

THE
MEDIÉVAL MEDITERRANEAN

PEOPLES, ECONOMIES AND CULTURES, 400-1453

EDITORS

MICHAEL WHITBY (Warwick)
PAUL MAGDALINO, HUGH KENNEDY (St. Andrews)
DAVID ABULAFIA (Cambridge)
BENJAMIN ARBEL (Tel Aviv)
MARK MEYERSON (Notre Dame)

VOLUME 20



M-8276
F-20

ADL
27

THE VISIGOTHS

Studies in Culture and Society

EDITED BY

ALBERTO FERREIRO



BRILL
LEIDEN · BOSTON · KÖLN
1999

CHAPTER ONE

FORGING A NEW IDENTITY: THE KINGDOM OF
TOULOUSE AND THE FRONTIERS OF VISIGOTHIC
AQUITANIA (418-507)

Ralph W. Mathisen and Hagith S. Sivan

The birth, duration, and demise of what is traditionally known as the Visigothic kingdom of Toulouse were only briefly noted by ancient annalists. Modern interpreters have reconstructed a much fuller picture of the history of the Visigoths in their Gallic home, although a sense of the precise nature of the kingdom is still lacking. In the wake of recent scholarly discussions of the nature of Romano-barbarian interaction along external frontier zones, one also might re-examine the formation and meaning of internal frontiers of the sort inherent in the settlement of barbarians within the empire.¹ New visions of the dynamics of frontier societies as evidenced by an ongoing mutual adaptation of the trappings of leadership, prestige, and status, further complicate the questions of who exactly was a barbarian and who was a Roman, and where the frontiers of *Romania* and *barbaria* were.

The Legacy of Alaric

Before settling in Aquitania at the beginning of the fifth century, two critical periods of evolution contributed to the formation of Gothic identity both outside and inside the imperial frontiers. For a century (ca.275-ca.375) the Goths had inhabited the abandoned trans-Danubian Roman province of Dacia, where archaeological data from burial inventories, technological-petrographic analysis of ce-

¹ See R. Mathisen and H. Sivan, eds., *Shifting Frontiers in Late Antiquity* (Aldershot, 1996); C.R. Whitaker, *Frontiers of the Roman Empire. A Social and Economic Study* (Baltimore 1994); and S.K. Drummond and L.H. Nelson, *The Western Frontiers of Imperial Rome* (Armonk, NY 1994). Also worth consulting are B. Isaac, *The Limits of Empire* (revised edition) (Oxford 1992); R.C. Blockley, *East Roman Foreign Policy: Formation and Conduct from Diocletian to Anastasius* (Leeds 1992); D.H. French and C.S. Lightfoot, *The Eastern Frontier of the Roman Empire* (Oxford 1989); and M.H. Dodgeon and S.N.C. Lieu, *The Roman Eastern Frontier and the Persian Wars* (London 1991).

ramics, and anthropological data relating to patterns of settlement point to cultural amalgamation among Dacians, Sarmatians, Romans, and Goths.² The very inability of archaeology to provide precise ethnic identification is in itself indicative of the degree of interaction and adaptation. The Gothic arrival on the northern Danubian/Carpathian frontier, to which Romanian and Ukrainian archaeologists have ascribed the flowering of the so-called Sintana de Mures/Chernjakhov culture, did not completely replace or submerge other traditions. The picture that emerges is one of a mixture of cultures in which no specific ethnicity can be identified.³

Written sources, meanwhile, tell of Christian missions into Gothic lands, of sporadic religious persecutions, of villages and social hierarchy, and of wars and treaties with the Roman government.⁴ They inform us of a settled agricultural society; of villagers, solicitous of preserving their authority in the face of perceived opposition, protecting their communities against agents sent by remote rulers; and of inherent weakness with regard to resisting outside invaders, either Roman or Hunnic. The crowds that begged admission to Roman territory in 376 were essentially groups of panic-stricken refugees, starved and terrorized and not as yet formed into a coherent community, although united in their desire to leave the old land for a new life. They carried with them souvenirs of native rites and traditions that even the mighty kings of Aquitania could not shake off at a later stage, as well as visual symbols of an ancestral worship.⁵ During the crossing of the Danube the leaders of these groups may have learned something about the working of the Roman government, whose of-

² See L. Ellis, "Dacians, Sarmatians, and Goths on the Roman-Carpathian Frontier: Second-Fourth Centuries," in Mathisen/Sivan, *Shifting Frontiers* (London, 1996) 105-125; P. Heather, J.F. Matthews, *The Goths in the Fourth Century* (Liverpool, 1991); P. Heather, "The Emergence of the Visigothic Kingdom," in J. Drinkwater, H. Elton eds., *Fifth Century Gaul: A Crisis of Identity?* (Cambridge 1992) 84-94; and idem, *Goths and Romans 332-489* (Oxford, 1991).

³ Note that the use and final disposition of objects are not necessarily indicative of ethnicity, because of factors such as trade, stealing, friendship, or marriage exchange. The process of manufacturing, on the other hand, can be used to identify ethnicity because of the nature of learning in pre-industrial societies. See Ellis, "Dacians." We are grateful to Prof. Ellis for making available information from her forthcoming book.

⁴ On Ulfila in Gothia, see H. Sivan, "The Making of an Arian Goth: Ulfila Reconsidered," *Revue Bénédictine* (forthcoming). For Gothic society prior to 376, E.A. Thompson, *The Visigoths in the Time of Ulfila* (Oxford 1966).

⁵ Eunapius, fr. 48.2 (Blockley).

ficers were free to misapply imperial orders and whose representatives abused their authority.⁶

Another forty years of alternating migrations and temporary settlements further shaped the fate of the peoples who had come under the Visigothic umbrella in the late 370s. Between 376 and 416 the Goths migrated from Dacia-Gothia to the southern Balkans, then to Epirus and Greece, then westward to Italy, south toward Sicily and back north across the Alps to Gaul and Spain. The destabilization of local society, the emergence of Alaric as the chief warlord of the majority of the Visigoths, the transformation of Gothic society in the process, and the effect of the mass conversion to Christianity, all modified the nature of Gothic traditions and societal bonds. Nearly a century and a half of exposure to *Romanitas*, both along frontier zones and inside the imperial frontiers culminated in a rapprochement between Goths and Romans which resulted in the emergence of a new Gothic society in Aquitania.

Throughout the Danubian and the peripatetic periods, Gothic aristocrats assumed the double mantles of native warlords and Roman generals. They served in the Roman army, coveted high-ranking military positions, fought Rome's wars, and married Roman women. Some retained their position within the structure of Visigothic leadership whereas others chose complete immersion in Roman society. War, in brief, was the chief Visigothic occupation and the breeder of a new type of warrior culture in both a Roman and a Visigothic context. Military activities also provided a means by which both Visigoths and Romans assimilated aspects of each other's culture.

The genesis of the kingdom of Toulouse lies in the career of Alaric, and his shifting relations with the Roman government. The tedious story of repeated negotiations, treaties, broken truces, friendship, and enmity between 395 and 410 highlights the ambiguous nature of the relations between Alaric's "Visigoths" and Honorius' government. If Alaric's intentions can be divined from his words and actions, he aimed at acquiring three things: a preeminent position for himself and his family within Gothic society, a well-defined landed domain, and an outside recognition of his leadership of the Visigoths.

⁶ Both Ammianus and Eunapius make it clear that the remoteness of the court was a weighty factor in the lax execution of its orders. The crossing was a highly disorderly affair in which neither "Goths" nor Romans kept to their side of the agreement.

An examination of his tactics, however, indicates that he had no clear idea of how to achieve these goals. In quick succession, he became an ally fighting Rome's war, an enemy attacking Roman territory, a blackmailer, a Roman officer, a supporter of the legitimate emperor, and a begetter of a usurper. In the end he died without achieving two of his three aims.

His lesson, up to a point, was not lost on his successors. His brother-in-law Athaulf (410-415) opted for a clearly pro-Roman course. He moved the Visigoths to Gaul in 412, and supported the Italian government against the Gallic emperor Jovinus in 413.⁷ He went so far as to marry the Roman princess Galla Placidia, who had been kidnapped by Alaric in 410, in a Roman ceremony and to declare in favor of the rule of law. His laudable intentions, however, were premature, and he survived only few years. His successor Sigeric (415) fared no better, and ruled only for a few weeks. The next ruler, Vallia (415-418), modeled his rule on both Alaric and Athaulf. He contracted an alliance with the Roman government, fought on Honorius' behalf against other barbarians in Spain, and in 418 negotiated a treaty that granted the Visigoths territory in Aquitania and seemingly achieved all of Alaric's aims; all he lacked was a Roman military appointment. Once the Visigoths had land for permanent settlement, a more stable system of rulership, and a contract with Rome, the Gothic rulers had new problems to face: how could the kings retain their authority? How could they forge a new sense of Gothic identity with themselves as undisputed leaders? How would the Roman model of monarchy, clearly adopted by the new ruling house of Gothic Aquitania, both reinforce (and perhaps also weaken?) the status of the Gothic monarchy? The following discussion will delineate the development of the Visigothic kingdom of Toulouse by focusing on these three questions, with an added aim of tracing the formation of internal frontiers and zones of interaction within the Roman provincial system as a Gothic presence modified the physical and cognitive landscape of Aquitania.

⁷ For these events, see Matthews, *Aristocracies*, pp.314-319; and Heather, *Goths*, pp.219-223.

The Visigothic Settlement in Aquitania

The foundation of the Visigothic Kingdom of Toulouse still raises significant and unanswered questions: why was Aquitania the site of Visigothic settlement; why did the settlement occur when it did; and, finally, through what processes was the settlement accomplished? All three of these considerations have been much debated, but no consensus has emerged. The Visigoths themselves offer little direct information. Only two relevant documents, the *Code of Euric* (*Codex Euricianus*) (late 470s) and the *Roman Law of the Visigoths* (*Lex Romana Visigothorum*), later known as the *Breviary of Alaric* (*Breviarium Alarici*) (506), survive from the nine decades of their Aquitanian monarchy.⁸ There is, in addition, the normal debris left behind by long habitation: hundreds of sarcophagi, possibly commissioned by Gothic clients but none bearing an identifying inscription; dozens of mosaics decorating luxurious rural residences and urban dwellings, some perhaps used by Gothic owners; and thousands of pot-shards. Modern toponymic observations have added a few score place-names throughout Aquitania which can be attributed to the Visigoths, but there is little other Visigothic material to which the historian may turn.

Roman sources are relatively more plentiful and more varied, ranging from imperial legislation, to chronicles, letters, and ecclesiastical and legal documents. None, however, offers more than a partial and often distorted picture of the complex events leading up to the Visigothic settlement in Aquitania. The presence of the Visigoths inside the imperial *limes* presented the imperial administration with intractable problems and imminent dangers. Moreover, the Visigothic Kingdom of Toulouse in Gaul was the predecessor of the Visigothic Kingdom of Toledo in Spain, and the latter monarchy, by absorbing much of the attention of the Merovingian Franks, made possible the last flourish of western classical culture in the Ostrogothic Kingdom of Italy. Thus the Kingdom of Toledo, too, was an important factor in the political and cultural life of the Late Roman west, and the circumstances of its origin deserve also careful consideration.

⁸ For the codes see T. Mommsen, P.M. Meyer, P. Krüger eds., *Theodosiani libri XVI*, vol.1 (Berlin, 1902) p.cccviii ff; *MGH Leges* 1.3ff; and G. Haenel, *Lex romana visigothorum*. For translations of some passages of the *Codex Euricianus*, see S.P. Scott tr., *The Visigothic Code* (Boston 1910).

The Gallic Background

Imperial attitudes toward Gaul ever since the late third century were influenced by the appearance of the Gallic Empire (259-273) and subsequent usurpations.⁹ Late in the third century costly fortresses like Jublains north of the Loire (Armorica) were abandoned peacefully and, as reflected in the *Notitia dignitatum* of post-400, never re-incorporated into the military defensive system. This move may have been a part of a strategy that considered Armorica dispensable. A century later, in the early 380s, the western seat of imperial government, which had temporarily been moved to Gaul by Valentinian I in 365/6, was relocated to Italy, to be followed ca. 395 by the transfer of the seat of the Gallic prefect from Trier to Arles. The move away from external frontier zones into internal buffer areas which, we suggest, had begun in the late third century, was confirmed in the early fifth with the assignment of Aquitania to the Goths.

The timing and the location of the Gothic accommodation also needs to be considered in light of a major reorganization of the Roman frontiers that took place in the wake of the collapse of the Rhine frontier after 406 and the subsequent abandonment of Britain. The constant engagement of government troops in civil wars against usurpers between 407 and 413 prevented a realignment of the frontier zones in the north and forced Honorius' government to consider new frontier strategies. By the mid 410s the western generalissimo Constantius may have conceived a frontier vision comprised of a series of internal buffer zones based on the existing provincial system and on a re-allocation of economic resources, all aimed at ensu- ing the security and prosperity of Italy and of adjacent or strategically important territories like the Gallic and Spanish Mediterranean and, of course, Africa. One such zone was located in western Gaul, between the Loire and the Garonne and along the Atlantic, an area which traditionally had been a major invasion route between the Rhine and the Pyrenees. Its central axis was the river Garonne, between Bordeaux and Toulouse, two urban centers which later served as capitals of the Gothic kings.

In allocating Aquitania to the Goths Constantius admitted that both the Rhine and Britain had in effect fallen out of the Roman *limes* system. The choice of Aquitania also confirmed what years of

⁹ See R. Mathisen, *Roman Aristocrats in Barbarian Gaul. Strategies for Survival in an Age of Transition* (Austin, 1993) pp.17-26.

invasions and usurpations had already established: that the region had become marginalised as far as the provincial network controlled from Milan and Ravenna was concerned. The settlement there also kept the Goths away from strategic areas.

The Settlement of 418

Ancient sources relating to the Gothic settlement of Aquitania are laconic. Indeed, the silence of the ancient sources regarding any novelties in the 418 arrangements perhaps imply that this *foedus* with the Goths, one among many, was conceived as a part of a larger strategy into which the Gothic-Aquitanian solution fitted without meriting specific comment. In a dry entry, the Gallic chronicler of the year 452 stated simply, "Aquitania was handed over to the Goths."¹⁰ The chronicler Prosper Tiro of Aquitania related that "the patrician Constantius concluded a peace treaty with Vallia and granted him Aquitania Secunda, along with a few cities of the neighboring provinces, for habitation."¹¹ Writing in the late 460s, the Spaniard Hydatius recorded, "The Goths, having broken off the campaign that they were waging [against the Suevi and the Vandals in Spain], were recalled to Gaul by Constantius and received lands in Aquitania extending from Toulouse all the way to the ocean.... After Vallia, their king, died, Theoderic succeeded to the throne."¹² And in the mid sixth century, Jordanes noted cryptically, "Vallia .. having won glory in Spain and having won a bloodless victory, returned to Tolosa, turning over to the Roman Empire several provinces [in Spain] after the enemies had been put to flight ... and after the death of Vallia [the Goths] chose Theoderic as his successor,"¹³ suggesting,

¹⁰ *Aquitania Gothis tradita: Chron.Gall.452 s.a.413, MGH AA 9.654.*

¹¹ *Constantius patricius pacem firmat cum Vallia data ei ad inhabitandam secunda Aquitanica et quibusdam civitatibus confinium prouinciarum: MGH AA 9.469, s.a.419.*

¹² *Gothi intermisso certamine quod agebant, per Constantium sedes in Aquitanica a Tolosa usque ad oceanum acceperunt. Vallia eorum rege defuncto Theodericus succedit in regno: Hyd. Chron. 69-70, s.a. 418, MGH AA 2.19 (cf. Eunapius fr.35).*

¹³ *Vallia ... nobilitatus namque intra Spanias incruentamque victoriam potitus, Tolosam revertitur. Romano imperio fugatis hostibus aliquantas provincias, quod promiserat, derelinquens... et illi iam post mortem Valliae Theodericum ei dederant successorem (Jord. Get. 173, 175).* Some modern sources (e.g. *PLRE II*, pp.1148, 1070), assert that Vallia died in Spain and that the settlement was effected by Theoderic I, but not only do none of the sources cited say anything of the sort (they only note that Theoderic succeeded Vallia), but this statement of Jordanes says clearly that Theoderic became king after Vallia's return to Toulouse. Heather, *Goths*, p.223, however, has Vallia as still alive after 418.

at least, that Vallia was responsible for the acquisition of Toulouse.

Modern scholars have generally agreed on a date of 418 for the execution of the treaty and the beginning of the Gothic kingdom of Aquitania. Yet, the Gallic Chronicle dates it to 413, Hydatius opts for 418, and Prosper suggests 419. The date of 413 can clearly be rejected for the date of the actual settlement, although it may well reflect some kind of agreement made with the Goths prior to their Spanish expeditions. Prosper's date of 419, moreover, is impossible, as Vallia had died the year before. This leaves Hydatius' date of 418 as a convenient choice for the date of the settlement, with the caveat that Prosper's date of 419 might reflect the actual transfer of the Goths from Spain to Aquitania. The agreement, therefore, even if initially made by Vallia, would have been implemented by his successor Theoderic I (418-451), whose claim to the throne seems to have been based on his marriage to a daughter of Alaric.¹⁴ And a point to note here is that none of the sources claim that the Roman government granted the Goths a kingdom in Aquitania.

In spite of any disagreement of the chroniclers over the date of the settlement, they are unanimous in insisting that the Goths achieved one major aim: lands for settlement. Two ascribe the initiative to Constantius, then *magister utriusque militiae* ("Master of Both Services"), and one states that the Gothic negotiator was Vallia, then leader of the Gothic people. The territory involved in the arrangement was one of the two Aquitanian provinces as well as a few cities in Novempopulana, and one, Toulouse, in Narbonensis Prima, being the only one specifically named.¹⁵ Since none of the sources bothered with details, they do not explain just how the territory was to be administered or allocated. Nor do they clarify what the Goths were supposed to deliver in return for the Roman land concession.

It would appear that the agreement of 418 suited the needs not only of both the Gothic and Roman leaders, but even, perhaps, the local population. From the Gothic point of view the settlement agreement could not have been more opportune. The brief Spanish interlude had brought military defeat, hunger, and the premature death

¹⁴ See *PLRE II*, pp.1070-1071. Theoderic I had six sons, Thorismund (451-453), Theoderic II (453-466), and Euric (466-484), who succeeded him in turn; Fridericus, who died in battle in 463; and Reteric and Himmerith, about whom nothing is known except that they were sent home by their father just before the battle against the Huns (see *PLRE II*, s.v.).

¹⁵ For Novempopulana, see the discussion of the *Constitutio saluberrima* below.

of two kings. Vallia, who came to the throne after the assassination of two predecessors (Athaulf and Sigeric) in one year, needed to feed his people, and to ensure his own survival. If Athaulf's pro-Roman and Sigeric's anti-Roman stands proved fatal to each, a third option was to meet the Romans half way. In 416, in a prelude to the settlement of 418, Vallia had already returned Galla Placidia and received food supplies in exchange for serving the Romans in Spain.¹⁶ The agreement two years later further regularized relations with the Roman government, and at the same time secured a defined settlement area for Vallia's people.

