lines but along religious ones.

Chapter two covers the early seventh century, the age of Isidore of Seville, following the adoption of Catholicism through a period of growing emphasis on Gothic Catholic strategies of identification. Isidore's own history of this period, and the Fourth Council of Toledo over which

he presided, show active promotion of a Gothic identity based around Catholicism, and thus open to those of Roman descent. The subsequent Fifth and Sixth Councils of Toledo reiterate the common message that all loyal, Catholic subjects were considered 'Goths' on both a religious and a political level. Chapter three illustrates the effectiveness of Isidore's and his successors' vision of community by examining the language of the *Visigothic Code* of 654 and later secular and canon law. The *Code* formally eliminated Roman-Gothic differences, and soon after, neither 'Roman' nor 'Goth' merit regular mention in either narrative or legal sources. This suggests that assimilation was so extensive that these identities no longer needed mentioning. Difference was viewed along other lines, like political factions and Christian versus Jew. Overall, in the Iberian peninsula under Visigothic rule, the opening of religious Gothicness to all Catholics made it easier for those of Roman descent to envision themselves as Goths on a political level and eventually for this Gothicness to supersede their Roman identity on all levels.

Part Two turns to sixth- and seventh-century Merovingian Gaul, where a similar phenomenon occurs but with less thorough assimilation in this somewhat different environment. Chapter four examines the language of Gregory of Tours, the sixth-century historian and hagiographer. Gregory is well-known for not using the term 'Roman' to describe himself and contemporaries. This chapter will show that the reason for this is not that no one identified as Roman anymore by his time, nor that using ethnonyms would interfere with his ability to promote strategies of Christian identification. Instead, the main reason is that the urban identities, family connections, and social status markers that mattered greatly in Roman times remained especially meaningful, salient forms of identity in his society. They were more useful identifiers for him within this environment, in most cases, than broader categories like Roman and Frank. Chapter five compares Gregory with his contemporary, the poet Venantius Fortunatus. Because Fortunatus did refer to some of his poetic subjects as Romans, his choice of terms illustrates the ways contemporaries negotiated identity shifts, especially the rising importance of descent as a way to identify as Roman. Fortunatus drew on literary resources from the Roman world to flatter, chastise, and eulogize his poetic subjects according to recognizable though slightly adapted scripts of identity.

Chapter six moves ahead to the seventh century and the *Chronicle* of Fredegar. This *Chronicle* uses Roman, Frank, and other ethnonyms frequently and includes many examples of political Frankishness that are mostly absent from Gregory and Fortunatus' work. Thus it sheds light on the increasing adoption of Frankish identity, especially along political lines, which appears to have made Romanness an exception worth mentioning. Chapter seven considers the evidence of three hagiographical works that show that the language of the three major narrative sources can be considered representative of the period. The *Life* of Caesarius of Arles from the mid-sixth century reads much like Gregory's *Histories*. Locals of Roman descent are described by city of origin or residence, important or noteworthy relatives, and senatorial or other social status. Because Arles changed hands from the Visigoths to the Ostrogoths to the Franks during Caesarius' time, however, these peoples appear regularly in the narrative and are described by these ethnonyms, particularly with political nuances tying them to their roles as soldiers, officers, or envoys for the ruling kingdoms. Gaugeric of Cambrai's *Life*, written in the early seventh century, describes both a Roman and a Frank as possessing these identities 'by birth' and depicts a society in which these two peoples lived alongside one another, served in both church and secular offices together, and had begun to experience significant cultural overlaps. Finally, the *Life* of Eligius of Noyon from the later seventh century presents an image of a highly mixed society. Groups of soldiers and envoys include Romans, Franks, Burgundians, and even a Saxon. The author, like Fredegar, seems to assume that such intermixing is normal and that his audience will want to know the background—often specifically 'by birth'—of these individuals more than any other mode of identification he could use. Eligius himself is identified as a Roman, but only in a context in which it stands out as exceptional. Together these three saints' *Lives* confirm that ethnic forms of identification became more important in Gaul over the course of these two centuries and that Roman identity began to stand out as an anomaly and mentioned more often as one of a variety of peoples living harmoniously together under Frankish rule.

In comparing these two kingdoms that are usually studied in isolation, this study will highlight the commonalities of experience during the transition from a more Roman to a more medieval world. In the sixth century, authors like Gregory of Tours, whose society retained

many Roman characteristics, saw themselves and others through a Roman lens, leading them to write about 'barbarians' and 'senators', eloquence and civility, and home cities and noble relatives. Even hagiographers in the more clearly divided Spain of this time noted these characteristics when discussing individuals on a local level. Later authors, like Fredegar and Isidore of Seville, wrote within a different framework, projecting images of a far more Frankish or Gothic society, and reinforcing these very images through the act of relating them. That they saw many of their countrymen as Franks or Goths indicates that an important mental shift had begun to take place between Gregory's time and their own. The emphasis on political language in Fredegar's writing and on unified political, religious, and descent rhetoric in Isidore's reveals how these identities were reconstructed in ways that facilitated this shift from Roman to Frank or Goth. Gallo- and Hispano-Romans gradually came to associate themselves politically and religiously with their new rulers, and most of them would, over the course of a few generations, come to identify entirely as Goths and Franks. In the wake of this political shift, their social landscape and their experiences of the world—and consequently the identity they held as most essential and deeply rooted—had ceased to be 'Roman'.

Terminological Note

Two of my particular choices of terminology and approach differ from other scholars and require additional explanation. In this study, I will focus more on differentiating between the political, religious, and descent overtones with which authors used the terms Roman, Goth, and Frank than on whether we should consider these examples as representing 'ethnic' identification. In doing so, I depart slightly from the language used by Pohl and many others writing along Vienna-school lines, though not from the spirit of these studies. I make this choice because there are still many scholars who will latch onto any use of the terms 'ethnic' or 'ethnicity' in studies of the early medieval world and subsequently read into the rest of the study their own preconceived notions and expectations of what this should mean, whether it is useful as a category, and how to delineate it. An excellent example of this is the neglect until quite recently of studies of Roman identity in the early Middle Ages.[67] Because 'Roman' in the ancient world is most closely associated with cultural and legal identities, it is regularly assumed

to be unable to function as an ethnic term denoting one 'people' alongside Franks, Goths, and others. This is a scholarly blind spot caused by expectations which colour historians' views of the sources and what can be learned from them. Yet, as we will see in this study, Roman identity *did* come to be seen in some aspects as ethnic, as just one among many peoples defined in the same way (however that happened to be). By leaving aside judgment as to whether or not the political, religious, or descent overtones authors used constituted ethnic discourse, I hope to focus attention on how people re-envisioned their identities by altering the balance of these aspects and by drawing on the interplay between them. This will both highlight the multiple layers of identity which contemporaries could claim, regardless of what ethnic group they might be associated with, and allow the sources to speak more for themselves and less to any particular taxonomy into which we historians may wish to fit them.

The second terminological choice to explain is my use of Spain and Iberia interchangeably to describe the kingdom ruled by the Visigoths and the peninsula where it was located. It has become common in the past decade to replace 'Spain' with 'Iberia' in scholarly works on the Iberian peninsula, and the title of the 'Late Antique and Early Medieval Iberia' series of which this book is part of this trend. There are good reasons to make this change, most especially that throughout history this geographical region has been politically divided more than it has been unified, and not all of these polities have used 'Spain' in their descriptions of themselves—including, of course, modern Portugal. 'Iberia' focuses our attention on the geographical region rather than the modern borders of Spain and reminds us that there is a difference between the peninsula and the countries within it. However, it is in its own ways problematic. Visigoths regularly used *Hispania* to refer to their kingdom, referring to the Roman name for this part of the empire. The modern translation of this term is 'Spain'. But geographically neither *Hispania* nor Iberia covers the province of Gallia Narbonensis or Septimania that the Visigoths also ruled, a territory that was within Roman Gaul and is currently part of France. The Visigoths dealt with this imperfectly, sometimes using *Hispania* as an imprecise but easier way to refer to their whole kingdom, and sometimes using *Hispania* and *Gallia* instead. There are no perfect solutions to this terminological quandary, and while I agree that Iberia has its advantages and have used it in this study, I also use Spain when it seems the

more obvious choice in context. They should be read interchangeably and understood to refer to the entire Visigothic kingdom, in the same imprecise manner that *Hispania* for the Visigoths often included their Gallic territories too.

Part One: From a Roman to a Gothic World in Visigothic Spain

In the spring of 507, King Alaric II of the Visigoths was killed while fighting the Frankish king Clovis at the Battle of Vouillé in Gaul.[68] As the Franks moved in to control the former Visigothic territory in the region, the defeated Visigoths retreated from their Gallic capital at Toulouse into the territory they loosely controlled in Spain, keeping only the southern region of Septimania (which they called Gallia or Gallia Narbonensis) of all their Gallic possessions. From this point on, their home would be Spain. Over the course of the sixth century, they would come to dominate the peninsula and to wrest its other inhabitants into (sometimes uneasy) submission. These inhabitants included Germanic Sueves who had settled in Gallaecia, Basques in the north, and the citizens of the former western Roman Empire whom we often call Hispano-Romans.

As these Romans adapted to being ruled by the Visigoths, their Roman identity would also adapt and ultimately fade away. Unlike in Gaul, as we will see later, this process in Spain was aided by the kings. After a period of Ostrogothic regency, succession crises, and a civil war leading to Byzantine control of some lands along the Mediterranean, Leovigild (r. 569-586) came to the throne.[69] He promptly began a campaign of unification, on multiple levels. Politically, he asserted full, central control over most of the Iberian peninsula. He conquered both semi-independent cities like Córdoba and entire regions like the Suevic kingdom in the northwest—including territory in the south which his rebelling son, Hermenegild, had claimed in the early 580s—and he asserted greater control over places which he already held, like Mérida.[70] Although for purposes of propaganda, these land gains were portrayed as reconquests by a rightful ruler, much of the territory which Leovigild 'regained' had probably never truly been under Visigothic control.[71] He also built a new city named for his other son, Reccared, to assert his authority and to portray himself as a proper imperial successor.[72] Along with this territorial unification, Leovigild attempted ethnic unification by giving official sanction in his revised law code to marriages between those of Gothic and Roman descent. It is possible that intermixing was already common, but Leovigild gave it the symbolic weight of his seal of approval. Finally, he encouraged religious unification by making conversion from Catholicism to Arianism easier and, in his mind, hopefully more appealing by eliminating from Arian doctrine

the requirement of rebaptism for converts from Catholicism. His son, Reccared (r. 586-601), completed the unity his father had begun – though not the way Leovigild would have wished – by converting to Catholicism in 587 and taking the entire kingdom with him over the next two years. The conversion was made official at the Third Council of Toledo (589), opening the way for the collaboration between church and state that would be a hallmark of the seventh-century kingdom, though there were still a few revolts by Arians who opposed the change.[73] Both kings were motivated in these actions by a desire to strengthen their hold over the peninsula and bring the fairly separate populations they ruled into union.

The period from 589 to the middle of the seventh century was one of consolidation. Religious unity led to increased persecution of those, like Jews, who did not conform, as with the harsh laws restricting them and forcing their conversion enacted by Sisebut (r. 612-621). Consolidation also occurred on a territorial level. During Sisebut's reign, the Byzantines were pushed out of some of their holdings, with Suinthila (r. 621-631) finally defeating them and seizing all their territory in Spain in the 620s. This was also the age of Isidore of Seville, the prolific author and influential religious leader who chaired church councils, wrote a history of the Goths, and served as both advisor and tutor to Sisebut.

After a series of short reigns and coups, Chindaswinth (r. 642-653) was elected king. He and his son, Recceswinth (r. 653-672), issued a number of laws which Recceswinth published in 654 along with a collection of old laws which were to remain in force. His *Visigothic Code* (*Lex Visigothorum*) superseded all previous codes and would remain the centrepiece of Spanish law long after the demise of the Visigothic kingdom. The promulgation of this code, and a similarly focused church council the following year, marks the last stage of the shift to Gothic identity in the seventh century. In rescinding previous laws, the *Visigothic Code* set out one law explicitly for 'Goths and Romans alike'. Though the variety of law books used in the Visigothic kingdom probably all applied universally anyway, the compilation of the valid ones into a single document made a strong statement of unity. From this point on, Roman identity virtually disappears from the record. The identities that mattered most at the end of the seventh century were allegiances to the right political factions and renunciation of Judaism in favour of Christianity. Recceswinth's successor, Wamba (r. 672-680), faced a revolt in Septimania that

one of his generals, a duke named Paul, joined. He suppressed the revolt, but was later deposed in suspicious circumstances while he was ill, and Ervig (r. 680-687) took the throne. Ervig quickly held a church council to legitimize his rule and repeal some of the unpopular laws which Wamba had enacted. He added his own laws to the *Visigothic Code,* restricting the activities of the Jews, and reissued it. Civil war plagued the kingdom in the early eighth century, and in 711 the invading Arabs seized control of all but a small northern strip of the peninsula. The Visigothic kingdom in Spain had come to an end.

This section will explore the process by which the shift from Roman to Gothic identity occurred through these three main periods. First we will investigate the era of Leovigild and Reccared and the expansion of options for identifying as Gothic which the latter's conversion facilitated. The texts of Isidore's time will then be examined as deliberate promoters of political and religious Gothicness. Finally, the language of the *Visigothic Code* and later secular and church law will reveal the absence of 'Roman' and eventually even 'Gothic' labels, a sign that assimilation was so thorough that these were no longer the most salient, remarkable strategies of identification within the Visigothic social landscape.

Chapter 1: Arians to Catholics

Study of Visigothic Spain prior to 589 is hampered the paucity of contemporary texts. Some of our key sources for events of this time were written between 620 and 640—early enough that their authors might have witnessed some events and be able to interview other witnesses, but possibly using language current to the time of writing rather than that of events. However, their language can shed light on how this earlier period was viewed in the decades that followed and reflect early seventh-century perceptions of the changes that took place. They also cover many of the same events as the earlier sources and can help us to better piece together a picture of sixth-century Iberia.

Two main observations can be made of the language in these texts. First, that religious divisions were expected to map closely onto ancestral ones. Historically, the Goths were followers of the Arian variety of Christianity, with many of them originally converted by Ulfila.[74] Sources for sixth-century Spain therefore tend to assume that all people identifying as of Gothic descent followed Arian doctrine. This is not just because the authors whose works survive were themselves Catholics, or because later authors may have generalized for ease or out of ignorance—council records show that even the kings framed their visions of the Gothic community as Arian (and after conversion, as Catholic). Of course, there were exceptions that did not match the assumed stereotype, and their existence could cause problems for kings trying to promote a specific narrative of who and what their people were, as we will see. Secondly, the texts of this period clearly demonstrate that the conversion of 'the entire people of the Goths' was both intended and viewed as a conscious attempt at unifying the diverse populations of Iberia. The close association between Arianism and Gothic identity—and between Catholicism and Roman identity—that pervaded the common contemporary discourse was a barrier to imagining all subjects as a single people. Conversion of one group to the other's faith was an important strategy to encourage social cohesion.

There are four main sources that help us understand the available repertoires of identification in this period. Two are contemporary: John of Biclar's *Chronicle* and the records of the Third Council of Toledo. The other two were written in the 620s-630s: the *History of the Goths* of Isidore of Seville and the hagiographical *Lives of the Fathers of Mérida*. We will look at

the evidence of each in turn, and then explore the implications their combined witness suggests.

John of Biclar's *Chronicle*

Most of what we know about John of Biclar (c. 540-c. 621) comes from Isidore's account of him in his *Lives of Famous Men*. He wrote that John was born in Scallabis in Lusitania (modern Santarém in Portugal) and was 'a Goth by nation (*natione Gothus*)', that is, born to parents who identified as Goths.[75] As a youth, John lived in Constantinople, where he was educated in Greek and Latin learning, and upon his return to Spain in the 570s he was soon exiled by the Arian king Leovigild for refusing to convert from Catholicism to Arianism. As a 'Goth' who was also a devout Catholic, he made obvious the imperfect nature of Leovigild's ideal of a uniformly Arian Gothic people.[76] When he was allowed to return, John founded a monastery at Biclar before being appointed bishop of Girona c. 591.[77]

John's *Chronicle* covers the years 567 through 590. It was written in the format of a universal chronicle and presented as a continuation of that begun by Eusebius, and like other early medieval chronicles, it is succinct and meant to tell when things happened rather than to explain the events in detail.[78] John listed the events of each year, beginning with the regnal dates of first the Eastern emperor and later both the emperor and the Visigothic king, and including events pertaining to each realm. He provided greater detail on a few occasions, most notably the Third Council of Toledo celebrating the conversion of the kingdom to Catholicism. Most historians agree that John began writing the *Chronicle* c. 590 in the context of the conversion, and finished or revised it a decade later.[79]

John's aims in writing appear to be twofold. First, he intended to fit the events of his home kingdom into the wider world represented by the empire, and particularly its Christian history. This made the chronicle genre—which tended to have a broad, universal focus—ideal for his purposes.[80] Secondly, he wished to tell the story of the Visigothic kingdom's integration into the Catholic community: the story of its salvation. For this reason, his longest entries are those for 589 and 590, at the time of the official conversion and its immediate aftermath. It also explains his positive portrayal of Leovigild despite his own exile at this king's hands. Leovigild

unified the peninsula, which was a necessary prerequisite for its religious unification, and so John depicted him as a defender and preserver of Spain who played an essential part in the divine plan to evangelize it.[81]

Because of John's desire to set this tale of Gothic salvation into the greater narrative of the world—that is, for him, the empire—Byzantines and other peoples from the Mediterranean region appear frequently in his *Chronicle*. In most cases, this is in a political context—as armies and kings of a people or an ethnonym meant to represent the army or the entire population. In the entry for 571, for example, 'the emperor Justin' defeated 'the Persians' and made conquered territories 'Roman provinces', though once 'the emperor of the Persians' prepared for war, 'the Persians' broke peace treaties with 'the Romans' and launched their own attack.[82] 'King Alboin of the Lombards' was killed by a faction loyal to his wife, but his wealth was claimed by 'the Roman state (*res publica Romana*)' and 'the Lombards' found themselves without king or treasure.[83] In Thrace in 576, 'the Sclaveni' destroyed many 'Roman cities' and the 'Avars' set up blockades along the coast.[84] Maurice, as *magister militum* in the east, waged war against the Persians, and in 582 he became 'emperor of the Romans'.[85]

These examples illustrate the degree to which John's story was one of peoples and kingdoms. The entries about activities among the Goths in Spain usually follow those of others and show them as part of this wider world. It was a world still in many ways centred on the Byzantine/Eastern Roman Empire, with the reigns of each emperor acknowledged and imperial actors sometimes not specified as 'Roman'. Maurice, for example, is simply '*magister militum* in the east', with the audience expected to know that he was a Byzantine official.[86] Usually, though, the empire interacting with its neighbours appears as 'the Romans'. The exception to this general rule is in Spain. John ignored the existence of imperial territory on the Iberian peninsula except for one occasion: Hermenegild's flight to 'the *res publica*' during battle with his father, Leovigild.[87] Clearly he remained in Iberia, because his father captured him later in Córdoba, though the *Chronicle* does not elaborate. John, as we have seen, lived in Constantinople for a number of years, and nowhere in his writing does he envision the empire as an enemy. This may be the reason we see so little of the Byzantines in Spain; he bore them

no ill will and preferred not to show the two main protagonists of his account—them and the Goths—in conflict.

Within the Iberian peninsula, various peoples appear, often in battle with the Goths. In 573, Leovigild invaded Sabaria and took it from 'the Sappi', and the previous year the 'Ruccones' warred with Miro, 'king of the Sueves'.[88] Until the 580s, there was an independent kingdom under the rule of Sueves in Galicia in northwest Spain. John tells that in 570 Miro was made 'king of the Sueves' after Theodemir.[89] Miro, again as 'king of the Sueves', died in battle supporting Hermenegild and was succeeded by his son, though quickly Audeca seized 'the kingdom of the Sueves' from him.[90] In 585, Leovigild, who had previously harassed 'the borders of the Sueves', laid waste to Galicia, captured and deposed Audeca, and made 'the people, treasure, and land of the Sueves' a province 'of the Goths'.[91] These Sueves then disappear almost entirely from the narrative, subsumed into 'the Goths'. In all of these examples, there is a clear political meaning. Sueves are the subjects of the 'king of the Sueves' or residents of his kingdom, directly serving or being subordinate to the king and defined according to their subject relationship. This is an unsurprising choice of scripts of identity for a world chronicle like John's, as kings and their subjects are the most common protagonists.

Often, though, John depicted Leovigild's enemies as rebels by town and territory. In Cantabria, Leovigild killed the 'invaders (*pervasores*)' and 'restored' the province to his domain.[92] Likewise, through the betrayal of 'a certain Framidaneus', he 'restored' the city of Sidonia to the jurisdiction 'of the Goths' and killed its soldiers.[93] In 572, he occupied the city of Córdoba, 'which had long rebelled against the Goths', killed the 'enemies (*hostes*)' and many 'peasants (*rustici*)', and restored many cities and fortresses to 'the dominion of the Goths'.[94] Five years later, 'King Leovigild' took Orospeda; soon after, 'the Goths' had to suppress a rebellion by the *rustici* there, but thenceforth the area was held by 'the Goths'.[95] In these passages, John selected words that suggested the Gothic kings had the right to rule all of the peninsula. Their opponents were invaders and rebels, and the lands were 'restored' to where they belonged: the Visigothic kingdom. In reality, the 'invaders' in Cantabria had probably been locals who had resided there since the era of the Roman Empire and the 'rebels' semi-independent under the decentralized rule of earlier kings; they were not newly struggling to

secede but attempting to maintain the devolved status quo.[96] This, however, did not fit with John's aims. His vision of a united Catholic community depended on territorial unity, for which Leovigild was, in his mind, the agent of God. All of Spain belonged to him, because it was through him that they were destined to join Reccared in conversion to the true faith.

The Goths, of course, are the chief protagonists here and are frequently mentioned by name. In the above examples, we see 'the Goths' used to refer to Leovigild's army that suppressed rebellions and oversaw territory. These soldiers might have included people of various backgrounds: Gothic, Roman, Sueve, Basque, and any others who had already fallen under Leovigild's dominance. They were not all Goths by descent, but they were all Goths by political allegiance. Earlier we saw 'a province of the Goths' meaning an area ruled by the Visigothic king. Athanagild and Reccared are both styled 'king of the Goths', though more often the Visigothic kings are simply mentioned by name or as 'king', much like the Roman emperors might be simply 'emperor'.[97] This is the approach of an insider, that the most important and relevant king is the local one—here the Visigothic king—and the reader should assume any 'king' is Visigothic unless told otherwise.

One group that is not named within John's description of Iberia is descendants of Roman citizens. The only exception is in the context of Hermenegild's rebellion. John described the rebellion as responsible for greater damage in Spain to 'Goths and Romans alike (*tam Gothis quam Romanis*)' than any attack by enemies (*adversariorum infestatio*).[98] The term *infestatio* implies an attack by external enemies; certainly this is the way it was used nearly a century later in a law of Wamba's reign.[99] If the attackers were invaders from outside the kingdom, then the Goths and Romans who were their victims must have been within it. Therefore, these are not Byzantine Romans but native Hispano-Romans, defined not in political terms referring to subjects of the empire but on descent grounds. Consequently, as the other half of the rhetorical pair, 'Goths' here takes on the same sense, implying 'people of Gothic ancestry'. As the two main segments of the Visigothic kingdom's population, which in other circumstances John simply called 'Goths' (i.e., political Goths as subjects of a Gothic king), 'Goths and Romans' represent the entire populace facing a common foreign enemy. For John, the choice to label these groups with ethnonyms that would highlight their distinct ancestries at

this specific point in his work lent rhetorical support to the idea of a harmonious community united behind their king for common benefit.[100] This solidified his depiction of Leovigild as a legitimate leader bringing multiple peoples together into what would soon be a common Christian kingdom.

The one context in which John depicts Leovigild in a negative light is (unsurprisingly) religious, as seeking to expand what he calls 'the Arian sect'. His entry for 580 tells that Leovigild assembled a synod in Toledo to amend 'the ancient heresy' with 'a new error' that seduced 'many of our own' [Catholics] to become Arians.[101] John takes pains to point out that these Catholics did not err because they had a change of heart and truly believed in Arian doctrine, but because they were serving their own self-interest rather than God. The converts can thus be dismissed as not being good Christians anyway. It is clear how John viewed Arianism: as wrong, seductive, heretical, and not 'us'. But he also provides a glimpse into how the Arians would have viewed themselves. In one of the few Arian perspectives that survived the later purge of 'heretical' documents, John quotes the Arian synod's opinion: Arianism was 'our catholic faith' while John's Catholicism was 'the Roman religion'. Each side saw their version of Christianity as 'catholic', meaning universal, and the true faith. For Leovigild and other Arians, their counterparts were therefore identified not as 'catholic' but as Romans. Whether the Arians understood 'Roman' here to mean that these people were natives who followed the doctrine espoused by the bishop of Rome or were Byzantine Romans residing along the coast—or both—is impossible to tell.

While the pope was not yet deemed the absolute authority within the church that he would one day become, he was certainly recognized as someone of particular importance by Catholics in Spain, which could have led Arians to draw a 'Roman' connection between them. Many of Spain's prominent bishops exchanged letters with popes during the sixth and seventh centuries about doctrinal issues, a sign that the latter's views were significant to them. That some of these show veiled hostility and resentment toward the presumption of popes in telling Spanish bishops what they ought to do does not mean that the papal office lacked power and influence (and in fact, Leander of Seville's long friendship with Pope Gregory the Great serves as a counterexample).[102] Nor, really, did the actual state of relations between Iberian Catholics

and the bishop of Rome (or the emperor) matter for Arian perceptions; Rome was a convenient way for them to distinguish the Catholics from their own believers. Thus, in a religious sense, people like John who were Goths 'by birth' would also be categorized as 'Romans'. 'Roman' could be activated as a religious identity for Catholics and likewise 'Goth' could take on a religious flavour in reference to Arianism, without conflicting with the political or descent affiliations that represented other aspects of these individuals' identity.

John then dropped the issue of religious difference until 587, when Reccared, now sole king of Spain, converted to the Roman/Catholic faith, setting in motion the events that would, in theory, deliver all of Iberia to salvation. He describes Reccared approaching priests of 'the Arian sect' and converting them through reason rather than force and by divine grace. In so doing, Reccared 'returned all the people (*gentes*) of the Goths and Sueves to the unity and peace of the Christian church'.[103] Considering that as a people the Goths had never been Catholic, 'return' is an especially interesting choice of words. When John used this word for territory that Leovigild took control of, it implied rightful ownership of the territory. Here it implies that all people's natural state is Catholic Christian—that like Adam and Eve who were once innocent and then sinned, the Goths had an innate correctness they could return to from before the days of their adoption of Arianism. Also important to note is the broad brush with which John painted the Goths; 'all the people of the Goths' converted, implying that all Goths had been followers of Arianism before Reccared. This is certainly not true, and John himself was one of the exceptions. His simplification conflates three ways of being Gothic: Gothicness by religion (Arianism) with Gothicness by descent and Gothicness as a political subject expected to follow the king's will, conforming to the filters of contemporary discourse through which his audience would understand the term 'Goth'. It was both a strategic selection of language that would best reach his audience and a play on the overlapping nuances of Gothic identity to make Reccared's conversion an even more momentous event in the history of Iberia.

John's entry for the following year tells that 'some of the Arians', including Segga and the bishop Sunna, tried to seize power and were exiled.[104] Sunna, who also appears in the *Lives of the Fathers of Mérida*, was one of a number of Arians who did not accept conversion peacefully. There, he is a main character whose wicked actions are described in detail; here,

such Arians are dealt with in a quick, short entry as if unfortunate anomalies. The events of 589 and 590, which are all about the victory of Catholics, receive much more attention. First, John summarizes a conflict with the Franks in the region of Septimania, a Visigothic-controlled territory around Narbonne which lay within the old Roman province of Gallia Narbonensis. When Claudius, the duke of Lusitania, arrived with the Gothic army, the Franks fled and the army 'was killed by the Goths'.[105] Their victory is depicted as a divine reward for conversion, with 'divine grace and the Catholic faith' at work, despite the fact that the Franks were also Catholic. John reiterates here that 'King Reccared along with the Goths' had recently adopted the Catholic faith, again imagining 'the Goths' as a homogenous group, and conflating a political meaning of an army serving the Gothic king with a religious emphasis as newly converted Catholics. The intersection of these two ways of identifying as a Goth was what brought them their victory.

Next, John described the Third Council of Toledo at which the official conversion of the Gothic people and the banning of Arian practice in the Visigothic kingdom was recorded. The bishops 'from all of Spain, Gaul [Septimania], and Galicia' were present—that is, every province that the Visigoths ruled—as was 'the most Christian Reccared'.[106] A confession of faith was made by Reccared, all the priests, and 'the Gothic people'. The account finishes with a summary of the beginning of the Arian heresy and a celebration of its end, here in Spain. He thus portrays Iberian events as of global importance—a turning point when the Arian heresy has vanished from the world and peace can now descend upon it. The Goths have not only joined the larger community of saved Catholics, they have eliminated one of the faith's greatest enemies.[107]

Overall, John's *Chronicle* portrays the Visigothic kingdom as the rightful home of the Goths, who come to be defenders and spreaders of Catholic Christianity. Multiple aspects of Gothic identity proved relevant to his story. Gothicness could represent a religious identity— first Arianism and then Catholicism. Simplifying a messy reality by equating all earlier Goths with Arian heresy and all later Goths with correct Catholicism served to promote a unified community. If all were now of the same faith, they could better imagine their other differences as inconsequential. Gothicness could be used to denote ancestry, as descendants of other Goths, though John used this meaning less often. This sense would remain after conversion, but

it would matter less than the ability for 'Goths and Romans alike' to work together against external enemies and to follow the same rules and regulations set out in the first united church council of all Iberia's peoples. Gothicness could also designate a political community of loyal subjects, like an army simply referred to as 'the Goths'; even before conversion, all residents were considered Goths in this sense. Others he defined as opponents or subsets of this Gothic community: Sueves to be conquered in Galicia, peasants rebelling against Leovigild's domination, or cities allying with the rebellious prince Hermenegild. His interpretation of the social landscape reflects his interest in recording the joining of the Goths to the wider Christian community and promoting their leadership role in the Christianization of the peninsula, and so it is the Goths and their conversion that feature most.

Isidore of Seville's *History* (up to 589)

Isidore of Seville (c. 560-636) wrote his *History of the Goths* and a shorter *Chronicle* that focused on Iberian events in two stages in the 610s to 630s.[108] He is therefore both a contemporary witness to events of the late sixth century and a representative of a later perspective from the seventh-century era of consolidation. We will look in this chapter at his descriptions of events up through Reccared's conversion and compare them with John's account, and shortly with the conciliar records of Toledo III and the hagiographical *Lives of the Fathers of Mérida*, and return to him in the next chapter for his perspective of and influence on the early seventh century.

We know much about Isidore and his family from his own and his brother's writings. He was one of four children of Severianus, a man 'of the province of Cartagena in Spain', all of whom (himself, brothers Leander and Fulgentius, and sister Florentina) entered religious life and were later canonized as saints.[109] The family moved from Cartagena to Seville around the time of Isidore's birth, and Leander's comments to Florentina at the end of his monastic rule that they were exiles from their homeland suggests that they moved under duress. The most likely context for such a forced move is the Byzantine takeover of the region c. 554.[110] Isidore became bishop of Seville c. 600 after the death of the previous bishop, his brother Leander, and remained so until his own death in 636. He undoubtedly inherited his brother's close ties with

King Reccared, and he served as teacher to another king, Sisebut (r. 612-621), among many other pupils.[111] He also presided over the Fourth Council of Toledo (633), which encouraged the education of clergy and promoted kingdom-wide unity.[112]

Unlike John, whom Isidore labelled as a Goth by birth, Isidore and his family members are never provided with an ancestral label—by themselves or any other authors. Isidore instead privileged regional identity, marking his father by province rather than city or ancestry. Attempts by historians to determine the ancestry of his parents through the family names or comments about exile and upbringing have been inconclusive; this simply was not the most salient identity for Isidore and so the information he provided points us toward other understandings of his place in his social environment.[113]

Like John, Isidore preferred to reserve Roman identity for the empire (both past and present). Emperors Maurice and Phocas, for example, appear in his *Of Famous Men* as 'princes of the Romans'.[114] A major difference, though, is that Isidore did not shy away from labelling the Byzantine soldiers in Iberia as 'Romans'. Most of these references are for seventh-century events, but one appears during Reccared's reign. Reccared sent troops to fight 'hostile peoples' including Franks invading Narbonne, arrogant Romans, and attacking Basques.[115] Both the Franks and the Basques were certainly fighting in territory claimed by the Visigothic kingdom, meaning these Romans likewise were probably those Byzantines settled along the Mediterranean coast of Iberia. Of course, Isidore had a different experience with the Byzantines from that of John. Rather than living in Constantinople and getting to know them as fellow Christians, Isidore was an exile for whom they were conquerors.[116]

Among the many enemies the Goths fought, some were rebelling locals and others were armies of neighbouring kingdoms. Isidore related the same tale of Leovigild's conquest of 'rebel cities of Spain' as John, though he did not name many of the locations.[117] Neither did he describe the residents; these were simply impersonal cities. In other circumstances the residents of Iberia do appear as 'citizens'—when Leovigild, who appears in a less positive light here than in John's work, is said to rob both 'citizens' and 'enemies' to fill his treasury, and when Agila fought 'the citizens of Córdoba' in 549.[118] In addition to Romans and Basques, the Visigothic kings waged war against the Sueves who held an independent kingdom in Galicia.

Isidore tells the story of their conquest on multiple occasions: as a Goth-focused tale in his *History of the Goths* and *Chronicle*, and as a more lengthy story in the *History of the Sueves*, a short narrative appended to the end of the *History of the Goths* along with that of the Vandals.

For both of these peoples who once ruled territory in Iberia, Isidore deemed them important to mention only as historical opponents. Once they ceased to have their own kingdoms, they disappeared from his Gothic history and their own *Histories* ended. In the *History of the Goths*, Isidore simply relates that Leovigild brought 'the Sueves' under his rule.[119] In the *History of the Sueves*, after Miro became 'prince of the Sueves' he went with soldiers to the aid of Leovigild in his war against Hermenegild.[120] Interestingly, Isidore has the Sueves switch sides—John depicted them as rebels along with Hermenegild. Because of this change, Isidore must explain why Leovigild seemingly turned on his allies and seized their kingdom. He turns what seems like betrayal into 'condemnation' of Audeca's seizure of the kingship from Miro's son. Leovigild only 'attacked the Sueves' to overthrow Audeca, though once he had done so, 'the kingdom of the Sueves was destroyed and transferred to the Goths'. In all of these examples, the Sueves, the Goths, the Romans, and others appear as political groups. In many cases, these are broad terms for armies fighting for their king or for subjects being conquered. People of various ancestries fought in these armies or were subject to these kings, but they were all 'Sueves' or 'Goths' in this political context. Isidore's story, like John's, is one of peoples interacting in a political landscape.

Unsurprisingly, the most prominent 'people' in Isidore's historical narratives is the Goths themselves. In his *Chronicle* he set the Goths within a wider framework just as John did, with activities and regnal dates of the Byzantine Romans playing an important role in his record. His *History of the Goths*, however, focuses on the Visigoths alone. While imperial regnal dating and his own 'era' dating system looking back to Roman occupation of Spain provide universal chronological markers, only the deeds and experiences of the Goths are retold. These Goths are described in the same political manner as in John's *Chronicle*, and as Isidore described other peoples. Kings occasionally appear as ruling 'in' a geographical location—as Theoderic (the Ostrogothic ruler of Italy) who gained 'the kingship in Spain' after the death of 'Gesalic, the king of the Goths', and the man he later appointed as 'king in Spain', Theudis.[121] In both cases, the

appointee is an outsider from Italy, perhaps requiring the explanation that it was the Goths of Spain, not the Goths of Italy, whom they ordinarily ruled. Similarly, when Liuva became ruler of the Goths in Narbonne and Leovigild obtained leadership of Spain in addition to Gallia Narbonensis, these two men had been sharing kingship and the provinces they were each responsible for therefore rise in relevance.[122] However, Isidore more often described kings as kings (or princes) of a people. Alaric II became 'prince (*princeps*) of the Goths' in 484, when they still ruled from Toulouse, and Theudis was 'prince of the Goths' when Apringus and Justinianus were bishops.[123] 'Leovigild, king of the Goths' attacked the Sueves, Theodemir was 'king of the Sueves' when Martin arrived in Braga to found a monastery, and Huneric was 'king of the Vandals' when he made Laetus a martyr.[124] Clovis and Childebert, both kings 'of the Franks', were enemies of the Visigoths on the battlefield, as were Gundobad, 'king of the Burgundians', and 'the kings of the Franks' who ravaged Tarraconensis during the reign of Theudis.[125]

These kings, of course, did not attack on their own but with the support of armies that were also named. 'The Goths' under the duke Theudegisel closed off passes into Spain and slaughtered the attacking 'army of the Franks' led by the aforementioned 'kings of the Franks' in 541.[126] Here there is both an 'army' fighting on behalf of Frankish kings and therefore 'Frankish' itself and an ethnonym made to stand alone for the army—the 'Goths' being subjects fighting for a Gothic king. 'The Goths' also killed Agila when they realized that civil war was destroying them and possibly paving the way for Byzantine interference, and did battle in Ceuta against soldiers who had previously expelled Gothic defenders from that fortress.[127] In Reccared's time, 'the Goths' devastated 'the Franks' who had attacked Gallia Narbonensis with the help of their new Catholic faith.[128] As we have already seen, all of these armies would have been composed of a wide variety of subjects, including people of Gothic ancestry, descendants of Hispano-Romans, and Sueves who had been assimilated into the Visigothic kingdom. They all could be categorized as Goths because they were members of a kingdom led by Goths and, as a group, functioned as a single 'Gothic' political unit within Isidore's narrative of battles between kingdoms.

The final aspect on which to compare John's *Chronicle* with Isidore's accounts is religion and conversion. For Isidore, Reccared's conversion was not the end of his narrative, and so it

does not play the same climactic role or merit as much additional description in his *History of the Goths*. Leovigild appears as a great military leader who raised his people up through war while Reccared elevated them through faith. Leovigild's Arian 'impiety' tarnished his successes, and it is due to madness from the 'Arian perfidy' that he launched a persecution and exile of Catholics and 'infected' many with its pestilence and heresy.[129] Reccared's conversion, as in John's *Chronicle*, is credited as 'returning all the peoples of the Gothic *gens*' to the correct faith, equating Arianism with Gothic identity. The specific act by which their Gothicness is defined is religious, yet the language used adds a descent overtone, linking these two ways of being Gothic together. At the council of bishops from 'Spain and Gallia Narbonensis', Reccared abandoned the false teachings of Arius which 'the people of the Goths (*populus Gothorum*)' had held until then. In his *Of Famous Men*, he credits his brother Leander for encouraging Reccared's conversion and thus leading 'the peoples of the Gothic *gens* from the Arian insanity to the Catholic faith'.[130] Like John, then, Isidore expanded his use of 'Goth' in connection with conversion, painting that event as the essential step in creating a kingdom-wide people.

While we have not yet examined Isidore's accounts of later years, we can still make some useful comparisons with John's *Chronicle* account. Both authors associated Roman identity almost exclusively with the Byzantines.[131] For John, the two focal points of his narrative were the Visigothic kingdom and the Byzantine Empire, so he included the events of each, and, as such, the two most prominent actors in his narrative are the 'Goths' and the Byzantine 'Romans'. Having spent time in Constantinople, he was familiar with events in the East and recalled the travails of the 'Roman' army against Persians and other imperial enemies. He also perceived the empire in a positive or at least neutral light, leading him to downplay their disputes with Visigoths on the Iberian peninsula. Isidore, on the other hand, showed them as foreigners and enemies from whom the Visigothic kings regained their lands. They appear more in his *Chronicle* than in his *History* because of the latter's direct focus on the Goths, and like other peoples, they no longer impinge on his story once they are vanquished and banished from the peninsula. While they remained, however, they were the most obvious 'Romans' present. It is likely that one reason Isidore did not ever refer to local residents of Roman

descent as 'Romans', and that John only did so once, is that they did want these locals to be confused with imperial Romans.

Both authors also wrote succinct overviews of history rather than detailed descriptions, and so primarily depicted unified peoples interacting on a political level as armies, subjects, and kingdoms. Thus we see 'the Goths' as an army fighting with the neighbouring Franks, 'the Sueves' being conquered by Leovigild, and rulers as kings of specific peoples. The Goths feature prominently in both men's narratives and were clearly envisioned as the essential actors on the peninsula. John's is a Gothic story in that it accounts for the advancement of the Goths into the history of the Christian community. Isidore's is a Gothic story because, as we will see in the next chapter, they overcame both armies and heretical errors to become the rightful rulers of Spain.

The Third Council of Toledo

The church council with which John of Biclar ended his *Chronicle* was also recorded by scribes in attendance, including the overall proceedings and the canons which were enacted as church law. These records survive, along with those of numerous other councils from the Visigothic kingdom, and can therefore be compared to narrative accounts by John and Isidore. The bulk of the Visigothic council records were compiled in the seventh century in a collection known as the *Hispana*, which contains papal letters, early Gallic and North African council records, and Spanish records from the Visigothic era. The compilers clearly had a bias toward Toledo—which as the capital was also the site of kingdom-wide councils—because all of its councils appear here though few regional ones do. The first recension of this collection was compiled c. 633 in Seville and is assumed to be the work of Isidore (hence its name, *Isidoriana*); the *Juliana* recension brought the work up-to-date c. 681, and the *Vulgata* c. 694. These later versions kept the original basically intact, adding rather than subtracting material.[132] Each church council was run by senior bishops, and some included royal involvement. Their recorded acts are therefore representative of the official agendas of these key people. As canon law, they are prescriptive rather than descriptive, telling us what was hoped for and promoted but not whether people within the kingdom followed the regulations therein.[133]

Because the conversion of both king and people was a momentous event of great symbolic potential, its proceedings and records were used to serve specific purposes, and Toledo III (as it is often abbreviated) therefore has one of the longest records of any Spanish council. It begins with a statement of the reason for the council: that 'the most glorious, pious, and faithful lord king Reccared' called it to thank God for 'his conversion and that of the Gothic people (*gens Gothorum*)'.[134] As in John's account, Reccared is the model of a good, faithful king and the reason the Goths have been saved. Also, the entire people converted with him, with no hint of anomalies (like John, the Catholic Goth) acknowledged here. As John related, it is not just the Goths that Reccared claims credit for saving, but also the Sueves.[135] Because of 'celestial help' their kingdom was subsumed by his, paving the way for 'the Suevic people (*gens Suevorum*)' to join the Goths in conversion to Catholicism. This shows that the official statement of the council was deliberately written to justify Leovigild's conquest and express an official message of concern for the spiritual well-being of the Sueves. Leovigild is here, as in John's depiction, an unwitting agent of God.

First Reccared and his queen, then 'all the bishops, priests, and leading men (*seniores* or *primores*) of the Goths', affirm the creed and a variety of statements professing their newly Catholic faith and condemning Arianism.[136] On multiple occasions, this list of important Gothic leaders appears, presumably representing the entire people and making these declarations on their behalf. Arianism is labelled in a variety of derogatory ways, some of which also appear in the narratives: heresy, perfidy, and superstition.[137] Its various tenets are listed and named anathema, and then 'the book [containing] the conversion of Romans to the Arian heresy' produced by Leovigild is declared anathema.[138] This is probably a reference to the records of the Arian synod of 580 recorded by John of Biclar. While it is the only book specifically condemned in Toledo III, it is highly likely that all Arian writings were condemned and later burned, as the seventh-century Frankish *Chronicle* of Fredegar asserts.[139]

All of these individuals signed the document, followed by a statement from Reccared and then twenty-two canons intended to guide churches through the transition. These churches are variously listed throughout the records of Toledo III as 'the churches of Spain', 'of Spain and Gaul', and 'of Spain, Gaul, and Galicia'.[140] Reccared's kingdom is presented as one of

multiple parts all united, just as its peoples have all been united in one Catholic faith. Finally, the king and all bishops—whether converts or not—signed the full record.

Like both John's and Isidore's works, the acts of Toledo III bundle all Goths together into a homogenous group. They are envisioned as a religious unit, as Arians converting to Catholic Christianity, and as politically defined, as subjects following the lead of their king. These two aspects of Gothicness coinciding in an official profession of loyalty through conversion brings greater weight to the sense of social cohesion the act entails. No mention of exceptions—some people of Roman ancestry among the converts, or individuals of Gothic ancestry not needing to convert—is included. The impression the reader is supposed to form is that a whole people converted *en masse*.[141] Another similarity between the council and John's *Chronicle* is the promotion of Christian unity. This council focuses on the newly Catholic Goths and brings them into the wider Catholic community, which also includes those of Roman ancestry. The rules set out at the end are not for the converts alone, but for *all* Catholic residents, no matter their background. This rhetoric of unity has official royal approval as well as the backing of the leading bishops of the Spanish church; it was not, after all, a private profession of faith but a public statement of the direction the Visigothic kingdom would take henceforth and the cooperation of both church and state in this endeavour. We can therefore read the language of these council records as evidence of explicit official intent to unite the diverse population of the kingdom under a common religious identity and to link their religious profession to political loyalty. As we will see, this religious unification with its political overtones proved an essential element of Isidore's imagined community of Gothic, Catholic subjects.

The *Lives of the Fathers of Mérida*

The last text which provides substantial information about sixth-century Iberia is the hagiographical *Lives of the Fathers of Mérida*. This work celebrates a handful of holy men, mostly bishops, from the city Mérida during the sixth and early seventh centuries.[142] The author was a deacon of the church of St. Eulalia in the city, and an active promoter of this patron saint of Mérida. Although he is sometimes given the name Paul, this does not appear in the earliest manuscripts and was certainly the addition of a later editor of the text.[143] As the latest event

mentioned is the death of bishop Renovatus, it was probably written during the episcopate of his successor, Stephen I, between 633 and 638.[144] The stated intent of the text is to give Méridans reason to believe in the miracle stories told by Gregory the Great in his *Dialogues* by illustrating miracles that had occurred in their city, but they seem additionally intended to support Mérida's historical role as an important bishopric at a time when it was losing its supremacy to Toledo, telling stories that focus on the important role of the city, and of its patron saint, in the kingdom.[145] As these *Lives* describe holy men, we can expect the conventions of the hagiographical genre to apply to them, including the religious focus of the text, moral instruction, the inclusion of occasional miracles, the creation of consensus, and divine intervention on behalf of the protagonists—and indeed all of these are present.[146] The text is divided into five parts, each describing the life of one individual or a small group of related individuals. The first three parts are very short, but the fourth and the fifth are more extensive and provide useful information on conceptions of identity.

Part four focuses on two past bishops of Mérida: Paul and Fidel. They are especially interesting individuals because they came to the Visigothic kingdom from the eastern Mediterranean. Paul is described as 'Greek by nation, doctor by trade (*natione Grecus, arte medicus*)' and as coming 'from eastern lands'.[147] Fidel arrived in Mérida with 'Greek merchants (*negotiatores Grecos*)' in a ship 'from the East' and remained there when Paul discovered they were related and kept him as his successor.[148] Paul's designation as 'Greek by nation' suggests that the author believed he was of Greek descent, and that Greekness could be inherited. However, there is no clarification as to whether the merchants were also deemed to be Greek for the same reason, or on whether it was language, names, practices, or some other aspect that led the author to assume they were Greek; the closest to an explanation he provided was that they all came from 'the East'.[149] Certainly there were many Greek-speakers who visited or lived in Spain, as evidenced by the number of inscriptions in the Greek language found in Mérida, Mértola, Lisbon, Cartagena, Tarragona, and other locations.[150] Because Greek was the common language of the east, as Latin was in the west, speakers could have come from a variety of places and seen themselves as Romans (*Romaioi* from the Byzantine Empire), Syrians, or something else entirely. What they would not have called themselves is 'Greeks' (*Hellenes* in

the Greek language). This label had a negative connotation, regularly identified in contemporary discourse with paganism—not an identity eastern Christians would want to claim. If they needed to distinguish themselves by region within the empire, they referred to themselves as *Helladikoi* ('those who lived in Greece'), and externally they used their political identity: Roman.[151]

Greeks also appear in a Visigothic context in the Council of Narbonne from 589. A local council was held in the Visigothic-controlled region of Gallia Narbonensis/Septimania to affirm the guidelines established at Toledo III. On two occasions, the records of this council emphasize that all the peoples resident in the region must follow the canons of the council: 'Goth, Roman, Syrian, Greek, or Jew'.[152] Again, there is no clarification as to what constituted a 'Greek' or any of these other peoples, though language, religion, and ancestry were probably intended in combination, since it is possible to distinguish each of these peoples from all the others using these three aspects of identity. The authors, though, assumed the precise boundaries of these peoples would be common knowledge universally understood.

Even without detailed descriptions of how these peoples were identified, the Council of Narbonne does highlight the presence of other groups who would sometimes be referred to simply as 'easterners'.[153] Jewish identity would be most easily defined along religious lines, but it was also often ethnicized and these two aspects of Jewishness seen to overlap.[154] 'Syrian', like 'Greek', was a broad term that could be envisioned according to different scripts of identity depending on context—linguistic, geographical, or generically eastern. These same people could also theoretically have been viewed as Greeks, if they spoke Greek around westerners, because it was the universal language of communication from the east. Syrians also appear in the writing of fifth- and sixth-century Gallic authors, including Salvian of Marseille and Gregory of Tours. Salvian wrote in the fifth century about Syrian merchants in southern Gallic cities, again without specifying how he distinguished them as Syrian, and Gregory's *Histories* tell that a Syrian merchant named Eusebius became bishop of Paris in the sixth century.[155]

These examples have perplexed historians partly because the questions they often seek to answer—where these people came from and who they 'really' were—are not usually answerable with the information provided. Instead, these examples ably illustrate the role of

perception in identification. Westerners writing these accounts and laws perceived their subjects as Syrian, Greek, or Jew, whether or not these people would have identified *themselves* that way. In an eastern context, where people called Syrians and Greeks were encountered more regularly, the lines along which these categories were regularly understood were more precise. In an external context, as in Spain or Gaul, boundaries were imagined more broadly because the salient fault line here was between foreigner and local, not Syrian and Greek. We learn from the story of Paul and Fidel not how the merchants and residents who came from the east saw themselves, but that people in the Iberian province of Lusitania viewed them as Greek.

Of course, Paul was himself 'Greek' and from the same region as the merchants who visited him, so he asked for more specific information to be able to place his visitors on a more local level. To Fidel, he asked for his name, the names of his parents, and his home town, eventually leading him to discover that Fidel was his sister's son. Thus we have a further hint of what type of information was most important for identifying people on a local level—family and town—when broader categories like Syrian, Greek, Goth, or Roman would be unhelpful.[156] Their story also provides an example from within Iberia: a woman of high status saved from death by Paul, who had been a doctor before becoming bishop. According to the author, she was 'illustrious' and 'born to an ancient noble family'. She was also the wife of one of the 'leading citizens' of Mérida, 'a most noble man of senatorial birth (*ex genere senatorum*)'.[157] They were probably major landowners in the region and clearly associated with a locally prominent (and wealthy) family.[158]

This couple is located within the social landscape as of high status and wealth, rather than according to Gothic or Roman ancestry, and the terms used show that nobility and senatorial status were viewed as heritable. The husband was 'senatorial' not because he was a member of the Roman senate—by this point an ancient and remote body that was obsolete in an Iberian context—but because his ancestors were; he was of the highest level of society from which senators had been drawn in the days of the western Roman Empire.[159] Their wealth is especially important to the story, because they made Paul their heir in appreciation for his aid and died soon after, leaving him enough wealth to make him the most powerful magnate in

Mérida, richer even than the local church itself. Paul made Fidel his heir, but when Fidel died their fortune passed to the control of the church to fund its administration and charitable works.[160] The story thus served as a semi-pious justification, whether true or not, for the great wealth held by the Mérida church, making 'senatorial' and 'illustrious' identity the most narratively relevant available option the author could choose.

Part five of the *Lives of the Fathers of Mérida* concerns Masona, bishop from c. 570. The author describes Masona as Catholic despite being a Goth: 'although of the Gothic *genus*, his mind [or heart] was completely devoted to God'.[161] Clearly he expected his audience in the 630s to be surprised that a Goth in the time before Reccared's conversion could be Catholic, in opposition to the stereotypical link of Arianism with the Gothic people. When a later bishop, Renovatus (d. 633), appears, he is simply 'Goth by nation (*natione Gotus*)', with no implication that his Gothic birth should be surprising.[162] Renovatus served as bishop in the post-conversion era when all Goths were supposed to be Catholic; it is Masona's service prior to the conversion that marks his identity as unusual (though not unique) within Iberian society.

Masona served during the reigns of both Leovigild and Reccared, and ran afoul of the former. The conflict between the Catholic bishop Masona and the Arian king Leovigild fits firmly into the religious focus and divine intervention aspects of the hagiographical genre and is the centrepoint of Masona's story, the longest of the *Lives*. Leovigild is the antithesis of the good Christian king—the 'severe and cruel king of the Visigoths' who 'hurt rather than helped, and destroyed rather than ruled, the land of Spain'.[163] Unlike John and Isidore's accounts, the *Lives* do not portray Leovigild as a unifier in any way; his control of Spain was not the prelude to its salvation but a travesty leading to destruction. Instead, his role as a diabolical 'prince of the Arians' is emphasized.[164]

Mérida was a highly important city within the Visigothic kingdom and Masona a powerful figure within it. Leovigild therefore expended great time and effort attempting to control Masona, and thereby the city. First he commanded the bishop to abandon Catholicism and 'turn to the Arian heresy along with all the people under his care'.[165] When this proved unsuccessful, he tried to terrorize Masona, and then to stir opposition to him from within Mérida. To that end, he appointed 'a bishop of the Arian faction called Sunna' to lead the Arians

of the city and encourage others to convert.[166] Sunna represents all that the author found foul about Arianism, and so the author described him as 'a bringer of death', 'a deviser of perfidy', an 'infidel', and 'bishop of the heretics'. When even this was not enough to force Masona's conversion or to convince locals to oust him from the city, Leovigild resorted to exile and replaced him with 'the false priest' Nepopis.[167] As in John of Biclar's case, it is probably the fact that Masona was an obvious exception to Leovigild's ideal picture of the Arian Goths rather than being a Catholic bishop generally that led Leovigild to target him so fiercely. Political loyalties might also have played a role, if Masona and Mérida were among the supporters of the rebellious (and Catholic) Hermenegild—which we unfortunately cannot prove.[168] The imperfect intersection of Masona's various identities—religious, political, and ancestral—by Leovigild's standards made him a liability in the king's attempts to promote his vision of a unified community.

Masona was allowed to return shortly before Reccared became king, and the hagiographer predictably highlights the differences between Reccared and his father. Reccared was 'a venerable man' and 'orthodox and in all things Catholic unlike his faithless father'.[169] While Leovigild had lured people away from the Catholic church, Reccared, by contrast, 'turned from the perversity of the Arian heresy' and through his conversion 'led the whole people of the Visigoths' to the Catholic faith with him.[170] Again we see depicted a unified people—all Goths as Arians following their leader—despite the fact that the protagonist was himself a Goth who did not fall into this generalization. It is not the complex reality that matters to the hagiographer's narrative but the impression of unity and the link between political loyalty and conversion.

In fact, the author does admit that some Arians fought against conversion and adds the stain of disloyalty to their sin of heresy.[171] In the city of Narbonne, 'the devil roused sedition against the Catholic faith'. There two counts named Granista and Vildigern, who were well-known for their wealth and nobility, together with an Arian bishop named Athaloc, brought 'a multitude of Franks' to the province to restore the Arian faction to power and possibly even overthrow Reccared.[172] In Mérida, Sunna led a rebellion of local nobles against the conversion generally and Masona in particular. Here Sunna is styled a 'Gothic bishop' and his followers

'nobles of the Goths by birth (*Gotorum nobiles genere*)' who were 'most distinguished', including many counts. We are also told that with the aid of the devil, Sunna turned these nobles away from the Catholic church.[173] The implication is that they either were long-time Catholics like Masona or had dutifully converted from Arianism then lapsed. Their Gothicness is also explicitly linked to their ancestry, but the reversion to Arianism also lends it a bit of a religious flavour. Sunna's faction plotted to assassinate Masona and the local duke Claudius. The first attempt failed when 'Witteric, who afterward was king of the Goths', was unable to remove his sword from its scabbard. After the crowd left, Witteric repented and begged Masona for forgiveness, revealing the entire plot and the conspirators' probable next move. Claudius was then dispatched to apprehend the 'Arian counts' during the next attempt and to round up and arrest any conspirator not present. Reccared decreed that they should be deprived of their social honours and then exiled.[174]

Although these men are introduced as Gothic nobles by birth, their Arian faith and political disloyalty are the focus of the account—not their Gothicness. They appear as 'Arian counts' and 'hostiles' and Sunna as 'the Arian bishop' and 'the heretical bishop'.[175] Their actions are associated with their religious affiliation rather than their descent. Similarly, the plotters in Narbonne appear as 'Arian', 'depraved', and 'in error', though never as 'Goths'.[176] Among the repertoire of possible strategies of identification available to the hagiographer, the religious opposition of Arians vs. Catholics clearly mattered more to him than their ancestry.

