

# FRÜHMITTELALTERLICHE STUDIEN

Jahrbuch des Instituts für Frühmittelalterforschung  
der Universität Münster

in Zusammenarbeit mit

Hans Belting, Hugo Borger, Dietrich Hofmann,  
Karl Josef Narr, Friedrich Ohly, Karl Schmid, Ruth Schmidt-Wiegand  
und Joachim Wollasch

herausgegeben von

KARL HAUCK

17. Band



1983

---

WALTER DE GRUYTER · BERLIN · NEW YORK

WALTER GOFFART

## The Supposedly 'Frankish' Table of Nations: An Edition and Study

I. Introduction, p. 98. – II. The manuscripts, p. 100. – III. Edition, p. 109. – IV. The earliest attainable version, p. 112. – V. Analysis of the Table, p. 115. – VI. The origins of the Table, p. 122. – VII. Conclusion, p. 127. – Appendix, p. 128.

### I. INTRODUCTION

Seven manuscripts, as well as the ninth-century *Historia Brittonum*, contain a brief genealogy of peoples that, in essentials, proceeds from Tacitus's threefold division of the Germans into Ingaevones, Herminones, and Istaevones. Although some of the names are Tacitean, the *gentes* mentioned belong to the neighborhood of the sixth century; they include Goths and Vandals, Thuringians and Lombards, Bretons and Franks. This document has, in modern times, customarily been called the 'Frankish Table of nations' ('fränkische Völkertafel'). Each of the eight versions varies in some respects from the others and is found in different contexts. One of them, probably the least noteworthy, has not yet been printed.

Until the mid-nineteenth century, many scholars who came across this text were unaware that others had done so before. The first published notice of the Table was given by G. H. Pertz in 1824, with reference to three manuscripts, but ten years passed until the text saw print<sup>1</sup>. In 1834, E. G. Graff published a part of the St. Gall version in a dictionary of Old High German<sup>2</sup>. Soon after, Jacob Grimm printed the version he had extracted 'many years ago' from a Vatican manuscript, without, he regretted, noting the age of the codex; he also illustrated its resemblance to a passage of the *Historia Brittonum*<sup>3</sup>. Other witnesses to the text were published by Benjamin Guérard in 1838 and by H. F. Massmann in 1841<sup>4</sup>. In 1848, Pertz reproduced as a footnote to his edition of Hugh of Flavigny the six versions of the Table known by then, including that of the *Historia Brittonum*; a new addition to the group came from a Paris manuscript that Pertz had drawn attention to in 1839 without reference to his earlier observations<sup>5</sup>. Finally, in 1851, F. J. Mone identified and published the

---

<sup>1</sup> GEORG HEINRICH PERTZ, *Populorum Germanorum generatio* (Archiv der Gesellschaft für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde 5, 1824, p. 46).

<sup>2</sup> EBERHARD GOTTLIEB GRAFF, *Althochdeutscher Sprachschatz* 1, Berlin 1834, col. 497. He omitted the accompanying genealogy of Roman 'kings' of Gaul.

<sup>3</sup> JACOB GRIMM, *Deutsche Mythologie*, Anhang, Berlin 1835 (= *Deutsche Mythologie* 3, Berlin 1877, pp. 399–400).

<sup>4</sup> BENJAMIN GUÉRARD, *Notice d'un manuscrit de la Bibliothèque du roi coté 4628A* (Notices et extraits des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque [Nationale] 13/2, 1838, pp. 62–79); HANS FERDINAND MASSMANN, *Langobardisches Wörterbuch* (*Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum* 1, 1841, pp. 561–62).

<sup>5</sup> MGH *Scriptores* 8, p. 314; GEORG HEINRICH PERTZ, *Handschriften der königlichen Bibliothek zu Paris* (Archiv d. Gesellschaft f. ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde 7, 1839, pp. 36–71), p. 37.

Reichenau version, pointing out that the hand of the manuscript was Lombard<sup>6</sup>. This initial phase in the modern history of the *Völkertafel* closed in 1862, when Karl Müllenhoff took the whole subject in hand, reconstructed an archetype on the basis of the six manuscript recensions, and added an impressive commentary<sup>7</sup>. Since then, Professor Bernhard Bischoff has found the Table in a Monte Cassino manuscript, but, as will be seen, the new version differs only in context from one already known<sup>8</sup>.

Almost everything written about the Table for the last century has depended, not on Müllenhoff, but on an article of 1928 by Bruno Krusch<sup>9</sup>. In the course of a polemic with Rudolf Much over the name 'Bavarian', Krusch took issue with Müllenhoff over the date ca. A.D. 520 attributed to the catalogue of peoples; he also disputed Müllenhoff's classification of the manuscripts. These objections led Krusch to reedit the *Völkertafel*, in two recensions, and to conclude that it had originally been composed toward 700, probably in Alamannia or nearby. Neither Krusch's conclusions nor the steps by which he reached them have since been questioned.

The supposedly 'Frankish' Table of nations, though very brief, is not without value as part of the scanty documentary record of the early barbarian kingdoms. Its dependence on Tacitus's *Germania* is noteworthy in itself, since persons acquainted with this work in Antiquity and the Middle Ages can be counted on less than the fingers of one hand<sup>10</sup>. Pertz as well as Müllenhoff realized that the particular *gentes* listed in the Table, as well as the order in which they were arranged, imply a much earlier date of composition than the one that Krusch eventually advocated, and their perception has by no means been shown to be wrong. When and where the catalogue was drawn up, what it was meant to signify, and what concepts of ethnicity it embodies are questions that have stimulated repeated speculations.

More scholars have published the *Völkertafel* than those already mentioned; the brevity of the text invites quotation in full<sup>11</sup>. But the successive printings have largely generated each other without involving further consultation and study of the

<sup>6</sup> FRANZ JOSEF MONE, *Herleitung der teutschen Völker* (*Zeitschrift für die Geschichte des Oberrheins* 2, 1851, p. 256).

<sup>7</sup> KARL MÜLLENHOFF, *Deutsche Altertumskunde*, ed. MAX ROEDIGER 3, Berlin 1892, pp. 325–32 (originally, *Abhandlungen der Berliner Akademie der Wissenschaften*, phil.-hist. Klasse 2, 1862, pp. 532–38). For MÜLLENHOFF's first discussion of the *Völkertafel*, see *Göttingische gelehrte Anzeiger* 1851, p. 174 (reprinted, *Deutsche Altertumskunde* 3, p. 298).

<sup>8</sup> See below n. 34.

<sup>9</sup> BRUNO KRUSCH, *Der Bayernname, der Kosmograph von Ravenna und die fränkische Völkertafel* (*Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde* 47, 1928, pp. 31–76). He was responding to RUDOLF MUCH, *Baiwarii* (*ibid.* 46, 1926, pp. 385–94).

<sup>10</sup> See below n. 87.

<sup>11</sup> CARLO TROYA, *Codice diplomatico Longobardo* 2, Naples 1853, p. 453; GODEFROID KURTH, *Histoire poétique des Mérovingiens*, Paris 1893, pp. 87–88, 520–21; THEODOR MOMMSEN (ed.), *MGH Auctores antiquissimi* 13, p. 159 n. 4; JOHANN FRIEDRICH, *Die sogenannte fränkische Völkertafel* (*Sitzungsberichte der Münchener Akademie der Wissenschaften*, phil.-hist. Klasse 1910, no. 11, pp. 3–5); EDMOND FARAL, *La légende arthurienne. Études et documents* 1 (*Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes-Études, sciences hist. et phil.* 255) Paris 1929, pp. 83–84; FERDINAND LOT, *Nennius et l'Historia Brittonum* 1 (*Bibl. de l'Éc. des Haut.-Ét.* 263) Paris 1934, pp. 50–51; KARL AUGUST ECKHARDT, *Ingwi und die Ingweonen in der Überlieferung des Nordens* (*Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte, Germ. Abt.* 59, 1939, pp. 1–87), pp. 72–76.

manuscripts. Even the authoritative editions of Müllenhoff and Krusch, as well as the useful one in parallel columns by Johann Friedrich, if based on manuscripts at all, took interest only in the lines or leaves containing the Table. One result has been that, whereas the genealogy of peoples has long been known to open in two manuscripts with a list of Roman "kings" of Gaul, the attached matter in two other manuscripts has been virtually ignored. Another oversight has profoundly affected modern study of the Table. Krusch attributed decisive importance to the version in an early Reichenau codex whose provenance he assumed to be the great monastery itself. In doing so, he neglected the finding of Mone and Anton Chroust that the manuscript was written in an Italian hand<sup>12</sup>. This singular flaw in Krusch's work has gone undetected by the many scholars who relied on his critical conclusions. For these various reasons, what the Table consists of is still far from clear. The *Völker-tafel* belongs to the category of sources that Léopold Genicot called "textes vivants" – writings whose every copy is a new and distinct edition, rather than just a witness to an established text<sup>13</sup>. Although the manuscript readings of the Table itself are adequately reported by existing editions, any attempt to carry our understanding of this document beyond the point where it was left in 1928 calls for reconsideration of the textual tradition.

The present study begins with a survey of the manuscripts, designed especially to replace each version of the Table in its context. An edition will then be given, setting out the eight versions in parallel lines so as to facilitate comparisons, and fully reporting all relevant accompanying matter. The next step will involve a consideration of the editorial principles of Müllenhoff and Krusch and an attempt to arrive, after them, at an approximation of the earliest recension attainable from the surviving witnesses. These lengthy preliminaries will make it possible to examine the contents of the Table with somewhat more assurance than before about the basis of discussion. Once this analysis is completed, a hypothesis will be developed about the origins of the Table and about its transmission to the manuscripts in which it survives.

## II. THE MANUSCRIPTS

For ease of reference, I retain the established sigla for the previously edited manuscript versions (A B C D E F). M is used to refer to the Monte Cassino version identified by Bischoff, and h for the edited text of the *Historia Brittonum*.

A St. Gall Stiftsbibliothek, 732. Mostly by one Carolingian hand down to p. 168 (of 194); the codex probably originated in the first third of the ninth century and may well have been written elsewhere than at the monastery<sup>14</sup>. The *Völker-*

<sup>12</sup> See below n. 44. GEORG WAITZ (*Göttingische gelehrte Anzeiger* 1856, pp. 1905–06) stressed the Italian origin of many of the manuscripts of the *Völkertafel*. MÜLLENHOFF (as n. 7) p. 329, also pointed to an Italian symptom in the Reichenau manuscript.

<sup>13</sup> LÉOPOLD GENICOT, *Les généalogies* (Typologie des sources du Moyen Âge occidental 15) Turnhout 1975, pp. 27–28.

<sup>14</sup> ALBERT BRUCKNER, *Scriptoria medii aevi Helveticae* 3, Geneva 1938, p. 117. The manuscript was probably written in 817, according to ALFRED CORDOLIANI, *Les manuscrits de comput ecclésiastique de l'Abbaye de Saint Gall du VIIIe au XIIe siècle* (*Zeitschrift für Schweizerische Kirchengeschichte* 49, 1955, pp. 161–200), p. 188.

tafel, on pp. 154–55, is in the same hand as the items immediately preceding and following it.

The contents are described by Gustav Scherrer, *Verzeichniss der Handschriften der Stiftsbibliothek von St. Gallen*, Halle 1875, pp. 240–41, to whose information clarifications are added where appropriate.

- p. 1, *Lex Alamannorum*, Carolingian recension (B 27 in the classification of Karl Lehmann, *MGH Leges nationum Germanicarum* 5/1)
- p. 98, Accounts of the holy places (a unique mixture, on which see Paul Geyer, *Itinera Hierosolymitana* [Corp. script. eccl. Latin. 39] Vienna 1898, pp. xxiv–xxv; pp. 98–108 are ed. Johann Gildemeister, *Theodosius de situ Terrae sanctae*, Bonn 1882, pp. 30–33)
- p. 115, *Assumptio b. Mariae virg.* (ed. André Wilmart, *Analecta Regimensia* [Studi e testi 59] Vatican City 1933, pp. 325–62)
- p. 142, *Chronicon de sex aetat. mundi*, to 810 (= *Generationum regnorumque laterculus Bedanus*, ed. Theodor Mommsen, *MGH Auctores antiquissimi* 13, pp. 349–53; other recensions end at 809)
- p. 154, *List of Roman kings of Gaul and Table of nations* (ed. Bruno Krusch, *MGH Scriptorum rerum Merovingicarum* 7, p. 851)
- p. 155, catalogue of Merovingian kings (*ibid.*)
- p. 156, *De symbolo apostolico*
- p. 168, Easter cycles beginning 703 with facing *Annales Sangallenses breves*, 708–815 (ed. D. I. von Arx, *MGH Scriptorum* 1, 64–65)<sup>15</sup>
- p. 189, Catalogue of popes, including historical notices until Gregory II (731), regnal years until Hadrian I (772), names only to Sergius II (844)

In spite of the first item, A cannot appropriately be classed as a legal manuscript. Chronology and history have a noteworthy place. The ordering of materials suggests that the Table of nations formed part of a continuous block of historical information, framed by texts of a completely different character, before (*Assumptio B.V.M.*) and after (a tract on the creed).

B Paris, *Bibliothèque nationale*, lat. 4628A. Tenth century, Carolingian minuscule, from St. Denis<sup>16</sup>. Two fifteenth-century copies of B, *Vaticanus Ottobonianus* 3081 and Paris lat. 4631, will be disregarded.

The extensive contents were carefully described by Guérard, *Notice d'un manuscrit coté 4628A*, pp. 62–79, but without indication of foliation; also after him by J. M. Pardessus, *Loi salique*, Paris 1843, pp. xviii–xx. The manuscript was meticulously examined on my behalf by Professor Elizabeth A. R. Brown, of Brooklyn College, City University of New York, and Professor Erika J. Laquer, of the College of Wooster, for whose assistance I am deeply grateful. Owing to the homogeneity of B's contents, only the opening items need be listed.

- f. 1v, Presentation of the codex to the bishop of Poitiers, 1636
- f. 3, Blank (modern shelf marks)

<sup>15</sup> The 19-year cycle starting in 703 was the tenth of the 28 cycles comprising the second great paschal cycle (532–1063), and is so marked in A; see CORDOLIANI (as n. 14) p. 188.

<sup>16</sup> GUÉRARD (as n. 4); *MGH Capitularia* 2, p. xxiii.