That Honorius' government was anxious to rid Spain of its Gothic warriors and to reorganize its own forces there seems clear from an imperial letter that can be plausibly dated to 418.¹⁷ Here, the government offered the Spanish troops the same rewards granted to those in Gaul and urged the soldiers not to abuse their right of *hospitalitas*, a process in which a Roman "host" provided a billet for a military "guest," but "to depart with all readiness and propriety, complying with the wishes of their hosts."¹⁸ By then, the barbarian presence had resulted in a decade of continuous devastation. Spain needed a breathing space to recover and the removal of one hostile element was vital. There always was a chance that if the Goths did succeed in eliminating the Vandals and the Suevi they would decide to further their own interests in Spain, independent of imperial authority and even in opposition to it.¹⁹ The Romans also would have learned by then that unless they reached a satisfactory agreement with the Goths they could face another Gothic imperial nominee like Attalus.

The agreement with the Goths, and their removal from Spain, brought the reestablishment of imperial control over Hispania Tarraconensis and enabled the Roman government to complete the task that it had begun there. In addition, the permanent settlement of the Visigoths promised to replace an uncertain and potentially dangerous wandering ally with a stable reservoir of fighting men in a region of little strategic importance for Italy. Nor was the western Roman

¹⁶ Orosius, *Adv. pag.* 7.43.12.

¹⁷ H. Sivan, "An Uncited Letter of the Emperor Honorius to the Spanish Soldiers," *ZPE* 61 (1985) 273-287 (and plate x). The letter's preface calls attention to "the devastation caused by various tribes of barbarians."

¹⁸ *omni alacritate atque virtute abeatis, hospitibus obsequamini* (ibid.).

¹⁹ Note Jord. *Get.* 164: *Honorius ... veritus, ne foedus dudum cum Athaulfo inito [Vallia] ipse turbaret et alius rursus in re publica insidias moliretur vicinas sibi gentes expulsas...*

government able, or cynical enough perhaps, to adopt the Gothic policy of its eastern brethren and to send the Goths back to the east.

As for the local residents, the Gallo-Roman inhabitants of Aquitania, they too may not have objected strenuously to the settlement. The surviving sources give little hint of protest.²⁰ Constantius had attempted to convince landowners in Gaul like Rutilius Namatianus that their presence back home at that particular moment was vital for the general reconstruction of the province after years of barbarian invasions and devastation.²¹ The thought that Visigothic arms might protect the region against usurpations, invasions, and perhaps even sea-raiders and Bagaudic insurrections must have been attractive. As would the hope of farmers to occupy lands that had been abandoned, fallen vacant, or despoiled. But were the Aquitanians told that their guests were coming to stay? No referendum, it seems, was held by the government regarding the readiness of the Aquitanians to become "hosts" for permanent Gothic "guests."

The Treaty Terms

A series of *foedera* (treaties) between Roman governments and Gothic leaders between 376 and 418 established a long line of precedents for the agreement of 418. Although the *foedus* of 382 has achieved mythical proportions in modern literature, the fact remains that we are singularly ill informed about its details. The eastern orator Themistius, invaluable as a strictly contemporary witness, speaks vaguely about the sharing of duties, responsibilities, and taxes. And the fragmentary historian Eunapius mentions an agreement with Athanaric involving provisions and land.²² But any attempt to integrate the Visigoths into the Roman system, largely based on an unrealistic assumption of Rome's integrative power, proved extremely difficult to achieve on the ground. The treaty of which we are best informed, the one which preceded the crossing of the Danube in 376, put a prime value on the Goths as potential military aid in imperial campaigns.²³ The question remains whether the defeat of Valens at

²⁰ Although even if they had, the retribution well may have been harsh, as in the early 440s when Alans were settled near Orléans (*Chron.gall.* 452 127 s.a. 442).

²¹ H. Sivan, "Rutilius Namatianus, Constantius III and the Return to Gaul in Light of New Evidence," *Medieval Studies* 48 (1986), 522-32.

²² See Themistius, *Oration* xx, Eunapius, fr.45.3.

²³ As both Ammianus and Eunapius state.

Adrianople in 378 really changed the Roman outlook and the terms that the Roman government was willing to negotiate and to concede.

In this light, then, the treaty of 418 may have been in essence a rephrasing of previous treaties with one significant difference. This time there was a chance for greater longevity and stability, based upon the granting of a specific area for Gothic settlement and upon the existence of a more stable Visigothic monarchy. Customarily, the Gothic leader represented the Goths in negotiations with the Roman government. Periodic re-negotiations strengthened the consolidation of the Gothic monarchy. The position of a negotiator worked in two directions: it reinforced the status of the Gothic representative in the eyes of his own people and it also conferred on him an official Roman recognition. Alaric capitalized on both scores, and his successors used his precedent to bolster their own authority. In this view, any lands that the Roman emperor allotted to the Goths would have been transferred to the Gothic king and thence to his people. Thus a pyramid of power was created with the Roman emperor as the owner of all imperial lands, at the top; the Gothic ruler as the nominal holder of the lands, directly below; and a whole hierarchical structure, from Gothic nobles to Gothic peasants.

Which is not to say, however, that the Roman government gave up their claims to Aquitania. An imperial decree in 418, the so-called *Constitutio saluberrima* ("Most Wholesome Ordinance"), was issued in the name of Honorius for the express purpose of returning normality to the Gallic provinces.²⁴ It rejuvenated the *Concilium septem provinciarum* ("Council of the Seven Provinces"), a forum for the meeting of the representatives of all the Gallic provinces that had been established ca.403/408 but which had fallen into desuetude during the subsequent Gallic usurpations. Here, the territory allocated to the Visigoths was still clearly included within the imperial fold. The law presumed that Roman officials would continue to serve in the territory occupied by the Visigoths, noting, "So that with regard to Novempopulana and Aquitania Secunda, which provinces are located further away, if a fixed duty occupies their governors, let them know that legates must be sent according to custom."²⁵ Thus, even if the Roman government continued to claim some kind of administra-

²⁴ See Haenel, *Corpus legum*, p.238.

²⁵ *ita ut de Novempopulana, et Secunda Aquitania, quae provinciae longius constitutae sunt, si earum iudices occupatio certa tenerit, sciant, legatos iuxta consuetudinem esse mittendos* ("Saluberrima magnificentiae": Haenel, *Corp.leg.* no.1171 p.238).

tive authority in these areas, the realization existed from the beginning that there might be difficulties when it came to these officials actually attending the meetings of the council.²⁶ Nor is there any evidence that any of them ever did.

Land Tenure I

The sources, as already seen above, are quite clear that in 418 the Goths received land for settlement. Nevertheless, there have been attempts to reevaluate the specific methods used for the settlement.²⁷ It has been argued that the Goths were not given lands to settle, but merely a portion of the tax assessment of the inhabitants of Roman Aquitania. Admittedly, the century-old view that espouses the institution of *hospitalitas* as a model of land division between Romans and barbarians stands in need of modification.²⁸ For Roman laws regulating *hospitalitas*, whether accorded to soldiers or civilians, Romans or barbarians, are unanimous in insisting on the temporary sharing of either lands or urban residences.²⁹ None considered any form of permanent billeting or the hosting of entire families, and, in particular, none considered the granting of actual lands. Indeed, most regulations regarding *hospitalitas* involved either exemptions or the manner in which a location was to be "shared." So the means by which these temporary arrangements—if there was indeed any direct connection at all—evolved into patterns of permanent land tenure remains unclear.

But the hypothesis that suggests that the Goths merely received a share of tax revenues raises even more thorny problems.³⁰ In the first place, a survey of all the *foedera* concluded between Rome and various peoples in Late Antiquity shows that many of them insisted on grants

²⁶ See Matthews, *Aristocracies*, p.336

²⁷ See W. Goffart, *Barbarians and Romans 418-584: The Techniques of Accommodation* (Princeton 1980), and J. Durliat, "Le salaire de la paix sociale dans les royaumes barbares," in H. Wolfram and A. Schwarcz, eds. *Anerkenung und Integration* (Vienna 1988), 21-72.

²⁸ H. Sivan, "On *foederati*, *hospitalitas* and the Settlement of the Goths in AD 418," *AJP* 108 (1987), 759-772. Note also Paulinus of Pella, *Euch.* 285, *hospite tunc etiam Gothico quae sola careret*, which indicates the existence of Gothic *hospes* prior to the 418 settlement, and not involving land.

²⁹ *CTh* 7.8 (*De metatis*).

³⁰ E.g. S. Barnish, "Taxation, Land and Barbarian Settlement in the Western Empire," *PBSR* 54 (1986), 170-195; T. Burns, *Historia* (1992); and Sivan, "Foederati."

of lands for settlement.³¹ Its omission from the 418 agreement would require a convincing explanation. For, if the Goths were barred from land tenure and had to be content with a share of tax revenues, where did they actually live? One would expect some evidence, either written or archaeological, if all the Goths were crowded into cities.³² Tax-divisions would further assume that the Roman government had the machinery to execute an orderly collection and redistribution, but the numerous laws pertaining to taxation in the *Theodosian Code* suggest rather an ever slackening administrative grasp.³³

It seems clear, therefore, that the settlement of 418 involved the actual distribution of land. The sources explicitly refer to it.³⁴ There were lands available. And there were even existing procedures for the allocation of such lands. Even before the fifth century the Roman government had settled vast numbers of barbarians on Roman lands, both along external frontier zones and inside imperial territory. And while the *foederati* of the fifth century must be distinguished from earlier settlers who had not contracted a favorable *foedus* with the Roman government, the precedent of settling barbarians in accordance with patterns of Roman land tenure had been established for centuries. What really changed was the importation of people to do the job which native peoples, like the Moors of Africa, did elsewhere.

Of the types of lands which, at least in Gaul, would have been sufficient to accommodate the Goths, three are relevant: the *agri deserti* (owned, but deserted, lands), the *caduca* (lands whose ownership had lapsed and had reverted to the fisc), and the *res privatae* (lands owned by the crown).³⁵ Indeed, the granting of these lands could have kept the barbarians under obligation to the imperial treasury. And to make matters palatable to all sides, it would have been possi-

³¹ E. Chrysos, "Legal Concepts and Patterns for the Barbarians' Settlement on Roman Soil," in Chrysos-Schwarcz, eds., *Das Reich und die Barbaren* (Vienna 1989) 17.

³² The testimony of Ausonius' *Ordo* on demographic explosion at Toulouse, and with it considerable extension of the suburbia, relates to the fourth century. The appearance of the Goths on the Aquitanian economic scene has yet to be analysed in the context of market forces.

³³ See *NVal.1* (*Codex Euricianus* 438), *NVal.* 32 (*Codex Euricianus* 451), and *NMaj.* 7, esp. 7.14.

³⁴ See also T. Burns ("The Settlement of 418," in Drinkwater/Elton, *Gaul*, p.53-63), who also cites Philostratus, *HE* 12.4-5 as specific evidence that the the Visigoths were "allotted a part of the land of the Gauls for farming."

³⁵ See *Codex Theodosianus*, passim.

ble to apply existing laws which offered an ingenious manner of sorting out land divisions in a perfectly legal and acceptable way, namely veterans, rights. Numerous laws granted veterans of the Roman army land-tenure as well as many exemptions which were intended to assist the soldier-turned-farmer to effect a successful professional transformation. *CTh* 7.20.2 granted veterans exemption from compulsory municipal services, public works, and the market tax. *CTh* 7.20.4 bestowed tax-exempt status on the veteran and his family, while *CTh* 7.20.3 assured the grant of vacant lands which the veterans could hold untaxed in perpetuity. A veteran was also entitled to receive measures of grain and funding for the purchase of equipment. Another law encouraged veterans to cultivate the neglected properties of absent owners and lands which had not been tilled for a while. The similarities between these legal benefits and what is known of the conditions of the treaties which the Roman government repeatedly concluded with its Gothic allies are striking. Above all, it made plain sense to maintain the Goths in a lifestyle to which they had been accustomed for at least a century and a half, namely as peasants and not as city dwellers.³⁶

As for the means by which individual Visigoths acquired property, one may suggest that the Visigothic settlement of 418 was comprised of several elements. It involved the actual partition of land, both urban and rural holdings, although the ratio of distribution need not always have been the 2:1 of the classical *hospitalitas*, as seen in the references to the Roman *tertia*. Property divisions and Gothic settlement were not uniform: some districts were affected more than others, some lands (as seen below) were partitioned later than others, and the pattern of initial settlement corresponded to the varying economic factors, particularly where the *res privatae* were located and where vacant lands invited new labor.³⁷ Finally, as seen above, the main beneficiary of the entire transaction was the Visigothic monarch, and his control of the settlement process contributed significantly to the institutionalization and relative stability of the kingdom of Toulouse. Gothic legislation of the fifth and the sixth century

³⁶ Sid. Apoll. Apollinaris, *Ep.* 5.13.2; 2.1.3.

³⁷ The *Lex Romana Visigothorum* omits all the imperial laws relating to deserted lands, an omission due perhaps to the disappearance of this category owing to Gothic settlers. This legal corpus also replaced the term *res privata* with *res* (or *domus*) *domenica*, suggesting the extent of the control which the Gothic monarch had over these properties. See also Jones, *LRE* 1.249.

demonstrates that the king succeeded the Roman emperor as the largest land owner in the region.³⁸

Visigothic Expansion: The Dynamics of Internal Frontiers

The Early Years

In 418, the Visigothic future in Aquitania was by no means secure, and no one could have foreseen the development of an independent kingdom that would eventually supplant the Roman imperial state in southwestern Gaul.³⁹ From its very inception, for a number of reasons, the kingdom of Toulouse, confined by the ocean on one side, the Loire on another, and elsewhere by traditional provincial boundaries that did not correspond to any conspicuous geographical features, was bound to transgress its appointed limits. The directions of its expansion were twofold—toward the Mediterranean and into Spain. Both areas had been familiar to the Goths, because they had trod the *Via Domitia*, which connected Italy to Spain in the early 410s, and had fought in Spain between 416 and 418. Several motivations were at work behind the repeated and continuous attempts of the Gothic kings to expand their domain. The first was individual monarchic ambitions which dictated repeated exploitation of Roman weaknesses, namely Alaric's chief legacy. Another was the long tradition of rivalries between chieftains and the necessity to provide diversion, employment, and booty to loyal followers while retaining a position of superiority over potential competitors for the throne.

A critical factor in the constant mobility of the Aquitanian Goths was the process of fashioning a new monarchical ideal for the Aquitanian-based king along the lines of the Roman imperial model. Athaulf had understood the function of legal institutions in a settled society; his immediate successors were more impressed by the prestige of a Roman emperor as a perennial victor over all enemies.⁴⁰

³⁸ *CTh* 10.4.1 = *Breviarium Alarici* 10.3.1; *CTh* 10.4.2 = *Breviarium Alarici* 10.3.2.

³⁹ See Heather, *Goths*, p.224, "The emergence of a separate Gothic kingdom in Gaul was no certainty."

⁴⁰ Orosius, *Hist. adv. pag.* 7.43, with comments of J. Harries, *Sidonius*, 61, on Athaulf's initiating a change of emphasis in Gothic dealings with Rome, and on desiring to create a "state."

Like an emperor, the Gothic kings had to excel on the battlefields, which produced heroes and endowed authority. They did not, however, neglect the function of the ruler as an exclusive source of legal pronouncement, and the surviving law codes of Euric and Alaric attest to their roles in this regard.

Two trends in Gothic military activities can be discerned: the first, expeditions under Roman standards; the second, independent initiatives. The former were largely aimed at the Iberian peninsula, the latter directed the steps of the restless Gothic warriors to Arles. The years immediately following the settlement in Aquitania appear to have been relatively calm, if the silence of our sources can be trusted. They were punctuated by a single expedition to Spain under Roman banners, in which the Gothic contingent appears to have been responsible for a dismal defeat at the hands of the Vandals. The harassed provincials in the Iberian peninsula had to wait another twenty years for another Roman army to succor them from the Suevi and from local Bagaudae. As before, the troops included Gothic recruits and likewise suffered defeat. The Goths began to find success in Spain only when they fought there on their own initiative from the mid 450s.

In 425, during the long reign of Theoderic I (418-451), the Goths began their periodic and largely vain expeditions against Arles.⁴¹ The choice of the capital of the Gallic prefecture and a city so far inside Roman territory perhaps was a symbolic gesture demonstrating to the government that the Gothic monarch was in a good position to renegotiate the treaty.⁴² A pattern developed. When the Romans were busy elsewhere, the Visigoths marched south-east to the coast, thereby violating the *foedus*. A campaign against Narbonne in 436, for example, led to a counterattack in 437 by an enterprising Roman commander, Litorius.⁴³ In 439, this same Litorius invaded Visigothic territory, but was defeated in a battle near Toulouse and subsequently died in captivity.⁴⁴ This was in fact the last time that a Roman government tried to substantiate its claim to its Aquitanian provinces by attacking the Goths on their own territory. The *foedus*

⁴¹ Harries, *Sidonius*, 125, on the small scale of these expeditions.

⁴² Wolfram, *Goths*, 181, remarks with accuracy and charm that the march on Arles had become a sort of initiation process of the renewal of the Romano-Gothic *foedus*.

⁴³ See Prosp. *Chron.* s.a. 436; Hyd. *Chron.* 107, 110, s.a. 436-347.

⁴⁴ *PLRE II*, p.685, prefers sources that claim Litorius was killed in the battle, but Salvian, *De gub.* 7.39-43, states clearly that he starved to death in captivity: *longo tempore et diuturna in ergastula barbarorum tabe consumptus*, and Sid. Apoll., *Carm.* 7.300-301, *capto ... Litorio, concurs.*

was then renewed by the Gallic prefect Eparchius Avitus. The terms are unknown, but coming on the heels of a decisive Gothic victory, it must have been advantageous to the Goths; perhaps it acknowledged a greater degree of Gothic sovereignty in Aquitania.⁴⁵ Although one cannot cite a specific date for the birth of a Gothic "kingdom" in Aquitania, the Roman retreat from Toulouse in 439 may serve as a convenient point of departure.

Two events during the 450s brought a change in the balance of power between the Goths and Romans. First of all, in 451, Attila and the Huns invaded Gaul, a threat that necessitated careful negotiations between Aëtius, the Roman commander, and Theoderic I of Toulouse. These dire straits, if Jordanes is to be believed, seem to have compelled Valentinian III to acknowledge Theoderic's sovereignty over the Gallic territories that the Visigoths had acquired in 418.⁴⁶ The battle of the Catalaunian Fields in 451, in which the Romans, Visigoths, and Franks combined their forces to defeat the Huns, was the only one fought on Gallic soil with the Goths and the Romans on the same side. It also seems to mark a new phase of Visigothic independence. An Aquitanian inscription dating to the brief reign of Thorismund (451-453) calls him *dominus noster*, suggesting that the Visigothic kings now saw themselves as equal in status, and presumably authority, to the Roman emperors.⁴⁷ The battle also was significant in that, as will be discussed below, it later was identified as a *terminus post quem* for making legal claims.