We see further proof of this religious concern in his description of the duke Claudius. The author explicitly stated Claudius' family background: 'This Claudius was born of noble lineage, begotten to Roman parents (*Idem vero Claudius nobili genere hortus Romanis fuit parentibus progenitus*)'.[177] Claudius' 'Roman' identity was plainly perceived as bestowed on him by birth; he was considered Roman because he descended from Romans. His Roman family is also called 'noble' here, which illustrates that membership in the kingdom's aristocracy was not exclusive to those of Gothic birth and that an individual did not necessarily cease to be Roman by participating in the activities of the Visigothic kingdom's nobility. Claudius was most definitely a participant: both John and Isidore identified him as the general who led a Visigothic army to a stunning victory against the Franks in 589.[178] He was also a Catholic and of sufficient

prominence within the kingdom that Pope Gregory the Great wrote to him in 599 requesting his assistance in escorting an envoy.[179]

The inclusion of Claudius' Roman descent proved useful for the *Lives*' central narrative. For the senatorial couple of Paul's day, it was wealth and piety that mattered for explaining Paul's role as healer and the church's consequent inheritance. Therefore the hagiographer did not describe them as Roman. Claudius, however, appears in the literary context of religious tension. Claudius interacted closely with a prominent Catholic Goth, Masona, and both men were intended targets of Sunna's plot. By showing the Arian Sunna attacking both a Goth and a Roman, the author emphasized that the conflict was based not on ethnic tensions but on religious identity, bringing the focus of his tale onto Catholicism's triumph over Arianism in the city of Mérida. This was not a fight between Goths and Romans over who should dominate post-Roman Spain, but a local victory in the wider battle between Catholicism and Arianism for the souls of the faithful—the most significant possible battle in a text promoting the Catholic faith. It is precisely in this context that Roman and Gothic descent suddenly become a useful tool for painting a picture of a society newly unified behind the right and proper faith.

Conclusion: The Evidence Together

Looking at all four of these sources together brings essential insights into the ways sixth-century Iberians negotiated their identities and experienced them within their social environment, and also into pitfalls the modern historian may face in attempting to explain that environment. At the beginning of this chapter, I noted that religious and descent identities were expected by sixth-century Iberians to map onto one another and that conversion was meant to encourage unity precisely by erasing the religious division and letting the new Catholic-Goth mapping eventually erase ethnic differences too. We have certainly seen many examples that suggest so. Masona is presented as an oddity for being of Gothic descent and a devout Catholic, as if Gothic ancestry automatically implied a 'Gothic' religious identity as Arian. John of Biclar, Isidore of Seville, the *Lives of the Fathers of Mérida*, and the records of Toledo III all portray the conversion as bringing *all* Goths from Arian to Catholic Christianity. Toledo III also emphasized the unity of the (theoretically) all Catholic populace, making rules for all

Visigothic provinces which would apply equally to the converts as to those already Catholic. John described the conversion as bringing the Goths and Sueves into the 'unity' of the Christian communion.

Underlying all of this are two seemingly contradictory conceptions of identity. First is the impression of well-defined, mutually exclusive, static, 'real' identities—like Goths who were all Arian and Romans who were all Catholic, staying within neatly delineated boxes. The second is the reality, occasionally even acknowledged by contemporaries, of multiplicity and overlap—that change is possible and that there might be exceptions to the exclusive stereotypes. These are of course the same understandings of identity still argued over today.

The former leads to generalizations—by contemporaries and by modern scholars—that mask social complexity. The clearest example for sixth-century Spain is the equation of Arian religion with Gothic ancestry. In all sources that discuss the conversion period, this generalization serves to connect the entire populace first to Arianism then to Catholicism. Contemporary actors and the authors who wrote about them sought to imply a unity that was not necessarily true in the hope of helping to make it true—to imagine a community and lead people to adhere to it. It was a strategic reconfiguring of the language used to describe the various categories with which people could identify in order to aid people's adaptation of their mental landscape to the shifts in their social reality.

There were, of course, repercussions to an excessively tidy equation of Gothic religious identity and Gothic ancestry. John and Masona, as Catholics of Gothic descent, proved by their very existence that this equation was false, and any power they maintained despite pressure from Leovigild made him and his Arianism appear weak. They set a bad example at a time when Leovigild hoped to encourage Arianism as a unifying force, and so they were exiled. There are, of course, other possible contributing factors to their exile such as the prospect that they (and the also-exiled Leander) supported Hermenegild's rebellion and could not be trusted as allies in Leovigild's Arianizing ventures.[180] However, their Catholicism alone is an insufficient explanation for their exile.[181] The written sources provide no evidence that Leovigild instituted a mass exile of Catholics, only of a handful of named individuals. As Collins points out, Leovigild replaced Masona with another Catholic, Nepopis, whose loyalty he could depend on. Had he

truly been concerned to eliminate all powerful Catholics, Nepopis would have been gone as well and Sunna made sole bishop of Mérida.[182] John was not even a bishop until c. 591, so he would have been far less powerful and influential than Masona and little threat to Leovigild's power on the ground. On an ideological plane, however, he constituted a great threat. By distinguishing between the various scripts of Gothic identity available to John and others, we can more clearly see the role rigid conceptions of identity played in alienating them from Leovigild's envisioned community.

For the majority of Iberians, though, associating Goths with Arianism and Romans with Catholicism was probably a fairly accurate generalization to make. That John and Masona stand out as exceptions implies that most children born to Goths belonged to the Arian church and so were Goths both by descent and by religion, and that the same was true of Romans and Catholicism. While this distinction affected Masona and others at the time, it might seem a fairly innocent generalization now, causing few problems and providing a useful shorthand, and many modern historians have adopted it. However, awareness of the constructions behind these acts of identification does not make historians immune to the subtle influence of this language; like sixth-century Iberians, we too can lose sight of the convenient simplification and begin to treat this generalization as complete truth.

For example, in his *The Goths in Spain*, E.A. Thompson asserted that, 'to become a Nicaean was, so to speak, to become a Roman, and to cease to be a Goth'.[183] While elsewhere he briefly acknowledged that some individuals converted sooner, to the point of naming John and Masona, the above assertion as well as the tenor of his language throughout makes it appear that they did not exist and ignores the very numerous uses of the term 'Goth' in sources after the conversion.[184] Drawing from Thompson's work, Roger Collins has insisted that Arianism was a reflection for Gothic desire for ethnic distinction, as if Arianism were a necessary element of being a Goth. He writes that the use by Arians of 'Roman religion' to refer to Catholicism is a sign that religious division was along 'ethnic lines'.[185] This definition would, of course, exclude Masona and John from the ranks of 'Goths', and indeed that seems to have been a factor in their exile. However, impressions and reality are not the same, and Collins seems to misunderstand them as so. José Orlandis is more explicit, describing Masona as bishop

of the 'Roman population' and Sunna as bishop of 'the Gothic minority of Arians' and 'the Goth-Arian faction'. He also labels Nepopis as 'Hispano-Roman' despite there being a complete lack of evidence in the *Lives of the Fathers of Mérida* or elsewhere for any aspect of his identity other than Catholic religion.[186] The common tendency to simplify matters by describing the religious division as equally an ethnic one, even if for the most part the religious divide did fall along these lines, contributes to the perception that this was always true and makes it harder to grasp the reality of Gothic identity.[187]

In briefly acknowledging the existence of these exceptions and then switching to language which implies they did not exist, these historians suggest that they are inconvenient—and unimportant—anomalies that interfere with our picture of what really happened in Spain, very much as Isidore and other contemporaries did to support their narrative agendas. There are, however, far more interesting things to say about Masona and John. Their exceptional nature—and the complex layers of their identity—means that the way they were described can tell historians far more than descriptions of others could about how contemporaries negotiated various forms of identity in the complicated and changing world of Visigothic Spain.

Such complicated individuals also proved particularly useful for a variety of contemporary authors, each of whom was trying to fit the same people into different narrative frames. Claudius is an excellent example, because he appears in three separate Spanish sources. Examining the varied ways authors described him and his interaction with 'Goths' both demonstrates how authors could select from a variety of possible identities available within the prevailing discourse to suit specific needs and illuminates the ways a shift from Roman to Gothic identity may have happened over the course of Visigothic rule in Spain.

In the *Lives of the Fathers of Mérida*, Claudius appears as a strong ally of the Catholic, Gothic bishop and a fellow target of the Arian Sunna's assassination attempt. His description in this account as of Roman birth made him the perfect counterpart to Masona: of different ancestry but united in common faith against what the author perceived as the real enemy of the Visigothic state, Arianism. In his *Chronicle*, John of Biclar describes Claudius as 'the duke of Lusitania' who led an army—simply 'the Goths'—against Frankish troops in Septimania.[188] In Isidore's version of this same tale, Claudius was sent against the Franks, and 'no victory of the

Goths in Spain' was greater than this one under his command.[189] Neither of these accounts refers to Claudius' Roman ancestry, which makes him appear to the reader as a 'Goth'. In a political sense, he was a subject of the Gothic king and the leader of his army, and so politically Gothic. Because both John and Isidore wrote these passages as celebrating the victory of the Goths in 589 over the heretical Arian beliefs of their ancestors, and over other peoples who were conquered and assimilated, Claudius' Roman descent was inconsequential. It was, instead, his political Gothicness—his loyalty to the king of the Visigoths—that was most salient for their narrative goals. Yet their omission of one aspect of his identity did not erase it from existence. One was not his 'true' identity and the other 'false', as rigidly exclusive characterizations about Gothicness and Romanness in Spain would lead one to believe. Rather, they represent multiple layers of identity—two different criteria of distinction which could exist together and be activated according to context and circumstance.

Both conceptions of identity—the rigid and the fluid—played an essential role in the ideological framework of conversion. The rigid depictions of Arian and Goth as interchangeable terms were generalizations, but it is these very generalizations that led Leovigild and Reccared to view religious difference within their kingdom as a barrier to overall unity. It is these generalizations that inspired them to choose and deliberately promote conversion, each to a different Christian confession, as a strategy for unifying the populace. By removing religious distinctions, Reccared equated Gothic identity with Catholicism, thereby making it available to his Roman subjects too. He redrew the boundaries around their imagined community so that any loyal, Catholic subject could be a Goth—religiously, politically, and maybe someday so thoroughly as to wipe out any meaningful connection to Roman ancestry. As we will see in the following chapters, this strategy worked. The reason it worked, though, was not because everyone suddenly switched from one exclusively-defined category to another, becoming 'really' Goths and Catholics, but because of the underlying multiplicity and complex layers each individual could identify with. People like Claudius did not suddenly cease to be Roman; they added a new layer of Gothic religious identity to the variety of possible strategies for identification they already could access, including Gothic political identity as subjects. Not needing to abandon one affiliation for another facilitated the association of all Visigothic

subjects with their Gothic rulers, allowing people to reimagine what it meant to be Catholic and what it meant to be a Goth. It was during the first half of the seventh century that this reimagining took shape, aided by the continuous expression of visions of this new community, especially by Isidore of Seville.

Chapter 2: Church and State: Isidore and his Influence

Isidore and John, in the late sixth and early seventh centuries, could describe contemporary Goths in a religious sense as Arians or new Catholics, in a political sense as subjects of the king, and in an ancestral sense as descending from earlier Goths. All of these options for identifying as Gothic enjoyed widespread currency in this time in Spain. This does not mean, however, that they all remained equally prevalent—and in fact, they did not. The sources for the first half of the seventh century reveal significant shifts in the use of each of these modes of identification.

Once Arianism was banned in 589, religious Gothicness came to be associated instead with Catholicism, and both Isidore and the monarchy endorsed this change. What prevailed alongside it was the political element of Gothic identity—again actively promoted. With these subjects united on religious terms, it became easier to envision them as a cohesive unit on political terms as well. The potential repertoire for identifying as Gothic had expanded and strengthened, and this period saw deliberate encouragement of all residents to redefine themselves as Goths.

This chapter follows the traces of this conscious linkage of Gothicness with Catholic faith and political loyalty. Isidore of Seville's historical writings, which we have already encountered, offer considerable insight into the ways narrative could be put to work for the goal of common identity. In his role as a bishop, he had enormous influence over church policy in this area, as can be seen in the Fourth Council of Toledo. He was also very influential over fellow bishops and scholars like Braulio of Zaragoza who continued his efforts in the following decades.[190] Two other councils held in the years immediately following his death (Toledo V and VI) use the language and ideas set forth in Isidore's time and set out the roles good kings should play in managing the unity of Visigothic society. By examining all of these sources, we will see the development of a common message during the mid-seventh century that all loyal, Catholic subjects could claim Gothic identity on both a religious and a political level.

Isidore's *History* (post-589)

It is well established that Isidore of Seville actively sought to promote a Gothic Catholic identity.[191] Most recently, Jamie Wood has shown that Isidore used both his history and his conciliar activities to 'intervene in a complex and ever-changing political and religious situation' and promote unity within the Visigothic kingdom.[192] That unity required a new vision of community with the Visigoths rightfully taking over from Rome as rulers of the peninsula. Isidore's strong position within the kingdom—as bishop of an important see and inheritor of his brother's close ties with the monarchy—provided him the ideal platform for influencing his society. His respected position in the church also made him an attractive ally for the Visigothic kings, who could draw on his authority within his Catholic flock. Isidore crafted his *History of the Goths* to serve the specific purpose of promoting and legitimizing Gothic dominance in the Iberian peninsula. The ways in which he did so include the borrowing of both classical and Christian models of history writing, his treatment of other peoples in Iberia as less important than the Goths, his depiction of the Romans losing God's favour and the Goths subsequently gaining it, and his praise of the Goths as destined to rule the peninsula.[193] Structurally, the *History* in its first redaction consists of a brief narrative of events from the mythical origin of the Goths from the Biblical Magog to Sisebut's reign. A second redaction brought events up to Suinthila and added introductory and concluding bookends.[194]

These bookends set the entire work within the frame of a sort of manifest destiny for the Goths to rule Spain. The prologue, titled 'In Praise of Spain (*Laus Spaniae*)', lauds the province personified with florid marriage imagery. Spain is the bride who first supported the glorious Roman Empire with her great riches and then wed and transferred her favour to the Goths.[195] 'It was right that golden Rome, the head of the nations, desired you long ago', it reads, and 'the most flourishing people of the Goths' love you now.[196] Some scholars have interpreted this prologue as proof that Isidore was the first Spanish nationalist. Jacques Fontaine, for example, believes it shows 'a medieval awakening of Hispanic nationality' enthusiastically embraced by Isidore.[197] However, it is clear that Isidore's prologue is in fact a praise of the geographical province, not of a nation or people.[198] At the end of his work, after a final computation of the years of the 'kings' and 'kingdom of the Goths', Isidore begins his

'Recapitulation' summing up the origins and great deeds of the Goths and reiterating their supremacy in the Mediterranean world.[199] Because the Goths had long ago sacked Rome, and had just removed the last of the Byzantine Romans from the Iberian peninsula, Isidore ends his praise with the Romans' subordination to the Goths: 'Rome itself, the conqueror of all peoples' submitted to 'the Getic triumphs', and 'subjected, the Roman soldier now serves' the Goths who themselves are served 'by many peoples and by Spain itself'.[200] Unlike the prologue, this is indeed a praise of the Goths as a people and illustrates quite well the degree to which Isidore intended his history to show them in a victorious light.

As Andrew Merrills has shown, this epilogue drew on classical ethnographic portrayals of the *Getae* and *Scythi* to depict the Goths as impressive warriors with an ancient past while also illustrating the ways they, like their warrior ancestors, had dominated the fearsome peoples around them.[201] The Scythians played an important role in Greek and Roman ethnographical tradition as a common 'other' to illustrate the barbarian opposite of classical civilized peoples.[202] Links between the peoples appear as early as Herodotus, who told that the Massagetae were like the Scythians and some of his contemporaries thought they were in fact a subset of the Scythians.[203] Both Orosius and Jerome, whose works Isidore certainly read, equated the ancient Scythians and *Getae* with the Goths of their time, as did Jordanes in his *Getica*.[204] In the first chapter of his *History*, Isidore spelled this connection out for his reader, relating that the Gothic kingdom was 'very ancient' because it derived from the kingdom of the Scythians.[205] The poetic reference to 'Getic triumphs' in the epilogue is therefore not a surprise to the reader but a continuation of a common theme. With this strategy, the epilogue sums up Isidore's entire narrative arc of the mighty Rome losing Spain to the Goths and turns the Goths into ancient Rome's rightful heirs on the peninsula.

We have already seen how Isidore's descriptions of sixth-century Spain privileged the Goths and depicted them as rightful rulers of the peninsula fighting against and conquering neighbouring peoples. The theme continues in his descriptions of the early seventh century. Sisebut 'brought rebellious Asturians' under his dominion on the northern coast and 'overcame the Ruccones' through his dukes.[206] The emphasis with the former is on Gothic supremacy; like the peoples Leovigild wrested into submission, Isidore's Asturians were probably not

independent people conquered, but disgruntled subjects of the Visigoths. Sisebut's successor, Suinthila, was one of the generals who defeated the Ruccones, and their subjection is mentioned again in the account of his reign.[207] The Basques along the Pyrenees that Reccared fought were similarly 'devastated' by Gundemar (r. 610-612) and subdued by Suinthila. Suinthila so terrified these 'mountain peoples' who 'invaded the province of Tarraconensis', that they surrendered and built a city 'for the Goths' using their own labour and money.[208] Again we see the assertion of Gothic rights to territory and those who oppose them as, in this case, invaders. The superiority of the Goths is shown in the thorough submission of these Basques, who not only give in militarily but contribute to the settlement of their Gothic rulers.

'Romans' also appear as opponents on multiple occasions that can only refer to Byzantines within the peninsula. Witteric (r. 603-610) battled 'the army of the Romans' and 'through his generals' captured some soldiers at Sagontia.[209] Gundemar subsequently 'besieged the Romans' and Sisebut 'triumphed twice over the Romans' himself, including subjecting some of their cities in battle.[210] Isidore's *Chronicle* likewise relates that Sisebut, 'the most glorious prince of the Goths', won victories over 'many cities of the Roman military'.[211] The Romans were finally expelled from Iberia during the reign of Suinthila. The *History* tells that he captured 'Roman fortresses' and obtained the last cities which remained 'in Roman hands', making him the first king to rule over 'the entire kingdom of Spain north of the straits', and the *Chronicle* that he came to rule 'all Spain' after warring with 'the remaining Roman cities'.[212]

These examples present victorious kings whose soldiers brought them great gains and who ultimately completed the unification of the peninsula that Leovigild had begun. That Witteric and Sisebut were victorious in part through their soldiers emphasizes political loyalty and service to the king as part of political Gothicness. Sisebut's title of '*princeps* of the Goths' encourages the audience to envision a united community comprised entirely of Goths, again in a political sense.[213] Sisebut himself even used the title 'king of the Visigoths' when addressing a letter to Adaloald, 'king of the Lombards', showing that it could be a self-identification, not just one given by others.[214] Because this is an external, international context, the clarification that he is ruler of the Visigoths is more clearly relevant than in letters or decrees within his own kingdom. Suinthila's defeat of the Byzantines seems to have been the reason Isidore updated

both his *History* and his *Chronicle* with a second redaction. This momentous event in the progression of Gothic dominance over the Iberian peninsula completed his narrative well, and of course depicting his new king in a victorious light would be helpful in maintaining an influential position in the kingdom.

To understand the impact of the defeat of the Byzantines, it is helpful to know how extensive the territory they controlled had been. Although John and Isidore both provide evidence of a Byzantine presence on Iberia's Mediterranean coast between the 550s and the 620s, there is still much debate over precisely what lands they occupied and to what degree.[215] Isidore wrote that Suinthila conquered their 'cities' but not which cities specifically.[216] Although often depicted on maps as a large swath of territory along the southern coast, Byzantine holdings may have been more disconnected. The old imperial organizational framework of cities and their associated territories remained in much of Spain, and the Byzantine Empire need not have conquered all of them in a particular region.[217] When Isidore referred to 'cities', he probably meant not just the city itself but also the territory under its purview, so even control of just a few cities would have meant control of rural areas as well, but not necessarily ones that abutted each other. The geography of southern Spain makes a number of the coastal cities best accessible by sea, and the Byzantine Empire was a dominant naval power in the Mediterranean. Thus it is easy to imagine that the sea, not connected lands, held the Byzantine possessions together.[218]

One city that *was* certainly in Byzantine possession is Ceuta in North Africa, with Procopius recording that Justinian had walls repaired and posted a naval squadron there.[219] Cartagena's status is also certain, as evidenced by an inscription discovered there in 1698 during construction at a convent.[220] The so-called 'Comenciolus inscription' commemorates the repair in 589 or 590 of a city gate by the *patricius* and *magister militum* Comenciolus. It states that he was sent by Emperor Maurice against the 'barbarian enemy' (*hostes barbaros*). The 'barbarians' in question can only be the Visigoths, seen from a Byzantine perspective. The timing of the inscription, in the wake of the Visigothic conversion to Catholicism, may be one reason for the label 'barbarian'; from a Byzantine mindset, this emphasized a common 'Roman' identity with Hispano-Romans which the Visigoths, despite their recent conversion, did not

hold.[221] The Byzantines could appeal to local Hispano-Romans through a common Roman ancestry and cultural identity in the hope of winning their loyalty and support against Visigothic incursion into these territories. The old Roman idea of civilized Romans vs. unworthy barbarians was a useful strategy of identification for these purposes.

Another issue to consider is Isidore's clear hostility toward the Byzantine Empire in contrast with John of Biclar's neutrality or even favourable opinion. Certainly the need for Isidore's family to leave their home city of Cartagena must have influenced his views, as we have already seen. However, there is also the possibility of religious conflict. The Byzantine emperors had placed their support behind movements within Christianity that Visigothic bishops viewed as heretical. Isidore's antagonism toward Justinian over the Three Chapters controversy is especially evident in his other writings, and the *Chronicle* regularly depicted emperors as supporters of heresy.[222] In shaping a narrative of Visigothic supremacy, he may not have included only territorial conquest but also religious correctness.

Finally, religious unity and orthodoxy arises too in Isidore's description of Sisebut's treatment of the Jews. Sisebut is widely recognized as the first Visigothic king to try to eliminate Jews completely from the Iberian peninsula.[223] According to Isidore, Sisebut 'forced Jews into the Christian faith' out of zeal, though wrongly.[224] A law to this effect does not appear in the later *Visigothic Code*, though other laws against Jews enacted by Sisebut do, including the freeing of slaves owned by 'Jews (*Iudeos*)' and banning Christian slaves from associating with 'Hebrews (*Ebreos*)'.[225] Wolfram Drews suggests that its absence may mean it was not enforced and therefore not needed in later records, and this is a strong possibility.[226] Opposition to such an extreme policy could have kept Sisebut's forced conversion from official legal memory.

 This is not to say that opponents like Isidore were not concerned by the presence of Jews in Spain. Isidore's piece *On the Catholic Faith against the Jews* and influence over restrictions placed on Jews and converts at the Fourth Council of Toledo certainly show otherwise.[227] Among the latter are canons demanding that children of converts be taken to be raised by lifelong Christians, that neither Jews nor converts hold offices over Christians, and that Jews not own Christian slaves.[228] These show that objections to excessive measures were over the possible pollution of the Christian community by people who were not genuine

adherents of Christianity if conversion was forced upon them. Sisebut's forced conversions had forced the bishops at Toledo IV and later councils to address such repercussions.[229]

Another problem the Jews presented was their inability to assimilate into the new ideal of the Gothic community—one based on Catholicism. As subjects of the Gothic king and residents of his kingdom, they might be viewed as politically Gothic, but never religiously Gothic. Jews were an exception to the idealized narrative of religious unity of the kingdom through which kings and bishops hoped to build political and ethnic unity, but especially those who had been forcibly converted and whose Christian identity was suspect. Neither Isidore's *History* nor the canons of Toledo IV explicitly mark the Jews as non-Goths, but Toledo VI (638) declares that King Chinthila forbids non-Catholics from remaining in the kingdom, and notes that these decrees shall be defended by all the forces of the 'kingdom of the Goths', implying that the Jews are not part of this Gothic kingdom.[230]

Church Councils to 654

Isidore of Seville's participation in contemporary conversations about issues of identity was not limited to his *History*. As a bishop, he participated in church councils and brought the influences of his ideology, both on Gothic identity and on Jews, to bear on their outcomes. The Fourth Council of Toledo, held in 633 at the instigation of King Sisenand, brought together all the bishops of 'the provinces of Spain and Gaul' and was presided over by Isidore himself.[231]

The vision of a Gothic community united by Catholic faith and political loyalty that Isidore supported is enhanced in Toledo IV through the overlapping of religious, ethnic, and political aspects of Gothic identity. The most explicit examples appear in canon 75, the last and most extensive of all the canons, which reads like a grand concluding pronouncement. It states that 'the glory of Christ strengthens his [the king's] realm and the people of the Goths in the Catholic faith'.[232] The kingdom and people are closely connected in this phrase, implying that the people in question was kingdom-wide. As descendants of both Goths and Romans would have been Catholic by 633, there was no reason to exclude one or the other from the spiritual benefits bestowed on the king's realm.

The conciliar records go on to declare punishments due to anyone 'of us or of the peoples of all Spain' who attempted to disrupt the 'stability of the country and people of the Goths'.[233] Isabel Velázquez, in an article focusing on the latter phrase, describes it as an attempt at social harmony and unity and compares it with the classical *senatus populusque Romanus* (senate and Roman people), with *gens* meaning the people subject to the king.[234] The connection of country and people in this formula indicates that this *gens* was inclusive just as country would be, referring to all residing in the kingdom regardless of ancestry. As the army of the Goths was an ensemble of people under the leadership of the Gothic king and with an obligation to him and to his kingdom, so the Gothic people was an ensemble under the king's jurisdiction and command.[235] Gothicness here was identified with a kingdom-wide, political meaning, and its promotion within the religious context of a church council linked that political Gothicness with religious, Catholic Gothicness. Those Goths in need of a stable kingdom and those in need of religious shepherding were one and the same, just as was established at conversion at Toledo III. Here in Toledo IV, stability was to be created through a specifically Christian consensus and anyone who deviated from the rules established therein would be excluded from the Catholic, and thus also the Gothic, community.[236]

The Fifth through Eighth Councils of Toledo over the following two decades continued to incorporate language of Gothic unity. Toledo VII (646) under the reign of Chindaswinth legislated against those who sought to harm 'the people of the Goths, the country, or the king' and thus cause difficulty for the 'army of the Goths'.[237] These include people going to regions of 'foreign peoples' for nefarious purposes, who should be seen as traitors and not given refuge. Toledo VIII (653) demanded harsh punishment for anyone who sought to ruin the 'country and people of the Goths (*Gothorum gens ac patria*)'.[238] Toledo V and VI (636 and 638) particularly concerned themselves with the legitimacy of kings, perhaps because Chintila had recently taken over from Sisenand in a coup.[239] The former states that in order to be king, one must be elected by all and be 'of the nobility of the Gothic people (*gens Gothicae*)'.[240] The latter specifies that among those not included were tyrants, those who had been tonsured as part of a religious order, those of 'servile origin', and those of a 'foreign people (*extranea gens*)'. To be the king in Visigothic Spain meant being 'by birth (*genus*) a Goth and of worthy character'.[241]

While the concern in all these passages is clearly for the integrity, safety, and stability of the Catholic Gothic people and their kingdom, the specific subset from which kings are expected to originate is less clear. In the context of the numerous other passages referring to the *gens* of the Goths broadly as all subjects of the king, being from the nobility of this *gens* seems to suggest any subject of high status, and not being of a foreign *gens* similarly suggests any native of the kingdom. The rare appearance of *genus* in Toledo VI, however, is trickier to understand and has led to a wide variety of conclusions in the scholarly literature.

The most common way historians have interpreted this passage is as restricting the kingship to Goths and excluding Hispano-Romans. Suzanne Teillet, for example, specifically mentions Romans as excluded and calls this a rare late example of 'discrimination by birth or by origin'.[242] Dietrich Claude, on the other hand, argues that its implication that people of Roman ancestry were excluded from ruling is misleading. He points to the ban on foreigners, believing, probably correctly, that by 'foreigners' the authors meant people from outside the kingdom's borders. Claude's argument is that the Goths were meant as people from inside the kingdom in contrast with these foreigners from outside, a political rather than ancestral definition of Goths.[243] Different historians have therefore taken the same passage and drawn certain, contrasting conclusions based on the assumption that only one aspect of Gothic identity could be intended in the passage. Instead, it may be (and I think it likely) that the authors intended to reserve the kingship for those native-born rather than foreigners, as indicted by their use of the terms 'foreigner' and *genus*, but defined that differently than we might today. By the 630s when these councils took place, more than forty years had passed since Toledo III and the concerted effort to get the 'Gothic' and 'Roman' populations to see themselves merged into one. Contemporaries may have begun to view all natives of the kingdom as of Gothic *genus*.

This particular canon also comes under debate in discussions of the election of King Ervig (r. 680-687). There are no contemporary sources which mention his ancestry, but the ninth-century *Chronicle of Alfonso III* claims that Ervig's mother was a relative of King Chindaswinth, whereas his father, Ardabast, was an immigrant exiled from the Byzantine Empire.[244] Claude argues that it was 'as a rule' the father's ancestry, not the mother's, that determined the ethnic identity of his children, and this would make Ervig Byzantine/Roman by

birth, a member of an *extranea gens* ineligible for the throne according to Toledo VI. Since Ervig became king, Claude reasons, the canon must not have been intended to refer to descent but political membership: Ervig was born in the Visigothic kingdom and was a loyal subject and participant in the affairs of the kingdom, which would make him, politically, a Goth.[245] Others assume that Toledo VI did indeed exclude both Hispano-Romans and foreigners, and so find other ways to explain Ervig's kingship. José Orlandis assumes that he was simply an exception to the rule, not evidence for a political meaning to the canon; he is sufficiently convinced that the only Gothic identity that mattered here was ancestry that he does not consider that Ervig could be anything other than an exception. Peter Heather solves the problem in another way by granting Ervig a Gothic ethnic identity via his mother.[246] None of these historians questions the believability of the story from Alfonso's chronicle despite its late date, but beyond that, these scholars have neglected the more than forty years which passed between the Sixth Council of Toledo and Ervig's accession to the throne. We cannot assume that people's interpretation of this passage did not change over this time, especially since the sources for these years seem to suggest a gradual shift in what it meant to be a 'Goth'.

Using a model of identification that allows for multifaceted and overlapping identities that are continually negotiated, one reaches a different conclusion altogether about the requirements of Gothic kingship in the canons of Toledo VI. What these canons in fact suggest is that multiple, overlapping senses of Gothicness were viewed as necessary for kingship—political and descent. Who exactly was viewed as of Gothic birth in 638, though, is unclear. In a period of especial flux, with an increasing repertoire of ways to identify as Gothic religiously and politically, it is entirely possible that Gothicness by ancestry had likewise begun to shift. The sources provide no examples of contemporary individuals so designated that can illuminate this further. Rather than attempting to determine which mode of identification the authors of Toledo VI 'really' intended by *genere Gothus*, historians would be better served by exploring the ways multiple aspects coincided here and were negotiated anew over the rest of the seventh century.

Doing so leads us to the interesting observation that references to Romans disappear by the early seventh century, indicating that Toledo III's rhetoric of everyone becoming Goths had

a quick and profound influence on the way contemporaries thought and wrote about residents of the Visigothic kingdom. They knew their kings were Goths and what that meant, not spelling it out for the audience because they felt such explication unneeded. Thus the precise meanings of Gothic identity Isidore and his contemporaries used remain less than clear—for us today and for later generations of Visigothic leaders and writers.

Conclusion

Throughout the first half of the seventh century, Gothic identity came to be applied more broadly to all residents of the Visigothic kingdom. The adoption of Catholicism had given Gothic religious identity a new meaning, which Isidore of Seville directly linked with loyalty to the Visigothic king. Being a good Catholic and a loyal subject were both ways to claim Gothic identity. In Isidore's *History* and conciliar records, the *gens Gothorum* appears as a unified group on both religious and political levels and linked closely to their country and king. Isidore's narrative arc linked the Gothic people to the Iberian peninsula as the destined rulers of the land, and throughout his account the Goths are victorious over 'rebels' and 'enemies' of this divinely ordained unification. Bishops at the church councils of this era increasingly referred to the 'king, people, and country of the Goths' as a unit, acting as one despite any diversity within, and in the process placing those not aligned with this vision in a vulnerable position. The increasing association of Gothicness with Catholic faith marginalized the Jews to an extent they had not before experienced in the Iberian peninsula. The first evidence of forced conversion in Spain comes from precisely this era, as Catholic leaders began to see Jewish residents as obstacles to their ideology of unity. New visions of community beginning with Toledo III marked Jews as 'other' and added an exclusionary discourse to the repertoire of identifications that contemporaries and future generations could draw upon. By the mid-seventh century, the social landscape would differ significantly from that of Reccared's day thanks to the assimilation of Romans and others into the ranks of religious and political Goths.

Chapter 3: The Later Seventh Century

Like 589, the year 654 was a turning point for discourses of identity in Visigothic Spain. It marks the end of the strong emphasis placed on Gothic identity during the first half of the century, with Isidore and various kings promoting the union of religious and political identity under the Gothic label. It was also the point at which differences between Romans and Goths—if any still existed—were formally eliminated in law. Clear statements that the whole Christian population should be treated equally appeared as kings reworked old laws that remained in use in a hodgepodge mix into a single code that would make unambiguous and uniform the law of the land.

Laws after this point, both civil and canon, would cease to refer to Romans and even Goths except in antiquated contexts, evidence that their authors no longer felt the need to specify their subjects' ethnicity. They assumed the populace was homogenous and that in all ways that mattered, everyone in the Visigothic kingdom was to be considered a 'Goth'. In place of Roman and Gothic, other identities came to be more salient, including factional loyalties between contenders for the throne and orthodox Christian identity in contrast with Jewish faith, practice, and ancestry.

The prime instigators of change this time, as in the 580s, were a father-son pair: the kings Chindaswinth and Recceswinth. This chapter will begin with them, including the church councils held under their reigns and the law code they compiled, known to us as the *Visigothic Code*. The second part of the chapter will examine the language of church councils from the year 666 on and of laws added to the *Visigothic Code* by kings Wamba, Ervig, and Egica. Finally, the evidence for all of sixth- and seventh-century Spain will be brought together into a coherent picture of the transformation of Romans to Visigoths to simply 'our people'.

Chindaswinth, Recceswinth, and Visigothic Law

King Chindaswinth (r. 641-653) came to power at an old age after Gothic nobles deposed the previous king. His attempts to assert his authority included suppressing (and even killing) some elements of the nobility in favour of those loyal to him and enacting laws relating to treason and conspiracy.[247] In 649, he made his son Recceswinth (r. 649-672) co-king, and

together they undertook an extensive overhaul of the laws of the kingdom. The *Visigothic Code* (*Lex Visigothorum*) was issued by Recceswinth in 654, incorporating laws he and his father had made with older laws still in use and revisions to old laws that no longer suited the state of Visigothic society.[248] Both the original of 654 and the 681 recension of Ervig adding laws from the interim survive.[249] Individual laws within the code are attributed to the king who enacted or emended them, usually Chindaswinth, Recceswinth, or Ervig, but occasionally also Reccared, Sisebut, or Wamba. Any which predate Reccared are simply marked *Antiquae*, and presumably come from Euric's and Leovigild's codes. This code banned the use of any preceding law codes and ordered them destroyed, framing itself as the one, unified code of law for the entire kingdom.[250] There were at least three such codes that may have been in use to one degree or another before 654: the *Code of Euric*, the *Breviary of Alaric*, and the *Codex Revisus* of Leovigild.

The *Code of Euric* was written in the late 470s, during the reign of Euric over the Visigothic kingdom of Toulouse in Gaul (466-484). It survives today only in a palimpsest fragment, probably written in southern Gaul in the sixth century.[251] By comparing the small amount that survives in this fragment with its corresponding pieces in the *Antiquae*, we can fill in some missing words and identify other laws which may date to Euric's code by their style, and Alvaro d'Ors helpfully includes in his edition a survey of those *Antiquae* which probably originate with the *Code of Euric*.[252] The code was apparently a mix of Gothic custom and Roman legal culture, including many rulings from Roman law as well as elements foreign to the Roman system.[253] D'Ors cautions that to understand Euric's code we must keep in mind that, for Euric, the disappearance after the end of the Western Roman Empire of the imperial prefect in Aquitaine (who would have directly affected Euric's control over the region) may have been more immediately significant than the disappearance of the emperor in Rome. He surmises that Euric commissioned his code in the wake of Odoacer's rise in Italy as a way to clarify the state of the law under this new administrative framework.[254]

The *Breviary of Alaric*, also known by the title *Lex Romana Visigothorum*, was issued in 506 on the authority of King Alaric II (484-507), also ruling from Toulouse. All but one of the many manuscripts which survive derive from a copy sent by Alaric to the count Timotheus, and some of these date to the sixth century. Only one manuscript comes from Spain, presumably in

part because the later *Lex Visigothorum* ordered the destruction of all law codes which preceded it, but the number of Gallic copies which survived suggests that it continued to be influential in Gaul after the Visigoths left.[255] The *Breviary* was created as an abbreviated version of the *Theodosian Code* (issued in 437 by Theodosius II, Roman emperor in the East) and most of the known fifth-century imperial laws, or *novella*, which were still used in former provinces of the empire, particularly by the church. Added to many of the laws are interpretations which explain or simply summarize the laws in order to make old laws understandable to a later society, making it a collection of older—and sometimes contradictory—laws, just as the *Theodosian Code* itself was.[256]

Alaric issued his *Breviary* during a time of tension between his Visigothic kingdom in Toulouse and Clovis' Frankish kingdom north of the river Loire, a year before Clovis would defeat and kill him and push the Visigoths out of all but the small part of Gaul known as Septimania. The timing and the thorough Romanness of the content suggest that Alaric's *Breviary* was, in part, intended to show Romans living under his rule who may have been tempted to ally themselves with Clovis that their legal tradition—still a strong symbol of Roman identity as the Empire waned—would continue to be honoured within his kingdom.[257] It had the additional benefit of casting Alaric as a direct successor to the Roman emperors: a ruler who continued to propagate their laws.[258] It was also a selection of the laws already in use in Alaric's kingdom from before the Roman Empire fell, abridged and interpreted for ease of use in their new political environment, and existing alongside the *Code of Euric* as a complement to the laws contained therein.

The *Codex Revisus* of Leovigild (568-586), probably composed c. 580, no longer survives except through the *Antiquae* of the *Lex Visigothorum*. We know it existed from Isidore of Seville's *History*, which tells us that Leovigild corrected laws promulgated by Euric, adding some which had been omitted and removing superfluous others, and we can deduce which of the *Antiquae* belonged to him rather than Euric by comparing the style.[259] Laws which are known to be Euric's do not seem to change in style from the extant sixth-century palimpsest of the *Code of Euric* to their incorporation in the seventh-century *Lex Visigothorum*, and those *Antiquae*

which share this style, therefore, can be attributed to Euric, and those which do not can be cautiously assigned to Leovigild.[260]

Many items from these old laws were included in the *Visigothic Code*, though whether they continued to be enforced in the same way as originally intended or existed mostly for reference is impossible to say. Legal sources present unique challenges to the historian because of their prescriptive nature and their reliance upon historical precedent. Laws may reflect a legal ideal rather than a social reality—attempts to affect the norms of society that may or may not have worked. They may be grand pronouncements made to make the ruler appear concerned about particular issues in his kingdom or to state official policy but never enforced. They may also reflect the past rather than contemporary society, as laws can remain 'on the books' without being enforced—either because no one has bothered to repeal an obviously out-of-date law or because it serves a useful illustrative purpose.[261] However, they do provide a window into a contemporary mindset and can tell us what a ruler wished for his society (and therefore included in his laws) or what concepts and ideals still had meaning, even on a rhetorical level.

Six of the *Antiquae* in the *Visigothic Code* pertain to land rights and can be traced to the *Code of Euric*. One of these states that any 'Gothic lots (*sortes Gothicas*)' and 'Roman thirds (*tertiae Romanorum*)' which had not been returned within fifty years could not be reclaimed.[262] This refers to the Visigothic settlement in Aquitaine, using the language common to texts from Gaul, Burgundy, and Italy.[263] Another law validated boundary changes made by Romans before Goths arrived and set out the rules for what must be done if the boundaries of land claimed by Goths and by Romans could not be easily determined by existing landmarks.[264] Two more laws pertaining to the division of arable land between 'Goths' and 'Romans' were retained in Recceswinth's code, as well as one declaring that any Roman *tertiae* unjustly appropriated by Goths must be returned.[265] One last law from the surviving parts of Euric's code appears in the *Visigothic Code*, though with alterations (presumably by Leovigild, given that it was labelled as part of the *Antiquae*). Euric's original states that if a Roman gave a Goth property that was in the process of litigation, and in so doing caused the Goth to lose his newly claimed land, the

Roman must compensate him with something of equal value.[266] The parallel law in the later code replaces the ethnonyms with a generic 'anyone (*quis*)'.

These laws are from a sufficiently early date that initially there would have been little question who the terms 'Roman' and 'Goth' applied to. In the Visigothic kingdom in Gaul, where they were written, Romans were those individuals who were citizens of the empire before it fell in the West. In later years, the terms were applied to descendants of these individuals. Since their political identity as imperial subjects had vanished, these Romans were instead identified by their former citizenship, or their ancestors' citizenship—they were born to non-barbarian parents, and thought to inherit their Romanness just as Goths inherited their Gothicness. What these terms meant in 654, though, was probably very different. The inclusion of these specific laws when other *Antiquae* were undoubtedly left out as no longer relevant suggests that some holdings continued to be managed along older lines according to a special legal status that other holdings did not fall under. It need not, however, mean that distinct segments of the population known as Goths and Romans remained in Visigothic territory, as Wolf Liebeschuetz and E.A. Thompson assume, because the arrangement these laws describe was not current but antiquated.[267] Gothic *sortes* and Roman *tertiae* refer to the property and the historical situation, not to people contemporary with Recceswinth. As often happens in law, older statutes appear in later codifications to emphasize that the *status quo* they created should continue—here that no challenges to property rights can be made based on claims dating to the settlement period. Their principles are upheld, though the language they use reflects an older reality. The item that Leovigild had edited, however, was not a clarification of the terms of settlement but a general rule that pertained to continuous practice. In the revised version, it becomes simply a law about compensation that applies to all land disputes. In this context, it is clear that the ethnonyms were removed from this specific law but not the others because it referred to something different and more broadly applicable.

From Leovigild's *Codex Revisus*, one particular law that survives in the *Visigothic Code* is of particular interest for understanding shifting conceptions of identity. *LV* III, 1, 1, which formally allowed Romans and Goths to marry, is a central point of many arguments about law and ethnic identities in the Visigothic kingdom. According to the text of the law itself, it was

enacted because an ancient law on the subject was unacceptable because it unjustly prevented the marriage of individuals of equal status and lineage. It declared that henceforth 'a Gothic man may marry a Roman woman, and likewise a Gothic woman a Roman man (*ut tam Gothus Romanam, quam etiam Gotam Romanus si coniugem habere voluerit*)', provided of course that they met the status and permission requirements recorded elsewhere in the code. Social class apparently mattered more to Leovigild and the elites of his kingdom than ancestry.

The prohibition on intermarriage has a complex history which is necessary to understand in order to see how the specific meaning changed from a Roman to a Visigothic context and why it probably was not as straightforward as the text of Leovigild makes it appear.[268] The ancient law to which Leovigild refers was issued on 28 May 373 by Emperor Valentinian I to Theodosius, the *magister equitum* (chief of the cavalry) serving in North Africa. Theodosius was fighting a difficult campaign against an African-Roman named Firmus and a group of African Moorish rebels. These were not outsiders or foreign enemies but rebels from within the boundaries of the Roman Empire.[269] This is a key point in understanding the intent of the law, which reads as follows: 'No provincial (*provincialis*), of whatever rank or class he may be, shall marry a barbarian wife (*barbara uxor*), nor shall a provincial woman be united with any gentile (*gentilis*)'.[270] In this original version, 'Romans' were not mentioned directly, but 'provincials' certainly referred to Roman citizens living in the provinces of the empire. Those whom the Roman provincials were barred from marrying were both 'barbarian' and 'gentile'. Normally throughout the *Theodosian Code* in which this older law was included, 'gentiles' refers to pagans or border tribesmen, and Moors living within the Roman frontier could easily be seen in this manner.[271] Further supporting this hypothesis is the fact that the penalty imposed in this law is not for the marriage itself but for the conspiratorial action which may come of it. The very next line states that if alliances come of these marriages and if anything should be disclosed as suspect or criminal, the parties will face capital punishment.[272] Valentinian aimed through this regulation to prevent Roman provincials from siding with 'barbarian' rebels because of ties through marriage.[273]

By 506 when Alaric ordered the compilation of his *Breviary*, the background of this law would have been difficult to discover, since the editors of the *Theodosian Code* had not

included most of the contextual details surrounding its promulgation.[274] The legal advisers who compiled the *Breviary* added an interpretation that slightly altered the meaning of this law, whether intentionally or not. 'Provincial' became 'Roman' and 'gentile' became 'barbarian'.[275] They also did not reiterate the original law's emphasis on collaboration with the enemy as the actual act being punished, altering the meaning further to focus on the marriage as the crime rather than its consequences.[276] Whether these alterations to the original meaning of the text were intentional or simply an indication that the context had been forgotten is impossible to know.

Historians have interpreted these changes in a number of ways, but usually ignoring the key evidence of a concurrent council of Catholic bishops.[277] These bishops were called together at Agde in 506 by Alaric himself, from Visigothic territory in both Gaul and Spain. This council was headed by Caesarius of Arles, whom Alaric had previously exiled to Bordeaux, and may have been intended to show Catholics—most of whom were then certainly Romans—that their ruler was concerned to preserve their institutions.[278] It provided security in the religious sphere while the *Breviary* provided it in the legal sphere. The records of this council include its own intermarriage ban between Catholics and 'heretics'. The canons state that it was improper to join in marriage with any heretics, and to give them sons and daughters, but it was allowed to marry them if they promised that they would become Catholic Christians.[279] The two types of bans are probably related. As the majority of Romans were Catholic and the majority of Goths were then members of the Arian sect, just as we saw in the first chapter, the Catholic-heretic marriage ban and the Roman-barbarian ban seem meant to apply to the same people, using different modes of identification. In a period when religious and descent identities would have mostly overlapped and, as we have already seen, been generally assumed to map onto one another, these identities reinforced each other, and the clear concern from both sides to maintain separation led to legislation in both ecclesiastical and secular spheres.

It is also unclear whether Alaric and his advisers intended 'barbarian' to refer to non-Romans (including Visigoths) or to foreigners from outside the kingdom. It is a bit odd for a document issued under the purview of the Goths to refer to the Goths as 'barbarians', something which does not happen in other such sources in the Visigothic kingdom, and even

elsewhere in the *Breviary*, 'barbarian' generally indicated an enemy or some sort of alien 'other'.[280] It was not completely unheard of, though, appearing around the same time in Burgundian law and in later sixth-century Gaul in Venantius Fortunatus' poetry.[281] The unique use of 'barbarian' and the removal of 'provincial'—a less meaningful term post-Empire— perhaps signal a time of transition and of confusion about how the two groups would now relate to each other. The dynamics of their world had changed, and not completely settled, as had reference points for what 'barbarian' and 'Roman' meant. If their identities were less than clear, it is unsurprising that the same was true of their language.

While we cannot be sure precisely how the *Breviary*'s ban was intended—or whether its authors were even sure—we can clearly see that by Leovigild's time both wording and meaning had shifted and the law was now interpreted as banning marriage between Goths and Romans. There had, though, been at least some such marriages prior to Leovigild's official legalization of them, including that of Theudis, an Ostrogothic nobleman sent by Theoderic as his royal proxy during the Ostrogothic domination of Spain in the 520s, who married a local Hispano-Roman woman. His subsequent rise to the throne shows that no one was terribly concerned about this particular intermarriage.[282] It may be that the lifting of the ban was a formality that made a no longer suitable law conform to actual practices that were already beginning to change. As with Alaric's *Breviary* and the Council of Agde, Leovigild's law was issued concurrently with his Arian synod. Given the common assumption in his day as in Alaric's that Goths were—or should be— all Arian Christians and Romans all Catholic, Leovigild probably conflated the religious and descent aspects of these identities and conceived of the civil and the canon laws as connected. We should see this law within the broader context of his attempts to renegotiate these identities to form a unified Gothic community, encompassing both aspects in one: whether Catholic, Arian, Roman, or Goth, all subjects of similar status were free to marry.

By the time Recceswinth included Leovigild's decree in his *Visigothic Code*, intermarriage had been officially legal for over sixty years. It would be foolish to presume that there remained a clear segmentation between Romans and Goths among the population of the kingdom unless the sources explicitly told us so. Children of these intermarriages would share the cultures, names, traditions, and lineages of both groups—a wide repertoire of possibilities

for navigating an increasingly intermixed community. They would have grown up during a period of particular interest in the assimilation of all Iberians into one 'people'. Roman and Gothic identities are highly unlikely to have remained distinct—and in fact, as we will shortly see, they would soon disappear from the source record altogether. References to Romans and Goths are more likely to have been rhetorical constructions acknowledging the possibility of different ethnicities within the kingdom and symbolically applying the law to all. So why does this law remain in the legal record? As with the vestiges of the settlement period from Euric's code, Leovigild's law in a mid-seventh-century context continued to represent the *status quo*, the rights people had to marry and the reasons these rights were granted. By keeping this law on record, Recceswinth supported the premise of marriage within one's social status that inspired it. In fact, in the Ninth Council of Toledo—held in 655, the year after the *Visigothic Code* was issued—we see another example of marriage rules privileging social status over ancestry. Canon thirteen states that because the nobility must 'preserve their *genus*' and prevent 'alien intermixing from polluting it', all freedmen (*liberti*) of the church—male or female, and their descendants—are forbidden from marrying free persons (*ingenui*)—whether Roman or Goth.[283] The following canon continued that should this rule be broken, again by Goths or by Romans, the children of these unions would be unable to leave the patronage of the church. Once again, both secular and church law emphasize marriage based on social standing rather than ethnicity in much the same language, the latter responding to and paralleling the former.

In addition to the *Antiquae*, three laws from Reccared and Sisebut regarding Jews appear in the *Visigothic Code*. Both of Sisebut's laws concern Christian slaves connected with Jews, and one refers back to Reccared's decree that Christian slaves should not remain with Jewish masters, hence the latter's inclusion along with the two of Sisebut.[284] These are situated among a number of new laws pertaining to Jews, and were probably included because Recceswinth wished these regulations (but not others, like Sisebut's forced conversion that Isidore recorded) to continue to be in force.[285] Both of Sisebut's laws contain a perplexing reference to Roman citizenship. *LV* XII, 2, 13 states that any Christian slaves still in the possession of Jews shall have the same legal rights as 'a citizen of the Romans (*civis*

Romanorum)', and the following clause reiterates that when a Jew frees a Christian slave it must be done in such way as to allow him to attain the rank of 'Roman citizen'. Obviously no (loyal) subject of the Visigothic kings was a citizen of the Eastern Roman Empire, so this is not actual citizenship. The focus here is on rights, referring to a collection of rights historically associated with Roman citizenship which made that status so highly valued in the late Empire. Similar grants of Roman citizenship to freed slaves appear in the *Visigothic Formulary*, a collection of model documents probably assembled in the late seventh century and used for the phrasing of charters of manumission found in the monastery of Celanova in the ninth century and later.[286] 'Roman citizen' was simply a formulaic phrase to be copied out, indicating not that the recipient would actually become a participating citizen of an empire which no longer existed in the West, but that he would have the same rights and privileges such a citizen had in the past, such as owning property and giving legal testimony. This sort of anachronistic language reflecting past rather than contemporary circumstances is common in legal texts, especially documents based on formularies, which simply copy the language present.

In Sisebut's time, though, the term 'Roman citizen' may have had a stronger resonance than in these later formulary examples. 'Roman law' in some form continued to be used throughout Western Europe beyond the demise of the western empire. Bishops at the Second Council of Seville (619), for example, clearly knew it and applied it to their canonical decisions, and in Frankish law, the Catholic Church was considered to be held to it.[287] The *Breviary of Alaric* still remained in use during Sisebut's reign, and as a summary of Roman law it contains guidelines pertaining to Roman citizens. It also mentions the even more antiquated *Latini*, a rank between full citizen and non-citizen created for the people of Latium in the fourth century B.C. and rendered a formality when full citizenship was granted throughout the empire in 212.[288] Jews themselves had been made Roman citizens in 212 and were identified as such in the *Breviary*.[289] The inclusion of Roman citizenship in both Alaric's *Breviary* and the law of Sisebut—and the repetition of Sisebut's laws in Recceswinth's code—indicates that these kings associated certain freedoms with Romanness and chose to perpetuate this connection, and that the phrase continued to have rhetorical significance—and was perhaps even expected—within contemporary mentalities.[290] These laws are proof that the privileges of such citizenship were

still acknowledged and desired; a slave who gained the rights of a Roman citizen did not necessarily become 'Roman' outside of this legal identity—what he or she gained was the freedom that this shorthand implied. As is often the case with legal language, 'Roman citizen' reflects not so much the contemporary social order as a historical one turned into legal shorthand that created legal identities different from other aspects of identity common elsewhere in society. Jews' status, however, was clearly more precarious in Recceswinth's Iberia than it had been under the old Roman laws. A number of new laws restricting both Jews and converts appear in the *Visigothic Code* along with the three borrowed from previous kings.[291]

There are a few occasions in which we can see the *Visigothic Code* continuing the concern for Gothic identity evident among earlier authors, though they are comparatively limited. *LV* II, 1, 8, attributed to Chindaswinth, laments the domestic strife which had been afflicting the 'country of the Goths (*Gotorum patria*)' and declares that anyone who deserted to the enemy or otherwise acted with criminal intent against 'the country or people of the Goths (*gens Gotorum vel patria*)' shall be harshly punished.[292] This matches the language of church councils from earlier in the century, including those of Toledo VII and VIII, held during Chindaswinth and Recceswinth's reigns, respectively. As we have already seen, Toledo VII (646) legislated against those who sought to harm 'the people of the Goths, the country, or the king' including those traveling to foreign regions to cause trouble, and Toledo VIII (653) similarly targeted anyone who sought to ruin the 'country and people of the Goths (*Gothorum gens ac patria*)'.[293] Gothic identity appears one further time, again in a law dating to Chindaswinth's reign, in the phrase 'leaders (*seniores*) of the Gothic people (*gens Gothorum*)'. The law sets the maximum size of the dowry for anyone from the nobles of 'our palace' or the leaders of the Gothic people who seeks to be married. It further stipulates that the bride may give whatever she wishes of her own property to the groom, 'as was permitted by Roman laws'.[294] Compared with the number of times Jews and Christians are mentioned by name in new laws issued by Recceswinth and his father, however, 'Goth' and 'Roman' barely merit notice. The majority of the laws referring to Goths and Romans that are contained in the *Visigothic Code* are *Antiquae*

referring to very different circumstances from an era long past. Different aspects of identity mattered more in the second half of the seventh century.

The relative lack of ethnic distinction in these laws, the earlier existence of Euric's and Leovigild's codes along side the Roman law of the *Breviary*, and the fact that the *Visigothic Code* expressly banned the use of older codes and any further borrowing from 'Roman law or foreign institutions' have contributed to the idea that this code represents the first time Goths and Romans lived according to the same laws within the Visigothic kingdom.[295] Proponents of the so-called theory of personality of law argue that different codes of law existed simultaneously for different peoples in post-Roman kingdoms, in this case the *Breviary of Alaric* applying only to Romans and the *Code of Euric* (and, for most, the later *Codex Revisus*) meant only for the Goths. Herwig Wolfram, for example, argues that if the *Code of Euric* were territorial, applying to Goths and Romans alike, there would be no need for Alaric to bother compiling his *Breviary*.[296] The only time Euric's code would apply to Romans, in his opinion, would be when both Goths and Romans were involved in the same case, as it lays out guidelines for their interaction which are absent from the *Breviary*. P.D. King insists that the two strands of law must be for separate peoples because of contrasts and apparent contradictions between them, though he does note that it is odd that Leovigild and Reccared, with all their actions toward unity, did not attempt to rectify this situation.[297] For all supporters of this stance, the most probable explanation is that these two codes, Euric's and Alaric's, functioned in Visigothic Gaul and Spain in the same way that the multiplicity of codes did (at least theoretically) in the Frankish kingdom, each pertaining to a different ethnic group.[298] There is no reason, in their view, to believe otherwise.

