

# CAMBRIDGE MEDIEVAL HISTORY VOLUME I

## THE CHRISTIAN ROMAN EMPIRE AND THE FOUNDATION OF THE TEUTONIC KINGDOMS 300-500



INTRODUCTION

I.- CONSTANTINE AND HIS CITY

II.-THE REORGANISATION OF THE EMPIRE

III.-CONSTANTINE'S SUCCESSORS TO JOVIAN: AND THE STRUGGLE WITH PERSIA

IV.-THE TRIUMPH OF CHRISTIANITY

V.-ARIANISM

VI.-THE ORGANISATION OF THE CHURCH

VII.-EXPANSION OF THE TEUTONS (To A.D. 378)

VIII.-THE DYNASTY OF VALENTINIAN AND THEODOSIUS THE GREAT

IX.-THE TEUTONIC MIGRATIONS, 378-412

X.-THE VISIGOTHS TO THE DEATH OF EURIC

THE FRANKS BEFORE CLOVIS

XI.-THE SUEVES, ALANS, AND VANDALS IN SPAIN, 409-429

A.-THE HUNS: THE ASIATIC BACKGROUND. ATTLA

XIII.-ROMAN BRITAIN

XIV.-ITALY AND THE WEST, 410-476

XV.-THE KINGDOM OF ITALY UNDER ODOVACAR AND THEODORIC

XVI.-THE EASTERN PROVINCES FROM ARCADIUS TO ANASTASIUS

XVII.-RELIGIOUS DISUNION IN THE FIFTH CENTURY. Nestorius.

XVIII.- MONASTICISM

XIX.-SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC CONDITIONS OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE IN THE FOURTH CENTURY

XX.-THOUGHTS AND IDEAS OF THE PERIOD

## INTRODUCTION

### *Invasion of Europe by the Barbarians*

There are two ways in which the subject may be treated, two points of view from which the sequence of changes which broke up the Roman Empire may be regarded. We may look at the process, in the earliest and most important stage, from the point of view of the Empire which was being dismembered or from that of the barbarians who were dismembering it. We may stand in Rome and watch the strangers sweeping over her provinces; or we may stand east of the Rhine and north of the Danube, amid the forests of Germany, and follow the fortunes of the men who issued thence, winning new habitations and entering on a new life. Both methods have been followed by modern writers. Gibbon and many others have told the story from the side of the Roman Empire, but all the principal barbarian peoples—not only those who founded permanent states, but even those who formed only transient kingdoms—have had each its special historian. One naturally falls into the habit of contemplating these events from the Roman side because the early part of the story has come down to us in records which were written from the Roman side. We must, however, try to see things from both points of view.

The barbarians who dismembered the Empire were mainly Germans. It is not till the sixth, century that people of another race—the Slavs—appear upon the scene. Those who approach for the first time the study of the beginnings of medieval history will probably find it difficult to group and locate clearly in their minds the multitude of Germanic peoples who surge over the scene in distracting confusion. The apparent confusion vanishes, of course, with familiarity, and the movements fall into a certain order. But at the very outset the study of the period may be simplified by drawing a line of division within the Germanic world. This capital line of division is geographical, but it has its basis in historical facts. It is the distinction of the West Germans from the East Germans. To understand this division we must go back for a moment into the early history of the Germans.

In the second millennium B.C. the homes of the Germanic peoples were in southern Scandinavia, in Denmark, and in the adjacent lands between the Elbe and the Oder. East of them beyond the Oder were Baltic or Lettic peoples, who are now represented by Lithuanians and Letts. The lands west of the Elbe, to the Rhine, were occupied by Celts.

After 1000 B.C. a double movement of expansion began. The Germans between the Oder and the Elbe pressed westward, displacing the Celts. The boundary between the Celts and Germans advanced to the west, and by about 200 B.C. it had been pushed forward to the Rhine, and southward to the Main. Throughout this period the Germans had been also pressing up the Elbe. Soon after 100 B.C. southern Germany had been occupied, and they were attempting to flood Gaul. This inundation was stemmed by Julius Caesar. Now all these peoples who expanded over western Germany from their original seats between Oder and Elbe we will class as the West Germans.

The other movement was a migration from Scandinavia to the opposite coasts of the Baltic, between the Oder and the Vistula, and ultimately beyond the Vistula. This migration seems to have taken place at a later period than the beginning of the expansion of the West Germans. It is placed by a recent authority, Kossinna, in the later bronze period, between 600 and 300 B.C. By the latter date they seem to have pressed right up to the Vistula to the neighbourhood of the Carpathians. These comers from Scandinavia formed a group which in dialect and customs may be distinguished from the West Germans, as well as in their



geographical position; and we designate them as East Germans. The distinction is convenient because the historical roles of these two divisions of the German race were different. There is also a third division, the North Germans of Scandinavia; but with them we are not concerned.

In the period with which we have to do, the West Germans are comparatively settled geographically, whereas the East Germans are migratory. Now it is not difficult to understand why this is so. All the ancient Germans were shepherds and hunters. They had some agriculture before the time of Julius Caesar, but not much. Central Europe till well into the Middle Ages consisted largely of dense forests and marshlands. There were, however, districts free from wood, and the absence of wood was the circumstance which largely determined the early settlements of the Germans. Geographers are able to fix the position of such tracts of steppe land by means of the remains of steppe plants—plants which cannot live either in the forest or on cultivated soil—and also by the remains of animals which are characteristic of the steppe. Cases of such land, for instance, are the plain of the upper Rhine and the eastern portion of the Harz district.

When a people settled down in such a district they could live, as a rule peaceably and contentedly, on their flocks and herds, until their number began to increase considerably. Then their pasture land, limited by the surrounding forests, became insufficient, and presently the food question grew pressing. There were three solutions open: they might take to agriculture, which would enable them to support a far larger population in the same area; they might extend their pasturage by clearing the forest; or they might reduce their superfluity of population by emigrating. The third resource was that which they regularly adopted; the other two were opposed to their nature and instincts. A portion would emigrate and seize a new habitation elsewhere. This, of course, meant war and conquest. This process went on at the expense of the Celts until Central Europe became entirely Germanised. They would then have naturally advanced westward or southward, but the Roman power hindered them. Thus the Western Germans, having no further room for expansion, shut in on the east by their own kinsfolk who were tightly packed, on the west and south by the Roman Empire, were forced to find another solution for the food question. Perforce they took to tilling the land. We have direct evidence for this important change in their habits. Caesar describes the Germans as mainly a pastoral people: they did practise agriculture, but it was little. About one hundred and fifty years later Tacitus describes them as practising agriculture. This transformation, then, from a pre-eminently pastoral state to an agricultural state came about during the century after their geographical expansion was arrested by the power of Rome. That period was a critical stage in their development. Now remember that all this applies to the West Germans: it is the West Germans to whom the descriptions of Caesar and Tacitus relate. The East Germans beyond the Elbe were by no means in the same position. They were not hemmed in in the same way. Their neighbours to the east and south were barbarians—Slavs and others—who did not hinder their freedom of movement, and so there was no motive to give up their pastoral and migratory habits.