The Visigoths and Avitus

A second turning point in the relations between Goths and Romans at this time was the ephemeral reign of the emperor Avitus (455-456).⁴⁸ In 410, Alaric the Goth had sacked the Eternal City. Forty-

⁴⁵ Sidonius states only, "you, Avitus, renewed the treaty, the reading of your pages tamed the savage king... the letter of a Roman voided what you, barbarian, conquered..." (*foedus, Avite, novas; saevum tua pagina regem lecta domat... littera Romani cassat quod, barbare, vincis*); see also Hyd. *Chron.* 117 s.a. 439, *inter Romanos et Gothos pax efficitur.*

⁴⁶ An embassy sent by Valentinian to Theoderic: *auxiliamini etiam rei publicae, cuius membrum tenetis. quam sit autem nobis expetenda vel amplexanda societas, nostis interrogate consilia* (Jord. *Get.* 188).

⁴⁷ *Bordeaux 2000 ans d'histoire* (Bordeaux 1992).

⁴⁸ See R. Mathisen, "Avitus, Italy and the East in AD 455-456," *Byzantion* 51(1981) pp.232-247; and "The Third Regnal Year of Eparchius Avitus," *Classical Philology* 80(1985) 192-196.

five years later his grandson, Theodoric II, "atoned" for the "crime" by bringing to Rome an emperor of his own making.⁴⁹ When the imperial throne fell vacant after the deaths of Valentinian III and Petronius Maximus in 455, the Gallo-Roman aristocracy and the Gothic court espoused the candidacy of Eparchius Avitus, an aristocrat from the Auvergne who had not only a good record of service in the Roman provincial and military administration, but also close ties to the Visigoths.

The circumstances of the Gothic support for Avitus remain obscure. It seems that the Goths took advantage of the disarray in Rome once again to violate the *foedus*. Knowing Avitus' past history of dealing with the Goths, the new emperor Maximus appointed him master of soldiers in Gaul—in itself a rather unusual example of a senator whose career had been civil being given a military appointment⁵⁰—and assigned him the task of inducing the Goths to adhere to the *foedus*. For Sidonius has Avitus say to Theodoric, "I beg for the old treaty."⁵¹ Theodoric obliged, but in an unexpected way, by supporting Avitus in a bid for the imperial throne.

This episode illustrates an attempt of the local Gallic nobility to cooperate with the court in Toulouse. With no army at their disposal the nobles clearly needed the military support of the Goths. This rapprochement between Romans and Goths began auspiciously. Avitus headed to Italy, where he occupied the imperial throne without opposition, and Theodoric turned his attentions to Spain. According to Sidonius' panegyric on Avitus, delivered in Rome on 1 January 456, the Visigoths were to provide fresh and much needed blood to boost Rome's weakness. At one point Avitus calls attention to his influence at the Gothic court, saying, "I once was accustomed to manage the affairs of the Goths."⁵² Sidonius also gave his own version of the secret of empire, saying that Avitus realized "that he could not conceal from the Gauls the fact that with him as emperor, the Goths would submit."⁵³ Theodoric himself, in words that echoed Athaulf's famous utterance about the mitigating power of *Romania*

⁴⁹ As a family friend claimed, Sid. Apoll., *Cam.* 7.504-509.

⁵⁰ Sidonius notes this anomaly when he has Avitus say, *ad lituos post iura vocat voluitque sonoris / praekonem mutare tubis* ("he summoned me, after I had enforced the laws, to the trumpets call, and wished me to exchange the cry of the usher for that of the tuba").

⁵¹ *foedera prisca precor* (Sid. Apoll. *Cam.* 7.469).

⁵² *tractare solebam / res Geticas olim* (*Cam.* 7.471-472).

⁵³ *Gallos scires non posse latere / quod possint servire Getae te principe* (*Cam.* 7.520-521).

over *Gothia*, confessed, "Though you, the laws of Romulus have long been pleasing to me ... you taught me even then to desire peace."⁵⁴ And a Gallic aristocrat recalled how the combined vigor of the Gauls and the Goths had for long supported "the shade of an empire" which Rome had become.⁵⁵

These were lofty sentiments, but hardly calculated to endear Avitus and Theodoric to the Italian audience of the panegyric. Rome's foreign policy, especially toward barbarians, had been conducted, at least ideologically, from a position of strength. A reminder of Rome's dire straits was a mistake for which the Gallic emperor paid after he inexplicably decided to send his Gothic troops away. In the fall of 456, Avitus, faced by unrest in Rome and opposition from the Italian high command, retreated to Gaul. In an attempt to return, he was defeated by the generals Ricimer and Majorian, and forcibly consecrated bishop of Piacenza. He died early in 457 while attempting to return to Gaul.

Avitus' failure marked a crucial turning point in the history of the Roman west. On the one hand, it marked the final breach in the gap between Rome and Gaul and contributed to the strengthening of a separatist Gallic identity.⁵⁶ And on the other, it brought a new sense of self-identity to the Goths, who, abandoning, it would seem, the last pretense of adhering to the old *foedus*, now proceeded enthusiastically to pursue territorial gain at the expense of the now impotent Roman government. Beforehand, Gothic military expeditions seem to have resulted in little real territorial gain, but beginning with the reign of Avitus, the Gothic kingdom expanded by leaps and bounds.

Visigothic Territorial Expansion

After 456, the Roman government was never again able to resist Gothic expansion effectively, as the Goths took advantage of both perceived and real Roman weakness. In the early 460s, Sidonius reflected on a situation characterized by "great vicissitudes of emperors and the unsteady fortunes of the state."⁵⁷ Statistics support this

⁵⁴ "mili Romula dudum / per te iura placent ... iam pacem tum velle doces" (Sid. Apoll., *Cam.* 7.498).

⁵⁵ Sid. Apoll., *Cam.* 7.540-1, *portavimus umbram imperii*.

⁵⁶ Mathisen, *Aristocrats*, 20f.

⁵⁷ *Epist.* 1.11.10: *ingentes principum motus atque inaequalem rei publicae status*; see Harries, *Sidonius*, 100.

sad observation which did not escape the watchful eyes of the rulers of Toulouse: between 455 and 475, the Goths in Aquitania had two rulers; the Roman government saw no less than seven emperors. The deaths of Aëtius, Valentinian III, Petronius Maximus, and Avitus between 454 and 457 heralded a change in Visigothic tactics and standing vis-à-vis the empire. During and after the reign of Avitus, for example, the Goths occupied most of Spain. At the same time, the Goths also began to assert their independence by undertaking diplomatic missions of their own. Hydatius records a string of independent diplomatic activities of the Goths in Spain beginning with the rather instructive story of a legation from Theodoric II to the Suevi in 456 and a simultaneous Roman diplomatic mission, an overlapping which must have confused the Suevic king who sent both missions back home empty-handed.⁵⁸

In Gaul, Gothic territorial ambitions turned again toward Narbonne, not unnaturally, because Narbonne was Aquitania's chief gate to the Mediterranean and thence to Spain. The Goths once again used their genius for obtaining diplomatic concessions from the Romans. In 462, Theodoric II (453-466), son and successor once-removed of Theodoric I, took possession of the city, not as a result of military prowess but, in this case, as a gift from the Italian government. The emperor Majorian had been executed in 461 by his barbarian Master of Soldiers Ricimer, who then had set his puppet Severus on the western throne. It is possible that the cession was made in exchange for Visigothic assistance against the Gallic loyalist Aegidius, who refused to accept Severus. Indeed, in 463 Aegidius killed Fredericus, the brother of Theodoric II, in a battle near Orléans.⁵⁹ The cession of Narbonne demonstrates the effectiveness of the persistent Gothic combination of continuous threats and occasional expeditions. It further shows the futility of the 418 attempt to contain the barbarians within recognized provincial boundaries and the determination of the Gothic kings to control the city that ensured their maritime access to Spain.

Under Euric (466-484), the most aggressive of all the kings of Toulouse, the Auvergne came under Visigothic attack. The end fi-

⁵⁸ Hyd. Chron. 170 s.a. 456. Hyd. Chron. 87 (96) s.a. 431, also cites a diplomatic mission of a Vetto from Gothic Aquitania to Gallacia (*Vetto, qui de Gothis dolose ad Galliciam venerat, sine aliquo effectu redit ad Gothos*). The entry may be an unusually early demonstration of Gothic ambitions to play a role in Spanish politics.

⁵⁹ See *PLRE II*, p.12.

nally came in the mid 470s. In 475, the Italian emperor Julius Nepos ceded the Auvergne to Euric in exchange for a reduction of the Visigothic pressure on Provence.⁶⁰ Subsequently, after the exile of Nepos and the forced retirement of the usurper Romulus in 476, "Euric, king of the Visigoths, recognizing the feebleness of the Roman empire, delivered Arles and Marseilles to his own authority."⁶¹ By this time, of course, there was no authority left that could resist the Visigothic advance, and the capture of the remaining cities of Provence was accomplished not, it seems, by force, but by simple occupation, and marks the demise of Roman Gaul. The Visigothic realm now extended to the Rhone in the east and the Mediterranean in the south. The Loire proved the most stable frontier of the Gothic kingdom and the only one not breached by the Gothic monarchs. Perhaps the independent spirit of the dwellers of Armorica intimidated even the Goths, although when the Britons attacked the Goths on their own territory (around Bourges) they suffered a signal defeat.⁶² Otherwise, Euric's ambitions knew no bounds. In 484, he planned to invade Italy itself, but he died in Arles before this scheme could be carried out.

Visigothic Policies

What emerges from this overview of Visigothic expansion is the role that warfare played in the policies of the Gothic monarchs. Visigothic troops were on the march even when their objectives were unattainable. Most of the Gallic cities were walled, and the Goths, at least at the beginning of the fifth century, had little success at siege warfare.⁶³ This mattered little for a people whose kings were made and unmade by wars. In 395 Alaric owed his elevation, we are told, to a fear of the debilitating effects of a long peace.⁶⁴ The issue of royal succession was centered on the attitudes of the candidates toward the Roman Em-

⁶⁰ See Mathisen, *Factionalism*, pp.268-271.

⁶¹ *Euricus rex Visigothorum Romani regni vacillationem cernens Arelatum et Massiliam propriae subdidit ditioni* (Jord. *Get.* 244).

⁶² Jordanes, *Get.* 237-8, dating the event to the reign of Anthemius (468-71) and connecting it with Riothamus; Greg. Tur. *HF* 2.18 for the location.

⁶³ Sidonius refers to the *semirutas ... arces* ("ruined fortifications") of Narbonne after the Visigothic occupation of 462, but because the government surrendered the city to the Goths peacefully, it may be that the Goths pulled down the fortifications after occupying the city.

⁶⁴ Jordanes, *Getica* 146. Cf. Sid. Apoll., *Carm.*, 7.416-430.

pire. A divergence from the traditional path of war often resulted in an untimely death, as that of Athaulf in 416. His successor, Vallia, signed a pact that turned the Goths into Roman soldiers and kept them fully engaged on the battle-field. Theodoric I, Thorismund, Theodoric II and Euric did not give their warriors respite from war. And yet, what is curious is that nearly all the Visigothic gains in Gaul occurred through diplomatic or peaceful means, not by force of conquest.

Turning internal into ever-changing external frontiers also meant a constant drain on Gothic manpower. When campaigns changed from temporary assaults to permanent acquisition, the Gothic monarch had to establish a visible and effective presence. The pressure on the available Gothic manpower in Aquitania must have increased tremendously during Euric's reign and contributed, in the short term, to the quick collapse of his kingdom just twenty years after his death. Traditionally, Gothic society had been inclusive, ready to welcome new "recruits" at any time. The Gothic court in Aquitania attracted various warriors, as a story about an Ostrogothic noble who kept his identity a secret but distinguished himself in Visigothic service nicely illustrates.⁶⁵ In the 470s, the Visigothic population was augmented by another infusion of Ostrogoths.⁶⁶ And, as seen below, even Gallo-Romans were absorbed into the Gothic army. But one wonders, given the additional demands of the Spanish conquests, whether the supply was able to keep pace with the demand.

As for the conceptual nature of the Visigothic kingdom, it has been suggested that Euric launched his expansionist campaigns with the aim of creating a nation-state and a recognizable successor to the Roman empire.⁶⁷ One may go even further. Euric was in fact a most zealous imitator of the Roman ideal of emperorship. As heir to the oldest Germanic kingdom established on Roman soil he also held a prior claim to a right to fill the power vacuum which the weakening of imperial power created in Gaul. Nor was he the first Gothic ruler to see wars of conquest as a natural extension of the building up of a new royal image. The first monarch of Toulouse, Theodoric I, had his son, Theodoric II, tutored in Roman literature and law, precisely

⁶⁵ Jordanes, *Getica* 174-5, 251. The story is dated to the beginning of the reign of Theodoric I (418-451).

⁶⁶ Jord. *Get.* 284.

⁶⁷ Harries, *Sidonius*, 222, supported by Jordanes, *Getica*, 237 who adds that Euric aimed to hold Gaul by his own right.

the type of education which one would expect of an heir to the imperial throne.

Visigothic "nationalism" was blatantly expressed by its most aggressive representative, Euric, when he insisted on the presence of translators during negotiations between his court and imperial emissaries.⁶⁸ Euric even responded in Gothic and his words were then translated into Latin. The king knew Latin rather well, of course. He not only sponsored an entire law code in that language but had been reared in a household where his brother could recite Virgil. By the 470s, however, when the occupants of the imperial throne sent ambassadors to the Gothic court, Euric's position enabled him to act precisely as an emperor would have done. Although the relations between Rome and Toulouse became irreparably damaged, the Gothic monarchs never failed to imitate the only imperial model which still carried the prestige of age and tradition. As the Roman presence in Gaul dwindled to a mere representation of sporadic officials, the power of imperial ceremony invaded the courts of the barbarian heirs of Augustus.⁶⁹

Land Tenure II

The expansion of the kingdom of Toulouse after 456 once again brings up the question of land tenure. In what light did the Gothic monarchs regard the territories that they annexed? These newly acquired regions presumably also provided lands for Gothic settlers who wished to migrate from Aquitania and live elsewhere.⁷⁰ A Gothic presence in Narbonensis, which must have begun after the annexation of Narbonne in 462, demonstrates the attraction of the new territories. Did subsequent expansion of Visigothic domains entail the same principles of land acquisition and distribution as had existed in 418? Or did there come to be two categories of territory administered by the Gothic rulers?

The Gothic settlement clearly brought great disruption in landholding patterns, as both Goths and Romans came and went, de-

⁶⁸ Ennodius, *Vita Epiphani*, 90.

⁶⁹ S.G. MacCormack, *Art and Ceremony in Late Antiquity* (Berkeley 1981), 222f. M. McCormick, *Eternal Victory: Triumphal Rulership in Late Antiquity, Byzantium, and the Early Medieval West* (Cambridge 1986).

⁷⁰ This was surely the case for the newly acquired territories in Spain, where the methods of land transfer also are most unclear.

pending on the vicissitudes of the times. Although the processes by which such land transfer occurred are extremely unclear, some suggestive evidence does survive. Especially instructive is a section of the *Codex Euricianus*, issued in the late 470s, dealing with land tenure and clearly intended to bring a return to stability, now that Roman authority had totally disappeared. They dealt in particular with changes in boundaries, with overturning illegal changes and implementing new changes legally. Two of the laws of the code attempted to prohibit what apparently was a common practice: the removal and relocation of boundary stones. Every attempt was to be made to restore the original boundary markings, even if by resorting to markings made on trees. Nor did length of possession permit one to claim the property of another.⁷¹ Furthermore, all property transactions that had occurred *ante adventum Gothorum* were allowed to stand, that is to say, the reopening of transactions closed under the Romans could not be reopened in hopes of obtaining a more favorable decision under the Goths.⁷²

The code also attempted to sort out property claims involving Goths and Romans, and in particular, those resulting from the divisions of land. One ruling, which unfortunately is fragmentary at a crucial point, reads:

... [si ... quas] habent Romani, fuerint, tunc Gothi [in]grediantur in loco hospitum et ducan[t ubi] terminum fuerat ostensus [sic]. Tunc iudex, quos certiores agnoverit, faciat eos s[a]cramenta praebere, quod terminum s[ine] ulla fraude monstraverint. Nullus n[on] terminum sine consorte part[is al]terius aut sine <in>spectore constituat...⁷³

... [if] there were [lands eligible for distribution which] Romans possess, then let Goths enter in the role of "guests" and let them consider where the boundary had been established. Then the judge shall compel those whom he accepted as knowledgeable to swear oaths that they pointed out the boundary without any fraud. Let no one establish a new boundary without a partner from the other side or without an inspector...

This passage seems to refer to property that was eligible for distribution to Goths, but which for some reason had not been divided.

⁷¹ *Cod.Eur.* 274-275.

⁷² *Si quodcumque ante adventum Gothorum de alicuius fundi iure remotum est et ... translatum est ... atque a Romanis antiquitus probatur adiunctum, iure consistat...* (*Cod.Eur.* 276).

⁷³ *Cod.Eur.* 276. There is a lacuna before *habent Romani*. Mommsen (*Codex Theodosianus* 1.4) suggests *si vero fundorum termini in tertiis, quas...*; we prefer to retain the sense without being nearly so specific regarding the key word *tertiis*.

Assuming that the word *consors* is used here in its technical sense, that is, as referring to the Goth who partitioned land with a Roman, this passage describes the method by which Roman land which had somehow hitherto escaped partitioning continued to be divided with Goths even as late as the 470s.

This conclusion would seem to be borne out by the following section, which reads:

Sortes Gothicas et tertias [Roma]norum quae intra L annis non fuerint revocatae, nullo modo repetantur. Si[mili]ter de fugitivis, qui intra L annis in[ven]ti non fuerint, non liceat eos ad ser[vitium] revocare. Antiquos vero terminos [sic] stare iubemus, sicut et bonae mem[ori]ae pater noster in alia lege praecepi[t]; et alias omnes causas, seu bonas seu m[al]as, qu[ae] intra XXX annis definitae non fue[ri]nt, vel mancipia, quae in contentione [po]sita fuerint, sive debita, quae exacta [no]n <fuerint>, nullo modo repetantur. Et si quis [po]st hunc XXX annorum numerum cau[sam] movere temptaverit, iste numerus [ei] resistat, et libram auri cui rex iusse[rit] coactus exsolvat. Omnes autem cau[sas], quae in regno bonae memoriae patris [no]stri seu bonae seu malae actae sunt, [no]n permittimus penitus commoveri...⁷⁴

The Gothic "allotments" and Roman "thirds" which have not been claimed within fifty years in no way are to be demanded anew. Likewise regarding fugitives who have not been apprehended within fifty years; it is not permitted to recall them to servitude. Truly, we decree that ancient boundaries are to remain, just as Our Father of blessed memory prescribed in another law, and all other cases, with or without merit, which have not been settled within thirty years, or property, which has been in dispute, or debts, which have not been paid, in no way shall be reclaimed. And if anyone after this period of thirty years tries to undertake a case, let that number prevent him, and let him be compelled to pay a pound of gold to whomever the king commands. Moreover, we forbid any cases, which were settled, with or without merit, during the reign of Our Father of blessed memory, in any way to be disturbed...