Yet the existence of multiple law codes before the *Lex Visigothorum* in 654 need not be a contradiction which can only be resolved in this way. As we have already seen, legal texts can reflect past practice as much as current reality, and projected ideals as much as actual practice. Burgundian and Frankish law is assumed to have functioned along personal lines because of passages in their codes declaring so (though this itself is not so simple).[299] As A. López Amo Marín notes, the Visigothic laws have no such explicit statement of limitation.[300] Both Alvaro d'Ors and Patrick Wormald find the *Code of Euric* to be similar to other edicts with a territorial

nature, such as those of imperial prefects and of the Ostrogothic kings preserved by Cassiodorus. Wormald also equates the codification by Recceswinth with the Roman practice of assembling various laws and edicts which had been in force simultaneously into a single body of legal writing. This means that the *Breviary* need not have replaced the *Code of Euric* or been intended for a separate people in order to exist concurrently with it; they could be complementary, with Euric's code meant for everyone and Roman law serving its own, supplementary purposes.[301] Wolf Liebeschuetz sees Euric's code itself as serving as a supplement to Roman law, providing guidance on matters unmentioned in the *Theodosian Code* and other Roman laws and addressing matters specifically relevant to the sharing of a kingdom between Goths and Romans. Alaric's later *Breviary* was a gesture meant to reassure his Roman subjects that the code of his father, Euric, had not superseded their cherished, familiar laws, and to clarify these laws with new interpretations for the changed situation in which they found themselves.[302] In this view, these two law codes were not mutually exclusive but compatible.[303]

Ultimately, the picture presented by Wormald and Liebeschuetz seems the most sensible option. There is a tendency in early medieval scholarship to assume that all the post-Roman kingdoms shared the same experiences, filling in gaps in source-poor regions like Spain with the relative wealth of evidence from the Frankish kingdom. The evidence for Visigothic law does not, however, match that written in the Frankish and Burgundian kingdoms; there is no explicit statement of personality in any of the Visigothic law codes, nor is there direct evidence that they were used in a personal manner in practice (though this evidence does not exist in the Frankish kingdom either). The similarities between the Visigothic codes and other post-Roman legal codes are not sufficiently great to allow us to assume the that they were applied in the same manner.

Moreover, the earliest Visigothic law codes do not lend themselves well to personal application. If, as the majority of those who argue in favour of personality of law believe, the *Breviary* was the sole law code for Romans within the Visigothic kingdom, while the *Code of Euric* and later the *Codex Revisus* applied only to Goths and to situations in which Goths and Romans interacted, then the Roman residents lived with a stagnant code, not once updated to

suit new circumstances between 506 and 654. Nor, indeed, did the updates made in 506 actually add any new legislation; they were all in the form of 'interpretations' which changed terminology to reflect a new political situation or clarified terms, and in the selection of material to keep and to omit.[304] Under a system of separate Gothic and Roman legislation, Romans in 653 would still have been using a clarified, but not truly updated, version of the *Theodosian Code* from 437.[305]

The simplest answer, and the one I find most convincing, is that it was never intended that the old Roman law would be abandoned, nor that it should be followed by all Romans unchanged for a century and a half. It was the foundation upon which the legal system had been built and would continue to serve as such, with Euric and later Leovigild supplementing this foundation as their situations warranted, for both Goths and Romans.[306] Together the various codes preceding Recceswinth's in 654 formed a single body of law, a collection with some inconsistencies—just like the *Breviary* and the *Theodosian Code* themselves were—which could be used or discarded as needed for Goths and Romans alike. Recceswinth's code, being unusually comprehensive, was sufficient to replace these and stand alone.[307]

Of course, the *Visigothic Code*'s predecessors need not have applied to Goths and Romans differently in order for the new set of laws to serve as a statement of legal unity. The new code specified that old and foreign codes were useful for reference and study, but clarified that they should not be used in court nor borrowed from beyond what borrowings survived in the *Visigothic Code* itself. It gathered together into one document all the laws which were to followed within the kingdom, ending not personality of law but the messy system of overlapping sources of legal precepts that the early Visigothic kingdom had inherited from the Roman Empire. It solidified the community that Chindaswinth and Recceswinth's predecessors had worked to unite under one envisioned Gothic banner. Henceforth, within this vision, there would be one law for the entire kingdom, just as there was one promoted religion and one loyal citizenry: the Gothic people.

Later Councils and Laws

In the years following Recceswinth's code and the related Ninth Council of Toledo, concern to present the community as unified and explicitly 'Gothic' seems to disappear quickly. Aside from one highly antiquated-sounding law from c. 680, the 654 version of the *Visigothic Code* is the last mention of Goths and Romans in civil law. Similarly, conciliar records cease to mention the *gens Gothorum* except for one case, referring instead to the good of the people generally, without additional labels. That these people were Goths was simply assumed. The *Visigothic Code* may not have officially eliminated any yet-extant differences between Goths and Romans, but it most definitely represents the point at which another shift toward a near complete lack of concern for ethnic identities took place in the language of the sources—and in the mentalities tied to this discourse.

The one civil exception appears in a law regarding the people who must report for a summons of the army. It is commonly attributed to Ervig (r. 680-687), though some manuscripts name Wamba as the issuer. The law states that anyone who joined the army must bring a tenth of his slaves with him. In case there was any question as to what 'anyone' meant, it was clarified: 'whether he is a duke, count, or *gardingus*; a Goth or a Roman; a freeman or a freedman; or any servant attached to the service of the crown'.[308] The language of this law seems both dated and symbolic. It reads much like the classical *consensus omnium* that used a list of known groups or pairings of groups to represent the whole population.[309] Together 'Goth' and 'Roman', or 'freeman' and 'freedman', symbolize all possibilities, and, in this case, reiterate that there were no exceptions to this rule, not even if you were a duke, or a Goth, or a Roman, with an implied 'and so forth'. 'Roman' may have been included simply as a rhetorical match for 'Goth'. In canon law, the exception is actually a reference back to the Fourth Council of Toledo. Toledo XVI (693) during the reign of Ervig's successor, Egica, discusses traitors and other enemies of the kingdom. In doing so, its authors quote the words 'of old (*ex antiquo*)' that anyone 'of us or of the people of Spain' who threatens the health and well-being of 'the country and people of the Goths' should be punished harshly.[310] This is a rare clear case of the citing of legal precedent as authority for current rules and regulations, not a reflection of common usage in 693.

In the majority of the legal sources, however, references to Gothicness are dropped from the usual formulas. Where once the phrase *gens Gothorum* appeared to refer to all inhabitants or participants in the kingdom's affairs, in the late seventh century the qualification *Gothorum* was usually dropped; the people were simply a *gens*. The Council of Mérida (666), for example, discussed the defence and security of the 'king, people, and country (*rex, gens, aut patria*)' without specifying that these were Gothic, and phrases like *seniores gentis Gothorum* virtually disappear in favour of simply *seniores*.[311] The text of this council still includes language of unity, but without the earlier concern to define the unified people along ethnic lines. The populace appears here not as 'the country and people of the Goths' but as 'his' (Recceswinth's) people and country. Similarly, some manuscripts of Toledo XII (681) during Ervig's reign simply refer to the people of 'our kingdom'.[312]

As a substitute for 'Gothic', the qualification *Hispaniae* (of Spain) appeared more frequently at this time. For example, all the bishops 'of Spain and Gaul' are described as being present at Toledo XV and XVII (688 and 694), referring to the territory under Visigothic control in the old Roman provinces of Hispania and Gallia Narbonensis.[313] Toledo X (656) aims to standardize a feast day 'in multiple parts of Spain' where it had been celebrated incorrectly.[314] Toledo XIV (684) tells of 'Spanish bishops (*Spanorum praesulum*) of all Spain and Gaul' rather than Gothic ones, and of the 'kingdom of Spain (*regnum Hispaniae*)' rather than the 'kingdom of the Goths'.[315] 'All inhabitants of Spain' are to be held to the regulations laid out in this council.[316] While Spain, or Spain and Gaul, had been mentioned as geographical locators in previous councils, *Spanorum* meaning 'Spanish' had not. Its use here to describe people from both Hispania and Gallia Narbonensis is a bit hard to understand, but at the very least it suggests that people in the late seventh century were beginning to reimagine their community as based on geographical lines.

This shift away from Gothic toward Spanish identity does not mean, as a number of historians have suggested, that the late seventh century was the era in which modern Spain and Spanish identity was born. It is not 'the birth of the first nation of modern Europe' or the awakening of 'the Hispanic nationality'.[317] It is simply a sign of assimilation of Hispano-Romans and others into 'Gothic' identity. Gothicness needed to be mentioned less often because in a

political sense, and perhaps even in all other senses, effectively everyone in the Visigothic kingdom had come to be envisioned as a 'Goth'.

Distinction based on ancestry may no longer have been particularly salient, but in its place religious distinctions between Christians and non-Christians rose in importance. In Iberia before the arrival of Muslims in 711, non-Christians essentially meant Jews.[318] Legislators no longer paid attention to Goths and Romans, at least in a contemporary context, focusing greater concern on the Jewish exception to kingdom-wide unity. Bishops at Toledo X showed particular concern for Christian slaves not falling under Jewish ownership.[319] Ervig devoted a full twenty-five laws in his recension of the *Visigothic Code* to restrictions on Jews and descendants of Jews, and these were all confirmed by the bishops of Toledo XII.[320] Ervig's successor, Egica (r. 687-702), was even harsher still in his legislation.[321] Both Ervig and Egica gave the appearance of being good Catholic kings who protected their subjects from non-Christian influence, but the fact that laws forcing conversion and expulsion of Jews continued to be enacted proves that earlier laws had not been successfully enforced, and that, while ideologically Jews were problematic, in practice they were more likely to be tolerated as long-time neighbours and fellow subjects.[322]

Conclusion

The early promoters of unity—particularly Leovigild, Reccared, and Isidore—could not have known how successful their vision of a united Gothic kingdom would be. The official promotion of unity on territorial, religious, and political levels redefined the possibilities for being a good, loyal Goth. Reccared's conversion to Catholicism eliminated religious barriers to envisioning the Gothic and Roman portions of the population as essentially different. Isidore drew on the new religious commonality that the conversion had established to solidify a vision of Gothic Catholic Spain, unified under one ruler, one kingdom, and one faith. The deliberate focus on universality of Gothic identity facilitated the renegotiation of residents' various affiliations and the reimagining of identities across the Iberian peninsula. By 654, when Recceswinth issued his *Visigothic Code*, this renegotiation had progressed to the point that Gothic and Roman identities seemed relics of a distant past. Chindaswinth and Recceswinth

eliminated any distinction that may yet have led subjects to divide themselves into these two groups, presenting one law for one community. The Ninth Council of Toledo in 655 similarly emphasized the application of regulations within the kingdom to 'Romans and Goths alike', and from then until the end of the Visigothic kingdom the few references to Romans or to the *gens Gothorum* described not the present but a point in Iberia's past. References to the security of the Gothic people in 633 served to bolster arguments for protecting the security of 'people' in the whole 'country' sixty years later. Historical people were the *gens Gothorum*, but contemporaries were simply a *gens*. Gothic identity had been so thoroughly adopted that neither it nor its metaphorical Roman opposite needed to be mentioned. In political, religious, and probably even descent terms, every Christian living under Visigothic rule could be envisioned as a Goth.

Part Two: From a Roman to a Frankish World in Merovingian Gaul

As in the Visigothic kingdom, a new political identity developed in the Merovingian kingdoms of the Franks during the sixth and seventh centuries. By the seventh century, political Frankishness had developed to the point that people of any background could identify with it, usually without renouncing their other identities. Unlike in Spain, however, Frankish political identity did not become so all-encompassing as to eliminate Roman and other identities from the map. In part because of continued geographical separation which created Frankish (north), Roman (south), Burgundian (Rhône valley) and other enclaves, and in part because of official sanction of continued ethnic difference in the *Lex Ribuaria* and later law codes, Merovingian society developed an environment in which at least two layers of identity remained especially salient and mutually compatible.[323] A diverse number of ethnic identities were still expressed and even encouraged, overlaid by a single Frankish political identity that unified inhabitants under the common banner of the Frankish kings as their subjects and participants in a kingdom-wide society.

To understand why Gaul was different, we need to look at the establishment and growth of the Merovingian kingdoms.[324] When the western Roman Empire ceased to be in 476 (or 480), Gaul had already been settled and governed by 'barbarians' for some time. The Visigoths had been imperial federates in Aquitaine in southern Gaul since 418, and the Burgundians in the Rhône valley since c. 440. The Franks were never settled by treaty on Roman territory and gradually entered northern Gaul from the north and east. Clovis became king of a small region in 481 and began a campaign to conquer, first lands held by other Franks, then those held by their neighbours. In 507, he defeated Alaric II, king of the Visigoths, at Vouillé and took most of his territory in Gaul, pushing the Visigoths firmly into Spain, as we have seen. Around the same time, Clovis converted both himself and many of his people to Catholicism.[325] Thus religious unity came early enough to the Frankish kingdoms that divisions along these lines never became problematic the way they did in Iberia.

When Clovis died in 511, his kingdom was divided among his four sons, a practice which would become common in Francia. In 531, they conquered Thuringia, and in 534, Burgundy. By 536, when they gained Provence after the fall of the Ostrogoths in Italy, they together ruled all

of modern France except Septimania (under Visigothic control) and Brittany (under Merovingian influence and occasionally loose control), plus most of the modern Low Countries and Switzerland, and a good deal of modern Germany. However, the division of the territory among multiple kings led to considerable infighting that continued through the rest of the century to 613, when Clothar II managed to get the whole under his control. By that time, the territory had settled into three units: Neustria, north of the Loire including Paris and Champagne; Austrasia, east of Champagne into the Rhineland; and Burgundy, along the Rhône valley. Aquitaine and Provence were divided among these three subkingdoms, and other areas like Thuringia gave allegiance to one subkingdom or another.

Clothar's unity held to some degree, but it was still common for father and son, or two brothers, to rule jointly, with one leading Neustria and Burgundy and the other Austrasia. The second half of the seventh century saw a new period of infighting, this time predominantly aristocrats versus kings or other aristocrats, rather than king versus king. During this time, the palace mayors became more prominent, especially in Austrasia. By the mid-eighth century, these mayors, from a family known to us as the Pippinids, had grown powerful enough for mayor Pippin the Short to depose King Childeric III in 751 and, with permission of the pope, take the kingship for himself, beginning the Carolingian dynasty.[326]

Because of the custom of sharing responsibility for ruling among multiple kings, Frankish territory was rarely unified. Rather than an age of consolidation like Spain saw in Isidore of Seville's time, Gaul/Francia experienced continued diversity—of kings, of subkingdoms, of peoples, and of cultures. An individual like Gregory of Tours might need to negotiate a neutral path that kept him in good favour as his city changed hands between different subkingdoms and kings.[327] Someone in Paris in the late seventh century might encounter Bavarians, Saxons, Britons, Burgundians, Frisians, and Franks rather than the homogenized social landscape of the same period in Spain.

Nevertheless, an increase in political and structural identification with the ruling Franks can be seen in Merovingian Gaul, as with the Visigoths in Spain. This section will illustrate the development of this political Frankish identity and the decrease in Roman styles of identification as more people came to embrace the new Frankish society. Because of Gaul's

unusual ethnic complexity and superior documentation among early medieval kingdoms, it has been studied more extensively than Spain and offers far more source material than can reasonably be covered here. Instead, this section will focus on comparisons with the Spanish material, through an examination of a handful of key texts. We will begin with a look at the sixth-century *Histories* and hagiographical writings of Gregory of Tours, the most studied figure from Merovingian Gaul. Gregory's work will then be compared with that of his contemporary, the poet and occasional hagiographer Venantius Fortunatus, and then with its nearest seventh-century counterpart, the *Chronicle* of Fredegar. The section will conclude with three hagiographical sources by different authors, chosen for their explicit use of terms that facilitate comparison, to demonstrate the place of Gregory, Fortunatus, and Fredegar within a wider social and literary landscape. Through these sources, we will see the development of a new, more Frankish-centred mental framework of identification and a steady and continual reconceptualization of what it meant to be a Roman or a Frank during the sixth and seventh centuries in Gaul.

Chapter 4: Gregory of Tours

Gregory, bishop of Tours from 573 until 594, is the best-known individual from the Merovingian kingdoms, and the source of the bulk of our knowledge of the late sixth century, for better or worse.[328] He is, therefore, the obvious writer with whom to begin. It is commonly known that in his *Histories* and hagiographical works, Gregory described people in his native Gaul as 'Roman' when writing abut the late Roman empire and its immediate aftermath, but not for his own contemporaries in the sixth century. There were certainly some who identified themselves or were identified by others as Romans, as we will see in the next chapter, yet Gregory did not choose this strategy of identification himself.

Historians have long puzzled over and attempted to explain this terminological choice. For Godefroid Kurth, there were no Romans to mention because everyone had become a Frank. Michel Rouche argued that as a descendant of Roman senators, Gregory would have felt a sense of superiority over non-Romans and continued to describe an extant Roman identity with terms like 'senator'.[329] However, these explanations rested on two long-held assumptions. First was that Gregory's work is an accurate, unmediated reflection of his society. During the literary turn of the late twentieth century, by contrast, Ian Wood and others demonstrated that, in fact, Gregory could be a cunning manipulator of information who recorded, omitted, and ordered episodes for specific purposes. These might have been ideological or simply practical aims to preserve his status in volatile political situations.[330] The second assumption was that his work was titled *The History of the Franks* and as such was meant as a story of the Frankish people. By tracing the reception of Gregory's work over the centuries, Walter Goffart showed that his *Histories* (or *Ten Books of Histories*) were only titled 'of the Franks' in the tenth century, on a copy of a seventh-century abridged recension. Abridgers who wanted Gregory's *Histories* to tell a somewhat different story less focused on Gregory's social connections trimmed his account to six books, and once tenth-century editors retitled it for their own purposes, the name stuck.[331]

As a result of these new insights, historians seeking to understand Gregory's terminology now must explain his reasons for writing and the literary strategies he may have employed. Thus Walter Goffart concludes that if we stop assuming that Gregory framed his world in ethnic terms and wrote a Frankish history, it is clear he in fact wrote a Christian

history, and this Christian focus led Gregory to see ethnic identities as unimportant. Goffart asserts that instead of calling people Romans (or Franks), Gregory identified them by city (*civitas*) or as part of a wider Christian community.[332] Most recently, Helmut Reimitz has built on Goffart's foundation to argue that Gregory deliberately suppressed ways of identifying as Frankish—including an origin story, a link with early Christianity, and agency in the sixth century—in order to promote his own, Christian vision of community. According to Reimitz, Gregory's aims were not simply to record history, but to 'study the reality and potency of pastoral power', to provide himself with legitimacy as both author and actor, and to destabilize alternatives to his preferred Gallic, Christian ideal community.[333]

Both historians' contributions have been extremely valuable. Goffart is certainly correct to direct attention to Gregory's status as a Christian bishop and his religious priorities, as well as the localism of the late antique world that makes Gregory's use of city identities unsurprising. Likewise, Reimitz stresses that Gregory's vision of community was a Christian one, further proving the importance of religious dedication to Gregory's life and writings, and demonstrates how to understand an author within the confines of his own context and the possibilities afforded to him—his *Spielräume*.

There are, however, some problems. Reimitz's theory that Gregory denied the Franks community building blocks because of his discomfort with the growing strength of Frankish identity is fascinating, and entirely possible. However, it seems to me still quite speculative—something Gregory *could* have intended but that we cannot *prove* he intended. In addition, both Goffart and Reimitz assume that the lack of ethnonyms in Gregory's *Histories* is directly related to his Christian focus—whether because ethnic identity seemed irrelevant (Goffart) or threatening (Reimitz). Yet this need not be the case, and a simpler explanation is at least equally plausible: that the localism of sixth-century Gaul, noted by Goffart, made city and other local identifiers both more meaningful and more relevant to Gregory's contemporary audience, and so he chose these labels in addition to ones that mattered to an influential Christian.

This explanation is especially compelling given the difference between insiders and outsiders from Gregory's perspective at Tours. Gregory's admonition at the end of his *Histories* that his work remain unaltered is addressed to his successors as bishop of Tours, suggesting

that he anticipated the manuscript would remain in the city and be read most by people familiar with the local area.[334] Just as a group of English people talking among themselves would not continually refer to each other as 'English', Gregory, writing primarily for and about people within the Frankish kingdoms, would not have found it necessary to continually label them as Romans or Franks. Other insiders would probably have known these labels without needing to be told, making their use unnecessary. We would expect, then, for Gregory to distinguish outsiders like Goths and Saxons along 'ethnic lines' but not Romans and Franks. And indeed he did, as Edward James noted in his evaluation of Gregory's use of the term 'Frank'.[335] Insiders would have found it more useful to situate his protagonists within their local landscape. Thus we see Gregory drop familiar names, refer to well-known places of the time, and otherwise situate the individuals he described within social networks. In addition to being practical categories on a local level, they were also common to the Roman mindset. Classical texts often described people according to a high rank, their fathers or other well-known relatives, and their city of origin, and Gregory, born to a Roman senatorial family, shared this earlier mindset and described his contemporaries accordingly.[336]

In what follows, I will examine Gregory's use, or non-use, of ethnonyms and what he elected to use instead: family, rank, and city identifiers. We will see that in describing both earlier times (when 'Roman' was a clearer political category and a term in his repertoire) and his own era he used these three types of identifiers regularly, enabling his audience to situate people within both a social and a geographical framework. We will also see that his ability to do so increased the closer an individual was to him. He was less likely to know the details of northerners, foreigners, and people outside his social circles and therefore more frequently resorted to broader descriptors for them. Gregory's Christianity undoubtedly shaped his views of the world, but so did his experience of a society still concerned with Roman markers of status and importance, and still sufficiently city-focused to envision their world from its horizons. His inclusion of status and other locally salient terms throughout his works indicates that his desire for shared Christendom did not override these concerns, and that any analysis of Gregory's choices must take this local perspective into consideration.

The Late Roman Empire and Clovis' Reign

One difficulty with examining Gregory's account of imperial times and the reign of Clovis is that he was understandably less well-informed the farther back in time he went. As a result, there are few individuals from before his lifetime he describes in detail and most of these were from his home city of Clermont and his adopted city of Tours. The patterns of word usage Gregory established when describing these earlier individuals and groups—when he called them Roman or Frank, for example, and when he substituted social status, family ties, or city affiliations—give us insight into his meaning when using the same patterns to discuss his own period.

For this earlier period, though, because the Roman Empire still ruled Gaul during or shortly before these people's lifetimes, we can be more certain about who was a Roman citizen or a descendant of one than we can later in the sixth century. These are people who could easily have been identified as Romans within the repertoire of identifications available to Gregory, though he elected to use other terms from that repertoire instead. Nevertheless, they do allow us to evaluate whether Gregory's chosen terms varied based on ancestry or on the different political situations (late empire and post-empire) the individuals experienced.

The attribute Gregory most commonly mentioned when writing about individuals in the period before 511 was a senatorial family. Leocadius, whom Gregory described as 'the leading senator of Gaul' in the late third or early fourth century and as a descendant of the lineage (*stirps*) of the martyr Vettius Epagatus, was in fact among Gregory's claimed ancestors.[337] Three bishops of Tours—Eustochius (444-461), Perpetuus (461-491), and Volusianus (491-498)—and two of Clermont—Urbicus (early fourth century) and Venerandus (early fifth century)—were also described as 'of a senatorial family (*ex senatoribus*)' or 'of senatorial birth (*ex/de genere senatorio*)'.[338] Senator was, of course, a term firmly associated with Roman government during the imperial era. In some places, such as Italy, when the Roman senate deteriorated after the collapse of the western empire, this strong political association meant that senatorial identity vanished—it was no longer a viable option within contemporary discourse. However, in Gaul there was a shift toward viewing this status as inheritable, allowing families to continue to express that identity and the prestige that came with it well into the sixth century.[339] In

describing bishops as of senatorial birth, Gregory used this script of identity to emphasize their good character and background.

At times, he also interwove senatorial and civic identities. For example, Helarius, living in the fifth century, was described as 'of a senatorial family' and living in Dijon, and the emperor Avitus (r. 455-456) was 'from senators and, as is very evident, a citizen of Clermont'.[340] Avitus' son-in-law, the famous bishop of Clermont and letter writer Sidonius Apollinaris, appears as 'a man most noble according to worldly rank and among the leading senators of Gaul'.[341] Similarly, Injuriosus was 'of senators in Clermont' and stated that his parents were 'of most noble people of Clermont'.[342]

Senatorial and noble were closely related terms that conferred prestige and social rank, and as we see here, they could be used together for added emphasis. They were not, however, interchangeable. All of the people Gregory called 'senatorial' appear to have had Roman ancestors, but 'noble' was less restricted. Gregory used noble to describe non-senators with Roman names—like the priest Severus 'descended from noble roots' and the bishop Reticius of Autun born to 'most noble parents'.[343] But he also used it to describe Franks, including Clovis' ancestor Clodio, who appears as both 'able and most noble among his people' and 'king of the Franks'.[344] While it is possible that Severus and Reticius were descended from Roman senators and Gregory simply chose not to say so, Clodio certainly was not. Because in Gaul senatorial identity was by now thought to be inherited, within this conceptual frame it was not a viable option for a Frank like Clodio; no one operating under the assumption that this identity was inherited would believe Clodio could be senatorial. Therefore we can say that, in sixth-century Gaul, 'noble' could always be used in place of 'senator', but 'senator' could not necessarily be used in place of 'noble'.

For some, Gregory did not assign a high social status, but he did provide family connections and city affiliations. For example, the bishops of Tours Litorius (338-371) and Bricius (397-430 and 437-444) were both 'citizen[s] of Tours'. Bricius' own flock, 'the citizens of Tours', temporarily evicted him from his see.[345] Venantius, a fifth-century monk, was 'an inhabitant of the territory of Bourges, of parents who were, according to secular rank, of free birth and Catholics'.[346] This description provides especially thorough information, with a

geographical location from the *civitas*-territory, a social location as a free-born man, and a religious location as born to a Catholic family.

On occasion, Gregory did also turn to broader people names like Roman and Frank, including for four individuals. One was Clovis, addressed by Remigius of Reims at his baptism as 'Sicamber', an allusion to the Sicambri tribe from whom the Franks supposedly descended.[347] Another was Silarius, a 'Goth' living in Visigothic-ruled Aquitaine who was a favourite of the Visigothic king Alaric.[348] Gregory described the bishop Quintianus of Rodez as 'of African birth (*Afer natione*)', which probably meant he was from a Roman family in Africa fleeing Vandal incursions.[349] Presumably Gregory did not call him Roman because his African birth made him stand out among his Gallic neighbours and was therefore a more useful designation locally. Finally, Aegidius *magister militum* in Gaul was 'of Roman background (*ex Romanus*)'.[350] His son Syagrius followed in his footsteps to be 'king of the Romans', in reality probably a general who no longer had an emperor to whom to report.[351]

Aegidius is the only individual Gregory designated as Roman. From the examples we have already seen, it is clear that Gregory preferred to use other terms to describe individuals. When mentioning groups, though, he regularly referred to Romans in the years before Clovis' death. These could be citizens under Roman leaders like Aegidius and Syagrius or new subjects of barbarian kings. For instance, when telling who held control over which territories, Gregory included the Romans alongside the Goths and the Burgundians. The count Paul led 'Romans and Franks' in battle against the Goths in 469, and around the same time a war was fought 'between Saxons and Romans' over islands in the Loire.[352] In a neighbouring kingdom, Gundobad, king of the Burgundians from 473 to 516, instituted milder laws among the Burgundians 'lest they oppress Romans', after executing those 'Burgundians' and 'senators' who had supported his brother's rival claim to the kingship.[353] Both terms, 'Roman' and 'senator', were applied to residents of Clermont in the time of St. Martin in the late fourth century: 'The senators of that city, who then in that place shone brightly with a pedigree of Roman nobility', heard that the holy man was approaching the city.[354] From these passages, it seems that Gregory saw senatorial status and Romanness as going hand in hand. Aside from Romans, Gregory also wrote of Franks, Goths, and Burgundians as groups. He described

Theudemer and Euric as kings of the Franks and Goths, respectively.[355] When describing struggles for control over southern Gaul, he wrote that 'the Goths' of Rodez feared Quintianus would turn control of the city over to 'the Franks'.[356] And in Burgundy, Gundobad exiled 'the Franks' who opposed him and killed both 'the senators' and 'the Burgundians' who did the same.[357]

Looking at all of these examples, we can see that Gregory tended to prefer a more specific means of identifying individuals than ethnonyms when he could, at least for people who did not stand out among the others he described. He provided the identities which were most meaningful to him and others like him on a daily basis: social rank, parents, and city of origin or residence. Most of those he so described were from his local area, particularly Tours and Clermont. Outside of this local sphere, he was more likely to paint individuals more generically, if he mentioned them at all. For groups, the same principles seem to apply: when discussing locals like the 'citizens of Tours', Gregory identified them according to their city, but outside of this sphere (and when discussing a broader context) he used 'Goth' and 'Frank', and even 'Roman'.

Gregory was not unique in valuing social rank, parentage, and city affiliations. The localism of the ancient and medieval world made these particularly useful forms of identification—the sort which related an individual to other people and places neighbours would be familiar with. City pride was particularly strong in the Roman and early post-Roman period, and Gregory's predecessors in Gaul also related this information.[358] It is unsurprising that people with such deep pride in their localities would be best identified, to a contemporary, by their cities of origin or residence. Gregory's choice to draw on these particular scripts of identity shows that he expected the social rank, parentages, and city affiliations of past residents of Gaul to continue to have meaning for his own contemporaries. Within the repertoire of possibilities available to him, these were best suited to explain past social connections for the present.

Contemporary Era

As we will see, this trend continued when he described events closer to his own time—which also, of course, post-dated the existence of the western empire—but as he knew more of these later individuals personally, his descriptions became more thorough and what we can learn from them is more complex. By analysing the ways Gregory perceived and wrote about these individuals, particularly whether he continued to use city, family, and rank identifiers in the same way as in his writings about earlier times, we can determine whether the absence of 'Roman' as a descriptor for the period 511 to 590 can be explained in the same way as for the earlier period: that other types of identifiers held more meaning for Gregory. The best example of a known family in Gregory's writing is his own, which he traced back to the second century, and I will begin there.[359]

The most distant ancestor that Gregory mentioned was Vettius Epagatus, martyred in Lyon in 177 during a persecution of Christians in the Roman Empire. He appears in the story of Gallus (c. 489-c. 553), Gregory's uncle with whom he lived as a boy, and for whom he could tell all three of his preferred identifiers: rank, parentage, and *civitas*. Gregory described Gallus in detail in his *Life of the Fathers*, connecting him with Vettius Epagatus and thus with Leocadius, whom I have already mentioned: 'His father was named Georgius and his mother Leucadia, of the lineage of Vettius Epagatus … Thus they were from the principal senators, and in Gaul no one managed to be higher born or more noble'.[360] Naming Gallus' parents identified him for people in the Clermont area who may have known the family. It also allowed Gregory to draw a connection between the contemporary holy man and a far earlier holy man as a way to imply that Christian sanctity was present in Gallus' very blood. That rank, parentage, and city of origin were thought to convey important information about a person is evident in the reaction of the abbot of Cournon to Gallus' desire to join this religious house against his father's wishes: the abbot 'seeing the wisdom and refinement of the boy, inquired about his name and asked his birth and homeland. He replied that he was Gallus, a citizen of Clermont, son of the senator Georgius'. Once the abbot learned this, he insisted that the boy receive his father's permission to be tonsured, clearly recognizing the father's name and status and being alerted by this information to the need to proceed carefully.[361] Similarly, Gregory's father, Florentius, who is

called 'son of the late Georgius, a senator' in *Life of the Fathers*, was investigated by the holy man Martius of Clermont; he inquired of Florentius' friends whose son he was, and they replied with Florentius' social rank and paternity.[362] In Spain, we saw Paul of Mérida ask these same questions of young Fidel. If this were the information which local individuals found most informative in taking the measure of others and sought upon meeting new people, it is unsurprising that Gregory would also use this information, when available, to identify people in his writings.

Through his mother, Armentaria, Gregory traced his ancestry back to another Gregory, the bishop of Langres (506/7-539/40), his great-grandfather. Gregory of Langres was 'of the foremost senators' and married to an elder Armentaria 'of senatorial genus (*de genere senatorio*)'.[363] Eufronius, the younger Gregory's predecessor as bishop of Tours (556-573), was the elder Gregory's grandson. Of him, the *Histories* say that the people of Tours told King Clothar 'the holy Eufronius' was a grandson of 'the blessed Gregory'. Clothar replied, 'That is a prominent and great lineage', judging Eufronius' worth by his noted grandfather.[364] Later, Gregory of Tours noted that Eufronius was 'from that *genus* which above I called senators'.[365] Another descendant of Gregory of Langres, Attalus, was said to be among the 'sons of senatorial families (*filii senatorum*)' taken as hostages by one Merovingian king against another.[366] Clearly senatorial status continued to be assigned based on family ancestry.

The story of Gregory's brother, Peter, a deacon of Langres who was killed in 574, provides us with a few more relatives. When Bishop Tetricus of Langres (539/40-572) became ill, Peter encouraged the inhabitants of the city to nominate as a replacement Silvester, 'a relative both of ours and of the blessed Tetricus'. Gregory tells that Tetricus was the 'son and successor' of Gregory of Langres.[367] Silvester died before he could be consecrated as bishop, and when his son accused Peter of murdering him, Peter appealed to Nicetius of Lyon (551/2-573), 'who was my [Gregory's] mother's uncle (*avunculus matris meae*)', to hear his case.[368] Gregory said of Nicetius' parents: 'a certain Florentinus, of senatorial family, accepted Artemia as his wife', identifying both Nicetius' direct ancestors for anyone who might know the family and his social rank as part of the senatorial order.[369]

All of these details Gregory gave about his relatives, both during the late Roman empire and the sixth century, conform to his earlier pattern of providing social rank and parents when possible, and some remind us that the family came from Clermont. Additionally, these individuals were explicitly connected to a 'senatorial' background and had Latin names, establishing a continuation of his common pattern. However, there is one more uncle of Gregory's mother who does not fit this pattern: Duke Gundulf. Gregory received a visit from him in 581 in his capacity as duke and discovered their relationship during this visit. He described Gundulf as 'a former *domesticus* who had been made duke, of senatorial *genus*'.[370] As both 'senatorial' and bearing a Germanic name, Gundulf has been a very problematic individual for historians to explain. There are multiple possible explanations for the name, which is unusual in its context: that Gundulf was born with a Latin name but took a Germanic one in order to improve his career in a Frankish court, that his parents destined him for a secular career and chose his name accordingly, or that his name represents intermarriage of Germanic and Roman families.[371] The first (or second) of these is often assumed, and Gundulf assigned to Florentinus and Artemia in Gregory's family tree, making him a brother of Nicetius, but there is no certain evidence that he belongs there; all Gregory says is that he was an uncle of his mother, not telling us who his parents were and in the process leaving open the possibility that he married into the family via an unnamed aunt.

Gundulf is a poster child for caution; he reminds us that even within the very solid pattern Gregory presented of his family, there are occasional exceptions. He also illustrates how historians' expectations colour their reading of the sources. Gundulf stands out as an anomaly to us, but perhaps not to Gregory. Additionally, what we modern historians look for when we investigate 'identity'—his descent, how naming patterns evolved, or how people's identities were perceived and people categorized—can change where we place Gundulf and do not necessarily match the concerns of authors and their society.

Outside of his family, Gregory described a number of others according to the same pattern. For example, three generations of Hortensius' family from Gregory's home city of Clermont appear in his writing. Hortensius was the count of Clermont (c. 524 or 525) and 'from a senatorial family'.[372] Evodius, Hortensius' son and successor as count, and later a priest in

Clermont, was described as a priest of senatorial family. Gregory probably knew much about him because he attacked Gregory's uncle, the bishop Gallus.[373] Evodius' son Salustius was a count of Clermont like his father and grandfather, and his other son Eufrasius was a priest whom Gregory described as 'son of the late senator Evodius'.[374] Again, Gregory had a personal reason to know about Eufrasius, since he was a rival of one of Gregory's mentors, Avitus, for the bishopric of Clermont in 571. Gregory clearly disapproved of this family, yet this did not prevent him from labelling its members as 'senators', illustrating that 'senator' was not a status he awarded based on how he perceived the merit of the individual in question but rather a marker widely recognized by his society. Like Gregory's family, Hortensius' family showed all the signs of a venerable Roman background; also like Gregory's family, they had a relative (*cognatus*) with a Germanic name, a certain Beregisil who aided Eufrasius in his bid for the episcopate but is otherwise unknown.[375]

Others whom Gregory identified as senatorial include Arcadius, 'one of the senators of Clermont'.[376] In the *Histories*, Gregory mentions Arcadius' mother, Placidina, and his paternal aunt, Alchima, and his *Glory of the Martyrs* shows that his father was Apollinaris, son of the well-known Sidonius Apollinaris.[377] Mentioning these women thus allowed his contemporary readers to locate Arcadius within one of the most noted (and presumably familiar) Roman senatorial families of the region. In another example, Andarchius 'was a slave of Felix the senator' and scandalously cheated a man in Clermont. This may be the same Felix Gregory referred to when calling the deacon and bishop Marcellus of Uzès 'the son of the senator Felix'.[378] Sulpicius I of Bourges was said to be 'a very noble man and from the foremost senators of Gaul', and Ommatius, bishop of Tours from 524 to 528, was 'of the senators and citizens of Clermont'.[379] The priest Epachius who was struck with epilepsy in Riom for performing Mass while drunk may well be Eparchius, the son of Ruricius, bishop of Limoges, whom we know was both a priest and an excessive drinker.[380] Finally, Francilio 'of senatorial family and a citizen of Poitiers was ordained bishop' of Tours in 528.[381]

All of these people fit the criteria often assumed to suggest Roman ancestry: all but one (Francilio) had Latin names, all were 'senatorial', and many could be traced back to imperial ancestors. The chances are good, then, that most of them could be considered 'Romans' and

that Gregory was most likely to know this information and choose to describe people in this way if they were of especially high Roman descent. However, there may be exceptions, as Gundulf and a few others I will discuss shortly illustrate, so we should not read likelihood as definite proof.

As for the earlier period, we also see Gregory describe people by noble (or inferior) birth, by city, and/or by parents. And, again, he opened noble identity to non-Romans, such as 'a certain Frank most noble among his people' whose son was cured by St. Martin, though there is the implication that Franks and Romans did not merit equal nobility, and that it was only when compared with other Franks that this man seemed noble.[382] Among those he called 'free-born (*ingenuus*)' were the holy man Leobardus, 'a native of the territory of Clermont, indeed not of senatorial birth, nevertheless free-born' and the abbot Aredius (d. 591), 'an inhabitant of Limoges, born of parents of no little importance in their region, but truly of free birth'.[383] That Gregory described Tetradia as 'noble through her mother, inferior through her father' illustrates the inherited nature of this status in Gregory's mindset.[384] It also shows that status could be inherited via the maternal line, not just paternal. A further hint that both status and character could be viewed as heritable appears in Gregory's description of Leudast, the count of Tours whose plot against Gregory forced the bishop to swear an oath of innocence before an assembly of bishops and the king. Gregory wrote that before detailing Leudast's actions, he should first describe 'his birth, his native land, and his character', as if this background would shed considerable light on who Leudast was and what could be expected of him as a person.[385] Gregory then related that he came from an island of Poitou called Gracina where he was born to a slave named Leocadius, that he ran away from servitude and only received his office through gifts to King Charibert, and that he caused significant trouble in Tours. Leudast made charges against Gregory, and ultimately Gregory's innocence was established by the bishops' insistence that '[a]n inferior man cannot be believed against a priest'.[386] Leudast's ancestry, then, and the information Gregory provided about his family and place of origin were vital elements of this story and of Gregory's trial. Surely this conflict provided strong reason for Gregory to find out such information about Leudast and to select for his record of the event

these specific elements of parentage and low social status, true or rumoured, which would tarnish his opponent.

For still others, he named parents but not a social rank. This includes Palladius, son of 'the count Britianus and Caesaria', who inherited his father's role as count of Javols in the 560s or 570s and Eunius Mummolus, son of a certain count Peonius, who became the count of Auxerre in 561.[387] The title of count, and similarly duke, probably provided its own marker of status, as well as closeness to the king (*Königsnähe*), and made further description of social position unnecessary. Similarly, he named Sicharius, 'son of John', who was among the citizens of Tours involved in civil discord at Christmas; 'Dacco, son of Dagaric', who was killed after leaving King Chilperic's service; and Ranichild, 'daughter of the aforementioned Sigivald', the duke of Clermont and a relative of King Theuderic.[388]

Gregory did the same for Romulf, who brings us into the controversial territory of personal names. While the issue of whether early medieval given names reflected an ethnic ancestry is neither my primary concern nor Gregory's, it is important to address here because many modern scholars continue to find it especially relevant.[389] As we saw with Gundulf, modern assumptions about onomastic evidence can affect how we perceive these individuals, occasionally even contrary to what a source tells us. Romulf and a handful of others allow us to test these assumptions against Gregory's.

Romulf, 'son of the duke Lupus' of Champagne, became bishop of Reims after the exile of his predecessor Egidius in 590.[390] The son's name was Germanic while the father—whom Venantius Fortunatus described as being of 'Roman roots'—kept a Latin name. Romulf was, of course, of the same Roman ancestry as his father, yet he either was given at birth or chose for himself a Germanic name—one which was, in fact, a mix of his father's ancestry ('Rome') and name ('wulf', the Germanic translation of *lupus*). Also in this family were Lupus' brother Magnulf, his son Johannes, and Romaric, founder of the abbey of Remiremont who was probably Romulf's son. Magnulf's name includes the –wulf element and Romaric's the Rome-element, though Johannes is a traditional Latin Christian name.[391]

We may be seeing here the beginnings of a shift from a Roman to a Frankish identity within the family, and this is how historians often interpret these names.[392] All of these men

came from the same Roman roots as Lupus, and elements of their names reflect this, but the Germanic element in some also connects them to the Frankish society around them.[393] Whether done for personal advancement and identification with the Frankish political arena or out of a sense of connection to Frankish culture, this naming choice placed them in both the Roman and the barbarian category—able to identify as either because of the multiple possible meanings each could have within contemporary social discourse. It would also probably cause them to be identified differently than if they had Roman names: someone coming across Magnulf outside of his family context might reasonably assume, based on his name, that he was not of Roman extraction, and treat him as if he were a Frank by birth. If Lupus wanted to emphasize his connection with the Franks, he might have chosen to go by the name Wulf when in Frankish company for these very reasons, though we have no record of his doing so. This was one possible strategy of identification that could show his willingness to be one of them, and given the names of others in his family, we should not discount the possibility of such a powerful symbolic gesture.[394]

Of course, Gregory did not explore these naming patterns or the ancestry of this family. Instead, he named Romulf's father and position, as we have seen him do with myriad others. The same is true for a few additional families whom scholars often argue about, such as Severus, whom Gregory noted was the father-in-law of Guntram Boso and had two sons named Burgolen and Dodo. Burgolen married Domnola and had a daughter named Constantina.[395] Also, when describing Felix of Nantes, Gregory mentioned two relatives: a nephew named Burgundio and a cousin (*consobrinus*) Nonnichius.[396] The mix of Latin and Germanic names in both families has often been interpreted as representing intermarriage, but it could as easily reflect changing naming practices and conscious choices as the names of Lupus' family could.[397]

Keeping all of these individuals in mind, let us turn to a particularly complicated trio of envoys, sent to Constantinople in 589, about whom Gregory provided much information. They are, in his words, 'Bodegisel, son of Mummolen of Soissons, Evantius, son of Dynamius of Arles, and this Grippo, a Frank by birth'. He also tells us that Bodegisel and Evantius were free-born (*ingenuus*).[398] We need not doubt Grippo's Frankish ancestry—his name was Germanic, Gregory said he was a Frank by birth, and there is no reason to suspect otherwise.[399] Nor is there much

reason for doubt about Evantius, who came from a southern family with Latin names and whose father is well-attested within the region's Roman nobility.[400] Gregory describes him in his usual way: by parent and city. Bodegisel, however, is a more complicated case. His name was clearly Germanic, as was that of his brother (Bobo) and possibly his father (Mummolen), but Gregory described him according to father and *civitas* exactly as he did Evantius, rather than labelling him a Frank like Grippo.

Historians have dealt with Gregory's language here in two ways. Walter Goffart follows the *Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire* in concluding that Bodegisel must have been of Roman ancestry because Gregory contrasted him with Grippo the Frank, indicating Bodegisel was *not* a Frank.[401] Helmut Reimitz, likewise, assumes that Grippo accompanied two 'members of the senatorial class'.[402] Guy Halsall, on the other hand, sees Bodegisel as a rare exception to the pattern of Gregory only knowing the fathers of people of Roman background or of the Merovingian royal family, presuming that Mummolen was of Germanic ancestry.[403] Each historian rests his conclusion on a different assumption—Goffart and Reimitz on Gregory being completely consistent in identifying Romans and Franks in different ways, and Halsall on names being a better 'tell' than Gregory's practice—and either could be correct. These envoys appear in his story near the end of the sixth century, at the same time that Romulf became bishop of Reims, and Bodegisel may be a similar case of an individual with at least some Roman background assuming or being given a Germanic name as a way to identify with the ruling Franks.

Once again, though, modern concerns to understand changes in names and identities by tracing ancestry do not match Gregory's. His pattern of identification seems to be not really centred around a person's ancestry but instead around the city or region they came from and Gregory's own connections within the Merovingian kingdoms which provided him information and helped him claim importance in his society. Many of the people he so describes, as I have already shown, came from Clermont or Tours, and most if not all of the others came from the south, where the proportion of Latin names (and probably also Romans) was highest, so it may be a coincidence of location that these were the majority of people Gregory was able to describe according to father and *civitas*—he knew the most about people he encountered often

where he lived and where his family connections were: within and along the borders of the south.[404] In the case of the envoys, he may have known of Evantius' and Bodegisel's families but *not* had such information about Grippo. There were also some with non-Latin names whom Gregory described according to city in other passages, as we saw with Sicharius, Dacco, and Ranichild. In his local area, these included a 'citizen of Tours (*civis Turonici*)' named Wistrimund Tatto, a 'citizen of Poitiers' named Wiliulf whom Gregory met on the road, and Senoch whom Gregory said was of the 'Taifal *genus'* and 'born in Poitiers'.[405] He identified all of them according to city, and gave only one an ethnic label (and a very old one, at that, referring to a tribe allied with the Goths who were settled as federates of the Roman Empire who had remained in the region).[406]

Taken together, these examples lead to two conclusions. First, names in sixth-century Gaul were not a reliable enough tell of ancestry for historians to base broader conclusions solely on onomastic evidence. Edward James suggests that Gundulf casts doubt on this once-common method, and that doubt is only reinforced by Romulf, Severus, Felix, and Bodegisel.[407] Second, it is impossible to determine Bodegisel's ancestry from Gregory's information. His patterns of word usage are insufficient for such purpose as, ultimately, providing an ethnic label and definitive ancestry were not among his primary concerns—nor were they necessarily the most salient of all possible modes of identification for the people he described. When Gregory's concerns and language throughout his entire corpus are taken into account, it becomes clear that the seemingly unusual Bodegisel is not an anomaly at all.

For groups, Gregory regularly exhibited the same concerns, setting them within the local stage by their city. So like we saw a 'citizen of Tours', we also see 'the people of Tours'. For example, in 583, Sigibert ordered 'the men of Clermont (*Arvernis*)' under the leadership of their count to attack the city of Arles and many 'great men from Clermont' died there. When Sigibert died the next year, the rival king Guntram, who controlled Burgundy, seized the cities of Tours and Poitiers for his own territory. Because 'the Tourangeaux and the Poitevins (*Toronici vero atque Pectavi*)' were unhappy with this change and wanted to be ruled by Sigibert's son instead, Guntram sent 'the men of Bourges' to harass them.[408] It is unlikely that every one of these citizens of Tours and Poitiers were of Roman background, and in fact, we know that

Saxons were among the 'men of Bayeux' who were sent in 578 with those of Tours, Poitiers, Le Mans, and Angers to fight Waroch in Brittany, because Gregory noted later in this passage that Waroch made a surprise attack by night against 'the Saxons of Bayeux'.[409] For these Saxons, being from Bayeux was like being a Frank or a Goth in a political sense—they were so named not because of their origin but because of their place of residence, and could hold both affiliations simultaneously. However, as Gregory otherwise mostly used such local designations sans ethnonym for southern cities, where those of Roman background remained a majority, they would also have been the majority of the men included in Gregory's descriptions. Using a city designation was convenient for Gregory: it was a long-established way of referring to people which would be familiar to his readers, it was inclusive and thus removed the need to specify individual groups within a mixed group of inhabitants, and it provided the local information which would have been most meaningful to local people, far more meaningful than the repeated use of 'Roman' would have been.

Although Gregory preferred to provide such relevant information, he did not always have this information (or choose to use it). In its absence, we might expect him to resort to ethnic labels referring to peoples, and for Franks and other barbarian groups he did indeed do so. I have already noted Attalus' master, the noble Frank of Vulfolaic's tale, and Grippo, whom Gregory labelled as a Frank by birth. There is also 'Warinar the Frank' whom King Sigibert sent as an envoy with 'Firminus of Clermont' in the mid-560s, presented in a parallel manner to the trio of envoys.[410] When Queen Fredegund poisoned the bishop of Rouen in 586, the 'Frankish leaders of that place (*seniores loci illius Franci*)' grieved greatly, and one 'Frank' complained to Fredegund. He was given a particular drink in hospitality as was a 'custom of the barbarians (*mos barbarorum*)', and died from the poison hidden within.[411] This example shows that Gregory saw both individuals and a group of leading men as Franks, and also saw some of their customs as 'barbarian', presumably used to emphasize the practice's foreignness to Gregory's own culture and experience. In fact, Gregory used 'barbarian' only very rarely for the Franks, in this neutral descriptive manner, or occasionally to contrast holy Christians with hostile enemies.[412]

When Gregory wrote of Franks as a group—either as 'the Franks' or in the genitive describing, for example, a kingdom or an army 'of the Franks'—he often described a political entity, the subjects of the Merovingian kings. 'King of the Franks (*rex Francorum*)' is the clearest expression of this phenomenon, as it is easy to see that these leaders ruled over people who were not exclusively Franks by birth (such as Burgundians, Romans, and Britons), and so the word 'Frank' in his title must have been intended not in an exclusive sense of people of Frankish ancestry but in a wider political sense of people living in a kingdom ruled by 'the Franks'.[413] While kings 'of the Franks' appear on a number of occasions in sixth-century sources, particularly official documents, this 'kingdom of the Franks (*regnum Francorum*)' appears as a phrase only three times in sixth-century Gaul—all in Gregory's works.[414] Twice he related the words of a king or duke, and in the other instance he lamented the civil wars that plagued 'the people and kingdom of the Franks (*Francorum gens et regnum*)'.[415]

Gregory's use of 'the Franks' is a bit ambiguous, as he rarely elaborated on whom this group might include. In the case of the Britons (of Armorica) coming under the 'power/rule of the Franks' in Clovis' time, it seems likely to refer to the kings and their representatives who exerted authority over these people. The 'Franks' who agreed that King Theudebert's abandonment of his betrothed in the 530s was scandalous were, on the other hand, completely disconnected from any context within Gregory's text and could have been meant to refer to Theudebert's courtiers, important nobles, or perhaps people who were personally involved in the matter. Whether these included only those of Frankish ancestry or also others who were political Franks as the king's subjects, Gregory left no clues.[416] In a passage reminiscent of Fredegund's poisoning of the bishop of Rouen, Gregory described the practice of remaining at table after a meal to continue drinking as 'a custom of the Franks' and designated the locals killed by Fredegund in this incident as 'Franks of Tournai'.[417] Like the Saxons of Bayeux, these Franks are identified by the city in which they reside, and like their counterparts in Rouen, they are singled out as a subset of the population of the city based on an ethnic label. Yet whether Gregory considered them Franks because they were undoubtedly elites, because of their customs, or because of descent is impossible to say. Similarly, the army King Childebert II sent

to Italy in 589 undoubtedly included people of various ancestries, but Gregory only told his audience that they were 'the Frankish army'.[418]

Historians once commonly assumed that these labels referred either to people of Frankish ancestry or to all people within the kingdom (thus meaning that all 'Romans' had become 'Franks'). In either case, this could be the whole population or just an elite segment of it that participated in political affairs. However, there is a middle ground that this assumption misses, and that we have already explored in the context of Spain: the possibility of being both a Frank and a Roman concurrently—one on a political level while the other remains intact on the level of ancestry. Army members could continue to be identified as Romans or Burgundians or Britons in one social context while adopting a Frankish identity in the political context of military service, just as we saw in the Visigothic kingdom with the duke Claudius. A group of 'Franks of Tournai' representing a subset of the entire population of the kingdom (and thus inherently excluding others from this level of Frankishness) need not necessarily preclude all residents of the kingdom from being called Franks in other ways. When we begin to acknowledge this middle ground, it becomes easier to see the possibilities for a middle ground in other respects, such as cultural or religious, and our picture of the late antique and early medieval world becomes more complex and dynamic.

For other non-Roman groups, Gregory commonly used the same language as with Franks, whether the groups lay within or outside Frankish territory. Foreign kings were usually 'kings of a people', such as Hermanfrid, King of the Thuringians (r. c. 507-531), and Alboin, King of the Lombards (r. c. 560-572), but also sometimes kings of a land, as with Miro, King of Galicia (r. 570-583), and Leovigild, King of 'the Spains' (r. 568-586).[419] While he sometimes called the Lombards simply 'Lombards', he also frequently described them as 'people of the Lombards (*gens Langobardorum*)'.[420] 'The Goths' as an army—a political identity—set a number of ambushes for Frankish troops during a military campaign and when attacking Arles, and Agde in Gallia Narbonensis was seen as lying within 'the kingdom of the Goths'.[421] Among individuals, he described a man he ordained as a priest in 578 as 'Winnoch the Briton' and the abbot Brachio of Ménat (d. 576) as 'of Thuringian birth (*genere Thoringus*)'.[422] Gregory expressed surprise that the deacon Vulfolaic came to serve the church, enquiring 'how he had entered

clerical office, because he was by birth a Lombard'.[423] He clearly did not expect someone of Lombard ancestry to embrace a religious calling in the Catholic church—it did not fit any script of identity he had experienced—and this is certainly the reason he felt the need to specify Vulfolaic's origins. Eusebius, whom he described as 'a merchant of Syrian birth', became bishop of Paris in 591 and replaced all household workers with others who, like him, were 'Syrian by birth (*Syrus de genere*)'.[424] As with the 'African' Quintianus, Gregory's understanding is filtered through Gallic assumptions and perspectives. Within Gaul, Eusebius stood out as foreign and so his ancestry became a more salient detail for Gregory than it was for descendants of local families. Having never travelled to the East, Gregory would not have known how locals there distinguished themselves—and in fact he was so poorly informed about the east that he wrote that Antioch was in Egypt—so his conception of Syrians is based on generalizations about easterners, much as references to Syrians and Greeks in an Iberian context.[425] Whether they would have considered themselves Syrians, and what Gregory meant by 'Syrian', we do not know.

Interestingly, the Gallic 'Syrians' play a key role in Gregory's depiction of the full community supporting their king. When Guntram arrived in Orléans in 585, he was greeted with 'the language of the Syrians, the language of the Latins, and also the language of the Jews'.[426] This is a rare example of Gregory choosing a linguistic vision of identity in his contemporary narrative, and a very symbolic one. As Martin Heinzelmann has noted, this scene exhibits many parallels to Biblical language about Jewish kings. It also reads much like a classical *encomium* praising a good emperor, calling him to ethical leadership, and imagining a diverse populace united in support.[427] Choosing Syrians, Latins, and Jews rather than groups like Romans, Franks, and Burgundians might well be a strategy to tie this populace to their Biblical counterparts through the languages the underinformed Gregory assumed they regularly spoke: Greek, Latin, and Hebrew. These are the three languages of the Christian scriptures, considered sacred by Isidore of Seville, and as such they set the scene in a Christian conceptual model.[428] It need not matter that Syrians often spoke Syriac outside of dealings with a Greek-speaking imperial administration and that Hebrew was only a ritual language by this time, nor that others were probably spoken in Gaul. This passage was intended metaphorically, and shows modern

readers that Gregory used a variety of repertoires of identification in his work from religious to descent to linguistic depending on the needs of each passage. His local descriptors and Christian frame of reference were not mutually exclusive.

Gregory's portrayal of representatives of the East Roman/Byzantine Empire is especially informative. One might expect that he would refer to the Byzantines as 'Romans', in the way they referred to themselves and that Iberian authors often referred to them. What we see instead is either 'imperial', as in the 'army of the emperor (*exercitus imperatoris*)' which Agila invited to aid him in Spain in 551-2, or 'Greek', referring to the Byzantine army in Spain at the time of King Leovigild in the 580s.[429] As with the people of Roman origin living in Gaul, Gregory did not label them as Roman; in fact, Romans only appear as a people in his contemporary world in quotations of others' words. One of these does refer to the Byzantines, the words 'glory of the Romans (*gloria Romanorum*)' on a medallion sent to King Chilperic by Emperor Tiberius in 581. The two others come from the mouths of Arians in the Visigothic kingdom who referred to Catholics as 'Romans', as Gregory himself explained in an account of a miracle in Spain, relating the words of the Arian king Theudigisel: '"It is a trick of the Romans"—that is to say, they call men of our [Catholic] religion Romans—"that this happened, and it is not the power of God"'.[430] Perhaps Gregory chose not to depict the Byzantines as Romans in his writing because they were simply the residents of the empire with no need to specify further, except to explain a foreign meaning of the term to his audience, though unfortunately, Gregory provides few clues about his motives here.

Conclusion

We no longer believe, as historians routinely did in the past, that Gregory was a naïve individual who recorded the events and people around him as they were without a clear pattern or even a clear understanding of what he was telling us. We now see Gregory as a sophisticated author who tailored what he wrote according to his goals and who gave us not an unvarnished look at his world but his own perspective coloured by his experiences and his mindset. The question that draws attention now is what goals, biases, and influences lay behind

his authorial choices, and historians have suggested a few possibilities of varying likelihood, mostly centred on Christianity.