You can now understand how in the second century A.D. the East and West Germans are distinguished not only by geographical position but also by the different stages of civilisation which they have reached. The West Germans are agricultural and have attained those relatively settled habits which agriculture induces. The East Germans are chiefly pastoral and represent a stage from which the West Germans began to emerge a couple of centuries before.

I may illustrate this further by referring to a different interpretation of the evidence which was put forward by Dr. Felix Dahn, who devoted his life and numerous works to early German history. He starts from the great change from the unsettled life of the Germans in the time of Caesar, when they depended chiefly on pasture and the chase, to the relatively settled life, in which agriculture predominated, corresponding to the description of Tacitus. Using

this fact as a minor premise, he lays down as a general rule that when such a change takes place from an unsettled to a settled life increase in population is a natural consequence. And from these two premises he argues that Germany increased largely in population. Such an increase, he says, would only begin to tell four or five generations after a people had adopted settled habits; that means 120 or 150 years. If we take about A.D. 20-30 as the middle point of the period of change—between Caesar and Tacitus—then four or five generations bring us down to the period A.D. 140-180, just the time in which the East German migratory movement began. He concludes that increase of population, due to the change from pastoral to agricultural habits, was the cause of the migrations and the expansive movements which began in the second century A.D.

You will readily perceive the fallacy which underlies this interesting argument. Dr. Dahn applies to the Germans as a whole, and to the East Germans in particular, the evidence of Tacitus, which is true only of the West Germans, who came under Roman observation. The picture of Tacitus is taken entirely from the West Germans; of the German peoples beyond the Elbe the Romans knew little more than the names and geographical positions of some of them. Thus Dr. Dahn does not take us any further. Increase of population, which means the food question, was the driving force in the whole process of German expansion from prehistoric times onward, and it was the main cause, no doubt, of the movement which began in the second century A.D.; but the new agricultural habits of the West Germans had nothing to do with it.

Before dealing with this movement, which is a movement of East Germans, I have a word more to say about the West Germans. The old names of the West German peoples between the Rhine and Elbe are preserved by Tacitus and in other records of early imperial history. But in the later times with which we have to do now, these names have almost entirely disappeared. We have no longer to do with the Tencteri, the Cherusci, the Chatti, etc.; we have to do with the Alamanni, the Franks, the Saxons, the Thuringians. The reason of this change is that from the end of the second century western Germany had been re-formed by a process of federation and blending of groups of smaller peoples in large unities. Thus the *Alamanni* were a composite nation formed from the Suevian tribes, and others, on the upper Rhine. In the same way the peoples on the lower Rhine had formed a loose conglomerate under the name of *Franks*. This name Frank or ('free' seems to have been given as a distinction from the neighbouring peoples who were subject to Rome in the province of Lower Germany. Between the Weser and Elbe, and inland to the Harz mountains, another group of people was collected under the name of *Saxons*. The tribes who gave the name to the whole confederation had come from beyond the mouth of the Elbe, near the neck of the Cimbric peninsula; for our purpose they are West Germans. But among the West Germans they were exceptional in the length of their migrations. The Saxons were parted from the Franks by the intervening *Frisians*; and south of the Saxons were the Thuringians who mainly represented the ancient Hermunduri.

It has been sometimes questioned whether these groups were really confederates, bound by a definite league. The fact seems proved by a text of Ammianus Marcellinus who, in speaking of the Alamanni, refers to a *pactum vicissitudinis reddendae*. They were bound to render mutual aid. Can we discover any cause for these approximations, these centripetal movements? Agriculture, in all probability, proved an insufficient solution of the population question, especially if in settled conditions the numbers increased more rapidly. It became necessary therefore for a people to enlarge the area of its habitation by reclaiming the surrounding forestland. You must picture Germany as consisting of small territories each of which was surrounded by a dense impenetrable ring of primeval forest. They were thus divided from and protected against each other by the forest-hedge which formed their hunting-grounds. In the middle of the territory were the separate agricultural allotments of the

freemen, all round this was the common pasture land, and beyond this again was the ring of forest. Now what naturally happened as the population increased? More land was required for the separate allotments, and it became necessary to encroach upon the pasture land. But the pasture could not be curtailed with an increasing population, and so it became necessary to encroach upon the forest. The result was that the dense rings of forest, which isolated each state from its neighbours more effectually than the sea severs islands, were reduced to narrow limits with the expansion of the population, and the states were brought into a close proximity which facilitated and promoted political unions, whether intimate or loose. This process of grouping was perhaps favourable to the institution of royalty.