- f. 3v, Continuation of the material begun on f. 4 (MGH Capitularia 2, p. 433 line 10, *interius inventum*, to line 28, *referre audivimus*).
- f. 4, Extract concerning Carolingian spoliation and restoration of church property, from the Letter of the Synod of Quierzy to Louis the German, 858 (MGH Capitularia 2, p. 432 line 31 to p. 433 line 10, *sepulchrum*). Ends in mid-sentence with a sign in the right hand corner referring to the continuation on f. 3v.
- f. 4v, Brief excerpts de privilegiis ecclesiarum from letters of Popes Leo I and Gregory I
- f. 5, List of Frankish kings (ed. Krusch, MGH Script. rer. Merov. 7, p. 853)  
List of Roman kings of Gaul and Table of nations (*ibid.*, p. 854)
- f. 5v, Alternative list of Frankish kings, with historical notes from Chlothar II (*ibid.*)
- f. 6v, Long and short prologues to Lex Salica
- f. 7, Capitularies legibus addenda of 803 (Boretius–Krause, nos. 39–40)
- f. 9v, Table of contents of Lex Salica (70 titles)
- f. 10v, Lex Salica (K 35 in the classification of Karl August Eckhardt)<sup>17</sup>
- f. 30, Over thirty additional capitularies and other legal tracts (for the Boretius–Krause capitulary numbers, see MGH Capitularia 2, p. xxiii). A partial copy of Einhardt's *Vita Karoli*, near the end of the codex, is the only exception.

Guérard's and Pardessus' descriptions need to be qualified on one point. Folios 3–4 are a bifolium conceivably added for protective purposes; the material on f. 3v–4v, although copied in hands of similar date to the rest, has no integral connection to what follows. Folios 5–12 form the first full quire of this codex – a careful and elaborate collection of Frankish law. Its proper beginning is the list of kings on f. 5, to which attention is drawn by a splendidly decorated initial. The compiler of this manuscript, or of its model, deliberately integrated the Table of nations into what he regarded as the suitable introductory matter for a Frankish legal collection.

C Rome, Bibliotheca Vaticana, Vat. lat. 5001. Gothic script of about 1300<sup>18</sup>. Ludwig Bethmann argued persuasively that this manuscript was copied from a codex in Beneventan script written at the direction of Abbot Desiderius of Monte Cassino (1058–86). Recent scholars are inclined to accept this view<sup>19</sup>. The various copies of C, such as Vat. lat. 5000, will be disregarded<sup>20</sup>.

The contents were fully described by Bethmann in *Archiv* 10, 1851, pp. 371–72, and more summarily by Nicola Cilento, *Italia meridionale Langobarda*, Milan <sup>2</sup>1971, pp. 125–26. My tabulation also draws on other works.

<sup>17</sup> KARL AUGUST ECKHARDT (ed.), *Pactus legis Salicae 1: Einführung und 80 Titel-Text* (Germanenrechte, Neue Folge. Westgermanische Recht) Göttingen 1954, p. 31.

<sup>18</sup> ELIAS AVERY LOWE, *The Beneventan Script 1: Text*, ed. VIRGINIA BROWN (*Sussidi eruditi* 33) Rome <sup>2</sup>1980, p. 28 n. 1.

<sup>19</sup> LUDWIG BETHMANN, *Die Geschichtsschreibung der Langobarden* (*Archiv d. Gesellschaft für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde* 10, 1851, pp. 335–414), pp. 372–74; ULLA WESTERBERGH (ed.), *Chronicon Salernitanum. A Critical Edition with Studies on Literary and Historical Sources and on Language* (*Studia Latina Stockholmensia*) Stockholm 1956, p. xxiv with n. 18; NICOLA CILENTO, *Italia meridionale Langobarda*, Milan-Naples <sup>2</sup>1971, p. 127 n. 58.

<sup>20</sup> Listed and discussed by WESTERBERGH (as n. 19) pp. xxiv–xxvi.

- f. 1, Catalogues of Lombard kings, emperors, and rulers of Benevento
- f. 2, Chronicon Salernitanum (ed. Ulla Westerbergh, Stockholm 1956)
- f. 105, Three epitaphs and a dedication, all in verse
- f. 106v, Erchempert, *Historia Langob. Salernitan.* (ed. Georg Waitz, *MGH Scriptorum rerum Langobardicarum*, pp. 231–64)
- f. 131, a papal letter
- f. 132, Capitulary of Sicard of Benevento (ed. Friedrich Bluhme, *MGH Leges* 4, pp. 216–21)
- f. 137, Inventory of the possessions of a certain Poto
- f. 138, Arderic, *Carmen ad Rofridum comitem* (ed. Pertz, *MGH Scriptorum* 3, pp. 469–70)
- f. 139, Brief glossary of Lombard legal terms (ed. Bluhme, *MGH Leges* 4, pp. 652–57)
- f. 140v, Table of nations and list of Frankish and Bavarian legislators (ed. H. F. Massmann, *Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum* 1, 1841, pp. 561–62)  
Fragment of a Beneventan chronicle
- f. 143, *Divisio ducatus Beneventani* (ed. Bluhme, *MGH, Leges* 4, pp. 221–25)
- f. 147, Landulf, panegyric poem
- f. 148–62, extraneous matter, added in the early fourteenth century

Krusch mistakenly indicated that, in this codex, the *Völkertafel* was entered "ebenfalls vor einer *Lex Salica*"<sup>21</sup>. In reality, the contents are a mixture of history and law, with a preference for history and a clearly defined focus on the Lombard principalities of southern Italy; the *Chronicon Salernitanum* and Erchempert survive only here. On the other hand, the placement of the Table of nations as an intercalary fragment, and its coupling with a set of Transalpine legislators, may justify the supposition that this short fragment came originally from a northern source. The same conclusion is suggested by C's recension of the Table, which has nothing in common with the Italian versions EMF. Its independence from E is the more noteworthy in that E and C have several legal items in common.

D Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, lat. 609. Early ninth century, Visigothic script. Once belonged to St. Martial at Limoges<sup>22</sup>.

The date and contents of this manuscript are virtually irrelevant to the *Völker-tafel*, since the latter is an addition to the blank f. 28v, in a much darker ink, not following the original lineation; the hand, smaller than and very different from that of the codex proper, but not northern, was considered eleventh-century by Pertz and tenth-century by the Paris cataloguers<sup>23</sup>. The manuscript – a small, almost pocket-sized codex, showing signs of heavy use – is predominantly computistic. Its

<sup>21</sup> KRUSCH (as n. 9) p. 68; cf. his earlier comment, *Hic quoque laterculus in Legis Salicae codices transit* (*MGH SS. rer. Merov.* 7, p. 851). But B is the only *codex Legis Salicae* in which the Table occurs.

<sup>22</sup> Bibliothèque Nationale. *Catalogue général des manuscrits latins* 1, Paris 1939, pp. 216–17; ALFRED CORDOLIANI, *Textes de comput espagnol du VI<sup>e</sup> siècle: Encore le problème des traités de comput de Martin de Braga* (*Revista de Archivos, Bibliotecas y Museos* 62, 1956, pp. 685–97), p. 695, specifies the date as 819 and the writing as from Catalonia or southern France, in agreement with CHARLES W. BARLOW (ed.), *Martini Bracarensis opera omnia*, New Haven 1950, p. 262.

<sup>23</sup> PERTZ (as n. 5).

contents are sketchily outlined in the *Catalogue général des manuscrits latins*, but could be adequately described only by an expert in computistic literature<sup>24</sup>. The addition on f. 28v is called by Krusch a passage *De gentiliis et barbarorum generationibus*, and by the Paris catalogue “quelques ‘questiones’ sur la Bible”<sup>25</sup>; it is, in fact, a hitherto unidentified example of the question-and-answer dialogues called *ioca monachorum*<sup>26</sup>.

The immediate context is as follows:

f. 23v, an Easter table (original hand)

f. 28v, *ioca monachorum* (later addition on a blank page)

f. 29, *Si uis scire quomodo pascha christianorum requiras* (original hand)

The ‘monks’ pastimes’ are a literary genre consisting of “das uralte Gesprächsbüchlein, die dem Abendlande im 6./7. Jahrhundert aus dem griechisch-byzantinischen Osten übermittelt sind, zu Anfang des 8. Jahrhunderts im Frankenreiche bereits in verschiedenen lateinischen Fassungen existieren und in der Hauptsache biblische Katechismen zum Gebrauch für Erholungsstunden vorstellen”<sup>27</sup>. There are versions under many titles in many languages; “Diese außerordentliche und länger als ein Jahrtausend anhaltende Lebenskraft jener Schriften zeigt deutlich, wie hoch ihre Bedeutung als Bildungsträger zu veranschlagen ist”<sup>28</sup>. Although no Greek version has been found that might have served as model for the main group of *ioca monachorum*, many of the questions in Latin versions are found here and there in Greek ones<sup>29</sup>. As with our Table of nations itself, “. . . die Kopisten sehr frei mit ihren Vorlagen umgehen, indem sie unbedenklich einzelne Fragen fortlassen oder andere einzusetzen, ohne daß die Gründe für dieses oder jenes Verhalten im Einzelfalle immer klar zu erkennen wären”<sup>30</sup>. The subject matter of the dialogues is mainly biblical, but hagiography and profane history also find a place in even the earliest surviving versions<sup>31</sup>.

The *ioca monachorum* on f. 28v of D consist of eight questions and answers. Four are paralleled in other manuscripts, although invariably in somewhat different words<sup>32</sup>. Three more – two biblical, one hagiographic – are new. The eighth item in the set, also new within the *ioca* genre, is the Table of nations.

<sup>24</sup> A catalogue of Paris computistic manuscripts was announced as being in preparation by ALFRED CORDOLIANI, *Textes de comput espagnol du VIIe siècle. Le Computus Cottonianus (Hispania Sacra 11, 1958, pp. 125–36)*, p. 125.

<sup>25</sup> KRUSCH (as n. 9) p. 69, after PERTZ; *Catalogue gén. des mss. latins 1*, p. 216. Possibly confusing D with E, KRUSCH claimed that “der Abschnitt . . . später der alten Hs. angebunden ist”, but he may have been misled by PERTZ’s description.

<sup>26</sup> *Clavis patrum Latinorum (Sacris Erudiri 3)* Turnhout 1961, no. 1155f. My gratitude to Professor James E. Cross, of the University of Liverpool, for introducing me to the *ioca* is expressed in the Appendix.

<sup>27</sup> PAUL LEHMANN, *Die Parodie im Mittelalter*, Stuttgart 1963, p. 10.

<sup>28</sup> WALTHER SUCHIER, *Das mittellateinische Gespräch Adrian und Epictetus nebst verwandten Texten (Ioca Monachorum)*, Tübingen 1955, p. 88.

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 47–48.

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.* p. 139.

<sup>31</sup> PAUL MEYER, *Ioca monachorum (Romania 1, 1872, pp. 483–90)*, p. 483.

<sup>32</sup> For an analysis of the eight questions and answers, see the Appendix.



M Monte Cassino, Archivio della Badia, 384. Beneventan script; pp. 1–112 are by an early tenth-century hand, the balance (pp. 113–72) by a slightly later scribe<sup>33</sup>. The presence of a copy of the Völkertafel in this manuscript was made known by Bernhard Bischoff to Alban Dold, who published the information<sup>34</sup>.

Since this codex is formed of two parts written at different times, only the first, in which the Table of nations appears, is of interest. Its contents are described in the Monte Cassino catalogue as *Florilegium patristicum ordine litterarum A–Q dispositum*; no detailed analysis is given. One does learn that the florilegium draws primarily on church fathers, from Tertullian to Alcuin, but that extracts from profane authors, such as Livy, Lucan, and Solinus, also appear<sup>35</sup>. For our Table, the applicable letter in the alphabetical order is M; after the opening words *Mulius rex*. It follows a passage of Prosper beginning *Malorum* and is followed by a similarly edifying extract beginning *Malum*.

In marked contrast to the diversity of all other recensions of the Völkertafel, the one in M is identical to that of E. Their agreement is probably attributable to the proximity of Monte Cassino and Benevento. The rubric, however, is unique: *Hieronymus in cronicis*. Whether anything can be made of this line is doubtful. The one rapprochement it suggests is with a short pseudo-Hieronymian chronicle in F (f. 62); but this chronicle is not located anywhere near the Table of nations (f. 184).

E La Cava, Archivio della Badia della Santissima Trinità, 4 (22). Beneventan script, toward 1005<sup>36</sup>. Presumably from Benevento, in view of the contents.

This is a famous illustrated Codex legum Langobardorum, whose contents have been inventoried many times: Pertz in Archiv 5, 1824, pp. 247–58; Bluhme, MGH Leges 4, pp. xxx–xxxiii; Leo Mattei-Cerasoli, Codices Cavenses 1: Codices membranacei, Cava 1935, pp. 22–25. As with D, however, the date and contents of the manuscript have little relevance to a study of the Table of nations, for the latter is a separate fragment, *folium ipsi codici praesutum*, as Bluhme put it<sup>37</sup>. The Völkertafel is written in a hand that Alban Dold believed to be different from that of the main manuscript, on an end leaf sewn to the front of the codex and now numbered f. 1. This leaf is one-third as large (vertically) as those that follow. The verso has a much faded illustration, whose character Dold contrasted to that of the Codex legum illustrations; it includes an inscription in yet a third hand<sup>38</sup>. Bluhme's findings depart from Dold's on one important point; to him, the Table seemed

<sup>33</sup> MAURUS INGUANEZ, Codicum Casinensium manuscriptorum catalogus 2, Monte Cassino 1928–34, pp. 246–47. The date is given as ca. 900 by LOWE (as n. 18) pp. 208, 243 with n. 5, 247, 275 – virtually a century before E. I am extremely grateful to Professor Marcello Rotili of Benevento for graciously supplying me with microfilm of the relevant portions of this manuscript.

<sup>34</sup> ALBAN DOLD, Zur ältesten Handschrift des Edictus Rothari, Stuttgart 1955, pp. 45–46.

<sup>35</sup> INGUANEZ (as n. 33) p. 245.

<sup>36</sup> MARIO ROTILI, La miniatura nella Badia di Cava 2: La raccolta di miniature italiane e straniere, Cava dei Tirreni 1978, p. 59.

<sup>37</sup> MGH Leges 4, p. xxxi; but cf. BERNARD GAETANO DI ARAGONIA (ed.), Codex diplomaticus Cavensis 3, Appendix, Naples 1876, p. 1.

<sup>38</sup> DOLD (as n. 34).

written *ab eadem manu, quae ultimos codicis quaterniones explevit*<sup>39</sup>. If this is so, the attachment of the leaf to the codex need not have been wholly accidental.