Most recently, Helmut Reimitz has argued that Gregory's Christian agenda emerges in two ways: his grounding of his *Histories* in Gaul's Christian past rather than a specifically Roman or Frankish framework, and his conscious avoidance of ethnic labels in order to not detract from the unifying potential he saw in espousing Christian identity first and foremost. The former is clear and I do not dispute it, but the latter remains unconvincing. Were it correct, we would expect Gregory to never mention ethnic identities within the kingdom (which, as we have seen, is not the case), nor any other form of identity which could conflict with and potentially outweigh Christianity, including social status and locality, both of which I have demonstrated he used extensively. But because Reimitz's interests for the purposes of his book are to trace broad structural trends in the historical writings of Gregory and of his Merovingian and Carolingian successors, he focuses—probably rightly—on the ways Frankishness does or does not fit into Gregory's overarching grand narrative, and in later chapters on the ways his successors altered his work to make it serve other ideologies. Doing so means, however, that individuals like the envoys Evantius and Grippo are absent from Reimitz's discussion (except in a passing reference to Frankish individuals as travellers), and others like Quintianus of Rodez who was 'of African *natio*' are only mentioned because of references to the Frankish kingdom in their story. Thus his argument does not account for Gregory's choices to label Quintianus as 'African' or Evantius as the son of an important member of the elite—choices that show a richer spectrum of identification than pro-Frank or pro-Christian. Far more often, Reimitz explores the ways Gregory described groups as Frankish, showing that Gregory used a multitude of ways of being a Frank. He correctly concludes that this diversity shows Gregory was not outlining a 'history of Frankish identity' as past generations have erroneously assumed.[431] However, promoting a Christian vision rather than a Frankish one does not mean Gregory must have been actively working *against* those who wanted to tell a Frankish story; it only tells us he did not want a common Christian identity forgotten in the process.

In the end, Gregory's Christian focus did not require him to avoid other resources for identification. Instead we should see it as one of many factors he weighed when selecting the

most useful or important identity for each passage: perhaps 'Christian', 'holy', or 'priest' when he wanted to emphasize someone's faith, 'senatorial' or 'noble' for social respectability, and 'African' or 'Syrian' when foreignness mattered to him or to his audience. He was clearly partial to Christians, Romans, and elites, but he did not unilaterally emphasize any one of these aspects at the expense of all others, nor did he need to in order to shape a Christian heritage and future for the Merovingian kingdoms.

Historians have been surprised by the lack of the 'Roman' label in Gregory's writing partly because we have been conditioned to expect ethnic rhetoric in the post-Roman world. This can be blamed to some extent on the misleading title *History of the Franks* which is still used despite the fact that it is neither Gregory's original title nor an accurate description of the contents. Whether or not Gregory considered local individuals of Roman ancestry to be ethnically Roman is beside the point; his choice of language reflects less on his views on this issue and more on which labels had the greatest meaning at a local, kingdom-wide, and worldwide level, as well as the greatest impact for the stories he wished to tell. This does not preclude him also seeing the world through a Christian lens. Gregory certainly wanted to promote Christian practice, history, and thought, as Reimitz's book shows clearly and effectively. However, depicting his Christianity as the only reason he chose the identification patterns he did both overreaches the limits of the evidence and ignores the obvious practical choices available to him. A concern to use locally salient criteria does not conflict with the conscious choice to select episodes and language that would promote a unified Christian identity for Gaul which Reimitz has expertly detailed. They are two complementary sets of practical choices Gregory made to further his goals. That there were other options available to him, including Roman identity, is made clear in the works of his contemporary Venantius Fortunatus, to whom we now turn.

Chapter 5: Venantius Fortunatus

Although Gregory is the most familiar figure of sixth-century Gaul, and therefore the one we often turn to for descriptions of the period, he is not our only contemporary source. Relying excessively on him blinds us to a wider variety of perspectives and experiences that he chose not to share. Venantius Fortunatus (d. 600), an Italian-born poet writing in Gaul, was a friend of Gregory and wrote many poems under his patronage. Among the multiple scripts of identity these men could choose from within the common discourse of their time and place, Gregory elected not to describe his contemporaries as Romans, but Fortunatus did, though in rather different senses within the poetic genre. By exploring the ways Fortunatus wrote about Roman identity and related it to barbarian and Frankish identity in his poems (and a few saints' *Lives*), historians get a glimpse into the fluctuations of these identities within their society.

Studies of Venantius Fortunatus have historically understood him as a last bearer of traditional Roman rhetoric in an increasingly barbarian world or as the first medieval poet to turn traditional motifs into something new.[432] Dill, for example, called him 'almost the last link between the classical and the medieval world', and Tardi 'a last representative of Latin poetry'.[433] Recent scholarship has begun to understand him as simply living in a time of rapid change and drawing on the resources of the past to help himself and others navigate this shifting landscape.[434] As they did so, they began to think about Romanness and other identities in new ways, and Fortunatus aided this process. Among his most potent resources was classical rhetoric about Romans and barbarians.[435] Though of course both terms could have widely varied meanings in both the imperial and the post-imperial eras, their common pairing as opposites—one civilized and the other not, one a political grouping and the other seen as kin-based—remained a powerful image.[436]

When Fortunatus mentions peoples of the Merovingian kingdoms in his writing, it is usually as Romans and barbarians. Sometimes he specifies particular barbarian groups with ethnonyms like 'Frank', but only in specifically royal or international settings. This chapter will investigate the nuances with which these terms were used within Fortunatus' writing to highlight the ways he drew from a variety of available models to promote Roman identity as still prestigious—and as compatible with a barbarian-ruled society.

Duke Lupus

Lupus, duke of Champagne, was among Fortunatus' first friends in Gaul; in later years, Fortunatus thanked him in poetry for aiding him as a new arrival in the Frankish kingdoms in 565 or 566.[437] He was probably a native of Champagne, as we have seen, and his sons and brother also obtained important positions as dukes and bishops.[438] Fortunatus wrote poem 7.7, probably soon after they met, to celebrate Lupus' appointment as duke, a military position which was more likely to be held by Franks than by Romans at this point in Gaul's history, though here held by a person of Roman background.[439] The poem would have been read publicly, probably at a formal celebration attended by his new colleagues and subordinates, and Lupus would expect it to reflect well upon him to those among the audience who were both paying attention and could follow all of the enclosed allusions.[440] In it Fortunatus extolled Lupus' Roman ancestry and virtues. Early lines conjure images of the splendour of ancient Rome and compare Lupus favourably with great figures from the Roman past, setting Lupus' public service within the traditions of this venerated society: 'Scipio was wise, Cato acted with maturity, Pompey was fortunate; only you have all of these traits. With these consuls, Rome's power shone forth, but with you as duke, Rome returns for us here and now'.[441] Through these lines, he depicted Lupus as possessing the wisdom and fortune of great figures from the Roman past, which would assist him in governance and bring the best of Roman civilization back to Champagne. Their great virtues became Lupus' in this poetic construction, and his Roman identity was set within the realm of character—as the norms of classical panegyric dictated.[442]

Fortunatus was not, however, simply drawing a comparison to important ancient Romans; he was situating these traits deep in Lupus' being—'ethnicizing' his Romanness. He wrote: 'You inherited the venerable character of your Roman roots: you drive battles with the force of arms, you govern with law peacefully'.[443] Here, Fortunatus evoked the image of a ruler able in both war and peace, a common device in Roman panegyric, in the context of Lupus' Roman heritage—his *stirps*, a word which originally referred to the stem or root of a plant but developed a figurative meaning of a biological 'stem' or 'roots', that is, family lineage.[444] By using *stirps*, Fortunatus implied permanence and an essential nature—that Lupus' Roman

identity was an integral part of his self whence his virtue stemmed. This ancestry, in Fortunatus'
depiction, was so deeply rooted that it both influenced Lupus' character and predisposed him
to the venerable traits of Scipio and others.

We gain two particularly interesting insights into Fortunatus' mentality through this
poem. First, he believed (or expected others to believe) that a person's character regularly
stemmed from his or her ancestry; in other words, one's birth predisposed one to certain
character traits. We saw this in relation to social class with Gregory's description of his enemy,
Leudast.[445] Second, Romanness was not just an acquired cultural trait in his chosen rhetorical
image but could also be derived from one's family of birth. Being innate to Lupus' being in this
way, his Romanness was not an aspect of his self that, in Fortunatus' view, could be changed
completely; he thought it too essential—too integral to his very self—to be mutable.

Of course, we have already seen that Lupus' family had begun a name shift that may
reflect a desire to identify with Frankish leaders.[446] If the naming pattern continued in the next
generations—as well as the associations with Frankish circles which the adoption of Frankish
names hints at—his grandchildren and great-grandchildren might well come to feel more
Frankish than Roman or to forget their Roman heritage altogether. Fortunatus, however, like
Gregory, did not even hint at these naming patterns, let alone their implications. He found
more descriptive power in images of the splendour and magnificence of Rome, and the lasting
importance of Roman birth, than in the blending of contemporary cultures and ethnic groups.

Leontius II of Bordeaux

As with Lupus, Fortunatus found poetic inspiration for his praise of Bishop Leontius II of
Bordeaux in his subject's Roman ancestry. Leontius was from a noble family in Aquitaine and
served in the military before succeeding another Leontius (possibly his father) as bishop of
Bordeaux in 549. Presumably he was related to his predecessor as bishop and to other *Leontii*,
including Sidonius Apollinaris' contemporary Pontius Leontius and various members of the
prominent *Ruricii* family, but the detail of the specific connection has not survived to modern
times.[447] His wife, Placidina, descended from Sidonius Apollinaris (d. 489) and the emperor

Avitus (d. 457) and thus provided him with a further connection to the highest echelon of Gallic society.[448]

Fortunatus praised both husband and wife for their nobility and for their construction of churches and villas in a full, traditional eulogy in poem 1.15, but it is the epitaph (poem 4.10) commissioned by Placidina after Leontius' death in 573 in which Fortunatus chose to explicitly bring Leontius' Roman background into play.[449] The epitaph states that Leontius' 'nobility drew its lofty name from his origin, of the sort of *genus* the senate of Rome perhaps has. And however much may have flown from the prominent blood of his fathers, he by his own merits makes his forefathers grow [in prominence]'.[450] The poet drew in this passage, as Gregory often did, upon the image of the Roman senate, in order to associate Leontius with its prestige. By this point in time, Leontius' connection to the senate will have been distant and, as we have seen, essentially descent-based, and so Fortunatus suggested that Leontius' family name was of a senatorial sort, which allowed him still to incorporate the prestige of such families. The family nobility itself, however, was not the main source of Leontius' merit; rather, it served, as always in panegyric, as a benchmark from which to judge his even more remarkable good deeds.

As in the poem to Lupus, Fortunatus emphasized multiple ways of identifying as Roman: by descent, by culture, and by connection to a civic institution—the senate. Here also, he found more value in an association with a grand Roman past than in the details of Leontius' individual relatives. This noble background was certainly important, but merely the foundation upon which Leontius built to earn greater nobility through merit.

The Ruricii

An epitaph Fortunatus wrote for the two bishops of Limoges named Ruricius, grandfather and grandson, similarly emphasizes their noble ancestry and the ideals shared by men of their background. The elder Ruricius (d. c. 510) became bishop of Limoges in the 480s after he and his wife chose to enter religious life. He was an epistolographer who corresponded with men like Sidonius Apollinaris and Caesarius of Arles.[451] The younger was bishop in the mid-sixth century and is attested at the First Council of Clermont and the Fourth and Fifth Councils of Orléans.[452] Fortunatus noted that both men gave alms to the poor and piously built

churches, indicating two deeds that were expected of such aristocrats and that their families would have been proud to hear declared.[453] On their ancestry, he wrote, 'The Ruricii were twin flowers, to whom Rome was joined through the ancestral height of the Anicii'.[454] This painted them as being of the highest nobility and made their sacrifice of that wealth and worldly connection all the more laudable. In fact, Fortunatus suggested that it brought them greater nobility, of a kind that mattered more: 'Happy are they who in this way fleeing their nobility, have purchased senatorial rights in heaven'.[455] Because they had held this high status in life, Fortunatus imagined their heaven matching it as befitted their lineage.

Vilithuta

While some individuals, like Lupus and Leontius, were Romans through and through in Fortunatus' poetic portrayals, others shared both Roman and barbarian traits. An excellent example is poem 4.26, an epitaph for Vilithuta, a young wife who died in childbirth. The poem was commissioned by her husband, Dagaulf.[456] It describes her as 'begotten of noble blood in the city of Paris' and 'Roman by effort, barbarian by descent'.[457] In Fortunatus' view, therefore, she was born a 'barbarian' but learned to be a Roman—one by nature, the other by nurture. Among his praises of her is that 'she drew out a gentle disposition from a fierce people: to conquer nature was her greater glory'.[458] In this portrayal, Vilithuta's 'nature' was to be a fierce barbarian, but she managed not to be ruled by this essential part of herself and wonderfully overcame this nature by 'nurturing' Romanness in herself. That barbarian tendency toward fierceness never ceased to be a part of her—she was not said to be 'formerly barbarian' but 'barbarian'—but it had been forced to the background by the taming influences of Roman civilization. While still a barbarian by ancestry, she could be considered culturally Roman, and Fortunatus gave greater weight to her earned merit (here the effort to adopt Roman character) than to her ancestry. As with the epitaph for Leontius, Fortunatus employed good panegyrical practice, but this time privileging actions over ancestry.

That Fortunatus saw this triumph as worthy of praise is unsurprising; he was, after all, of Roman upbringing himself in Italy, near the birthplace of Roman civilization and from an area of the peninsula ruled by the East Roman Empire for part of the time he lived there. However, it

was not for himself that Fortunatus was writing but for Vilithuta's grieving husband, Dagaulf, as well. Given his name, Dagaulf was probably of barbarian ancestry like his wife, yet Fortunatus clearly believed that he would not object to her being labelled a 'barbarian', showing evidence that the term could be regarded as fairly neutral. He also thought Dagaulf would take comfort in the idea that Vilithuta had attained a measure of Romanness through her manner of life, and that he valued Roman civility and culture more than barbarian virtues—hence hiring a writer like Fortunatus who shared such values. Fortunatus used the currency of this Roman ideal to engender feelings of pride in Vilithuta's laudable attainment of it, against the difficult odds of her birth, in her husband and other readers or listeners of the epitaph, all through the judicious placement of a few very powerful words.

Duke Launebod

Calling a person 'Roman' was not the only way Fortunatus could associate him or her with ideal Roman traits. In the case of the duke Launebod, merely stating that he performed a task Romans ought to have done is enough to bring hints of Romanness to his character. Launebod, the duke of Toulouse, and his wife, Berethrude, built a church to St. Saturninus in the city in the late 560s or early 570s. As far as we know, Fortunatus did not regularly visit Toulouse, so he may have been invited specifically for the dedication of the new church, where he would have read this poem aloud to the assembled guests.[459] He used the opportunity not only to praise Launebod and his wife for their nobility and their generosity to the church but also to rebuke local Romans for not stepping forward to complete the task themselves, writing with a definite tone of chastisement: 'This work, which no one coming from the Roman *gens* undertook, this man of barbarian descent completed'.[460] The poet clearly saw it as the Romans' duty to build churches, and other important buildings in the community, just as they would have under the Roman Empire, and it reflected very poorly upon them that a barbarian was required to step forward to see the task completed.[461] For Launebod and his wife, however, doing so earned them even higher nobility than they already possessed and the favour of God, apparently in part because it was less expected from barbarians, even those in leadership roles.[462]

Fortunatus expected a certain standard of behaviour from other upper-class Romans and felt perfectly justified in rebuking them for failing to meet his (and presumably others') expectations. Romanness was not merely a state of being as he perceived the concept, but required those fortunate enough to be born 'Roman' to act like it—to show their Roman character through their actions by using their own funds to build churches and other grand edifices, by supporting the church and its saints, and by behaving in a civil and gentle manner as Vilithuta did. Just as Orosius could chastise his fellow Romans for behaving in a savage manner and portray the Goths who sacked Rome as less harsh and more likely to offer their subjects freedom, so Fortunatus reprimanded his fellow Romans, and lauded his patron, by comparing their behaviour unfavourably with that of a 'barbarian'.[463]

King Charibert

'Barbarian' kings often drew on imperial Roman imagery in an attempt to earn for themselves its prestige.[464] Fortunatus' very presence at the courts of various Merovingian kings attests to their desire to be presented in the Roman terms and imagery which were so firmly associated in the minds of many of their subjects with a legitimate leader's authority to rule.[465] While, as the leading Franks of their respective kingdoms, they would always be (and want to be) identified as 'barbarian' in many ways, some of the trappings of Romanness were still available to them, illustrating very well the ability of one individual to identify with multiple groups at once, along different lines.

Fortunatus' panegyric 6.2 to the Merovingian king Charibert manipulates scripts of both Roman and barbarian identity to portray him as a ruler suited for all his subjects. Charibert (561-567) was the eldest son of Clothar I and, after his father's death, split the kingdom with his three brothers, gaining control for himself of the portion ruled from Paris.[466] The poem, written for Charibert's *adventus* ceremony into Paris in 567, follows a traditional sequence from a fanfare and call for all to praise the king through to his lineage, youth, and virtues in both peace and war. It also expresses ties to both his Frankish ancestry and Roman culture. It addresses Charibert: 'Although you are a Sicamber, born of an illustrious people, the Latin language

flourishes in your speech', and then wonders: 'How great must you be in learned speech in your own language, who conquers us Romans in eloquence?'.[467]

Eloquence was strongly associated with the ideal educated Roman, and being a professional poet, Fortunatus certainly would have valued eloquence especially highly, making this particularly effusive praise for his king.[468] That he marked himself as one such eloquent Roman increases the flattery—Fortunatus being known to be a well-educated Roman who would definitely know eloquence when he saw it—and provides a glimpse into how Fortunatus saw his own identity: not just as an Italian and a foreigner in a new land, but also as a 'Roman'.[469] That he chose to depict the king's Germanic language as capable of being spoken in a learned and eloquent manner is interesting, as often these traits were reserved for Latin. Drawing on the traditional reverence for well-spoken Latin, he appropriated the concept of civilized language from the classical Roman context to serve a flattering role in a new, Frankish context, linking eloquence to political success and expanding the potential repertoire for identifying as a Frank.

Sicamber serves as an especially poetic way of saying Charibert was of barbarian birth and of ascribing to him all the trappings of this ancestry in addition to the Roman eloquence. It may also be an allusion to Clovis, whom the bishop Remigius of Reims supposedly called a Sicamber upon his baptism.[470] Such an allusion would have called on the symbolic power of the founder of the contemporary kingdom to fortify Charibert's image and paint him as made of the same core that made Clovis great, adding religious and political overtones to his Frankishness. It also would have reminded those in the probably quite public audience in Paris of the dual aspects—secular and religious—of their leader, mediating between ruler and ruled, as a good panegyrist would.[471] His acceptance by both parties is illustrated in the line: 'Here barbarian lands and there Romania applaud him, in different tongues rings out a single song of praise to this man'.[472] The barbarians and Romans form the *consensus omnium*, a potent traditional literary device for demonstrating the support of all (or at least everyone who mattered).[473] Yet the construction of Frankish kingship Fortunatus supports here is not a classicizing adoption of Romanness in all its aspects, but a borrowing of useful elements for a new, Frankish context.

Radegund

While Fortunatus clearly thought Roman traits superior, he did not hold barbarian ancestry against anyone, and he became close friends with people of barbarian ancestry as well as with 'Romans'. One of his closest friends in Gaul was Radegund, who was born into the Thuringian royal family and brought to the Frankish kingdoms in 531 when the sons of Clovis conquered her uncle's kingdom and murdered most of her family.[474] King Clothar I claimed her as his bride, but after some time as a reluctant queen, she escaped to the monastery she established in Poitiers, where she remained until her death in 587.[475] It was there that Fortunatus first met her not long after his arrival in Gaul, ultimately settling in the same city.

Numerous poems in his collection are addressed to Radegund and her abbess Agnes, including one written in the voice of Radegund herself which tells the tale of the conquest of Thuringia through her eyes. In it, Fortunatus labelled her (in her own voice) 'the barbarian woman'.[476] Similarly, in the hagiographical *Life* he wrote after her death, he called her 'most blessed Radegund of barbarian *natio* from the region of Thuringia ... born of royal seed'.[477] In other poems, he commended her rejection of royal wealth for a religious life, her commitment to asceticism, and her hospitality, and he addressed her as a mother.[478] The division in Fortunatus' mental landscape between unavoidable barbarian birth and barbaric actions is apparent in her *Life*, which tells that her homeland was 'laid to waste by the barbaric storm of the victory of the Franks'.[479] The contrast between the kindly, devout Radegund and the Franks who destroyed her home is stark; while Radegund was of a barbarian people—and therefore, like Vilithuta, was predisposed to uncivilized behaviour—she did not behave in the barbaric, destructive, cruel manner that the Franks of Fortunatus' depiction did.

Although ostensibly written to Radegund's cousin in Constantinople, this poem was probably intended as part of an embassy to the East Roman emperor which requested a piece of the Holy Cross for Radegund's monastery. It would have accompanied a letter written by Radegund herself and two other poems introducing Radegund and her piety to the emperor, and this audience outside the Frankish kingdoms may account for his getting away with portraying the Franks in a negative light in the poem.[480] The depiction of Radegund as the last of a royal line, of noble birth, and as tremendously pious despite the wrongs done to her, was

meant to prove her worthiness as a guardian of such a precious relic as a fragment of the Holy Cross. The label 'barbarian' was itself part of this rhetoric. 'Radegund' specified in the poem that 'even a barbarian woman' was able to cry enough tears at the destruction of her people to create a lake, showing she must have experienced particularly intense suffering.

This tale is one of the few instances of Fortunatus using the term 'Frank'. Most of the others refer directly to the Merovingian royal family or, as here, to the Franks as an army interacting with others.[481] Later in this poem, 'Radegund' asks the recipient to please recommend her to the Franks who piously honoured her as a mother.[482] Poem 9.4, an epitaph for the young prince Chlodobert, states that by his birth he raised the hopes of 'the Franks'.[483] In both cases, Fortunatus presents the kings as the centre of the Frankish people, and probably for a partially foreign audience: Radegund's for the East Roman emperor and Chlodobert's for any representatives from other kingdoms who may have attended his funeral or visited the tomb to which the epitaph was affixed. Like Charibert, Chlodobert embodied royal Frankishness.

Clearly when writing about groups connected to the ruling family (as royals, as an army, or as subjects mourning a prince), Fortunatus was happy to call them Franks, with politicized overtones. However, he gave the label to only one individual in all his poems and hagiographical works: a 'certain Frank (*quidam Francus*)' named Chariulf.[484] Chariulf appears in the *Life* of Saint Germanus of Paris as a villain who seized possession of a villa owned by the local basilica and was duly punished by God for the deed. It might seem that such a barbaric act would merit the term 'barbarian'. However, as is evident from the examples already shown, Fortunatus preferred to use 'barbarian' as a more neutral term for those who, while inferior to Romans, were not necessarily barbaric evil-doers. Nowhere in all his writings does Fortunatus use the term with such negative implications. 'Frank', therefore, may serve as a substitute when such negativity was required, as well as for distinguishing Frankish kings and armies from their neighbours.

Conclusion

Fortunatus' writing contrasts with Gregory's in the greater use of ethnicity as a strategy to describe his subjects. It is hard to know why precisely, though Fortunatus' Italian background may play a role in his choices, as may the more florid style of poetry. Despite this difference, though, the two authors' works also share many traits. The use of 'Roman' and 'barbarian' descriptors did not preclude Fortunatus' extolling of Christian virtue among the same patrons; spiritual nobility, service to the church, and moral character all appear in his poems alongside ancestral and cultural virtues. His views of nobility seem to mesh with Gregory's as well: Vilithuta and Launebod, both barbarians, could be described as noble, but not as 'senatorial', and such social status (even senatorial ancestry in his epitaph for the young boy Arcadius) mattered in Fortunatus' descriptions as it did in Gregory's.[485] Fortunatus even chose Gregory's favoured local and parental associations occasionally, as with his poem on Palatina, 'daughter of Gallus', and Paternus, born 'in Aquitaine to famous parents'.[486]

Looking at Fortunatus' terminology, one can see some other clear patterns. The common theme throughout his works is a choice to describe individuals' affiliations within a Roman-barbarian framework. The value he placed on traits he associated with Romanness—eloquence, polite manner, community leadership, philanthropy—matches traditional Roman values, as does the barbarian being not as well equipped with these traits. On close examination, however, Fortunatus' language shows two innovations from the traditional construct. First, the strongly derogatory connotations of barbarians as destructive and terrifying seen in third- and fourth-century writing are absent. Fortunatus presents barbarian status as at best neutral and at worst a sign of handicap that may or may not be overcome. For truly derogatory emphasis, he preferred 'barbaric' or even 'Frank'. As Ian Wood has shown, this is consistent with other sources of the fifth and sixth centuries.[487]

Second, Fortunatus used these two terms to describe multiple aspects of identity, particularly culture and descent. Descent from barbarians handicapped individuals with a predisposition to rude, uncivilized behaviour. Vilithuta, Launebod, and Radegund are particularly praiseworthy precisely because they overcome this handicap by adopting superior Roman cultural traits. Likewise, descent from Romans meant being born to privilege and to the

expectation of upright, cultured behaviour. Lupus' greatness stems in part from his Roman birth and upbringing, Leontius is noble and praiseworthy not just because of his own merits but also because of his forefathers, and Launebod's Roman neighbours are particularly in need of chastisement for not building churches in their community as a properly civilized Roman would. An individual's descent and cultural traits are intrinsically linked in Fortunatus' panegyrical view. Someone like Vilithuta (or Lupus) could adopt elements of another culture, but would still be judged based on the expectations of her barbarian (or his Roman) heritage. In a post-imperial West negotiating new conceptions of Romanness, descent became a more important facet.

Because Fortunatus, unlike his contemporary Gregory of Tours, used the term Roman, his works allow us a unique glimpse into its shifting meanings. We can see that it remained prestigious and available to all through education and culture, and that Fortunatus actively promoted these ways of being Roman. We can also see the relationship between Roman and barbarian identities as complex and flexible; Fortunatus, while using ancient language of a Roman-barbarian dichotomy, emphasized their compatibility and room for adaptation in a new environment. Further, we see descent as a common way to claim Romanness, in addition to language, culture, education, and actions of positive character. That Fortunatus played on these aspects of Roman identity shows how potent they were as tools in his available repertoire. Clearly his contemporaries valued such associations, whether or not they were Roman by descent.

In the late sixth-century, Fortunatus, Gregory, and their contemporaries still related their environs to a Roman past—whether through exposure to old Roman edifices, tales from elders about late imperial Gaul, or just being raised with a general mentality that stemmed from these earlier times. They still had access to such experiences, and the effect on their mindsets can be seen in the character of their writings. They were, however, probably among the last generation in Gaul to have a strong enough connection to the symbolic weight of the empire and the imagery of its grandeur. In the seventh century, as we will see, visions of a persistent Roman world in Gaul became eclipsed by new visions of a Gaul dominated by and intrinsically linked to the Franks. Consequently, new frameworks for conceptualizing and

discussing identities gained prominence and seventh-century authors, from Fredegar to a range

of hagiographers, adjusted their writing accordingly.

Chapter 6: Fredegar

The nearest seventh-century counterpart to Gregory of Tours' *Histories* is the *Chronicle* of Fredegar, and as such these two sources are frequently compared. The chronicler(s) that a later editor named Fredegar wrote in Burgundy and Austrasia between 613 and the 660s.[488] His *Chronicle* is really a 'chain of chronicles', with book one deriving largely from an anonymous *Liber generationis*, book two excerpting from Jerome and Hydatius' chronicles, book three adapting the six-book recension of Gregory's *Histories*, and book four his own work bringing Gregory's story up to 642.[489] That Fredegar's *Chronicle* incorporates excerpts from the *Histories* makes the task of comparison easier and permits us to see that the changes and additions the chronicler made to Gregory's text (or, more precisely, the recension) reflect their different goals in writing. Helmut Reimitz's recent work uses these changes to argue convincingly that greater emphasis on ethnic identities in the *Chronicle* indicates a different vision for the future of the Merovingian kingdoms on the part of its author—a redefinition of the world in ethnic rather than religious terms in order to promote Frankish identity as a unifying force for society.[490] He assumes that Fredegar consciously and deliberately elected to attempt to alter people's perceptions and identities through his language, which is in all likelihood true. However, it is important not to forget that Fredegar did not create this vision in a vacuum; what he could believably create depended on currents already existing in his society—his 'literary *Spielräume*'—that he drew and expanded upon.[491] His work thus not only shaped but also reflected the views and trends of his time.

Gregory wrote in a sixth-century society that was in many ways still recognizably Roman. As a senatorial southerner and a bishop (and writing mostly for others like him), his horizons predisposed him to see a society of local connections—between cities, church leaders, and families of status. Connections to the ancient past, whether an old Roman family or a long-revered saint, remained central concerns. Fredegar wrote between 613 and the 660s in Burgundy and Austrasia, so naturally he and his protagonists experienced a different society. The notable people in his *Chronicle* came from families that counted among their number both secular officials and episcopal or monastic power. Many of them traced their ancestry to Burgundians and Franks instead of (or in addition to) Romans. Identifying with their Frankish

political leaders helped them prosper in this society, and working alongside people of various backgrounds would make them more conscious of diversity within Francia. Thus ethnonyms would be more useful markers within Fredegar's context than within Gregory's—or than in the context of state-sponsored unity in Spain.

Indeed, if Fredegar wanted people to identify themselves and others as Franks, it would make sense for him to present a vision of multiple peoples united under an overarching political umbrella, without forsaking other aspects of their identity. Reimitz's recent treatment of the *Chronicle* indeed demonstrates that its intertwining of different perspectives and peoples that made up the Frankish kingdoms contributes to a narrative of shared Frankish identity in a political sphere.[492] As in Iberia, such a vision had enormous potential to facilitate acceptance of this new, Frankish identity. In this chapter, I argue that the most important change in mentality we can see by analysing books three and four of Fredegar's text is an increase in Frankishness as a political identity. The continued, relatively heavy use of other terms—Roman, Saxon, and Briton, for example—indicates that Frankish identity was not meant to subsume all other identities but to coexist with them, unlike in Spain where all other peoples were expected to assimilate into the overarching Gothic identity. Fredegar's presentation of various identities concurrently helped contemporaries to conceptualize a world in which multiple heritages need not be relinquished in order to partake of the benefits a Frankish political identity could provide.

Book Three: Rewriting Gregory

Reimitz has expertly detailed the changes made to Gregory's text by later abridgers and by Fredegar. The most commonly circulated abridgement into the Carolingian period was the six-book recension, compiled within a generation after Gregory's death. While Walter Goffart believed the redactors aimed to make the text into a history of the Franks preferred by later readers, Reimitz's detailed analysis of the passages omitted shows there were no added instances of the term 'Frank' nor any changes to the place of Franks within Gaul; this was not a history of the Franks but a history stripped of Gregory's references to his family and social network. The redactors kept his spiritual emphasis, though they altered its topography for a

new generation with different political realities and frames of reference than Gregory had.[493] Fredegar used this redaction of Gregory's *Histories* to construct the third book of his *Chronicle*, and so these omissions also appear here. In addition, though, Fredegar frequently added the term 'Frank' to the text, as well as other ethnonyms, altering the emphasis to a history of multiple ethnic communities, which set Romans and Franks equally alongside others. Doing so also allowed Fredegar to balance the diversity of a society composed of Romans, Franks, Burgundians, and others with the Frankish political identity shared by the whole kingdom.[494]

The most obvious example of the addition of Franks to Gregory's story is the Trojan origin myth Fredegar provided for the Frankish people.[495] Gregory had written that nothing concrete was known about the Franks' early kings, but that it was commonly said that the Frankish people came originally from Pannonia.[496] Fredegar, on the other hand, tied the Franks to the Romans, Macedonians, and Turks through the Trojans. Most of this story he added to book two, interpolating into Jerome's narrative, but he repeated some of it in Gregory's narrative as well. He made the Trojan Priam the first king of the Franks and divided his descendants into three peoples: the Macedonian people (*genus Macedonis*) who became warriors under King Philip and his son Alexander, the Turkish people (*gens Torcorum*) or Turks (*Turchi*) who went into Asia and elected a king named Torquoto from which they drew their name, and the Franks (*Franci*) who likewise elected Francio from whom their name derived.[497] He went on to say that Aeneas, whom legend said fled Troy for Italy and was the Trojan father of the Romans, was the brother of Friga, the second king of the Franks after Priam, thus linking the Franks and the Romans as sibling peoples.[498]

Whether Fredegar contrived this story himself or it was already circulating by his time is unknown, but stories about the Trojans' connections with the Romans must have been known in Gaul and would have served as an excellent existing resource for creative minds to weave into their own history.[499] By tying the Roman and Frankish pasts together in this manner, Fredegar gave the Franks as grand a past as the Romans—still the pinnacle of civilization—while simultaneously making them a strong, independent people from early antiquity. This brought the two peoples onto an even footing and encouraged their further unity in the present and

future, while removing Rome from its pedestal and presenting it as only one among many options.

Fredegar then added another layer of antiquity to the Franks by providing Clovis' grandfather, Merovech, with a mythological origin, suggesting that he had been conceived by a sea creature.[500] Similar non-human origin stories were told about Alexander and Augustus, and all three used the ambiguous 'and then he was born' rather than a direct 'leading to his birth' which left open the possibility of either divine or human conception. This story could easily have been an allusion to these great rulers. If so, this would be another example of Fredegar bringing the Franks in line with other great peoples and making them and the Romans just two among many.[501] Further support for this levelling, as Reimitz shows, is the complete change of format Fredegar performed on Jerome's chronicle from its original parallel presentations of multiple lines of history for multiple peoples (ultimately leading all of them into 'Roman' history) to a single, linear history in which all peoples were mentioned at intervals, their narratives interwoven as equal players in the same story.[502]

In addition to origin legends, Fredegar demonstrably added ethnonyms into Gregory's narrative, both for individuals and for groups. Two of these individuals—Deuteria and Aurelian—were explicitly labelled as Roman. Deuteria was a married woman with whom King Theudebert had a scandalous affair in the early 530s. She went from being described by Gregory as 'a matron named Deuteria' living in Cabrières to Fredegar's 'Deuteria of Roman birth (*Deotheria genere Romana*)'.[503] Gregory's description stays true to his usual pattern, providing her location in a southern city rather than her ancestry. As he later relates, she resided for a time in Clermont, meaning Gregory was undoubtedly quite familiar with her story and saw her as a local. From Fredegar's perspective, at a later time and probably not from a Roman family, she was simply a 'Roman'.

The second example, Aurelian, appears in a long elaboration of the tale of Clovis' acquisition of his future wife Clotild from Burgundy. Gregory's description of the event was very short, stating only that messengers told Clovis about her and, when he asked for her hand in marriage, King Gundobad (of Burgundy) was afraid to refuse, and so sent her to Clovis.[504] Fredegar expanded this into a detailed story about Clovis contriving a plan to obtain Clotild, a

messenger telling her about the plan, and the events of her departure, naming the messenger 'a certain Aurelian from the Romans (*Aurilianus quidam ex Romanis*)'.[505] Most of the additions in the story, however, were of 'Franks': there were coins offered in exchange for marrying for Clotild 'as was the custom of the Franks', Aurelian told her that 'Clovis, king of the Franks' sent him, and it was 'the Franks' who quickly arrived once the deal was done to bear Clotild away on a litter and whom she addressed when she wished to be placed on a horse so they could move more quickly.

As a supporter of Clovis, Aurelian could have been considered a Frank politically and may even have been among 'the Franks' escorting her away. As an individual, though, Fredegar saw the need to tell that he was 'from the Romans', which makes him seem to stand out as an exception among Clovis' men. We might conclude that people of Roman descent were rare in this context, and therefore noteworthy, or that it was important to Fredegar to show Clovis had the support of Romans as well as Franks. It is also possible that the Burgundians would have permitted someone they recognized as Roman to visit Clotild, but not a Frank. Aurelian's ability to claim either identity—one by ancestry, the other by political allegiance—allowed him to manoeuvre across boundaries others could not.

The majority of Fredegar's additions throughout the third book were, however, of Franks. Another extended tale elaborates on the exile of Clovis' father, Childeric, and the manner by which the Franks were persuaded to welcome him back. Gregory, again, was brief and basic, writing that 'a faithful friend of his' succeeded in winning the Franks back to him and sent half of a broken coin in a prearranged signal to let 'Childeric, king of the Franks', know it was safe to return. Fredegar, on the other hand, provided many details about the ways in which this friend effected such a change and, along with multiple references to 'the Frankish people (*gens Francorum*)', he also named the friend: 'Wiomadus the Frank'.[506] In the late fifth century, when Clovis asked his soldiers to give him a particular vase from among their plunder, he was called a 'glorious king' and told that anything he wanted was his. In Gregory's tale these people were 'those who were wiser', and in Fredegar's they were 'the Franks'.[507] By making this change, Fredegar not only clarified that Clovis' army was comprised of Franks, he also presented them as a united front with only one individual protesting Clovis' dominance. In

doing so, he denied that individual a Frankish identity and implied that being a Frank meant being a good follower of the king. Similarly, about Clovis' baptism, Gregory wrote that it was 'the army' that was baptized alongside him, but Fredegar said it was 'Franks' and added an anecdote about Clovis claiming, 'Had I been [at Jesus' crucifixion] with my Franks, I would have avenged his injury'.[508] Soon after, Clovis battled in a civil war between Gundobad and Godigisel of Burgundy, and again Fredegar named 'the Franks' as participants alongside Clovis. In his description of the aftermath, Fredegar added a number of Franks working with Clovis' allies and removed Gregory's description of new laws enacted by Gundobad that would prevent the Burgundians from oppressing the Romans in their territory. Together, these changes placed the focus more firmly on the Frankish story.[509]

In all of these examples, the Franks are political actors: consenting to be ruled, supporting their leader, proving their loyalty, or fighting for a king. In the tale of Clovis' baptism, they are also good Christians.[510] Many of them would also have been descended from Franks, but among them too were men like Aurelian who could be classified as Romans (or Saxons or others) by birth. They were not either 'really' Franks or 'really' Romans; they were both depending on the context and the particular mode of identification in question.

Clearly Fredegar was more interested than Gregory in categorizing people into ethnic groups, but that did not prevent him from cutting some of Gregory's early passages with ethnonyms if these did not align with his story. One such passage Fredegar cut told that in the days of Clodio, Clovis' great-grandfather, the Romans controlled the area south of him as far as the Loire, and the Goths the land beyond the Loire.[511] In another instance, where Gregory stated that the Goths handed Syagrius over to 'the Franks' in 486 or 487 in order to avoid their wrath, Fredegar simply said he was 'handed over' but not to whom.[512] A number of ethnonyms also disappeared in the trimming of tales about Visigothic Aquitaine and rival Frankish kings, such as a reference to the people of southern Gaul (who were under Visigothic control) wanting the Franks to rule them, and early sixth-century Franks near Cambrai resenting the yoke of their king, Ragnachar. The former might have lent a sense of predestination to unity within Gaul, while the latter took away from the picture of unity by even mentioning rival kings.[513] Fredegar

might have chosen to omit these in order to paint the Franks in the best light possible, but it is also likely that a desire for brevity led to the sacrifice of stories less central to the main arc.

Book Four: Fredegar's Original Work

In the last book of the *Chronicle*, which describes Fredegar's own time, we see a similar pattern to the third book: he continued to use many more ethnonyms than Gregory (for both ancestry and political affiliation), he maintained a particular focus on Franks, and he labelled a handful of individuals as Roman or Frank. Many of these 'Franks by birth' appear in a Burgundian context. Two mayors of the palace in Burgundy, Bertoald in 603-604 and Flaochad in 643, were called 'Frank by birth (*genere Francus*)'. The same is true for Quolen, made patrician in Burgundy in 599, and Herpo, made a duke in Burgundy in 613.[514] Theudelinda, who married a Lombard king in the late sixth century, was described as 'by birth a Frank (*ex genere Francorum*)' and 'sister of Grimoald and Gundoald'.[515] Paul the Deacon wrote in his *History of the Lombards* that she was the daughter of Vuldetrada, a Lombard princess, and Garibald, king of the Bavarians, so we might at first expect that she would have been called a Bavarian.[516] However, Gregory of Tours related that Garibald was a duke rather than a king, and we know that his successor, Tassilo, was appointed by the Frankish king Childebert c. 593, so he was probably a Frank who was sent to Bavaria to keep the region connected to the Frankish hegemony—or at least perceived as such by the Franks for whom Fredegar was writing.[517]

From an Italian perspective, what was most relevant to Paul was Garibald's power in Bavaria, not any allegiance he may have had to the Franks. But for Fredegar, writing from inside and perhaps knowing some background that Paul did not, Bavaria was a subset of Francia and its leaders should be called Franks. Interestingly, he could have depicted Theudelinda as a Lombard via her mother rather than as Frankish via her father; he certainly seems to have used maternal descent in the case of Chramnelen, as we will see shortly.[518] His choice seems to be a strategy to draw attention to Frankish dominance in the region, and through mention of her brothers to situate her among the powerful families of the era.

Similarly, Samo, the future king of the Wends/Slavs, was described as being 'Frank by nation (*natione Francos*)' despite his later affiliation with a different people.[519] His city of origin,

Soignies or Sens (*Senonagum*), was also given, providing him—like Theudelinda with her brothers—both an ethnonym and a Gregory-style social location. Clearly city of origin and notable relatives were also sometimes important to Fredegar alongside ancestry, and indeed the trio may be completed with 'duke' and 'patrician' telling something about social rank in place of the older term 'senatorial'.

A notable commonality shared by all these 'Franks' is their location outside the original core of Frankish power. Being in Bavaria and Slavic territory makes Theudelinda and Samo's Frankish identity stand out as different from those around them. If Fredegar did not want his audience to assume they were Bavarian or Slavic, he needed to explicitly state otherwise. The others were officials in Burgundy, one of the three main subkingdoms of Francia alongside Neustria and Austrasia. Unlike the other two, Burgundy had a history as an independent kingdom ruled by people called Burgundians. It may, therefore, have been more important for Fredegar to specify the ancestry of these leaders, since it could not automatically be assumed they were of Frankish rather than Burgundian descent.

For 'Berthar, count of the palace [under Clovis II of Neustria and Burgundy] and a Frank from the Transjura district', the contrast with 'Manaulf the Burgundian (*Manaulfus Burgundio*)' merits similar labelling. Manaulf and Berthar had once been friends but were now fighting on opposing sides of a battle over who would be appointed mayor of the palace in Burgundy.[520] The same is true of the final example of individual Franks: a list of dukes whom King Dagobert sent from Burgundy under the leadership of a referendary named Chadoind to deal with rebellious Gascons in 635. Fredegar called them Arnebert, Amalgar, Leudebert, Wandalmar, Walderic, Hermenric, Barontus, and Chaira 'of the Franks by birth (*ex genere Francorum*)', Chramnelen 'Roman by birth (*ex genere Romano*)', Willebad 'the patrician, of the Burgundians by birth (*patricius genere Burgundionum*)', and Aighyna 'Saxon by birth (*ex genere Saxsonum*)'.[521] He may have deemed ancestry especially salient here because of the mix of backgrounds and their origin in Burgundy. It certainly was not because these specific people required the label, since many of them appear elsewhere in this book sans ethnonyms. Arnebert and Amalgar, for example, were simply labelled as dukes and Willebad as a patrician in an earlier passage telling about their assassination of Produlfus on Dagobert's orders in

628.[522] Similarly, in a later passage, Chramnelen was simply a duke and Willebad again a patrician during a description of Flaochad's 643 plot to kill Willebad.[523] Fredegar again called Amalgar simply a duke on an embassy to King Sisenand in Spain in 630, Barontus a duke when in the same year Dagobert sent him to fetch the treasure of his recently deceased brother, King Charibert, and Aighyna a duke when he accused Palladius and Sidocus of supporting Gascon rebels in 626.[524] The only other time one of these men was associated with an ethnic group was when Ermenarius was killed by the followers of 'Aighyna, of the Saxons by birth (*Aeghyna genere Saxonorum*)'.[525] Something about this particular passage and the assembly of this variety of dukes together inspired him to phrase his list in this way.

It seems likely that Fredegar's choice was inspired both by narrative form and by a desire to show multiple peoples united. In terms of the former, such a lengthy list seems to want further description, and in terms of the latter, choosing ethnicity as the descriptive mode makes the Gascons stand out as troublemakers in a happily mixed society. The Frankish individuals are clearly depicted as equal, though more numerous, partners to the Roman, the Burgundian, and the Saxon, and their Frankish identity as analogous to these other identities— as one of a multitude. As a group, they functioned as a single 'army of the Burgundians' or 'army of the Franks'; whether Franks, Romans, Burgundians, or Saxons 'by birth', they were also Franks politically by virtue of fighting in the army of Dagobert, king of the Franks.[526] Whereas Gregory in a similar circumstance identified the two legates Bodegisel and Evantius according to their fathers and home city and the third, Grippo, as a Frank, Fredegar labelled all individuals in this party in the same manner, by ancestry.[527] Thus, while he did use the same style of description as Gregory on occasion, he did not share Gregory's local, Roman view of the world in which a person's social rank, city of origin, and notable parents were his or her most important identifiers. His world was one of officials ranked as dukes and patricians and of many peoples united under Frankish leadership.

Just like Gregory's Bodegisel, Chramnelen's labelling within this list has attracted speculation about ancestry and personal names. We actually know quite a bit about his family because they appear in Jonas of Bobbio's *Life of Columbanus*, though without ethnonyms. His father was Waldelen, a duke based in Besançon, and his mother Flavia, 'noble by her birth and

her prudence'. His parents were childless until they went to Columbanus for help, after which they had Donatus, who became bishop of Besançon; Chramnelen, who succeeded his father as duke; and two daughters.[528]

It is often assumed that this family was related to others with names beginning 'Wa-' in Burgundy simply for onomastic reasons, including Chramnelen's Frankish companions in Gascony, Wandalmar and Walderic, although this cannot be definitively proven.[529] This logic alongside Chramnelen's label as 'Roman' have led historians to the conclusion that at least Waldelen, if not others like Wandalmar and Walderic, must have been of Roman origin. For example, Horst Ebling, Jörg Jarnut, and Gerd Kampers insist that Waldelen was of 'clear Roman ancestry', and that the mix of Roman and Germanic names in his family suggests that he was the product of a mixed marriage.[530] However, not only is Waldelen's 'Romanness' an unfounded assumption, his descent from one Germanic and one Roman parent in order to make Chramnelen 'Roman by birth' is completely unnecessary. Even if a mixed marriage were required for Waldelen's children to have mixed names (and it is not), why could that marriage not be Waldelen's own to Flavia? There is, after all, no reason to assume that Waldelen had any Roman ancestors except for the 'Roman' ethnic label Fredegar gave to his son. As Patrick Geary points out, arguments that extrapolate Chramnelen's 'Romanness' to all of his supposed relatives miss the very important point that Fredegar called Wandalmar and Walderic 'Franks by birth' in the same passage. Chramnelen could just as easily be assumed to be a 'Frank' based on them as they could be 'Romans' based on him.[531] It is just as possible that he derived his Roman *genus* via his mother, and Wandalmar and Walderic—if they were even related to Chramnelen—would thus not need to be 'Roman' for Chramnelen to be considered of 'Roman birth'.

This is not, to my mind, an example of a Roman family that had nearly assimilated into a Frankish society, reflected in their choice of names, nor is it evidence that people like Chramnelen, Wandalmar, and Walderic could pass as either Frank or Roman as it suited them. It is instead evidence that names need not reflect a person's perceived ancestry, that parents sometimes chose names of different linguistic origins for their children (here the Germanic Chramnelen for a secular position and the Latin Donatus for a future bishop), and that the

Roman identity of parents could still be remembered for children even if those children bore Germanic names. These far more interesting observations about strategies for naming and identification provide us with insight into how individuals negotiated the in-betweens of a shifting environment and made use of an array of options for identification to do so.

As with book three, the political mode of identification Fredegar used to describe 'the army of the Franks' led by Chramnelen and his fellow dukes is common throughout book four. The 'army of the Franks', for example, marched in support of the aspiring Gothic king Sisenand and fought with the 'army of the Britons'.[532] When Fredegar described a war in 590 'between Franks and Britons (*inter Francos et Brittanis*)', he surely meant between the Frankish and Breton armies.[533] Similarly, he described 'Frankish and other peoples (*Francorum ceterasque gentes*)', particularly Saxons and Thuringians, together in the year 612 in a great battle, the likes of which they had never fought before.[534] The Saxons and Thuringians, while nominally under Frankish control, were semi-independent at this point and therefore Fredegar did not consider them to be Franks. In this example, he again portrayed the Franks as just one of many peoples, but they were also an army, representing their king in battle.

The inclusive phrases 'king' and 'kingdom of the Franks' are also common: 'Gunthram, king of the Franks', ruled over Burgundy in the late sixth century; 'Dagobert, king of the Franks', baptized Jews in his kingdom at the request of the emperor Heraclius in 629; and in 630, Wends plundered land around the 'kingdom of the Franks' and allied with the Sorbs who had been subject to the 'kingdom of the Franks' for a long time.[535] Other political uses of 'Frank' include Beppelen, whom Fredegar called 'duke of the Franks'—a political position which made him a representative and servant of the king—and Dagobert and Clothar arguing in 625 over who should rule over the 'kingdom of the Austrasians (*regnum Austrasiorum*)', ultimately electing 'twelve Franks (*duodicem Francis*)'—political subjects, though they may also have been of Frankish descent—to settle the issue.[536]

This last example shows that residents were both Austrasians and Franks politically depending on context, and Fredegar chose between these political designations based on which distinction mattered in a given passage. Because the subkingdoms under Frankish control sometimes had different rulers and went to war with each other, Fredegar often found it

necessary to distinguish which subkingdom he meant; that these subkingdoms had come by his time to have separate names made this an easier task than it had been in the sixth century, when only the king's name could have definitively distinguished between them. Fredegar thus wrote that Dagobert agreed to a proposal on the 'advice of the Neustrians (*consilium Neustrasiorum*)' in 631 and raised an army within the 'kingdom of the Austrasians (*regnum Austrasiorum*)' to fight Samo and the Wends in 630. The mayor Erchinoald went to battle with 'those Neustrians which he had with him' in 643, Queen Bilichild 'was vehemently loved by all the Austrasians, and Theudebert 'with a great army of Austrasians' arrived to do battle with his brother Theuderic, who ruled Burgundy, in 610.[537] It is important to note that no one was called 'Neustrian' or 'Austrasian' by birth; these were solely political terms describing residents of particular subkingdoms.[538]

In these examples, Frankish identity was attributed to a political association—service under a king as a counsellor or army member, or residency within a kingdom ruled by a Frankish king—rather than a seemingly inherent affiliation from birth. Neustrian and Austrasian identity were subsets of this Frankish political identity within the context of these individual kingdoms. Not being born to Franks seems not to have been a barrier to serving under these kings and drawing one's political identity from them. Had it been, we would expect to see other identities quickly disappear from the sources as people hurried to paint themselves as Franks in every way in order to be considered viable political actors within the kingdom. Instead, we see an increase in the appearance not just of the term 'Frank', but also of other terms such as 'Roman'.

While Fredegar did not often add 'Roman' to excerpts he borrowed from others' writings, he did make use of 'Roman' a number of times within his original work, as both an imperial and a local label. The two occasions referring to the Byzantine Empire were in foreign contexts: the *Romani* fought against the Visigothic king Sisebut's army in Spain in the early seventh century where Sisebut's army captured several 'cities from the Roman empire' along the coast, and a 'Roman patrician' in Ravenna paid a tribute in gold to the Lombards in Italy in 630.[539] Elsewhere, however, the Byzantine ruler was simply 'emperor', his patrician a 'patrician of the *res publica*', and the territory he ruled 'the empire'.[540] On a local level, in addition to the

previously-mentioned Chramnelen, Protadius, mayor of the palace in Burgundy from 604 to 606, and his successor Claudius were both called 'Roman by birth'.[541] Ricomer, who replaced the patrician Wulf in Burgundy in 607, was similarly labelled as *Ricomerus Romanus genere*, and like Chramnelen did not bear a Roman name.[542] As all three of these men were powerful individuals within the government of the Burgundian kingdom—a kingdom governed by the Frankish king Theuderic II—they could just as easily have been considered Franks, or even Burgundians, in a political sense. Their ancestry may also have been more relevant to Fredegar because of their presence in Burgundy specifically, where the mix of Franks, Burgundians, and Romans among elite officials made it more likely that people would think of them along ethnic lines. Gregory would certainly have mentioned their fathers and cities of origin if he knew them instead of ascribing Roman ethnicity to them, yet Fredegar found 'Roman birth' more important to mention in all three cases.

This supports Reimitz's idea that Fredegar possessed an ethnic view of the world comprised of peoples, not just a Frankish one, and it also indicates that Roman identity persisted as a recognizable social category to Fredegar's own time in the mid-seventh century. This does not mean that he labelled *everyone* in an ethnic manner—the patrician Wulf was not so designated, though similar characters like Quolen and Bertoald were said to be 'Franks' by birth—just that he placed greater emphasis on this way of structuring society than Gregory did. While identification with a 'people' by ancestry was important to Fredegar, it clearly was not essential. For those of Roman birth, having a secular office may have made these identities seem particularly notable. Romans, after all, seem to stand out when they are mentioned. They appear in the *Chronicle* but far less often than the Franks, and, of course, those native to Gaul (as opposed to those living within imperial boundaries) had no corresponding 'Roman' political identity; instead they would be Franks politically.

There are many possible explanations for this clear difference between Fredegar's usage and that of his predecessors. Fredegar encountered a different social circle than Gregory and, coming from a different part of Francia, imagined his society's shape from a different centre. It could also be a sign that important people identifying as Roman were becoming less common. As non-Roman families rose to prominence, and as more people came to identify as Franks on

all levels, 'Romans' may have become rarer anomalies especially worthy of mention. Either way, within the *Chronicle*, 'Romans' seem to have been gradually making way for 'Franks'.

Other peoples in the Frankish sphere would, of course, be in the same position—notable because they were not the dominant group. They clearly acted as groups, and were regularly portrayed in the *Chronicle* with both political and descent connotations. The Alamans, as an army, invaded the district of Avenches; the Saxons sent messengers as a political delegation to Dagobert asking for relief from tribute in exchange for defending the Frankish frontier against the Wends; and, as we have already seen, the Saxons and Thuringians summoned to fight with Theudebert were considered separate peoples from their Frankish overlords, with the chroniclers stating that such a battle had never before been fought by 'the peoples of the Franks and the others'.[543] Although the Saxons and Thuringians clearly owed allegiance to the Frankish kings and were required to fight for them and pay tribute to them, they were separate entities with the ability to negotiate and to act for themselves, not fully integrated into the kingdom. Similarly, Fredegar depicted the Bretons, though nominally subject to the Franks, as possessing a separate kingdom, just as Gregory did in his *Histories*. They had an 'army of the Britons', waged war with the Franks, and even once were shown to have their own king: *Iudacaile rex Britannorum*.[544]

Other kingdoms throughout Europe, of course, had their own kings that ruled over multiple peoples, and armies that consisted of individuals from a variety of backgrounds, as in the Frankish kingdoms, and these elements appear in descriptions of them in the *Chronicle*. Reccared, for example, was said to be 'king of the Goths' despite ruling over Romans and Sueves as well as Goths in Spain, Agilulf was similarly 'king of the Lombards', and Samo was 'king of the Slavs (*rex Sclavinorum*)'.[545] Fredegar also used similar wording for Leudefred, 'duke of the Alamans'.[546] In one instance, he even provided a whole people with an ancestry: in describing Dervan, 'duke of the people of the Sorbs', Fredegar specified that the Sorbs 'were by descent of the Slavs (*ex genere Sclavinorum erant*)'.[547]

If Fredegar indeed hoped to offer Frankish identity as a way of structuring society, he needed to stress Frankish identity in his narrative, but he also chose to stress the identities of other peoples. This choice provided a narrative place for these peoples within the Frankish

realm, and within the Frankish political identity his *Chronicle* promoted. By portraying Frankish identity as accommodating rather than exclusive—as a complementary identity rather than necessarily a replacement identity—he increased the likelihood of its success in influencing a diverse group of peoples to unify under a common political banner, intentionally or not. Like the Visigoths' conversion opening up Catholicism as an avenue for people of any ancestry to identify as Gothic, Fredegar's construction of a Frankish political identity that was available to subjects of any ancestry made it easier for those subjects to consider themselves 'Franks', first by political loyalty, then possibly in other ways as well.

Conclusion

By 727 when the *Liber Historiae Francorum* was written, Frankishness would be more fully adopted as a political identity to the point that Romans were, in the author's eyes, no longer in the picture, though they would appear on occasion in other texts over the next couple of centuries, in the south or in antiquated legal language.[548] The increase in the use of 'Frank' in politically-oriented phrases like 'king of the Franks' within Fredegar's *Chronicle* itself signals the beginning of this trend, incorporating people of disparate ancestry within its framework. Whether due more to Fredegar's own engineering or to independent shifts he observed in society, there is definitely a different picture of Frankish society in his *Chronicle* than in Gregory's *Histories*. The term 'Roman' and other ethnonyms appear more in Fredegar's writing than they did in sixth-century texts by Gregory and even Fortunatus. This is not just because he chose to incorporate such identities regularly in his work, but because his focus was, in the first instance, a political one. The underlying implication is that one need not be a Frank by birth to become one politically and co-exist under a common ruler. Gregory may have believed the same, since he also used political phrases like 'king of the Franks', though less often than Fredegar did. However, his society and likely audience were different from Fredegar's, and political Frankishness played a less important role for him than did the local Roman social structure he and others in his social network were accustomed to. As this changed, and the Roman and Frankish elements of society became more integrated, Frankishness became a greater part of people's lives.