It will not be amiss to say a few words here, at the very outset, about the political institutions of the Germans—words which apply not merely to the times of Tacitus and of Caesar, with which we are not now directly concerned, but also to the whole time of the migrations which form the subject of the next few lectures. I will not go into any details or discuss vexed questions, but merely emphasise what seems to be the chief feature. I would say in the first place that the whole period of German history before the migrations and during the migrations may be called, from the political point of view, the period of popular freedom. As soon as the German people have formed permanent states in the dismembered Roman Empire a new period of political development begins, a monarchical period. Now I daresay you may be inclined to make an objection to this statement. You may say that in early times (*e.g.* in the time of Tacitus) some of the German states were ruled by kings; there were kingdoms as well as republics; and during the actual period of the migrations nearly every people had a king. This is quite true, and the point on which I wish to insist is that it does not affect my proposition. A German state might have a king or it might not, but in either case it was virtually a democracy. All German states, so far as we know, had to all intents and purposes the same constitution; the political distinction between republic and monarchy has no application to them. Some of them had kings; any of them might at any moment elect a king; but the presence or absence of a king might almost be described as a matter of convenience; it had no decisive constitutional importance. In every German state, whether there was a king or not, the assembly of the freemen was sovran; and that is the main thing to remember. The king not only had no power to legislate or take any political decision without the consent of the assembly, but he had no power to hinder or check what seemed good to the assembly. He was the great executive officer of the state and had the right of summoning the host whenever the assembly had decided on war; also the right of summoning extraordinary meetings of the assembly. But the people who had no king required an executive officer of this kind likewise. Well, they had an officer who was called the graf. The graf had functions and duties corresponding to those of the king. The true distinction then between the German states is not ‘republican’ and ‘monarchical’ states, but states with a graf and states with a king. Was the distinction then merely one of name? No, there was one real and important difference. The graf was elected by the assembly, and the assembly might elect anyone they liked. The king was likewise elected by the assembly, but in his case their choice was limited to a particular family, a royal family. In other words, the kingship was hereditary, and the grafship was not. But this hereditary character of the kingship was of a limited kind. When a king died, the office did not devolve on any particular kinsman of his; the sovran people might elect any member of the family they chose; they might refuse to elect a successor at all. There was no fixed successor; the eldest son, *e.g.*, had no greater claim than anyone else. The existence of these kingly families such as the Amals among the East Goths, the Balthas among the West Goths, the Mervings among the Salian Franks, is for us an ultimate fact, behind which with our present knowledge we can hardly penetrate. It is like the existence of the German nobility, the origin of which we have not material to explain. We only know that the kingly family was supposed to be the most ancient of all the families of the folk, and that

it traced its origin to a god. And families possessing this right seem to have existed among all the German folks, among those who had no kings as well as among those who had. So that if any kingless folk suddenly resolved that it would be expedient to have a king, they had a family designate within which their choice would fall. It is highly important to realise this absolute nature of the theoretical principle of the ancient German states—namely, the sovereignty of the folk, a vital principle which has undergone many modifications, passed through transient eclipses, but has never been extinguished in Europe. But I must go on to point out that, though the king had no independent power, the kingship had importance by virtue of the fact that it *might* become a real power. It was a germ out of which a true royal power might spring—and did spring. The fact that he belonged to a chosen family of high prestige would naturally secure that more special consideration and honour would be shown to the king than to a graf; and a strong man might be able to exercise enormous influence in the assembly by perfectly constitutional means. This was no infringement of freedom, but it might lead ultimately to infringement of freedom.

Now it may be that the growth of these centripetal tendencies, the process of group formation, of which I have spoken, was favourable to the institution of royalty. In the time of Tacitus, states, such as the Saxon, which had a king were exceptional. The motives of this general change of feeling in favour of kingship were no doubt various, and perhaps we cannot determine them with any certainty; but I may point out one consideration. If several states formed a political union and required a head for their common actions, *e.g.* for a war, a king may have seemed the easiest solution. They may have found it easier to agree on giving precedence to the royal family of a particular state than to join together to elect a president. I may observe that within these federal unions each *civitas* had often its own king; this was the case with the Alamanni, and partly with the Franks.

The events of the fifth century were decisive for the future of Europe. The general result of these events was the occupation of the western half of the Roman Empire, from Britain to North Africa, by German peoples. Now the Germans who effected this occupation were not, with one or two exceptions, the Germans who had been known to Rome in the days of Caesar and Tacitus. They were not West Germans. They were East Germans. The principal of the East German peoples were the Goths, the Vandals, the Gepids, the Burgundians, and the Lombards. There were also the Rugians, the Heruls, the Bastarnae, the Sciri. Most of these peoples believed that they had reached the coast of East Germany from Scandinavia, and this tradition is confirmed by the evidence of names. The best students of German antiquity identify the name of the Goths with that of the Scandinavian Gauts. The Rugians who settled in Pomerania are explained by Rogaland in Norway. The Swedish Bornholm is supposed to be Burgundarholm, the holm of the Burgundians. Of these East German peoples, most were moving slowly through Europe in a generally southward direction, to the Black Sea and the Danube, in the third and fourth centuries. These East German barbarians were still in the stage in which steady habits of work seem repulsive and dishonourable. They thought that laziness consisted not in shirking honest labour but, to quote words of Tacitus, in “acquiring by the sweat of your brow that which might be procured by the shedding of blood”. Though the process is not revealed in our historical records, it seems very probable that the defensive wars in which the Emperor Marcus Aurelius, in the third quarter of the second century, was engaged against the Germans north of the Danube frontier—that these wars were occasioned by the pressure of East Germans beyond the Elbe driven by the needs of a growing population to encroach upon their neighbours.

The earliest great recorded migration of an East German people was that of the Goths, about the end of the second century. They moved from their homes on the lower Vistula to the shores of the Black Sea, where we find them in A.D. 214 in the reign of Caracalla. Before this migration the Goths had formed one people, consisting, like all German peoples, of a number



of separate units or *gaus*. I do not think there can be much doubt that it was after their settlement there that they broke up into two great divisions, the Ostrogoths and the Visigoths, and that the motive of the division was geographical. It is easy to imagine how this could have happened, as there can be little doubt that they did not migrate all at once but rather in successive bands. The earlier comers, we might suppose, settled nearer the Danubian lands, in the neighbourhood of the Dniester, and they, in consequence of years of separation, felt themselves in a certain measure distinct when the later comers arrived; and the result was the formation of two groups, distinguished as East and West. After the whole Gothic nation had been reunited on the shores of the Euxine, the ancient Greek cities of Olbia and Tyras seem to have soon fallen into their hands. We may infer this from the fact that the coinage of those cities comes to an end in the reign of Alexander Severus, who died in A.D. 235. Soon afterwards the Gothic attacks upon the Roman Empire began.