This passage clearly refers to the Gothic "allotments" and Roman "thirds" that resulted from divisions of property between Romans and Goths subsequent to the original Gothic settlement of 418—and also seems once again to put to rest notions regarding a distribution of revenue.⁷⁵ A similar reference is found in Sidonius, who in the 470s spoke of a *limes sortis Gothicae*,⁷⁶ perhaps a reference to an internal

⁷⁴ *MGH Leges* pp.5-6. Sections of the law are restored from the *Lex Visigothorum* 10.2-3 (which deleted, for example, the references to Euric's father).

⁷⁵ As does *Cod.Eur.* 312, discussed below.

⁷⁶ *Sid.Apoll. Epist.* 7.6.10; cf. the African *sortes Vandalorum*. The word *sortis* conventionally referred to the land allotment allocated to a barbarian.

frontier that enclosed the territory covered by the original treaty of 418. This could suggest that new lands acquired by the Goths after the initial settlement also were eligible for partition, and were treated the same way as lands acquired in 418.

This particular law, among other things, must have been intended to settle a welter of conflicting claims over land by both Goths and Romans that had accrued during the period of Visigothic expansion. Claims involving the land distributions had a fifty-year statute of limitations, presumably fifty years after the property first had become eligible for distribution. If this restriction were intended to begin immediately, it would mean that land that became eligible for division after c.430 could be litigated. This already would suggest that the distribution of the *sortes Gothicae* and *tertia Romanae* had continued after 418. But it might be reasonable, also, to suppose that those who might have claims were given a period of time to make them. In that case, the law perhaps was effectively meant to commence with the settlement of 439.

For a specific example of the kinds of claims this law was intended to deal with, one might note, for example, the case of the sons of Paulinus of Pella, who returned to Bordeaux in the late 450s to attempt to reclaim some of their family property, but could only do so "in company with a Gothic fellow-claimant."⁷⁷ And this law also confirms the supposition resulting from the previous law, that is, that some eligible lands had escaped partitioning, but still could be distributed later.

Also significant is the ruling that ancient boundary markings continued to be valid, a reissuance of a ruling from the reign of Euric's father, Theoderic I (418-451). Both laws would reflect the jockeying over property that clearly went on during the period of Visigothic expansion. A case in point is provided, again, by Paulinus of Pella. Sometime before the composition of his *Eucharisticon* (ca.460) he had a Gothic buyer for some of his property. The passage is obscure, but appears to refer to a quitclaim for any remaining interest that he had in his family's former Aquitanian properties, which would have been located in Aquitania Secunda, the area assigned for Visigothic settlement in 418.⁷⁸ Paulinus had apparently lost most of his inheritance

⁷⁷ *Gothico quamquam consorte colono* (Paul.Pel. *Euch.* 502).

⁷⁸ "ut, cum iam penitus fructus de rebus avitis [sc. in Aquitania] sperare ulterius nullos me posse probasses... emptorem mihi ignotum de gente Gothorum

about 415, not to the Goths initially but to Honorius' government, since his lands were confiscated as a result of his support for Attalus, the Visigothic nominee.⁷⁹ Such lands would have been a ready target for partitioning. Furthermore, the aforementioned Gothic *consors colonus* who several decades later briefly shared the remainder of the family's Bordeaux property, may be none other than the Gothic buyer of Paulinus' remaining property claims. Upon the death of both sons, he may have wished to obtain clear title over the rest of the land. Paulinus may have considered the payment miraculous, but the meticulous Goth merely wanted to ensure that his ownership would not be contested in the future.

Finally, for other cases that had not yet been settled, the statute of limitations was only thirty years. This would put the original cut-off point for claims at ca. 450, that is, at the time of the battle of the *campus Mauriacus*, and the death of Theoderic I, in 451. That this is just what was intended is also suggested by the prohibition on re-initiating any claims that had been settled under Theoderic I (418-451). Coupled with the ruling that all settlements made prior to 418 likewise could not be challenged, it would appear that Euric saw 451, the date of the death of his father and the battle against the Huns, as a *terminus post quem* for all future litigation involving land tenure claims. And in this regard, one can only note that the Burgundians, too, chose the portentous battle against the Huns (even though they had not been involved) as the cut-off point for legal claims in their own kingdom.⁸⁰

excires, nostri quondam qui iuris agellum
mercari cupiens pretium transmitteret ultro,
haud equidem iustum, verumtamen accipienti
votivum, fateor..." (*Euch.* 572-581).

Some of the confusion over the location of the property has arisen because of an intervening three lines that referring to Paulinus poverty stricken condition at Marseilles; but Paulinus' statement that the payment had to be "transmitted" would seem to make it clear that the Gothic purchase was not located at Marseilles.

⁷⁹ *Euch.* 422f.

⁸⁰ *Lex.Burg.*17.1, *omnes omnino causae, quae ... habitae sunt et non sunt finitae usque ad pugnam Mauriacensem...*

*Rulers and subjects in Visigothic Aquitania:
The Social and Political Culture of the Kingdom*

The Court

An interested observer of the Gothic court in the middle of the fifth century depicted an image of a Gothic monarch who, both in public and in private, projected power, prestige, and confidence.⁸¹ In an enchanting description sent by Sidonius Apollinaris to his brother-in-law, Theoderic II is portrayed as a leader careful to conduct his daily routine in full public view. The king punctually attends church services, receives embassies, looks after financial matters, goes hunting, offers lavish dinner parties, plays dice, listens to petitions, and allows himself to be entertained. In all cases the monarch is attended either by his retinue (*comitatus*), or by his armed nobles (*comites armigeri*), and guards (*pellitorum turba satellitum*). Also present are the courtiers (*aulici*), who dispensed patronage and served as links between the king and his subjects.⁸² Subsequently, as a reluctant subject of Euric, Sidonius portrayed him as a victorious monarch, dictating treaties and issuing laws to vanquished nations.⁸³ He asserted, "Your forces are called for, Euric, so that the gallant Garonne, through its martial settlers, might defend the feeble Tiber."⁸⁴ This is, of course, precisely the type of behavior expected of a Roman emperor.

The Visigothic court became a new source of power and patronage, and enticed Roman petitioners of various kinds. In the late 460s, the Gallic aristocrat Evodius, having been summoned to Toulouse "at the order of the king," attempted to influence Euric by presenting to queen Ragnahilda an engraved silver bowl.⁸⁵ Sidonius himself apparently was a frequent visitor with petitions of his own: in his description of Theoderic II, he noted, "When I wish to obtain some favor, I achieve a favorable result when I lose at the dice table in order to win my case."⁸⁶ Here also is a rare insight into the relation-

⁸¹ Sid.Apoll., *Epist.* 1.2, see H. Sivan, "Sidonius Apollinaris, Theoderic II, and Gothic-Roman Politics from Avitus to Anthemius," *Hermes* 117 (1989) 85-94.

⁸² Sid.Apoll., *Epist.* 1.2.9.

⁸³ Sid.Apoll., *Epist.* 8.3.3; 9.4; 9 (*car.*).

⁸⁴ "Eorice, tuae manus rogantur / ut Martem validus per inquilinum / defendat tenuem Garumna Thybrim" (*Epist.* 8.9.5 *car.* 42-44).

⁸⁵ Sid.Apoll. *Epist.* 4.8.1-5.

⁸⁶ *etiam ego aliquid obsecraturus feliciter vincor, quando mihi ad hoc tabula perit, ut causa salvetur* (*Epist.* 1.2.8).

ship between the king and the Gothic aristocracy—they are his hunting companions and play-mates, men who appreciate the king's "good sport" attitude.

A rather different portrayal of royal hospitality, moreover, is found in the *vita* of bishop Vivianus of Saintes. During the reign of Theoderic II, Vivianus was invited to sup with the king at Toulouse. He accepted, but was put in an awkward position when he was offered a cup which had been shared by the Arian clerics in attendance. He had no choice but to refuse, and as a result was imprisoned for this insult to the king.⁸⁷

The court also attracted Romans, both laymen and ecclesiastics, in a more official capacity, often a diplomatic one. In 439, for example, the Visigoths themselves were said to have used Nicene bishops, including Orientius of Auch, as ambassadors to the Roman general Aëtius.⁸⁸ In 451, Theoderic I was visited by both the future emperor Eparchius Avitus, and Anianus, bishop of Orléans, who had been sent by the imperial government in an attempt to secure Gothic cooperation against the Huns.⁸⁹ In the same year, Tonantius Ferreolus, the prefect of Gaul, was able to induce Theoderic to lift an opportunistic siege of Arles—supposedly at a dinner party and presumably in exchange for concessions of some sort.⁹⁰ Circa 470, another Avitus served as negotiator between the imperial government and the Goths, and at about the same time, the aristocrat Simplicius represented Bourges in the same capacity.⁹¹

Even later, in 474, the emperor Nepos (474-475) chose Epiphanius of Pavia as his emissary to Euric at Toulouse.⁹² On this occasion, Epiphanius, like Vivianus before him, was invited to dinner with the Visigothic king. Epiphanius, however, was more discreet. Rather than openly supping with the Arian clergy whom he knew would be there, he dissembled, saying that "he was not accustomed to eating out and wanted to get an early start two days hence."⁹³ In point of fact, however, in spite of his hagiographer's pious claims, Epiphanius failed to resolve the issue—perhaps he had offended the Visigoths

⁸⁷ *Viviani* 6; *MGH SRM* 3.96-98.

⁸⁸ *Salv. De gub.* 7.9.39; *Vorientii* 5.

⁸⁹ Sid.Apoll. *Car.* 7; *Fred. Chron.* 2.53.

⁹⁰ *ab Arelatensium portis ... te prandio removisse* (Sid.Apoll. *Epist.* 7.12.3)

⁹¹ Sid.Apoll. *Epist.* 3.1.4-5, 7.9.19.

⁹² *VEpiphani* 81ff.

⁹³ *cui excusavit dixitque sibi non esse in more positum alienis aliquando prandis vesci, perendie se magis velle proficisci* (*VEpiph.* 92).

after all. As a result, four Gallic bishops then were sent to complete the negotiations; to one of them, Sidonius wrote, "Through you, the evils of treaties are expedited, through you, the agreements and conditions of both kingdoms are channeled."⁹⁴

At times, Gallo-Roman cooperation with the Gothic court became more complex—and dangerous. In the changing political climate in the 460s and 470s, it sometimes became necessary for influential Gauls to choose sides.⁹⁵ In 469, a group of Gallic aristocrats accused the popular ex-prefect Arvandus of collusion with the Gothic court. They even produced a letter in which Arvandus encouraged Euric to declare war against the emperor Anthemius and to divide Gaul between the Goths and the Burgundians.⁹⁶ Perhaps Arvandus aimed at an imperial throne obtained with the aid of the Goths and the Burgundians. The story is strange, and Sidonius' report omits crucial details, but it highlights the tension that existed in the ranks of the Gallo-Roman aristocracy. Euric's reaction is not recorded but he clearly stood to gain from internal divisions among the Gallo-Romans and from the support of powerful individuals like Arvandus.

Another Roman official, Seronatus, the "Vicar of the Seven Provinces" (*vicarius septem provinciarum*), was accused of attempting to substitute Gothic for Roman law and of helping the Visigoths to extend their settlement at Roman expense.⁹⁷ Seronatus' motives are unclear—he may have been merely a product of his times. For Sidonius, Seronatus was "the Catiline of our age,"⁹⁸ an epithet that expressed distaste but did little to explain what precisely Seronatus did. Other Gauls, too, were concerned about collaborators with the barbarians. A canon of the Council of Angers in 453, during the reign of Thorismund or Theoderic II, attempted to regulate relations between Romans and barbarians by decreeing, "If anyone is apprehended having been involved in the betrayal or capture of cities, let him not only be excluded from communion, let him also be excluded from dinner parties."⁹⁹ A most weighty sentence.

⁹⁴ *per vos mala foederum currunt, per vos regni utriusque pacta condicionesque portantur* (*Epist.* 7.6.10); for discussion see Mathisen, *Factionalism*, pp.268-271.

⁹⁵ Mathisen, *Aristocrats*, 77f. for what follows.

⁹⁶ Sid. Apoll., *Epist.* 1.7.5.

⁹⁷ Sid. Apoll., *Epist.* 2.1.; 5.13.1.; 7.7.2.

⁹⁸ Ibid., *Epist.* 2.1.1.

⁹⁹ Canon 4: *Corp. chr. lat.* 148.138.

Romans in Gothic Service

Beginning in the 460s, some Gallo-Romans escaped the ambiguous positions of such as Arvandus and Seronatus by holding official positions in the evolving Gothic administration.¹⁰⁰ In 461. Such assistance, it would seem, was clearly needed. Territories that the Goths annexed appear to have been thinly guarded by Gothic garrisons, and kept under the control of a Gothic commander. Any civil administrative structure seems to have been thin at best. One recalls, for example, the aforementioned penalty that violators of the land claims legislation were to pay "a pound of gold to whomever the king commands"—as if it was unclear just who this would be.

As one would expect, however, given Gothic predilections, most of the attested Gallo-Roman service was in the military. For example, the Master of Soldiers Nepotianus "accepted Arborius as his successor at the behest of Theoderic."¹⁰¹ In this instance, it would appear that the Gothic king simply was appropriating the right of appointing an official of the old Roman administration, who then presumably would report to him rather than to the emperor.

The next Visigothic king, the ambitious Euric, made more extensive use of Gallo-Roman officials, in both military and civil capacities. At the same time, he began to tailor the Visigothic administrative system to suit his own particular needs. The Gallo-Roman Victorius was appointed as *dux super septem civitates* ("Duke of the Seven Cities") in Aquitania Prima; he also was referred to as a *comes* ("Count"), so perhaps his full title was *comes et dux Aquitaniae Primae* ("Count and Duke of First Aquitania").¹⁰² Such an office had no clear Roman antecedent. Shortly thereafter, in 473, the *dux Hispaniarum* ("Duke of Spain") Vincentius commanded Visigothic armies in Spain.¹⁰³ This, too, was a newly created position. In the same year, Vincentius was sent "like a Master of Soldiers" (*quasi magister militum*) by Euric to invade Italy.¹⁰⁴ Now, it usually is assumed that in this capacity Vincentius was just another Master of Soldiers, the successor to the aforementioned Arbo-

¹⁰⁰ See Mathisen, *Aristocrats*, pp.126-128.

¹⁰¹ *Nepotianus Theoderico ordinante Arborium accipit successorem* (*Chron.* 213; cf. 230); see *PLRE II*, p.129.

¹⁰² See Sid. Apoll. *Epist.* 4.10.2; Greg. Tur., *HF* 2.20, *Vit. pat.* 3, *Glor. mart.* 44; and *PLRE II*, pp.1162-1164.

¹⁰³ *Chron. gall.* 511. no. 652; *PLRE II*, p.1168.

¹⁰⁴ *Chron. gall.* 511 no. 653.

rius.¹⁰⁵ But the insertion of the qualifier *quasi* indicates that this was not the case: the writer apparently believed that Vincentius fulfilled the function of a Master of Soldiers, but that he was not the genuine article. In this instance, the Roman writer was at a loss as to exactly what kind of official titulature to use. And once again, the developing Visigothic administration is seen to be diverging from its Roman model.

Another Gallo-Roman in Visigothic military service, in the late 470s, was the "admiral" Namatius of Saintes, who commanded naval forces defending the Atlantic coast against the raids of the Saxons. Sidonius cited a report that "recently you sounded the bugle in the fleet and performing the duties first of a sailor, then of a soldier, you wandered about the sinuous shores of the ocean in opposition to the serpentine pirate ships of the Saxons... You accompany the standards of a victorious people [sc. the Visigoths]."¹⁰⁶ Namatius' official title was not cited. His multifarious responsibilities, however, would have been similar to those of the Roman *dux tractus armoricani ac nervicani* ("Duke of the Armorican and Nervian Region"), and here, again, the old Roman office apparently had been adapted to suit the needs of the Visigoths. On a lesser, yet in its own way equally revealing, scale, the Aquitanian Calminius, for example, served in the Visigothic army besieging Clermont; Sidonius purported to believe that his friend had been compelled to do so.¹⁰⁷ And many other Gauls, including Apollinaris, the son of Sidonius, fought on the Gothic, losing, side at the battle of Vouillé against the Franks in 507.¹⁰⁸

In the 470s, Gallo-Roman civil officials serving the Visigoths included Potentinus, whom Sidonius referred to as a "iudex," that is, a provincial governor.¹⁰⁹ At the same time, or shortly thereafter, a Rusticus, who may have lived near Bordeaux, also seems to have been in office.¹¹⁰ But a more instructive example is provided by the jurist Leo of Narbonne, who by circa 474 was serving as a *consiliarius* ("Counsel-

¹⁰⁵ See *PLRE II*, p.1168.

¹⁰⁶ *nuper vos classicum in classe cecinisse atque inter officia nunc nautae, modo militis litoribus Oceani curvis inerrare contra Saxonum pandos myoparones ... victoris populi signa comitatis* (*Epist.* 8.6.13-18); see *PLRE II*, p.771.

¹⁰⁷ *Epist.* 5.12: *ad arbitrium terroris alieni ... in hoc solum captivis adduceris*. Note also Trygetius of Bazas, who had been on campaign outside Cadiz (*Epist.* 8.12.2), in either Roman or Visigothic service (*PLRE II*, p.1129).

¹⁰⁸ Greg.Tur. *HF* 2.37.

¹⁰⁹ *Epist.* 5.11.2, *indicas ut qui aequissime*; see *PLRE II*, p.903.