Traditionally, historians have interpreted this as the end of Roman identities altogether, but this neglects the multi-layered nature of identity which would allow Romans to identify as Franks in one sense while still maintaining Roman identity along other lines. While people did, in time, lose connection with Romanness completely, the chronicler's depiction of his society gives us fewer hints of this than of the development of an overarching group identity centred on a political unit which all Merovingian subjects could hold in common, just as a political-religious Gothic identity in Spain was open to those not of Gothic birth.

Of course, so far we have only examined the writings of a few authors. Were Gregory, Fortunatus, and Fredegar the only sources for sixth- and seventh-century Gaul, we might think that the shift toward greater identification as Franks was a reflection solely of their differing narrative goals. However, as we will see in the next chapter, a look at the hagiographical corpus shows these emphases are too widespread in the sources to be attributed solely to authorial design. While Fredegar's *Chronicle* may well have influenced some hagiographers of the second half of the seventh century toward visions of Frankish unity, it cannot be deemed responsible for the views of all, and certainly not for those in the first half. This indicates a shift in mentality within the community at large—changing *Spielräume*—not just a narrative which hoped to inspire such a mentality. The two forces coexisted simultaneously and in a mutually reinforcing manner. Fredegar may have helped the process along by providing conceptual and narrative tools, but a change, it seems, was already occurring within Merovingian society at the time he was writing. This change was not primarily from a Christian to a Frankish view of the world, or in the degree of prevalence of Christian and Frankish discourse to draw upon, but from a Roman outlook to a Frankish one.

Chapter 7: Frankish Hagiography

While both Gregory and Fortunatus wrote a handful of saints' *Lives*, some of which I have already discussed, the majority of *Lives* for the sixth and seventh centuries are the work of others. A look at the full corpus for these two centuries confirms that the focal shift from a Roman to a Frankish society was not solely the invention of a few cunning authors, but a trend occurring throughout their society.

In these saints' *Lives*, two main points become clear. First is that Frankish identity came to be discussed more often in political terms over the course of the two centuries, as an inclusive label that could encompass all within the kingdom. Sixth-century hagiographers used 'Frank' less often than seventh-century ones, and their language when using it is reminiscent of Gregory's. Kings of the 'Franks' and Franks as an army make appearances, and the few individuals are described as 'a Frank' or 'a certain Frank'.[549] In seventh-century texts, individuals are often said to be Franks 'by birth', which at first glance might seem counter to a unifying Frankish identity.[550] However, they regularly appear alongside Burgundians, Romans, or Saxons 'by birth', all of whom are included in group descriptions of 'the Franks'. Only some were Franks by descent, but all were Franks by political affiliation. This political usage is far more frequent in seventh-century texts than in earlier ones, and is responsible for the great increase in the use of the term 'Frank' generally during this century. 'Kingdom of the Franks', for example, is present on multiple occasions, while it is absent completely from sixth-century *Lives*.[551]

The second key trend is that Roman identity was asserted more frequently in seventh-century *Lives*, undoubtedly because it was coming to be seen as exceptional and thus especially worth noting. As with Gregory's *Histories*, Romanness as a local identity is completely absent from sixth-century saints' *Lives*. This makes Venantius Fortunatus' poetry the only literary source from this period in which locals appear explicitly as Roman. In contrast, nine *Lives* spread fairly evenly across the seventh and very beginning of the eighth centuries mention local 'Romans'.[552] Almost all of these are Roman 'by birth', and all but one came from south of the Loire. This suggests a changing view of Romanness throughout the period, from the common identity a reader would assume an individual held unless explicitly told otherwise—and therefore not necessary to mention outside of Fortunatus' poetic rhetoric—to a noteworthy

exception that needed to be expressed in the face of broader adoption of Frankish identity across much of the Merovingian kingdoms.

Rather than attempting to cover the entire corpus in detail, this chapter will focus on three of these *Lives*: the sixth-century Caesarius of Arles, the early seventh-century Gaugeric of Cambrai, and the later seventh-century Eligius of Noyon.[553] I have chosen these texts for two reasons. First, they cover the sixth century, the seventh century pre-Fredegar, and the seventh century post-Fredegar and can therefore provide comparisons for the trends seen in Gregory's, Fortunatus', and Fredegar's works across the two centuries. Second, all three incorporate ethnonyms for us to analyse, and do so in a way that is representative of other contemporary hagiographical texts. These three *Lives* are thus especially useful examples for seeing the shift from Roman to Frankish identification in action, and a deeper focus on just these will permit a greater understanding of the ways context affected hagiographers' choice of language—as well as the particular uses these pieces could serve.

Caesarius of Arles

Caesarius (469/70-542) served as bishop of Arles from 502 until his death. During that time, Arles changed hands from Visigothic to Ostrogothic to Frankish rule. His environment was thus both volatile and international. His *Life* was written between 543 and 546 by a team of authors. Book one was the work of Cyprian of Toulon, a pupil of Caesarius who knew him well, with the assistance of the bishops Firminus of Uzès and Viventius of an unknown city. Book two was written by two clerics who had served Caesarius from youth: Messianus and Stephanus.[554]

What we know of Caesarius comes predominantly from his *Life*. Its first description of him reads: 'The holy and most blessed Caesarius, bishop of Arles, was a native of the territory of Chalon-sur-Saône. His parents as well as his family—an exceptionally great example of honour and nobility—were distinguished above all their fellow citizens because of their faith and even more their conduct'.[555] Like Gregory, Cyprian emphasized details most meaningful to locals, like *civitas* and parents. As is common in hagiographical texts, the holiness of the saint is established from the very beginning with not only his faith but that of his family as witness.[556] Caesarius was predisposed to good Christian character, the text suggests, because his family

members were noble in both earthly and heavenly ways. We learn more a few chapters later when a young Caesarius was first introduced to his predecessor as bishop, Aeonius. Aeonius 'questioned him carefully about his native city and his parents'. On learning the answers, he rejoiced and embraced Caesarius as a 'fellow citizen' and 'relative'.[557] This episode bears a remarkable resemblance to Gregory's tale of his ancestor Gallus being questioned by an abbot, and eve more so to Paul and Fidel in Mérida. In all three instances, parentage and home city were the essential identifiers that located the individual within both a social and a geographical context.

Also like Gregory's work, these local sorts of descriptors are common in Caesarius' *Life*. Firminus appears as 'illustrious' and God-fearing alongside his relative Gregoria, a matron who was 'the most illustrious of women'.[558] Agretia was also most illustrious and the wife of Liberius, who himself is only described as a patrician, a designation officially given him by the Ostrogothic king Theoderic.[559] Another 'illustrious patrician', Parthenius, had a slave whom Caesarius healed through anointing.[560] Two other cured men were described only as the sons of 'illustrious' fathers Salvius and Martianus.[561] For all of these, social status as *illustri* and connections through family or servitude placed them within a local social network.

Occasionally Cyprian and his co-authors described individuals using ethnonyms. One of the authors of book two encountered 'a Frank' walking in front of him who suffered from a fever. Presumably so far south a Frank stood out as exceptional—the majority of Arles' citizens were still viewed according to Roman status markers and offices and probably were descended from Roman citizens. Also, a man named Pomerius is presented as an associate of Firminus and Gregoria, a *rhetor* by training, and 'African by birth (*Afer genere*)'.[562] Thus he is located socially, vouched for by two known *illustri*, but still clearly foreign enough that his ancestry needs accounting for. Like Quintianus of Rodez, whom Gregory described as *Afer natione*, Pomerius' most marked difference is his African origin, and he is not called 'Roman'.[563] In fact, local Roman identity is completely absent from the *Life* of Caesarius; only clergy in the city of Rome are so labelled.

Living in a region fought over by various kingdoms, Caesarius would have encountered many kings, armies, and residents who did not fit into local, Roman-style categories from his

perspective. As a result, we see many Goths, Franks, and Burgundians in his *Life.* Initially, Arles was under Visigothic control, so it was Alaric, 'king of the Visigoths', to whom Caesarius appealed for aid for his church.[564] The Goths were Arian Christians at this time, so the hagiographers sometimes depict Caesarius as the victim of their heresy and impiety and other times as the recipient of respect and reverence, proving that even heretics acknowledged his holiness. So Alaric both 'venerated the servant of Christ' along with his court and was 'an impious king'.[565] Alaric soon died in battle, and the city of Arles suffered through a siege by 'the Franks and Burgundians'—that is, by their armies.[566] Within the city were Goths, Jews, and 'us' or 'Catholics'.[567] These Goths feared Caesarius would betray the city to the surrounding troops and imprisoned him in his residence under guard. Thus his residence was crowded with 'Arians', including 'one of these Goths' who was struck dead by God for reclining in the bishop's bed. The churches were also filled with 'unbelievers'.

As in Spain, Arian and Gothic identity were linked in the minds of Catholic Romans in Arles. Goths, because they professed Arianism, were unbelievers 'corrupted by the Arian perversity of barbarians'.[568] While there are elements of political Gothicness in their role as soldiers and they were probably also assumed to be Gothic by descent, the most salient aspect was religious Gothicness in contrast with the Catholicism of the saint and 'his' people. The same can be seen with the Jews, one of whom attempted to deliver the city to the besiegers in exchange for safety for the Jewish residents.[569] The Jews appear as a distinct group of people responsible for certain duties during the siege, and the greatest difference between them and their fellow residents was their religion. Caesarius' people were not Arian Goths, nor Jews, but Catholics.

The siege was finally broken by the arrival of soldiers sent by Theoderic, 'king of Italy'. Arles then passed from 'the Visigoths to the kingdom of the Ostrogoths'.[570] Caesarius had an audience with his new king who, like Alaric, recognized the bishop's holiness. Cyprian did not, however, mark Theoderic or his people as Arian heretics; their religion goes judiciously unmentioned. He did, however, have the king inquire after 'his Goths and the people of Arles (*Arelatenses*)', highlighting the co-existence of multiple groups in the region while painting them with different brushes.[571] These Goths may serve in the military at Arles, but Cyprian did

not consider them *Arelatenses*. They were 'Goths', and specifically Goths subject to Theoderic. Here it is the political aspect the author chose to emphasize. The non-Goths remain defined by their city of residence, not as Roman descendants or 'Gothic' subjects or even Catholics. This is again reminiscent of Gregory's writing in its conception of 'us' local Catholics as an urban community and others as larger ethnic groups.

On the whole, Caesarius' *Life* reads as we would expect a sixth-century Gallic *Life* to read. Its authors assume an insider's perspective that imagines neighbours according to local scripts of identity: city, social status, and family connections. These neighbours are Catholics when opposed to Arian Goths or Jews, but never Romans. From this perspective, outsiders are envisioned according to a different script that emphasizes their otherness. They might be of a different religion, soldiers or subjects of one king or another, temporarily in Arles but not *of* Arles. They are part of another group called the Goths, or the Burgundians, or the Franks— sometimes defined religiously, sometimes politically, according to circumstance. Like Gregory, the authors lived in the south where Roman institutions and culture remained longer and wrote as churchmen promoting the interests of their Catholic faith. The similarities between their texts stem from this similar social and mental landscape.

Gaugeric of Cambrai

In the seventh-century north, the situation was a bit different. Franks had dominated this region for longer than the south, and so the adoption of Frankish culture and identity probably happened sooner there. Particularly in the kingdom of Austrasia, which included areas east of the Rhine that were never held by the Roman Empire, we might expect Roman identity to fade more quickly. This is the environment of Gaugeric's short *Life.*

Gaugeric served as bishop of Cambrai from c. 585 until his death c. 626. His *Life* was probably written by a cleric in Cambrai during or soon after his successor's tenure. It was certainly complete by 642 when Jonas of Bobbio borrowed passages for his *Life* of Vedast, Gaugeric's predecessor.[572] It therefore predates the completion of Fredegar's *Chronicle* and can serve as a witness to changes in the available repertoire of identifications during the first half of the seventh century.

As is common in hagiographical texts, the author begins with an account of the saint's birth and origins. 'The most blessed Gaugeric', we are told, 'was born in Germania in the fortified town of Eposium [modern Carignan in the Ardennes] to parents who were, according to secular dignity, neither of first nor highest rank, Roman by birth (*natio*), and truly Christian by religion'.[573] His parents are then named as Gaudentius and Austadiola. Like Caesarius, he is identified with a place of origin and with parents whose faith reflects positively on his prospects. Their rank is also revealed though their social status was not high—with their Christian faith demonstrating that holiness was not class-dependent. The main difference between the two descriptions is Gaugeric's Roman ancestry—via both parents. Gaugeric's successor is likewise described by his ancestry: 'Bertoald of Frankish birth (*ex Francorum natione*)'.[574] Clearly the author has chosen to depict Cambrai as part of a mixed society, with Romans and Franks living alongside one another and serving in the church together. The mix of names in Gaugeric's family also suggests cultural overlaps between the two groups, and possible a desire within the family to affiliate with the Frankish majority in this northeastern region.[575]

Not everyone in this *Life* is labelled as Roman or Frank, though. Wado is simply a count, Walcharius a tribune, and Baudegisel a custodian at the basilica[576]. Landericus, the mayor of the palace in 603/4, appears along with his title as 'the illustrious man (*vir inluster*)'.[577] In the context of leadership of the local diocese, the fact that people of both Roman and Frankish origin held the post may have mattered more than the ancestries of these other officials. Just as Gregory assumed Roman identity was less important to mention than markers of status and family in a time and region where the majority of people he encountered could claim Roman ancestry, Gaugeric's hagiographer may have found titles placing these men within the local hierarchy of officials more useful than naming them Franks among a majority of Franks.

One more term of particular interest appears in Gaugeric's tale: the title given King Childebert. Rather than 'king of the Franks', as we have seen regularly elsewhere, Childebert is labelled 'king of the Austrasians (*rex Austrasiorum*)'.[578] Because Neustria and Burgundy do not appear within the *Life,* it is impossible to determine how the author would have viewed *their* kings—as rulers of Neustrians and Burgundians or of Franks. The former would suggest he was

merely distinguishing between the subkingdoms, and the latter that he saw Neustrians (probably) as the true, dominant Franks. Certainly later texts, like the *Lives* of Balthild and Desiderius of Cahors and the *Liber Historiae Francorum*, would make such judgments.[579] Cambrai was, at the time of writing, in a potentially precarious position near the border of Austrasia and Neustria at a time when the relationship between these two kingdoms was under re-negotiation. So we may also see 'king of the Austrasians' as evidence of 'a prudent political neutrality' that simply stated facts without passing judgment on hierarchies among the kings.[580]

Gaugeric's *Life* is quite short and very locally-focused, so it is hard to compare with longer works with broader horizons, like Fredegar's *Chronicle*. However, it does prove the use of both locally-relevant markers of identity and ethnic labels simultaneously. It also shows that Fredegar was not the first seventh-century author to highlight Roman and Frankish identities by birth.

Eligius of Noyon

The *Life* of Eligius of Noyon, on the other hand, was written after the Fredegar *Chronicle* and may reflect its influence as well as broader social realities. Eligius was born in Aquitaine and moved to the Neustrian court to work as a goldsmith, then a councillor to the king. He was made bishop of Noyon in 642 and served until his death in 660. His friend Audoin, from a well-known family in Soissons, followed a similar trajectory, serving at the court where he met Eligius, then becoming the bishop of Rouen.[581] Audoin wrote Eligius' *Life* between 660 and 686.[582]

Among the most striking aspects of this *Life*, at first glance, is the abundance and variety of ethnonyms that appear, very much like in Fredegar's *Chronicle*. This is not to say that city, family, or status descriptions never appear. Erchenbert, for example, appears as simply 'a most illustrious man'. Willibad, to whom Fredegar introduced us, is described both as a Christian man and a patrician of Burgundy.[583] However, these are overshadowed by the greater number of ethnic labels present in the *Life*.

Prime among these are its many references to the 'Franks', more in fact than the entire corpus of sixth-century *Lives*. The majority of these are in the form of 'king' or 'kingdom of the

Franks', such as the statement made of King Dagobert that 'no one was similar to him among all past kings of the Franks', a vision of the 'kingdom of the Franks' under the rule of a queen regent, the description of legates from other kingdoms who stopped to meet with Eligius before continuing on to the 'palace of the king of the Franks', and multiple mentions of 'Clothar, king of the Franks'.[584] Being both from and based in Neustria, Audoin privileged this region as especially Frankish compared to the south. When telling of Eligius' departure from his Aquitanian home, he states that Eligius 'left his homeland and parents and went to the land of the Franks'.[585] Aquitaine was ruled by Frankish kings, and that would make it politically 'Frankish', but culturally—or in terms of its populace or its distance from the centre of the Neustrian political sphere—Audoin envisioned it retaining some element of Romanness or foreignness that made it less 'Frankish' than the north.

At court, Eligius worked with people from a variety of backgrounds. A slave named Thille is described as 'a Saxon by birth (*ex genere Saxonico*)' and a *cubicularius* named Tituin as 'Sueve by birth'. His assistant Bauderic was a 'countryman (*cumprovincialis*)' of his from the south and Buchin was converted from the gentiles.[586] When he became bishop of Noyon, he was responsible for a large region from the more central, urban Noyon to the rural, peripheral outskirts north of Tournai. Therefore his *Life* emphasizes his role in conversion of 'pagan' peoples to the north.[587] He 'illuminated all the barbarian lands' where Frisians, Sueves, and 'barbarians from near the sea coast' lived. By stimulating a love of God in 'the minds of the barbarians', he converted a great many of them, including 'erroneous Sueves' in the region of Antwerp.[588] Sometimes Audoin described these peoples with an ethnic label, identifying specific groups that were especially peripheral to Frankish society, but often they were simply collectivized as 'barbarians'. This is not the fairly neutral term of Fortunatus' poetry, meant only to describe ancestry and predispositions. Rather it is a strategy for othering much of Eligius' flock as not properly Christian.[589]

A description of the pious Eligius using his wealth to free slaves adds a few more peoples to the landscape. The slaves were 'of diverse peoples', including Romans, Gauls, Britons, Moors, and especially Saxons, whom Audoin says were often refugees and therefore found everywhere.[590] The Moors probably came from Africa and the Britons either from

Brittany or Britain. 'Gaul' or 'Gallic' is unusual in the seventh century, though it does make an appearance in the *Life* of Eligius' and Audoin's friend Desiderius, bishop of Cahors, to refer to southerners and their customs.[591] 'Roman' is also hard to interpret here because of the variety of possible meanings it could have. Audoin could have meant southerners of Roman descent, though these could also fit into the category of Gauls, and therefore citizens of the eastern Roman Empire might be more true to his intention. He did, after all, depict the empire as 'Roman' on two other occasions: Constans II as leader of the 'Roman empire' and a delegation from 'the Roman province' paying respects to Eligius before visiting the king of the Franks.[592]

There is one other example of Roman identity in Eligius' *Life*, and that is to describe Eligius himself. However, it does not appear in the initial description of the saint, as with Gaugeric. There, Audoin tells that Eligius was born in Chaptelat near Limoges in Aquitaine to 'free parents and Christians of an ancient line', Eucherius and Terrigia.[593] Like Gaugeric, their status is mentioned despite not being high and their Christian faith bolsters Eligius' character and importance, vouching for the family's worthiness in the absence of earthly nobility. Eligius was thus 'nurtured in the true faith' from his birth.[594]

Instead of calling Eligius Roman here, Audoin puts the label into the mouths of his detractors in the diocese of Noyon. In order to understand why, we need to examine the context of this episode in detail. On the feast day of the apostle Peter, Eligius preached to the celebrating crowd that had gathered in Noyon 'the word of God with great constancy' and denounced 'all demonic games and wicked leapings, and all remnants of inane superstitions'. Some of the leaders in the crowd were followers of Erchinoald, mayor of the palace of Neustria and a political opponent of Eligius. These men protested his interference in local customs, which they deemed legitimate, and threatened him with death if he continued. Following the common hagiographical narrative, Audoin writes that Eligius was struck by the desire for martyrdom and preached all the more in the face of danger. The crowd replied, 'Never, Roman, however hard you try, shall you be able to uproot our customs but we will attend our solemnities always and forever as we have done until now, nor will any man ever forbid us our ancient and gratifying games'. Upon seeing that these men would not listen to him, Eligius prayed for the Lord to make an example to compel others through fear to behave correctly.

Immediately, many people were possessed and began raving, and the others instantly fell at the bishop's feet begging to be counted among his sincere followers.[595]

Eligius' Romanness in this story singles him out as different from his flock—an outsider. This marked difference centres on religion, with Eligius being properly Christian and Erchinoald's men not. Like a good saint, he covers all the important elements of the common hagiographical *topos* of battling pagan superstition: he ends the worship of old gods (in an earlier passage), he works in a frontier region with locals who are portrayed as backward and incompletely converted, he has the opportunity for martyrdom, and he performs a show of power and connection with the divine.[596] In this case, the locals were almost certainly not pagans but Christians who continued some of what Eligius and Audoin thought of as pre-Christian practices. After all, they were supporters of the mayor of the palace and it would be inappropriate at the Christianized court for them to deviate so far from normal practice as to potentially taint the king by association.[597] Nor did this take place at the edges of 'civilization', being in Noyon not too far from Paris rather than in the northernmost reaches of Eligius' diocese in Flanders.

Perhaps the key factor here is Noyon's location along the borders of Neustria and Austrasia, and of the various political factions maneuvering between the two kingdoms. The most powerful faction at this time was the Faronids.[598] Audoin was a member of this extended family, as was his friend Burgundofaro of Meaux, and Eligius was aligned with them. Erchinoald, however, regularly opposed them and frustrated their ambitions.[599] By the 670s, tensions between these factions led to violence. Erchinoald had died by then, but his son was involved on the non-Faronid side against the new mayor, Ebroin. Audoin, though his own *Life* suggests he helped broker peace, is depicted in other sources as an active participant on Ebroin's behalf.[600]

It is here—where religion, politics, and identity intersect—that we come to an understanding of the multivalent roles Eligius' Romanness played in the above passage. Among the meanings that Audoin could engage with, in addition to imperial ties and ancestry, were cultural and religious Romanness. Classically, Roman culture was the high point to strive for, associated with enlightenment, civilization, and prestige. Its barbarian opposite was uncouth,

uncivilized, and looked down upon. The crowd's derisive classifying of Eligius as a Roman thus marks *them* as barbarians and their religion as tainted—in the wrong compared with Eligius representing 'right' in both cultural and religious spheres. He was an interloper bringing foreign religious customs from the more Roman south, and so his Roman identity was, to them, intrinsically intertwined with a potentially foreign culture and religious practice. Furthermore, it was a clash of politics, with Eligius and Audoin on one side—associated with everything Faronid, Roman, Christian, enlightened, and right—and Eligius' opponents on the other—following Erchinoald, barbarian, pagan, superstitious, and wrong. By emphasizing Eligius' Romanness here, delivered by the opposing faction as an insult, Audoin deftly painted the entire group as enemies of everything 'Roman' had the potential to mean: rightness and justice, civilization, and God himself through the Roman church.

Among the true people of God, Eligius' most salient identity was as a Christian. All Christians, no matter their ancestry, were to be one community united against pagans and heretics. Perhaps this is the reason Audoin refrained from identifying Eligius as of Roman birth, to focus his readers' attention not on possible differences but on their common Christian bond. Instead he saved the powerful potential of the Roman label for where it would make the biggest rhetorical impact, using the interplay between its varied meanings as a strategy to enhance the holiness of both Eligius and his own faction in the political sphere.

Conclusion

In the preceding chapters, we saw that the ways three authors—Gregory of Tours, Venantius Fortunatus, and Fredegar—expressed social relationships and identities varied according to their time, circumstances, and motives. Gregory and Fortunatus, living in the sixth century, described a more recognizably classical society than Fredegar in the seventh. Gregory privileged the locally-relevant categories of a classical urban landscape, Fortunatus drew on imagery from classical portrayals of Romans and barbarians, and Fredegar emphasized the multi-ethnic character of a society identifying more strongly with the ruling Franks on a political level. Similarly, the sixth-century authors of Caesarius' *Life* described locals according to the same city, family, and status markers as Gregory while reserving ethnonyms for the various

armies and kings who jockeyed for control of the Arles region. The authors of Gaugeric's and Eligius' *Lives*, while still using some of these markers, put greater emphasis on Roman, Frank, Saxon, and other such labels. In Eligius' *Life* especially the kingdoms are regularly envisioned as Frankish.

Clearly the changing views of collective identity during these two centuries were not solely the work of two or three authors. The chance that the multiple authors of Caesarius' work, the Cambrai monk who described Gaugeric, Audoin of Rouen, and the authors of many other saints' *Lives* all shared the same specific interests as Gregory and Fredegar in promoting certain forms of identity is highly unlikely. While any one author's values may have influenced later authors, clearly a wider shift in mentality from Roman to Frankish perspectives was in progress, permeating the entire fabric of society and being reflected in a wide variety of texts.

Conclusion

The kingdoms of western Europe changed significantly over the course of the sixth and seventh centuries, and a large part of this change was the weakening of Roman identities in favour of greater identification with Gothic, Frankish, and other rulers. For most of the fifth century, the Roman Empire still existed in the West, and its citizens were still politically Roman, serving in imperial offices and being, at least nominally, under Roman rule. While on a local level many of them were ruled by barbarian federates, the fact that these federates were supposedly managing on behalf of Rome provided an illusion of Roman control even if actual Roman control was shaky. By the seventh century, however, the Western Empire had faded into memory in much of the West, and descendants of Roman citizens in most of Gaul and Spain had become clear subjects of barbarian kings. No one alive then, outside of the strip of Byzantine holdings on the Iberian coast, had experienced imperial rule first-hand, and thus Roman identity had lost much of its resonance for these later generations. In Spain, it was even associated with the Byzantine enemies of the Visigothic kings, who aimed to be the 'true' heirs of Rome in comparison. The most essential identity of those of Roman descent—Roman—no longer matched the political state(s) in which they lived. People born to Roman parents under barbarian rule who participated in a mixed society and a barbarian army and court are likely, therefore, to have identified more strongly with these barbarians than with their distant Roman ancestors.

Many aspects of their lives, however, were much the same, particularly in the sixth century. In southern Gaul especially, Romans maintained a similar culture, social structure, and set of world views as they had before. The words they used to express their experiences reflected this 'Roman' milieu. Writing in sixth-century Gaul, Venantius Fortunatus contrasted 'Roman' with 'barbarian' as was common in antiquity. Roman ancestry in his view meant being civilized, cultured, educated, and otherwise privileged, while barbarian birth predisposed a person to incivility and uncouthness and was often a handicap, though not an insurmountable one. One could claim Roman identity through education and culture in addition to descent from Roman citizens, and outside of an imperial framework, descent became a more important facet. His contemporary, Gregory of Tours, preferred locally important identifiers by city, social

153

status, and parents to ethnonyms whenever possible. This was common language in the Roman world, and Gregory and his contemporaries were still very immersed in the social structures and mindsets of that world. Many of the people he described were also linked to Roman senatorial families, as he himself was, and those high society ties were more meaningful ways of identifying on a local level. For foreigners or others distant from his personal social network, he was more likely to choose ethnic labels, either because he did not know more about these people or because the best reference point for a local audience would not be unfamiliar parents or cities but broader Saxon, African, or Lombard identities. The same was true for Caesarius of Arles' hagiographers, who described the local Gallo-Roman population according to city, parents, and social status but the many outsiders who attacked and took over the city as Goths, Burgundians, or Franks. In writing about sixth-century Iberia, the author of the *Lives of the Fathers of Mérida* also used senatorial identity, seemingly to refer to important local magnates. He saw the sixth-century world as still a deeply Roman social landscape, in many ways the same despite functioning under new masters. These authors conjured a strong sense of living Romanness; for them, Roman culture and tradition was alive and well, despite being less tangible without imperial service.

John of Biclar's *Chronicle*, however, reveals an important shift in mentality that had begun in Iberia. By reserving 'Roman' for the East Roman Empire, which fought the Visigoths in the second half of the century, he signalled a detachment from that way of being Roman by Visigothic subjects of Roman descent, the Hispano-Romans. Politically they were Goths, and when contrasted with Roman outsiders, this Gothic facet of their identity may have seemed more immediate than their Roman heritage. Emphasis on Gothic and Frankish political identity—by its very nature inclusive as it was open to all subjects of these kingdoms regardless of ancestry—increased as the seventh century progressed. Isidore drew on resources from past historians and theologians to give the Goths a grand lineage worthy of succeeding Rome in domination of Spain. He saw Spain as a Gothic society and used language of the 'country and people of the Goths' in his *History* and the church councils he presided over to both express this vision and encourage greater political and religious unity as good Catholic Goths within Iberia. In the Merovingian kingdoms, Fredegar regularly described individuals as Romans, Franks, or

Burgundians and emphasized these peoples' participation within the Frankish political milieu. More people in his *Chronicle* appear as Franks than as Romans, and ancestry rather than Gregory's local labels predominate. The hagiographers who wrote about Gaugeric and Eligius likewise described both Romans and Franks, and the choices they made demonstrate that while identification by Roman descent, culture, and even religion (as Catholic) was still meaningful in seventh-century Gaul, it was no longer taken for granted as dominant in an increasingly Frankish society.

In in the latter half of the seventh century, the trends apparent in Spain and Gaul diverged. In Spain, Roman identity based on descent disappeared entirely, signalling the thorough adoption of Gothicness across the Visigothic kingdom. Where earlier in the century church councils and legal statutes sought to protect the 'king, people, and country of the Goths', later records simply mentioned 'king, people, and country'; the Gothicness of these was assumed. Just as Gregory of Tours did not need to explain that the senatorial bishops and residents of Clermont he described could also be identified as Romans, so Iberian writers took for granted that their audience did not require further explanation. Class distinctions certainly persisted, though, and material culture varied, as archaeological studies have shown. And the image of Rome remained; it would still inspire, with kings adopting imperial trappings to enhance their authority, scholars continuing to embrace the Latin language, and the ideological power of the city itself harnessed by popes seeking to secure dominance, but it was no longer current. Society had moved on, new polities had formed, and with it new political and ethnic affiliations. Ethnic assimilation in Spain was ostensibly complete. Arab conquest of the bulk of Iberia from 711 put a halt to further development of Gothic unity, but it would be Gothic, not Roman, identity that Christian residents revived as a marker of heritage and a potentially unifying rallying point for reconquest in later centuries. Gothicness had superseded Romanness as the most salient identity from a nostalgic past. Within Gaul, the image of Rome also remained, in culture and in imitations of the empire, but Roman ethnic identity became yet more of an anomaly, restricted to the south and to legal language. In the *Liber Historiae Francorum*, written by a Neustrian noble in 727, Roman identity is completely absent from descriptions of contemporaries. Frankish identity, however, remained: in the formula 'king' or

'kingdom' of the Franks, for individuals described as Frankish by birth, and as the dominant political identity throughout Merovingian lands. It was not Roman but Frankish identity that clearly dominated in authors' minds, experiences, and narratives.

The different trajectories seen in Spain and Gaul, present despite the kingdoms' many commonalities, can be explained by the varied circumstances facing each kingdom and the choices rulers made surrounding them. Geographically, the Visigothic kingdom aligned closely with the Iberian peninsula; only the province of Gallia Narbonensis lay outside. This aided efforts by the Visigoths to create a vision of a unified territory within the ancient Roman land of *Hispania*. Both John of Biclar and Isidore of Seville emphasized the ideal of territorial unity in their writings, lauding Leovigild and Reccared as unifiers, and praising the marriage of the Gothic people with the land of Spain. Leovigild actively sought to exercise control over that whole territory, conquering all but a small area of Byzantine settlement and instituting stricter central rule over all parts of his kingdom. The Byzantines served as a convenient external enemy against which Visigoths and Hispano-Romans could distinguish themselves as a united front. That this external enemy was known by the name 'Roman' would have a huge mental impact, encouraging those loyal subjects of the Visigoths who were of Roman descent—faced with a stark contrast between themselves and these others, and surrounded by a common social discourse that fashioned Romans as outsiders—to see themselves as more Gothic than Roman. By the 630s, the last bit of the peninsula was won, prompting Isidore of Seville to celebrate the merger of the Gothic people with the peninsula under its old Roman provincial name: *Hispania*. From this point, all of Iberia and the small territory in Gaul were ruled by a single Visigothic king.

The Frankish kingdoms, on the other hand, did not have such ancient provincial boundaries within which to define themselves, though they might have developed their own clearer boundaries had they stopped expanding to the north and east. The Alamans and their territory, for example, were conquered in the early sixth century, Thuringians in 531, Bavarians in the mid-sixth century, and Frisians in the early eighth century. Most of these maintained their own dukes and customs as well as a distinct identity.[601] In the mid-seventh century, their local customary laws were codified along with those of the Ripuarian Franks living along the

Rhine, so that all peoples might have their own law.[602] In addition, the Franks regularly divided their land into subkingdoms with their own kings. This would have hampered the ability of both kings and subjects to envision an overarching Frankish identity holding all of them together as *the* dominant identity that all would inevitably take on. Continued expansion also meant continued assimilation. While the Visigoths, with more stable boundaries, focused on merging their varied residents into one Gothic people and came to experience difference most strongly along non-ethnic lines, the Franks kept adding ever more diversity to their multiplicity of peoples, continually changing the social and ethnic landscape in new ways. So long as there were clear newcomers described along ethnic lines, ethnicity would retain at least some degree of salience as a form of identification even among those long subject to Frankish rule.

Religiously, the Franks at least had the advantage of an early conversion. Because Clovis converted himself and the Franks to Catholic Christianity near the beginning of the sixth century, his kingdoms developed without the religious barrier to conceptualizing a united kingdom that the Visigoths experienced for so long. Yet, paradoxically, the lack of a religious fault line may have made unification a less important concern generally for the Franks than for the Visigoths. Because of the widespread association of Arian Christianity with Gothic ancestry and Catholicism with Romanness, these two segments of the population would always be seen as distinct unless the religious division was eliminated. Visigothic kings therefore took measures to remedy the disunity this division engendered within their kingdom. Thus we see Leovigild altering the requirements for conversion to Arianism to make it more attractive to his Catholic subjects, in addition to bringing the peninsula more firmly under his rule. Reccared, in turn, converted to Catholicism and banned the Arian practices that were closely associated with the Gothic people. In doing so, he gave Goths and Romans a common religious identity that could encourage these peoples to focus on commonalities along political and other lines too. Records of the Third Council of Toledo at which the Goths' conversion was affirmed in 589 put strong emphasis on the unifying potential of universal religion. They first portrayed the Goths as a homogenous group changing their faith *en masse*, then addressed rules to the entire Christian community, Goths and Romans alike. Now united religiously, these two peoples could reconcile and be treated as one. The council was, in fact, an attempt after two years of rebellion against

conversion, an official attempt to do precisely that. Kings were aided in their renegotiation of Gothic identity by authors like John of Biclar and Isidore of Seville who told stories of the salvation of the Gothic people and their rightful inheritance of Spain, respectively. Isidore's *History of the Goths* and church councils promoted an image of the good Catholic Goth, linking political and religious identity in a way that facilitated the adoption of Gothic identity for all Catholics. Because religious difference had been framed along ethnic lines in sixth-century Spain, the conceptual resources for understanding Gothicness as *Catholic* instead of Arian were readily available and easily understood.

Overall, the Visigoths' exerted exceptional effort toward attaining religious and ethnic unity, while the Franks seem to have sanctioned and embraced diversity. Thus in Visigothic Iberia, the people, the kingdom, and the landscape appear closely linked. Assimilation of the varied population was widespread enough for ethnic identities to lose much of their relevance (in our sources, at least) by the end of the seventh century. Differences persisted along other lines, and regular civil wars over succession to the throne would continue until the kingdom's end, but ethnicity was no longer among the primary discourses of division. The kingdoms which would come to be known as Francia continued to be quite ethnically diverse and socially complex. While greater emphasis was placed on Frankish political affiliation and some clear shifts toward Frankish identity in other aspects can be seen, many subjects continued to identify as Romans, Saxons, or Burgundians by descent.

Among the advances made in recent years by historians and social scientists about the nature of identity is a greater sense of its multidimensionality. Individuals and groups can hold multiple identities simultaneously, and dealing with a changing environment often leads to identity shifts on many levels. The overlap of various facets of identity means that changes in one makes changes in others more likely. It is precisely this process of negotiation that we have seen in this study as facilitating the transition from Roman to Gothic and Frankish identities. These three identities could manifest in political, ethnic, or religious contexts. Politically, all subjects of a Frankish king, whether born to Burgundian, Roman, Saxon, Alaman, or Frankish parents, could be considered Franks. They would appear this way in groups like armies, which would be described generally as 'Franks' or as the 'army of the Franks', fighting as one unit

associated with the kingdom, or in general references to all the king's subjects. Religiously, residents of the Visigothic kingdom could be considered Gothic if they followed the Arian form of Christianity before 589 or the Catholic one after. The common assumption that all people of Gothic birth fit into these categories and all those of Roman ancestry had always been Catholic obscured the exceptions to this rule and made those exceptions potential threats to unified visions of community. One could also, of course, be considered a Roman, a Goth, or a Frank based on one's ancestry. Sometimes descriptions of individuals along descent lines included the name and social status of one or more prominent relatives to situate the individual of 'Roman (or other) birth' in a more precise context.

Changes over the course of two centuries in the ways authors made use of ethnonyms—which ones they selected, and which modes of identification they used them for—reflect broader shifts in the social landscape. Labels like 'barbarian' and 'senator' used by Gregory, Fortunatus, Cyprian of Toulon, and the author of the *Lives of the Fathers of Mérida* evoke a society strongly influenced by Roman culture and discourses of difference. These labels gradually gave way to language about kings and kingdoms 'of the Franks/Goths'. Later authors, like Fredegar and Isidore of Seville, projected images of Frankish and Gothic identity, with greater political overtones. This change suggests that political and religious affiliation with rulers was increasing, even if some may have continued to be identified as Roman by descent. As political identity strengthened in the next few generations, fewer people would continue to view their social landscape and identities as 'Roman'.

With most of our sources, it is such shifts in language use and authorial strategies of identification that this study has traced. Analysing a variety of texts by multiple authors across two centuries makes apparent broad patterns that suggest an increase in the salience of political identity, which resulted in shifts of other aspects of people's identities. We have, however, met a few individuals who allow us a closer glimpse of this negotiation in action. In Iberia in the late sixth century, Masona and Claudius shared a common Catholic religious identity that Masona's hagiographer emphasized in order to tout the triumph of Catholicism. Masona was also a Goth by birth, and this aspect of his identity clearly troubled the author, who wrote that Masona was strongly Catholic 'although' he was a Goth by birth. Masona's

religious and descent identities required careful negotiation here. Claudius, by contrast, was Roman by birth, while also appearing in John and Isidore's works as the leader of an 'army of the Goths'. He was both a Roman and a Goth, each in different ways. Similarly, Chramnelen in seventh-century Gaul was both a Roman by birth and a leader in the 'army of the Franks'. In the case of Lupus of Champagne, we see a man of Roman descent serving a Frankish king in an official capacity as a duke. His son took the more traditional Roman career path of becoming a bishop, yet his name, Romulf, mixes Latin and Germanic elements. Other family members also held a mix of names and positions in their society, suggesting that they were gradually identifying more closely with their Frankish rulers. Taken together with the increasing political rhetoric overall throughout the sources, and the increasing like of political and religious identity in Spain, these individuals seem to demonstrate the privileging of political aspects of identity over other aspects.

These are, of course, authors' descriptions of these individuals, not their own, and so coloured by each author's own views and goals. However, if the authors could believably identify in these various ways, we can surmise that these people might have done the same in their daily lives. The possibilities open to these individuals for negotiating their identities seem to confirm what we have seen in the sources as a whole—that changing political identification was a useful first step toward a more complete shift of ethnic affiliation. It is only by differentiating between political, religious, and descent aspects of Roman, Gothic, and Frankish identity that we can see this.

Differentiating between multiple aspects of identity also illuminates the concept of the 'situational construct'. Far from being something that can be changed on a whim, a person's identity is multi-faceted, with different aspects being more relevant at different times or in different situations. Past attempts to understand shifts in ethnic identity in this period often aimed to determine whether our historical actors were 'really' Romans or 'really' Goths, and at what magical point they 'switched'. The more fruitful and enlightening question to ask is which identities were used by (or for) an individual out of all the available possibilities, and why and how. This can tell us a great deal that the former question can not: when descent or political affiliation or religious confession mattered and when they did not, what rhetorical or

ideological reasons might lay behind a strategy of identification, and how the meanings of specific identifiers—and the scripts used to describe them—changed over time as people adapted to a shifting social landscape. In the process, more of the complexity of past societies is revealed, allowing us to come to a more thorough understanding of what it meant to be Roman or Gothic or Frankish in the sixth and seventh centuries and how these people made the transition from a Roman to a post-Roman world, one facet of identity at a time.

Bibliography

Abbreviations

AHDE	*Anuario de Historia del Derecho Español*
BA	*Breviary of Alaric*, ed. Gustav Haenel, *Lex Romana Visigothorum* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1849).
CCH	*La colección canónica Hispana*, ed. Gonzalo Martínez Díez, 6 vols. (Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1966-2002).
CCSL	*Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina*
CE	*Codex Euricianus*, ed. Álvaro d'Ors, *El Código de Eurico* (Rome: Redondo, 1960).
DVI	Isidore of Seville, *De viris illustribus*, ed. Carmen Codoñer Merino, *El 'De viris illustribus' de Isidoro de Sevilla* (Salamanca: Universidad de Salamanca, 1964).
EHR	*English Historical Review*
EME	*Early Medieval Europe*
GC	Gregory of Tours, *Gloria Confessorum*, in Bruno Krusch (ed.), *MGH SSRM* I, 2 (Hanover: Hahn, 1969), pp. 284-370.
GM	Gregory of Tours, *Gloria martyrum*, ed. Bruno Krusch, in *MGH SSRM* I, 2 (Hanover: Hahn, 1969), pp. 34-111.
Historiae	Gregory of Tours, *Historiae*, in Bruno Krusch and Wilhelm Levison (eds.), *MGH SSRM* I, 1 (Hanover: Hahn, 1951), pp. 1-537.
HGVS	Isidore of Seville, *Historia Gothorum, Vandalorum, et Suevorum*, ed. Cristóbal Rodríguez Alonso, in *Las Historias de los godos, vándalos y suevos de Isidoro de Sevilla: estudio, edición crítica y traducción* (León: Centro de Estudios e Investigación San Isidro, 1975).
JLA	*Journal of Late Antiquity*
JMH	*Journal of Medieval History*
LCL	Loeb Classical Library
LV	*Lex Visigothorum*, ed. K. Zeumer, in *MGH Leges nationum Germanicarum* I (Hanover: Hahn, 1902), pp. 33–456.
MGH	*Monumenta Germaniae Historica*
AA	*Auctores Antiquissimi*
SS	*Scriptores*
SSRL	*Scriptores rerum Langobardicarum*
SSRM	*Scriptores rerum Merovingicarum*
I, 2	*MGH SSRM* I, 2, ed. Bruno Krusch (Hanover: Hahn, 1969).
II	*MGH SSRM* II, ed. Bruno Krusch (Hanover: Hahn, 1888).

III	*MGH SSRM* III, ed. Bruno Krusch (Hanover: Hahn, 1896).
IV	*MGH SSRM* IV, ed. Bruno Krusch (Hanover: Hahn, 1902).
V	*MGH SSRM* V, ed. Bruno Krusch and Wilhelm Levison (Hanover: Hahn, 1910).
VI	*MGH SSRM* VI, ed. Bruno Krusch and Wilhelm Levison (Hanover: Hahn, 1913).
VII	*MGH SSRM* VII, ed. Bruno Krusch and Wilhelm Levison (Hanover: Hahn, 1920).
PBSR	*Papers of the British School at Rome*
PL	J.P. Migne (ed.), *Patrologia Latina* (Paris: Garnier, 1844-1865).
PLRE	A.H.M. Jones, J.R. Martindale, and J. Morris, *The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire*, 3 vols. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971-1992).
VP	Gregory of Tours, *Vita patrum*, in *MGH SSRM* I, 2, pp. 211-83.
VSPE	*Vitas sanctorum patrum Emeritensium*, ed. A. Maya Sánchez, *CCSL* 116 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1992).

Primary Sources

Ammianus Marcellinus, *Res gestae*, ed. and trans. John Carew Rolfe, LCL, 3 vols. (London: Heinemann, 1950-1952).

Audoin of Rouen, *Vita Eligii episcopi Noviomagensis*, in *MGH SSRM* IV, pp. 663-742.

Baudonivia*, Vita sanctae Radegundis*, in *MGH SSRM* II, pp. 377-95.

Bobolen, *Vita Germani abbatis Grandivallensis*, in *MGH SSRM* V, pp. 25-40.

Braulio of Saragossa, *Letters*, ed. L. Riesco Terrero, *Epistolario de San Braulio* (Seville: Universidad de Sevilla, 1975).

Braulio of Saragossa, *Vita Aemiliani*, ed. L. Vázquez de Parga, *Vita sancti Emiliani* (Madrid: Instituto Jerónimo Zurita, 1943).

Breviary of Alaric, ed. Gustav Haenel, *Lex Romana Visigothorum* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1849).

Capitularia Merowingica, ed. Alfred Boretius, in *MGH Capitularia regum Francorum* I (Hanover: Hahn, 1883), pp. 1-23.

Cassiodorus, *Variae*, ed. Theodor Mommsen, in *MGH AA* XII (Berlin: Weidmann, 1894).

Chronicle of Albelda, ed. Juan Gil Fernández, in *Crónicas asturianas* (Oviedo: Universidad de Oviedo, 1985), pp. 151-93.

Chronicle of Alfonso III, ed. Juan Gil Fernández, in *Crónicas asturianas* (Oviedo: Universidad de Oviedo, 1985), pp. 113-50.

Codex Euricianus, ed. Álvaro d'Ors, *El Código de Eurico* (Rome: Redondo, 1960).

Codex Theodosianus, ed. Theodor Mommsen and Paul Meyer (Berlin: Georg Olms Verlag, 1905).

Codices latini antiquiores, ed. E.A. Lowe, 12 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1934-1971).

La colección canónica Hispana, ed. Gonzalo Martínez Díez, 6 vols. (Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1966-2002).

Concilios visigóticos e hispano-romanos, ed. J. Vives (Barcelona: Instituto Enrique Flórez, 1963).

Council of Agde, ed. C. Munier, in *Concilia Galliae a.314-a.506*, *CCSL* 148 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1963).

Cyprian of Toulon, *Vita Caesarii*, ed. Germain Morin, in *Sancti Caesarii episcopi Arelatensis opera omnia nunc primum in unum collecta*, vol. 2 (Maredsous: n.p., 1942), pp. 293-345.

Cyprian of Toulon, *Vita Caesarii episcopi Arelatensis*, ed. Bruno Krusch, in *MGH SSRM* III, pp. 433–501.

Epistolae Wisigothicae, ed. Wilhelm Arndt, in *MGH Epistolae* III (Berlin: Weidmann, 1892), pp. 658-90.

Flodoard of Reims*, Historia Remensis ecclesiae*, ed. Martina Stratmann, in *MGH SS* XXXVI (Hanover: Hahn, 1998).

Formulae Turonenses, ed. Karl Zeumer, in *Formulae Merowingici et Karolini aevi*, *MGH Leges* (Hanover: Hahn, 1886), pp. 125-65.

Formulae wisigothicae, ed. Juan Gil, in *Miscellanea wisigothica* (Seville: Universidad de Sevilla, 1972), pp. 70–112.

Fredegar, *Chronicle*, in *MGH SSRM* II, pp. 1-168.

Fredegar, *Continuations*, in *MGH SSRM* II, pp. 168–93.

Gregory of Tours, *Gloria confessorum*, in *MGH SSRM* I, 2, pp. 284-370.

Gregory of Tours, *Gloria martyrum*, in *MGH SSRM* I, 2, pp. 34-111.

Gregory of Tours, *Historiae*, ed. Wilhelm Levison and Bruno Krusch, in *MGH SSRM* I, 1 (Hanover: Hahn, 1951).

Gregory of Tours, *Vita Martini*, in *MGH SSRM* I, 2, pp. 134-210.

Gregory of Tours, *Vita patrum*, in *MGH SSRM* I, 2, pp. 211-83.

Gregory the Great, *Dialogi*, ed. Adalbert de Vogüé, 3 vols. (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1978-1980).

Gregory the Great, *Registrum Epistolarum*, ed. Ludo Moritz Hartmann, *MGH Epistolae* I-II (Berlin: Weidmann, 1891-1899).

Herodotus, *Histories*, trans. G. C. Macaulay (London: MacMillan and Co., 1890).

Ibn al-Qūṭīya, *History*, trans. David James, *Early Islamic Spain: The History of Ibn al-Qūṭīya* (London: Routledge, 2009).

Inscripciones cristianas de la España romana y visigoda, ed. J. Vives. 2nd ed. (Barcelona: A.G. Ponsa, 1969).

Isidore of Seville, 'The *Chronica Maiora* of Isidore of Seville', trans. Sam Koon and Jamie Wood, *e-Spania* 6 (2008). http://e-spania.revues.org/index15552.html.

Isidore of Seville, *Chronicle*, ed. José Luis Martín, *Isidori Hispalensis Chronica, CCSL* 112 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2003).

Isidore of Seville, *Contra Judaeos*, ed. J.P. Migne, in *PL* 83, cols. 449-538.

Isidore of Seville, *De viris illustribus*, ed. Carmen Codoñer Merino, *El 'De viris illustribus' de Isidoro de Sevilla* (Salamanca: Universidad de Salamanca, 1964).

Isidore of Seville, *Etymologies*, ed. W.M. Lindsay, 2 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1911).

Isidore of Seville, *Historia Gothorum, Vandalorum, et Suevorum*, ed. Cristóbal Rodríguez Alonso, in *Las Historias de los godos, vándalos y suevos de Isidoro de Sevilla: estudio, edición crítica y traducción* (León: Centro de Estudios e Investigación San Isidro, 1975).

John of Biclar, *Chronica*, ed. Theodor Mommsen, in *MGH AA* XI (Berlin: Weidmann, 1894), pp. 211–20.

Jonas of Bobbio, *Vita Columbani abbatis discipulorumque eius*, in *MGH SSRM* IV, pp. 1-152.

Leander of Seville, *De institutione virginum et contemptu mundi*, ed. Ángel Custodio Vega (Madrid: Typis Augustinianis Monasterii Escurialensis, 1948).

Lex Ribuaria, ed. Franz Beyerle and Rudolf Buchner, in *MGH Leges nationum Germanicarum* 3,2 (Hanover: Hahn, 1954).

Lex Visigothorum, ed. K. Zeumer, in *MGH Leges nationum Germanicarum* I (Hanover: Hahn, 1902), pp. 33–456.

Liber Constitutionum sive Lex Gundobada, ed. Ludwig Rudolf von Salis, in *MGH Leges nationum Germanicarum* 2,1 (Hanover: Hahn, 1892), pp. 29–122.

Liber Historiae Francorum, in *MGH SSRM* II, pp. 215-328.

Menander Rhetor, *Division of Epideictic Speeches*, ed. D.A. Russell and N.G. Wilson in *Menander Rhetor* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981).

Orosius, *Historiarum adversum paganos libri*, ed. M.P. Arnaud-Lindet in *Orose: Histoire contre les païens* (Paris: Belles Lettres, 1990).

Panegyrici Latini, ed. C.E.V. Nixon, Barbara Saylor Rodgers, and R. A. B Mynors, *In Praise of Later Roman Emperors: The Panegyrici Latini* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994).

Passio Praejecti episcopi et martyris Arverni, in *MGH SSRM* V, pp. 212-248.

Paul the Deacon, *Historia Langobardorum*, ed. L. Bethmann and G. Waitz, in *MGH SSRL* (Hanover: Hahn, 1878), pp. 45-187.

Procopius, *Buildings*, ed. and trans. H.B. Dewing, LCL (London: W. Heinemann, 1940).

Procopius, *History of the Wars*, ed. and trans. H.B. Dewing, LCL (London: W. Heinemann, 1914-1928).

Salvian of Marseille, *De gubernatione Dei*, ed. Charles Halm, in *MGH AA* I (Berlin: Weidmann, 1877), pp. 1-108.

Sidonius Apollinarius, *Poems and Letters*, ed. and trans. W.B. Anderson, LCL, 2 vols. (London: W. Heinemann, 1936-1965).

Sisebut, *Vita Desiderii episcopi Viennensis*, in *MGH SSRM* III, pp. 630-37.

The Theodosian Code and Novels and the Sirmondian Constitutions, trans. Clyde Pharr (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1952).

Venantius Fortunatus, *Poems*, ed. and French trans. Marc Reydellet, *Poèmes*, 3 vols. (Paris: Belles Lettres, 1994-2004).

Venantius Fortunatus, *Vita Germani episcopi Parisiaci*, in *MGH SSRM* VII, pp. 372-418.

Venantius Fortunatus, *Vita Paterni*, in *MGH AA* IV, 2 (Berlin: Weidmann, 1885), pp. 33-7.

Venantius Fortunatus, *Vita sanctae Radegundis*, in *MGH SSRM* II, pp. 364-77.

Victor of Vita: History of the Vandal Persecution, trans. John Moorhead, Translated Texts for Historians (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1992).

Vita Amati abbatis Habendensis, in *MGH SSRM* IV, pp. 215-21.

Vita Audoini episcopi Rotomagensis, in *MGH SSRM* V, pp. 536-67.

Vita Boniti episcopi Arverni, in *MGH SSRM* VI, pp. 110-39.

Vita Desiderii Cadurcae urbis episcopi, in *MGH SSRM* IV, pp. 563-602

Vita Domnae Balthildis, in *MGH SSRM* II, pp. 475-508.

Vita Gaugerici episcopi Camaracensis, in *MGH SSRM* III, pp. 649-658.

Vita Genovefae, in *MGH SSRM* III, pp. 204-238.

Vita Romarici abbatis Habendensis, in *MGH SSRM* IV, pp. 221-5.

Vita Rusticulae sive Marciae abbatissae Arelatensis, in *MGH SSRM* IV, pp. 337-51.

Vita sanctae Geretrudis, in *MGH SSRM* II, pp. 447-74.

Vita sancti Arnulfi, in *MGH SSRM* II, pp. 426-446.

Vita sancti Samsonis episcopi Dolensis [*Vita Prima*], ed. Pierre Flobert, *La vie ancienne de Saint Samson* (Paris: CNRS, 1997).

Vita Severini abbatis Acaunensis, in *MGH SSRM* III, pp. 166–170.

Vitas sanctorum patrum Emeretensium, ed. Joseph N. Garvin (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1946).

Vitas sanctorum patrum Emeritensium, ed. A. Maya Sánchez, *CCSL* 116 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1992).

Secondary Sources

Aherne, Consuelo María, 'Late Visigothic Bishops, Their Schools, and the Transmission of Culture', *Traditio* 22 (1966), pp. 435-44.

Alonso Campos, J.I., 'Sunna, Masona, y Nepopis: Las luchas religiosas durante la dinastía de Leovigildo', in A. González Blanco (ed.), *Los visigodos: historia y civilización* (Murcia: Universidad de Murcia, 1986), pp. 151–7.

Álvarez García, Fernando, 'Tiempo, religión, y política en el "Chronicon" de Iohannis Biclarensis', *En la España Medieval* 20 (1997), pp. 9–30.

Amory, Patrick, 'The Meaning and Purpose of Ethnic Terminology in Burgundian Law Codes', *EME* 2 (1993), pp. 1–28.

Amory, Patrick, 'Names, Ethnic Identity, and Community in Fifth and Sixth Century Burgundy', *Viator* 25 (1994), pp. 1–30.

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

Anderson, Benedict, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (London: Verso, 1983).

Arce, Javier, 'The City of Mérida (Emerita) in the *Vitas Patrum Emeritensium* (VIth Century A.D.)', in Evangelos Chrysos and Ian Wood (eds.), *East and West: Modes of Communication* (Leiden: Brill, 1999), pp. 1–14.

Armstrong, John Alexander, *Nations Before Nationalism* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1982).

Arndt, Ernst Moritz, 'Des Deutschen Vaterland', in *Fünf Lieder für deutsche Soldaten* (Berlin: Reimer, 1813).

Arnheim, M.T.W., *The Senatorial Aristocracy in the Later Roman Empire* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972).

Auerbach, Erich, *Literary Language and its Public in Late Latin Antiquity and in the Middle Ages* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993).

Bachrach, Bernard S., *Early Medieval Jewish Policy* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1977).

Bachrach, Bernard S., *Liber Historiae Francorum* (Lawrence, KS: Coronado Press, 1973).

Bachrach, Bernard S., 'Pirenne and Charlemagne', in Alexander C. Murray (ed.), *After Rome's Fall: Narrators and Sources of Early Medieval History: Essays Presented to Walter Goffart* (Buffalo: University of Toronto Press, 1998), pp. 214–31.

Banks, Marcus, *Ethnicity: Anthropological Constructions* (London: Routledge, 1996).

Banniard, Michel, 'Latin et communication orale en Gaule franque: le témoignage de la *Vita Eligii*', in Jacques Fontaine and J.N. Hillgarth (eds.), *The Seventh Century: Change and Continuity* (London: Warburg Institute, 1992), pp. 58-86.

Barceló, Miquel, 'Els "Hispani" de Qurtuba a Meitat del Segle III', *Faventia* 3, no. 2 (1981), pp. 185–91.