The main manuscript properly begins on f. 2, with an illustration based on the *Origo gentis Langobardorum*, and then with the *Origo* itself; it serves as introduction for the *Edictus Rothari*, which immediately follows. Although on a separate fragment, the *Völkertafel* is not badly assorted in subject matter with the narrative that it happens to precede, and, as has been seen, an element of deliberation, rather than mere chance, may have brought this leaf to the head of the *Codex legum*. Even if Bluhme is right, however, the Table entered E as an afterthought. The text certainly did not occur in the model from which the *Codex legum* was copied.

The fragment containing the Table is reproduced in colored facsimile in Bernard Gaetano D'Aragonia (ed.), *Codex diplomaticus Cavensis 3*, Appendix, Naples 1876, opposite p. 250; and in a photograph in Alban Dold, *Zur ältesten Handschrift des Edictus Rothari*, p. 47, table XIII.

F Karlsruhe, Badische Landesbibliothek, Reichenau CCXXIX. Early ninth century, Italian hand. The paleography of this manuscript calls for special attention.

Although the Italian provenance of F – one set of leaves excepted, as will be seen – is generally agreed upon by paleographers, further details are somewhat elusive. Bischoff proposed that it was written in the Abruzzi between 806 and 822<sup>40</sup>. The localization hinges on a note concerning the Frankish destruction of Chieti and a nearby town in 801 and 805<sup>41</sup>. Bischoff himself pointed out, however, that since the manuscript seems to have been copied no earlier than 821 (the year is entered on f. 58v in one of the two original hands), the note about Chieti must have a historical character rather than one of immediacy. As a result, its value for localizing the manuscript cannot be taken for granted<sup>42</sup>. Although the writing belongs to the “tentative period” of Beneventan script, implying a southern provenance, E. A. Lowe cautioned that such early southern products can be distinguished only with great difficulty from north Italian ones<sup>43</sup>. The date limit 822 hinges on the belief,

<sup>39</sup> MGH *Leges* 4, p. xxxi.

<sup>40</sup> BERNHARD BISCHOFF, *Panorama der Handschriftenüberlieferung aus der Zeit Karls des Großen* (*Karl der Große 2: Das geistige Leben*, ed. BERNHARD BISCHOFF, Düsseldorf 1965, pp. 233–54), p. 253 n. 160.

<sup>41</sup> For the text, see ALFRED HOLDER, *Die Reichenauer Handschriften. Die Pergamenthandschriften* (*Die Handschriften der Großherzogl. Badischen Hof- und Landesbibliothek 6*) Karlsruhe 1914, p. 525; also MONE (as n. 6).

<sup>42</sup> Cf. the parallel reasoning of PAOLA SUPINO MARTINI, *Per lo studio delle scritture altomedioevali italiane: la collezione canonica chietina* (*Vat. reg. lat. 1997*) (*Scrittura e civiltà* 1, 1977, pp. 133–154), p. 152. In a different sense, LUIGI SCHIAPARELLI, *Influenze straniere nella scrittura italiana dei secoli VIII e IX. Note paleografiche* (*Studi e testi* 47) Vatican City 1927, p. 57. I am much indebted to the Institut de recherches et d'histoire des textes, Paris, for providing me with photocopies of material concerning this manuscript.

<sup>43</sup> LOWE (as n. 18) pp. 40, 93–123, esp. 114; cf. BISCHOFF (as n. 40) p. 251. The hand of the manuscript was taken to be Irish by CHARLES W. JONES (ed.), *Beda opera de temporibus*, Cambridge, Mass. 1943, pp. 151–52, and BARLOW (as n. 22) pp. 263–64; both believed it to have been written at Reichenau. According to JONES, pp. 146, 152, the extracts of Bede in F (f. 25) are derived from Karlsruhe Reichenau CLXVII or a common source; whether this view can be reconciled with the Italian origin of F remains to be determined.

espoused by Chroust, that the second part of F is entered under nos. 330 and 331 in the Reichenau library catalogue of 822; the catalogue entry in fact corresponds very precisely to the contents<sup>44</sup>. Some hesitation is nevertheless in order. Owing to the date on f. 58v, the manuscript could not have been finished in Italy before 821. It would have needed to travel very fast in order to be catalogued at Reichenau in the very next year<sup>45</sup>. The rapid journey is possible, but only just. In sum, neither F's precise point of origin nor its terminus ante quem can be regarded as assured.

According to the authoritative paleographic examination published by Chroust in 1914, the codex is divided into three parts: I, ff. 1–69; II, ff. 70–185; III, ff. 186–222. Two Italian hands can be discerned; both worked on part I, one only – the main scribe – on II and III. No great interval can have separated the writing of the three parts. The manuscript also contains the contribution of a third and later scribe, who used Carolingian minuscule; he is responsible for the Assumptio s. Mariae on ff. 184v–190. Most of this text is on a single leaf and a binio that were bound between parts II and III (ff. 186, 187–90). The beginning of the Assumptio, however, was copied onto leaves of part II that had apparently been left blank by the main Italian scribe (ff. 184v–185)<sup>46</sup>. The addition of this narrative may well have taken place at Reichenau. The Assumptio in question – different from that in A – is unique<sup>47</sup>.

In an article of importance to the Table of nations in this manuscript, it has lately been argued that the main scribe's contribution to part II ended at f. 183v and that f. 184r is in an alien but still Italian hand<sup>48</sup>. I am unable to find a basis for this distinction.

The extremely varied contents of F are described in Alfred Holder, *Die Reichenauer Handschriften*, pp. 521–27. A select list will be given here, with special attention to the parts flanking the Table of nations.

- f. 1, Isidore of Seville, *De officiis* (= *Etymologiae* VI, 9)
- f. 12, Pseudo-Council of Caesarea (ed. Wilmart, *Analecta Reginensia*, pp. 19–27)
- f. 16, Pseudo-Martin of Braga, *De pascha* (ed. Barlow, *Martini Bracarensis opera omnia*, pp. 270–75)<sup>49</sup>

<sup>44</sup> ANTON CHROUST, *Monumenta palaeographica. Denkmäler der Schreibkunst des Mittelalters* 2, 2, Munich 1914, 10, Tafel 10 (unpaged); GUSTAV BECKER, *Catalogi bibliothecarum antiqui*, Bonn 1885, p. 10. The manuscript appears with a date of *saec. IX*<sup>2</sup> in ELIAS AVERY LOWE, *The Beneventan Script 2: A Hand List of Beneventan MSS*, ed. VIRGINIA BROWN (*Sussidi eruditi* 35) Rome 1980, p. 30. Unless based on still unpublished findings, neither this date nor the Beneventan attribution can be deemed secure.

<sup>45</sup> To be sure, the date 821 appears in part I of F, whereas the portions listed in the catalogue of 822 are in part II; but the same main scribe worked on both parts, so that they cannot have originated at significantly different times.

<sup>46</sup> In addition to CHROUST (as n. 44), see SUPINO MARTINI (as n. 42) p. 150 n. 39.

<sup>47</sup> See ANTOINE WENGER, *L'Assomption de la T. S. Vierge dans la tradition byzantine du VI<sup>e</sup> au Xe siècle. Études et documents* (*Archives de l'Orient chrétien* 5) Paris 1955, pp. 10, 12, 66, 74, 87–88, 145–148. WENGER overlooked CHROUST and did not himself observe that the Assumptio narrative was in a different hand from the rest of the manuscript; he therefore ascribed an earlier date to the Assumptio than is appropriate on paleographic grounds (pp. 23, 68). See also ALBERT SIEGMUND, *Die Überlieferung der griechischen christlichen Literatur in der lateinischen Kirche*, Munich 1949, p. 48.

<sup>48</sup> SUPINO MARTINI (as n. 42) pp. 150–52 with n. 43.

<sup>49</sup> Cf. CORDOLIANI (as n. 22).

- f. 25, Bede, *De temporum ratione*, cc. 36, 48, 50, 61, 52, 55 (ed. C. W. Jones, *Bedaes opera de temporibus*, pp. 248–50, 268, 269–70, 281–83, 273, 275–76)
- f. 44, *De montibus*
- f. 46, Table of lunar positions
- f. 46v, Apocryphal letter of Chromatius and Jerome on the Assumption of the Virgin (ed. Émile Amann, *Le protévangelie de Jacques et ses dérivés latins*, Paris 1910, pp. 272–77)
- f. 48v, Map of the world
- f. 49, *Incipit compotus*<sup>50</sup>
- f. 54, *Tractatio symboli*
- f. 57v, *Indictiones a Romani inventa*
- f. 60v, *Incipit ratio bisexti*<sup>51</sup>
- f. 61v, Image of the Labyrinth<sup>52</sup>
- f. 62, *Incipit chronica s. Hieronimi de principio cęli et tęrrę* (unidentified; not the Eusebius-Jerome chronicle)
- f. 70, Isidore, *Libri proemiorum* (*Clavis patrum Latinarum*<sup>2</sup> 1192)
- f. 88v, Isidore, *De ortu et obitu patrum* (*Clavis*<sup>2</sup> 1191)
- f. 114v, Isidore, *Allegoriae quaedam s. Scripturae* (*Clavis*<sup>2</sup> 1190)
- f. 139v, Isidore, *De natura rerum*, with diagrams (*Clavis*<sup>2</sup> 1188)
- f. 183v, Explanation of how the stadium is measured  
Drawing representing Asia, Africa, Europe
- f. 184, Table of nations (ed. Krusch in *Neues Archiv* 47, 1928, pp. 70–71)  
Notices on the destruction of Chieti and another town by the Franks (ed. Holder, *Reichen. Hss.*, p. 525)
- f. 184v, *Assumptio s. Mariae* (ed. A. Wenger, *Assomption de la Vięrgę*, pp. 245–56).
- f. 191, Caesarius of Arles, *Breviarium adversus hereticos* (*Clavis*<sup>2</sup> 1015)
- f. 205, Priscian, *Institutio de nomine, pronomine et verbo*, incomplete<sup>53</sup>
- f. 212, *Orationes*
- f. 218, Creed of Athanasius (ed. Krusch, *MGH Auct. antiq.* 4/2, pp. 105–06)
- f. 220, Miscellaneous creeds

In sum, it appears as though part I is mainly computistic and chronological, part II a comprehensive collection of Isidorian treatises, and part III doctrinal and grammatical. One curious feature is that the later insertion of a narrative Assumptio B.V.M. between parts II and III was anticipated in part I by the apocryphal letter of Chromatius and Jerome. The Table of nations is rather straightforwardly entered as one of four short, disconnected items, or fillers, added by the main scribe after

<sup>50</sup> See ALFRED CORDOLIANI, *Les traités de comput du haut Moyen Âge, 526–1003* (*Bulletin du Cange* 17, 1943, pp. 51–72), p. 59 no. XLII.

<sup>51</sup> See ALFRED CORDOLIANI in *Hispania Sacra* 8, 1955, p. 27.

<sup>52</sup> See WOLFGANG GRAPE, *Das Jericho Labyrinth in dem Karlsruher Codex Augiensis 229* (*Das Münster: Zeitschrift für christliche Kunst und Kunstwissenschaft* 28, 1975, pp. 199–202). I have not been able to consult WOLFGANG HAUBRICH, *Error inextricabilis. Form und Funktion der Labyrinthabbildung in mittelalterlichen Handschriften* (*Text und Bild*, ed. CHRISTEL MEIER and UWE RUBERG, Wiesbaden 1980, pp. 63–174).

<sup>53</sup> See COLETTE JENDY in *Revue d'histoire des textes* 2, 1972, pp. 73–144.

completion of the last of the treatises of Isidore. As is apparent from part I, many similar fragments of useful information were at his disposal.

A photograph of f. 184 was published by Paola Supino Martini in *Scrittura e civiltà* 1, 1977, Table 4 (mistakenly labelled as f. 184v).

- h The *Historia Brittonum* formerly ascribed to Nennius. Much of the scholarship surrounding this text is undergoing revision at the hands of Dr. David Dumville, of Cambridge University, whose new edition will presently appear<sup>54</sup>. For the limited purposes of the present study, it suffices to point out that the *Historia* is dated to about 830, was composed in the Welsh part of the British Isles, and consists of a great variety of chronological, genealogical, descriptive, and historical items concerning Britain<sup>55</sup>.

Our Table of nations occurs early in the *Historia*; it is integrated into an alternative genealogy of Brutus, the Stammvater of the Britons. The wider framework of this genealogy is that of the biblical/Hippolytan table of nations beginning with Noah. The author of the *Historia* first entered an enlarged version of our Table, beginning with a certain Alanus<sup>56</sup>. Next, he provided two contradictory lists of ancestors, one for Alanus, grandfather of Brutus, the other for Brutus himself; the first is purely biblical, the second takes a detour through the Aeneas legend about Rome before regaining biblical ground.

At the close of this survey, it might be pointed out that the *Völkertafel* comes to us in the majority of cases as a casual filler (ACDEF) and even, twice, as an alien scrap added or attached to the surviving codex (DE). Three times, it is organically related to the main contents: in B, among the introductory royal genealogies of a comprehensive collection of Frankish law; in M, as part of a patristic florilegium; and in h, within a more comprehensive table of nations. The wider context of the Table is "sacred" in DM, as well as F, but it is historical in A and legal in BC (more questionably in E). The author of the *Historia Brittonum* found good use for the Table and assured it of the only medieval diffusion that it enjoyed. Most other copyists who chanced upon the Table appear to have been perplexed. Although interested enough to modify the text in small ways, they wrote it into odd corners, from which no one thought to extract it until the nineteenth century.

### III. EDITION<sup>57</sup>

- A St. Gall 732, f. 154–55  
 B Paris lat. 4628A, f. 5–5v  
 C Vaticanus lat. 5001, f. 140v

<sup>54</sup> Cf. DOROTHY WHITELOCK (ed.), *English Historical Documents c. 500–1042*, London 1979, pp. 125–26.

<sup>55</sup> ANTONIA GRANSDEN, *Historical Writing in England, c. 550 to c. 1307*, London 1974, pp. 5–6.

<sup>56</sup> On this name, see below n. 78.

<sup>57</sup> The basis of my transcriptions are: A, microfilm; B, collated by me; C, photocopy of microfilm; D, collated by me; M, microfilm; E, photograph in DOLD (as n. 34) p. XIII; F, photograph in SUPINO MARTINI (as n. 42) pl. IV.