The recorded attacks of the Goths on the Roman Empire began about A.D. 247. The success of these attacks was due to (1) the internal weakness of the Empire at the time; for it had suffered from a succession of incompetent rulers since the death of Septimius Severus in A.D. 211, and (2) the simultaneous rise of the new Persian Empire, which had given it a very formidable enemy in the east. The Goths now inflicted upon Rome the most grievous and shameful blow that had been struck by northern barbarians since the reign of Augustus when Arminius annihilated the legions of Varus in the forest of Teutoburg. They drew the army of the Emperor Decius into a swamp near the mouths of the Danube, destroyed the army, and slew the Emperor, A.D. 251. Soon afterwards they took to the sea, and sailing forth from the ports of south Russia they became the terror of the cities of the Black Sea, the Marmora, and the Aegean. These ravages did not cease till they attempted a great joint invasion by sea and land, which was decisively repelled by the Emperor Claudius I (A.D. 269). A despatch is preserved professing to have been written by the Emperor when the foes had been defeated and routed. It runs thus: "We have destroyed 320,000 Goths, we have sunk 2000 of their ships. The rivers are bridged over with shields; the fields are hidden by their bones; no road is free". But the despatch is a later fabrication. The number of 320,000 is a ludicrous exaggeration, as we shall see afterwards when we come to consider the general question as to the numbers of the German invaders and the size of their armies. The achievement of Claudius—who is generally known, in consequence, as Claudius Gothicus—secured peace from the Goths for a long time in the regions south of the Danube; but it would not have done so if he had not been followed by a series of able rulers.

But meanwhile the Goths were securing a success of a more abiding and important nature than their sensational victory in which a Roman Emperor had perished. They had in fact begun the actual dismemberment of the Empire by penetrating and ultimately occupying one of its provinces—the province of Dacia, north of the Danube, which had been conquered nearly a hundred and fifty years before by the Emperor Trajan, the country which is called Transilvania or Siebenburgen. It was the last European province to be acquired by Rome; it was the first to fall away. No Roman coins, no Roman inscription of date later than about A.D. 256 have been found in Dacia. The Emperor Aurelian, who succeeded Claudius Gothicus in A.D. 270, withdrew the Roman officials and military garrisons from Dacia, and made the Danube once more the frontier of the Empire. Evidently the Goths had been gradually and steadily encroaching on Roman territory for fifteen or twenty years, and Aurelian simply decided to abandon a province which was already virtually lost. No doubt there was a considerable exodus of the provincials when the imperial government withdrew its protection; but we have no trustworthy evidence as to what exactly happened. It is an obscure question, and one on which a great deal of ink has been wasted; for it has been the subject of heated discussions in modern times between the Roumanians and Hungarians. As you know, the Roumanians speak a romance, that is, a Latin language, and they claim to be



descendants of the Latin-speaking inhabitants of Roman Dacia, surviving throughout all the vicissitudes of the Middle Ages, throughout all changes of master, since the time of Aurelian, in Transilvania. The Hungarians have strenuously denied this. Transilvania belonged to Hungary up to the recent war, the results of which enabled it to fulfil its aspiration of shaking off the Hungarian yoke and of being united in the free kingdom of Roumania to its eastern neighbours who speak the same language. The view of the Hungarians was that all the romance-speaking peoples north of the Danube were later immigrants from the lands south of the Danube—the Balkan peninsula—who moved northward as late as the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. I can only just call your attention to the existence of this burning question. To discuss it usefully or even intelligibly would take us away to the history of the Danubian lands in the twelfth century. The main thing to point out now is that the Roman period of the history of Dacia or Transilvania comes to an end about A.D. 270 (having lasted for 150 years) and that the Gothic period begins.

Incursions of the Goths continued during the following sixty years. After the Emperor Constantine the Great became sole Emperor in A.D. 324, he gave his attention to the danger, and endeavoured to secure the lower Danube frontier by fortified camps and castles. He built a wall in the north-east corner of Thrace across the region which is now known as the Dobrudzha—a region which in modern times has been disputed between Roumania and Bulgaria. Towards the end of his reign Constantine concluded a forced treaty with the Visigoths. They became *federates* of the Empire; that is, they undertook to protect the frontier and to supply a certain contingent of soldiers to the imperial army in case of wars. In return for this they received yearly subsidies which, theoretically a supply of corn, was actually paid in money, and was technically called *annona foederatica* (federal corn supplies). Federal relations of this kind are a standing feature of the whole period during which the German people were encroaching upon the provinces of the Empire from the fourth to the sixth century. They were nearly all *federates* of the Empire, for a longer or shorter time, before they were independent masters of the lands which they had seized. Through this treaty Dacia, occupied by the Visigoths, became nominally a dependency of the Empire, and Constantine might boast that he had in a sense recovered Dacia. The peace lasted for a generation, and during this time the Visigoths, unable to press from the southward or westward, took to more settled habits and began to learn the arts of agriculture.

The territory of the Goths as a whole, including Visigoths and Ostrogoths, now, towards the middle of the fourth century, extended from the river Theiss or somewhere near it on the west to the river Dnieper on the east. The Visigoths held Dacia, and also parts of what are now Moldavia and Walachia; the Ostrogoths lived in the steppes beyond the Dniester, but we do not know the exact line of division between the two branches of the Gothic race.

These two peoples remained independent of each other. Our sources give us abundant proof that throughout the period up to the end of the fourth century the Visigoths had no king; their constitution was republican. The *gaus* acted in common, and some of the *gau* chiefs had a predominant influence in guiding the council of the nation and were recognised as natural leaders in the case of war; but we must not be misled by the occasional use of the term *rex*, instead of the more usual and proper *judex*, in Roman writers, into supposing that there was a king. Prominent leaders like Athanaric and Fritigern meet us, but they are only *judices*, *gau* chiefs; they are not kings.

On the other hand, royalty was adopted or maintained by the Ostrogoths. We meet an Ostrogothic king before the end of the third century, and in the fourth there arose the prominent figure of Hermanric, of whom more will have to be said presently.

After this peace in the reign of Constantine there is a pause for a generation in the hostilities between the Empire and the East Germans. For about fifty years the Germanic wars of Rome are almost wholly with the West Germans—the Franks and the Alamanni—who give a great

deal of trouble on the Rhine frontier. The really grave dangers for Rome in the east will begin in A.D. 378; after which the Emperors will begin to realise how formidable the German peril is.

At this point it will be convenient for us to examine the strength of the Empire itself and compare it with the strength of the Germans. We are greatly handicapped in attempting to form an idea of the actual state of things by not having any accurate statistics of population, and the inferences which we may draw from the very few trustworthy figures we have must be taken with a great deal of reserve.

The first thing to grasp is that in the third century the Empire was declining. This was due not only to external troubles, such as wars with the new Persian Empire which had arisen in the east, but much more to internal dissensions and disruptions, civil wars and contests for the imperial throne. The central government had become weak and almost bankrupt; the various parts of the Roman world were showing tendencies to fall asunder and to set up rulers of their own. One of the most significant symptoms of decay was the depreciation of the coinage.