Barlow, Claude W., *Iberian Fathers*, Fathers of the Church 62-3 (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1969).

Barnish, Samuel, 'Taxation, Land, and Barbarian Settlement in the Western Empire', *PBSR* 54 (1986), pp. 170–95.

Barnish, Samuel, 'Transformation and Survival in the Western Senatorial Aristocracy, c.400-700', *PBSR* 56 (1988), pp. 120-55.

Barth, Fredrik (ed.), *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries: The Social Organization of Culture Difference* (London: Allen & Unwin, 1969).

Bayer, Clemens M. M., 'Vita Eligii', *Reallexicon der Germanischen Altertumskunde* 35 (2007), pp. 461-524.

Beltrán Torreira, F.M., El concepto de barbarie en la Hispania visigoda', in A. González Blanco (ed.), *Los visigodos: historia y civilización* (Murcia: Universidad de Murcia, 1986), pp. 53–60.

Besga Marroquín, Armando, *Orígenes hispanogodos del Reino de Asturias* (Oviedo: Real Instituto de Estudios Asturianos, 2000).

Bierbrauer, Volker, 'Archäologie und Geschichte der Goten vom 1.-7. Jahrhundert: Versuch einer Bilanz', *Frühmittelalterliche Studien* 28 (1994).

Bierbrauer, Volker, 'Zur ethnischen Interpretation in der frühgeschichtlichen Archäologie', in Walter Pohl (ed.), *Die Suche nach den Ursprüngen: von der Bedeutung des frühen Mittelalters*, Forschungen zur Geschichte des Mittelalters 8 (Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2004), pp. 45–84.

Boulainvilliers, Henri comte de, *Essais sur la noblesse de France* (Amsterdam: n.p., 1732).

Brather, Sebastian, 'Ethnic Identities as Constructions of Archaeology: The Case of the Alamanni', in Andrew Gillett (ed.), *On Barbarian Identity: Critical Approaches to Ethnogenesis Theory* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2002), pp. 149–176.

Brennan, Brian, 'The Image of the Frankish Kings in the Poetry of Venantius Fortunatus', *JMH* 10, no. 1 (1984), pp. 1–11.

Brennan, Brian, 'The Image of the Merovingian Bishop in the Poetry of Venantius Fortunatus', *JMH* 18, no. 2 (1992), pp. 115–39.

Brennan, Brian, 'Senators and Social Mobility in Sixth-Century Gaul', *JMH* 11, no. 2 (1985), pp. 145-161.

Breukelaar, Adriaan H.B., *Historiography and Episcopal Authority in Sixth-Century Gaul: The Histories of Gregory of Tours Interpreted in Their Historical Context* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1994).

Brogiolo, Gian Pietro, 'Towns, Forts, and the Countryside: Archaeological Models for Northern Italy in the Early Lombard Period (AD 568-650)', in Gian Pietro Brogiolo, Nancy Gauthier, and Neil Christie (eds.), *Towns and Their Territories Between Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages* (Leiden: Brill, 2000), pp. 299–323.

Brown, Elizabeth A. R., 'The Trojan Origins of the French and the Brothers Jean du Tillet', in Alexander C. Murray (ed.), *After Rome's Fall: Narrators and Sources of Early Medieval History: Essays Presented to Walter Goffart* (Buffalo: University of Toronto Press, 1998), pp. 348–84.

Brubaker, Rogers, *Ethnicity Without Groups* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Pres, 2006).

Brunner, Heinrich, *Deutsche Rechtsgeschichte*, 2 vols. (Leipzig: Verlag von Duncker & Humblot, 1887-1892).

Buchberger, Erica, 'Gothic Identity and the "Othering" of Jews in Seventh-Century Spain', in
    Thomas J. MacMaster, Yaniv Fox, and Erica Buchberger (eds.), *Inclusion and Exclusion in the*
    Late Antique and the Early Medieval Mediterranean (Leiden: Brill, forthcoming).

Buchberger, Erica, 'The Growth of Gothic Identity in Visigothic Spain: The Evidence of Textual
    Sources', in Juan Antonio Quirós Castillo and Santiago Castellanos (eds.), *Identidad y*
    etnicidad en Hispania: Propuestas teóricas y cultura material en los siglos V-VIII,
    Documentos de Arqueología Medieval 8 (Bilbao: Universidad del País Vasco, 2015), pp. 87-
    100.

Burgess, R.W., *The Chronicle of Hydatius and the Consularia Constantinopolitina* (Oxford:
    Clarendon Press, 1993).

Burns, Thomas S., *Rome and the Barbarians* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2003).

Castellanos, Santiago, 'Astures, Cantabri, and Vascones: The Peoples of the Spanish North
    during the Late and Post-Roman Period', in Florin Curta (ed.), *Neglected Barbarians*
    (Turnhout: Brepols, 2010), pp. 479-502.

Castellanos, Santiago, *Los godos y la cruz: Recaredo y la unidad de Spania* (Madrid: Alianza
    Editorial, 2007).

Castellanos, Santiago, *La hagiografía visigoda: dominio social y proyección cultural* (Logroño:
    Fundación S. Millán de la Cogolla, 2004).

Castellanos, Santiago, *Poder social, aristocracias y hombre santo en la Hispania Visigoda: la Vita*
    Aemiliani de Braulio de Zaragoza (Logroño: Universidad de La Rioja, 1998).

Castellanos, Santiago, 'The Significance of Social Unanimity in a Visigothic Hagiography: Keys to
    an Ideological Screen', *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 11, no. 3 (2003), pp. 387–419.

Castro, Américo, 'Los visigodos no eran aún españoles', *Nueva revista de filología hispánica* 15,
    no. 1-2 (1961), pp. 1–3.

Chadwick, H. Munro, *The Nationalities of Europe and the Growth of National Ideologies*
    (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1945).

Christys, Ann, *Christians in Al-Andalus, 711-1000* (Richmond: Curzon, 2002).

Claude, Dietrich, *Adel, Kirche und Königtum im Westgotenreich* (Sigmaringen: Thorbecke, 1971).

Claude, Dietrich, 'Remarks About Relations Between Visigoths and Hispano-Romans in the
    Seventh Century', in Walter Pohl and Helmut Reimitz (eds.), *Strategies of Distinction: The*
    Construction of Ethnic Communities, 300-800 (Leiden: Brill, 1998), pp. 117–130.

Coates, Simon, 'Regendering Radegund? Fortunatus, Baudonivia, and the Problem of Female
    Sanctity in Merovingian Gaul', in R.N. Swanson (ed.), *Gender and Christian Religion*
    (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1998), pp. 37–50.

Coates, Simon, 'Venantius Fortunatus and the Image of Episcopal Authority in Late Antique and
    Early Merovingian Gaul', *EHR* 115, no. 464 (2000), pp. 1109-1137.

Collins, Richard, 'Observations on the Form, Language, and Public of the Prose Biographies of
    Venantius Fortunatus in the Hagiography of Merovingian Gaul', in Howard B. Clarke and

Mary Brennan (eds.), *Columbanus and Merovingian Monasticism* (Oxford: B.A.R., 1981), pp. 105-31.

Collins, Roger, '¿Dónde estaban los arrianos en el año 589?', in *El Concilio III de Toledo: XIV Centenario, 589-1989* (Toledo: Arzobispado de Toledo, 1991), pp. 211-22.

Collins, Roger, *Early Medieval Spain: Unity in Diversity, 400-1000*, 2nd ed. (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1995).

Collins, Roger, *Die Fredegar-Chroniken* (Hanover: Hahnsche Buchhandlung, 2007).

Collins, Roger, 'Isidore, Maximus, and the *Historia Gothorum*', in Anton Scharer and Georg Scheibelreiter (eds.), *Historiographie im frühen Mittelalter* (Vienna: Oldenbourg, 1994), pp. 345–58.

Collins, Roger, 'Law and Ethnic Identity in the Western Kingdoms in the Fifth and Sixth Centuries', in Alfred P. Smyth (ed.), *Medieval Europeans: Studies in Ethnic Identity and National Perspectives in Medieval Europe* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1998), pp. 1-23.

Collins, Roger, 'Mérida and Toledo: 550-585', in Edward James (ed.), *Visigothic Spain: New Approaches* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1980), pp. 189–219.

Collins, Roger, '"*Sicut lex Gothorum continet*": Law and Charters in Ninth- and Tenth-Century León and Catalonia', in *Law, Culture, and Regionalism in Early Medieval Spain* (Aldershot: Variorum, 1992), pp. 489–512.

Collins, Roger, *Visigothic Spain, 409-711* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2004).

Conant, Jonathan, *Staying Roman: Conquest and Identity in Africa and the Mediterranean, 439-700* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012).

Cornell, Stephen, and Douglas Hartmann, *Ethnicity and Race: Making Identities in a Changing World*, 2nd ed. (Thousand Oaks: Pine Forge Press, 2007).

Coumert, Magali, *Origines des peuples: Les récits du haut moyen âge occidental (550-850)* (Paris: Institut d'études augustiniennes, 2007).

Courcelle, Pierre, *Histoire littéraire des grandes invasions germaniques*, 3rd ed. (Paris: Institut d'études augustiniennes, 1964).

Curta, Florin, 'From Kossinna to Bromley: Ethnogenesis in Slavic Archaeology', in Andrew Gillett (ed.), *On Barbarian Identity: Critical Approaches to Ethnogenesis Theory* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2002), pp. 201–220.

Curta, Florin, *The Making of the Slavs: History and Archaeology of the Lower Danube Region, c. 500-700* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001).

Curta, Florin, 'review of Sebastian Brather, Ethnische Interpretationen in der frühgeschichtlichen Archäologie: Geschichte, Grundlagen und Alternativen', *Archaeologica Bulgarica* 10 (2006), pp. 91–4.

Curta, Florin, 'Slavs in Fredegar and Paul the Deacon: Medieval *gens* or "scourge of God"?', *EME* 6, no. 2 (1997), pp. 141-67.

Curta, Florin, 'Some Remarks on Ethnicity in Early Medieval Archaeology', *EME* 15, no. 2 (2007), pp. 159–185.

Cusack, Carole M., 'review of Andrew Gillett (ed.), On Barbarian Identity', *Parergon* 20, no. 1 (2003), pp. 227–229.

d'Ors, Alvaro, 'La territorialidad del derecho de los visigodos', *Estudios Visigóticos* 1 (Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1956), pp. 91-104.

Dahn, Felix, *Das Kriegsrecht* (Würzburg: Stuber, 1870).

Dahn, Felix, *Westgothische Studien: Entstehungsgeschichte, Privatrecht, Strafrecht, Civil- und Straf-process und Gesammtkritik der* Lex Visigothorum (Würzburg: Stahel, 1874).

Davies, Wendy, 'The Early Middle Ages and Spanish Identity', in Huw Price and John Watts (eds.), *Power and Identity in the Middle Ages: Essays in Memory of Rees Davies* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), pp. 68-84.

Delehaye, Hippolyte, *The Legends of the Saints: An Introduction to Hagiography* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 1998).

de Vos, George A., 'Ethnic Pluralism: Conflict and Accommodation', in Lola Romanucci-Ross and George A. de Vos (eds.), *Ethnic Identity: Creation, Conflict, and Accommodation*, 3rd ed. (London: Sage, 1995), pp. 15–47.

Devroey, Jean-Pierre, 'Juifs et syriens: à propos de la géographie économique de la Gaule au haut Moyen Âge', in Jean-Marie Duvosquel (ed.), *Peasants and Townsmen in Medieval Europe* (Ghent: Snoeck-Ducaju & Zoon, 1995), pp. 51–72.

Díaz, Pablo C., 'City and Territory in Hispania in Late Antiquity', in Gian Pietro Brogiolo, Nancy Gauthier, and Neil Christie (eds.), *Towns and Their Territories Between Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages* (Leiden: Brill, 2000), pp. 3–36.

Díaz, Pablo C., and Maria R. Valverde, 'The Theoretical Strength and Practical Weakness of the Visigothic Monarchy of Toledo', in Frans Theuws and Janet L. Nelson (eds.), *Rituals of Power: From Late Antiquity to the Early Middle Ages* (Leiden: Brill, 2000), pp. 59–94.

Díaz, Pablo C., and Maria R. Valverde, 'Goths Confronting Goths: Ostrogothic Political Relations in Hispania', in Samuel Barnish and Federico Marazzi (eds.), *The Ostrogoths from the Migration Period to the Sixth Century: An Ethnographic Perspective* (San Marino: Boydell & Brewer, 2007), pp. 353–86.

Dill, Samuel, *Roman Society in Gaul in the Merovingian Age* (London: Macmillan, 1926).

Dopsch, Alfons, *The Economic and Social Foundations of European Civilization* (New York: Harcourt, 1937).

Drews, Wolfram, 'Jews as Pagans? Polemic Definitions of Identity in Visigothic Spain', *EME* 11 (2002), pp. 189–207.

Drews, Wolfram, *The Unknown Neighbour: The Jew in the Thought of Isidore of Seville* (Leiden: Brill, 2006).

Dubois, Jacques, and Jean-Loup Lemaitre, *Sources et méthodes de l'hagiographie médiévale* (Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1993).

duQuesnay Adams, Jeremy, 'Ideology and the Requirements of Citizenship in Visigothic Spain: The Case of the Judaei', *Societas* 2 (1972), pp. 317–32.

duQuesnay Adams, Jeremy, 'The Political Grammar of Early Hispano-Gothic Historians', in D.J. Kagay and J.T. Snow (eds.), *Medieval Iberia: Essays on the History and Literature of Early Medieval Spain* (New York: Peter Lang, 1997), pp. 1–25.

Durliat, Jean, 'Cité, impôt, et intégration des barbares', in Walter Pohl (ed.), *Kingdoms of the Empire: The Integration of Barbarians in Late Antiquity* (Leiden: Brill, 1997), pp. 153–180.

Durliat, Jean, 'Le salaire de la paix sociale dans les royaumes barbares', in Herwig Wolfram and Andreas Schwarcz (eds.), *Anerkennung und Integration: Zu den wirtschaftlichen Grundlagen der Völkerwanderungszeit (400-600)* (Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1988), pp. 21–72.

Ebling, Horst, Jörg Jarnut, and Gerd Kampers, '*Nomen et gens*: Untersuchungen zu den Führungsschichten des Franken-, Langobarden-, und Westgotenreiches im 6. und 7. Jahrhundert', *Francia* 8 (1980), pp. 687-745.

Effros, Bonnie, *Merovingian Mortuary Archaeology and the Making of the Early Middle Ages* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003).

Elton, Hugh, 'Defining Romans, Barbarians, and the Roman Frontier', in Ralph W. Mathisen and Hagith Sivan (eds.), *Shifting Frontiers in Late Antiquity* (Aldershot: Variorum, 1996), pp. 126-35.

Elukin, Jonathan, *Living Together, Living Apart* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2009).

Engels, Friedrich, *The Origin of the Family, Private Property, and the State* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1985).

Eriksen, Thomas Hylland, *Ethnicity and Nationalism: Anthropological Perspectives* (London: Pluto Press, 1993).

Evans Grubbs, Judith, *Law and Family in Late Antiquity: The Emperor Constantine's Marriage Legislation* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995).

Ewig, Eugen, *Die Merowinger und das Frankenreich* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2001).

Ewig, Eugen, *Trier im Merowingerreich: Civitas, Stadt, Bistum* (Trier: Paulinus-Verlag, 1954).

Ewig, Eugen, 'Volkstum und Volksbewusstsein im Frankreich des 7. Jahrhunderts', in *Spätantikes und frankisches Gallien* (Munich: Artemis Verlag, 1979), pp. 231-73.

Fanning, S., 'Emperors and Empires in Fifth-Century Gaul', in J.F. Drinkwater and Hugh Elton (eds.), *Fifth-Century Gaul: A Crisis of Identity?* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), pp. 288-97.

Farrell, Joseph, *Latin Language and Latin Culture: From Ancient to Modern Times* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001).

Fear, A.T. (ed.), *Lives of the Visigothic Fathers*, Translated Texts for Historians (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1997).

Fehr, Hubert, 'Volkstum as Paradigm: Germanic People and Gallo-Romans in Early Medieval Archaeology since the 1930s', in Andrew Gillett (ed.), *On Barbarian Identity: Critical Approaches to Ethnogenesis Theory* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2002), pp. 177–200.

Ferris, I. M., *Enemies of Rome: Barbarians Through Roman Eyes* (Stroud: Sutton, 2000).

Fichte, Johann Gottlieb, *Addresses to the German Nation*, trans. R.F. Jones and G.H. Turnbull (London: Open Court, 1922).

Fontaine, Jacques, *Isidore de Séville et la culture classique dans l'Espagne wisigothique* (Paris: Institut d'études augustiniennes, 1959).

Fontaine, Jacques, *Isidore de Séville: genèse et originalité de la culture hispanique au temps des Wisigoths* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2000).

Fouracre, Paul, *The Age of Charles Martel* (Harlow: Longman, 2000).

Fouracre, Paul, 'Merovingian History and Merovingian Hagiography', *Past and Present* 127 (1990), pp. 3–38.

Fouracre, Paul, 'The Work of Audoenus of Rouen and Eligius of Noyon in Extending Episcopal Influence from the Town to the Country in Seventh-Century Neustria', *Studies in Church History* 16 (1979), pp. 77-91.

Fouracre, Paul, and Richard A. Gerberding, *Late Merovingian France: History and Hagiography, 640-720* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1996).

Fox, Yaniv, *Power and Religion in Merovingian Gaul: Columbanian Monasticism and the Frankish Elites* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014).

Furtado, Rodrigo, 'From *gens* to *imperium*: A Study of Isidore's Political Lexicon', in Roger Wright (ed.), *Latin vulgaire--latin tardif VIII: actes du VIIIe Colloque international sur le latin vulgaire et tardif, Oxford, 6-9 septembre 2006* (Hildesheim: Olms-Weidmann, 2008), pp. 408–14.

Fustel de Coulanges, Numa Denis, *Questions historiques* (Paris: Hachette, 1893).

Galán Sánchez, Pedro Juan, 'La *Chronica* de Juan de Bíclaro: primera manifestación historiográfica del nacionalismo hispano-godo', in *Los visigodos y su mundo* (Madrid: Comunidad de Madrid, 1998), pp. 51–60.

Galán Sánchez, Pedro Juan, *El género historiográfico de la Chronica: las crónicas hispanas de época visigoda* (Cáceres: Universidad de Extremadura, 1994).

Gallego Blanco, Enrique, 'Los concilios de Toledo y la sucesión al trono visigodo', *AHDE* 44 (1974), pp. 723–39.

Gantner, Clemens, Rosamond McKitterick, and Sven Meeder (eds.), *The Resources of the Past in Early Medieval Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015).

García Gallo, Alfonso, 'Consideración crítica de los estudios sobre la legislación y la costumbre visigodas', *AHDE* 44 (1974), pp. 343–464.

García Gallo, Alfonso, 'Nacionalidad y territorialidad del derecho en la época visigoda', *AHDE* 13 (1936-1941), pp. 168–264.

García Moreno, Luis A., 'The Creation of Byzantium's Spanish Province: Causes and Propaganda', *Byzantion* 66 (1996), pp. 101–19.

García Moreno, Luis A., 'La imagen de Bizancio en España en la temprana Edad Media (siglos VI-X)', *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 91 (1998), pp. 32–48.

García Moreno, Luis A., 'Prosopography, Nomenclature, and Royal Succession in the Visigothic Kingdom of Toledo', *JLA* 1, no. 1 (2008), pp. 142–156.

García Moreno, Luis A., 'Spanish Gothic Consciousness Among the Mozarabs in Al-Andalus, VIII-Xth Centuries', in Alberto Ferreiro (ed.), *The Visigoths: Studies in Culture and Society* (Leiden: Brill, 1999), pp. 303–24.

Garipzanov, Ildar H., *The Symbolic Language of Authority in the Carolingian World (c. 751-877)* (Leiden: Brill, 2008).

Geary, Patrick J., *Aristocracy in Provence: The Rhone Basin at the Dawn of the Carolingian Age* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1986).

Geary, Patrick J., 'Barbarians and Ethnicity', in G. W. Bowersock, Peter Brown, and Oleg Grabar (eds.), *Interpreting Late Antiquity: A Guide to the Postclassical World* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap, 2001), pp. 107–129.

Geary, Patrick J., *Before France and Germany: The Creation and Transformation of the Merovingian World* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988).

Geary, Patrick J., 'Ethnicity as a Situational Construct in the Early Middle Ages', *Mitteilungen der anthropologischen Gesellschaft in Wien* 113 (1983), pp. 15–26.

Geary, Patrick J., *The Myth of Nations: The Medieval Origins of Europe* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002).

Geary, Patrick J., 'Slovenian Gentile Identity: From Samo to the Fürstenstein', in Ildar H. Garipzanov, Patrick J. Geary, and Przemysław Urbańczyk (eds.), *Franks, Northmen, and Slavs* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2008), pp. 243-57.

Gellner, Ernest, *Nations and Nationalism* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1983).

George, Judith W., 'Portraits of Two Merovingian Bishops in the Poetry of Venantius Fortunatus', *JMH* 13, no. 3 (1987), pp. 189–205.

George, Judith W., *Venantius Fortunatus: A Latin Poet in Merovingian Gaul* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992).

George, Judith W., 'Venantius Fortunatus: Panegyric in Merovingian Gaul', in Mary Whitby (ed.), *The Propaganda of Power: The Role of Panegyric in Late Antiquity* (Leiden: Brill, 1998), p. 225–46.

George, Judith W. (ed.), *Venantius Fortunatus: Personal and Political Poems*, Translated Texts for Historians (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1995).

Gerberding, Richard A., *The Rise of the Carolingians and the* Liber Historiae Francorum (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987).

Ghosh, Shami, *Writing the Barbarian Past: Studies in Early Medieval Historical Narrative* (Leiden: Brill, 2015).

Gil, Juan, 'Judios y cristianos en la Hispania del s. VII', *Hispania Sacra* 30 (1977), pp. 9-110.

Gillett, Andrew, 'Ethnogenesis: A Contested Model of Early Medieval Europe', *History Compass* 4, no. 2 (2006), pp. 241–260.

Gillett, Andrew, 'Introduction: Ethnicity, History, and Methodology', in Andrew Gillett (ed.), *On Barbarian Identity: Critical Approaches to Ethnogenesis Theory* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2002), pp. 1–20.

Gillett, Andrew, 'The Mirror of Jordanes: Concepts of "The Barbarian," Then and Now', in Philip Rousseau (ed.), *Companion to Late Antiquity* (Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009), pp. 392-408.

Gillett, Andrew, 'Was Ethnicity Politicized in the Earliest Medieval Kingdoms?', in Andrew Gillett (ed.), *On Barbarian Identity: Critical Approaches to Ethnogenesis Theory* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2002), pp. 85–122.

Gilliard, Frank D., 'The Senators of Sixth-Century Gaul', *Speculum* 54, no. 4 (1979), pp. 685-697.

Godman, Peter, *Poets and Emperors: Frankish Politics and Carolingian Poetry* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986).

Godoy, Cristina, and Josep Villela, 'De la fides góthica a la orthodoxia nicena: inicio de la teología política visigótica', in A. González Blanco (ed.), *Los visigodos: historia y civilización* (Murcia: Universidad de Murcia, 1986), pp. 117–44.

Goetz, Hans-Werner, '*Gens*, Kings, and Kingdoms: The Franks', in Hans-Werner Goetz, Jörg Jarnut, and Walter Pohl (eds.), *Regna and Gentes: The Relationship Between Late Antique and Early Medieval Peoples and Kingdoms in the Transformation of the Roman World* (Leiden: Brill, 2003), pp. 307–44.

Goffart, Walter, *Barbarian Tides: The Migration Age And the Later Roman Empire* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006).

Goffart, Walter, *Barbarians and Romans, A.D. 418-584: The Techniques of Accommodation* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1980).

Goffart, Walter, 'Does the Distant Past Impinge on the Invasion Age Germans?', in Andrew Gillett (ed.), *On Barbarian Identity: Critical Approaches to Ethnogenesis Theory* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2002), pp. 21–38.

Goffart, Walter, 'Foreigners in the Histories of Gregory of Tours', in *Rome's Fall and After* (Ronceverte, WV: Hambledon Press, 1989), pp. 275-91.

Goffart, Walter, 'From *Historiae* to *Historia Francorum* and Back Again: Aspects of the Textual History of Gregory of Tours', in *Rome's Fall and After* (Ronceverte, WV: Hambledon Press, 1989), pp. 255-74.

Goffart, Walter, *The Narrators of Barbarian History (A.D. 550-800): Jordanes, Gregory of Tours, Bede, and Paul the Deacon* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1988).

Goffart, Walter, 'Rome's Final Conquest: The Barbarians', *History Compass* 6, no. 3 (2008), pp. 855–883.

Goffart, Walter, 'Two Notes on Germanic Antiquity Today', *Traditio* 50 (1995), pp. 9-30.

González Fernández, R., 'El mito gótico en la historiografía del siglo XV', in A. González Blanco (ed.), *Los visigodos: historia y civilización* (Murcia: Universidad de Murcia, 1986), pp. 289–300.

González-Salinero, Raúl, 'Catholic Anti-Judaism in Visigothic Spain', in Alberto Ferreiro (ed.), *The Visigoths: Studies in Culture and Society* (Leiden: Brill, 1999), pp. 123-50.

Grahn-Hoek, Heike, 'Gundulfus subregulus', in *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters* 59 (2003), pp. 1-47.

Greatrex, Geoffrey, 'Roman Identity in the Sixth Century', in Stephen Mitchell and Geoffrey Greatrex (eds.), *Ethnicity and Culture in Late Antiquity* (London: Duckworth, 2000), pp. 267–292.

Green, Dennis Howard and Frank Siegmund (eds.), *The Continental Saxons from the Migration Period to the Tenth Century: An Ethnographic Perspective* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2003).

Grieve, Patricia E., *The Eve of Spain: Myths of Origins in the History of Christian, Muslim, and Jewish Conflict* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2009).

Grimm, Jacob, *Kleinere Schriften*. 7 vols. (Berlin: Dümmler, 1864).

Guterman, Simeon L., *From Personal to Territorial Law: Aspects of the History and Structure of the Western Legal-Constitutional Tradition* (Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press, 1972).

Guyon, Jean, 'Grégoire de Tours et le Midi de la Gaule', in Nancy Gauthier and Henri Galinié (eds.), *Grégoire de Tours et l'espace gaulois* (Tours: Association Grégoire, 1997), pp. 27-34.

Hall, Edith, *Inventing the Barbarian: Greek Self-Definition Through Tragedy* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991).

Hall, Jonathan M., *Ethnic Identity in Greek Antiquity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997).

Hall, Jonathan M., *Hellenicity: Between Ethnicity and Culture* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002).

Halsall, Guy, *Barbarian Migrations and the Roman West, 376-568* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008).

Halsall, Guy, *Cemeteries and Society in Merovingian Gaul: Selected Studies in History and Archaeology, 1992-2009* (Leiden: Brill, 2010).

Halsall, Guy, 'Ethnicity and Early Medieval Cemeteries', *Arqueología y Territorio Medieval* 18 (2011), pp. 15–27.

Halsall, Guy, 'The Origins of the Reihengräberzivilisation: Forty Years On', in J.F. Drinkwater and Hugh Elton (eds.), *Fifth-Century Gaul: A Crisis of Identity?* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), pp. 196–207.

Halsall, Guy, 'Social Identities and Social Relationships in Early Merovingian Gaul', in Ian Wood (ed.), *Franks and Alamanni in the Merovingian Period: An Ethnographic Perspective* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1998), pp. 141-76.

Hammer, Carl I., *From* ducatus *to* regnum*: Ruling Bavaria under the Merovingians and Early Carolingians* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2007).

Härke, Heinrich, 'All Quiet on the Western Front? Paradigms, Methods, and Approaches in West German Archaeology', in Ian Hodder (ed.), *Archaeological Theory in Europe: The Last Three Decades* (London: Routledge, 1991), pp. 187–222.

Härke, Heinrich, 'Archaeologists and migrations: a problem of attitude?', in Thomas F.X. Noble (ed.), *From Roman Provinces to Medieval Kingdoms* (New York: Routledge, 2006), pp. 262–276.

Harries, Jill, 'Not the Theodosian Code: Euric's Law and Late Fifth-Century Gaul', in Ralph W. Mathisen and Danuta Shanzer (eds.), *Society and Culture in Late Antique Gaul: Revisiting the Sources* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2001), pp. 39–51.

Harrison, Thomas (ed.), *Greeks and Barbarians* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2001).

Haubrichs, Wolfgang, 'Identität und Name: Akkulturation in Namen und die Traditionsgesellschaften des frühen Mittelalters', in Walter Pohl (ed.), *Die Suche nach den Ursprüngen: von der Bedeutung des frühen Mittelalters*, Forschungen zur Geschichte des Mittelalters 8 (Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2004), pp. 85-106.

Haubrichs, Wolfgang, 'Romano-germanische Hybridnamen des frühen Mittelalters nördlich der Alpen', in D. Hägerman and J. Jarnut (eds.), *Akkulturation: Probleme einer germanisch-romanischen Kultursynthese in Spätantike und frühen Mittelalter* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2004), pp. 179-203.

Haubrichs, Wolfgang, 'Typen der anthroponymischen Indikation von Verwandtschaft bei den "germanischen" *gentes*: Traditionen—Innovationen—Differenzen', in Steffen Patzold and Karl Ubl (eds.), *Verwandtschaft, Name und soziale Ordnung* (300-1000) (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2014), pp. 29–72.

Heather, Peter, 'The Barbarian in Late Antiquity: Image, Reality, and Transformation', in Richard Miles (ed.), *Constructing Identities in Late Antiquity* (London: Routledge, 1999), pp. 234–58.

Heather, Peter, 'The Creation of the Visigoths', in Peter Heather (ed.), *The Visigoths from the Migration Period to the Seventh Century: An Ethnographic Perspective* (San Marino: Boydell & Brewer, 1999), pp. 41–72.

Heather, Peter, 'Disappearing and Reappearing Tribes', in Walter Pohl and Helmut Reimitz (eds.), *Strategies of Distinction: The Construction of Ethnic Communities, 300-800* (Leiden: Brill, 1998), pp. 95-111.

Heather, Peter, *Empires and Barbarians: The Fall of Rome and the Birth of Europe* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010).

Heather, Peter, 'Ethnicity, Group Identity, and Social Status in the Migration Period', in Ildar H. Garipzanov, Patrick J. Geary, and Przemysław Urbańczyk (eds.), *Franks, Northmen, and Slavs* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2008), pp. 17–49.

Heather, Peter, *The Goths* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1998).

Heather, Peter, 'The Huns and the End of the Roman Empire in Western Europe', *EHR* 110, no. 435 (1995), pp. 4–41.

Heather, Peter, and John Matthews, *The Goths in the Fourth Century*, Translated Texts for Historians (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1991).

Heikkinen, S. 'The Poetry of Venanatius Fortunatus: The Twilight of Roman Metre', in M. Gourdouba, L. Pietilä-Castrén, and E. Tikkala (eds.), *The Eastern Mediterranean in the Late Antique and Byzantine Periods* (Helsinki: Suomen Ateenan-instituutin säätiö, 2004), pp. 17-31.

Heinzelmann, Martin, *Bischofsherrschaft in Gallien: zur Kontinuität römischer Führungsschichten vom 4. bis zum 7. Jahrhundert: soziale, prosopographische und bildungsgeschichtliche Aspekte* (Munich: Artemis Verlag, 1976).

Heinzelmann, Martin, 'Gallische Prosopographie, 260-527', *Francia* 10 (1983), pp. 531-718.

Heinzelmann, Martin, *Gregory of Tours: History and Society in the Sixth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001).

Hen, Yitzhak, 'A Visigothic King in Search of an Identity—Sisebutus Gothorum gloriosissimus princeps', in Richard Corradini, Matthew Gillis, Rosamond McKitterick, and Irene van Renswoude (eds.), *Ego Trouble: Authors and Their Identities in the Early Middle Ages*, Forschungen zur Geschichte des Mittelalters 15 (Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2010), pp. 88–99.

Herder, Johann Gottfried von, *Outlines of a Philosophy of the History of Man*, trans. T. Churchill (London: Hansard, 1800).

Herrin, Judith, *The Formation of Christendom* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987).

Heydemann, Gerda, 'Biblical Israel and the Christian *gentes*: Social Metaphors and Concepts of Community in Cassiodorus' *Expositio psalmorum'*, in Walter Pohl and Gerda Heydemann (eds.), *Strategies of Identification: Ethnicity and Religion in Early Medieval Europe* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2013), pp. 143-208.

Hillgarth, Jocelyn N., 'Coins and Chronicles: Propaganda in Sixth-Century Spain and the Byzantine Background', *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte* 15, no. 4 (1966), pp. 483–508.

Hillgarth, Jocelyn N., 'Historiography in Visigothic Spain', in *La storiografia altomedievale* (Spoleto: Centro italiano di studi sull'alto Medioevo, 1970), pp. 261–311.

Hillgarth, Jocelyn N., 'review of Suzanne Teillet, *Des goths à la nation gothique*', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 39 (1988), pp. 578-81.

Hillgarth, Jocelyn N., 'Spanish Historiography and Iberian Reality', *History and Theory* 24, no. 1 (1985), pp. 23-43.

Hillgarth, Jocelyn N., *The Visigoths in History and Legend* (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 2009).

Hobsbawm, E. J. (ed.), *The Invention of Tradition* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983).

Hoeflich, M.H., 'Between Gothia and Romania: The Image of the King in the Poetry of Venantius Fortunatus', *Res publica litterarum: Studies in the Classical Tradition* 5 (1982), pp. 123-36.

Höfler, Otto, 'Das germanische Kontinuitätsproblem', *Historische Zeitschrift* 157 (1938), pp. 1–26.

Höfler, Otto, *Kultische Geheimbünde der Germanen* (Frankfurt: M. Diesterweg, 1934).

Humfress, Caroline, *Orthodoxy and the Courts in Late Antiquity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007).

Humphries, Mark, 'Chronicle and Chronology: Prosper of Aquitaine, His Methods and the Development of Early Medieval Chronography', *EME* 5, no. 2 (1996), pp. 155–175.

James, Edward, *The Franks* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1988).

James, Edward, 'Gregory of Tours and the Franks', Alexander C. Murray (ed.), *After Rome's Fall: Narrators and Sources of Early Medieval History: Essays Presented to Walter Goffart* (Buffalo: University of Toronto Press, 1998), pp. 51-66.

Jarnut, Jörg, *Agilolfingerstudien: Untersuchungen zur Geschichte einer adligen Familie im 6. und 7. Jahrhundert* (Stuttgart: A. Hiersemann, 1986).

Jarnut, Jörg, '*Nomen et gens*: Political and Linguistic Aspects of Personal Names between the Third and the Eighth Century—Presenting an Interdisciplinary Project from a Historical Perspective', in Walter Pohl and Helmut Reimitz (eds.), *Strategies of Distinction: The Construction of Ethnic Communities, 300-800* (Leiden: Brill, 1998), pp. 113-16.

Jenkins, Richard, *Rethinking Ethnicity: Arguments and Explorations*, 2nd ed. (London: Sage, 2008).

Jenkins, Richard, *Social Identity*, 3rd ed. (Abingdon: Taylor and Francis, 2008).

Jiménez Garnica, Ana María, 'El origen de la legislación civil visigoda sobre la prohibición de matrimonios entre romanos y godos: Un problema de fundamento religioso', *AHDE* 55 (1985), pp. 735–47.

Jones, A.H.M., *The Later Roman Empire, 284-602: A Social, Economic, and Administrative Survey* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1964).

Jones, A.H.M., J.R. Martindale, and J. Morris, *The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire*, 3 vols. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971-1992).

Jones, Siân, *The Archaeology of Ethnicity: Constructing Identities in the Past and Present* (London: Routledge, 1997).

Jones, W.R., 'The Image of the Barbarian in Medieval Europe', *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 13, no. 4 (1971), pp. 376–407.

Jorge, Ana Maria, 'Church and Culture in Lusitania in the V-VIII Centuries', in Alberto Ferreiro (ed.), *The Visigoths: Studies in Culture and Society* (Leiden: Brill, 1999), pp. 99–122.

Kaldellis, Anthony, *Hellenism in Byzantium: The Transformations of Greek Identity and the Reception of the Classical Tradition* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008).

Kazanski, Michel, *Les Goths: (Ier-VIIe siècles ap. J.-C.)* (Paris: Editions Errance, 1991).

Kazanski, Michel, 'The Ostrogoths and the Princely Civilization of the Fifth Century', in Samuel Barnish and Federico Marazzi (eds.), *The Ostrogoths from the Migration Period to the Sixth Century: An Ethnographic Perspective* (San Marino: Boydell & Brewer, 2007), pp. 81–112.

King, P.D. 'The Alleged Territoriality of Visigothic Law' in Brian Tierney and Peter Linehan (eds.), *Authority and Power: Studies in Medieval Law and Government* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980), pp. 1-11.

King, P.D., 'King Chindasvind and the First Territorial Law-code of the Visigothic Kingdom', in Edward James (ed.), *Visigothic Spain: New Approaches* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1980), pp. 131–158.

King, P.D., *Law and Society in the Visigothic Kingdom* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972).

Klingshirn, William E., *Caesarius of Arles: The Making of a Christian Community in Late Antique Gaul* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994).

Koch, Manuel, 'Arianism and Ethnic Identity in Visigothic Spain', in Guido M. Berndt and Roland Steinacher (eds.), *Arianism: Roman Heresy and Barbarian Creed* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2014), pp. 257-70.

Koch, Manuel, *Ethnische Identität im Entstehungsprozess des spanischen Westgotenreiches* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2012).

Koder, Johannes, 'Byzanz, die Grechen, und die Romaiosyne—eine "Ethnogenese" der "Römer"?', in Herwig Wolfram and Walter Pohl (eds.), *Typen der Ethnogenese unter besonder Berücksichtigung der Bayern* (Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1990)*, pp. 103–11.

Koebner, R., *Venantius Fortunatus: Seine Persönlichkeit und seine Stellung in der geistigen Kultur des Merowingerreiches* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1915).

Koon, Sam, and Jamie Wood, 'Unity from Disunity: Law, Rhetoric and Power in the Visigothic Kingdom', *European Review of History* 16, no. 6 (2009), p. 793.

Kossinna, Gustaf, *Die Herkunft der Germanen: zur Methode der Siedlungsarchäologie* (Würzburg: C. Kabitzsch, 1911).

Kreiner, Jamie, *The Social Life of Hagiography in the Merovingian Kingdom* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014).

Kulikowski, Michael, *Late Roman Spain and Its Cities* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2004).

Kulikowski, Michael, 'Nation versus Army: A Necessary Contrast?', in Andrew Gillett (ed.), *On Barbarian Identity: Critical Approaches to Ethnogenesis Theory* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2002), pp. 69–84.

Kurth, Godefroid, *Études franques*, 2 vols. (Paris: Champion, 1919).

Lacarra, J.M., 'La iglesia visigoda en el siglo VII y sus relaciones con Roma', in *Le chiese nei regni dell'Europa occidentale e i loro rapporti con Romasino all'800* (Spoleto: Presso la Sede del Centro, 1960), pp. 353–84.

Ladner, G.B., 'On Roman Attitudes toward Barbarians in Late Antiquity', *Viator* 7 (1976), pp. 1–25.

Lambert, David, 'The Barbarians in Salvian's De gubernatione Dei', in Stephen Mitchell and Geoffrey Greatrex (eds.), *Ethnicity and Culture in Late Antiquity* (London: Duckworth, 2000), pp. 103–16.

Lamprecht, Karl, 'Über Belgien: Nach geschichtlichen und persönlichen Erfahrungen', *Die Woche* 12 (Berlin, 1915), pp. 397-406, http://www.zum.de/psm/1wk/lamprecht.php.

Lapeyre, H., 'Deux interpretations de l'histoire d'Espagne: Américo Castro et Claudio Sánchez-Albornoz', *Annales: Histoire, Sciences Sociales* 20, no. 5 (1965), pp. 1015-37.

Le Jan, Régine, *Famille et pouvoir dans le monde franc, VIIe-Xe siècle: Essai d'anthropologie sociale* (Paris: Publications de la Sorbonne, 1995).

Leerssen, Joep, *National Thought in Europe: A Cultural History* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2006).

Lewis, Archibald R., 'The Dukes in the Regnum Francorum, A.D. 550-751', *Speculum* 51, no. 3 (1976), pp. 381–410.

Lewis, Catrin, 'Gallic Identity and the Gallic *Civitas* from Caesar to Gregory of Tours', in Stephen Mitchell and Geoffrey Greatrex (eds.), *Ethnicity and Culture in Late Antiquity* (London: Duckworth, 2000), pp. 69-82.

Lewis, Charlton T., and Charles Short*, A Latin Dictionary* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1933).

Liebeschuetz, J.H.W.G., 'Cities, Taxes, and the Accommodation of the Barbarians: The Theories of Durliat and Goffart', in Thomas F.X. Noble (ed.), *From Roman Provinces to Medieval Kingdoms* (New York: Routledge, 2006), pp. 309–324.

Liebeschuetz, J.H.W.G., 'Citizen Status and Law in the Roman Empire and the Visigothic Kingdom', in Walter Pohl and Helmut Reimitz (eds.), *Strategies of Distinction: The Construction of Ethnic Communities, 300-800* (Leiden: Brill, 1998), pp. 131–152.

Liebeschuetz, J.H.W.G., 'Goths and Romans in the *Leges Visigothorum*', in Gerda de Kleijn and Stéphane Benoist (eds.), *Integration in Rome and in the Roman World: Proceedings of the Tenth Workshop of the International Impact of Empire (Lille, June 23-35, 2011)* (Leiden: Brill, 2013), pp. 89–104.

Linehan, Peter, *Past and Present in Medieval Spain* (Aldershot: Variorum, 1992).

Linehan, Peter, 'Religion, Nationalism, and National Identity in Medieval Spain', in Stuart Mews (ed.), *Religion and National Identity* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1982), pp. 161–99.

López Amo Marín, A., 'La polemica en torno a la territorialidad del derecho visigodo', *Arbor* 1 (1944), pp. 227–41.

Loseby, S.T., 'Gregory's Cities: Urban Functions in Sixth-Century Gaul', in Ian Wood (ed.), *Franks and Alamanni in the Merovingian Period: An Ethnographic Perspective* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1998), pp. 239-84.

Loyen, André, 'Résistants et collaborateurs en Gaule à l'époque des Grandes Invasions', *Bulletin de l'Association Guillaume Budé* 23 (1963), pp. 437-50.

MacCormack, Sabine, 'Change and Continuity in Late Antiquity: The Ceremony of "Adventus"', *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte* 21, no. 4 (1972), pp. 721–752.

MacCormack, Sabine, 'Latin Prose Panegyrics', in T.A. Dorey (ed.), *Empire and Aftermath* (London: Routledge, 1975), pp. 143-205.

MacGeorge, Penny, *Late Roman Warlords* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002).

Martin, Céline, 'La notion de *gens* dans la péninsule Ibérique des VIe-VIIe siècles: quelques interprétations', in Véronique Gazeau, Pierre Bauduin, and Yves Modéran (eds.), *Identité et Ethnicité: Concepts, débats historiographiques, exemples (IIIe-XIIe siècle)* (Caen: Publications du CRAHM, 2008), pp. 75–89.

Martínez Jiménez, Javier, and José María Moreno Narganes, '*Nunc autem a Gothis subversa*: The Province of Alicante and the Spanish Mediterranean Towns between the Byzantine and Visigothic Periods', *EME* 23, vol. 3 (2015), pp. 263-89.

Maskarinec, Maya, 'Who Were the Romans? Shifting Scripts of Romanness in Early Medieval Italy', in Walter Pohl and Gerda Heydemann (eds.), *Post-Roman Traditions: Christian and Barbarian Identities in the Early Medieval West* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2013), pp. 297-363.

Mathisen, Ralph W., 'The Family of Georgius Florentius Gregorius and the Bishops of Tours', *Medievalia et Humanistica* 12 (1984), pp. 83-95.

Mathisen, Ralph W., 'The Letters of Ruricius of Limoges and the Passage from Roman to Frankish Gaul', in Ralph W. Mathisen and Danuta Shanzer (eds.), *Society and Culture in Late Antique Gaul: Revisiting the Sources* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2001), pp. 101-15.

Mathisen, Ralph W., '*PLRE* II: Suggested Addenda and Corrigenda', *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte* 31, no. 3 (1982), pp. 364-86.

Mathisen, Ralph W., *Roman Aristocrats in Barbarian Gaul: Strategies for Survival in an Age of Transition* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1993).

Mathisen, Ralph W., *Ruricius of Limoges and Friends: Collection of Letters from Visigothic Gaul*, Translated Texts for Historians (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1999).

Mathisen, Ralph W., and Danuta Shanzer (eds.), *Romans, Barbarians, and the Transformation of the Roman World: Cultural Interaction and the Creation of Identity in Late Antiquity* (Burlington: Ashgate, 2011).

Mathisen, Ralph W., and Hagith Sivan, 'Forging a New Identity: The Kingdom of Toulouse and the Frontiers of Visigothic Aquitania (418-507)', in Alberto Ferreiro (ed.), *The Visigoths: Studies in Culture and Society* (Leiden: Brill, 1999), pp. 1–62.

Mathisen, Ralph W., and Hagith Sivan (eds.), *Shifting Frontiers in Late Antiquity* (Brookfield, VT: Variorum, 1996).

Matthews, John, 'Interpreting the *Interpretationes* of the *Breviarium*', in Ralph W. Mathisen (ed.), *Law, Society, and Authority in Late Antiquity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), pp. 11–32.

Matthews, John, *Laying Down the Law: A Study of the Theodosian Code* (London: Yale University Press, 2000).

Matthews, John, 'Roman Law and Barbarian Identity in the Late Roman West,' in Stephen Mitchell and Geoffrey Greatrex (eds.), *Ethnicity and Culture in Late Antiquity* (London: Duckworth, 2000), pp. 31-44.

Matthews, John, *Western Aristocracies and Imperial Court, A.D. 364-425* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975).

Maya, Antonio, 'De Leovigildo perseguidor y Masona mártir', *Emerita* 62 (1994), pp. 167-86.

McCormick, Michael, *Eternal Victory: Triumphal Rulership in Late Antiquity, Byzantium, and the Early Medieval West* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986).

McNamara, Jo Ann, and John E. Halborg (eds.), *Sainted Women of the Dark Ages* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1992).

Menéndez Pelayo, Marcelino, *Historia de los heterodoxos españoles* (Madrid: Librería Católica de San José, 1881), vol. 3.

Menéndez Pidal, Ramón, *Los españoles en la historia* (Buenos Aires: Espasa-Calpe Argentina, 1959).

Menéndez Pidal, Ramón, *Historia de España*, vol. 3: *España Visigoda* (Madrid: Espasa-Calpe Argentina, 1940).

Merêa, Manuel Paulo, *Estudos de direito visigótico* (Coimbra: Atlântida, 1948).

Mériaux, Charles, 'Une *Vita* mérovingienne et ses lectures du IXe au XIe siècle: Le dossier de saint Géry de Cambrai', in Monique Goullet, Martin Heinzelmann, and Christina Veyrard-Cosme (eds.), *L'hagiographie mérovingienne à travers ses réécritures*, Beihefte der Francia 71 (Ostfildern: Thorbecke, 2010), pp. 161-91.

Merrills, Andrew, *History and Geography in Late Antiquity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005).

Merrills, Andrew, and Richard Miles, *The Vandals* (Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010).

Miles, George, *The Coinage of the Visigoths of Spain, Leovigild to Achila II* (New York: American Numismatic Society, 1952).

Mitchell, Kathleen, and Ian Wood (eds.), *The World of Gregory of Tours* (Leiden: Brill, 2002).

Montesquieu, Charles de Secondat, Baron de, *The Spirit of the Laws*, ed. Anne M. Cohler, Basia Carolyn Miller, and Harold Samuel Stone (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989).

Mousourakis, George, *A Legal History of Rome* (London: Routledge, 2007).

Muhlberger, Steven, 'War, Warlords, and Christian Historians', in Alexander C. Murray (ed.), *After Rome's Fall: Narrators and Sources of Early Medieval History: Essays Presented to Walter Goffart* (Buffalo: University of Toronto Press, 1998), pp. 83-98.

Murray, Alexander C., *From Roman to Merovingian Gaul: A Reader* (Peterborough, ON: University of Toronto Press, 2000).

Murray, Alexander C., 'Introduction: Walter André Goffart', in Alexander C. Murray (ed.), *After Rome's Fall: Narrators and Sources of Early Medieval History: Essays Presented to Walter Goffart* (Buffalo: University of Toronto Press, 1998), pp. 3–7.

Murray, Alexander C., '*Post vocantur Merohingii*: Fredegar, Merovech, and "Sacral Kingship"', in Alexander C. Murray (ed.), *After Rome's Fall: Narrators and Sources of Early Medieval History: Essays Presented to Walter Goffart* (Buffalo: University of Toronto Press, 1998), pp. 121–52.

Murray, Alexander C., 'Reinhard Wenskus on "Ethnogenesis," Ethnicity, and the Origins of the Franks', in Andrew Gillett (ed.), *On Barbarian Identity: Critical Approaches to Ethnogenesis Theory* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2002), pp. 39–68.

Näf, Beat, *Senatorisches Standesbewusstsein in spätrömischer Zeit* (Freiburg, Schweiz: Universitätsverlag, 1995).

Nixon, C.E.V., 'Relations Between Visigoths and Romans in 5th-C. Gaul', in J.F. Drinkwater and Hugh Elton (eds.), *Fifth-Century Gaul: A Crisis of Identity?* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), pp. 64–74.

Noble, Thomas F. X. (ed.), *From Roman Provinces to Medieval Kingdoms* (New York: Routledge, 2006).

Olmo Enciso, Lauro, *Recópolis: un paseo por la ciudad visigoda* (Madrid: Museo Arqueológico Regional de la Comunidad de Madrid, 2006).

Olmo Enciso, Lauro, 'The Royal Foundation of Recópolis and the Urban Renewal in Iberia during the Second Half of the Sixth Century', in J. Henning (ed.), *Post-Roman Towns, Trade, and Settlement in Europe and Byzantium*, vol. 1, *The Heirs of the Roman West* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2007), pp. 181–96.

Orlandis, José, 'Los hispano-romanos en la aristocracia del siglo VII', *Revista Portuguesa da Historia* 13 (1970), pp. 189–96.

Orlandis, José, *Historia del reino visigodo español* (Madrid: Ediciones Rialp, 1988).

Orlandis, José, 'Problemas canónicos en torno a la conversión de los visigodos al catolicismo', *AHDE* 32 (1962), pp. 301–21.

Orlandis, José, 'Los romanos en el ejército visigodo', in *Homenaje a Fray Justo Pérez de Urbel* (Burgos: Silos, 1977), pp. 121–31.

Orlandis, José, *Semblanzas visigodas* (Madrid: Ediciones Rialp, 1992).

Orlandis, José, and Domingo Ramos-Lissón, *Historia de los concilios de la España romana y visigoda* (Pamplona: Universidad de Navarra, 1986).

Payne, Stanley G., 'Visigoths and Asturians Reinterpreted: The Spanish Grand Narrative Restored?', in Ivy A. Corfis and Ray Harris-Northall (eds.), *Medieval Iberia: Changing Societies and Cultures in Contact and Transition* (Woodbridge: Tamesis Books, 2007), pp. 47–56.

Pejenaute Rubio, Francisco, 'En los confines de la Romanidad: Venancio Fortunato, un escritor de frontera', *Archivum: Revista de la Facultad de Filosofía y Letras* 51 (2001), pp. 383–427.

Philippart, Guy, 'Latin Hagiography Before the Ninth Century: A Synoptic View', in Jennifer R. Davis and Michael McCormick (eds.), *The Long Morning of Medieval Europe* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008), pp. 111–29.

Pietri, Luce, 'Venance Fortunat et ses commanditaires: un poète italien dans la société gallo-franque', in *Committenti e produzione artistico-letteraria nell'alto Medioevo occidentale*, vol. 2 (Spoleto: Centro Italiano di Studi sull'alto Medioevo, 1992), pp. 729-54

Piganiol, André, *L'empire chrétien (325-395)*, 2nd ed. (Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1972).

Pirenne, Henri, *Mohammed and Charlemagne* (New York: Meridian Books, 1957).

Pirenne, Henri, *Souvenirs de captivité en Allemagne (mars 1916-novembre 1918)* (Brussels: M. Lamertin, 1920).

Pohl, Walter, 'A Non-Roman Empire in Central Europe: The Avars' in Hans-Werner Goetz, Jörg Jarnut, and Walter Pohl (eds.), *Regna and Gentes: The Relationship Between Late Antique and Early Medieval Peoples and Kingdoms in the Transformation of the Roman World* (Leiden: Brill, 2003), pp. 571-95.

Pohl, Walter, 'Aux origines d'une Europe ethnique: transformations d'identités entre antiquité et moyen âge', *Annales: Histoire, Sciences Sociales* 60 (2005), pp. 183-208.

Pohl, Walter, 'Christian and Barbarian Identities in the Early Medieval West: Introduction', in Walter Pohl and Gerda Heydemann (eds.), *Post-Roman Traditions: Christian and Barbarian Identities in the Early Medieval West* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2013), pp. 1-46.

Pohl, Walter, 'Conceptions of Ethnicity in Early Medieval Studies', in Lester K. Little and Barbara H. Rosenwein (eds.), *Debating the Middle Ages* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1998), pp. 15–24.

Pohl, Walter, 'Ethnicity, Theory, and Tradition: A Response', in Andrew Gillett (ed.), *On Barbarian Identity: Critical Approaches to Ethnogenesis Theory* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2002), pp. 221–240.

Pohl, Walter, 'Introduction: Ethnicity, Religion, and Empire', in Walter Pohl, Clemens Gantner, and Richard Payne (eds.), *Visions of Community in the Post-Roman World: The West, Byzantium, and the Islamic World, 300-1100* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2012), pp. 1–23.

Pohl, Walter, 'Introduction—Strategies of Identification: A Methodological Profile', in Walter Pohl and Gerda Heydemann (eds.), *Strategies of Identification: Ethnicity and Religion in Early Medieval Europe* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2013), pp. 1-64.

Pohl, Walter, 'Romanness: A Multiple Identity and its Changes', *EME* 22, no. 4 (2014), pp. 406-18.

Pohl, Walter, 'Telling the Difference: Signs of Ethnic Identity', in Thomas F.X. Noble (ed.), *From Roman Provinces to Medieval Kingdoms* (New York: Routledge, 2006), pp. 120–167.

Pohl, Walter, and Gerda Heydemann (eds.), *Strategies of Identification: Ethnicity and Religion in Early Medieval Europe* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2013).

Pohl, Walter, and Helmut Reimitz (eds.), *Strategies of Distinction: The Construction of Ethnic Communities, 300-800* (Leiden: Brill, 1998).

Prego, Augusto, 'La inscripción de *Comitiolus* del Museo Municipal de Arqueología de Cartagena', in Josep Gurt and Núnia Tena (eds.), *V Reunió de Arqueologia Cristiana Hispànica: Cartagena, 16-19 d'abril de 1998* (Barcelona: Institut d'Estudis Catalans, 2000), pp. 383-92.

Prinz, Friedrich, *Frühes Mönchtum in Frankenreich: Kultur und Gesellschaft in Gallien, den Rheinlanden, und Bayern am Beispiel der monastischen Entiwcklung (4. bis 8. Jahrhundert)* (Munich: Oldenbourg, 1965).

Pucci, Joseph (ed.), *Poems to Friends* (Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing, 2010).

Quirós Castillo, Juan Antonio, and Santiago Castellanos (eds.), *Identidad y etnicidad en Hispania: Propuestas teóricas y cultura material en los siglos V-VIII*, Documentos de Arqueología Medieval 8 (Bilbao: Universidad del País Vasco, 2015).

Ramallo Asensio, Sebastian F., 'Carthago Spartaria: un núcleo bizantino en Hispania', in Gisela Ripoll and Josep María Gurt (eds.), *Sedes regiae (ann. 400-800)* (Barcelona: Reial Acadèmia de Bones Lletres, 2000), pp. 579-612.

Ramallo Asensio, Sebastian F., and Jaime Vizcaíno Sánchez, 'Bizantinos en Hispania: Un problema en la arqueología española', *Archivo español de arqueología* 75 (2002), pp. 313–332.

Redfield, James, 'Herodotus the Tourist', in Thomas Harrison (ed.), *Greeks and Barbarians* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2001), pp. 24-49.

Reimitz, Helmut, 'The Art of Truth: Historiography and Identity in the Frankish World', in Richard Corradini, Rob Meens, Christina Pössel, and Philip Shaw (eds.), *Texts and Identities in the Early Middle Ages*, Forschungen zur Geschichte des Mittelalters 12 (Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2006), pp. 87–104.

Reimitz, Helmut, 'Cultural Brokers of a Common Past: History, Identity and Ethnicity in Merovingian Historiography', in Walter Pohl and Gerda Heydemann (eds.), *Strategies of Identification: Ethnicity and Religion in Early Medieval Europe* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2013), pp. 257-302.

Reimitz, Helmut, *History, Frankish Identity, and the Framing of Western Ethnicity, 550-850* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015).

Reimitz, Helmut, 'The Providential Past: Visions of Frankish Identity in the Early Medieval History of Gregory of Tours' Historiae (6th – 9th cent.)', in Walter Pohl, Clemens Gantner, and Richard Payne (eds.), *Visions of Community in the Post-Roman World: The West, Byzantium, and the Islamic World, 300-1100* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2012), pp. 109-35.