- D Paris lat. 609, f. 28v  
 M Monte Cassino 384, f. 136 (= p. 71)  
 E La Cava 4, f. 1  
 F Karlsruhe, Reichenau CCXXIX, f. 184  
 h *Historia Brittonum*, ed. Theodor Mommsen, MGH Auct. ant. 13, pp. 159–61.  
 Dr. David Dumville has very kindly furnished a typescript of the appropriate pages of his forthcoming edition, reproduced here with his permission. For this passage, Mommsen's text is the same.

In F and h, the three sets of nations are listed in a unique order. So as to facilitate comparisons of names, the corresponding lines are printed here in the order of the other manuscripts and are numbered F<sup>1</sup>, F<sup>2</sup>, F<sup>3</sup>, and h<sup>1</sup>, h<sup>2</sup>, h<sup>3</sup> in order to indicate the sequence proper to them.

Abbreviations have been expanded. Capitalization and punctuation are modernized.

- D Interrogatio: Qui pugnauit contra Allofilos et Filisteos et contra Goliam gigantem? Responsio: Daud in uicem Saal regis et obtinuit uictoriam. Interrogatio: Que mulier occisit Olofernem principem militiae Nabuchodonosori regis? Responsio: Iudit. Qui primus inuenit utiro et ordinauit s[. . .]a[. .] facere? Responsio: Salomon rex. Qui sine arma et sine uaculum leonem interfecit? Responsio: Samson. Qui serpentem [crocodi]lum sedit et sic flumen transiuit? Responsio: Sanctus Helen[us]. Qui bestiam mulsit iterum? Responsio: Sanctus Mamis. Qui ter mortuus et ter resurrexit? Responsio: Sanctus Cyricus et Sanctus Georgius.

- h Aliud experimentum inueni de isto Bruto ex ueteribus libris ueterum nostrorum. Tres filii Noe diuiserunt orbem in tres partes post diluuium. Sem in Asia, Cham in Affrica, Iafeth in Europa dilatauerunt terminos suos.

- A Incipit generatio regum.  
 B Item de regibus Romanorum.  
 M Hieronymus in cronicis.

- A Primus rex Romanorum Analeu:  
 B Primus rex Romanorum Allanius dictus est.  
 M Mulius rex  
 E Mulius rex  
 F Alaneus dictus est homo  
 h Primus homo uenit ad Europam de genere Iafeth: Alanus

- A Analeus genuit Papulo; Papulus genuit Egegium; Egegius genuit Egegium;  
 B Allanius genuit Pabolus, Pabolus Egetium. Egetius genuit Egegium.

- A Egegius genuit Fadiru, et ipsum Romani perdiderunt.  
 B Egegius genuit Siagrius, per quem Romani regnum perdiderunt.

- A Tres fuerunt fratres unde sunt gentes,  
 B Tres fuerunt qui dicti sunt  
 C Tres fuerunt fratres ex quibus gentes XIII:  
 D Qui fuerunt qui gentes genuerunt? Responsio: Tres fratres,  
 M tres filios habuit quorum nomina haec sunt:  
 E tres filios habuit quorum nomina hec sunt:  
 F qui genuit tres filios, id est,  
 h cum tribus filiis suis quorum nomina sunt
- 

- A Erminus, Inguo et Istio frater eorum;  
 B Primus Ermenius, secundus Ingo, tertius Escio. Inde adcreuerunt gentes XIII.  
 C  
 D Ermenus, Ingus, et Scius.  
 M Armen, Tingus, Hostius. Singuli genuerunt quaternas generationes.  
 E Armen, Tingus, Ostius. Singuli genuerunt quaternas generationes.  
 F Hisisione, Ermenone et Niguelo.  
 h Hessitio, Armeno, Negue.
- 

- A Erminus genuit Gothos, Walagotus, Wandalus, Gepedes et Saxones. Haec sunt gentes V.  
 B Primus Ermenius genuit Gothos, Walagotus, Wandalos, Gippedios, et Saxones.  
 C Primus Ermenius genuit Butes, Gualangutos, Guandalos, Gepidos, Saxones;  
 D Ermenus genuit Gotos, Wandalos, Gebeteos et Saxones.  
 M Armen genuit Gothos, Guandalos, Brigidos, Saxones;  
 E Armen genuit Gothos, Guandalos, Brigidos, Saxones;  
 F<sup>2</sup> De Ermenone nate sunt generationes V: Gothi, Walagothi, Cybedi, Burgundio et Langobardos.  
 h<sup>2</sup> Armenon autem habuit quinque filios: Gothus, Valagotus, Gebidus, Burgandus, Longobardus.
- 

- A Inguo frater eorum genuit Burgundiones, Loringus, Langobardus, Baioarius, Haec sunt gentes IIII.  
 B Ingo genuit Burgundiones, Thoringos, Langobardos et Baoweros.  
 C Ingo genuit Burgundiones, Turingos, Langobardos, Baioeros;  
 D Ingus genuit Burgundionis, Toringos, Longobardos et Bawarios.  
 M Tingus genuit Tuscos, Langobardos, Burgundiones et Baioarios;  
 E Tingus genuit Tuscos et Langobardos, Burgundiones, Baioarios;  
 F<sup>3</sup> De Niguelo nate sunt generationes quattuor, id est: Wandalos, Saxones, Baioarios et Toringus.  
 h<sup>3</sup> Neugo autem habuit tres filios: Vandalus, Saxo, Boguarus.
- 

- A Istio frater eorum genuit Romanos, Brictones, Francus, Alamannus. Haec sunt gentes IIII.  
 B Escio genuit Romanos, Brittones, Francos et Alamannos.  
 C Estio Romanos, Brictones, Francos, Alamannos.

- D Scius genuit Romanos, Brittones, Francos et Alamannos.  
 M Hostius genuit Romanos, Brittones, Francos et Alamannos.  
 E Hostius genuit Romanos, Brittones, Francos et Alamannos.  
 F<sup>1</sup> De Hisisione nate sunt generationes quattuor, id est: Romanos, Francos, Alamannos et Brittones.  
 h<sup>1</sup> Hissitio autem habuit filios quattuor; hi sunt Francus, Romanus, Britto, Albanus.

F Istas XIII generationes omnino non separantur.

C Capitula legis (regis *cod.*) Saliche que constituit domnus Karolus imperator. Dicta est enim Salicha per proceres ipsius gentis qui tunc erant rectores, id est, Guisogaste, Salegaste, Guidogaste, Arogaste, Bodogaste, Guicouodo, in loco cognominante Salachanne, Bodoganne, et Guidobane. Lex Ribuarum, sub Clothario rege edita. Lex Baioariorum, sub regibus Francorum Theoderico, Childeberto, Clotthario.

- h Ab Hisitione autem orte sunt quattuor gentes – Franci, Latini, Albani et Britti; ab Armenone autem quinque – Gothi, Valagothi, Gebidi, Burgandi, Longobardi; a Neugio uero quattuor – Boguarii, Vandali, Saxones et Taringi. Iste autem gentes subdiuise sunt per totam Europam. Alanus autem, ut aiunt, filius fuit Fetebir, filii Ougomun, filii Thoi, filii Boib, filii Simeon, filii Mair, filii Aurthach, filii Oth, filii Abir, filii Ra, filii Ezra, filii Izrau, filii Baath, filii Iobaath, filii Iouan, filii Iafeth, filii Noe, filii Lamech, filii Matusalem, filii Enoch, filii Iareth, filii Malaleel, filii Cainan, filii Enos, filii Seth, filii Adam, filii Dei uiui. Hanc peritiam inueni ex traditione ueterum qui incole in primo fuerunt Brittanie.  
 Brittones a Bruto; Brutus filius Hisitionis; Hisition Alanei; Alaneus filius Reae, filie Siluie Reae, filie Nume Pampilii, filii Ascanii; Ascanius filius Aeneae, filii Anchise, filii Troi, filii Dardani, filii Flise, filii Iuani, filii Iafeth.

#### IV. THE EARLIEST ATTAINABLE VERSION

Once the contents of the manuscripts are fully published, it becomes possible to reopen the question that Müllenhoff and Krusch answered in diametrically opposite ways, namely, what does the Table of nations consist of? Despite their divergent answers, the two editors agreed in giving precedence to what each one considered the earliest manuscript and in ascribing fundamental importance to its first lines. Their positions need to be set out before the premise they shared is reexamined.

Müllenhoff selected A, with its list of Roman kings, as the earliest text and as the basis for a critical edition. It, of course, closely resembles B<sup>58</sup>. The logic of his classification implies the existence of two other groups: one from which the king list was excised (CD) and another in which it was reduced to its first name (EMFh).

<sup>58</sup> MÜLLENHOFF (as n. 7) pp. 328–29.



Krusch sharply criticized Müllenhoff for attributing a date ca. 520 to the composition of the Table of nations because, Krusch argued, the list of Roman kings embodied notions that are late Merovingian<sup>59</sup>. Moreover, he held that A was datable "s. IX/X", whereas F, from Reichenau, not only belonged to the early ninth century but also contained a version of the Table whose antiquity was vouchsafed by its occurring in the *Historia Brittonum*. (Krusch even inclined to the opinion that the *Historia* antedated Bede.)<sup>60</sup> To the principle that F was the oldest manuscript, Krusch added two arguments. The *Germania* of Tacitus, from which the Table of nations proceeds, mentions a father, Mannus, and his three sons. Only versions Fh (and E, which Krusch dismissed as 'corrupt') stand close to Tacitus by approximating his model, in the form of Alaneus and his sons; all others mention three brothers and are therefore farther removed from the Tacitean point of departure<sup>61</sup>. A final consideration involved the list of peoples: "Die Franken aber waren . . . das Hauptvolk des Reichs und mußten den Ausgangspunkt für eine solche Aufstellung bilden." Only in Fh are they in the first set; the other versions place them last<sup>62</sup>. For all these reasons, F was to be taken as the unique witness to the earliest recension of the Table. On Krusch's hypothesis, it followed that, in subsequent stages of the textual tradition, the groups of *gentes* were reorganized (all versions except F), the sons were changed into brothers (ABCD), the 'father' was made a Roman king and given four successors (AB)<sup>63</sup>, and, as a last step in deterioration, all the Roman kings were struck out (CD). What to make of the 'corrupt' E, which has a king like AB but gives him sons like F, was left unexplained by Krusch and considered irrelevant.

As has already been pointed out, Krusch's reasoning harbored a decisive flaw; the manuscript to which he gave precedence and attributed to Reichenau is in fact from Italy<sup>64</sup>. Although possibly the oldest of the seven, F was not copied markedly earlier than A, whose age Krusch underestimated. (In any case, neither he nor Müllenhoff was necessarily well advised to select his preferred version of the Table on the basis of the antiquity of the manuscripts.) Krusch's subsidiary arguments for the originality of F's recension fall by the wayside once its Italian provenance is observed. He wished the Table to be a 'Frankish' production of the late seventh or early eighth century, betraying its proximity to Tacitus's *Germania* by a list featuring a father with sons; and he believed that the Alamannic contents of A were as significant for the origins of the Table as was F's coming from nearby Reichenau. Once F is recognized as Italian, however, none of these considerations can apply; if its provenance bears any relationship at all to the original composition of the Table, the connection is bound to be entirely different from what Krusch imagined<sup>65</sup>. The main consequence of restoring F to its proper, and possibly 'Beneventan', home involves

<sup>59</sup> KRUSCH (as n. 9) pp. 65–68. Concerning MÜLLENHOFF's date, see below n. 80.

<sup>60</sup> KRUSCH (as n. 9) pp. 69–70, 73.

<sup>61</sup> *Ibid.* p. 69.

<sup>62</sup> *Ibid.* p. 72.

<sup>63</sup> For KRUSCH's original statement of this view, see MGH *Script. rer. Merov.* 7, p. 851 n. 2.

<sup>64</sup> Above pp. 106–07.

<sup>65</sup> Cf. ECKHARDT (as n. 11) p. 74. Oddly, he espoused KRUSCH's point of view even though, unlike KRUSCH, he recognized that the script of F was Lombard.

recognizing the substantial resemblance of its text to the definitely Beneventan versions EM, which, like F, feature a father with sons. All three, besides, embody a more emphatically modernized catalogue of peoples than any of the northern recensions; E and M displace the Lombards and introduce the Tuscans, whereas F embodies even more drastic changes, one of which brings the Franks almost to the head of the list. Müllenhoff did not go wrong in regarding F, despite its early date, as the recension that departs most radically from the tradition.

Although Krusch was misled by the lack of a vital detail, his initial objection to Müllenhoff's edition was not unjustified. He rightly pointed out that the list of Roman kings of Gaul in AB embodied late Merovingian ideas and name spellings and is, therefore, ill assorted with a Table of nations to which Müllenhoff assigned an early sixth-century date. A similar view had been advanced fifty years earlier by Adolf Bachmann, when he insisted, more simply, that the list of kings was not connected to the catalogue of peoples<sup>66</sup>. Friedrich made the same observation, and so did Edmond Faral: in AB, no bond of filiation – or other link, for that matter – exists between Alaneus, king of the Romans, and the three brothers who generated the *gentes*<sup>67</sup>. The important consideration is not so much that Müllenhoff's choice of A was wrong, as Krusch thought, but that, for a variety of reasons, the list of kings looks like a separate composition from the Table of nations. Guérard himself had realized the independence of the two texts when he brought them to light in 1838<sup>68</sup>.

The truth of this conclusion is further confirmed once the contents of C and D are fully published. In no manuscript do the brothers and their peoples stand alone; but since they are joined to three different companion pieces – Roman kings (AB), Frankish and Bavarian legislators (C), and *ioca monachorum* (D) – it seems to follow that the Table of nations once existed as an item distinct from any accompanying material. In other words, the earliest attainable version of the *Völker-tafel* contains neither a list of Roman kings nor a Tacitean father of three sons; it is limited to three brothers and the thirteen peoples proceeding from them.

On this premise the manuscript recensions of the Table divide, without reference to date, into a Transalpine group (ABCD) and an Italian group (EMF). The list of four Roman kings of Gaul in AB embodies late Merovingian ideas<sup>69</sup>. Since the first of the kings appears in the Italian group EMF, it must descend from an ancestor of AB. The common feature of the group is that this fragment is integrated with the catalogue of peoples. The version of the *Historia Brittonum* (h) is, of course, closely connected to F.

The freedom with which copyists treated the Table makes it a vain task to attempt a single version that can pretend to supersede all others. The composite offered here is a tentative approximation, designed only to facilitate rapid consultation and not

<sup>66</sup> ADOLF BACHMANN, *Die Einwanderung der Baiern* (Sitzungsberichte der Wiener Akademie der Wissenschaften, phil.-hist. Klasse 91, 1878, pp. 815–92), p. 865 n. 2.