¹¹⁰ See *Ruric.Epist.* 2.20,54; and *Sid.Apoll. Epist.* 2.11,8.11.3. *PLRE II*, (p.964) has the Rustici of Sidonius and Ruricius as two different individuals.

lor") of Euric.¹¹¹ Ennodius of Pavia described him as "the moderator and arbiter of the counselors of the king."¹¹² And Sidonius said of him, circa 476/477, "Today, solicitous of the whole world, you oversee in the councils of the most powerful king contracts and laws, war and peace, localities, regions, and rewards."¹¹³ Leo preserved his position of *consiliarius* under Alaric II (484-507).¹¹⁴ So Leo would have been an influential person indeed. Others who served in a legal capacity were those, too numerous to mention individually, involved in the compilation in 506 of the *Breviarium* of Alaric II (discussed below).¹¹⁵

Legal Considerations

Aside from interactions with the Gothic kings, court, and administration, we know precious little about social hierarchy, class relations, and interaction among the Goths of the fifth century, and about relations between ordinary Goths and Romans. Formal social and economic interactions in the Visigothic kingdom were regulated by Visigothic legislation. The aforementioned *Codex Euricianus* is the earliest corpus of which we have any extant remains, although there are indications that Theodoric I or II, if not both, also issued laws. Sidonius, for example, mentioned "laws of Theoderic."¹¹⁶ And the law code of Euric confirmed a law originally issued by his father, and also reaffirmed all the "cases that were prosecuted, either for good or ill, during the reign of our father of blessed memory."¹¹⁷

The surviving portions of the *Codex Euricianus* amount to one sixth

¹¹¹ *PLRE II*, p.5.

¹¹² *consiliorum principis et moderator et arbiter, Leo nomine* (*VEpiphaniū* 85).

¹¹³ *cotidie ... per potentissimi consilia regis lotius sollicitus orbis pariter negotia et iura, foedera et bella, loca spatia merita cognoscis*. Leo also was Euric's speechwriter: *Sid.Apoll. Epist.* 8.3.3, see also *Carm.* 9.311-314, 14 *epist.* 2, 23.441-444, *Epist.* 4.22.1-3, 9.3.2 *carm.* 20, and 9.15.1 *carm.* 19-20.

¹¹⁴ Greg.Tur. *Glor.mart.* 92.

¹¹⁵ Note Hispanus (*PLRE II*, p.566; *Ruric.Epist.* 2.45); Elaphius (*PLRE II*, p.387; *Ruric.Epist.* 2.7; *Sid.Apoll. Epist.* 4.15); Praesidius (*PLRE II*, p.903; *Ruric. Epist.* 2.12); Anianus (*PLRE II*, p.90; *CTh*, Mommsen ed., 1.1.xxxiv-v); Timotheus (*PLRE II*, p.1121; *CTh*, Mommsen ed., 1.1.xxxiii-iv); Goiaricus (*PLRE II*, p.517 [possibly a German]; *CTh*, Mommsen ed., 1.1.xxxii-v); Eudomius (*PLRE II*, p.409; *Caes.Epist ad Ruric.* 7; *Ruric.Epist.* 2.39); Apollinaris (*PLRE II*, p.114; *III* 2.37; *Avit. Epist.* 51); and Avitus (*AASS* June IV p.292).

¹¹⁶ *leges ... Theodoricianas* (*Epist.* 2.1.3; see also *Carm.* 7.495-496).

¹¹⁷ *omnes autem cau[sa]s, quae in regno bonae memoriae patris [no]stri, seu bonae seu male actae sunt, [no]n permittimus penitus connoveri...* (*Codex Euricianus* no.177: *MGH Leges* 1.5).

of its original length and touch on matters of property, buying and selling, loans and gifts.¹¹⁸ Euric, for his part, seems to have been concerned with preserving the identity of the Goths, but his code also safeguarded many institutions dear to the hearts of Roman aristocrats.¹¹⁹ As seen above, several laws concerned landholding, and would have reassured Gallo-Roman landowners in the Visigothic kingdom that their interests would be protected.

The *Codex Euricianus*, issued in Latin, also suggests a growing assimilation between Goths and Gallo-Romans, for its application appears to apply to both. It further reveals a context in which legislation had become an instrument of national unity. Euric codified his laws to assert Visigothic independence of any vestige of Roman authority, and his effort to do so is another indication of his desire to portray himself as an ersatz emperor. But he did so, moreover, at precisely the same time that his nobles were apparently adopting many elements of a Roman lifestyle themselves, and as a result would have felt more comfortable living within an established legal framework.

Social Interactions

The Visigothic legislation, of course, is primarily concerned with generalities, and does not provide many specific examples of interactions between Romans and Visigoths. For these, one must rely upon only very occasional *obiter dicta* in other sources, often relating to land and property. In some instances, one hears of amicable interactions, as in the aforementioned case of the Goth who purchased the Aquitanian property rights of Paulinus of Pella. Another person who benefited from the regularization of relations would have been Sidonius' friend Lampridius, who after having his property rights restored by Euric was described by Sidonius as a *civis* (citizen) of the Gothic kingdom.¹²⁰

At other times, no doubt, relations were more adversarial. Once again, the case of Paulinus of Pella, who seems to have lost much of his Aquitanian property, perhaps even to his relatives, comes to mind. At other times, too, it seems, Romans used sharp practices to

¹¹⁸ Only about sixty of the original 350 clauses survive, many of them fragmentary. The controversial collection which goes under the title of *Edictum Theoderici* appears to be Ostrogothic rather than Visigothic in origin.

¹¹⁹ It is not clear who was responsible for the actual compilation, but Gallo-Romans were undoubtedly involved: see Mathisen, *Aristocrats*, p. 219, for suggestions of the jurist Leo of Narbonne and Marcellinus of Narbonne.

¹²⁰ Sid. Apoll. *Epist.* 8.9.3.

try to take advantage of less legally sophisticated Goths. The *Codex Euricianus* decreed,

[Ro]manus, qui Gotho donaverit rem, quae [est i]udicio repetenda, aut traderit [occup]andum, priusquam adversarium iudicio s]uperarit, si etiam eam Gothus inva[serit, tum] possessor rem suam per executio[nem i]udicis quae occupata fuerint statim [recipi]at, nec de eius postmodum repeti[tione p]ulsetur, etiam si bona sit causa re[peten]tis; sed Romanus Gotho eiusdem meriti [rem aut pretium repensare cogatur; quia rem antequam vindicaret, fecit invadi].¹²¹

[Regarding] a Roman who grants to a Goth, or hands over for occupation, property which must be reclaimed in court before he has overcome his adversary in court: if the Goth has already occupied it, then let the original owner, through a judicial order, immediately reclaim the property which had been occupied [by the Goth], nor may [the original owner] be expelled subsequently by any demand for a return by the Roman claimant, even if there is good cause for such a demand; but let the Roman be compelled to reimburse the Goth with property or compensation of the same value, because he allowed the property to be occupied before he obtained ownership."

In this instance, it seems, Romans were avoiding their responsibility for partitioning their estates with Goths by attempting to pass off lands to which they did not have title: if they were apprehended doing so, they not only had to fulfill their obligations to the Goths, but they also lost any claim they had to the land.

Which is not to say that Goths, too, did not sometimes attempt to take advantage of Romans, relying not on legal chicanery but upon simple coercion. Gregory of Tours reports a case that occurred in the Visigothic kingdom during the reign of Alaric II. It seems that the Goth Sichlarius, a favorite of the king, attempted to take advantage of the Roman abbot Ursus, who had built a waterwheel near Tours. According to Gregory, "Sichlarius ... said to the abbot, 'Give me this mill ... and I will pay what you wish,' to which the abbot responded, 'We cannot give it up now, lest my brothers die of hunger,' and [Sichlarius replied], 'If you wish to yield it of your own free will, I thank you, but if not, I will take it by force...'¹²² Eventually, says Gregory, the monks' prayers brought Sichlarius' ruin. Other Gauls in similar straits, however, lacking such divine intervention, would have

¹²¹ *Cod. Eur.* 312, with missing material supplied from the *Lex Visigothorum* 4.20.

¹²² Sichlarius ... dixitque abbati, 'dona mihi hoc molendinum ... et quod volueris repensabo,' cui ille, '... nunc non possumus ipsum donare, ne fratres mei fame pereant,' et ille, 'si vis,' inquit, 'ipsum bona voluntate tribuere, gratias ago, sin aliud, vi ipsum auferam' (Greg. Tur. *V. Pat.* 18.2).

had to suffer the loss.¹²³ Indeed, such a one might have been Paulinus of Pella, whose friendly Goth likewise might have made an "offer he couldn't refuse."

Other Romans of small means and influence also suffered from the Visigothic occupation. One such was the monk Marianus, who is said in a late source to have fled after 450 from Bourges to Auxerre to escape the Goths: "Evading their pollution, he migrated from his home."¹²⁴ Another would have been the deacon who circa 470 had abandoned his property in the Visigothic kingdom, become a wanderer (*peregrinus*), and fled to Auxerre, "avoiding the whirlwind of the Gothic depredation."¹²⁵ And Ruricius of Limoges wrote to Aeonius of Arles circa 500 on behalf of the presbyter Possessor, who, "In order that he not lose his life through a most cruel death, himself has been made an exile from his homeland."¹²⁶

Other Gallo-Romans faced other problems in Visigothic Aquitania. The Goths were not averse, for example, to taking hostages or prisoners in order to secure their ends. Circa 420, for example, the Gallic aristocrat Theodorus, a relative of Eparchius Avitus, was held by the Goths as a "noble hostage."¹²⁷ In the third quarter of the century, the *vir spectabilis* Simplicius of Bourges was confined by the Goths in a "barbarian prison."¹²⁸ At about the same time, the nobles of Saintes supposedly were imprisoned in an attempt to confiscate their wealth; they were released only after the intervention of their bishop.¹²⁹ Imprisonment led to an even worse fate for a friend of Sidonius, the *vir illustris* Eucherius of Bourges, who had been unsuccessful in a bid to become bishop of the city circa 470. At the end of the decade, he ran into difficulties with the Visigothic-appointed duke Victorious. According to Gregory of Tours, Victorious "poured malicious accusations down upon the senator Eucherius, whom one night he ordered to be dragged from the prison in which he had been placed, and having tied him next to an ancient wall, he ordered this

¹²³ See Ennod. *Epist.* 2.23. For barbarian appropriations of Gallo-Roman ecclesiastical property, see *VEparchi* 2.16; *VGerm.Par.* 5; Greg.Tur. *Glor.mart.* 79 and *Glor.conf.* 70; *VDomnuli* 9.

¹²⁴ *pollutionem eorum evitans ... e laribus propriis commigravit* (*VMariani* 1: AASS April II p.758, cf. *Gest. epp. Autis.*8: PL 138.229).

¹²⁵ *depraedationis Gothicae turbinem vitans* (*Sid.Apoll. Epist.* 6.10.1-2).

¹²⁶ *ut ille crudelissima morte non privaretur vita, ipse extorris est factus e patria* (*Epist.* 2.8).

¹²⁷ *nobilis obses* (*Sid.Apoll. Cam.*7.215-220); see *PLRE II* p.1087.

¹²⁸ *barbaricus carcer* (*Sid.Apoll.Epist.*7.9.20).

¹²⁹ *VViviani* 4.

very wall to be pulled down on top of him."¹³⁰ Eucherius did not survive.

In many ways, therefore, even though life in the Gothic kingdom often went on as before, this was not always the case. Both Romans and Goths had to make accommodations, and the road was sometimes rocky. Nevertheless, in matters of administration, economy, and even, in general, society, a rapprochement was often found. But some Gallo-Romans, especially the elite, had cause to be unhappy with the treatment they received. This was especially the case with regard to religion, where the gap was too great to be bridged. And it was this consideration that was to have a significant impact on the survivability of the Gothic kingdom of Toulouse.

State and Church in Visigothic Aquitania

As imperial fortunes in Gaul waned, many of the Gallo-Roman nobility who saw no future in traditional secular career-patterns turned to the church as an alternative.¹³¹ When aristocrats became bishops, their power, prestige, and wealth were transferred to their new circumstances. This process was neither rapid nor straightforward, but by the beginning of the sixth century loyalty to the ideals of *romanitas* became firmly associated with participation in the Nicene church. These bishops also became involved in politics, either as mediators between monarchs or as representatives of their own communities to the government of the day, and these relations were not always amicable.¹³²

In every Gallic province, moreover, the lines of Nicene ecclesiastical authority radiated from urban centers to the countryside. A complex organization and well-developed hierarchy existed in each city in Roman Gaul, and constant communication had tightened the fabric of these networks until they virtually displaced other types of bureaucracy. In some areas of Gaul, ecclesiastical unity was fostered by the holding of numerous church councils. One aspect of ecclesiastical activity was an extensive building program. Practically every

¹³⁰ *super Eucherium vero senatorem calumpnias devolvit, quem in carcere positum nocte extrahi iussit, ligatumque iuxta parietem antiquum, ipsum parietem super eum elidi iussit* (Greg.Tur. *HF* 2.20).

¹³¹ See, in general, Mathisen, *Aristocrats*, 89ff and passim.

¹³² For all of these developments, see Mathisen, *Factionalism*, passim.

bishop in Gaul sponsored building projects in his diocese, often depending upon donations from the congregation, which at the same time augmented his local status and authority.

But religion also created an insurmountable division between the Roman and Gothic populations of Aquitania. The former were Arians; the latter, faithful to the Nicene creed ("Nicenes", or "Catholics"). Both were devoted to their own particular brand of Christianity. Gothic Arianism had deep roots in a past which looked back to a venerable bishop of their own, Ulfila, and had been an integral part of the Gothic strategy for survival during their four decades of wandering on Roman soil.¹³³

After the settlement, Arians and Catholics lived in permanent proximity, and, in general, they coexisted peacefully. The first half century of the Aquitanian Gothic kingdom is remarkable for a religious *modus vivendi* in which the question of opposing religious sentiments rarely arose.¹³⁴ Indeed, the existence of Nicene and Arian populations in the same community seems to have caused little concern. Sidonius, for example, noted that in the selection of Simplicius as bishop of Bourges c.470, even "those who follow the Arian faith" did not object to the choice.¹³⁵

In spite of formidable theological ammunition and a likely superiority of intellect, moreover, the Gallo-Roman leaders of the Nicene church never managed to convert a single Goth to their cause, and they rarely tried. Nor did the Goths make any attempt to impose their Arian beliefs on their Catholic subjects. This is striking, for the Gallic church certainly did not shun attempts to convert other barbarians in Gaul, nor did the Visigoths abstain from missionary efforts of their own among other barbarians.¹³⁶ In only a single instance before the end of Roman rule are Arian Goths known to have challenged Catholic theology: the celebrated debate, presumably non-violent, between the Arian Modaharius and the Catholic bishop

¹³³ The date of Gothic conversion *en masse* to Arianism is still debated. See, P. Heather, "The Crossing of the Danube and the Gothic Conversion," *GRBS* 27 (1986), 289-318.

¹³⁴ An isolated expression of desire to convert the Goths is the voice of Eutropius *de similitudine carnis peccati*, ed. Morin (*PLS* 1.555).

¹³⁵ *qui fidem fovent Arianorum* (Sid. Apoll. *Epist.* 7.8.3).

¹³⁶ The Romans successfully converted the Franks, and a certain Ajax, a Nicene apostate described as *natione Galata*, converted the Suevi of Spain to Arianism "with the support of his king" (*regis sui auxilio*), presumably Theoderic II (Hyd. *Chron.* 232)

Basilius of Aix.¹³⁷ Reports, like that in the life of St. Vincent of Agen, of Goths imitating the fervor of a St. Martin and desecrating tombs of holy (Catholic) men, are rare.¹³⁸ On the whole, Arians displayed greater tolerance than the Catholics, if a story narrated by Gregory of Tours is to be taken at face value.¹³⁹

*Arian Church Organization*¹⁴⁰

There is scant information about the Arian church of Aquitania. According to Eunapius, the Goths had monks as early as 376, if not before.¹⁴¹ But there is no subsequent attestation of them, and certainly none for Aquitania. The structure and hierarchy of the Arian church appear to have been rather different than that of the Catholic. Alaric I had a bishop, Sigesarius, in his train who baptized Attalus, the Gothic nominee for the imperial throne.¹⁴² In general it would appear that unlike the Nicene church, which had a multitude of bishops associated with different cities, the Visigothic church seems to have been centered on the person of the king, who was accompanied by a retinue of *sacerdotes* ("prelates"), who carried out duties that, in the Nicene church, would have been performed by both bishops and priests. In the 460s, for example, Arian services for the Visigothic king at Toulouse were presided over by "his own prelates" (*sacerdotes suos*).¹⁴³ This royal chapel may be identified with Notre Dame de la Daurade in Toulouse.¹⁴⁴ Gothic *sacerdotes* appear again in 474, when as seen above, bishop Epiphanius of Pavia visited Toulouse and was invited to sup with king Euric (466-485). But he had learned that Euric's banquets were "polluted by his prelates (*sacerdotes*)," and he declined to attend.¹⁴⁵

¹³⁷ Sid. Apoll. *Epist.* 7.6.2.

¹³⁸ *Passio S. Vincentii Agninnensis* 6: *Analecta Bollandiana* 2 (1883), 300f.

¹³⁹ *HF* 5.43, in a later context.

¹⁴⁰ See, in general, R. Mathisen, "Barbarian Bishops and the Churches 'in barbaricis gentibus,'" *Speculum* 72(1997) pp. 664-697.

¹⁴¹ Fr. 55 (Müller). H. Sivan, "The Making of an Arian Goth. Ulfila reconsidered," *Revue bénédictine* (forthcoming).

¹⁴² Sozomen, *HE* 11.9.

¹⁴³ "antelucanos sacerdotum suorum coetus minimo comitatu expetit" (Sid. Apoll. *Ep.* 1.2.4).

¹⁴⁴ On La Daurade see, most recently, *Palladia Tolosa. Toulouse romaine* (catalogue of an exhibition at the Musée Saint Raymond in Toulouse, (Toulouse 1988), 141-146. My thanks to the director, Daniel Cazes, for providing me with a copy (HS).

¹⁴⁵ "iugiter per sacerdotes suos polluta habere convivium" (Ennodius, *Vita Epiphani* 92).

These royal prelates seem to have carried out duties for the king. Under the year 466, for example, the chronicler Hydatius reported, "Ajax, by nationality a Gaul, after becoming an apostate and the *senior Arrianus*, appeared among the Suevi as an enemy of the Catholic faith and the divine trinity."¹⁴⁶ Furthermore, Ajax was said to have come "from the abode of the Goths, with the support of his king," that is, the Visigothic king Theoderic II (453-466). He may have been one of the members of Theoderic's sacerdotal college—were they called *seniores*?—sent on a special mission to the Suevi. And a successful mission to boot, for the Suevi were converted to Arianism, and remained Arians until the Spanish Visigothic conversion of 589.

There is little evidence for a Visigothic ecclesiastical presence outside of the royal cities. In the 450s, the presbyter Othia, apparently a Visigoth and therefore an Arian, dedicated a church—a bishop's task in the imperial church—to the popular saints Felix, Agnes, and Eulalia near the *oppidum* of Ensérune, between Narbonne and Béziers.¹⁴⁷ Othia's non-Nicene affiliation also is suggested by his unprecedented practice of dating by the years of his presbyterate, a clear emulation of the equally unprecedented practice of Rusticus of Narbonne, the powerful Nicene bishop of Narbonne, who dated by the years of his episcopate.¹⁴⁸ It would seem that by doing so, Othia not only blatantly underscored his independence, but also portrayed himself, a Gothic presbyter, as the equal of a Nicene bishop.