This state of things was ended by two great Emperors, viz. Aurelian, who obtained the supreme power in 270, and Diocletian, who ascended the throne fifteen years later (285) and reigned for twenty years till 305. In the generation—thirty-five years—which elapsed between the accession of Aurelian, who rescued the Empire at the brink of an abyss, and the end of Diocletian's reign, the administration, the army, and the finances were reorganised. After Diocletian's abdication of power in 305, there were twenty years of trouble—struggles for power among his successors, at the end of which (324) one of the most notable figures in the history of the world, Constantine the Great, emerged victorious. The work of these sovereigns completely renovated the Empire; and up to the end of the fourth century it enjoyed a series of able and hard-working rulers who preserved its frontiers virtually intact. There is a striking historical fact which illustrates how the Empire recovered. It relates to the reform of the currency. A new gold standard was introduced by Constantine. You know that we coin 45 sovereigns out of a pound weight of gold. Constantine coined 72 gold pieces to the pound weight. This gold piece was called an aureus or a solidus; and thus in point of value the solidus corresponds to 12s. 6d. Now this standard gold coin, the solidus, was issued from his time up to the eleventh century, by the imperial mints, without any depreciation.

In the third and fourth centuries the Roman Empire extended from the Tyne to the Euphrates. It included all of the lands now known as England and Wales, France, Spain, Italy and Switzerland, Austria and Hungary, the Balkan peninsula, Asia Minor and Syria, and the whole coast lands of North Africa from Egypt to Morocco.

The history of the third century, as already remarked, showed the natural tendency of the parts of this huge heterogeneous empire to fall asunder. The principal line of division was a language line—a line passing through the Balkan peninsula—to the west of which line Latin was spoken generally, and to the east, Greek. Thus the Empire fell naturally into two great sections—a western or Latin section and an eastern or Greek section. This, of course, does not mean that other languages were not spoken too. Coptic was spoken in Egypt, Aramaic in Syria, Celtic tongues in Britain and parts of Gaul, and so on: it means that in the eastern section Greek was the prevailing tongue and the general language of intercourse, and in the western, Latin. The Emperor Diocletian was convinced that the Empire was too huge to be centralised under one sole ruler, and so he made a scheme to place it under two coequal emperors, one ruling the western section, and the other the eastern; each of them to be assisted by a subordinate, or lieutenant, who had not the full imperial title of Augustus, but only the lower title of Caesar. I need not enter upon the details of the scheme, which was highly artificial and remarkably unsuccessful; for it was abandoned by Constantine. But it involved a

new imperial centre of government in the east, as well as at Rome; and this led to the great and decisive act of Constantine in establishing a second Rome at Constantinople, A.D. 330.

This division of the Empire into two parts, one mainly Latin, the other mainly Greek, lasted for 150 years; it was for the greater part of that time ruled by two emperors, occasionally it was under one. But throughout all this period there were the two seats of government, one at the old Rome on the Tiber, the other at the new Rome on the Bosphorus; and the two governments, their systems, their organisations, their officials were exactly the same; one was virtually the replica of the other. That was a very remarkable, indeed a unique, experiment in government; an empire ruled not from one centre, but from two foci, through two parallel organisations. The two parts are often loosely spoken of as if they were two distinct Empires—the eastern and the western. That is a mistake against which we must be on our guard. The unity of the two parts was always most carefully maintained. The Roman Empire was always considered one and indivisible. It never entered anyone's head to think of two. The unity was maintained and expressed in various ways, particularly in legislation. When a law was passed at Constantinople, it was issued not merely in the name of the emperor who was ruling there but in the joint names of him and the emperor ruling in the west; and conversely. The old practice of appointing two consuls at the beginning of every year was preserved, and one of them was nominated at Rome and the other at Constantinople.

The renovated Empire received a new organisation, the result of reforms partly due to Diocletian and partly to Constantine. The general result was that for the purposes of civil administration the whole Empire fell into four great sections, two in the west and two in the east, known as prefectures, because each section was governed by a great minister entitled a praetorian prefect, who was responsible solely to the Emperor. The two western prefectures were the Gauls and Italy, but each of these included many lands which we do not now associate with those names. The *Prefecture of the Gauls* included, as well as Gaul, Britain and Spain and the north-west corner of Africa—Morocco. The *Prefecture of Italy* included, as well as Italy, Switzerland and the provinces between the Alps and the Danube, and also the coast lands of North Africa. The two eastern prefectures were the *Prefecture of Illyricum*, which covered the Balkan peninsula, with the exception of Thrace, and was the smallest of the four; and the *Prefecture of the Orient*, which comprised Thrace and Egypt, and all the Asiatic territory that belonged to the Empire.

Each of these prefectures was divided into large districts called dioceses, each of the size of a fair-sized modern state. Thus in the prefecture of the Gauls there were four dioceses: Britain, two dioceses in Gaul, and Spain. And each diocese was under a vicar, who was subject to the praetorian prefect. And in each diocese there were a number of provinces, each under a provincial governor. Thus the whole system of civil government was, roughly speaking, a hierarchy, like a ladder, with the Emperor at the top, the provincial governor at the foot, and the praetorian prefects and the vicars as the intermediate steps—roughly speaking, for there were a number of exceptions and complications which we need not trouble about. For our present purpose what I have said is enough respecting the civil organisation, and its general hierarchial character. Only observe that there are two such systems, two of these hierarchies, one centring at Rome, the other at Constantinople, like two clocks similarly constructed but functioning independently. And it is important to remember that neither of these great civil administrations had any military functions. The separation of civil and military authority was one of the capital features which differentiated the new monarchy of the fourth and following centuries from the earlier empire of Augustus.

It is the military organisation of the Empire which it is of great importance for us to understand, in trying to follow the struggle between the Empire and its German invaders. The principal feature in which the military establishment of the fourth and fifth centuries differed from that of the early Empire was the existence of a mobile army. While all the frontiers were

defended by troops permanently stationed in the frontier provinces, distinguished as *limitanei*, there was also a field army which the Emperor could move to any part of his dominion which happened to be threatened whenever war broke out; and these troops, which accompanied the Emperor in his movements and so formed an imperial retinue, or *comitatus*, were distinguished as *comitatenses*. Thus the military forces consisted of two main classes, the *comitatenses*, who were the most important when there was serious warfare, and the *limitanei*.