<sup>67</sup> FRIEDRICH (as n. 11) p. 27; FARAL (as n. 11) p. 85.

<sup>68</sup> GUÉRARD (as n. 4) pp. 66–69.

<sup>69</sup> KRUSCH (as n. 9) pp. 66–68.

pretending to render superfluous the full report of manuscript readings a few pages ago<sup>70</sup>.

[GENERATIO GENTIUM]

*Tres fuerunt fratres, primus Erminus, secundus Inguo, tertius Istio.*

*Inde adcreuerunt gentes XIII.*

*Primus Erminus genuit Gothos, Walagothos, Wandalos, Gepedeos, et Saxones.*

*Inguo genuit Burgundiones, Turingos, Langobardos, Baioarios.*

*Istio genuit Romanos, Brittones, Francos, Alamannos.*

V. ANALYSIS OF THE TABLE

When and where was the Table composed, on what basis and with what intent? Some of these problems had begun to find answers when Krusch entered the discussion and set the tone for all subsequent comments. The views and opinions about the Table that his polemics drowned out regain value and can be considered with renewed interest once Krusch's reasoning is established to have been flawed. An appropriate point of departure for examining the Table is, perhaps, to question its accepted title.

Even a brief look at the Völkertafel must make one wonder whether there is any basis for calling it 'Frankish', as tradition now demands. The name was coined by Müllenhoff in 1851 on the grounds that the lineup of peoples was set out "von dem standpunkt eines Franken um das jahr 520", but the distinctive characteristics of this Frankish outlook were left unexplained<sup>71</sup>. Much clearer reasons were given for the year of composition than for the nationality of the compiler. He may have been identified as a Frank because of the idea, espoused by Müllenhoff but later abandoned, that the same ethnogony that had come to Tacitus's attention still survived among sixth-century West Germans and was known in some form to the compiler<sup>72</sup>, but even that point was not spelled out. Strangely, no one after Müllenhoff tried to refine his argument for a Frankish compiler. Maximilian Rieger considered the Istio quartet, including the Franks, to be the only part of the Table that made sense; he was therefore satisfied with Frankish composition<sup>73</sup>. Krusch was influenced by Rieger in giving primacy to F; an additional reason for preferring its recension over

<sup>70</sup> A title is supplied in brackets, since none of the transmitted titles has any claim to originality. The common ancestor of the Italian group (FME) probably approximated A more closely than B because of the resemblance of A and F in enumerating the tribes; e.g., *Haec sunt gentes IIII (A)* and *nate sunt generationes quattuor (F)*.

<sup>71</sup> MÜLLENHOFF (as n. 7) pp. 330–31; his real basis for the identification was not the Table but the (obviously Frankish) list of Roman kings of Gaul.

<sup>72</sup> KARL MÜLLENHOFF, *Deutsche Altertumskunde* 4, Berlin 1900, pp. 115–16. Cf. JACOB GRIMM, *Deutsche Mythologie*, Göttingen <sup>2</sup>1844, p. vii (and as n. 3); BETHMANN (as n. 19) pp. 335–36; RUDOLF AUGUST USINGER, *Zu Tacitus Germania cap. 2 (Forschungen zur deutschen Geschichte* 11, 1871, pp. 595–616), p. 609; KURTH (as n. 11) pp. 85–99.

<sup>73</sup> MAXIMILIAN RIEGER, *Ingävonen Istävonen Herminonen (Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum* 11, 1859, pp. 177–209), p. 180.

all others was that it placed the Istio quartet in first position<sup>74</sup>. Later commentators, espousing Krusch's conclusions, often spoke as though the Table contained nothing but the Istio quartet. Some claimed that the Table was designed to strengthen the community of the peoples of the Frankish kingdom, others that it illustrated their community and the inward (geistige) Frankisation of the Romans<sup>75</sup>. Even more oddly, it was said that the compiler "hat die Stämme als zusammengehörig betrachtet, deren Nachbarschaft und lebendige Beziehungen er noch vor Augen hatte" in the second half of the seventh century<sup>76</sup>; where he would then have gazed upon Vandals, Gepids, and a second type of Goths was not explained. By whatever arguments, time and usage have tended to strengthen the belief that the Table is Frankish.

Müllenhoff's attribution had not, however, been unchallenged. In an important study of the Völkertafel, Friedrich had had little difficulty in showing how inappropriate it was to suppose a Frankish author<sup>77</sup>. Ferdinand Lot heartily agreed with him, but did not help matters by hastily replacing the Frank with a "clerc Alain", on the strength of the first name in the king list<sup>78</sup>. Friedrich, for his part, voiced the obvious and decisive objection: the compiler was so far from having a Frankish point of view that he placed the Franks in the third set of peoples. Even supposing (with Krusch) that the F recension were preferable, the difficulty of a Frankish attribution would be overcome only in part; why the compiler listed his own, dominant people second instead of first would continue to be obscure. Properly edited, as we now see, the Table opens with two kinds of Goths, whereas the Franks occupy next-to-last place. If one were disposed to argue from the contents, the hypothesis of a Gothic compiler might possibly be entertained, but surely not that of a Frankish one. Even the Goths would be a poor choice. The Table gives no sign of having been drawn up in order to feature or glorify any of the peoples listed, either individually or as a group. There is no self-evident way to detect the nationality of the anonymous compiler.

<sup>74</sup> KRUSCH (as n. 9) p. 72; so also ECKHARDT (as n. 11) pp. 74–75.

<sup>75</sup> WALTHER KIENAST, *Studien über die französischen Volksstämme des Frühmittelalters*, Stuttgart 1968, p. 20; WALTER SCHLESINGER, *Die Grundlegung der deutschen Einheit im frühen Mittelalter* (Beiträge zur deutschen Verfassungsgeschichte des Mittelalters 1, Göttingen 1963, pp. 244–85), pp. 253–54; HEINZ LÖWE, *Von Theoderich dem Großen zu Karl dem Großen* (Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters 9, 1951–52, pp. 353–401), p. 373.

Additional endorsements of KRUSCH's date: LUDWIG SCHMIDT, *Geschichte der deutschen Stämme bis zum Ausgang der Völkerwanderung. Die Westgermanen*, Munich <sup>2</sup>1938–40, reprinted 1970, p. 195; *Id.*, *Die Ostgermanen*, Munich <sup>2</sup>1941, p. 31; HEINZ LÖWE, *Die Herkunft der Bajuwaren* (Zeitschrift für bayerische Landesgeschichte 15, 1949, pp. 5–67), p. 23 n. 70; ERICH ZÖLLNER, *Die politische Stellung der Völker im Frankenreich* (Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für österreichische Geschichtsforschung 13) Vienna 1950, p. 47; *Id.*, *Geschichte der Franken bis zur Mitte des 6. Jahrhunderts*, Munich 1970, p. 6; ARNO BORST, *Der Turmbau von Babel. Geschichte der Meinungen über Ursprung und Vielfalt der Sprachen und Völker*, Stuttgart 1957–63, pp. 461–62.

<sup>76</sup> LÖWE, *Herkunft der Bajuwaren* (as n. 75) p. 67.

<sup>77</sup> FRIEDRICH (as n. 11) pp. 8–9.

<sup>78</sup> LOT (as n. 11) p. 50 with n. 1. His unfortunate conjecture was based on the form *Alanus* in the *Historia Brittonum*. It is apparent, however, that the version of the Table available to the author of the *Hist. Brit.* read *Alanens*, like F (as shown by the list of the ancestors of Brutus, above p. 112); he was personally responsible for the trivial variant *Alanus*.

Müllenhoff's determination of the date of the list of peoples was much better founded than his invocation of a Frankish compiler. Pertz himself had observed, in 1824, that the catalogue could not be earlier than the fifth century or later than the sixth<sup>79</sup>. Müllenhoff established much narrower terminal dates<sup>80</sup>. Three of the peoples in the first quartet vanished during the sixth century: the Vandals in 534, the (Ostro)goths in 555, and the Gepids in 567. In the second set, the Thuringians and Burgundians are listed as though no less independent than the Lombards, but they were annexed to the Frankish kingdom in 531 and 534 respectively. The political vicissitudes of the sixth century therefore provide three reasons for believing that the latest limit for the Table is the beginning of the 530s. The earlier limit depends chiefly on the Lombards, who are entered in the second group. Ignored by Roman observers since the second century, the Lombards returned to prominence by inflicting a crushing defeat on the Herules in about 510. It is improbable that the catalogue could have been drawn up before that date. The Bavarians, whose first known mention otherwise is in Jordanes (551), supply another incentive for not straying backward from the sixth century. Müllenhoff concluded that the Table was composed in 520, give or take no more than ten years.

The result Müllenhoff arrived at is startling, and no one has succeeded in shaking the rigor of his reasoning. But few scholars seem to have liked this date or to have dealt with the Table in its terms<sup>81</sup>. To Rieger as to Alfred Dove, the assortment of *gentes* was 'arbitrary', except for the Istio quartet<sup>82</sup>. Friedrich, in trying to displace the date to the later sixth century, proceeded not so much on the grounds that Müllenhoff's arguments were flawed but that the Table could hardly be thought to have been drawn up in the West until after the 550s or about the time of Gregory of Tours<sup>83</sup>. His objections are better designed to underline the perplexing character of the Table than to invalidate Müllenhoff's results. Ever since Krusch intervened in the discussion, little more has been heard of the year 520; the Table has been transposed to a completely different time, variously given as the later seventh century, or ca. 700, or the age of Bede, with no attempt being made to reconcile the contents of the document to this period<sup>84</sup>. Yet Krusch had never addressed himself properly to the date. His objections, as we saw, were to the king list; because its ideas and names were demonstrably late Merovingian, Krusch said, the year 520 was "ganz ungläubhaft". It went unnoticed that, since Müllenhoff reasoned from the catalogue of peoples, no arguments concerning the king list, however well founded,

<sup>79</sup> PERTZ (as n. 1).

<sup>80</sup> MÜLLENHOFF (as n. 7) pp. 331–32.

<sup>81</sup> In contrast, ECKHARDT (as n. 11) p. 72, praised MÜLLENHOFF's dating as "eine wahrhaft meisterliche Leistung historischen Textkritik", but rejected his edition. The earliest dissent came from BACHMANN (as n. 66) pp. 864–65. For a firm objection to MÜLLENHOFF's dating but without explicit endorsement of KRUSCH's revision, see WATTENBACH – LEVISON, *Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen im Mittelalter. Vorzeit und Karolinger* 1, Weimar 1952, p. 118 n. 269.

<sup>82</sup> RIEGER (as n. 73); ALFRED DOVE, *Studien zur Vorgeschichte des deutschen Volksnamens* (Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften, phil.-hist. Klasse 1916, no. 8) p. 91 n. 2.

<sup>83</sup> FRIEDRICH (as n. 11) pp. 9–25.

<sup>84</sup> REINHARDT WENSKUS, *Die deutschen Stämme im Reiche Karls des Großen* (Karl der Große 1, ed. WOLFGANG BRAUNFELS, Düsseldorf 1965, pp. 178–219), pp. 180–81.

could dispose of the early date. The irrelevance of Krusch's criticism is further confirmed when the Table is shown to be an entirely separate composition from the list of Roman kings. Under these circumstances, Müllenhoff's inferences from vanished or conquered peoples regain their full weight. It need not be taken as conclusively proved that the text before us – that is, the Table that can be attained from the surviving recensions – was composed between 510 and 530; there are anomalies, as will presently be seen. Even so, the relationship of the Table to an early date of composition is difficult to shake and must be seriously pondered.

Although novel in referring to three brothers, the Völkertafel clearly looks as though its inspiration came from a short passage of Tacitus's *Germania*:

*Tuistonem deum terra editum et filium Mannum originem gentis, conditoresque Manno tres filios adsignent, e quorum nominibus proximi Oceano Ingaevones, medii Herminones, ceteri Istaevones vocentur.*

' . . . [The Germans] celebrate the earth-born god, Tuisto. They assign to him a son, Mannus, the author of their race, and to Mannus three sons, their founders, after whose names the people nearest Ocean are called Ingaevones, those of the centre Herminones, the remainder Istaevones'<sup>85</sup>.

The elder Pliny mentioned the Ingaevones, Herminones, and Istaevones in the *Historia Naturalis*, but as three of five groups without reference to an ancestral family<sup>86</sup>. For lack of any identifiable trace of Pliny in the Table, Tacitus appears to have been its only source. With noteworthy self-assurance, the compiler extracted the personal names from those of the peoples, and he set them out as brothers. There the Tacitean influence ended. The father and divine grandfather were dispensed with, and Tacitus's system for classifying *gentes* was reinterpreted in an original way.

The compiler's usage of the *Germania* places him in a select company. No ancient reader can be positively identified. Our surviving manuscript is deemed to descend from a fifth-century copy, and to have perhaps passed through the hands of an annotator (in Gaul?) responsible for a gloss that was incorporated into the text. The treatise is first known to have been quoted by Cassiodorus and then, more extensively, by Rudolf of Fulda in the mid-ninth century<sup>87</sup>. The one place where the *Germania* can be located with certainty before its emergence in a Carolingian monastery is Ostrogothic Italy.

After a very limited borrowing from Tacitus, the compiler went on to list and subdivide a certain number of peoples that, presumably, were contemporary to himself. His procedure in this regard poses several problems of interpretation. For one

<sup>85</sup> Tacitus, *Germania* c. 2 (ed. JACQUES PERRET, Collection des universités de France, Paris 1967, p. 71); the translation is based mainly on that of HAROLD MATTINGLY, *Tacitus on Britain and Germany*, Harmondsworth, Middlesex 1948, p. 102.

<sup>86</sup> Pliny, *Historia naturalis* IV, 28, 96, 99–100.