The liturgy in the Aquitanian-Gothic church quite probably was conducted in Gothic, for the Goths possessed a translation of the Bible made in the fourth century, and some manuscripts bear traces of later revisions, influenced by the Latin Bible, and were probably introduced in Aquitania and Spain.¹⁴⁹ Other Arian intellectual activity is attested in a debate between an Arian *presbyter* and a Nicene deacon.¹⁵⁰ And aforementioned Modaharius, described by Sidonius

¹⁴⁶ "Ajax, natione Galata, effectus apostata et senior Arrianus, inter Suevos regis sui auxilio hostis catholicae fidei et divinae trinitatis emergit. A Gallicana Gothorum habitatione hoc pestiferum inimici hominis virus adfectum" (Hydatius, *Chron.* 232; cf. Isidore of Seville, *Hist. Suev.* 90).

¹⁴⁷ *CIL* 12.4311. A Gothic nationality is suggested not only by his name, but also by the fact that such establishments by any other than bishops were forbidden in the Nicene church, see The Council of Orange, can.9(10) (AD 441): *Corp. Chr. Lat.* 148.80.

¹⁴⁸ See H.-I. Marrou, "Le dossier épigraphique de l'évêque Rusticus de Narbonne," *Rivista di archeologia cristiana* 3-4(1970) 331-349.

¹⁴⁹ See Heather/Matthews, *Goths*.

¹⁵⁰ *Greg. Tur. Glor. mart.* 80; also *Glor. conf.* 14.

Apollinaris not as a bishop, or even as a cleric, but as a "Gothic citizen" (*civem Gothum*), had a celebrated Christological debate with the Nicene bishop Basilius of Aix circa the early 470s.¹⁵¹

One thing of which both Goths and Romans partook was divine assistance. Both Salvian of Marseille and the anonymous biographer of bishop Orientius of Auch believed that Theoderic's Gothic army won a victory over the Roman army in 439 of because of the king's piety and the prayers of the saintly prelate of Auch.¹⁵² On another occasion, early in the 460s, the hermit Maximus of Chinon saved besieged Visigoths from the Roman general Aegidius and his Frankish troops.¹⁵³ Divine help also was enlisted against Gothic aggression, as happened during the siege of Arles in 458, when St. Martin of Tours was invoked, and the Goths failed in their endeavor.¹⁵⁴

Prior to the reign of Euric it is difficult to identify clearly any specific Gothic religious policies vis-à-vis the Catholic church of Aquitania, although the lack of church councils there before Agde in 506, at a time when they were common elsewhere in Gaul, is suggestive, and may indicate an attempt to isolate the Aquitanian bishops from the rest of Gaul. The situation becomes clearer during the reign of the aggressive Euric, whom Sidonius went so far as to accuse of "plotting against Christian regulations."¹⁵⁵ And, at the end of the next century, Gregory of Tours recalled these Visigothic practices as a "grave persecution of the Christians in Gaul."¹⁵⁶ In even later years, the supposed barbarian persecution of the church in the fifth century became a commonplace. The *Deeds of the Bishops of Auxerre*, for example, discussed the difficulties caused at that time "on account, of course, of the savagery of the barbarians who were devastating Gaul."¹⁵⁷

Euric's intervention in the internal affairs of the church took the form of a ban on episcopal elections. As a result, several sees, the occupants of which had died peacefully, remained vacant for some time. These included nine bishoprics in the heart of Visigothic Aquitania. What, precisely, was Euric attempting to accomplish? It already has been seen that Euric saw himself as the legitimate succes-

¹⁵¹ "Modaharium, civem Gothum, haeresos Arianæ iacula vibrantem" (Sid. Apoll. *Epist.* 7.6.2-3).

¹⁵² Salvian, *De gub.* 7.9; Prosper, *Chron.* 1335; *Vita Orientii* 3 (*AASS* May I 60-65).

¹⁵³ *Greg. Tur. Glor. Conf.* 22 (late 450s/early 460s).

¹⁵⁴ Paulinus of Périgueux, *De vita Martini* 6.111-150 (*CSEL* 16.143).

¹⁵⁵ *legibus Christianis insidiaturum* (*Epist.* 7.6.6).

¹⁵⁶ *gravem in Gallias super Christianos ... persecutionem* (HF 2.25).

¹⁵⁷ *ob saevitiam scilicet vastantium Gallias barbarorum* (*Gest. epp. autiss.* 8-10).

sor of the Roman government in Aquitania, if not in all of Gaul. It also has been seen that the Gallic ecclesiastical establishment formed a virtual state within a state. This Euric could not tolerate, especially while his own vision of the kingdom's future was still undergoing development.

Because the number of sees that became vacant appears large enough to suggest a conscious policy, Euric's measure may have been connected to his legislative initiative, and to his effort to consolidate his own authority at the expense of Romans, both secular and ecclesiastical. The growing union between Gallo-Roman aristocrats and the ecclesiastical hierarchy was a clear threat to the stability of the Gothic regime. So it would appear that, *pace* Sidonius, the Arian Euric was not attacking Catholic orthodoxy *per se* but the Catholic leadership, and for essentially political rather than religious reasons.¹⁵⁸

Nor did Euric limit his interference in the Catholic church merely to prohibiting new ordinations. As new territories came under his control, bishops ran the risk of various kinds of punishments. Sidonius himself, and a number of other bishops, were exiled. The Visigoths, moreover, apparently used other means to undercut Catholic ecclesiastical authority, as seen in a curious appeal by the Visigothic prince Fridericus to bishop Hilarus of Rome immediately after the annexation of Narbonne in 462.¹⁵⁹ The case concerned an apparently illegal ordination, and Hilarus had only learned of the incident, he said, "From the deacon John, who was recommended to us by our son, the magnificent man Fridericus, in his letter...."¹⁶⁰ But, an understanding of the Gothic attitude to, and concern about, the Gallic church hierarchy makes this strange circumstance a bit more understandable, for the only alternative to an appeal to Rome would have been to hold a church council to settle the matter, and from the Gothic point of view, this would have been even worse.

Euric's successor Alaric II, on the other hand, seems to have had markedly better relations with the Gallo-Roman church. He permitted vacant sees to be filled, and his approval was sought for the ordination of local favorites. Circa AD 500, for example, Aeonius of Arles successfully sought to ensure that his relative Caesarius would succeed him: "through messengers he queried the very lords of af-

¹⁵⁸ See Mathisen, *Aristocrats*, pp.32-34.

¹⁵⁹ Mathisen, *Factionalism*, 210. Hilary, *Ep.* 7 (*MGH Ep.* 3.22-23).

¹⁶⁰ *a diacono Iohanne, qui a magnifico viro filio nostro Friderico litteris suis nobis insinuatus est...* (Hil. *Epist.* *ibid.*).

fairs."¹⁶¹ And Caesarius himself received from Alaric not only funds for the release of captives, but even a perpetual tax exemption for the church of Arles.¹⁶² Furthermore, a number of Nicene refugees from Africa were in exile in Alaric's kingdom, presumably with his permission, including bishop Eugenius of Carthage, at Albi, and Quintianus, nephew of an African bishop Faustus, at Rodez.¹⁶³ On the other hand, however, Alaric himself was compelled to send bishops into exile when they were accused of complicity with foreign enemies, Volusianus and Verus of Tours with the Franks in the 490s, and Caesarius of Arles with the Burgundians in 505.¹⁶⁴

Alaric also intervened in a case involving the church of Narbonne. Ca.508/511, the Ostrogothic king Theoderic, who now controlled the city, addressed the *dux* Iba,

Cur enim priora quassemus, ubi nihil est quod corrigere debeamus? Atque ideo praesenti tibi auctoritate praecipimus ut possessiones Narbonensis ecclesiae, secundum praecelsae recordationis Alarici praecepta, <quae> a quibuslibet pervasoribus occupata teneantur, acquitatis facias contemplatione restitui, qui versari nolumus in ecclesiae dispendio praesumptiones illicitas

Why indeed do we debate past issues, when there is nothing we need to correct? And therefore we, who do not desire to be involved in illicit presumptions in the administration of the church, command you by present authority, according to the ruling of Alaric of excellent memory, that, with a view toward fairness, you see to it that the possessions of the church of Narbonne, which are held occupied by certain invaders, are restored.¹⁶⁵

¹⁶¹ "ipsos dominos rerum per internuntios rogat" (*Vita Caesarii* 1.13). See E. Griffe, "L'épiscopat gaulois et les royautés barbares de 482 à 507," *Bulletin de littérature ecclésiastique* 76(1978) pp.261-284 at p.282, where this "témoigne déjà des bons rapports qui existaient entre Alaric et les évêques."

¹⁶² *Vita Caesarii* 1.20, "namque pecunias captivorum profuturas remediis impertivit et data firmitate praeccepti ecclesiam in perpetuum tributis fecit immunem." It has been suggested (*MGH SRM* 3.456) that this is a later interpolation intended to attest to the exemption; but surely a forger would have attributed an exemption to a Frank, rather than to a Visigoth whose statutes would have been void in Frankish Gaul. See Klingshirn, *Caesarius*, pp.85, 90 for Caesarius' dependence on Alaric.

¹⁶³ Eugenius: Greg.Tur. *HF* 2.3: the date is uncertain; Gregory places his exile in the reign of Huneric (477-484), but he also has Hilperic (523-531) as Huneric's successor. Quintianus: Greg.Tur. *Vit.pat.* 4, as "an African."

¹⁶⁴ Volusianus and Verus: Greg.Tur. *HF* 2.26, 2.29, 10.31. Caesarius: *Vita Caesarii* 1.21; Ruricius of Limoges, *Epist.* 2.33.

¹⁶⁵ Cassiodorus, *Variarum* 4.17.2. It is unclear whether this controversy was related to Gregory of Tours' complaint that Alaric lowered the roof of the cathedral of Narbonne because it obstructed his view (*Gloria martyrum* 91).

So, at some point Alaric had issued a ruling apparently in support of the Nicene ecclesiastical establishment at Narbonne.¹⁶⁶ On balance, therefore, it would seem that, except in cases involving state security, Alaric's relations with the Gallo-Roman church were harmonious¹⁶⁷

The Visigoths, Aquitania, and Archaeology

The literary sources for the history of the Visigoths in Aquitania have received fulsome attention. It is no exaggeration to state that the only real advances in our understanding of the physical context of the Visigothic presence in Aquitania can be made by archaeology.¹⁶⁸

Signs of prosperity were evident throughout Aquitania in the fourth century. Both the statements of Ausonius of Bordeaux and modern excavations confirm the extent of the recovery of the area after the Diocletianic restoration.¹⁶⁹ The remains of numerous rural estates document a rebuilding program on a large scale, and a remarkable array of colorful mosaics suggest a general air of wealth and exuberance. Although the walls of most cities enclosed a fairly small urban space, the pace of life within appears to have been vigorous. Indeed, the very undertaking of these massive fortifications at the end of the third and the beginning of the fourth century indicates considerable economic resources. Their construction also led to a greater density of population within the walls and entailed a restructuring of urban life. Signs of renewed prosperity are also seen in the establishment of large-scale ceramic industries in some cities, like Bordeaux, the products of which, the distinctive *sigillée grise et orangé*, circulated throughout Gaul.

¹⁶⁶ As seen above Visigothic involvement in the church of Narbonne began as early as 462, when the prince Fridericus complained to Hilarus of Rome about the ordination of Hermes as bishop; see Hilarus, *Epist.*, "Miramur fraternitatem": *MGH Epist.* 3.22-23.

¹⁶⁷ For a different spin on these events, see Rouche, *Aquitaine*, pp.43-50.

¹⁶⁸ As further witnessed by the multiplicity of new journals dedicated to archaeology in its widest content, like *Aquitania, Archéologie en Aquitaine*, the consolidation of *Gallia Informations*, and numerous outstanding catalogues which have accompanied various exhibits. See now, *Villes et agglomérations urbaines antiques du sud-ouest de la Gaule. Histoire et Archéologie* (Deuxième colloque Aquitania: Bordeaux, 13-15 septembre 1990) (Sixième supplément à *Aquitania*) (Bordeaux 1992).

¹⁶⁹ H. Sivan, *Ausonius of Bordeaux. Genesis of a Gallic Aristocracy* (London 1993). For a recent overview of urbanism in Aquitania in general throughout the Roman period see now *Villes et agglomérations*.

It is fair to assume, moreover, that urban revival followed rather than preceded a steady rural recovery after the devastations of the third century, and similarly after the briefer and possibly less ruinous invasions of the early fifth, although neither occurred overnight. In gauging the scope and chronology of this process, we are entirely at the mercy of archaeology. One result is an extremely uneven picture—if cities of Novempopulana like Eauze show unmistakable signs of wealth in the fourth century, and throughout the fifth century as well, as do Bordeaux, Agen, and Saintes in Aquitania II, we have no information at all about other cities like Périgueux. The scale of restoration in the cities, moreover, appears more modest than that in the countryside. With one exception, for example, there are no traces of new public buildings—the mentality that had opened the pockets of the rich in the early empire for the beautification of their cities had by now undergone a far-reaching change. The needs of the church doubtless diverted resources that had earlier been spent on urban amenities toward the construction of naught but churches. Furthermore, the massive investment in the countryside must also have turned the attention of the estate owners away from the concerns of the town.¹⁷⁰

The rubble found in the remains of city walls indicates that the villas that had once formed the suburbs of most Roman cities had been razed and that their debris had been used for the purposes of fortification. Now, if the walls of the cities of fourth-century Aquitania were primarily defensive, military considerations would have required that a wide belt of open ground lay beyond those walls. It is not necessary to assume, however, that military was the only, or even the greatest, function performed by these massive fortifications. Their size and design often betray such a careful attention to architectural aesthetics that one cannot help but suspect that these walls, towers, and gates answered needs beyond the purely military. Their construction, maintenance, and manning were the work of the urban community as a whole; they symbolized the commonweal and defined community identity in a most tangible fashion. The *laudes* of individual cities, a common enough genre in these years, dwelled upon the city's fortifications with loving care, and, in iconography, the image of the city became that of great closed gates set in high, massive, and well-

¹⁷⁰ For a rare exception, Nymfius of Valentine, see H. Sivan, "Town, Country and Province in late Roman Gaul: The Example of CIL XIII 128." *JPE* 79 (1989), 103-113.

guarded walls behind which only the tip of a tower or two might appear. The walls defined the city, but also unmistakably delineated its separation from the surrounding countryside and this too required a wide tract of vacant land between the urban walls and the rural villas. All this represented the growing differentiation between the *civitas* and *pagus*, and presupposed a corresponding division within Gallic society. The wealthier classes were dividing into separate urban and rural entities, and the cities no longer had the number of possible benefactors that they once enjoyed.

One curious result of this transformation of the notion of a *cives* in the sense of membership in an urban community was a marked distinction between the urban rich and poor. This distinction was reflected in the great range of residence—from small palaces to wretched hovels—within remarkably small areas within the city walls. In other words, economic and social differences were translated into architectural spaces in a manner which apparently had no parallels in the second and third centuries.

How can one measure the effect of the intrusion of a new element into the urban and rural landscapes of Aquitania? A period of ninety years of Visigothic presence may have appeared long to the Gallo-Roman inhabitants of Aquitania but is rather short in terms of historical development. Both cities and rural estates must have been affected by Visigothic settlers. The court was established in Toulouse, and later in Bordeaux and Narbonne. The kings, if they resided *intra muros*, had to resort to the use of already existing structures, although the case of La Daurade in Toulouse points to a conscious effort to leave a mark on the decor. Visigothic nobles, likewise, may have been content to occupy the residences of Aquitanian aristocrats either *intra* or *extra muros*.

Did Visigothic presence in the cities set off an economic boom, or did it lead to a decline? At this point we cannot construct a general picture of either continued prosperity or marked decline. Excavations in Bordeaux, for example, during the 1980s show clear signs of building activities, of continued active trade and of the continued use of the internal harbor of the city.¹⁷¹ Decline only set in under Merovingian occupation in the sixth century. The Visigothic tendency and ability to imitate the manners and behavior of the local Gallo-Roman aristoc-

¹⁷¹ H. Sivan, "Town and Country in Fifth Century Gaul: The Example of Bordeaux" in Drinkwater/Elton, *Gaul*, pp.132-143.

racy may have been responsible for artistic patronage, evident in the funerary monuments and mosaics mentioned above.

The Aquitanian sarcophagi of Late Antiquity have been the subject of long debate. In 1985, the hypothesis which connected the sarcophagi with the Arian Visigoths seemed most plausible,¹⁷² but renewed interest in the issue has provided an opportunity for further reflection.¹⁷³ Two observations seem paramount; the materials used were exclusively local marbles, quarried in the area of St. B eat in the Pyrenees; and the workmanship was of relatively poor quality compared with the carved marble sarcophagi that Gallic notables had imported from Italy in the fourth century. This said, the sarcophagi of Aquitania present two main stages of decorative schemes—one with figures and stories, clearly influenced by the decor of the Italian sarcophagi; and the second with an exclusively vegetal and geometrical decor that presents curious similarities with the repertory of themes seen on a large group of late Antique mosaics in Aquitania. Neither sarcophagi nor mosaics display great originality. But both are unique in their vast application of non-figural motives to the limited surface of either sarcophagi or the walls/floors of rich dwellings.

Since the earliest of the Aquitanian sarcophagi of Late Antiquity portrayed human figures, they must have been anchored in pre-existing artistic forms. Such forms occur in the rich repertory of imported Roman sarcophagi found practically all over Gaul, including Aquitania. These have been dated to the fourth century and no later than the early years of the fifth. The turning from the luxurious Italian imports to locally produced sarcophagi whose carvers valiantly attempted to imitate their Italian counterparts demonstrates the relative isolation of Aquitania occasioned by the Gothic presence. This isolation is reflected in the cessation of imports as well as lack of Italian artists to execute commissions in Gallic marble. It would also appear that there had been a temporary economic decline or at least a perceived economic decline. Rich Aquitanians of 418 may have adopted the attitude of "wait and see what is going to happen." One result was trimming of luxury items like imported sarcophagi. It is clear that the region lacked the skills or facilities for training that would have allowed local industry to replace the high-quality goods that had formerly been imported. The Aquitanian sarcophagi notably lack the depth of carving that the Italian monuments possess.

¹⁷² Sivan, above.

¹⁷³ *Antiquit  Tardive* I (1993): *Les Sarcophages d'Aquitaine*.

If these points are correct, the following pattern of events may have occurred. Local Aquitanian aristocrats in need of funerary monuments but incapable of importing from Italy or even buying in Arles, the center of importation and possibly the seat of a Gallic workshop, commissioned local carvers to execute an Italian type decor with local materials. Visigothic notables, eager to imitate their neighbors, turned to the same craftsmen but insisted on non-figural decor since the classical symbols and allusions of the Italianate style held little meaning for them, their families or their retinue. Whether or not an aversion to human representation was an aspect of Arianism is still an open question.