A second outstanding feature in the military organisation of the later Empire is the smaller size of the legionary unit. The strength of the old Roman legion, as it had hitherto been, was about 6000 men; and it was associated with a number of cohorts of infantry and squadrons of cavalry, all under the command of the *legatus* or commander of the legion, so that the *legatus* had about 10,000 men under him. All this is changed. The old legion of 6000 is broken up into detachments of 1000; new legions that are formed are only 1000 strong; the cohorts and the cavalry squadrons are under separate commanders.

Most important is the separation of the cavalry from the infantry, and its conversion into an independent arm instead of a subordinate one. All these armies were under the supreme command of Masters of Soldiers, *Magistri Militum*. It is usual to translate this term literally; they correspond in rank to what we call Field-Marschals, but they had definite commands, and here the systems in the west and in the east developed rather differently. As this office will constantly be mentioned in these lectures it is necessary to explain briefly its position both in the east and in the west—as it was just before the end of the fourth century.

In the east there were five Masters of Soldiers. Two of these resided at Constantinople and commanded the troops of the field armies stationed in the immediate neighbourhood of the capital. They were distinguished as *Magistri in praesenti*, *i.e.* in immediate attendance on the Emperor. The other three were stationed in the large districts of the east; Thrace, and Illyricum respectively, and commanded the troops stationed in them.

In the *west* it was different. Here we do not find five co-ordinate commanders, but two, *magistri militum in praesenti*, whose headquarters were in Italy; one was commander of the infantry, *magister peditum*, the other of the cavalry, *magister equitum*. But though nominally co-ordinate, the first, the Master of Foot, was much the more important. He had supreme authority not only over the mobile infantry of the west, but also over the commanders of the *limitanei*. Towards the end of the fourth century he acquired superior authority over his colleague the Master of Horse, and thus supreme command of all the military forces of the west, and received the title *magister utriusque militiae*, Master of Both Services. *i.e.* both infantry and cavalry.

This difference in organisation had grave political results. In the west the concentration of military power in the hands of one man made the Master of Both Services the most important and influential minister, the man who really directed the policy of the state, and from the close of the fourth century up to the time when the western half of the Empire had completely passed into the power of the Germans, not only the defence of the Empire but the general management of its affairs was in the hands of a succession of soldiers, Masters of Both Services, who were sometimes a danger to the throne. In the east, on the other hand, there are a few cases, but not many, in which a Master of Soldiers attained to undue power.

We have now to consider what the strength of the whole military power of the Empire was, both the mobile army and the stationary forces which were arranged along the frontiers and in the most exposed and assailable parts of Roman dominion, and to see how they compared with the forces which were already threatening and were soon to become a very grave danger.

The question of the number of the army leads us to the general question of the population, for which very different figures have been reached. In old days the numbers of the ancient peoples in Greek and Roman times were immensely exaggerated. This was first



pointed out in the eighteenth century by David Hume in an epoch-making essay, which showed the impossibility of a great many of the figures given by ancient writers. Gibbon, who fully accepted the conclusions of Hume, made an estimate of the population of the Roman Empire in the first century A.D., and concluded that it was about 120 millions. Nobody now would put it quite so high. A modern computation has assigned the figure 54 millions, which is less than half Gibbon's. Now there is reason to believe that between the first century A.D. and the time of Constantine there was an increase of population, because the increase of town life and civilisation in the provinces of Gaul and Spain and the Danubian countries would naturally bring with it an increase in numbers. I am inclined to think that we shall not be extravagantly astray if we say that in Constantine's age the population was somewhere about 70 millions.

Now with this figure—which is a moderate one—you might expect that in wartime an army could be raised numbering many millions. In a modern state, which has conscription, it used to be calculated that if necessary one-tenth of the total population could be sent into the field, *e.g.* in the late war it used to be calculated that Germany—with a population of 65 millions or more—had 6 or 7 millions to draw on for her army in the field. But conditions in modern warfare are entirely different from those in ancient; because so many of the male population, who would otherwise serve in the actual fighting, are required for making munitions, etc. The conditions in ancient warfare were very different. No substantial portion of the able-bodied men of a country was needed for auxiliary services. Therefore a state of which the free population was, say, a million, could put in the field a far larger fraction than nowadays.

It might, therefore, seem surprising at first to find that the total fighting forces of the Roman Empire (with a population of 70 millions—or even if you lower it and take as the very minimum 55 millions) never reached 1 million. To explain this the first thing to observe is that in the old civilised countries round the Mediterranean Sea the population had become quite useless for military service. They were too highly civilised, and not physically fit enough, on the average, to do hand-to-hand fighting with the uncivilised barbarians. Thus, large parts—and the most populous parts—of the Empire are practically withdrawn from our calculation, for they contributed almost nothing in the form of fighting men to the military strength of Rome. So far did this go that in the end it may be said that the only provinces in the interior of the Empire which furnished a constant supply of recruits were the highlands of the Balkan peninsula and the mountainous regions of Asia Minor, for instance Isauria. Otherwise, the army was chiefly recruited from frontier provinces, where there was a population with a large barbarian admixture.

In the third century the army was very largely Illyrian. Diocletian and Constantine both belonged to families of the Balkan peninsula which had risen through military service. In old days foreigners used to be excluded from military service; it was confined to Roman citizens. But at the end of the third century this was given up; foreigners from beyond the limits of the Empire were freely admitted as recruits; while at the same time the principle of the universal liability of citizens was abandoned in practice.

When we examine the way in which the armies were recruited we find that there were four classes of recruits, *i.e.* four sources from which they were drawn.

(1) *The sons of soldiers*: military service was hereditary and the son was bound to follow his father's profession.

(2) *Serfs*: it was a state burden on landed proprietors to supply a certain number of recruits from among their serf tenants.

(3) *Barbarian settlers*: some troops were supplied from the communities of foreign barbarians who were settled in some provinces, especially in east Gaul and north Italy.