<sup>87</sup> FRANCIS JOHN HAVERFIELD, Tacitus during the Late Roman Period and the Middle Ages (*Journal of Roman Studies* 6, 1916, pp. 196–200); JACQUES PERRET (ed.), *Tacite. La Germanie*, Paris 1967, pp. 45–50. On the annotator of *Germania* c. 21, see EDUARD NORDEN, *Die germanische Urgeschichte in Tacitus Germania*, Leipzig-Berlin 1920, pp. 454–57. The reliance of the Völkertafel on the *Germania* is not known to Tacitus scholarship. The western users of Tacitus listed by ZÖLLNER, *Geschichte der Franken* (as n. 75) p. 6 n. 5, consulted his major works; the minor works, to which the *Germania* belongs, were rarer.

thing, the thirteen *gentes* are necessarily a selection, regardless of the date when the Table was composed. Lot rightly observed that, if a comprehensive catalogue had been attempted, one might expect also to find the Sueves of Spain, the Scotti of Ireland, and such others as the Herules and Warni<sup>88</sup>. If a date later than Müllenhoff's were favored, the presence of 'destroyed' peoples, such as the Vandals and Gepids, and the omission of newly important ones, such as the Avars, would call for explanation. The absence of poetic or archaic names, like Sygambri, Getae, Scythae, Geloni, and the like, is also noteworthy. Since the compiler had Tacitus before him, he may be presumed to have wished to classify 'the Germans', but the latter, as he conceived them, included *Romani* and *Brittones*. It is faintly possible that he equated "Germans" with "Westerners", or, if the Vandals are overlooked, with "Europeans". Even as a selection, the groupings are not altogether straightforward. It is curious to find the Lombards alongside the Thuringians and much more so to find the Saxons with the Vandals. Rieger and Dove dealt with such oddities by dubbing the Table 'arbitrary', but so sweeping a dismissal may be excessive. As most readers have agreed, the Istio quartet, in last place, effectively portrays the peoples gathered within the early Frankish kingdom<sup>89</sup>, and the two other groups can, with a little effort, be justified comparably well. The main point seems to be that the author interpreted the contemporary ethnic scene within his own angle of vision; he arranged the *gentes* as self-confidently as he handled the passage of Tacitus that provided his frame.

Before looking more closely at the catalogue, it needs to be asked whether the version reconstructed above can be firmly assumed to represent the Table in its original form. Even a cursory examination of the variant readings establishes that such an assumption is hardly justified; the Table is a "texte vivant", which copyists handled with considerable freedom. Only one recension out of seven closely agrees with another; all the manuscripts associate the Table with extraneous matter; the opening words are liberally altered; and various *gentes* are omitted, exchanged, or moved about in DEMF. Such forms as *Wandalus* (acc. pl.), *Brigidos* (= Gepidos), and *Bawarios* suggest that almost every copyist spelled the proper names after his fashion<sup>90</sup>. Although it seems assured that the surviving versions descend from a single model, the variations in our copies give ample reason for believing that the Table may have been edited or emended at an earlier stage in transmission than the one we are able to attain.

The Table, as we have it, contains two salient anomalies, both of them located in the first set. Here, contrary to the four peoples assigned to Inguo and Istio, there is a fifth *gens: et Saxones*. The Saxons called enough attention to themselves from the fourth century onward to merit a place in the Table regardless of its date<sup>91</sup>, but one looks in vain for a historical, geographic, or political reason that would justify ever classifying them together with the Goths, Vandals, and Gepids; either of the two

<sup>88</sup> LOT (as n. 11) p. 50 n. 1.

<sup>89</sup> MÜLLENHOFF (as n. 7) p. 331; RIEGER (as n. 73); KRUSCH (as n. 9) p. 72; ECKHARDT (as n. 11) p. 74; and others.

<sup>90</sup> For this reason, the spellings of 'Bavarian' in the Table have little bearing on discussions of the earliest form of this name; cf. KRUSCH (as n. 9) p. 65.

<sup>91</sup> SCHMIDT, *Die Westgermanen* (as n. 75) pp. 40–51.

other sets would have provided more suitable company. Besides, the location of the Saxons as an appendage to the regular four reinforces the impression that their name, in fifth position, might be an extraneous addition<sup>92</sup>. Earlier in the Erminus group, there comes the remarkable name *Walagothi*, a veritable *hapax legomenon*. The sense of the compound is not in doubt. *Wala* is the common Germanic word or prefix for 'foreigner', as illustrated by 'Welsh', meaning the Celtic Britons, or 'Walloon' for the Romance population of northern Gaul<sup>93</sup>. The catalogue seems to single out a body of 'foreign' Goths alongside one of unqualified Goths, leaving it for us to guess which of the two are the Ostrogoths of Italy and which the Visigoths of Septimania and Spain<sup>94</sup>. The name is remarkable for a second reason. After the hypothesis of Frankish composition is rejected, the prefix *wala* constitutes the sole evidence for the passage of the Table through Germanic hands<sup>95</sup>. A Germanic symptom is not out of keeping with the manuscript tradition (especially ABC), or, one might add, with the subject matter; but it is exceptionally difficult to reconcile with an author who was inspired by Tacitus and worked near the year 520. In sum, the first group of *gentes*, as transmitted to us, contains a high concentration of incongruities: a fifth people, a unique name for Goths, the trace of a Germanic author, and the placement of the Saxons in preposterous company. The prominence of these oddities is enhanced when one realizes that the rest of the Table is basically unobjectionable. Even though the Thuringians and Lombards, or the Bretons and Franks, can be considered ill assorted as the offspring of a common father, the logic of each set embodies no glaring flaw.

There are more than internal grounds for believing that the words *Walagothi* . . . *et Saxones* result from interference with a version of the catalogue that did not contain them. Friedrich's outstanding contribution to the criticism of the *Völkertafel* was the observation that the Erminus group almost precisely corresponds to a quartet of *gentes* found in other sixth-century sources<sup>96</sup>. The view that the whole Table contains a 'fanciful' selection of peoples, as Lot proposed, or was composed in an 'arbitrary' fashion, does not wholly lack plausibility; even if the progeny of Inguo and Istio are accepted as forming rational sets, the compiler's principle of classification needs to be explained. In the case of the Erminones, however, no interpretation is required; almost the whole group is found ready-made as a unit in contemporary documents. Procopius, at the start of the *Bellum Vandalicum*, presents the 'Gothic nations' that, as he believed, 'all came originally from one tribe'; they are 'the Goths, Vandals, Visigoths, and Gepids'<sup>97</sup>. Procopius need not be held

<sup>92</sup> Cf. KURTH (as n. 11) p. 95; FRIEDRICH (as n. 11) pp. 13, 18.

<sup>93</sup> On the prefix, MARGARET GELLING, *Signposts to the Past. Place Names and the History of England*, London 1978, pp. 93–95; LEO WEISGERBER, *Walhisk. Die geschichtliche Leistung des Wortes welsch* (Rheinische Vierteljahrsblätter 13, 1948, pp. 87–146). See also KARL MÜLLENHOFF, *Deutsche Altertumskunde* 2, Berlin 1887, p. 280.

<sup>94</sup> In favor of the Ostrogoths, MÜLLENHOFF (as n. 7) pp. 329–31, and others after him; for the Visigoths, FRIEDRICH (as n. 11) pp. 5, 15.

<sup>95</sup> Cf. KRUSCH (as n. 9) p. 73.

<sup>96</sup> FRIEDRICH (as n. 11) pp. 12–14.

<sup>97</sup> Procopius, *Bellum Vandalicum* I, 2, 2–5; ed. and tr. HENRY BRONSON DEWING, *Procopius 2* (Loeb Classical Library) London 1953, pp. 8–11.



responsible for assembling this set. Three of the four occur together in the *Cosmographia* of Julius Honorius (ca. 500), and all of them in Cyril of Scythopolis's *Vita Sabae* (ca. 556), in which they are identified as the Arian peoples who controlled all the West, over whom Justinian would prevail<sup>98</sup>. Thereafter, the quartet was firmly anchored in Byzantine historiography<sup>99</sup>. It occurs nowhere in western documents, except, with modifications, in the first group of our *Völkertafel*.

Friedrich, after pointing out the astonishing correspondence between the Table and Byzantine sources, ventured only the most moderate inferences. He did not question the originality of *Walagothi*, with its implication of a Germanic compiler, and he regarded *et Saxones* alone as an extraneous addition. In his view, the Table was composed somewhere in the West in the later sixth century; its compiler had been encouraged by a Byzantine source to devise two additional groups of four and to join them to the one that had come to him from the East<sup>100</sup>. Friedrich stopped short of explaining how the Germania happened to be consulted and why a westerner would have assembled this catalogue at such a date except as a flight of fancy. His excellent point of departure seems to have been inadequately exploited.

An analysis of the Table takes us somewhere but not quite far enough. Several important points seem securely established. The Table is not Frankish, nor does its authorship plainly belong to a member of one of the *gentes* mentioned; Müllenhoff's astonishingly early date accounts better for the contents than any other; the compiler was one of the rare users of Tacitus's *Germania*; and the first group in the catalogue is nearly identical to the established quartet of Gotho-Arian peoples in Byzantine sources. As for the list of thirteen *gentes*, it is neither wholly 'arbitrary' nor easy to interpret. The words *Walagothi . . . et Saxones* constitute a serious anomaly, almost impossible to reconcile with the rest of the evidence. However encouraging these findings are, they offer no answers to the question of authorship, let alone of purpose; if we stop here, the circumstances in which the Table was compiled seem fated to remain a deep and intriguing puzzle.

One way out of this dead end is suggested by the likely possibility that the Table we can reconstruct from the manuscripts does not faithfully reflect the original text. In the recension we have, the anomalous names in the Erminus group are the obvious problem. When the assumption of an early emendation is applied to this feature, the ascertained facts about the Table lend themselves to being fitted into a theory of composition.

<sup>98</sup> Julius Honorius, *Cosmographia* c. 26 (only one set of Goths, the three merely terminate a longer list of *gentes occidentalis oceani*); ed. ALEXANDER RIESE, *Geographi Latini minores*, Heilbronn 1878, p. 40. Cyril of Scythopolis, *Vita Sabae* c. 72; ed. EDUARD SCHWARTZ, *Kyrillos von Skythopolis (Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur 4, 4, 2)* Leipzig 1939, p. 176; Cyril lists the four *gentes* in precisely the same order as they appear in the *Völkertafel*. I am very grateful to Mr. Ross Arthur, of York University, Toronto, for helping me with the *Vita Sabae*. See also JOHANN FRIEDRICH, *Über die kontroversen Fragen im Leben des gotischen Geschichtsschreibers Jordanes (Sitzungsberichte der Münchener Akademie der Wissenschaften, phil.-hist. Klasse 1907, pp. 379–442)* pp. 410–11.

<sup>99</sup> FRIEDRICH (as n. 11) p. 14.

<sup>100</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 14–19, 25.

## VI. THE ORIGINS OF THE TABLE

If the words *Walagothi . . . et Saxones* are assumed to represent an alteration, the formation of the Table might be envisaged as having taken place in two steps. First, the original *Völkertafel*, compiled near 520, would have presented the offspring of Erminus in the form paralleled in Byzantine writings, namely, as Goths, Visigoths, Vandals, and Gepids. The text was otherwise as we now have it. The second step would have occurred about 200 years later. The Table would then have come into the hands of a Germanic-speaking scribe or editor who changed the Erminus group by substituting *Walagothi* for the Visigoths and by adding the Saxons as an irregular fifth. This hypothesis seems to permit a comprehensive interpretation of the Table.

Two facts in addition to Müllenhoff's date help to suggest where the 'primitive' Table may have been composed: the use of Tacitus's *Germania* implies that we should look to Ostrogothic Italy, whereas the group of Gothic peoples draws us toward Byzantium. Owing to the close cultural ties between Italy and Constantinople in the Ostrogothic period, the choice is perhaps more artificial than real<sup>101</sup>. And yet, the contents of the Table make one hesitate to endorse the more prudent alternative of an Italian compiler. An Italo-Roman interested enough in barbarian *gentes* to compose our catalogue would presumably have come from among the Italians reconciled to Theodoric's régime rather than from among those who held themselves aloof<sup>102</sup>. If on friendly terms with the barbarian overlords, the compiler might reasonably be supposed to have taken account of what the Goths thought about tribal affinities and common ancestors, or to have imparted some other trace of Gothic coloring to his composition. Yet, such expectations are not at all borne out by our Table. Except for the prominence of the Goths in the first set – the result of historical fact in the early sixth century rather than of favoritism – the catalogue seems devoid of Gothic influence. If the Goths believed they were siblings of the Vandals or regarded the *Romani* even of Gaul as being of the same stock as the Franks and Alamans, no document stemming from them tells us so; if anything, the sources imply the reverse<sup>103</sup>. As we shall see, the Table makes sense for the time when it was composed; each set of four fits into a coherent conceptual pigeonhole. But whoever drew it up was totally insensitive to ethnic niceties. Most conspicuously, he turned Romans and Bretons into Germans, applying current political geography as the sole guide to classification; the same insensitivity no doubt inspired him to

<sup>101</sup> Cf. ARNALDO MOMIGLIANO, *Cassiodorus and Italian Culture of His Time* (reprinted, *Studies in Historiography*, New York 1966, pp. 181–210) pp. 186–87.

<sup>102</sup> *Ibid.* p. 190, contrasting Cassiodorus to Symmachus and Boethius, who "studied and wrote to forget [their Gothic masters]".

<sup>103</sup> Hostility between Goths and Vandals, with no reference to kinship: Jordanes, *Getica* c. 113. Ostrogothic observation of the hostility between Alamans and Franks: Cassiodorus, *Variae* II, 41. Theodoric's letter to the Gallo-Romans whom he had 'saved' from the Franks; *ibid.* III, 17. Even the famous idea that the Goths and Gepids were kindred tribes (Jordanes, *Getica* c. 94–100, 133) has never been shown to be of Gothic rather than Byzantine origin; for its roots in ancient ethnographic theory, see below n. 112.

align Burgundians with Lombards<sup>104</sup>. Practical ruthlessness of this sort is hard to reconcile with composition in Ostrogothic Italy, but one would expect no less from a Byzantine compiler.

The idea that the Völkertafel was drawn up in Constantinople or elsewhere in the Eastern Empire is not uniformly attractive. The *Germania* is not generally recognized as having been available in Byzantium, although some evidence suggests that it was<sup>105</sup>; even if the Table was originally in Latin rather than Greek, it needed to travel a long distance to reach surviving manuscripts<sup>106</sup>; and the presence in it of *Romani* among the Istiones may conceivably clash with the exclusive sense that the term 'Roman' had in Byzantine sensibilities<sup>107</sup>. On the other hand, Constantinople around the year 520 offered far more favorable circumstances for the composition of our text than any region of the West except Italy. The Hyppolitan table of biblical nations was reworked by Greek chroniclers in the early sixth century as well as in the fifth, and, towards mid-century, Procopius and Jordanes amply illustrate the ethnographic interests of Justinian's capital<sup>108</sup>. The probable date of the Table of nations coincides with the years when Justinian's uncle was emperor and Justinian already a power in the state<sup>109</sup>. If, at this time, a Byzantine had read Tacitus's *Germania* and classified the western barbarians, the practical motive of his initiative would hardly be obscure in view of the conquests to come<sup>110</sup>.