Reimitz, Helmut, 'Social Networks and Identities in Frankish Historiography: New Aspects of the Textual History of Gregory of Tours' *Historiae',* in Richard Corradini, Max Diesenberger, and Helmut Reimitz (eds.), *The Construction of Communities in the Early Middle Ages* (Leiden: Brill, 2003), pp. 229–68.

Renan, Ernest, *Qu'est-ce qu'une nation?: Conférence faite en Sorbonne, le 11 mars 1882* (Paris: Calmann Lévy, 1882), http://fr.wikisource.org/wiki/Qu%E2%80%99est-ce_qu%E2%80%99une_nation_%3F.

Reynolds, Susan, 'Our Forefathers? Tribes, Peoples, and Nations in the Historiography of the Age of Migrations', in Alexander C. Murray (ed.), *After Rome's Fall: Narrators and Sources of Early Medieval History: Essays Presented to Walter Goffart* (Buffalo: University of Toronto Press, 1998), pp. 17-36.

Riché, Pierre, *Education and Culture in the Barbarian West, Sixth Through Eighth Centuries* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1976).

Ripoll López, Gisela, 'On the Supposed Frontier Between the *Regnum Visigothorum* and Byzantine *Hispania',* in Walter Pohl, Ian Wood, and Helmut Reimitz (eds.), *The Transformation of Frontiers from Late Antiquity to the Carolingians* (Leiden: Brill, 2000), pp. 95–115.

Rivers, Theodore John (ed.), *Laws of the Salian and Ripuarian Franks* (New York: AMS Press, 1986).

Roberts, Michael, *The Humblest Sparrow: The Poetry of Venantius Fortunatus* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2009).

Romeny, Bas ter Haar, 'Ethnicity, Ethnogenesis, and the Identity of Syriac Orthodox Christians', in Walter Pohl, Clemens Gantner, and Richard Payne (eds.), *Visions of Community in the Post-Roman World: The West, Byzantium, and the Islamic World, 300-1100* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2012), pp. 183-204.

Rouche, Michel, *L'Aquitaine des Wisigoths aux Arabes, 418-781: Naissance d'une région* (Paris: Editions de l'Ecole des hautes études en sciences sociales, 1979).

Rouche, Michel, 'Fortunat et Baudonivie: deux biographes pour une seule sainte', in Robert Favreau (ed.), *La vie de sainte Radegonde par Fortunat* (Paris: Seuil, 1995), pp. 239-49.

Rouche, Michel, 'Francs et gallo-romains chez Grégoire de Tours', in R. Morghen (ed.), *Gregorio di Tours* (Todi: Accademia tudertina, 1977), pp. 141–69.

Ruggini, Lellia Cracco, 'Ebrei e orientali nell'Italia settentrionale fra il IV e il VI secolo d. cr.', *Studia et documenta historiae iuris* 25 (1959), pp. 186–308.

Sánchez-Albornoz, Claudio, 'El aula regia y las asembleas políticas de los Godos', in *Estudios Visigodos* (Rome: Instituto storico italiano per il Medio Evo, 1971), pp. 151–250.

Sánchez-Albornoz, Claudio, *España, un enigma histórico* (Buenos Aires: Editorial Sudamericana, 1956).

Sánchez-Albornoz, Claudio, 'España y el Islam', *Revista de occidente* 7, no. 70 (1929), pp. 1-30.

Sánchez-Albornoz, Claudio, *El Reino de Asturias: orígenes de la nación española. Estudios críticos sobre la historia del Reino de Asturias (selección)*, 2nd ed. (Oviedo: IDEA, 1983).

Sayas Abengochea, Juan José, and Luis A. García Moreno, *Romanismo y germanismo: el despertar de los pueblos hispánicos (siglos IV-X)* (Barcelona: Editorial Labor, 1981).

Scheibelreiter, Georg, 'Ein Gallorömer in Flandern: Eligius von Noyon', in Walter Pohl (ed.), *Die Suche nach den Ursprüngen: von der Bedeutung des frühen Mittelalters*, Forschungen zur Geschichte des Mittelalters 8 (Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2004), pp. 45–84, pp. 117-28.

Schlinkert, Dirk, *'Ordo Senatorius' und 'Nobilitas': Die Konstitution des Senatsadels in der Spätantike* (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1996).

Schmidt-Wiegand, Ruth, 'Das Dorf nach den Stammesrechten des Kontinents', in H. Jankuhn (ed.), *Das Dorf der Eisenzeit und des frühen* Mittelalters (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1977), pp. 408–43.

Schwarcz, Andreas, 'Visigothic Settlement, Hospitalitas, and Army Payment Reconsidered', in Ralph W. Mathisen and Danuta Shanzer (eds.), *Romans, Barbarians, and the Transformation of the Roman World: Cultural Interaction and the Creation of Identity in Late Antiquity* (Burlington: Ashgate, 2011), pp. 265–70.

Séjourné, Paul, *Le dernier père de l'église: Saint Isidore de Séville. Son rôle dans l'histoire du droit canonique* (Paris: Gabriel Beauchesne, 1929).

Selle-Hosbach, Karin, *Prosopographie merowingischer Amtsträger in der Zeit von 511 bis 613* (Bonn: Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität, 1974).

Sieyès, Emmanuel Joseph, *Qu'est-ce que le tiers-état?*, 3rd ed. (Paris: n.p., 1789).

Sivan, Hagith, 'The Appropriation of Roman Law in Barbarian Hands: "Roman-Barbarian" Marriage in Visigothic Gaul and Spain', in Walter Pohl and Helmut Reimitz (eds.), *Strategies of Distinction: The Construction of Ethnic Communities, 300-800* (Leiden: Brill, 1998), pp. 189–203.

Sivan, Hagith, 'Why Not Marry a Barbarian? Marital Frontiers in Late Antiquity (The Example of *CTh* 3.14.1)', in Ralph W. Mathisen and Hagith Sivan (eds.), *Shifting Frontiers in Late Antiquity* (Brookfield, VT: Variorum, 1996), pp. 136-45.

Smith, Julia, 'Early Medieval Hagiography in the Late Twentieth Century', *EME* 1, no. 1 (1992), pp. 69-76.

Smith, Anthony D., *The Antiquity of Nations* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2004).

Smith, Anthony D., *The Ethnic Origins of Nations* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1986).

Smith, Anthony D., *The Nation in History: Historiographical Debates About Ethnicity and Nationalism* (Hanover, NH: University Press of New England, 2000).

Sowerby, Richard, 'The Lives of St Samson: Rewriting the Ambitions of an Early Medieval Cult', *Francia* 38 (2011), pp. 1–31.

Steinacher, Roland, 'Who is the Barbarian? Considerations on the Vandal Royal Title', in Walter Pohl and Gerda Heydemann (eds.), *Post-Roman Traditions: Christian and Barbarian Identities in the Early Medieval West* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2013), pp. 437-86.

Stocking, Rachel L., *Bishops, Councils, and Consensus in the Visigothic Kingdom, 589-633* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2000).

Stocking, Rachel, 'Early Medieval Christian Identity and Anti-Judaism: The Case of the Visigothic Kingdom', *Religion Compass* 2 (2008), pp. 642-58.

Stroheker, Karl F., 'Die Senatoren bei Gregor von Tours', in *Germanentum und Spätantike* (Zurich: Artemis Verlag, 1965), pp. 192-206.

Stroheker, Karl F., *Der senatorische Adel im spätantiken Gallien* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1970).

Stroheker, Karl F., 'Spanische Senatoren der spätrömischen und westgotischen Zeit', in *Germanentum und Spätantike* (Zurich: Artemis Verlag, 1965), pp. 55–87.

Szövérffy, J., 'À la source de l'humanisme chrétien medieval: Romanus et "Barbarus" chez Vénance Fortunat', *Aevum* 45, no. 1 (1971), pp. 77-86.

Tardi, Dominique, *Fortunat: étude sur un dernier représentant de la poésie latine dans la Gaule mérovingienne* (Paris: Boivin, 1927).

Teillet, Suzanne, *Des goths à la nation gothique: Les origines de l'idée de nation en Occident du Ve au VIIe siècle* (Paris: Belles Lettres, 1984).

Thompson, E. A., 'The Conversion of the Visigoths to Catholicism', *Nottingham Medieval Studies* 4 (1960), pp. 4–35.

Thompson, E. A., *The Goths in Spain* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1969).

Thorpe, Lewis (trans.), *History of the Franks* (London: Penguin, 1974).

Vallejo Girvés, Margarita, *Bizancio y la España tardoantigua (ss. V-VIII): un capítulo de historia mediterránea* (Alcalá de Henares: Universidad de Alcalá de Henares, 1993).

Vallejo Girvés, Margarita, '*Commentiolus, Magister Militum Spaniae missus a Mauricio Augusto contra hostes barbaros*: The Byzantine Perspective on the Visigothic Conversion to Catholicism', *Romanobarbarica* 14 (1996), pp. 289–306.

Vallejo Girvés, Margarita, 'Desencuentros entre el emperador Justiniano y las iglesias hispanas', in Josep Gurt and Núnia Tena (eds.), *V Reunió de Arqueologia Cristiana Hispànica: Cartagena, 16-19 d'abril de 1998* (Barcelona: Institut d'Estudis Catalans, 2000), pp. 573-84.

Van Dam, Raymond, *Leadership and Community in Late Antique Gaul* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985).

van der Essen, Léon, *Étude critique et littéraire sur les vitae des saints mérovingiens de l'ancienne Belgique* (Louvain: Bureaux du recueil, 1907).

Velázquez, Isabel, 'Jural Relations as an Indicator of Syncretism from the Law of Inheritance to the *Dum inlicita* of Chindaswinth', in Peter Heather (ed.), *The Visigoths from the Migration Period to the Seventh Century: An Ethnographic Perspective* (San Marino: Boydell & Brewer, 1999), pp. 225–70.

Velázquez, Isabel, '*Pro patriae gentisque Gothorum statu*', in Hans-Werner Goetz, Jörg Jarnut, and Walter Pohl (eds.), *Regna and Gentes: The Relationship Between Late Antique and Early Medieval Peoples and Kingdoms in the Transformation of the Roman World* (Leiden: Brill, 2003), pp. 161–217.

Vizcaíno Sánchez, Jaime, *La presencia bizantina en Hispania (siglos VI-VII): La documentación arqueológica* (Murcia: Universidad de Murcia, 2009).

Wallace-Hadrill, J.M., *The Fourth Book of the Chronicle of Fredegar: With its Continuations* (London: Nelson, 1960).

Wallace-Hadrill, J. M., 'Fredegar and the History of France', in *The Long-Haired Kings, and Other Studies in Frankish History* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1982), pp. 71-94.

Wallace-Hadrill, J. M., *The Long-Haired Kings, and Other Studies in Frankish History* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1982).

Ward-Perkins, Bryan, *The Fall of Rome and the End of Civilization* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005).

Wenskus, Reinhard, *Stammesbildung und Verfassung: Das Werden der Frühmittelalterlichen Gentes* (Cologne: Böhlau, 1961).

Werner, K.F., 'Important Noble Families in the Kingdom of Charlemagne', in Timothy Reuter (ed.), *The Medieval Nobility* (Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing, 1978), pp. 137-202.

Westeel, Isabelle, 'Quelques remarques sur la *Vita Eligii*, vie de Saint Éloi', *Mélanges de science religieuse* 56, no. 2 (1999), pp. 33-47.

Wickham, Chris, *Framing the Early Middle Ages: Europe and the Mediterranean, 400-800* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005).

Wolf, Kenneth Baxter (ed.), *Conquerors and Chroniclers of Early Medieval Spain*. 2nd ed., Translated Texts for Historians (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1999).

Wolfram, Herwig, 'Auf der Suche nach der Ursprüngen', in Walter Pohl (ed.), *Die Suche nach den Ursprüngen: von der Bedeutung des frühen Mittelalters*, Forschungen zur Geschichte des Mittelalters 8 (Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2004), pp. 11–22.

Wolfram, Herwig, 'Gothic History as Historical Ethnography', in Thomas F.X. Noble (ed.), *From Roman Provinces to Medieval Kingdoms* (New York: Routledge, 2006), pp. 43-69.

Wolfram, Herwig, *Gotische Studien: Volk und Herrschaft im frühen Mittelalter* (Munich: C.H. Beck, 2005).

Wolfram, Herwig, *History of the Goths* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988).

Wolfram, Herwig, 'How Many Peoples are in a People?', in Walter Pohl, Clemens Gantner, and Richard Payne (eds.), *Visions of Community in the Post-Roman World: The West, Byzantium, and the Islamic World, 300-1100* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2012).

Wolfram, Herwig, 'Neglected Evidence on the Accommodation of Barbarians in Gaul', in Walter Pohl (ed.), *Kingdoms of the Empire: The Integration of Barbarians in Late Antiquity* (Leiden: Brill, 1997), pp. 181–4.

Wolfram, Herwig, '"Origo et religio": Ethnic Traditions and Literature in Early Medieval Texts', *EME* 3 (1994), pp. 19–38.

Wolfram, Herwig, *The Roman Empire and Its Germanic Peoples* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997).

Wood, Ian, 'Barbarians, Historians, and the Construction of National Identities', *JLA* 1, no. 1 (2008), pp. 61–81.

Wood, Ian, 'Chains of Chronicles: The Example of London, British library MS. Add. 16974', in Richard Corradini and Maxmilian Diesenberger (eds.), *Zwischen Niederschrift und Wiederschrift: Frühmittelalterliche Historiographie und Hagiographie im Spannungsfeld von Edition und Kompendienüberlieferung*, Forschungen zur Geschichte des Mittelalters 18 (Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2010), pp. 67-77.

Wood, Ian, 'Conclusion: Strategies of Distinction', in Walter Pohl and Helmut Reimitz (eds.), *Strategies of Distinction: The Construction of Ethnic Communities, 300-800* (Leiden: Brill, 1998), pp. 297–303.

Wood, Ian, 'Deconstructing the Merovingian Family', in Richard Corradini, Max Diesenberger, and Helmut Reimitz (eds.), *The Construction of Communities in the Early Middle Ages* (Leiden: Brill, 2003), pp. 149-71.

Wood, Ian, 'Defining the Franks: Frankish Origins in Early Medieval Historiography', in Thomas F.X. Noble (ed.), *From Roman Provinces to Medieval Kingdoms* (New York: Routledge, 2006), pp. 110-19.

Wood, Ian, 'The Ecclesiastical Politics of Merovingian Clermont', in Patrick Wormald, Donald Bullough, and Roger Collins (eds.), *Ideal and Reality in Frankish and Anglo-Saxon Society: Studies Presented to J.M. Wallace-Hadrill* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1983), pp. 34–57.

Wood, Ian, 'Ethnicity and Ethnogenesis of the Burgundians', in Herwig Wolfram and Walter Pohl (eds.), *Typen der Ethnogenese unter besonder Berücksichtigung der Bayern* (Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1990), pp. 53–69.

Wood, Ian, 'Fredegar's Fables', in Anton Scharer and Georg Scheibelreiter (eds.), *Historiographie im frühen Mittelalter* (Vienna: Oldenbourg, 1994), pp. 359-66.

Wood, Ian, '*Gentes*, Kings, and Kingdoms—the Emergence of States: The Kingdom of the Gibichungs', in Hans-Werner Goetz, Jörg Jarnut, and Walter Pohl (eds.), *Regna and Gentes: The Relationship Between Late Antique and Early Medieval Peoples and Kingdoms in the Transformation of the Roman World* (Leiden: Brill, 2003), pp. 243-69.

Wood, Ian, *Gregory of Tours* (Bangor: Headstart History, 1994).

Wood, Ian, 'Gregory of Tours and Clovis', *Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire* 63, no. 2 (1985), pp. 249-72.

Wood, Ian, *The Merovingian Kingdoms, 450-751* (London: Longman, 1994).

Wood, Ian, *The Modern Origins of the Early Middle Ages* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013).

Wood, Ian, 'The Secret Histories of Gregory of Tours', *Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire* 71, no. 2 (1993), pp. 253-70.

Wood, Ian, 'Social Relations in the Visigothic Kingdom from the Fifth to the Seventh Century: The Example of Mérida', in Peter Heather (ed.), *The Visigoths from the Migration Period to the Seventh Century: An Ethnographic Perspective* (San Marino: Boydell & Brewer, 1999), pp. 191–207.

Wood, Ian, 'The Term "barbarus" in Fifth-, Sixth-, and Seventh-Century Gaul', *Zeitschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Linguistik* 41 (2011), pp. 39-50.

Wood, Ian, 'The Use and Abuse of the Early Middle Ages, 1750-2000', in Marios Costambeys, Andrew Hamer, and Martin Heale (eds.), *The Making of the Middle Ages: Liverpool Essays* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2007), pp. 36–53.

Wood, Jamie, 'Defending Byzantine Spain: Frontiers and Diplomacy', *EME* 18, no. 3 (2010), pp. 292–319.

Wood, Jamie, *The Politics of Identity in Visigothic Spain: Religion and Power in the Histories of Isidore of Seville* (Leiden: Brill, 2012).

Wood, Jamie, '*Religiones* and *gentes* in Isidore of Seville's *Chronica maiora*', in Walter Pohl and Gerda Heydemann (eds.), *Post-Roman Traditions: Christian and Barbarian Identities in the Early Medieval West* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2013), pp. 125-68.

Wood, Jamie, and Javier Martínez Jiménez, 'New Directions in the Study of Visigothic Spain', *History Compass* 14 (2016), pp. 29-38.

Woodruff, Jane Ellen, 'The *Historia epitomata* (Third Book) of the *Chronicle* of Fredegar: An Annotated Translation and Historical Analysis of Interpolated Material', Ph.D. diss. (University of Nebraska-Lincoln, 1988).

Woolf, Greg, *Tales of the Barbarians: Ethnography and Empire in the Roman West* (Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2011).

Worchel, Stephen, et al., 'A Multidimensional Model of Identity: Relating Individual and Group Identities to Intergroup Behaviour', in *Social Identity Processes*, ed. by Dora Capozza and Rupert Brown (London: Sage, 2000), pp. 15–32.

Wormald, Patrick, 'The *Leges Barbarorum*: Law and Ethnicity in the Post-Roman West', in Hans-Werner Goetz, Jörg Jarnut, and Walter Pohl (eds.), *Regna and Gentes: The Relationship Between Late Antique and Early Medieval Peoples and Kingdoms in the Transformation of the Roman World* (Leiden: Brill, 2003), pp. 21–53.

[1] Wolfram, 'Gothic History', p. 52; Teillet, *Des goths,* p. 553; Claude, 'Remarks', pp. 127-9.

[2] Hall, *Inventing the Barbarian*; Hall, *Hellenicity*; Harrison (ed.), *Greeks and Barbarians*, esp. chs. 1, 4, and 11.

[3] Geary, *Myth*, pp. 49-52. For the classical dichotomy between Roman and barbarian, see Ferris, *Enemies of Rome*; Woolf, *Tales of the Barbarians*.

[4] Geary, *Myth*.

[5] Wood, 'National Identities'; Wood, 'Use and Abuse'; Wood, *Modern Origins*; Geary, *Myth.*

[6] Goffart, 'Impinge', pp. 22–3; Wood, 'National Identities', pp. 64–5; Geary, *Myth*, pp. 20–21; Boulainvilliers, *Essais sur la noblesse de France*; Montesquieu, *The Spirit of the Laws*, books 30–31, pp. 619–722.

[7] Sieyès, *Qu'est-ce que le tiers-état?*, esp. pp. 10-15, 104-112.

[8] On nationalism in the early modern world, see Armstrong, *Nations Before Nationalism*; Anderson, *Imagined Communities*; Smith, *Ethnic Origins of Nations*; Smith, *Nation in History*; Smith, *Antiquity of Nations*; Gellner, *Nations and Nationalism*; Hobsbawm (ed.), *Invention of Tradition*; Reynolds, 'Our Forefathers?'

[9] Fichte, *Addresses to the German Nation*, esp. pp. 52-71 and 108-129; Geary, *Myth*, pp. 24-6.

[10] Grimm, *Kleinere Schriften*, vol. 7, pp. 557-566 and 573-581; Herder, *Outlines of a Philosophy*, pp. 172-6, 188-93; Arndt, 'Des Deutschen Vaterland', pp. 7-8; Wood, 'National Identities', pp. 73–4.

[11] Fustel de Coulanges, *Questions historiques*, pp. 1-16, 505-12.

[12] Renan, *Qu'est-ce qu'une nation?*

[13] Dahn, *Das Kriegsrecht*; Leerssen, *National Thought in Europe*, pp. 122–3. Interest in an Aryan or Nordic race also increased during the century, although not along national lines.

[14] Lamprecht, 'Über Belgien'; Wood, 'National Identities', pp. 73–6.

[15] Pirenne, *Mohammed and Charlemagne*; Bachrach, 'Pirenne and Charlemagne'. On Pirenne's wartime experiences, see Pirenne, *Souvenirs de captivité*.

[16] Dopsch, *Economic and Social Foundations*.

[17] Linehan, 'Religion, Nationalism, and National Identity', pp. 161–99; Davies, 'The Early Middle Ages and Spanish Identity'; Grieve, *Eve of Spain*, esp. pp. 29–31, 232; Hillgarth, *The Visigoths*; Payne, 'Visigoths and Asturians Reinterpreted'; González Fernández, 'El mito gótico', pp. 289–300.

[18] *Chronicle of Alfonso III*, pp. 114, 126; *Chronicle of Albelda*, p. 174. For continued Gothic identification in the Muslim-ruled south, see Ibn al-Qūṭīya, *History*, esp. pp. 22-4; Christys, *Christians in Al-Andalus*, pp. 181-3; Barceló, 'Els "Hispani"', pp. 189-90. García Moreno, 'Spanish Gothic Consciousness', pp. 303–24, overstates the case.

[19] Hillgarth, *The Visigoths*, pp. 172-6; Grieve, *Eve of Spain*, pp. 28-31; Castellanos, *Los godos y la cruz*, pp. 15-19.

[20] Grieve, *Eve of Spain*, p. 28; Menéndez Pelayo, *Historia*, vol. 3, pp. 832-5.

[21] Hillgarth, *The Visigoths*, pp. 174-5; Linehan, 'Religion, Nationalism, and National Identity', pp. 163-4, 198; Grieve, *Eve of Spain*, p. 30; Sánchez-Albornoz, *España, un enigma histórico*, pp. 122-39; Sánchez-Albornoz, *El Reino de Asturias*, pp. 75-116. Despite his nationalism, Sánchez-Albornoz joined the republican cause and was exiled to Argentina when Franco won the Spanish civil war: Linehan, *Past and Present in Medieval Spain*, pp. 12-19.

[22] Menéndez Pidal*, Los españoles en la historia*, p. 120.

[23] Castro, 'Los visigodos no eran aún españoles', pp. 1–3. The debate between Sánchez-Albornoz and Castro is discussed in detail in Lapeyre, 'Deux interpretations', pp. 1015-37; Hillgarth, 'Spanish Historiography and Iberian Reality'. See also, Sánchez-Albornoz, 'España y el Islam', pp. 1-30.

[24] Barbero and Vigil, *Sobre los orígenes*.

[25] Besga Marroquín, *Orígenes hispanogodos*.

[26] Höfler, *Kultische Geheimbünde*; Höfler, 'Das germanische Kontinuitätsproblem', pp. 1–26; Wood, 'National Identities', pp. 76–7; Herder, *Outlines of a Philosophy*, p. 421; Murray, 'Reinhard Wenskus', pp. 39–68; Fehr, 'Volkstum as Paradigm', p. 182. Even Engels, *Origin of the Family*, pp. 186-7, 192, portrayed the Germans as rescuing Rome.

[27] Kossinna, *Die Herkunft der Germanen*; Curta, 'From Kossinna to Bromley'; Fehr, 'Volkstum as Paradigm', esp. p. 184; Härke, 'Archaeologists and Migrations', esp. pp. 267–8. Archaeologists have generally been slower to move past ethnic ascription than historians have moved beyond essentialism. For recent examples, see Bierbrauer,

'Zur ethnischen Interpretation'; Bierbrauer, 'Archäologie und Geschichte'; Kazanski, 'The Ostrogoths'; Kazanski, *Les Goths*; Brogiolo, 'Towns, Forts, and the Countryside'.

28 Fehr 'Volkstum as Paradigm', pp. 184-97; Halsall, 'Reihengräberzivilisation'.

29 Härke, 'All Quiet on the Western Front?', pp. 205–6; Wood, 'National Identities', p. 77.

30 For examples of French reactions to German invasion in World War II, see Piganiol, *L'empire chrétien*, pp. 465-6; Courcelle, *Histoire littéraire*, p. 255; Loyen, 'Résistants et collaborateurs', pp. 437-50. Also, Wood, 'National Identities', pp. 78–9; Ward-Perkins, *The Fall of Rome*, pp. 173–4; Goffart, *Barbarian Tides*, p. 231.

31 For a good overview, see Halsall, *Barbarian Migrations*, pp. 14-19. On rare occasions, older views were defended as containing still-useful elements, such as in Chadwick, *Nationalities of Europe*, pp. 50–90.

32 Wenskus, *Stammesbildung und Verfassung*; Wolfram, *The Roman Empire and Its Germanic Peoples*; Wolfram, *History of the Goths*; Wolfram, '"Origo et religio"', pp. 19–38; Wolfram, 'Auf der Suche nach der Ursprüngen', pp. 11–22; Wolfram, 'How Many Peoples are in a People?'; Murray, 'Reinhard Wenskus'; Wood, *Modern Origins*, pp. 299-301, 313. For the ancient world, Hall, *Ethnic Identity in Greek Antiquity*, and *Hellenicity*, follows a similar model.

33 Pohl, 'Telling the Difference', pp. 122-3; Pohl, 'Response', pp. 221-40; Pohl, 'Conceptions', esp. pp. 16-17, 21-2.

34 Anderson, *Imagined Communities*; Barth (ed.), *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries*; Eriksen, *Ethnicity and Nationalism*, pp. 10–12, 18, 47, 60.

35 Geary, 'Situational Construct'.

36 Geary, 'Barbarians and Ethnicity', esp. pp. 108-10.

37 Jones, *Archaeology of Ethnicity*, esp. pp. 82-110, 130-31. See also Brather, 'Ethnic Identities as Constructions'; Halsall, 'Ethnicity and Early Medieval Cemeteries'; Halsall, *Cemeteries and Society*; Effros, *Merovingian Mortuary Archaeology*.

38 Curta, 'Remarks', pp. 162, 165–7, 178–81, 184–5; Curta, 'review of Sebastian Brather, Ethnische Interpretationen', p. 91; Curta, 'From Kossinna to Bromley'.

39 Curta, *Making of the Slavs*. See also his critiques of ethnic ascription in Curta, 'From Kossinna to Bromley'. Walter Pohl has made similar inroads with the Avars: Pohl, 'A Non-Roman Empire'.

40 Most recently, see the contributions to Quirós Castillo and Castellanos (eds.), *Identidad y etnicidad en Hispania*.

41 Goffart was born to a Belgian diplomat and fled Europe ahead of Nazi occupation. As Ian Wood has noted, the parallel between his experience and Pirenne's is striking, though it is of course hard to know to what degree Goffart's Belgian heritage and childhood experiences have influenced his scholarship. Murray, 'Introduction: Walter André Goffart', pp. 3-7; Wood, *Modern Origins*, p. 314.

42 Goffart, *Barbarians and Romans*.

43 Goffart, 'Rome's Final Conquest', p. 860.

44 Murray, 'Reinhard Wenskus'.

45 Gillett, 'Was Ethnicity Politicized?', pp. 85–122; Gillett, 'Ethnogenesis: A Contested Model', pp. 241–260; Gillett, 'Introduction'. A student of Wolfram has now done a study of Vandal titles that is far more discerning: Steinacher, 'Who is the Barbarian?'

46 Quotation from Kulikowski, 'Nation versus Army', p. 74. See also Murray, 'Reinhard Wenskus', p. 58.

47 Halsall, *Barbarian Migrations*, pp. 457-62; Pohl, 'Response', pp. 224-5.

48 For example, as noted by Kulikowski, 'Nation versus Army', pp. 72-3: Heather, 'The Huns'; Heather, *The Goths*, p. 6; Heather, 'Disappearing and Reappearing Tribes'; Heather, 'The Creation of the Visigoths', p. 84.

49 For evaluations of the tone of these critiques, see Curta, 'Remarks', p. 160; Wood, 'National Identities', p. 79; Wood, *Modern Origins*, p. 314; Halsall, *Barbarian Migrations*, pp. 17-18; Pohl, 'Response', pp. 222, 239; Noble, *From Roman Provinces*, p. 91; Cusack, 'review of Andrew Gillett (ed.), *On Barbarian Identity*', pp. 228–9; Heather, 'Ethnicity', pp. 33–6. Wolfram, *Gotische Studien*, p. 11.

50 Cusack, 'review of Andrew Gillett (ed.), *On Barbarian Identity*', p. 228; Murray, 'Reinhard Wenskus', pp. 55-7. See also Goffart, *Barbarian Tides*, pp. 51–2; Goffart, 'Impinge', p. 31; Goffart, 'Two Notes'; Wood, 'National Identities', p. 79.

51 Pohl, 'Response'; Wood, *Modern Origins*, p. 314; Romeny, 'Syriac Orthodox Christians', p. 187; Pohl, 'Introduction: Ethnicity, Religion, and Empire', p. 4.

52 Reimitz, *Frankish Identity*, p. 5; Geary, 'Situational Construct'; Pohl, 'Response', p. 238.

[53] Pohl, 'Introduction—Strategies of Identification', pp. 4, . 50; Halsall, *Barbarian Migrations*, pp. 38-9, 473-4; Worchel, 'A Multidimensional Model', esp. pp. 15, 17-18, 32.

[54] For discussion of this concept using the example of Roman identity, see Pohl, 'Romanness: A Multiple Identity and its Changes', pp. 406-7, 414-16; Pohl, 'Introduction—Strategies of Identification', pp. 23-4; Pohl, 'Christian and Barbarian Identities', pp. 27-34; Pohl, 'Introduction: Ethnicity, Religion, and Empire', pp. 7-8.

[55] For explanations and examples of this methodology, see the recent special issue of *Early Medieval Europe* on 'Being Roman After Rome': 22, no. 4 (2014); the volumes stemming from major international projects led and co-edited by Pohl: *Visions of Community*, *Strategies of Identification*, and *Post-Roman Transitions*; Gantner, McKitterick, and Meeder (eds.), *Resources of the Past*; Reimitz, *Frankish Identity*.

[56] Wood, *Politics of Identity*; Reimitz, *Frankish Identity*; Heydemann, 'Biblical Israel'.

[57] Pohl and Heydemann (eds.), *Strategies of Identification*, and underlying it and developing the idea in slightly different ways, the earlier Pohl and Reimitz (eds.), *Strategies of Distinction*.

[58] Pohl, 'Introduction—Strategies of Identification'; Reimitz, *Frankish Identity*; Heydemann, 'Biblical Israel'; Maskarinec, 'Who Were the Romans?'

[59] Pohl, 'Introduction—Strategies of Identification'. Among the sociological perspectives he draws on, perhaps the most helpful are Brubaker, *Ethnicity without Groups*; Jenkins, *Rethinking Ethnicity*. See also, Banks, *Ethnicity: Anthropological Constructions*; Cornell and Hartmann, *Ethnicity and Race*; de Vos, 'Ethnic Pluralism'; Jenkins, *Social Identity*.

[60] Pohl, 'Introduction—Strategies of Identification', p. 2.

[61] Pohl attempted a criteria list in 'Telling the Difference', and Anthony D. Smith did so in *Ethnic Origins of Nations*, pp. 22-30. For his current stance, see Pohl, 'Introduction—Strategies of Identification', pp. 6-7.

[62] Reimitz, *Frankish Identity*, is the most sustained monographic account of this model.

[63] [cross-ref]

[64] [cross-ref]

[65] [cross-ref]

[66] [cross-ref]

[67] See *EME* 22, no. 4 (2014), for both discussion of the reasons for this and studies seeking to fill the scholarly gap.

[68] A broad overview of the material presented in this section has already appeared in Buchberger, 'Growth of Gothic Identity'. For a good recent overview of the current state of historical and archaeological scholarship on Visigothic Spain, see Wood and Martínez Jiménez, 'New Directions.'

[69] For a more detailed account of events, see Collins, *Visigothic Spain*; Sayas Abengochea and García Moreno, *Romanismo y Germanismo*; and the older, but still useful Claude, *Adel, Kirche und Königtum*, and Thompson, *Goths in Spain*. On the Ostrogoths, see Díaz and Valverde, 'Goths Confronting Goths', pp. 353-86.

[70] Kulikowski, *Late Roman Spain*, pp. 277-86, makes a good case for the independence of many cities and minimal Visigothic control in the peninsula before Leovigild's time. See also Collins, 'Mérida and Toledo', p. 202. On the conflict with Hermenegild, see Hillgarth, 'Coins and Chronicles', pp. 483-508.

[71] Kulikowski, *Late Roman Spain*, pp. 285-6; John of Biclar, *Chronica*, pp. 212-15.

[72] On Reccopolis, see Olmo Enciso, *Recópolis: un paseo*; Olmo Enciso, 'Royal Foundation', esp. pp. 181, 192. Other imperial imagery appears on his coins, for which, see Hillgarth, 'Coins and Chronicles'; Miles, *Coinage of the Visigoths*; McCormick, *Eternal Victory*, pp. 317–20; García Moreno, 'Prosopography, Nomenclature, and Royal Succession', p. 146.

[73] *VSPE* V.12, pp. 92-3; John of Biclar, *Chronica*, p. 218; Stocking, *Bishops, Councils, and Consensus*; Díaz and Valverde, 'Theoretical Strength', p. 75; Gallego Blanco, 'Los concilios', p. 738; Geary, 'Barbarians and Ethnicity', p. 127. On Reccared as a unifier, see Castellanos, *Los godos y la cruz*.

[74] Heather and Matthews, *The Goths in the Fourth Century*, pp. vii, 124-32.

[75] *DVI* 31, p. 151.

[76] [cross-ref to later, where discussed in more detail.]

[77] Wolf, *Conquerors and Chroniclers*, p. 1, Galán Sánchez, *El género historiográfico*, pp. 81-2.

[78] On the chronicle genre, see Galán Sánchez, *El género historiográfico*; Burgess, *Chronicle of Hydatius*, pp. v-vi; Humphries, 'Chronicle and Chronology', pp. 155–175.

[79] Hillgarth, 'Historiography in Visigothic Spain', p. 267, proposed that the overbalance of events in the empire's favour before 579, and in Spain's after this date, means he began writing while in Constantinople. However, it may simply reflect John's greater knowledge of events which occurred while he lived in each location. See also Galán Sánchez, 'La *Chronica* de Juan de Bíclaro', p. 53; Velázquez, '*Pro patriae*', p. 175. Collins, *Visigothic Spain*, p. 51, observes that Maurice is said to live 20 years (until 602), which John couldn't have known in 590.

[80] Álvarez García, 'Tiempo, religión, y política', p. 11.

[81] John of Biclar*, Chronica*, p. 212; Galán Sánchez, 'La *Chronica* de Juan de Bíclaro', p. 57.

[82] John of Biclar*, Chronica*, pp. 212-13.

[83] Ibid. p. 213.

[84] Ibid. p. 214.

[85] Ibid. p. 216.

[86] Ibid. p. 215.

[87] Ibid. p. 217.

[88] Ibid. p. 213.

[89] Ibid. p. 212.

[90] Ibid. p. 216.

[91] Ibid. pp. 214, 217.

[92] Ibid. p. 213.

[93] Ibid. p. 212.

[94] Ibid. p. 213. For earlier Córdoban defiance against Agila, see *HGVS* 45, p. 285.

[95] John of Biclar, *Chronica*, p. 215.

[96] The *Life* of Aemilian (San Millán de la Cogolla, d. c. 573) tells of a 'senate' in the region before Leovigild's time: *Vita Aemiliani* 33/26, pp. 38-9. See also Castellanos, 'Astures, Cantabri, and Vascones', esp. pp. 493-5; Castellanos, *Poder social*, pp. 40-52; Díaz, 'City and Territory', pp. 20-23; Kulikowski, *Late Roman Spain*, pp. 303-7; Barbero and Vigil, *Sobre los orígenes*, pp. 33-67.

[97] John of Biclar, *Chronica*, pp. 212, 220. On ethnic identity and armies, see Heather, *The Goths*, p. 69; Kulikowski, 'Nation versus Army'.

[98] John of Biclar, *Chronica*, p. 215.

[99] *LV* IX, 2, 8: 'aliqua infestatio inimicorum in provincias regni nostri se ingerit, dum nostris hominibus, qui in confinio externis gentibus adiunguntur …'; Wolf, *Conquerors and Chroniclers*, p. 68; Claude, 'Remarks', p. 124.

[100] This is similar to the *consensus omnium* showing universal support of all peoples for a ruler. [cross-ref to below]

[101] John of Biclar, *Chronica*, p. 216.

[102] For conflict, see the letter from Braulio of Zaragoza, on behalf of all bishops in Spain, to Pope Honorius, no. 21, in Riesco Terrero (ed.), *Epistolario*. On Leander and Gregory, see the letter from King Reccared to Gregory, in Vives (ed.), *Concilios*, p. 145; Gregory the Great, *Dialogi* III.31, vol. 2, pp. 384-5; Barlow, *Iberian Fathers* 62, p. 178. See further Lacarra, 'La iglesia visigoda', pp. 353–84.

[103] John of Biclar, *Chronica*, p. 218.

[104] Ibid.

[105] Ibid.

[106] Ibid. p. 219.

[107] Stocking, *Bishops, Councils, and Consensus*, p. 27.

[108] Wood, *Politics of Identity*, pp. 4-6, 68-73; Collins, 'Isidore, Maximus, and the *Historia Gothorum*', pp. 345-58; Merrills*, History and Geography*, pp. 179-85; On the two redactions of the *Chronicle*, see the critical edition by Martín and further commentary by Koon and Wood, 'The *Chronica Maiora*'.

[109] *DVI* 28, p. 149: 'genitus patre Severiano, Carthaginiensis provinciae Hispanie'.

[110] Leander of Seville, *De institutione virginum*, p. 124; Wolf, *Conquerors and Chroniclers*, p. 12; Barlow, *Iberian Fathers* 62, p. 175. Proof of their presence in the city of Cartegena comes from an inscription at a local convent: Inscription no. 362, in Vives (ed.), *Inscripciones*, p. 126.

[111] Wolf, *Conquerors and Chroniclers*, p. 12.

[112] On Isidore's focus on unity under the Goths, see Wood, *Politics of Identity*; Merrills, *History and Geography*, p. 38.

[113] Teillet, *Des goths*; Fontaine, *Isidore de Seville: genèse*, p. 88, Collins, *Early Medieval Spain*, p. 60

[114] *DVI* 27, p. 149; 31, p. 152.

[115] *HGVS* 54, p. 290. For Byzantines' perception of their own Roman identity, see Greatrex, 'Roman Identity'.

[116] [cross-ref to next chapter for more detail?]

[117] *HGVS* 49, p. 287; Isidore, *Chronicle*, p. 196.

[118] *HGVS* 51, p. 288; 45, p. 285.

[119] In *HGVS* 49, p. 287, Leovigild brings them under the rule of 'his people'. In the *Chronicle*, pp. 198-9, they come under the rule of 'Leovigild, king of the Goths'.

[120] *HGVS* 98-9, p. 303.

[121] *HGVS* 39 and 41, p. 283.

[122] *HGVS* 48-9, p. 286.

[123] *HGVS* 36, p. 281; *DVI* 17, p. 143, and 20, p. 145.

[124] *HGVS* 98-9, p. 303, and Isidore, *Chronicle*, p. 196; *DVI* 22, p. 146; *HGVS* 83, p. 299.

[125] *HGVS* 36, p. 281; 40, p. 283; 37, p. 282; 41, p. 284.

[126] *HGVS* 41, p. 284.

[127] *HGVS* 46, p. 289; 42, p. 284.

[128] *HGVS* 54, pp. 289-90.

[129] *HGVS* 49-52, pp. 286-9.

[130] *HGVS* 52-3, p. 289; *DVI* 28, p. 149.

[131] Paul the Deacon writes similarly about the Byzantines in Lombard Italy, though he does use 'Roman' for a few other purposes too. See Maskarinec, 'Who Were the Romans?', esp. p. 333; Ghosh, *Writing the Barbarian Past*, p. 149.

[132] Martínez Díez and Rodríguez's *La colección canónica Hispana* has edited them up through Toledo XV (688), with vol. 1 an introduction to the text and manuscripts, and vols. 4-6 containing the Spanish councils. Others can be found in the older edition: Vives, *Concilios*. See also Stocking, *Bishops, Councils, and Consensus,* pp. 15-16, 35-6, on this collection and on the history of the conciliar tradition, and Orlandis, 'La problemática conciliar', pp. 277–306.

[133] Stocking, *Bishops, Councils, and Consensus*, pp. 1-25; Evans Grubbs, *Law and Family*, pp. 77-8.

[134] Toledo III, in *CCH*, vol. 5, p. 50.

[135] Ibid. p. 58.

[136] Ibid. pp. 75-7, 98-9.

[137] Ibid. p. 76-7.

[138] Ibid. pp. 80-82.

[139] Fredegar, *Chronicle* IV.8, p. 125.

[140] Toledo III, in *CCH*, vol. 5, pp. 108, 110, 122, for examples of each.

[141] [cross-ref to its mention w/Clovis in GoT]

[142] The edition by Maya Sánchez includes a more thorough analysis of all the manuscripts of the text than previous editors, though the commentary in Garvin's 1946 edition is still useful. For a good English translation, see Fear, *Lives of the Visigothic Fathers*.

[143] Garvin, *Vitas sanctorum*, p. 1. On his promotion of Eulalia, see *VSPE* p. 101.

[144] Garvin, *Vitas sanctorum*, pp. 3-4; *VSPE*, p. lv.

[145] *VSPE*, Preface, p. 4; Arce, 'The City of Mérida (*Emerita*)', pp. 5, 14. In general on Mérida, see Collins, 'Mérida and Toledo'; Wood, 'Social Relations'.

[146] Castellanos, *La hagiografía visigoda*, esp. p. 356; Castellanos, 'Significance of Social Unanimity', pp. 392-3. Generally on hagiography, see Delehaye, *Legends of the Saints*; Dubois and Lemaitre, *Sources et methods*; Fouracre and Gerberding, *Late Merovingian France*, pp. 27–45; Fouracre, 'Merovingian History and Merovingian Hagiography'; Smith, 'Early Medieval Hagiography', p. 70; Philippart, 'Latin Hagiography', pp. 111–29.

[147] *VSPE* IV.1, p. 25.

[148] *VSPE* IV.3, p. 31.

[149] The presence of these Greeks in Mérida has been the subject of much speculation, some of it rather far-fetched. See Séjourné, *Le dernier père de l'église*, pp. 223-4; Collins, 'Mérida and Toledo', p. 202; Wood, 'Social Relations', p. 194; Arce, 'Mérida (Emerita)', pp. 12-13.

[150] Vives (ed.), *Inscripciones*, pp. 141-6, 173; Jorge, 'Church and Culture in Lusitania', p. 109; Orlandis, *Historia del reino visigodo español*, p. 202.

[151] Koder, 'Byzanz, die Griechen und die Romaiosyne', p. 104; Kaldellis, *Hellenism*, pp. 173-4; Harrison, *Greeks and Barbarians*, pp. 267-8; Pohl, 'Conceptions', p. 21.

[152] Council of Narbonne 4 and 14, ed. Vives, in *Concilios*, pp. 147, 149; Orlandis and Ramos-Lissón, *Historia de los concilios*, p. 232.

[153] Orlandis, *Historia del reino visigodo español*, p. 201; Jorge, 'Church and Culture in Lusitania', pp. 108-11.

[154] [cross-ref to chapter 3 law, where I discuss it more, with examples.] The literature on Jews in medieval Spain is extensive, but the most useful sources for this particular discussion are Drews, *The Unknown Neighbour*; González-Salinero, 'Catholic Anti-Judaism', pp. 123-50.

[155] Salvian of Marseille, *De gubernatione Dei* IV.xiv[69], pp. 49-50; *Historiae* X, p. 519 [cross-ref to GoT chapter]; Ruggini, 'Ebrei e orientali', p. 188.

[156] These are also among Gregory of Tours' most common chosen means of identification in his writing. [cross-ref to GoT chapter.]

[157] *VSPE* IV.2, p. 26.

[158] Castellanos, 'Social Unanimity', p. 404.

[159] The literature on the senatorial aristocracy is extensive. On the late Roman empire, see Arnheim, *Senatorial Aristocracy*; Barnish, 'Transformation and Survival', pp. 120-55; Jones, *The Later Roman Empire*, pp. 523–62; Matthews, *Western Aristocracies*; Näf, *Senatorisches Standesbewusstsein*; Schlinkert, *'Ordo Senatorius'*, especially pp. 171–88, 210–19. On the Visigothic kingdoms, see Claude, *Adel, Kirche und Königtum*; Stroheker, 'Spanische Senatoren'.

[160] *VSPE* IV.2, p. 30; IV.5, pp. 35-6.

[161] *VSPE* V.2, p. 48: 'genere quidem Gothus, sed mente promtissima erga Deum devotus'.

[162] *VSPE* V.14, p. 100. For other examples of Goths converting to Catholicism, though misinterpreted as proof that contemporaries did not see religion and ancestry as linked, see Koch, 'Arianism'.

[163] *VSPE* V.4, p. 54: 'wisegotorum rex'; V.9, p. 79; Maya, 'De Leovigildo perseguidor'.

[164] *VSPE* V.4, p. 55; V.6, p. 63.

[165] *VSPE* V.4, p. 55.

[166] *VSPE* V.5, pp. 56-7.

[167] Alonso Campos, 'Sunna, Masona, y Nepopis'

[168] Collins, '¿Dónde?', p. 215.

[169] *VSPE* V.9, p. 79.

[170] *VSPE* V.4, p. 55; V.9, p. 79: 'totusque Wisegotorum gens'. Wolf, *Conquerors and Chroniclers*, p. 92, n. 193 notes that this account follows that of Gregory the Great's *Dialogues* 3.31 closely.

[171] *VSPE* V.9, p. 80. See also Castellanos, *Los godos y la cruz*, pp. 153-8.

[172] *VSPE* V.12, pp. 92-3. See also *Histories* IX.15, p. 430.

[173] *VSPE* V.10, p. 81.

[174] *VSPE* V.10, pp. 81-5.

[175] *VSPE* V.11, p. 87.

[176] *VSPE* V.9, p. 80.

[177] *VSPE* V.10, p. 83.

[178] John of Biclar, *Chronica,* p. 218; *HGVS* 54, pp. 289-90. See also Orlandis, 'Los hispano-romanos en la aristocracia', pp. 189–96. [cross-ref to later comparison of accounts.]

[179] Gregory the Great, *Registrum Epistolarum*, IX.230, vol. 2, pp. 226-7.

[180] Collins, '¿Dónde?', p. 215; Collins, 'Mérida and Toledo', p. 211. Contra, Thompson, 'Conversion of the Visigoths', p. 30. For Leander's exile, see *DVI* 28, pp. 149-50.

[181] Godoy and Villela, 'De la fides góthica', p. 126; Thompson, 'Conversion of the Visigoths', p. 30. For claims to the contrary, see Muhlberger, 'War, Warlords, and Christian Historians', pp. 92-3; Velázquez, '*Pro patriae*', p. 177.

[182] Collins, '¿Dónde?', p. 215.

[183] Thompson, *The Goths in Spain*, p. 40.

[184] Thompson, 'Conversion of the Visigoths', p. 7.

[185] Collins, '¿Dónde?', pp. 216. Curiously, Manuel Koch's attempts to disprove such equations result in a similar conclusion that Claudius' Roman label must refer to his religion, not his ancestry: *Ethnische Identität*, p. 292.

[186] Orlandis, 'Problemas canónicos, p. 319. Jorge, 'Church and Culture in Lusitania', p. 105, likewise makes Masona leader of the 'Hispano-Romans'. See also Teillet, *Des goths*, pp. 553-4; Alonso Campos, 'Sunna, Masona, y Nepopis', p. 155.

[187] Wood, 'Conclusion: Strategies of Distinction', p. 302, notes that the correlation of Arianism with Visigothic ethnic self-identification rarely stands up to scrutiny.

[188] John of Biclar, *Chronica*, p. 218.

[189] *HGVS* 54, pp. 289-90.

[190] Aherne, 'Late Visigothic Bishops'.

[191] Wood, *Politics of Identity*, esp. pp. 1-2, 6-7, 142; Merrills, 'Comparative Histories', p. 38.

[192] Wood, *Politics of Identity*, p. 2.

[193] Wood, *Politics of Identity*; Merrills, *History and Geography*; Fontaine, *Isidore de Seville: genèse*; Fontaine, *Isidore de Seville et la culture classique*; Collins, 'Isidore, Maximus, and the *Historia Gothorum*'.

[194] For the structure and timing of each, see Wood, *Politics of Identity*, pp. 4-6, 72-3; *HGVS*, ed. Rodriguez Alonso, *Las historias*, pp. 24-57; Collins, 'Isidore, Maximus, and the *Historia Gothorum*'.

[195] du Quesnay Adams, 'Hispano-Gothic Historians', p. 5; Merrills, *History and Geography*, pp. 185-96.

[196] *HGVS*, p. 267.

[197] Fontaine, *Isidore de Séville et la culture classique*, pp. 816-17. Other examples include Teillet, *Des goths*, pp. 3-6; Menéndez Pidal, *Historia de España III*, pp. xxxv-xxxvi.

[198] Hillgarth, 'Historiography in Visigothic Spain', pp. 298-9; Hillgarth, 'review of Suzanne Teillet, *Des goths à la nation gothique*'.

[199] Computation: *HGVS* 65, pp. 293-4.

[200] *HGVS* 67, p. 294; 70, p. 295.

[201] Merrills, *History and Geography*, pp. 197-9. See also Furtado, 'From *gens* to *imperium*', p. 409; Pohl, 'Aux origines', pp. 199-200; Isidore of Seville, *Etymologies* IX.2.63, IX.2.89.

[202] Redfield, 'Herodotus the Tourist', p. 45; Burns, *Rome and the Barbarians*, p. 65; Hartog, *Mirror of Herodotus*, pp. 3-4.

[203] Herodotus, *Histories* I.215, I.201; Redfield, 'Herodotus the Tourist', p. 42.

[204] Merrills, *History and Geography*, pp. 120-21; Wood, '*Religiones* and *gentes*', p. 153.

[205] *HGVS* 1, p. 172.

[206] *HGVS* 61, p. 291.

[207] *HGVS* 62, p. 292.

[208] *HGVS* 59, p. 291; 63, pp. 292-3.

[209] *HGVS* 58, p. 291.

[210] *HGVS* 59, p. 291; 61, p. 291.

[211] Isidore, *Chronicle*, pp. 204-5.

[212] *HGVS* 62, p. 292; Isidore, *Chronicle*, p. 205.

[213] Isidore, *Chronicle*, pp. 204-5. See also Hen, 'A Visigothic King', p. 98.

[214] *Epistolae Wisigothicae* 9, p. 671.

[215] See generally Vallejo Girvés, *Bizancio y la España tardoantigua*; Ramallo Asensio and Vizcaíno Sánchez, 'Bizantinos en *Hispania*'; Vizcaíno Sánchez, *La presencia bizantina en Hispania*.

[216] Vallejo Girvés, *Bizancio y la España tardoantigua,* pp. 126, 144, 290-91. Isidore did mention Roman troops in connection with Sagontia, making it a probable candidate for a Byzantine-controlled city.

[217] Kulikowski, *Late Roman Cities*. [cross-ref to GoT section on Roman cities.]

[218] Ripoll López, 'Frontier', pp. 95-115. For a recent counterargument to Ripoll's, which suggests a greater expanse but without fortified boundaries, see Wood, 'Defending Byzantine Spain'.

[219] Procopius, *Buildings* 8.14-16.

220 Inscription no. 362, ed. J. Vives, in *Inscripciones*, p. 126; Prego, 'La inscripción de Comitiolus', p. 387; Vallejo Girvés, '*Commentiolus*', pp. 289–306; Ramallo Asensio, 'Carthago Spartaria'; Ripoll López, 'Frontier', pp. 103-5. Other possible Byzantine holdings include Algeciras, Málaga, Asidona, Basti, and Alicante: Martínez Jiménez and Moreno Narganes, '*Nunc autem a Gothis subversa*'.

221 García Moreno, 'The Creation of Byzantium's Spanish Province', p. 115; García Moreno, 'La imagen de Bizancio', pp. 32–48.

222 Wood, *Politics of Identity*, pp. 192, 213; García Moreno, 'La imagen de Bizancio', pp. 37-9; Herrin, *Formation of Christendom*, pp. 240-43. Isidore, *Chronicle* 385, for example. On Isidore's focus on older rather than current Byzantine doctrine, see Wood, '*Religiones* and *gentes*', pp. 142-6. Generally on Justinian and Iberian churches, see Vallejo Girvés, 'Desencuentros'.

223 González-Salinero, 'Catholic Anti-Judaism', pp. 123-4; Wood, *Politics of Identity*, p. 196. On Jews in the Visigothic kingdom, see Bachrach, *Early Medieval Jewish Policy*, pp. 3-26; Stocking, 'Early Medieval Christian Identity and Anti-Judaism', pp. 642-58; Gil, 'Judios y cristianos'.

224 *HGVS* 60, p. 291.

225 *LV* 12.2.13-14, pp. 418-23.

226 Drews, *The Unknown Neighbour*, pp. 16-17.

227 Isidore, *Contra Judaeos* 2.5; Wood, *Politics of Identity*, pp. 195-6.

228 Toledo IV 57-66, in *CCH*, vol. 5, pp. 235-42.

229 Orlandis and Ramos-Lissón, *Historia de los concilios*, p. 289; Drews, *The Unknown Neighbour*, pp. 7-32. On forced conversion as a continued concern, see Stocking, *Bishops, Councils, and Consensus*, pp. 138, 153-6; González-Salinero, 'Catholic Anti-Judaism', pp. 146-7.; and Braulio, Letter 21, which states Iberian bishops' concerns to Pope Honorius.

230 Toledo VI 3 and 18, in *CCH*, vol. 5, pp. 304-7, 328; González-Salinero, 'Catholic Anti-Judaism', p. 124; Jorge, 'Church and Culture in Lusitania', p. 110. I will address the problem of Jews within the narrative of Catholic Goths in greater detail in Buchberger, 'Gothic Identity and the "Othering" of Jews'.

231 Toledo IV, in *CCH*, vol. 5, p. 178.

232 Toledo IV 75, in *CCH*, vol. 5, p. 259: 'conroboret Christi gloria regnum illius gentisque Gothorum in fide catholica'.

233 Toledo IV 75, in *CCH*, vol. 5, pp. 252-4: 'Quiquumque igitur a nobis vel totius Spaniae populis qualibet coniuratione vel studio sacramentum fidei suae, quod patriae gentisque Gothorum statu vel observatione regiae salutis pollicitus est ...'

234 Velázquez, '*Pro patriae*', pp. 187, 200-202.

235 Martin, 'La notion de *gens*', p. 88.

236 Stocking, *Bishops, Councils, and Consensus*, pp. 148-9, 152.

237 Toledo VII 1, in *CCH*, vol. 5, pp. 340-43.

238 Toledo VIII, in *CCH*, vol. 5, p. 375.

239 Collins, *Visigothic Spain*, pp. 80-81.

240 Toledo V, in *CCH*, vol. 5, p. 282.

241 Toledo VI 17, in *CCH*, vol. 5, pp. 326-7: 'genere Gothus et moribus dignis'.

242 Teillet, *Des goths,* p. 553: 'une discrimination de naissance ou d'origine'. Liebeschuetz, 'Goths and Romans', also uses a black and white definition of Gothicness that leads him to see a distinction between Goths and Romans here, and, unconvincingly, to the end of the seventh century. See also the examples from the discussion of Ervig's ancestry below. [cross-ref]

243 Claude, 'Remarks', pp. 127-9.

244 *Chronicle of Alfonso III*, p. 116.

245 Claude, 'Remarks', pp. 128-9.

246 Orlandis, *Semblanzas visigodas*, p. 142; Heather, *The Goths,* p. 289.

247 Collins, *Visigothic Spain*, p. 82; *LV* II, 1, 8, pp. 53-7.

248 This was probably not its original title, as the earliest manuscript of it, dating to the eighth century, calls it the *Liber Iudiciorum*: see Karl Zeumer, preface to *LV*, p. xix. The nature of cooperation between the two kings on this code has been debated, but given the massive extent of the project and the overlap of their reigns, it is far more

likely that the final product was the work of both kings together rather than a revision of an entirely separate code issued by Chindaswinth only a few years earlier, as suggested by King, 'King Chindasvind'. See Braulio, Letters 37 and 38, for hints of this, and Lynch, *St Braulio*, pp. 135-40.

[249] For the context of Ervig's recension, see King, *Law and Society*, p. 19.

[250] *LV* II, 1, 11, pp. 58-9: 'Nullus prorsus ex omnibus regni nostri preter hunc librum, qui nuper est editus, adque secundum seriem huius amodo translatum, librum legum pro quocumque negotium iudici offerre pertemtet'. See Wormald, '*Leges Barbarorum*', p. 37, for Roman precedent for destroying all prior law books.