(4) *Adventurers*: the most important source of supply was the numerous poor adventurers, both native and foreign, who voluntarily offered themselves to the recruiting officers. Of these adventurers the barbarian volunteers were the most useful and efficient. The Germans who came to enlist, attracted by the pay and the prospect of a career, gradually replaced the Illyrians as the predominant element in the army. Under Roman drill and discipline they became excellent soldiers and rose rapidly to officer rank. Very many of the soldiers who held the highest posts in the last part of the fourth century were of German origin. This is an exceedingly important point. There was in fact a process of Germanisation going on during that century, and it constituted a grave danger. Looking back we can see that the Emperors adopted too liberal a policy in allowing Germans to occupy posts of supreme command. This liberality was due to the desirability of attracting the best men to a career in the imperial service; the Emperor Constantine always showed marked favour to Germans, and Julian reproached him for pampering them. German customs (*e.g.* of elevating an emperor on a shield) made way in the army. The general result was that from the end of the first quarter of the fourth century the German star was gradually rising.

I have now explained how it is that the actual population of the Empire has really no relation at all to its powers of resistance and defence against its enemies. Only a few parts of it made any considerable contribution to the military man-power of the state; and the men who could be got from the Balkan peninsula, the highlands of Asia Minor, the borders of Arabia and Africa, or the lowlands of Batavia had to be supplemented by the recruits who came in great numbers from beyond the Rhine and Danube. We may consider now the actual numbers.

The general result of inquiries into the size of the army after its radical reorganisation by Diocletian and Constantine is that its total strength was between 600,000 and 650,000. This includes both the *comitatenses* and the *limitanei*, the mobile army and the stationary forces who garrisoned the exposed provinces. Of this total strength it is estimated that about one-third (more than 200,000) were in the mobile army and the rest in the garrisons. When you consider the large frontiers which had to be defended, the line of the Rhine, the line of the Danube, as well as the north frontier of Britain in the west, the long frontiers of Africa in the south, the Euphrates, and the Syrian desert in the east, the numbers seem very small. Relatively to the lengths of the frontiers the greater proportion of troops was demanded for the defence of the eastern frontier; for there the enemy was a mighty, well-organised state—the Persian Empire. On the western and northern frontiers the danger came from a number of independent barbarian peoples, who occasionally acted together, but were, even so, far outmatched by the Roman legions in discipline and drill. It has been commonly supposed, however, that this inferiority was more than balanced by their multitude, at least in the case of the East Germans, whose armies have been generally imagined to consist of hundreds of thousands. This idea is fundamentally erroneous, and it is one of the most important points to be quite clear about in studying the barbarian invasions. The enormous figures for the German armies given by many of the chroniclers of the time are absolutely untrustworthy: not only are they on *a priori* grounds impossible, but they are inconsistent among themselves and inconsistent with the statements of those who were most likely to know. When we compare together the figures which we have good reason to consider trustworthy we reach the conclusion that the total number of one of the larger East German nations varied from 80,000 to perhaps 120,000, while that of the smaller peoples varied from 25,000 to 50,000. Now from these totals, which included women and children, the Germans could put a much larger fraction in the field than a civilised state. The military age began somewhat earlier and lasted much longer. A German host could number a quarter or a fifth of the population. And so we find that an army of one of the big East German peoples like the Visigoths, or Ostrogoths, or Vandals, would be as a rule about 20,000 or 25,000, or at most 30,000. And so in most of the

battles between imperial troops and East Germans from the fourth to the sixth century we find that the opposing numbers were about 20,000 or so on either side. These facts put a different complexion on the whole history of the German invasions and conquests, and show that the problem of the military defence was not at all in itself hopeless or even superlatively difficult, and that if other elements had not entered in there was no reason why the Empire should have been dismembered. The numbers of the Germans did not make it inevitable.

These facts, as to the comparative size of the Roman armies and the German hosts which were opposed to them, are extremely important to grasp in following the course of the East German invasions, and in most histories they have been either passed over or misrepresented. The second important fact which should be emphasised is the gradually increasing power of the army and the consequent growth of German influence, which at first the Emperors did not realise as a danger. It was, in fact, a sort of peaceful penetration.

I may add that a Germanic element had been filtering into the population of the Empire, in certain districts, in other ways. In the first place, we must remember that the western fringe of Germany had been incorporated with the Empire, in the two Germanic provinces of Gaul. The imperial towns of Cologne, Treves, Mayence, were German. In the second place, many Germans had been induced to settle within the Empire as farmers in desolated tracts of country, after the wars of Marcus Aurelius in the second century. And there were settlements in the Belgic provinces of Germans who had come from beyond the Rhine and received lands in return for which they performed military service, and were organised in communities, and were technically called *laeti*. In many frontier districts there was a considerable German population; because lands were assigned to the soldiers who protected the frontiers (the *limitanei*), and as the army became more and more recruited from Germans, the population of a district on a military frontier might become largely German.

We may now return to the Goths, and first of all the Ostrogoths. Towards the middle of the fourth century a great warrior king arose among them, by name Hermanric, who seems to have created a Gothic empire which lasted for a few years and secured him a place in Teutonic legend. He is said to have extended his dominion eastward to the Don and also over the Slavonic peoples—Wends and Slovenes—whose habitations stretched from the Upper Vistula to the Dnieper. It is even stated that his power reached to the shores of the Baltic Sea, to the neighbourhood of the old home of the Gothic people. I should not care to guarantee that this empire of Hermanric touched both the Black Sea and the Baltic, stretching from the mouths of the Danube and Dnieper to the mouth of the Vistula. But there is nothing really incredible in the record that he formed one of those transitory barbarian empires of which there have been several other examples in Europe, fabrics which soon and suddenly dissolved because they had no organisation and could not be consolidated, but owed their existence to momentary conditions.

Meanwhile among the Visigoths something of much more importance was happening than the erection of a transitory empire. A Goth of greater ecumenical significance than Hermanric was busy at work. The first introduction of Christianity among a German people outside the Roman Empire, and the first translation of the Bible into a German tongue, mark the beginning of a new era in the history of the Germanic world. The man who accomplished these tasks, and thus became a maker of history, was not of pure Gothic descent. He was sprung from a Cappadocian family which had been carried into captivity among the spoil secured in one of the Gothic raids in the time of Decius or Claudius. But he had been brought up as a Goth, speaking the Gothic tongue, bearing the Gothic name of Wulfilas. Born in the second decade of the fourth century, he was sent while a boy as a hostage to Constantinople, where he came under the influence of Arian Christians, was ordained as a lector, and when he was not more than thirty years of age was consecrated bishop by the great Arian leader,