Our Table, in addition to incorporating the established Byzantine group of Gothic nations, particularly resembles Procopius and Jordanes by casting ethno-

<sup>104</sup> The role of political geography in the ordering of the Table was already recognized by MÜLLENHOFF (as n. 7) p. 332.

<sup>105</sup> Dr. Alexander Callander Murray has kindly pointed out to me that a part of *Germania* c. 7 is very probably translated in the *Strategikon* of Maurice (late sixth century).

<sup>106</sup> Comparable transmission will be dealt with shortly.

<sup>107</sup> The identification of Byzantines with Romans is, of course, well established; see JULIUS JÜTHNER, *Hellenen und Barbaren*. Aus der Geschichte des Nationalbewußtseins, Leipzig 1923, pp. 105–18; FRANZ DÖLGER, *Rom in der Gedankenwelt der Byzantiner* (Byzanz und die europäische Staatenwelt, Ettal 1953, pp. 76–112); and KLAUS ERICH MÜLLER, *Geschichte der antiken Ethnographie und ethnologischen Theoriebildung 2* (Studien zur Kulturkunde 52) Wiesbaden 1980, pp. 398–99, 431–32. In this instance, however, the precise issue is when an easterner would have denied, or been unable to endure, the presence of *Romani* in the West; for example, Jordanes, *Romana* c. 373, *Belisarius Romanam urbem ingressus est exceptusque ab illo populo quondam Romano* (ed. THEODOR MOMMSEN, MGH Auctores antiquissimi 5, p. 49). From the evidence in JÜTHNER and DÖLGER, it seems hard to conclude that, towards 520, a Byzantine would have identified *Romani* exclusively with easterners. On the other hand, Agathias's famous portrayal of the Franks as almost civilized (quoted by MÜLLER 2, pp. 459–61) might well serve as terminus ante quem for Byzantium's assimilation of the Gallo-Romans to the nationality of their barbarian rulers.

<sup>108</sup> ADOLF BAUER and JOSEF STRZYGOWSKI, *Eine alexandrinische Weltchronik* (Denkschriften der Wiener Akademie der Wissenschaften, phil.-hist. Klasse 51, 1906, no. 11); ADOLF BAUER, *Hippolytos von Rom, der Heilige und Geschichtsschreiber* (Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum 33, 1914, pp. 110–24); BORST (as n. 75) p. 297. Ethnographic interests similar to Procopius's are manifested by Agathias, and the *Strategikon* of Maurice describes how barbarians fight.

<sup>109</sup> See now TONY HONORÉ, *Tribonian*, London 1978, pp. 5–12.

<sup>110</sup> Western conquests were not a sudden impulse of the 530s; *ibid.* p. 18.

graphic relations in strictly contemporary form<sup>111</sup>. Although three mythical ancestors are evoked, the conditions portrayed are nothing other than the ethnic panorama of the current West as seen from a metropolitan angle of vision. The first set of *gentes* aligns the 'Gothic' and Arian peoples<sup>112</sup>; in recognition of their exceptional place in the politics of the day, the compiler identified them with Tacitus's *medii Herminones* by reading *medii* in the metaphorical sense of 'central' or 'foremost'. The second set gathers together the major independent peoples north of Italy and east of Gaul, whose northward position merited classification as Ingvaeones 'nearest Ocean' (three of the four are mentioned as a group in Jordanes)<sup>113</sup>; and the third consists of the 'Gallic' and largely Catholic peoples, whose miscellaneity earned them the label of 'the rest', *ceteri*, attributed to Istio<sup>114</sup>. Another aspect of the third group may be noteworthy. We tend to consider that, at the time, the Romans, Bretons, Franks, and Alamans of Gaul were all subjects of the Merovingians. But in order to be consistent with the eight mutually independent peoples composing the first sets, the compiler needed to have a looser association in mind for the Istiones than that of a unified and supreme Frankish kingdom. Although our knowledge of Gaul towards 520 is too scant to permit precise verification, the compiler's perception of the situation there – four *gentes* rather than one monarchy – might be

<sup>111</sup> Since the Huns of Attila had vanished, Procopius does not mention them (although he mentions Attila), and he transposes to sixth-century Huns the origin myth formerly assigned to those of the earlier age: *Bellum Vandalicum* I, 4, 24, 29–35; *Bellum Gothicum* IV, 5, 5–12. On these legends, see ALEKSANDR ALEKSANDROVICH VASILIEV, *The Goths in the Crimea*, Cambridge, Mass. 1936, pp. 23–32. In the case of Jordanes, the main influence of sixth-century conditions is seen in the portrayal of the Gothic past as a tale of western and eastern Goths (cf. HERWIG WOLFRAM, *Geschichte der Goten*, Munich 21980, p. 17). Note also *Getica* c. 117–18, cf. 269: the origins of the Herules narrated in a context of their current fame as light infantry. Similarly, the Gepids are, from a Byzantine geographical perspective, fittingly considered 'slow' (*Getica* c. 95) by comparison with the 'advanced' Goths and Vandals.

<sup>112</sup> For the Byzantine origin of this grouping, see above nn. 97–99, 103. Cyril of Scythopolis (as n. 98) singles out the four as being specifically Arian. A comparably interesting association of *gentes* on religious grounds is found in Ennodius of Pavia, *De vita s. Antonii monachi*; ed. WILHELM HARTEL (*Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum Latinorum* 6) Vienna 1882, p. 386: Franks, Saxons, and Herules as a family of pagan tribes engaging in human sacrifice. More relevant to the four 'Gothic' peoples is the old example of Posidonius arguing in favor of the original unity of the Armenians, Syrians, and Arabs; see KLAUS ERICH MÜLLER, *Geschichte der antiken Ethnographie und ethnologischen Theoriebildung* 1 (*Studien zur Kulturkunde* 29) Wiesbaden 1972, pp. 319–20. MÜLLER spells out the scientific presuppositions of such reductionist ethnography, namely, that the multiplicity of peoples was not primitive but the result of a process of differentiation.

<sup>113</sup> Jordanes, *Getica* c. 280: Thuringians, Bavarians, and Burgundians encircle Swabia. Pairing of Thuringians and Burgundians: Vegetius, *Mulomedicina* III, 6, 3; Jordanes, *Getica* c. 297–98; Procopius, *Bellum Gothicum* I, 12, 10–11. Procopius transposes to the Thuringians the Burgundian origin legend (Orosius, *Historia adversus paganos* VII, 32, 12). In view of the Lombards' dislodging the Herules towards 510 (Procopius, *Bellum Gothicum* II, 14, 9–22), it is also significant that the Thuringians are grouped with the Herules in Cassiodorus, *Variae* III, 3.

<sup>114</sup> Procopius, *Bellum Gothicum* I, 12, 12–19; Jordanes, *Getica* c. 191, 237–38. The compiler of the Table did not yet distinguish the Romans of Gaul from the sub-group that Procopius called Arborychi. The Alamans are the elusive component of this set. Jordanes and Procopius mainly refer to Sueves (subject to the Franks, according to Procopius, *Bellum Gothicum* I, 15, 26); on their identity to the Alamans in this context, see SCHMIDT, *Die Westgermanen* (as n. 75) pp. 195, 199, 278. For an interesting but not ultimately persuasive analysis of the Istiones, see FRIEDRICH (as n. 11) p. 18.

remarkably accurate for the years of comparative Merovingian weakness after Clovis's early death in 511<sup>115</sup>. In sum, the selection of peoples and their arrangement into sets seems compatible with Müllenhoff's date and with the perspective of a Byzantine author. Those portrayed were the westerners who mattered at the accession of Justin I (518) or of Justinian (527), or somewhere in between, not many years before Belisarius set out for Africa with an army to begin the task of restoring lost provinces to imperial rule.

Our examination of the manuscripts has shown that the textual tradition of the *Völkertafel* is basically northern or Frankish; even the Italian branch, including its earliest member, descends from a northern ancestor. If the original Table was composed in Byzantium, the text needed to make its way somehow to the Frankish kingdom in the sixth or seventh century. The possibility of such transmission is assured by the considerable flow of works, in Greek as well as Latin, known to have come westward within that span; in fact, this was when a number of texts whose Greek originals are lost entered Latin manuscripts<sup>116</sup>. For the diffusion of a small fragment like our Table, the example of major works – such as the *Romana* and *Getica* of Jordanes, the *Chronicle of Count Marcellinus*, or the many writings connected with the debate over the *Three Chapters*<sup>117</sup> – furnishes a less appropriate parallel than do various unexpected odds and ends, such as the brief but important Greek set of ruler lists used in the *Fredegar Chronicle*, the fragment of an Alexandrian chronicle known as the *Barbarus Scaligeri*, or indeed the presumed Greek model for the *ioca monachorum*<sup>118</sup>. Although the circumstances of transmission are necessarily mysterious, there seems to be no incongruity in the eventual emergence of a Table of nations composed in the Eastern Empire among the miscellaneous data copied into Carolingian manuscripts.

<sup>115</sup> These are among the darkest years of Merovingian history; ZÖLLNER, *Geschichte der Franken* (as n. 75) pp. 74, 79–80.

<sup>116</sup> They include the *Synodicon adversus tragoediam Irenaei*, translated by the Roman deacon Rusticus, and the *Codex encyclius*, translated at the behest of Cassiodorus; see EDUARD SCHWARTZ (ed.), *Acta conciliorum oecumenicorum* I 4, Berlin–Leipzig 1922–23, pp. viii–xv, and II 5, Leipzig–Berlin 1936, pp. xii–xvi. The Latin chronicle of Victor of Tununa is important for reconstructing the lost church history of Theodore Anagnostes; see GÜNTHER CHRISTIAN HANSEN (ed.), *Theodorus Anagnostes Kirchengeschichte* (*Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte*) Berlin 1971, p. xxi.

<sup>117</sup> For the transmission of Jordanes, see ROLF HACHMANN, *Die Goten und Skandinavier* (*Quellen und Forschungen zur Sprach- und Kulturgeschichte der germanischen Völker* N.F. 34) Berlin 1970, pp. 15–35. The *Chronicle of Marcellinus* survives in an Italian manuscript from about 600; see ELIAS AVERY LOWE, *Codices Latini antiquiores* 2, Oxford 1972, no. 233b. On ecclesiastical writings, see SIEGMUND (as n. 47) pp. 136, 147–56; GUY PHILIPPART, *Vitae patrum. Trois travaux récents sur d'anciennes traductions latines* (*Analecta Bollandiana* 92, 1974, pp. 353–65).

<sup>118</sup> On the list in *Fredegar*, see BRUNO KRUSCH, *Die Chronicae des sogenannten Fredegar* (*Neues Archiv d. Gesellschaft f. ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde* 7, 1882, pp. 471–72); WALTER GOFFART, *The Fredegar Problem Reconsidered* (*Speculum* 38, 1963, pp. 211–12). The *Barbarus Scaligeri*, ed. ALFRED SCHOENE, *Eusebii Chronica* 1, Berlin 1875, pp. 177–239; see also SIEGMUND (as n. 47) pp. 171–72. On the *ioca*, above n. 27 and LLOYD WILLIAM DALY and WALTHER SUCHIER, *Altercatio Hadriani Augusti et Epicteti Philosophi* (*Illinois Studies in Language and Literature* 24) Urbana 1939, pp. 36–37. Cf. JEAN IRIGOIN, *La culture grecque dans l'Occident latin du VIIe au XIe siècle* (*Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo* 22, 1975, pp. 425–46).

The reason for believing that the Table first surfaced in the Frankish kingdom is that its earliest attainable version bears the imprint of someone whose mother tongue was Germanic. The hypothesis of Byzantine (or, for that matter, Italian) authorship presupposes that the words *Walagothi . . . et Saxones* are the result of tampering with an original that listed only twelve peoples and called one of them *Visigothi*. An alteration of this kind can be accounted for by supposing it to be the work of a Frankish editor or scribe, probably in the later seventh or eighth century. By then, Saxons were too prominent on Frankish horizons for a thoughtful northern reader to tolerate their absence from a Table of nations<sup>119</sup>. What is more, their reputation as disturbers of the peace and wicked pagans offered a clear directive as to where they should be fitted into the catalogue; Saxons deserved to be classed with such notorious enemies of the faith as the Vandals and the Goths, therefore among the progeny of Erminus<sup>120</sup>. The second change was more trivial, but no less compatible with the culture of a late Merovingian editor. The name *Visigothi* never circulated very widely, nor was it used for a long time. Absent from authors like Fortunatus, Gregory of Tours, and Isidore, it seems to occur only once in a Frankish text, namely, in a letter of Theudebert I between 534 and 547, precisely during the period in which the Goths of Spain had to be distinguished from those of Italy<sup>121</sup>. When, in the late eighth century, Paul the Deacon thought that the Goths he was writing about needed further definition, he called them *Hispani Gothi*<sup>122</sup>. These circumstances tend to explain the conduct of our Germanic-speaking editor. Encountering *Visigothi* in the Table, he clarified the obsolete name by substituting the appropriate gloss *Walagothi* – those Goths speaking a Romance dialect in Septimania and Spain<sup>123</sup>.

The Frankish editor was not ambitious or disposed to subjecting the Table to a thorough modernization. After his fashion, he respected a text whose traditional character was vouchsafed by references to mythical ancestors; he treated it as warily as would the scribes who followed him. Nevertheless, current conditions impelled him to make minor changes in wording; he clarified an obscure name and, taking care to choose suitably bad company, he added one people that was now too deplorably prominent to be left out of the family of nations. With these emendations,

<sup>119</sup> Fredegar, *Chronicon* IV 74 (similar language in connection with the Gascons, IV 78); Fredegar *Continuatus* c. 31; *Liber historiae Francorum* c. 27, 31, 41 (MGH *Script. rer. Merov.* 2, pp. 158, 159–61, 181, 286, 292, 311–14). Conversely, it is unremarkable that the Saxons are omitted from a Table composed towards 520 near the Mediterranean, since Saxons are absent from Cassiodorus, incidentally mentioned by Jordanes (*Getica* c. 191), and unknown to Procopius (note particularly *Bellum Gothicum* IV, 20, 7).