Now, most of the carved marble sarcophagi were found within an urban milieu, and not a few in a crypt of one church or another. None was inscribed, and, as a result, nearly all were later reused. The complete anonymity of the entombed is another curious feature of these items. Does it indicate a very low level of literacy? A desire to avoid identification? A specific place of burial which did not require individual identification since the place was, say, a family burial ground? Perhaps there were inscriptions which did identify the buried but which became detached and were eventually lost. Be that as it may, the Aquitanian sarcophagi of Late Antiquity display characteristics of both imitative nature and departure from tradition.

The urban context of this group, here seen as Visigothic in its non-figural stage, points not only to a Visigothic presence in general but to their appropriation of specific religious structures as well. It is impossible to tell whether buildings like the churches of St. Sernin in Toulouse, St. Seurin in Bordeaux, and St. Paul in Narbonne, were built in the fourth or fifth century. If the latter, one wonders if their erection involved Visigothic patronage, the patronage of the Catholic community, or even both. The lack of clearly identifiable signs of specific religious affiliation may have allowed these monuments to be placed and survive even in a Catholic church.

As expressions of social and economic conditions, the Aquitanian sarcophagi indicate the existence of class consciousness as well as the availability of economic resources. As reflections of Visigothic tastes, they confirm a degree of assimilation and the final disintegration of ethnic structures. They also demonstrate a personal taste which clearly distinguished the Gothic noble dead from the funerary domain of Gallo-Romans.

How were the less affluent buried? To judge by examples from all

over the empire, many were laid in simple sarcophagi, barely decorated, if at all, and in large and crowded cemeteries. Such sarcophagi do exist in Aquitania but they have been invariably associated with the Merovingians. There is no convincing justification for such a single-minded identification. It assumes that the barbarian peoples of Late Roman Gaul met only briefly on the battle field and did not further interact. In fact, there is no evidence to exclude a constant interchange, diplomatic, economic, and cultural, among Visigoths, Burgundians, Ostrogoths and Franks. Such contacts account for the presence of thousands of uninscribed and poorly carved trapezoid-shaped plain sarcophagi both north and south of the Loire, starting in the fifth century. The decor, primarily primitive geometrical, seems to be an imitation of the more complex shapes of aristocratic sarcophagi. Their shape is likewise reminiscent of the striking and unique trapezoid form of the Aquitanian carved marble sarcophagi. And, unlike their aristocratic models, the "poor man" sarcophagi were produced in cheaper material like local limestone.

Common graves ordinarily enclose no clue as to the ethnic identity of the dead. The rare burials with grave goods invariably contain clothing accessories like fibulae. Yet, such ornamental items can hardly be associated with either Goths or Franks or even Gallo-Romans since they are clearly products of the taste of the day. Moreover, most show, if anything, faint links with types found in the Danubian and Crimean Gothic homelands. Thus, although the existence of Visigothic cemeteries has long been suspected, the criteria for establishing these with any degree of certainty are still lacking.

Closely akin to the aristocratic sarcophagi is a large group of mosaics, most of which had been found in rural milieus and within the architectural context of large and rich estates.¹⁷¹ Traditionally these mosaics have been placed within a Gallo-Roman cultural context and dated, for the most part, to the fourth century. That the Visigoths had access to rural estates seems indubitable. The question arises of whether those who commissioned the carved marble sarcophagi and those who ordered the mosaics were the same people, either Visigothic or Gallo-Roman. The mosaics display greater dexterity of artistry than the marble sarcophagi. Although decorated for the most part with vegetal and geometrical themes, the lines, for example, of the trees are more supple and appear to have been

¹⁷¹ Balmelle, above.

drawn with more skillful hands. Can these mosaics be regarded as a manifestation of distinct artistic development linked to the wealth of Roman Aquitania in the fourth century? This appears to be the prevailing opinion. But a more nuanced progression can perhaps be proposed. Emerging from a fourth century context of renovation and restoration, the mosaics continued to serve as the main decorative feature in the wealthier houses of the countryside and were widely commissioned by both Gallo-Romans and Goths in the fifth. Since the repertory of the Aquitanian mosaics appears to have included vegetal and geometrical motives from its inception, these designs may further have served as models for the repertory of the non-figural Aquitanian sarcophagi of Late Antiquity.

In this light, the arrival and presence of the Goths in Aquitania did not create a disruption but rather intensified the pace of urban and rural prosperity. This hypothesis can be strengthened by an examination of other products, like pottery. The production of pottery cannot, of course, be directly connected to the Goths, but the Gothic presence and Gothic demand for this sort of goods may have acted as important economic impetus. The map of distribution of the Late Roman sigilata in Aquitania shows concentrations between the Dordogne and the Garonne with sparser finds throughout Aquitania. Most of the finds belong to villae in the countryside, precisely those which were rich in mosaics. The quantities of finds incite researchers to stipulate the existence of workshops in cities like Bordeaux and possibly Saintes. The question of chronology is still difficult in the absence of clearly dated criteria. It would appear that Provençal workshops started producing this type of pottery around the end of the fourth century and continued to do so for no less than two centuries. In Aquitania, the period of activity may have enjoyed similar longevity.¹⁷⁵ Perhaps the most striking feature of the late Roman Aquitanian pottery is its repertory of decorative elements. Like the sarcophagi, the Aquitanian sigilata show preference for geometrical and vegetal motives and for the occasional Chrism, the only evidence of religious affiliation.¹⁷⁶ The gradual turning away from figural images is to be once more associated with Visigothic patronage.

No other region of Gaul at this date displays an artistic production

¹⁷⁵ C. Marmion, *La sigillée tardive d'Aquitaine* (Thesis, Univ. of Bordeaux, 1985).

¹⁷⁶ M. Gauthier, "La céramique estampée tardive d'Aquitaine," *Revue historique de Bordeaux et du département de la Gironde* 24 (1975), 24-45.

of such range and quantity as Aquitania. Such a phenomenon appears to be a reflection of the political stability and order established then in the area. It is therefore reasonable, if not necessary, to associate this distinctive and well defined artistic efflorescence with the political, social and economic development of Aquitania in Late Antiquity. The more specific problem of interaction between the Visigothic and provincial Roman aristocracy in this process is difficult to evaluate. But whatever the nature of this give and take, the role of the Visigoths must be considered as a key factor in the emergence of this highly idiosyncratic new dialect of western provincial Roman art in Late Antique Gaul.

*The End of the Kingdom of Toulouse:
Too Little, Too Late*

The end of the fifth century and the beginning of the sixth was a crucial period for Gaul as the Visigoths of Toulouse contended for supremacy with the Franks. In the 470s, it had looked as if the Goths, under king Euric (466-484), would reign supreme.¹⁷⁷ But in 481/482 the ambitious Clovis succeeded to the rule of one of several Frankish groups. After his victory over the Gallo-Roman Syagrius in 486, even the Visigoths, under Euric's son Alaric II, were menaced by the expanding Frankish kingdom. For the defeated Syagrius had taken refuge with Alaric, and Clovis threatened to attack if Alaric refused to turn over Syagrius. Alaric, demonstrating what Gregory of Tours called "customary Gothic cowardice," complied.¹⁷⁸ And Gregory's view has become that of modern historiography: that Alaric was an ineffectual weakling who only at the eleventh hour attempted to reach a rapprochement with his Gallo-Roman subjects.

As for Clovis, eventually his threat of 486 became reality. The latter half of the 490s saw a series of poorly known Frankish attacks

¹⁷⁷ See in particular Sid. Apoll. *Epist.* 4.22 and 8.3 for Euric's preeminent status.

¹⁷⁸ "Chlodovechus vero ad Alarico mittit, ut cum redderet, alioquin noveret, sibi bellum ob eius retentionem inferret, at ille metuens, ... ut Gothorum parere mos est, vinctum legatis tradidit" (Greg. Tur. *HF* 2.27; cf. Fredegar. 3.15; *LHF* 9). H. Wollram, *History of the Goths* (Berkeley, 1983) p. 191, suggests that Syagrius might not have been handed over immediately. For Visigothic fears of the Franks after ca. 493, see Procop. *Bell. goth.* 1.12.21.

upon Aquitania.¹⁷⁹ A continuation of Prosper's chronicle notes under the year 496, "Alaric, in the twelfth year of his reign, captured Saintes."¹⁸⁰ Such a statement, of course, presupposes that someone, presumably the the Franks,¹⁸¹ had captured Saintes themselves at some earlier time. It may be, moreover, that the Frankish ability to conduct such campaigns resulted from Visigothic commitments elsewhere, and, in particular, from an increasing Visigothic interest in consolidating their holdings in Spain. The *Chronicon Caesar Augustanum*, for example, tells of significant Visigothic involvement in Spain. In 494, there was a Visigothic invasion of Spain; and in 496, "Burdele-nus assumed a tyranny in Spain."¹⁸² But, presumably distracted by the Frankish attack on Saintes, the Visigoths could not respond until 497: "The Goths seize territory in Spain and Burdele-nus is betrayed by his supporters, taken to Toulouse, placed within a bronze bull, and incinerated in a fire."¹⁸³

The Visigothic capability to retake Saintes in 496 might have improved when Clovis was forced to confront the Alamanni in the same year. The subsequent battle was so hard-fought that Clovis, on the point of defeat, was later said to have promised to become a Christian if the Franks emerged the victors.¹⁸⁴ And win they did. Subsequently, on Christmas Day, probably in 496 or 497, Clovis' actual baptism was carried out, stage-managed to have the greatest positive effect upon the Nicene Gallo-Roman population.¹⁸⁵ Gallo-Roman bishops not even living in the Frankish kingdom, such as Avitus of

¹⁷⁹ E.g. T. Hodgkin, *Italy and Her Invaders* (London, 1888) 3.392 n.1; B.S. Bachrach, "Procopius and the Chronology of Clovis' Reign," *Viator* 1(1970) pp.21-31; Wolfram, *Goths*, p.191; and E. James, *The Franks* (London, 1988) p.86.

¹⁸⁰ "Alaricus anno XII regni sui Santones obtinuit" (*Auct. prosp. haur.*: *MGH AA* 9.323).

¹⁸¹ As assumed by, e.g., Wolfram, *Goths*, p.191; James, *Franks*, p.86.

¹⁸² "Burdunelus in Hispania tyrannidem assumit" (*MGH AA* 11.221-222).

¹⁸³ "Gotthi intra Hispanias sedes acceperunt et Burdunelus a suis traditus et Tolosam directus in tauro aeneo impositus igne crematus est" (*ibid.*).

¹⁸⁴ "Iesu Christi... tuae opis gloriam devotus efflagito, ut, si mihi victuriam super hos hostes induleris... credam tibi et in nomine tuo baptizer... te nunc invoco, tibi credere desidero, tantum ut eruam ab adversariis meis" (Greg. Tur. *HF* 2.30).

¹⁸⁵ Greg. Tur. *HF* 2.31, at Reims. See M. Spencer, "Dating the Baptism of Clovis," *Early Medieval Europe* 3(1994) pp.97-116, for the scholarship and for refutations of attempts to date the baptism to after AD 500. It also has been suggested that as a result of his baptism, Clovis lost a good part of his Frankish support. His desire to come to an agreement with the Visigoths, therefore, also could have been based in part on his realization that this was likely to happen.

Vienne, were notified of the celebration.¹⁸⁶ It generally has been assumed that Clovis' baptism then made him the darling of the Gallo-Roman population.

Two events related to Clovis' southward expansion that seem to have occurred before his baptism now can be given a suggested context. For one thing, Gregory reports that "at the time of King Clovis" the Franks besieged Nantes, at the mouth of the Loire, for sixty days or more. They eventually were put to flight by an apparition of St. Similinus, and the Frankish commander Chilo was so overwhelmed that he converted to Christianity.¹⁸⁷ If the campaign had occurred after Clovis' baptism, one would suppose that Clovis' generals certainly would already have been Christian as well. So it may be that the siege of Nantes occurred at the time of the campaign against Saintes, ca.495-496.¹⁸⁸

A curiously comparable tale is found in a letter of circa the 560s written by Nicetius, bishop of Trier, to Chlodosuinda, queen of the Lombards. Nicetius claimed that at some time prior to his victory over the Burgundians in 500 Clovis, after hearing of miracles done at the tomb of Martin, "Humbly fell at the doorstep of the lord Martin and promised to be baptized without delay."¹⁸⁹ If one credits this report, its omission from the extant works of Gregory of Tours, who usually missed no opportunity to glorify Tours and St. Martin, certainly stands in need of some explanation.

Such a visit necessarily must have occurred before Clovis' baptism, and therefore, either before, or at least not long after, his victory over the Alamanni. Now, prior to AD 507, Tours supposedly was in Visigothic territory, albeit in a very exposed position, situated right on the border between the two kingdoms. So what was Clovis doing there not only before 507, but also before his baptism in 496/497? One possibility would be that Clovis actually captured the city, perhaps during the Saintes campaign; after all, there is only one major stop, Poitiers, on

¹⁸⁶ Avit. *Epist.* 46. Krusch/Levison (*MGH SRM* 1.1.76 n.3) suggest that Avitus was actually invited to take part.

¹⁸⁷ Greg. Tur. *Glor. mart.* 60. Chilo is omitted in *PLRE II*.

¹⁸⁸ It may be at this time that Ruricius of Limoges wrote to Aconius of Arles (c.490-502) (*Epist.* 2.8) on behalf of the priest Possessor, whose brother had been taken captive "ab hostibus" in the area of Angers, situated on the Loire between Tours and Nantes.

¹⁸⁹ "humilis ad domni Martini limina cecidit et baptizare se sine mora promisit, qui baptizatus quanta in heritocos Alaricum vel Gundobadum regnum fecerit..." (*Epist. aust.* 8: *MGH Epist.* 3.121-122).

the road from Tours to Saintes.¹⁹⁰ And as for Gregory's omission of Clovis' promise, it clear that is such a promise was made, it was not kept. For Gregory himself reported Clovis' dramatic Alamannic promise which clearly had captured the public imagination. And given that Clovis was in fact baptized at Reims to boot, from Gregory's point of view, an ostentatious, yet unfulfilled, promise at Tours without any concrete benefit to Tours would have reflected scant credit upon St. Martin. Yet, one wonders if his story about Chilo, who actually did convert after witnessing a miracle in the neighborhood of Tours, in some sense retains an echo of the story about Clovis at Tours.

However that may be, it would appear that Clovis' Aquitanian offensive of 495/496 ended in dismal failure. After some initial successes, including the captures of Tours, Saintes, and presumably Poitiers as well, the campaign had stalled. The siege of Nantes failed, the Visigoths recalled their forces from Spain, and Clovis himself was distracted by the Alamanni. Saintes, and presumably Tours and any other Frankish acquisitions were retaken by the Goths. So for Clovis, perhaps the only concrete result of this campaign may have resulted from his promise at Tours (and perhaps elsewhere), which could have been intended as a play upon the sympathies, and prejudices, of the Nicene Gallo-Roman population of the Visigothic kingdom. If so, it may have had its desired effect. For Gregory of Tours noted, "At that time, many Gauls wished with the greatest desire to have the Franks as masters."¹⁹¹

One Gaul who was much affected by these developments was Volusianus, bishop of Tours, who, perhaps just prior to the Frankish campaigns of circa 495/496, wrote to Ruricius, bishop of Limoges ca.485-507, that he was "stupefied by fear of the enemy."¹⁹² Subsequently, Volusianus clearly was not trusted by the Visigoths: "Having been considered suspect by the Goths because he wished to subject himself to the rule of the Franks and having been condemned to exile in the city of Toulouse, he died there."¹⁹³ Now, the anxiety he ex-

¹⁹⁰ See L. Pietri, *La Ville de Tours de IV^e au VI^e siècle* (Rome, 1983) p.133, who suggests the Franks held the city 494-496; note also James, *Franks*, p.86; Lippold, "Chlodovechus," *RE* suppl 13 (1973) 155.

¹⁹¹ "Multi iam tunc ex Galliis habere Francos dominos summo desiderio cupiebant" (*HF* 2.35).

¹⁹² "nam quod scribis te metu hostium hebetem factum" (Ruric. *Epist.* 2.65).

¹⁹³ "suspectus habitus a Gothis, quod se Francorum ditionibus subdere vellet, apud urbem Tholosam exilio condemnatus, in eo obiit" (Greg. Tur. *HF* 10.31, cf. 2.26). Elsewhere (*HF* 2.29), Gregory claims that Volusianus was exiled to Spain.

pressed to Ruricius does not suggest a person actively colluding with the enemy he purported to fear. So, perhaps Volusianus' "collusion" was more circumstantial in nature: Volusianus not only owned *praedia* deep in Frankish territory at Baiocasses (Bayeux), but all of his suffragan sees were located north of the Loire as well.¹⁹⁴ So he, or any bishop of Tours, of necessity would have had to maintain at least a working relation with the Franks. And if the Franks ever did hold the city in the course of their campaigns, Volusianus would have been all the more suspect. Given that he died ca. 496¹⁹⁵, he may have been exiled after the Visigothic recapture of Saintes, and, in this interpretation, Tours.

During the next two years Clovis seems to have concentrated upon consolidating his position within his own kingdom, but by 498 he seems again to have been ready to try his luck. His strategic position may have been strengthened by an alliance, perhaps facilitated by his baptism, with the Christian "Arborychi" (Armoricians?) living in Lugdunensis III, modern Brittany, north-west of Tours.¹⁹⁶ This would have given him safe access to the Visigothic kingdom south of the Loire. Moreover, under the year 498, the aforementioned continuator of Prosper states, "In the fourteenth year of Alaric the Franks captured Bordeaux and transferred it from the authority of the Goths into their own possession, having taken captive the Gothic duke Suatrius."¹⁹⁷

Now, there is no indication as to how long the Franks occupied cities such as Saintes or Bordeaux. So far from the Frankish kingdom, they could not have hoped to have held them for long. Saintes seems to have been recaptured quickly, and the same may have been the

¹⁹⁴ Volusianus is painted in rather stronger terms by Sidonius (*Epist.* 7.16), who requested his aid in controlling the fractious monks of the monastery of Abraham in the Auvergne. *Praedia*: *ibid.* 4.18.2.

¹⁹⁵ According to Gregory (*HF* 2.26, 10.31; see Duchesne, *Fastes* 2.305), Volusianus (*PLRE II* p.1183) was bishop for seven years and his successor Verus for eleven. Given that Verus sent his deacon Leo to represent him at the Council of Agde in 506 (*CCL* 148.219), and that his successor Licinius was in office by 507 (Greg. Tur. *HF* 2.29), Verus' death must have been in late 506 or early 507. This would put his tenure ca.496-507 and Volusianus' ca. 489-496. Gregory's statement elsewhere (*HF* 2.43) that Clovis died in the eleventh year of Licinius, must be mistaken, unless, perhaps, Licinius had begun serving as bishop of Tours while Verus was still living in exile (on which, see below). On the bishops of Tours, see R. Mathisen, "The Family of Georgius Florentius Gregorius and the Bishops of Tours," *Medievalia and Humanistica* 12(1984) pp.83-95.