[251] d'Ors, *El Código*, pp. 3-4; Lowe (ed.), *Codices latini antiquiores*, vol. 5, no. 626; Collins, 'Law and Ethnic Identity', p. 4.

[252] Merêa, *Estudos*, p. 247; d'Ors, *El Código*, pp. 9-10.

[253] Liebeschuetz, 'Citizen Status', p. 143.

[254] d'Ors, *El Código*, pp. 4-6. See also Harries, 'Not the Theodosian Code', pp. 39–51.

[255] Collins, 'Law and Ethnic Identity', pp. 6-7; *LV* II, 1, 11, pp. 58-9. Gustav Haenel's edition presents a number of manuscript variations in a useful column format: *Lex Romana Visigothorum* (abbreviated *BA*).

[256] Mousourakis, *A Legal History of Rome*, pp. 180-182, explains why and how the *Theodosian Code* was assembled. As no copies of this code survive in full, the *Breviary* is our best example of much of this older text; Theodor Mommsen and Paul Meyer used it for the bulk of their edition of the *Theodosian Code* (*Codex Theodosianus*). On the date of the interpretations, see Matthews, 'Interpreting the *Interpretationes*', p. 14. See also Mathisen and Sivan, 'Forging a New Identity', p. 58; Matthews, 'Roman Law and Barbarian Identity', p. 36.

[257] Sivan, 'Appropriation', p. 195; Peter Heather and Mayke de Jong in discussion of Velázquez, 'Jural Relations', pp. 262-3; King, *Law and Society*, pp. 10-11; Nixon, 'Relations Between Visigoths and Romans', pp. 64–74.

[258] Mathisen and Sivan, 'Forging a New Identity', p. 58.

[259] *HGVS* 51, p. 288: 'In legibus quoque ea quae ab Eurico incondite constituta videbantur correxit, plurimas leges praetermissas adiciens, plerasque superfluas auferens'.

[260] Merêa, *Estudos*, p. 247. For the idea that the *Codex Revisus* never existed, see García Gallo, 'Consideración crítica', pp. 381-2, 395-400.

[261] King, *Law and Society*, p. ix; Koon and Wood, 'Unity from Disunity', pp. 803-4.

[262] *LV* X, 2, 1, p. 391 (*CE* 277, p. 20).

[263] There has been significant debate about whether the so-called *hospitalitas* system involved allotments of land or of tax revenue, with Walter Goffart and Jean Durliat favouring the latter: Goffart, *Barbarians and Romans*; Durliat, 'Le salaire de la paix sociale'; and 'Cité, impôt, et intégration des barbares'. J.H.W.G. Liebeschuetz provides a good summary of their positions followed by his own in 'Cities, Taxes, and the Accommodation of the Barbarians'. See also Wolfram, 'Neglected Evidence', pp. 181-4; Barnish, 'Taxation, Land, and Barbarian Settlement'; Schwarcz, 'Visigothic Settlement', pp. 265-70.

[264] *LV* X, 3, 5, pp. 398-9 (*CE* 276, p. 20).

[265] *LV* X, 1, 8, p. 385; X, 1, 9, p. 386; and X, 1, 16, p. 389, thought to correspond to Euric's very fragmentary 301-4, pp. 30-31.

[266] *CE* 312, p. 34, corresponding to *LV* V, 4, 20, pp. 225-6; See also d'Ors, *El Código*, p. 247.

[267] Liebeschuetz, 'Goths and Romans', p. 92; Thompson, *Goths in Spain*, pp. 58-9

[268] Sivan, 'Appropriation' provides an excellent discussion of the intermarriage ban.

[269] Sivan, 'Appropriation', p. 191.

[270] *Codex Theodosianus* III, 14, 1: 'Nulli provincialium, cuiuscunque ordinis aut loci fuerit, cum barbara sit uxore coniugium, nec ulli gentilium provincialis femina copuletur'. The English translation is that of Clyde Pharr, *Theodosian Code*, translating *loci* as 'class'.

[271] Liebeschuetz, 'Citizen Status', p. 139.

[272] 'Quod si quae inter provinciales atque gentiles affinitates ex huiusmodi nuptiis exstiterint, quod in iis suspectum vel noxium detegitur, capitaliter expietur'.

[273] Liebeschuetz, 'Citizen Status', pp. 139-40; Sivan, 'Why Not Marry a Barbarian?', p. 139.

[274] Sivan, 'Appropriation', p. 192.

[275] *BA* III, 14, 1, p. 92: 'Nullus Romanorum barbaram cuiuslibet gentis uxorem habere praesumat, necque barbarorum coniugiis mulieres Romanae in matrimonio coniungantur'. Matthews, 'Interpreting the *Interpretationes*', p. 19.

[276] 'Quod si fecerint, noverint se capitali sententiae subiacere'. Liebeschuetz, 'Citizen Status', pp. 139-40.

[277] For examples and discussion, see Dahn, *Westgothische Studien*, pp. 15-17; Merêa, *Estudos*, p. 235; García Gallo, 'Nacionalidad y territorialidad', p. 199.

[278] Mathisen and Sivan, 'Forging a New Identity', p. 59

[279] Council of Agde 20(67), p. 228: 'quoniam non oportet cum omnibus hereticis miscere conubia, et vel filios vel filias dare, sed potius accipere, si tamen se profitentur christanos futuros esse catholicos'. Jiménez Garnica, 'El origin de la legislación civil visigoda', p. 744.

[280] Sivan, 'Appropriation', pp. 193-4; Beltrán Torreira, 'El concepto de barbarie', pp. 53–60. Similarly, in the Ostrogothic kingdom, Cassiodorus, *Variae* III.17, p. 88.

[281] Wood, 'Conclusion: Strategies of Distinction', p. 298. On Burgundy, see the examples in *Liber Constitutionem* LV.1-5, p. 90; Amory, 'Meaning and Purpose'; Wood, '*Gentes*, Kings, and Kingdoms'; Wood, 'Ethnicity and Ethnogenesis of the Burgundians'. [cross-ref to VF]

[282] Collins, *Visigothic Spain*, p. 44; Kulikowski, *Late Roman Spain*, p. 260; Procopius, *Wars* V.12.50-54. Sinticio's parents may also be an example: Vives (ed.), *Inscripciones* 86, pp. 31-2. For more examples, see Thompson, *Goths in Spain*, p. 59.

[283] Toledo IX 13-14, in *CCH*, vol. 5, pp. 507-8. See also Vives (ed.), *Concilios*, p. 304.

[284] *LV* XII, 2, 12-14, pp. 417-23.

[285] [cross-ref back to Isidore and Sisebut's forced conversion.]

[286] *Formulae wisigothicae* 2-6, pp. 72-6; Collins, *Visigothic Spain*, p. 244; Collins, '"*Sicut lex Gothorum continet*"', p. 495.

[287] 2 Seville, in Vives (ed.), *Concilios*, pp. 163-85; *Lex Ribuaria* LXI.1, pp. 108-9; Orlandis and Ramos-Lissón, *Historia de los concilios*, p. 254.

[288] For example, *BA* II, 23, 1, p. 60; IX, 19, 1, p. 192. See also Kulikowski, *Late Roman Spain*, p. 12.

[289] *BA* II, 1, 10, p. 34: 'Iudaei … qui Romani esse noscuntur'; Thompson, *Goths in Spain*, p. 165; Drews, 'Jews as Pagans?', p. 194; du Quesnay Adams, 'Ideology and the Requirements of Citizenship', pp. 317–32.

[290] This is contrary to Wolf Liebeschuetz's assertion that Roman citizenship ceased to have either practical or rhetorical significance by this time: 'Citizen Status', p. 152.

[291] *LV* XII, 2, 3-11 and 15-17, pp. 413-17, 423-6.

[292] *LV* II, 1, 8, pp. 53-4.

[293] [cross-ref back to last chapter]. For the possibility that this was related to Chindaswinth's treatment of his and his predecessors' *fideles*, see Collins, *Visigothic Spain*, pp. 81-3.

[294] *LV* III, 1, 5, p. 127.

[295] *LV* II, 1, 10, p. 58: 'sive Romanis legibus seu alienis institutionibus amodo amplius convexari'.

[296] Wolfram, *History of the Goths*, p. 195. For similar views, see also: Wallace-Hadrill, *Long-Haired Kings*, p. 39; Thompson, *Goths in Spain*, pp. 121-6; Stocking, *Bishops, Councils, and Consensus,* p. 76; Brunner, *Deutsche Rechtsgeschichte*, vol. 1, pp. 259-73, 320-32.

[297] King, *Law and Society*, p. 18; King, 'King Chindasvind'; King, 'Alleged Territoriality'. Other proponents include Thompson, *Goths in Spain*, pp. 121-6, 311-14; Brunner, *Deutsche Rechtsgeschichte*, vol. 1, pp. 259-73, 320-32; Guterman, *From Personal to Territorial Law*. Supporting personality of law at least to Leovigild's time are Wallace-Hadrill, *Long-Haired Kings*, p. 39; Stocking, *Bishops, Councils, and Consensus,* p. 76. More generally, see Collins, 'Law and Ethnic Identity'; Wormald, '*Leges Barbarorum*'; Lupoi, *The Origins of the European Legal Order*, pp. 388-403.

[298] On differences between Visigothic and Frankish law, see Wormald, '*Leges Barbarorum*', pp. 44-6; García Gallo, 'Nacionalidad y territorialidad', p. 169.

[299] *Liber Constitutionem* Preface 8, p. 32; *Lex Ribuaria* XXXV.5, p. 87. Schmidt-Wiegand, 'Das Dorf', pp. 408–43; Wood, *Merovingian Kingdoms*, p. 115; Amory, 'Meaning and Purpose', p. 20.

[300] López Amo Marín, 'La polemica en torno', p. 228.

[301] d'Ors, *El Código*, p. 6; Wormald, '*Leges Barbarorum*', pp. 27-8, 36.

302 Liebeschuetz, 'Citizen Status', pp. 142-3.

303 Other proponents of such a territorial view are Collins, 'Law and Ethnic Identity', p. 2; Collins, *Visigothic Spain*, pp. 225-6; García Gallo, 'Nacionalidad y territorialidad'; d'Ors, 'La territorialidad'.

304 Matthews, 'Interpreting the *Interpretationes*', pp. 11-32.

305 Liebeschuetz, 'Citizen Status', p. 142; Wolfram, *History of the Goths*, p. 196. Liebeschuetz presents this as the main flaw in personality theory.

306 Liebeschuetz, 'Citizen Status', pp. 143-4.

307 Velázquez, 'Jural Relations', p. 230; Humfress, *Orthodoxy and the Courts*, esp. pp. 65-7; Matthews, *Laying Down the Law*, p. 292.

308 *LV* IX, 2, 9, p. 377.

309 [cross-ref to VF and GoT]

310 Toledo XVI, in Vives (ed.), *Concilios*, p. 511. [cross-ref to 4T above.]

311 Council of Mérida, in Vives (ed.), *Concilios*, p. 327; Sánchez-Albornoz, 'El aula regia', p. 172. The one exception is Toledo XVI, p. 291.

312 Toledo XII, in Vives (ed.), *Concilios*, p. 384.

313 Toledo XV, in *CCH*, vol. 6, p. 391; Toledo XVII, in Vives (ed.), *Concilios*, p. 522.

314 Toledo X, in *CCH*, vol. 5, p. 519.

315 Toledo XIV, in *CCH*, vol. 6, pp. 277-9.

316 Toledo XIV, in *CCH*, vol. 6, p. 278.

317 Teillet, *Des goths*, p. 638; Fontaine, *Isidore de Séville et la culture classique*, p. 816.

318 Generally on Jews during this period, see King, *Law and Society*, pp. 131-44; du Quesnay Adams, 'Ideology and the Requirements of Citizenship'.

319 Toledo X, in *CCH*, vol. 5, p. 551.

320 *LV* XII, 3, 1-25, pp. 429-53; Toledo XII, in Vives (ed.), *Concilios*, p. 395.

321 *LV* XII, 2, 18, pp. 426-7, and 3, 24-25, pp. 452-3; Toledo XVII, in Vives (ed.), *Concilios*, p. 525; González Salinero, 'Catholic Anti-Judaism', p. 137.

322 King, *Law and Society*, p. 138; Elukin, *Living Together, Living Apart*.

323 On the greater proportion of people of Frankish descent in the north and descendants of Romans in the south, see Geary, *Before France and Germany*, p. 115; Halsall, 'Social Identities', pp. 145–6; Riché, *Education and Culture*, pp. 177–83; Rouche, *L'Aquitaine: Naissance d'une région*; Ewig, *Die Merowinger*, p. 54. On the *Lex Ribuaria*, see Wormald, '*Leges Barbarorum*'; Collins, 'Law and Ethnic Identity'; *Lex Ribuaria*.

324 More detailed overviews can be found in Wood, *Merovingian Kingdoms*; Geary, *Before France and Germany*.

325 Wood, 'Gregory of Tours and Clovis', suggests that Clovis may have converted to Arianism first; however, I do not find his argument conclusive.

326 On the eighth century, see Fouracre, *The Age of Charles Martel*; Gerberding, *Rise of the Carolingians*.

327 Wood, 'Secret Histories'.

328 Useful biographies of Gregory can be found in Wood, *Gregory of Tours*, p. 28; Heinzelmann, *Gregory of Tours*, pp. 29-35; and the introduction of Lewis Thorpe's translation, *History of the Franks*, pp. 7-16.

329 Kurth, *Études franques*, vol. 1, pp. 99–100; Rouche, 'Francs et gallo-romains', p. 141–69; Rouche, *L'Aquitaine: Naissance*, esp. p. 392. See also Van Dam, *Leadership and Community*, p. 180.

330 Wood, 'Secret Histories'; Breukelaar, *Historiography and Episcopal Authority*; Goffart, *Narrators*; Heinzelmann, *Gregory of Tours*; Reimitz, 'Cultural Brokers'; Mitchell and Wood (eds.), *The World of Gregory of Tours*, among many others.

331 On the purposes of the six-book recension, see below [cross-ref to Fredegar chapter, beginning of Book 3 section]. Goffart, 'From *Historiae* to *Historia Francorum*', pp. 257, 270, 273 n. 82; Reimitz, 'Social Networks'; Reimitz, *Frankish Identity*, pp. 127-65. It is worth noting that in French, it is typically called *Histoire des Francs*— and in the usual English translation by Lewis Thorpe it is *History of the Franks*—but the German translation is *Zehn Bücher Geschichten*. Goffart is not the first to suggest *Histories* as a title, as is evident by Krusch and Levison's choice of *Historiae* for the title of their edition, but he is the first to bring the idea widespread acceptance.

[332] Goffart, *Narrators,* especially pp. 165, 169; Goffart, 'Foreigners', pp. 283-4, 291. See also Breukelaar*, Historiography and Episcopal Authority*; Heinzelmann*, Gregory of Tours*, esp. pp. 202-9.

[333] Reimitz, *Frankish Identity*, esp. pp. 12, 51-7, 115-16, 447. For earlier comments on similar themes, see Reimitz, 'Cultural Brokers'; Reimitz, 'The Providential Past', pp. 114-17.

[334] *Historiae* X.31, p. 536; Goffart, 'From *Historiae* to *Historia Francorum*', p. 269; Reimitz, 'Social Networks', p. 231; Heinzelmann, *Gregory of Tours*, pp. 94-5, 97 n. 17, 100-101; Wood, *Gregory of Tours*, p. 57.

[335] James, 'Gregory', especially pp. 65–6. James was perhaps the first to emphasize this point, though it is unfortunately often forgotten beneath the shadow of this same piece's excellent charting of 'Frank'.

[336] For example, Ammianus Marcellinus' description of Silvanus: *Res gestae*, XV.5.16, vol. 1, p. 142. Goffart, 'Foreigners', pp. 282-4, has also noted Gregory's emphasis on city of origin.

[337] *Historiae* I.31, p. 24; *GC* 90, p. 355. [cross-ref to Gregory's family in next subsection.]

[338] *Historiae* II.26, p. 71; X.31, pp. 529-31; I.44, p. 28; II.13, p. 62.

[339] Wickham*, Framing*, p. 161; Näf*, Senatorisches Standesbewusstsein*, pp. 186–9, on Gregory's usage. On the senatorial aristocracy in Merovingian Gaul, and Gregory in particular, see Stroheker*, Der senatorische Adel*, pp. 113–15; Stroheker, 'Die Senatoren bei Gregor von Tours', pp. 192-206; Brennan, 'Senators and Social Mobility', pp. 145-161; Gilliard, 'The Senators of Sixth-Century Gaul', pp. 685-697.

[340] *GC* 41, pp. 323-4; *Historiae* II.11, pp. 60-61.

[341] *Histories* II.21, p. 67.

[342] *Histories* I.47, p. 30.

[343] *GC* 49, p. 327; 74, p. 342.

[344] *Historiae* II.9, pp. 57-8.

[345] *Historiae* X.31, pp. 526-8.

[346] *VP* XVI.1, p. 274.

[347] *Historiae* II.31, p. 77.

[348] *VP* XVIII.2, p. 285.

[349] *VP* IV.1, p. 224. Compare Victor of Vita, writing within Africa, who used 'Roman' to mean African-Romans generally, but not for any individual, yet used *Africanus* far more: *Victor of Vita: History of the Vandal Persecution*, Merrills and Miles, *The Vandals*, pp. 83–108; Conant, *Staying Roman*, pp. 189-92.

[350] *Historiae* II.11, p. 61. Some manuscripts have –os or –is, though –us is favoured by the *MGH* editors as more likely to represent Merovingian-era usage.

[351] *Historiae* II.27, p. 71. Fanning, 'Emperors and Empires in Fifth-Century Gaul', pp. 288-97, discusses the use of *rex Romanorum* here and elsewhere. See also MacGeorge, *Late Roman Warlords*, pp. 69–164; *PLRE* III, pp. 11-13.

[352] *Historiae* II.9, p. 58; II.18, p. 65; II.19, p. 65. According to Alexander C. Murray, *From Roman to Merovingian Gaul*, pp. 189-90, Gregory probably excerpted II.18-19 from now-lost annals of Angers.

[353] *Historiae* II.33, p. 81.

[354] *GC* 5, p. 301.

[355] *Historiae* II.9, pp. 57-8; II.20, p. 65; *VP* III.1, p. 223.

[356] *VP* IV.1, p. 224.

[357] *Historiae* II.33, p. 81.

[358] Loseby, 'Gregory's Cities', pp. 241-2; Lewis, 'Gallic Identity and the Gallic *Civitas*', pp. 69-82; Heather, *Empires and Barbarians*, p. 311; Goffart, 'Foreigners', pp. 282-4.

[359] For Gregory's family connections to the bishopric of Tours, see Mathisen, 'The Family of Georgius Florentius Gregorius'.

[360] *VP* VI preface, p. 230.

[361] *VP* VI.1, p. 230.

[362] *VP* XIV.3, p. 270. For biographies, see Heinzelmann, *Gregory of Tours*, pp. 11–22.

[363] *VP* VII.2, p. 238; VII.1, p. 237.

[364] *Historiae* IV.15, p. 147.

[365] *Historiae* X.31, p. 534.

[366] *Historiae* III.15, p. 112.

[367] *VP* VII.4, p. 689.

368 *Historiae* V.5, p. 201.

369 *VP* VIII.1, p. 691.

370 *Historiae* VI.11, p. 281. On the possibility that Gregory got the relationship wrong, or that Gundulf was born when his father was quite old, see Werner, 'Important Noble Families', pp. 154–5; Wickham, *Framing*, p. 172, n. 70.

371 Halsall, 'Social Identities', pp. 141–76, at p. 152; Brennan, 'Senators and Social Mobility', p. 156; Grahn-Hoek, 'Gundulf *subregulus*'. [cross-ref to personal names discussion in a few pages.]

372 *VP* IV.3, p. 225; *Histories* IV.35, p. 167. See also Wood, 'Ecclesiastical Politics', p. 48.

373 *VP* VI.4, p. 233.

374 *Historiae* IV.35, p. 167.

375 *Historiae* IV.35, p. 167; G. Kurth, *Études franques*, vol. 1, p. 233; Stroheker, *Der senatorische Adel*, p. 156, no. 68.

376 *Historiae* III.9, p. 106.

377 *Historiae* III.12, p. 108; *GM* 64, p. 91.

378 *Historiae* IV.46, p. 181; VI.7, p. 277; *PLRE* III, p. 481 (Felix 3).

379 *Historiae* VI.39, p. 310; X.31, p. 532.

380 *GM* 86, p. 96; Mathisen, 'PLRE II: Suggested Addenda', p. 371; Heinzelmann, 'Gallische Prosopographie, 260-527', p. 596.

381 *Historiae* X.31, p. 532; *PLRE* II, p. 483; Ebling, Jarnut, and Kampers, '*Nomen et gens*: Untersuchungen', p. 700. Two other examples not discussed in detail above are *Historiae* V.45, pp. 254-6 (Agricola), and VIII.39, p. 406 (Virus).

382 *Historiae* VIII.16, p. 383.

383 *VP* XX.1, p. 291; *Historiae* X.29, p. 522.

384 *Historiae* X.8, p. 489.

385 *Historiae* V.48, p. 257: 'prius videtur genus ac patriam Moresque ordiri'.

386 *Historiae* V.48-49, pp. 257-62.

387 *Historiae* IV.39, p. 170; IV.42, p. 174.

388 *Historiae* VII.47, p. 366; V.25, p. 231; *VP* XII.3, p. 263.

389 Ebling, Jarnut, and Kampers, 'Nomen et gens: Untersuchungen', use the circular logic of trying to determine whether using names to determine ancestry is a viable technique yet using this very technique within their proof. Further, see Haubrichs, 'Identität und Name'; Haubrichs, 'Typen der anthroponymischen'; Jarnut, '*Nomen et gens*'. See Amory, 'Names, Ethnic Identity, and Community', for an extreme counterapproach.

390 *Historiae* X.19, p. 513; *PLRE* III, p. 1095 (Romulfus 2). Romulf also appears in Flodoard of Reims, *Historia Remensis ecclesiae* II.4, pp. 140–41. [Cross-ref to VF chapter]

391 Lupus: *PLRE* III, pp. 798-9 (Lupus 1); Koebner, *Venantius Fortunatus*, pp. 30-31; Selle-Hosbach, *Prosopographie merowingischer Amtsträger* 139, pp. 127-8; and Pucci (ed.), *Poems to Friends*, p. 51. Magnulf: *PLRE* III, p. 804 (Magnulfus); Venantius Fortunatus, Poem 7.10, line 20. Johannes: Selle-Hosbach, *Prosopographie merowingischer Amtsträger* 126, p. 177. Romaric: Fox, *Power and Religion*, pp. 90-91; *Vita Romarici*.

392 Reimitz, *Frankish Identity*, pp. 210-12; Ebling, Jarnut, and Kampers, '*Nomen et gens*: Untersuchungen', pp. 697-9.

393 For discussion of mixed culture (or 'two-tier') naming, see Haubrichs, 'Typen der anthroponymischen', and 'Romano-germanische Hybridnamen'; and in connection with Lupus' family, Reimitz, *Frankish Identity*, p. 211.

394 I owe this idea to Wickham, as in *Framing*, p. 176. Going by two different names was not terribly remarkable. It was a common practice in the late Empire and many examples are recorded for Ostrogothic Italy. See *Historiae* VII.3, p. 327-8 for Vedast/Avius; Halsall, *Barbarian Migrations*, p. 469; Amory, *People and Identity*, pp. 355 (Ademunt qui et Andreas), 381 (Gundeberga qui et Nonnica), for example.

395 *Historiae* V.25, p. 232; VIII.32, pp. 400-401; IX.40, p. 466.

396 *Historiae* VI.15, p. 285. On the name Nonnichius, see Heinzelmann, *Bischofsherrschaft in Gallien*, p. 215 n. 131. Nonnichius also appears in Gregory of Tours, *Vita Martini*, p. 206.

397 Ebling, Jarnut, and Kampers, '*Nomen et gens*: Untersuchungen', pp. 698-9; Brennan, 'Senators and Social Mobility', p. 156.

[398] *Historiae* X.2, p. 482: 'Bodigysilus filius Mummolini Sessionici, et Evantius, filius Dinami Arelatensis, et hic Gripo genere Francus'; X.4, p. 487.

[399] *PLRE* III, p. 557.

[400] *PLRE* III, p. 454 (Evantius), pp. 429-30 (Dynamius 1 and 2); Stroheker, *Der senatorische Adel*, pp. 164-5, no. 108 (Dynamius).

[401] *PLRE* III, p. 236 (Bodegiselus 2), pp. 898-9 (Mummolenus 2); Goffart, 'Foreigners', p. 282 n. 17.

[402] Reimitz, *Frankish Identity*, p. 59.

[403] Halsall, 'Social Identities', pp. 166-7.

[404] Guyon, 'Grégoire de Tours et le Midi de la Gaule', pp. 27–34. Halsall, 'Social Identities', pp. 166-7, and James, 'Gregory', p. 60, suggest that for Franks, Gregory rarely knew city or parents.

[405] *Historiae* X.29, p. 524; IX.13, p. 428; V.7, p. 204, and *VP* XV.1, p. 271.

[406] On the Taifali in Gaul, see Wolfram, *History of the Goths*, pp. 237-9.

[407] James, *The Franks*, p. 8.

[408] *Historiae* IV.30, p. 163; VII.12, p. 333.

[409] *Historiae* V.26, p. 232.

[410] *Historiae* IV.40, p. 172.

[411] *Historiae* VIII.31, pp. 398-400.

[412] An example of the latter is monks of the monastery of St. Martin c. 573-574 warning hostile troops against crossing the river and looting their monastery by stating: 'O barbarians, do not cross over here', *Historiae* IV.48, p. 185. The only others are *VP* V.1, p. 277; *GC* 91, p. 356; *Historiae* VII.29, p. 347.

[413] We see this in *GM* 30, p. 56; 51, p. 74; *Historiae* VII.36, p. 357; X.31, p. 533; *VP* XVII.5, p. 282. James, 'Gregory', gives statistics on Gregory's usage of this particular phrase in his *Histories*. See also Goetz, '*Gens*, Kings, and Kingdoms: The Franks', p. 322.

[414] The latter is more frequent in the seventh century, but it did not become common until the Carolingian period. See Garipzanov, *The Symbolic Language of Authority*, p. 122. Examples of the former include Venantius Fortunatus, Poem Appendix 1, p. 275; and charters of Guntram from 585 and Childebert II from 596 in *Capitularia Merowingica*, pp. 11 and 15.

[415] *Historiae* VI.24, p. 291; VIII.37, p. 405; V preface, p. 193.

[416] *Historiae* IV.4, pp. 137-8; III.27, p. 124.

[417] *Historiae* X.27, pp. 519-20. See also Reimitz, *Frankish Identity*, p. 59, for them as a group within the society of the kingdom.

[418] *Historiae* IX.25, p. 445. As Helmut Reimitz has noted, the soldiers' shared responsibility for the wellbeing of the kingdom and people may have contributed to a sense of belonging to the Frankish people: Reimitz, *Frankish Identity*, p. 113.

[419] *Historiae* III.7, p. 103; IV.41, p. 174; V.41, p. 248; VI.40, p. 310.

[420] *Historiae* IV.41, p. 174; X.3, p. 483, for example. IX.25, p. 444, and IX.29, p. 447, employ both methods.

[421] *Historiae* VIII.30, p. 394; IX.7, p. 420; VI.2, p. 266. Additional examples: VI.45, p. 317; VIII.30, pp. 393-4.

[422] *Historiae* V.21, p. 229; V.12, pp. 206-7. Also VII.3, p. 328; VII.31, p. 350.

[423] *Historiae* VIII.15, p. 380.

[424] *Historiae* X.26, p. 519. On Syrian merchants in Gaul, see Devroey, 'Juifs et Syriens'.

[425] On Antioch: *Historiae* IV.40, p. 172.

[426] *Historiae* VIII.1, p. 370.

[427] Heinzelmann, *Gregory of Tours*, pp. 61-2. [cross-ref to Venantius Fortunatus on praise imagery.]

[428] Isidore of Seville, *Etymologies* IX.I.3: 'There are three sacred languages—Hebrew, Greek, and Latin—which are preeminent throughout the world'. Isidore himself may have seen Syrians as speaking Greek and Jews as speaking Hebrew (at least some of the time): IX.I.4-5 and IX.I.8-9.

[429] *Historiae* IV.8, p. 140; V.38, p. 245.

[430] *Historiae* VI.2, p. 267; *GM* 24, p. 52. The third is *GM* 78, p. 91, referring to a dispute in Agde in Septimania.

[431] Reimitz, *Frankish Identity*, pp. 59-60.

[432] An earlier version of this chapter has appeared in *Early Medieval Europe*.

[433] Tardi, *Fortunat*; Dill, *Roman Society in Gaul*, p. 377. See also Koebner, *Venantius Fortunatus*, p. 1; Pietri, 'Venance Fortunat et ses commanditaires', pp. 729-54, at p. 733, following Tardi; Pejenaute Rubio, 'En los confines de la Romanidad', pp. 383–427; Heikkinen, 'The Poetry of Venanatius Fortunatus', pp. 17-31.

[434] Most recently: Roberts, *The Humblest Sparrow*, esp. pp. 3-4; J. Pucci (ed.), *Poems to Friends*, esp. p. ix. For a recent comparison of Gregory and Fortunatus, writing within the same social context, see Reimitz, *Frankish Identity,* pp. 88-97.

[435] For late antique views of the Roman and the barbarian, see Elton, 'Defining Romans', pp. 126-35; Ladner, 'On Roman Attitudes', pp. 1–25; Mathisen and Shanzer (eds.), *Romans, Barbarians*; Heather, 'The Barbarian in Late Antiquity', pp. 234-58; Gillett, 'The Mirror of Jordanes', pp. 392-408; Lambert, 'The Barbarians', pp. 103–16; Wood, 'The Term "barbarus"', pp. 39-42; Conant, *Staying Roman*, pp. 3-9, 186-93; Jones, 'The Image of the Barbarian', pp. 378-87; Mathisen, *Roman Aristocrats*.

[436] On variation, see Pohl, 'Romanness: A Multiple Identity and its Changes', pp. 412-13; Pohl, 'Christian and Barbarian Identities', p. 39; Maskarinec, 'Who Were the Romans?', p. 310; Heydemann, 'Biblical Israel', pp. 143-208, esp. p. 146.

[437] Poem 7.8, vol. 2, p. 99, lines 49-50. Thorough information about Fortunatus' life and education can be found in M. Reydellet's introduction to his edition and translation *Poèmes*, at vol. 1, pp. vii–xxviii.

[438] [cross-ref back to Lupus in GoT chapter.]

[439] Selle-Hosbach, *Prosopographie merowingischer Amtsträger*, pp. 23–7, lists all dukes in this period by locale; and Lewis, 'The Dukes in the Regnum Francorum', pp. 381–410, discusses dukes' roles.

[440] On the reading of the poem, see George, 'Panegyric', p. 229; Koebner, *Venantius Fortunatus*, p. 27. How much people continued to follow classical allusions and understand tricks of rhyme and metre is uncertain: see Roberts, *The Humblest Sparrow*, p. 322; Auerbach, *Literary Language and Its Public*, p. 261.

[441] Poem 7.7, vol. 2, p. 94, lines 3-6. All references are to Reydellet's edition. George, 'Panegyric', p. 229, notes that this is part of the traditional sequence of topics in a eulogy.

[442] Menander Rhetor, *Speeches*.

[443] Poem 7.7, vol. 2, p. 96, line 45: 'antiquos animos Romanae stirpis adeptus / bella moves armis, iura quiete regis'. Compare to Cassiodorus, *Variae* 9.14.18.

[444] On panegyric, see MacCormack, 'Latin Prose Panegyrics', p. 145; Menander Rhetor, *Speeches*, pp. 85–93, 179–81; *Panegyrici Latini* IV.16, p. 361. Fortunatus also used *stirps* along with the term *genus* in poem 2.8 for Launebod, vol. 1, p. 62, line 27. Hoeflich, 'Between Gothia and Romania', p. 125, notes that he also often used it to describe royal lineage. For a definition, see Lewis and Short, *A Latin Dictionary*, p. 1761.

[445] [cross-ref to GoT chapter]

[446] [cross-ref to GoT chapter]

[447] Fortunatus also wrote an epitaph for two Ruricii which similarly highlighted good deeds and vague senatorial connections: Poem 4.5, vol. 1, pp. 135-6. On Leontius' possible family connections, see Brennan, 'Senators and Social Mobility', pp. 152–3; Heinzelmann, *Bischofsherrschaft in Gallien*, pp. 217–19; Mathisen, *Ruricius of Limoges and Friends*, p. 24. I follow Brennan, who is more cautious than Heinzelmann.

[448] *PLRE* III, p. 774 (Leontius 3), and p. 1042 (Placidina); Stroheker, *Der senatorische Adel*, p. 188, no. 219.

[449] Poem 1.15, vol. 1, p. 34, lines 15-18, 21-24, and 31-32. On the panegyric forms used, see George, 'Portraits of Two Merovingian Bishops', at pp. 191–4.

[450] Poem 4.10, vol. 1, p. 142, lines 7-8: 'quale genus Romae forte senatus habet'.

[451] Mathisen, *Ruricius of Limoges and Friends*; Mathisen, 'The Letters of Ruricius of Limoges', pp. 960-61.

[452] *PLRE* III, pp. 1099-1100.

[453] Poem 4.5, vol. 1, p. 136, lines 13-14, 17.

[454] Poem 4.5, vol. 1, p. 135, lines 7-8.

[455] Poem 4.5, vol. 1, p. 136, lines 21-22.

[456] *PLRE* III, p. 380 (Dagaulfus), and p. 1377 (Vilithuta).

[457] Poem 4.26, vol. 1, p. 156, lines 13-14: 'Romana studio, barbara prole fuit'. Another example of non-Romans called 'noble' is poem 2.8, vol. 1, p. 62, line 38, for the duke Launebod and his wife Beretrude, discussed below.

[458] Poem 4.26, vol. 1, p. 156, lines 15-16. Szövérffy, 'À la source de l'humanisme', p. 85, misses the point that this barbarian side of her is subordinated to the Roman.

[459] George, *Latin Poet*, pp. 31–2; Reydellet (ed.), *Poèmes*, p. xxx; *PLRE* III p. 226 (Berethrude), and p. 765 (Launebodis).

[460] Poem 2.8, vol. 1, p. 62, lines 23-4.

[461] Brennan, 'Senators and Social Mobility', p. 157.

[462] On Romans in the south, see Rouche, *L'Aquitaine: Naissance d'une région*.

[463] Orosius, *Historiarum adversum paganos* , pp. 120-32. Similarly, Salvian of Marseilles, *De gubernatione Dei*, pp. 59–66.

[464] McCormick, *Eternal Victory*, pp. 260–387.

[465] George, 'Panegyric', pp. 226–8; Brennan, 'The Image of the Frankish Kings', pp. 1–11, esp. pp. 1–3; Farrell, *Latin Language and Latin Culture*, pp. 10–11.

[466] *PLRE* III, pp. 283-4 (Charibertus 1).

[467] Poem 6.2, vol. 2, p. 56, lines 797-100. On the rhetorical sequence, see George, 'Panegyric', p. 231. On *adventus*, see MacCormack, 'Change and Continuity', pp. 721–752.

[468] Roberts, *The Humblest Sparrow*, p. 20; Brennan, 'The Image of the Frankish Kings', p. 5. Gregory of Tours, *Historiae* V.44, p. 254, suggested this praise was false. For a similar praise of Arbogast's eloquence, see Sidonius Apollinarius, Poem IV.17, pp. 126-9.

[469] Poems 7.9, vol. 2, p. 101, line 7 and 8.1, vol. 2, p. 125, lines 11-14 on being Italian; Poem 7.8, vol.2, p. 99, line 49 on being a foreigner.

[470] Gregory of Tours, *Historiae* II.31, p. 77. [cross-ref to Sicamber in GoT chapter]

[471] George, *Personal and Political Poems*, p. 37 n. 63; George, 'Panegyric', p. 8; Brennan, 'The Image of the Frankish Kings'; Godman, *Poets and Emperors*, pp. 25–31. MacCormack, 'Latin Prose Panegyrics', p. 187, recounts Cassiodorus' panegyric sometimes serving a similar mediatory role.

[472] Poem 6.2, vol. 2, p. 53, lines 7-8.

[473] George, *Latin Poet*, pp. 44, 48; Godman, *Poets and Emperors*, esp. pp. 25-6; contra Szövérffy, 'À la source de l'humanisme', p. 84. On his use of it in poem 5.3 for Gregory of Tours' *adventus*, see Brennan, 'The Image of the Merovingian Bishop, p. 132. The lands undoubtedly stand for the people in this passage.

[474] On Fortunatus' concepts of friendship, see Pucci (ed.), *Poems to Friends*, pp. xxxiii–xxxix; Koebner, *Venantius Fortunatus,* p. 31.

[475] Biographies of Radegund can be found in *PLRE* III, pp. 1072-4; Wood, *Merovingian Kingdoms,* pp. 136–9; McNamara and Halborg (eds.), *Sainted Women*, pp. 60–63; *GC* 104, pp. 364-6; and two contemporary *Vitae* of her by Venantius Fortunatus and Baudonivia, *Vitae sanctae Radegundis*, pp. 364-77, and 377-95, respectively. See also Coates, 'Regendering Radegund'; Rouche, 'Fortunat et Baudonivie'.

[476] Poem Appendix 1, vol. 3, p. 134, line 31. Some historians have suggested that Radegund herself was the author, but the style of the poem matches that of others by Fortunatus. See Tardi, *Fortunat*, pp. 196-200; George (ed.), *Personal and Political Poems*, p. 116 n. 22.

[477] Venantius Fortunatus, *Vita sanctae Radegundis* II, p. 365.

[478] Poems 8.8, vol. 2, p. 151; 11.7, vol. 3, p. 125; and 11.9, vol. 3, p. 126.

[479] Venantius Fortunatus, *Vita sanctae Radegundis* II, p. 365: 'tempestate barbarica Francorum victoria regione vastata'. See also Coates, 'Image of Episcopal Authority' p. 1110.

[480] George believes it was sent with Poem Appendix 3 (addressed to Radegund's cousin but perhaps meant for a wider audience) and Poem 8.1. Poem Appendix 2, addressed to Emperor Justin and Empress Sophia, was sent as thanks after the relic arrived in Gaul. On the intent of these poems, see George (ed.), *Personal and Political Poems*, pp. 111 n. 1, and 116 n. 21; George, *Latin Poet*, p. 164.

[481] The only one not mentioned below is Poem 7.20, vol. 2, pp. 117-18, wanting to know if the Franks will go to battle in Italy.

[482] Poem Appendix 1, vol. 3, p. 139.

[483] Poem 9.4, vol. 3, p. 23.

[484] Venantius Fortunatus, *Vita Germani episcopi Parisiaci*, p. 376. For more on his hagiography, see Collins, 'Observations', pp. 105-31.

[485] Arcadius: Poem 4.17, vol. 1, p. 148.

[486] Poem 7.6, vol. 2, pp. 92-3; *Vita Paterni* 3, p. 34.

[487] Wood, 'The Term "barbarus"', esp. p. 50.

[488] Whether this chronicle was written by one or more authors remains under debate. It seems likely to have been compiled by either one person with connections to both Burgundy and Austrasia, as suggested by Ian Wood, or multiple people from these areas building on each other's work in a chain of chronicles, as Reimitz surmises. The truth is probably irrecoverable. For ease, I will refer to Fredegar in the singular, but this should not be read as precluding the possibility of a group of chroniclers with a collective Burgundian-Austrasian perspective. See Wood, 'Fredegar's Fables'; Wood, 'Chains of Chronicles'; Reimitz, *Frankish Identity*, pp. 174-6; Collins, *Die Fredegar-Chroniken* , pp. 3-25.

[489] Reimitz, 'Cultural Brokers', pp. 264-5; Wood, 'Chains of Chronicles.'

[490] Reimitz, *Frankish Identity*, pp. 166-231. Earlier reflections include 'The Providential Past' and 'Cultural Brokers'.

[491] Reimitz, 'The Providential Past', p. 116.

[492] Reimitz, *Frankish Identity*, pp. 188-9, 197-8, 208-9, 235, 447.

[493] Reimitz, 'Social Networks', esp. pp. 237-40, 249-53, 261; Reimitz, *Frankish Identity*, pp. 133-59; Goffart, 'From *Historiae* to *Historia Francorum*'', p. 270.

[494] Reimitz, *Frankish Identity*, pp. 166-8, 223, 230, 447-8. I disagree with Reimitz that Fredegar also intended to counter Gregory's Christian vision, though; again, the simplest explanation is that he adapted Gregory's writings according to the needs of a new audience with different reference points and concerns.

[495] Much has been written on this addition, the newest of which being Reimitz, *Frankish Identity*, pp. 168, 171-2. Also useful are Wallace-Hadrill, 'Fredegar and the History of France', pp. 80-83; Woodruff, 'The *Historia epitomata*', pp. 99-100; Wood, 'Defining the Franks', pp. 113-14. On early modern questioning of this legend, see Brown, 'The Trojan Origins of the French', pp. 348–84.

[496] *Historiae* II.9, pp. 57-8.

[497] Fredegar, *Chronicle* II.4-6, pp. 45-6; III.2, p. 93. The 'Turks' may indeed refer to the Asiatic people as they had contact with Constantinople in the sixth century. See Coumert, *Origines des peuples*, pp. 311-16.

[498] Fredegar, *Chronicle* II.8, p. 47.

[499] Wallace-Hadrill, 'Fredegar and the History of France', p. 80.

[500] Fredegar, *Chronicle* III.9, p. 95. Old assumptions that it must have derived from an ancient oral tradition were central to theories of a Merovingian kingship based on a perception of sacrality. These theories are discussed in Reimitz, 'Cultural Brokers', pp. 284-5; Wood, 'Deconstructing', pp. 149–52; Murray, '*Post vocantur Merohingii*', pp. 121–52; Woodruff, 'The *Historia epitomata*', pp. 112–13.

[501] Murray, '*Post vocantur Merohingii*', p. 148. Wood, 'Deconstructing', pp. 151-2, suggests (based on another story of Fredegar's about the degeneration of Clodio's descendants) that this story is not meant to be flattering but derogatory. However, Murray's argument that the parallel with Alexander and Augustus means it was intended in positive light seems to me more convincing, as this is a classic element of hero myths.

[502] Reimitz, 'Cultural Brokers', pp. 264-5, 280-89; Reimitz, *Frankish Identity*, pp. 167-72, 185-6.

[503] *Historiae* III.22, p. 122; Fredegar, *Chronicle* III.38, p. 105. A footnote in the *MGH* edition points out that in one manuscript the 'Roman' designation was erased.

[504] *Historiae* II.28, pp. 73-4.

[505] Fredegar, *Chronicle* III.18, pp. 99-100.

[506] *Historiae* II.12, p. 61; Fredegar, *Chronicle* III.11, pp. 95-6.

[507] *Historiae* II.27, p. 72; Fredegar, *Chronicle* III.16, p. 99.

[508] *Historiae* II.31, p. 77; Fredegar, *Chronicle* III.21, p. 101.

[509] *Historiae* II.32, p. 78; II.33, p. 81; Fredegar, *Chronicle* III.22-3, p. 102. Fredegar similarly added the Franks in Paris as partaking in an agreement with Chilperic that he would not enter their city: *Historiae* VI.27, p. 295; Fredegar, *Chronicle* III.90, p. 118.

[510] Reimitz, *Frankish Identity*, p. 173.

[511] *Historiae* II.9, p. 58; Fredegar, *Chronicle* III.9, p. 95.

[512] *Historiae* II.27, p. 71; Fredegar, *Chronicle* III.15, p. 98.

[513] *Historiae* II.35, p. 84; II.42, p. 92.

[514] Fredegar, *Chronicle* IV.24, p. 130; IV.89, p. 165; IV.18, p. 128; IV.43, p. 142. *PLRE* III, pp. 229, 485-6, 1072, 595-6.

[515] Fredegar, *Chronicle* IV.34, p. 133; *PLRE* III, pp. 1235-6.

[516] Paul the Deacon, *Historia Langobardorum* III.30, pp. 109-10.

[517] *Historiae* IV.9, p. 141; Paul the Deacon, *Historia Langobardorum* IV.7, p. 118; *PLRE* III, p. 504 (Garibaldus 1). On the duchy of Bavaria and the Agilolfings, see Jarnut, *Agilolfingerstudien*, esp. pp. 57-75; Werner, 'Important Noble Families', pp. 161–8; Le Jan, *Famille et pouvoir,* pp. 387–96; Hammer, *From* ducatus *to regnum*, pp. 26-36.

[518] [cross-ref to Chramnelen below.]

[519] Fredegar, *Chronicle* IV.48, p. 144; *PLRE* III, pp. 1109-10. On the Wends, see Curta, *Making of the Slavs*, pp. 59-61; Curta, 'Slavs in Fredegar'; Geary, 'Slovenian Gentile Identity'.

[520] Fredegar, *Chronicle* IV.90, p. 167.

[521] Fredegar, *Chronicle* IV.78, p. 160. On Burgundians, see , see Wood, 'Ethnicity and Ethnogenesis of the Burgundians', pp. 53–69; Wood, 'Gentes, Kings, and Kingdoms'; Amory, 'Meaning and Purpose'. On Saxons, see Green and Siegmund (eds.), *Continental Saxons*.

[522] Fredegar, *Chronicle* IV.58, p. 150.

[523] Fredegar, *Chronicle* IV.89-90, p. 166.

[524] Fredegar, *Chronicle* IV.73, p. 158; IV.67, p. 154; IV.54, p. 148.

[525] Fredegar, *Chronicle* IV.55, p. 148.

[526] Fredegar, *Chronicle* IV.78, p. 160.

[527] *Historiae* X.2, p. 482; Reimitz, 'Social Networks', p. 238.

[528] Jonas of Bobbio, *Vita Columbani* I.14, pp. 79-80; *PLRE* III, pp. 309 (Chramnelenus), 486 (Flavia), 1399 (Waldelenus); Fox, *Power and Religion*, pp. 99-108, 209-10.

[529] Ewig, *Trier im Merowingerreich*, p. 109; Werner, 'Important Noble Families', p. 155. While both historians make this assumption, only Werner notes that the genealogical connections are in fact vague—though this does not stop him from connecting them.

[530] Ebling, Jarnut, and Kampers, '*Nomen et gens*: Untersuchungen', pp. 693, 697, 700. See also Werner, 'Important Noble Families', p. 155.

[531] Geary, *Aristocracy in Provence*, p. 112.

[532] Fredegar, *Chronicle* IV.73, p. 158; IV.15, p. 127.

[533] Fredegar, *Chronicle* IV.11, p. 127.

[534] Fredegar, *Chronicle* IV.38, p. 139.

[535] Fredegar, *Chronicle* IV.1, p. 124; IV.65, p. 153; IV.68, p. 155; Goetz, '*Gens*, Kings, and Kingdoms: The Franks', p. 322.

[536] Fredegar, *Chronicle* IV.12, p. 127; IV.53, p. 147. Lewis, 'The Dukes in the Regnum Francorum', p. 392, points out that, unusually, Beppelen governed disparate cities rather than a whole territory.

[537] Fredegar, *Chronicle* IV.74, p. 158; IV.68, p. 155; IV.90, p. 167; IV.35, p. 134; IV.37, p. 138. From 629 to 634, Dagobert was ruler of all three kingdoms, which explains his interaction with both Neustrian and Austrasian subjects.

[538] Geary, *Myth*, p. 137, and *Before France and Germany*, p. 192, notes that the Neustrians and Austrasians considered their wars to be civil wars, which tell us that they saw themselves as parts of a single people. Although Fredegar did not single one of these groups out as 'Franks', other sources did reserve 'Frank' for Austrasians in contrast with Neustrians or vice versa. These include the *Lives* of Balthild and Desiderius of Cahors, the *Liber Historiae Francorum* written from a Neustrian perspective in 727, and the *Continuations* of Fredegar's *Chronicle* written from an Austrasian perspective beginning in 736. See *Vita Domnae Balthildis* 5, pp. 487-8; *Vita Desiderii Cadurcae* 35, p. 592; Fredegar, *Continuations*, p. 168–93; Wallace-Hadrill, *Fourth Book*, p. xxv; Gerberding, *Rise of the Carolingians,* pp. 76, 172; Geary, *Before France and Germany*, p. 223; Reimitz, 'The Art of Truth', p. 94.

[539] Fredegar, *Chronicle* IV.33, p. 133; IV.69, pp. 155-6.

[540] For example, Fredegar, *Chronicle* IV.9, pp. 125-6; IV.49, p. 145; IV.23, p. 129.

[541] Fredegar, *Chronicle* IV.24, p. 130; IV.28, p. 132.

[542] Fredegar, *Chronicle* IV.29, p. 132.

[543] Fredegar, *Chronicle* IV.37, p. 138; IV.74, p. 158; IV.38, p. 139.

[544] Fredegar, *Chronicle* IV.15, p. 127; IV.11, p. 127; IV.78, p. 160. On the Breton balance between submission and independence, see Wood, *Merovingian Kingdoms*, pp. 159-60.

[545] Fredegar, *Chronicle* IV.8, p. 125; IV.34, p. 133; IV.68, p. 154.

[546] Fredegar, *Chronicle* IV.8, p. 125.

[547] Fredegar, *Chronicle* IV.68, p. 155.

[548] On the context of the *Liber Historiae Francorum*, see Gerberding, *Rise of the Carolingians*; Bachrach, *Liber Historiae Francorum*. For the eighth century: *Liber Historiae Francorum*, pp. 215-328; Fredegar, *Continuations* 25, p. 180; *Vita Boniti* 1, p. 119; *Formulae Turonenses* 12, p. 141, for example.

[549] Kings: *Vita Genovefae* 26, p. 226; *Vita Severini*, pp. 166–170. Army: Cyprian of Toulon, *Vita Caesarii* I.28, p. 306; Venantius Fortunatus, *Vita sanctae Radegundis* II, p. 365; *Vita Genovefae* 35, p. 229. Individuals: Cyprian of Toulon, *Vita Caesarii* II.42, pp. 341-2; Venantius Fortunatus, *Vita Germani episcopi Parisiaci* 5, p. 376.

[550] *Vita Gaugerici* 14, p. 657 (Bertoald), see below [cross-ref]; Jonas of Bobbio, *Vita Columbani*, II.12, p. 131 (Gibitrud, *ex genere Francorum*); *Vita sanctae Geretrudis* 6, pp. 459-60 (Wulfetrud, *ex antiquo Francorum genere*); Bobolen, *Vita Germani abbatis Grandivallensis* 6, p. 35 (Waldebert, *ex genere Sicambrorum*); *Vita Arnulfi* 1, p. 432 (Arnulf, *prosapie genitus Francorum*).

[551] For example, *Vita Domnae Balthildis* 5, pp. 487-8, and 18, pp. 505-6; *Vita Eligii* II.32, p. 717.

[552] These are the *Lives* of Gaugeric of Cambrai ([cross-ref]); Desiderius of Vienne (Sisebut, *Vita Desiderii episcopi Viennensis* 2, p. 630), Rusticula of Arles (*Vita Rusticulae* 1, p. 340), Desiderius of Cahors (*Vita Desiderii Cadurcae* 31, pp. 588-9), Eligius of Noyon ([cross-ref]), Praejectus of Clermont (*Passio Praejecti* 1, p. 226), Amatus of Remiremont (*Vita Amati* 2, p. 216), Bonitus of Clermont (*Vita Boniti* 1, p. 119), and Samson of Dol (*Vita sancti Samsonis (Prima)* I.5, pp. 152-3). On the date of the *Life* of Samson, see Sowerby, 'The Lives of St. Samson'.

[553] An article analyzing the full corpus is in preparation.

[554] A thorough exploration of Caesarius' *Life* and the local background can be found in Klingshirn, *Caesarius of Arles*. The edition of Morin has superseded the older one by Krusch, though Krusch's commentary is still useful. Klingshirn has also produced an English translation with useful commentary, and I have borrowed his translations here.

[555] *Vita Caesarii* I.3, p. 297.

[556] Delehaye, *Legends of the Saints*, pp. 54-5; Fouracre and Gerberding, *Late Merovingian France*, pp. 37-45; Kreiner, *Social Life of Merovingian Hagiography*, pp. 201-2; Prinz, *Frühes Mönchtum*, pp. 498-500.

[557] *Vita Caesarii* I.10, p. 300: *concives* and *propinquus*.

[558] *Vita Caesarii* I.8, p. 299.

[559] *Vita Caesarii* II.13 and II.10, pp. 328-9.

[560] *Vita Caesarii* I.49, p. 316.

[561] *Vita Caesarii* II.40-41, p. 341.

[562] *Vita Caesarii* I.9, p. 299.

[563] [cross-ref to GoT]

[564] *Vita Caesarii* I.20, p. 304.

[565] *Vita Caesarii* I.20 and I.23, pp. 304-5.

[566] *Vita Caesarii* I.28, p. 306.

[567] *Vita Caesarii* I.29-32, p. 307.

[568] *Vita Caesarii* I.20, p. 304.

[569] *Vita Caesarii* I.31, p. 307.

[570] *Vita Caesarii* I.28 and I.34, pp. 306 and 309.

[571] *Vita Caesarii* I.36, p. 310.

[572] van der Essen, *Étude critique et littéraire*, pp. 207-8, 214. I owe this observation to Kreiner, *Social Life of Merovingian Hagiography*, p. 238.

[573] *Vita Gaugerici* 1, p. 652.

[574] *Vita Gaugerici* 14, p. 657.

[575] On the potential advantages of such an identity shift, see Halsall, 'Social Identities', pp. 151-2.

[576] *Vita Gaugerici* 7, p. 654; 8, p. 655; 15, pp. 657-8.

[577] *Vita Gaugerici* 9, p. 655.

[578] *Vita Gaugerici* 6, p. 654.

[579] [cross-ref back to footnote in Fredegar chapter with the references]

[580] Mériaux, 'Une *Vita* mérovingienne', pp. 168-70; Wood, *Merovingian Kingdoms*, pp. 146-9.

[581] *Vita Audoini* 1, pp. 554-5; *PLRE* III, pp. 151-2 (Audoenus qui et Dado); Fouracre and Gerberding, *Late Merovingian France*, pp. 136-9; Fox, *Power and Religion*, pp. 69-81.

[582] There has been a lot of debate about the dating of this *Life*, because it survives only in a ninth-century copy with some modifications. I follow Michel Banniard's and Clemens Bayer's analyses that show later edits were minimal and can be isolated to certain later passages in the *Life*, and that the language matches closely that of unaltered texts like the *Life* of Praejectus. The language described here can, therefore, be considered representative of Audoin's Merovingian context. Banniard, 'Latin et communication orale'; Bayer, 'Vita Eligii', pp. 461-524. For the counter-argument, see Westeel, 'Quelques remarques', p. 47. I owe the Bayer reference to James Palmer: https://merovingianworld.wordpress.com/saints-lives/audoin-vita-eligii/.

[583] *Vita Eligii* II.12, p. 701; II.28, p. 715

[584] *Vita Eligii* I.14, p. 680; II.32, p. 717; I.10, pp. 676-7; I.5, p. 672; I.9, p. 676; II.1, p. 694.

[585] *Vita Eligii* I.4, p. 671.

[586] *Vita Eligii* I.10, pp. 676-8.

[587] Fouracre, 'The Work of Audoenus', p. 80.

[588] *Vita Eligii* II.3, pp. 696-7; II.8, p. 700.

[589] Jones, 'The Image of the Barbarian', esp. pp. 387–9; Ewig, 'Volkstum und Volksbewusstsein im Frankreich', pp. 249-54.

[590] *Vita Eligii* I.10, p. 677.

[591] *Vita Desiderii Cadurcae* 1, pp. 563-4; 31, pp. 588-9.

[592] *Vita Eligii* I.10, pp. 676-7.

[593] *Vita Eligii* I.1, pp. 669-70.

[594] *Vita Eligii VE* I.3, p. 671.

[595] *Vita Eligii* II.20, pp. 711-12: 'Numquam tu, Romane, quamvis haec frequenter taxes, consuetudines nostras evellere poteris, sed sollemnia nostra sicut actenus fecimus, perpetuo semperque frequentabimus, nec ullus hominum erit, qui priscos atque gratissimos possit nobis umquam prohibere ludos.'

[596] Delehaye, *Legends of the Saints*, pp. 148-59, 168-77; Fouracre and Gerberding, *Late Merovingian France*, pp. 37-45.

[597] Fouracre, 'The Work of Audoenus', pp. 82-3. Contra, see Scheibelreiter, 'Ein Gallorömer'.

[598] Fox, *Power and Religion*, pp. 59-61, 65-81; Le Jan, *Famille et pouvoir*, pp. 387-96; Jarnut, *Agilolfingerstudien*, pp. 41-3.

[599] Gerberding, *Rise of the Carolingians*, pp. 67-89; Fox, *Power and Religion*, pp. 204-5.

[600] Kreiner, *Social Life of Merovingian Hagiography*, p. 82; Fouracre and Gerberding, *Late Merovingian France*, pp. 82-4, 151, 210-11; *Liber Historiae Francorum* 45, pp. 318-19; *Vita Audoini* 12-15, pp. 561-4.

[601] Wood, *Merovingian Kingdoms*, pp. 159-64.

[602] As with Iberia, though, true segregation by law would have been impossible in practice. Collins, 'Law and Ethnic Identity', p. 11; Wormald, '*Leges Barbarorum*', pp. 22, 40-41; Rivers, *Salian and Ripuarian Franks*, p. 8; Wood, *Merovingian Kingdoms*, pp. 114-15.