<sup>120</sup> For the notoriously bad reputation of the Vandals and Goths in Frankish historiography, see Gregory of Tours, *Historiae* II 2–4, 29, III 10, 30–31, IV 8, V 38, 43, etc.; Fredegar, *Chronicon* II 56–58, 60, III 15, 42, 47, 59, 82–83, 87, 92, IV 33, 73, 82.

<sup>121</sup> For the name *Visigothi*, see JOSEF SVENNUNG, *Jordanes und Scandia. Kritisch-exegetische Studien*, Stockholm 1967, p. 122; HACHMANN (as n. 117) pp. 121–25; WOLFRAM (as n. 111) pp. 17–18. The letter of Theudebert, *Epistola Austrasica* 20 (MGH *Epistolae* 3, p. 133).

<sup>122</sup> Paul the Deacon, *Historia Langobardorum* III 21 (MGH *Script. rer. Langob.* pp. 103–04). When directly relying on Jordanes, Paul mentioned *Wisigothi* in connection with the kingdom of Toulouse; see *Historia Romana* XIV 19, XV 5, 6, 12, etc. (MGH *Auctores antiquissimi* 2, pp. 207, 209, 212).

<sup>123</sup> Cf. FRIEDRICH (as n. 11) p. 16, citing ninth-century evidence for *Gothonicum* (= Septimania) as “Walchenland”.

and a minor adjustment in numbering, he imprinted upon the *Völkertafel* the common form in which it began to circulate and to be coupled with likely companion pieces. But only the author of the *Historia Brittonum*, relying on a much altered Italian version, ever found a way to put its information to constructive use.

#### VII. CONCLUSION

In the decades that the Table of nations has been known to modern scholars, it has successively acquired two major interpretations. Each rested on a distinct edition of the text, and each gave the Table an exciting place in early medieval culture. Grimm and Müllenhoff considered it to illustrate the survival into the sixth century of the West Germanic ethnogony that Tacitus had learned about almost 500 years earlier; in this way, the *fränkische Völkertafel* (as it was then called) helped to document both the persistence of *Volksüberlieferung* over many centuries and the passage of primitive oral tradition to written form<sup>124</sup>. The idea that the compiler was directly influenced by Tacitus' *Germania* came eventually to be preferred to the belief that he knew age-old songs. Under these circumstances, Krusch re-edited the Table and provided it with a new but comparably evocative context. Its composition was now to be regarded as having taken place during the earliest development of written German culture on the eastern margins of the Frankish kingdom<sup>125</sup>. So conceived, and dated towards 700, the Table became associated almost exclusively with its quartet of *gentes* in the Frankish orbit, which Krusch's edition brought to the head of the list. The compiler, some said, gave literary expression to the great population displacements of early medieval Gaul; his work showed that language was not regarded as the main basis of nationality; he expressed the triumph of 'tribal thinking' (*gentiles Denken*) and the self-assurance of those who considered themselves the equals of the world-ruling Romans; the Table, as a bold imitation of the Mosaic table of nations, constituted a sort of reply to the particularism of the Trojan legend about the Franks<sup>126</sup>.

All such views suffered from being based on inadequate editions. Müllenhoff's classification of the manuscripts came very close to being correct, and his dating of the Table by its contents was a permanent achievement. The intervention of Krusch had, by contrast, only one positive result, namely, an accurate dating and evaluation of the attached list of Roman kings of Gaul. For the Table itself, Krusch charted a false course by featuring a manuscript that had already been shown several times to originate from Italy, and not from Reichenau, as he believed. Rectifying this attribution, as well as the interpretations of the Table that have followed from it, is only a by-product of the more needed task of fully reassessing the textual tradition. Once all the manuscripts are surveyed and classified, three principal observations may be made: the textual tradition, although it includes several Italian copies, nevertheless proceeds from the Frankish kingdom; the Table is a distinct document despite its

<sup>124</sup> The fullest statement of this view is by KURTH (as n. 11) pp. 85–99.

<sup>125</sup> KRUSCH (as n. 9) p. 73.

<sup>126</sup> LÖWE, *Von Theoderich dem Großen* (as n. 75) p. 374; WENSKUS (as n. 84) p. 180; BORST (as n. 75) pp. 461–62. For additional opinions of this kind, see above nn. 75–76.

invariable association with alien material; and its grouping of *gentes* aligns the Goths and Vandals in an early position while placing the Franks next to last.

For the Table that the manuscripts allow us to reconstruct, no plain and straightforward explanation can be given. The Germanic prefix of the name *Walagothi*, as well as the inclusion of the Saxons, points in a completely different direction from the use of Tacitus, the influence of a Byzantine grouping of 'Gothic peoples', and the most probable date of composition. The apparent impossibility of reconciling these opposites forces one to conclude that something is wrong with the text. On this basis, the interpretation that seems most economical is that the two anomalous names result from the alteration of an original version in which twelve *gentes* were listed, and in which the opening group precisely agreed with the Goths, Visigoths, Vandals, and Gepids of Byzantine tradition.

To a text drafted in this slightly different form, a date of composition towards 520 would apply; the Table might have originated in Ostrogothic Italy but makes better sense if traced to Constantinople, or elsewhere in the Eastern Empire, and associated with the range of interest in western affairs that Justinian's conquests conspicuously exemplify. Relying on Tacitus's *Germania* to provide a biological system of classification, the compiler disregarded authentic ethnographic relationships but otherwise showed considerable discernment in portraying the main *gentes* of the contemporary West in a suitably political and geographical order; he is most remarkable, perhaps, for consistently mirroring current conditions in preference to literary ethnography. His catalogue appears to embody the earliest reference to the Bavarians<sup>127</sup>, and it possibly affords an insight into the frail condition of the Frankish kingdom after Clovis's death. Along with Procopius and the equally Byzantine Jordanes, it would help to remind us how profoundly the modern image of the barbarian invasions and settlements has been conditioned by informants from the East Roman Empire.

The transmission westward of this Table with twelve *gentes* and its change to the surviving form are comparatively unremarkable steps. A trickle of Byzantine compositions flowed into the Latin cultural sphere during the period that concerns us. Like many anonymous writings, the Table was a "texte vivant", subject to continual adjustments at the hands of scribes. The editor who first altered it, increasing the twelve peoples to thirteen, made two small changes that current conditions seemed to call for. In doing so, he inadvertently colored the Table Frankish and created a problem for modern interpreters. He also launched this ethnographic fragment upon the broad but inconsequential diffusion that it enjoyed in early medieval lands.

#### APPENDIX

##### The Ioca monachorum of Paris lat. 609

A set of ioca monachorum was published above in connection with one version of the Table of nations. These eight questions and answers deserve a brief commentary establishing their relationship to the other known collections of 'monks' pastimes' – an interesting medium of instruction spanning many centuries but not widely known to historians.

<sup>127</sup> Cf. MÜLLENHOFF (as n. 72) pp. 120–21; KRUSCH (as n. 9) p. 40; and above n. 90.



In preparing these comments, I am indebted especially to James E. Cross, Baines Professor of English Language at the University of Liverpool, who, in a letter of 19 May 1980, did most of the work for me. I also owe heartfelt thanks to Mlle. Marie Thérèse d'Alverny, of the Centre national de la recherche scientifique, Paris, for helping me decipher the manuscript; to Professor John M. McCulloh, of Kansas State University, for elegantly emending a lacuna in the line about St. Helenus; and to Professor Michael McCormick, of Johns Hopkins University and Dumbarton Oaks, for procuring extracts from a needed book. None of these generous helpers bears responsibility for the errors that my remarks, and reading of the manuscript, may be found to contain.

The following published collections will be referred to:

Georg Baesecke, *Der Vocabularius Sti. Galli in der angelsächsischen Mission*, Halle 1933.

Max Förster, *Das älteste mittellateinische Gesprächsbüchlein* (Romanische Forschungen 27, 1901–10, pp. 342–48).

Henri Omont, *Interrogationes de fide catholica (Ioca monachorum)* (Bibliothèque de l'École des chartes 44, 1883, pp. 58–71).

Walther Suchier, *L'Enfant sage* (Das Gespräch des Kaisers Hadrian mit dem klugen Kinde Epitus) (Gesellschaft für romanischen Literatur 24) Dresden 1910.

Id., *Das mittellateinische Gespräch Adrian und Epictetus nebst verwandten Texten* (Ioca Monachorum), Tübingen 1955.

Wilhelm Wilmanns, *Ein Fragebüchlein aus dem neunten Jahrhundert* (Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum 15, 1872, pp. 166–80).

E. Wölfflin-Troll, *Ioca monachorum, ein Beitrag zur mittelalterlichen Rätselliteratur* (Monatsberichte der Berliner Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1872, pp. 106–18).

1. *Qui pugnavit contra Allofilos et Filisteos et contra Goliath gigantem? R. David in vicem Saal regis et obtinuit victoriam.* Wölfflin-Troll, p. 114 no. 82, *Qui pugnavit cum Golia rege Alofilorum, et cum una petra obtinuit victoriam? R. David pro Saul rege.* More distant parallels in Suchier, *Adrian u. Epikt.*, p. 135 no. 5; Omont, p. 64 no. 22.

2. *Que mulier occisit Olofernem principem militiae Nabuchodonosori regis? R. Iudit.* Unparalleled in Latin collections. But compare the Castilian collections in Suchier, *L'Enfant sage*, pp. 357–58 no. 83, 380 no. 98.

3. *Qui primus inuenit utiro et ordinavit s[. . .]a[. . .] facere? R. Salomon rex.* Unparalleled. This is the oddest and most intriguing of the eight questions. The one feature very commonly found in other Latin collections is a concern with 'firsts' (*quis primus . . .*); e.g., Baesecke, p. 7 nos. 8–10, 12–18, 26, 40–42, 46; Omont, pp. 70–71 nos. 8–14; and many others. I was unable to decipher the word beginning with *s* (and almost ending with *a*); it seems to be about six characters long, three on one line, three on the next. The emendation that most tempts me is *scutas*, based on 2 Par. 9:15–16, *Fecit igitur rex Salomon . . . trecenta quoque scuta aurea* (cf. 3 Reg. 10:16), on the premise that the author intended to epitomize Solomon's wisdom (by his identification of the 'womb' of the right mother) and his wealth – *sapientissimus et ditissimus*, in the words of Freulf of Lisieux<sup>1</sup>. The Castilian collections that

<sup>1</sup> Freulf of Lisieux, *Chronicon* I 3, 4 (MIGNE PL 106, col. 974).

mention Judith (no. 2) are also interested in the wealth of Solomon; see Suchier, *L'Enfant sage*, p. 358 no. 91, 381 no. 105.

4. *Qui sine arma et sine uaculum leonem interfecit? R. Samson.* Suchier, Adrian u. Epikt., p. 35 no. 79, *Quis leonem sine gladio et sine fuste interfecit? Samson.* Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 15 no. 47, 180 no. 67. Omont, p. 62 no. 63, *Qui sine fuste et gladio occidit leone? Samson.* See also Omont, p. 66 no. 41; Wilmanns, p. 168 no. 24.

5. *Qui serpentem [crocodi]lum sedit et sic flumen transiuit? Sanctus Helen[us].* Wölfflin-Troll, p. 110 no. 28, *Qui super serpentem corcodrillum fluuium transiuit? Sanctus Helenus.* See also Suchier, Adrian u. Epikt., pp. 116 no. 27, 132 no. 53; Baesecke, p. 7 no. 30; Wilmanns, p. 168 no. 38. St. Helenus was one of the desert fathers<sup>2</sup>.

6. *Qui bestiam mulsit iterum? Sanctus Mammis.* Omont, p. 69 no. 85, *Dic mihi quis uestias mulsit? R. Mamma.* Wölfflin-Troll, p. 110 no. 29, *Qui bestia mulsit? Sanctus Mamas.* The same in Suchier, Adrian u. Epikt., pp. 116 no. 28, 132 no. 54. Note that, in three collections, the entries for Helenus and Mammias are paired in the same way as here. On two separate occasions, St. Mammias tamed the lion that attacked him when he was exposed in an arena<sup>3</sup>. The Paris version, with *iterum*, incorporates a detail of the legend omitted elsewhere.

7. *Qui ter mortuus et ter resurrexit? Sanctus Cyricus et Sanctus Georgius.* Unparalleled. For biblical wonders of this type, see Wilmanns, pp. 168 no. 20, 169 no. 38; Omont, p. 69 no. 80. The exceptionally gruesome and fantastic passions of St. Cyricus (with his mother Julitta) and of St. George, which are sometimes paired in manuscripts, were banned as apocryphal in the Gelasian Decree and, in 810, in a comparable measure in the Greek church<sup>4</sup>. The three deaths and resurrections of St. George are spelled out in his earliest Latin passion<sup>5</sup>, but the earliest published passion of St. Cyricus in Latin is less explicit; the saint is only saved by miracle from tortures that would normally have proved fatal<sup>6</sup>. In order to determine whether the two martyrs deserve to be paired quite so precisely as they are here, the many other versions of the passion of St. Cyricus, in many languages (including unpublished ones in Latin) would have to be investigated.

8. *Qui fuerunt qui gentes genuerunt? Etc. (= the Table of nations).* Unparalleled. Although no. 8 contrasts in length to nos. 1–7, long answers are by no means unusual in the ioca genre; see, for example, Omont, pp. 63 nos. 9 and 13, 64 nos. 15 and 20; Wölfflin-Troll, pp. 109 no. 15, 110 no. 40, 111 no. 49, 112 no. 53. The obvious analogues to the Table are the questions concerning Noah, his three sons, and the divisions of the earth. See Förster, p. 347 nos. 21–22; Baesecke, p. 7 no. 27; and, in Old English, The 'Prose Solomon and Saturn' and 'Adrian and Ritheus', ed. James E. Cross and Thomas D. Hill (*McMaster Old English Studies and Texts* 1) Toronto 1982, pp. 28, 74–75 no. 14.

<sup>2</sup> On his encounter with the crocodile, see Rufinus, *Historia monachorum* c. 11 (MIGNE PL 21, col. 430).

<sup>3</sup> BONINUS MOMBRIUS (ed.), *Sanctuarium seu Vitae sanctorum* 2, Paris 1910, pp. 126–29.

<sup>4</sup> ERNST VON DOBSCHÜTZ, *Das Decretum Gelasianum* (Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur 3, 8, 3) Leipzig 1912, pp. 41, 57, 273–75.

<sup>5</sup> Summarized by HIPPOLYTE DELEHAYE, *Les légendes grecques des saints militaires*, Paris 1909, pp. 51–55.

<sup>6</sup> *Acta Sanctorum Junii* 4, Paris 1867, pp. 24–28.