¹⁹⁶ Procop. *Bell.* 1.12.13; see Bachrach, "Procopius."

¹⁹⁷ "Ann. XIII Alarici Franci Burdigalam obtinuerunt et a potestate Gothorum in possessionem sui redelegerunt capto Suatrio Gothorum duce" (*MGH AA* 11.323).

case with Bordeaux. Moreover, it also is unclear whether the seizures of Saintes and Bordeaux resulted from large-scale attacks by land which somehow escaped notice in the other sources, or from surprise sea-borne raids.¹⁹⁸ Other evidence attests that Saintes, at least, was vulnerable to attack from the sea at this time.¹⁹⁹

Shortly thereafter, in the midst of a Burgundian civil war in 500, the Burgundian Gundobad recaptured Vienne from his brother Godegisil and sent his Frankish captives "in exile to king Alaric at Toulouse."²⁰⁰ This might have given Alaric a bargaining chip he could use to reach a settlement with Clovis. For Gregory of Tours reports that afterwards,

Igitur Alaricus rex Gothorum, cum videret Chlodovechum regem gentes assidue debellare, legatos ad eum dirigit, dicens, 'Si frater meus velit, insederat animo, ut nos Deo propitio pariter viderimus.' Quod Chlodovechus non respiciens, ad eum venit. Coniunctique in insula Ligeris, quae erat iuxta vicum Ambaciensem territorium urbis Tironicae, simul locuti, comedentes pariter ac bibentes, promissa sibi amicitia, pacifici discesserunt

Alaric, king of the Goths, when he saw king Clovis unrelentingly defeating various nations, sent ambassadors to him, saying, 'If my brother wishes, he might decide that, with God's blessing, we should meet.' Clovis did not reject this suggestion and came to him. And meeting on an island of the Loire, which was next to the village of Amboise in the territory of Tours, they ate and drank together, and having promised friendship to each other, they departed in peace."²⁰¹

Alaric's reference to Clovis' victories would have been especially appropriate, not to mention ironic, if Clovis' own victory over the Burgundians earlier in AD 500, on the side of Godegisil, were meant. As for any settlement that was reached, Gregory portrays the two as

¹⁹⁸ Ruricius' 83 letters, for example, give no indication of hostilities save for the reference to Volusianus noted above.

¹⁹⁹ Note, for example, the Saxon attack upon Saintes, apparently in the 460s (*Viviani* 7; *MGH SRM* 3.98), "accidit etiam quodam tempore, ut multitudo hostium Saxonum barbarorum cum plurimis navibus ad locum qui dicitur Marciacus (Marsas [Gironde]) amore depraedationis incumberet..." This attack on the city was beaten off. Sea attacks are preferred by Bachrach, "Procopius," p.26, who also suggests that the chronicler may have mistaken Saxon raiders for Franks.

²⁰⁰ "Tolosae in exilium ad Alaricum regem" (Greg.Tur. *HF* 2.33); for date, see Mar.Avent. *Chron.* s.a. 500; *MGH AA* 11.234.

²⁰¹ Greg.Tur. *HF* 2.35. This incident is conventionally dated to AD 502: Wolf-ram, *Goths*, p.192; Gregory merely places the meeting between Gundobad's victory in 500 and Clovis' invasion of Aquitania in 507. The location of the meeting confirms that the Loire served as the border between the two kingdoms.

bosom banquet buddies. Alaric presumably returned his Frankish "guests", and was probably happy to be rid of them. Clovis would have returned any Visigothic territory he held, but it seems doubtful that by this time there was any. Indeed, it might seem that if anything, Alaric was left with the upper hand. For he had been able to counteract any previous Frankish offensives, and it had been he who had summoned Clovis to the conference, not the other way around. The status quo seems to have been maintained between the two kingdoms until ca. 505, when the situation for the Visigoths worsened. For one thing, Alaric's erstwhile friend Gundobad seems to have turned against him, and the Burgundians besieged Arles; bishop Caesarius was exiled to Bordeaux after being accused of plotting to betray the city.²⁰² At the same time, the Goths faced continuing problems in Spain.²⁰³ As for Clovis, ca.505 he undertook another campaign against the Alamanni, in which the latter were totally defeated; Theoderic, the Ostrogothic king of Italy, settled their remnants in Raetia and ordered Clovis to let them be.²⁰⁴ This then left Clovis free to renew his attacks upon the Visigoths.

Faced with this northern threat, Alaric attempted to fortify his Gallo-Roman support. In the year 506, therefore, he not only called on Gallo-Roman bishops to convene a church council, he also ordered the compilation of a civil law code based upon existing Roman statutes. As a result, Gallic jurists published the *Breviarium Alarici*, or *Lex Romana Visigothorum*, which enjoys the distinction of being the main transmitter of the *Codex Theodosianus*, originally issued by the eastern emperor Theodosius II (402-450) in 438.²⁰⁵ The *Breviary* was intended to supplant the Theodosian code in the minds and lives of the Romans of Aquitania. It was distributed by two Gallo-Romans, the *vir spectabilis* Count Timotheus and the *vir spectabilis* Anianus. Its prologue proclaimed that it had been issued "So that all the obscurity of Roman laws and ancient jurisprudence, led into the light of a better intelligence with the assistance of bishops and the nobility, might be made clear and so that nothing might remain in doubt,"

²⁰² *VCaes.* 1.21.

²⁰³ In 506, "Dertosa a Gotthis ingressa est. Petrus tyrannus interfectus est et caput eius Casaraugustam deportatum est" (*Chronicon Casaraugustanum*; *MGH AA* 11.222).

²⁰⁴ Cass. *Var.* 2.41; Hodgkin, *Italy*, 3.390-391; S.J.B. Barnish, *Cassiodorus: Variae* (Liverpool, 1992) p.38-44; and *PLRE II* pp.233-234.

²⁰⁵ See R. Lambertini, *La codificazione di Alarico II* (Torino 1990).

and it asserted that "the assent of the venerable bishops and chosen provincials has strengthened" it.²⁰⁶

The work is a typical product of Roman provincial jurisprudence. It complemented, but did not replace, the *Codex Euricianus* by giving the Visigothic *imprimatur* to the great bulk of existing Roman legislation. In doing so, it reinforced the notion that the Visigothic kings were the direct successors of the Roman emperors. But this is not to say that the *Breviarium* merely copied the *Codex Theodosianus*. Far from it. For one thing, some Roman legislation, such as that on *hospitium*, *agri deserti*, and heretics, was omitted. Other laws were revised. The *Breviarium* repeated the Roman 370s-era prohibition of intermarriage between Romans and barbarians, but substituted the words *Romani* and *barbari* for *provinciales* and *gentiles*, a curious instance of the Visigoths self-identifying as barbarians.²⁰⁷

The *Breviarium* also included extensive legal commentaries (*interpretationes*) on the Theodosian provisions, which serve as an indication of the enormous scope of legal activities in fifth-century Gaul. Although it has been generally assumed that Alaric's Gallo-Roman legal advisers completed the task of assembling and issuing the code within the remarkably short space of a few months, it would seem more likely that the work might have been going on for a very long time in private Gallic legal circles, and that the politically astute Gauls merely used Alaric's dire straits to their own advantage in securing his approval for work which was already essentially complete.

The Nicene bishops of Aquitania, meanwhile, were allowed to congregate in the small coastal town of Agde, the first Aquitanian council since the arrival of the Goths in Aquitania, indeed, the first since the late fourth century. The chief figure in the gathering was Caesarius of Arles who had been banished to Bordeaux but had now been assigned the honor of convening the council. The prologue to the council begins: "When in the name of the Lord, with the permission of Our Lord the Most Glorious, Magnificent and Pious King [Alaric] the blessed synod had gathered, and there with our knees bent to the ground we prayed for his kingdom and for his long life, so

²⁰⁶ "ut omnis legum Romanarum et antiqui iuris obscuritas adhibitis sacerdotibus ac nobilibus viris in lucem intelligentiae melioris deducta resplendeat et nihil habeatur ambiguum ... venerabilium episcoporum vel electorum provincialium nostrorum roboravit adsensus" (Mommsen ed., *C.Th.* 1.xxxiii-xxxv).

²⁰⁷ *C.Th.* 3.14.1: this clearly Roman alteration may have escaped the notice of the *Breviarium's* Visigothic sponsors.

that the Lord might expand the realm of him who had permitted to us the opportunity to meet..."²⁰⁸ This apparently servile wording demonstrates the extent to which the Visigothic king proposed to control the ecclesiastical life of the kingdom.

The council's no less than 48 canons demonstrate that the Aquitanian bishops had a lot of catching up to do. The bishops' primary concern was for regulating ecclesiastical life of both clergy and laity. One canon, whose authenticity, however, is in doubt, repeats the aforementioned restriction on mixed marriages found in the *Breviary*: "It is not proper to mix marriages with any heretics, and to give them sons or daughters, but [it is proper] to accept them, if they promise that they are going to become Catholic Christians."²⁰⁹ The final canon, meanwhile, decreed hopefully, "It is fitting that a synod be summoned each year, according to the dictates of the fathers."²¹⁰

Meanwhile, Clovis' plans to attack Alaric continued apace. Gregory of Tours reports that he declared, "I take it very ill that these Arians should hold so large a part of Gaul. Let us go and overcome them with God's help, and bring their land under our rule."²¹¹ It is probably at this time, moreover, that Theoderic the Ostrogoth again attempted to interfere in Gaul by proposing that the quarrel between Alaric and Clovis be settled by mediation. He sent extant letters not only to these two, but also to Gundobad, and to the kings of the Thuringians, Heruls, and Varni.²¹² He suggested an arbitrated end to the disputes, with himself as the mediator, and he specifically forbade his father-in-law Clovis from attacking Alaric.

Clovis, however, was in no mood to subordinate himself to Theoderic, and in 507 he undertook his threatened invasion of the Visigothic kingdom. At Tours, meanwhile, the bishop was now Licinius.²¹³ Volusianus' successor Verus (ca. 497-506/507) already

²⁰⁸ *cum in nomine domini ex permisso domini nostri gloriosissimi magnificentissimi piissimique regis... sancta synodus convenisset, ibique flexis in terram genibus, pro regno eius, pro longaeuitate... deprecaremur, ut qui nobis conuegationis permisisset potestatem, regnum eius dominus... extenderet...* (*Corp.chr.lat.* 148.192).

²⁰⁹ *quoniam non oportet cum omnibus hereticis miscere connubia, et vel filios vel filias dare, sed potius accipere, si tamen se profitentur christianos futuros esse catholicos* (no. 20[67]; *Corp.chr.lat.* 148.228). The most likely source of "heretics" would have been the barbarian Arians. The canon is included in a list appended to some manuscripts of the council.

²¹⁰ *synodum etiam secundum constituta patrum annis singulis placuit conuegari* (*Corp.chr.lat.* 148.212).

²¹¹ *HF* 2.37.

²¹² *Cass. Var.* 3.1-4; see Barnish, *Variar.* pp.45-49.

²¹³ *Greg.Tur. HF* 2.39.

had suffered the same fate as his predecessor: "And he, because of his enthusiasm for the same cause, was considered suspect by the Goths, and having been carried off into exile, he died."²¹⁴ The circumstances of Verus' exile, however, are very unclear. One wonders whether his failure to attend Agde indicates he was in exile already, or whether it might have influenced the decision to exile him: if the bishop of Tours had proven unreliable once, he was not to be trusted again.

It also was just before 507, it seems, that Quintianus, bishop of Rodez, already exiled from Africa, was faced with both civic dissension and accusations of treachery: "After a quarrel had arisen between the citizens and the bishop, a suspicion came to the Goths who then were stationed in [Rodez] that the bishop wished to subject himself to the rule of the Franks, and having considered the matter, they decided to run him through with a sword."²¹⁵ But Quintianus, apprised of this plot, took refuge at Clermont. But there is at least one problem with this account: Clermont too was in the Visigothic kingdom, and even closer to the Franks. So this story may be more representative of the general anxiety that prevailed at the time just preceding Clovis' invasion than of any actual dealings Quintianus had with the Franks.

In the spring of 507 Clovis undertook his threatened invasion of the Visigothic kingdom.²¹⁶ The two armies met at Vouillé, just outside of Poitiers. One result of Alaric's policy of conciliation was the participation of Gallo-Romans at the deciding battle. There was a large contingent from Clermont, led by Apollinaris, the son of Sidonius, and the flower of the Arvernian aristocracy.²¹⁷ And another tradition tells of an Avitus from Périgueux who engaged in military service at this time "so that he could fight against the hostile army of the Franks."²¹⁸

²¹⁴ "et ipse pro memoratae causae zelo suspectus habitus a Gothis in exilio deductus vitam finivit" (Greg.Tur. *HF* 10.31).

²¹⁵ "orto inter cives et episcopum scandalo, Gothos qui tunc in antedicta urbe morabantur suspicio attigit, quod se vellet episcopus Francorum ditionibus subdere, consilioque accepto, cogitaverunt eum perfodere gladio" (Greg.Tur. *HF* 2.36, cf. *Vit.pat.* 4.1).

²¹⁶ One of Clovis' soldiers stole hay from a poor man of Tours, which would not have been a serious problem in the summer or fall, and Clovis could not cross the Vienne because its swollen by heavy rains (*HF* 2.37).

²¹⁷ Greg.Tur. *HF* 2.37.

²¹⁸ "ut contra hostilem Francorum aciem pugnaturus" (*Vita Aviti eremitae* 1: *AASS* June IV p.292).

But it was all for naught. The end result was the destruction of the Visigothic army and the death of Alaric. The *Gallic Chronicle of 511* reported, "Alaric, king of the Goths, was killed by the Franks. Toulouse was burned by the Franks and Burgundians, and Barcelona was captured by Gundobad, king of the Burgundians."²¹⁹ According to the *Chronicle of Saragossa*, "At this time a battle between the Goths and Franks was fought at Vouillé. King Alaric was killed in the clash by the Franks and the kingdom of Toulouse was destroyed."²²⁰ Isidore of Seville, moreover, writing in the mid seventh century, shows how the reputation of Alaric suffered from his defeat:

Alaricus ... apud Tolosensem regnans, qui cum a pueritia vitam in otio et convivio peregrissit, tandem provocatus a Francis in regione Pictavis in proelio into extinguitur eoque interfecto regnum Tolosanum occupantibus Francis destruitur..." [version 1]. *adversus quem Fluducius Francorum princeps Galliae regnum affectans Burgundionibus sibi auxiliantibus, bellum movit fisisque Gothorum copiis ipsum postremum regem apud Pictavis superatum interfecit. Theodericus autem Italiae rex dum interitum generi comperisset, confestim ab Italia profiscitur, Francos proterit, partem regni, quam manus hostium occupaverat, recepit Gothorumque iuri restituit* [version 2]²²¹

Alaric ... was reigning at Toulouse. After spending his youth in leisure and good times, he was finally incited by the Franks.... Clovis, king of the Franks, desired to rule Gaul and declared war against him, having gained the assistance of the Burgundians. And he killed Alaric who was overcome near Poitiers after the Gothic army had been put to flight.... and after his death the kingdom of Toulouse was destroyed and occupied by the Franks. Furthermore, when Theoderic, the king of Italy, learned of the death of his son-in-law, he immediately set out from Italy and defeated the Franks, and restored part of the kingdom, which had been occupied by the forces of the enemy, to the rule of the Goths.

After Vouillé, Clovis' son Theoderic advanced from Poitiers to occupy Albi, Rodez, and Clermont. Clovis left Poitiers, wintered in Bordeaux, then in 508 went to Toulouse and Angoulême, and then returned to Tours. During the next year, Clovis occupied much of the rest of the kingdom of Toulouse. All that remained to the Visigoths in Gaul was Septimania, a coastal strip focused on Nar-

²¹⁹ "Occisus Alaricus rex Gothorum a Francis. Tolosa a Francis et Burgundionibus incensa et Barcelona a Gundefade rege Burgundionum capta..." (*Chron.gall.511* s.a.507: *MGH AA* 9.665).

²²⁰ "His diebus pugna Gothorum et Francorum Voglada facta. Alaricus rex in proelio a Francis interfectus est: regnum Tolosanum destructum est" (*Chron.Caesarang.* s.a.507: *MGH AA* 11.222).

²²¹ Isid.Hisp. *Hist.goth.* 36: *MGH AA* 11.281-282.

bonne. The kingdom of the Visigoths was now the Kingdom of Toledo, and was firmly entrenched in Spain. But the Gothic kingdom of Toulouse was at an end after a brief 87-year existence. And the history of post-Roman Gaul was to be written not by the Visigoths but by the Franks.

CHAPTER TWO

ST. MARTIN OF BRAGA, THE SUEVES AND GALLAECIA¹

Maria João Violante Branco

1. *Before the Arrival of the Sueves*

The northwestern boundary of the Iberian Peninsula, to which both the Sueves and Martin would come to, was an area marked by its extraordinary blend of different peoples and cultures (see map). This gave the province a special character, which allows us to recognize, by the time the barbarians settled there, a diverse population, forced to live together within the framework of Roman culture.² The inhabitants of fifth century Gallaecia had already witnessed several migrations of varied dimensions and designs, peaceful and warlike expeditions, and settlements of different peoples with diverse commercial purposes.³

The Roman conquest was the last major invasion before the Germanic one. But the Roman supremacy was to be quite different from the preceding ones, not only because it entailed a long period of warfare against the local populations (namely the Lusitanians) but

¹ I must begin by thanking my friend and colleague Professor Alberto Ferreiro for his kind invitation to take part in this work and for his accurate exhaustive corrections of my English, as well as for all his useful suggestions and criticisms. I also wish to express my gratitude to Professor Aires Nascimento, who thoroughly examined the study, and to my friends and colleagues Filipa Reis, John Huffstott and Paulo Batista, who helped me a great deal with English grammar and with the illustrations.

² This variety of cultures is also partially responsible for the uniqueness of the Iberian Peninsula during the celebrated Hispanic seventh century with its cultural expressions. The cultural importance of the Iberian Peninsula in the seventh century, in contrast to other regions is a well known fact. See J. N. Hillgarth, "Visigothic Spain and Early Christian Ireland," *Visigothic Spain, Byzantium and the Irish*. London, 1985, pp. 167-194. J. Fontaine, *Isidore de Séville et la culture classique dans l'Espagne wisigothique*. Paris, 1959 and M. C. Díaz y Díaz, "Introducción general," *Etimologías de San Isidoro*. Madrid, 1982, pp. 7-95.

³ For the pre-Germanic period, see S. Piggot, *Ancient Europe, from the beginnings of Agriculture to Classical Antiquity*. Edinburgh, 1965. J.-P. Milotte, *Précis de Protohistoire Européenne*. Paris, 1970. H. Livermore, *The origins of Spain and Portugal*. London, 1971, and H. N. Savory, *Espanha e Portugal*. Lisboa, 1985.