Eusebius of Nicomedia, for the purpose of spreading and organising a Christian church in Gothland. He worked in Dacia and made many converts; but the leaders of the Goths were hostile to Christianity, and their persecutions finally drove him to a course which earned for him from the Emperor Constantine the title of a new Moses. He led his band of Gothic converts out of the pagan land, across the Danube, within the borders of the Empire. They were permitted to settle in Moesia, not far from the ancient city of Nicopolis, and not far from the site where afterwards was to arise the Bulgarian city of Trnovo. They were known as the Lesser Goths—*Gothi Minores*. The Arianism of Wulfilas is of great importance, for it determined the form in which the Goths ultimately accepted Christianity, a form which was, we may suspect, simpler for their intelligence than the difficult doctrine of Nicaea. Important as the work of Wulfilas was in actually making converts, it would have been of very much less moment if he had not achieved two great feats as a means for the accomplishment of his mission. One was the creation of a Gothic alphabet; the other was the translation of the Scriptures into Gothic. Of this Gothic Bible we possess some parts; more than half the Gospels, a great part of the Epistles, some small fragments of the Old Testament. By a strange chance the famous ancient manuscript which contains part of the New Testament, the oldest literary monument of the Teuton, is preserved in Sweden—in that island of Scanzia which the Gothic race remembered as its most ancient home.

The alphabet which Wulfilas invented was based on the Greek, but also partly on the runic alphabet; a fact which shows that the runes were in use among the Goths. But we have another highly interesting record of the use of runes by the Goths in their Dacian period. In 1838 a gold ring (now to be seen in the museum at Bucharest) was found at Petrossan in Little Walachia. It bears a runic inscription, of a dedicatory nature: the word *hailag*, ‘holy’ is clear, but about the other words there is doubt. The inscription has been interpreted variously as ‘holy to the temple of the Goths’ or ‘Scythia is holy to Woden’. It is in any case a memorial of the pagan period of Gothic history, and of the Gothic period of the history of Dacia.

The Goths were brought into serious collision with the Empire during the civil war which followed upon the death of the Emperor Jovian in A.D. 364. They furnished help to Procopius, the unsuccessful candidate for the Empire, and on the defeat of his cause they incurred the vengeance of his rival Valens, who sent an army against them, notwithstanding their wish to pacify him. The war ended in a complete triumph for the Empire and peace with honour; and it looked as if for many a long year the Danube frontier would be secure.

Meanwhile there was trouble among the Visigoths themselves. They were passing through that painful and exciting crisis which occurs when an old religion is striving to maintain itself against a new religion which is gradually spreading. With the exodus of bishop Wulfilas and his company, Christianity had not died out in Gothland, and the pagan chiefs, especially one of the most prominent, named Athanaric, were intent upon killing it. It made them indignant to see men of their folk withholding sacrifices from the national gods, insulting the images, even burning the sacred groves. And so the blood of martyrs flowed in Dacia. A religious test was instituted. On feast days statues were carried round the wooden dwellings in every village, and whosoever refused to worship was burned alive. You may read about this persecution in the Acts of the martyr Saint Sabas, which preserve a general picture of its character. Besides the religious strife, there was also political strife arising from the jealousy which flamed between the powerful Athanaric and another judge named Fritigern, whose name becomes prominent in the seventies of the fourth century.

Yet it was a moment at which it behoved the Goths to be united—Visigoths to be united with Ostrogoths, and the two peoples among themselves. Hitherto their wars had been chiefly aggressive. Now they were to be put upon their defence; for a new enemy was already on the horizon, an enemy of Teuton and Roman alike. The nomad hordes known to history as the



Huns appeared in the reign of the Emperor Valens west of the Caspian Sea, and swept over southern Russia.

The Huns belonged to the Mongolian division of the great group of races which also includes the Turks, the Hungarians, and the Finns. It may be called the Ural-Altai race group, and is divided into two great sections, the Uralic and the Altaic. The Uralic section falls into three classes: (1) the Finnic, of which the Finns are the best known representative: (2) the Permian (3) the Ugrian, of which the Hungarians are the most important. The Altaic section falls into several classes, of which one is the Turkish and another the Mongolian. This classification is based on a comparison of the language of these peoples.

It is probable that for many generations the Huns had established pastures near the Caspian and Aral Lakes. It may be considered almost certain that their westward movement into Europe was occasioned by political events in northern and central Asia which set in motion new movements among the nomad peoples. Now we know of a great political revolution in Asia in the fourth century which is the probable explanation of the movements of the Huns. Our knowledge, such as it is, of the early history of central Asia is derived from the annals of China. From these records we know that in the third and early fourth centuries the dominant people in these regions was the Sien-pi, and that towards the middle of the fourth century their power was overthrown by the Zhu-zhu, who succeeded them to the dominion of Tartar Asia, and finally founded a great empire extending from the coast of the North Pacific, from Corea to the borders of Europe. It may be supposed that it was events connected with the rise to power of the Zhu-zhu that disturbed the Huns and induced them to move westward.

The name Huns, Greek *ounnoi*, is generally supposed to be a corruption of the word *Hiung-nu*—the name, meaning common slaves, that was given by the Chinese to all the nomadic peoples of Asia. It is important to understand what nomad life meant in the proper sense of the word; for the word is often used in a loose and inaccurate way, as if it simply meant wandering or unsettled. Etymologically, of course, nomad means a grazer. In the strict and proper sense nomad peoples are peoples of pastoral habits who have two fixed lands far apart and migrate between them twice a year regularly like migratory birds. In central Asia northern tracts which are green in summer supply no pasturage in winter, while the southern steppes, which in summer are not inhabitable on account of the drought, afford food to the herds in winter. Hence arises the necessity for two homes.

These nomads are not people who roam promiscuously over a continent. They are herdsmen with two fixed habitations, summer and winter pasture lands, between which they might move for ever, provided the climatic conditions did not change and they were allowed to remain undisturbed by their neighbours. Migrations to new homes would as a rule occur only if strange tribes drove them from their pastures. The successive immigrations of nomads into Europe—of the ancient Scythians; of the Huns; and of all those who come after them—were due, as has already been intimated, to the struggle for existence in the Asiatic steppes, and the expulsion of the weakest. As to those who were forced to migrate: “With an energetic Khan at their head, who organised them on military lines, such a horde transformed itself into an incomparable army, compelled by the instinct of self-preservation to hold fast together in the midst of the hostile population which they subjugated; for however superfluous a central government may be in the steppe, it is of vital importance to a conquering nomad horde outside it”. These invading hordes were not numerous; they were esteemed by their terrified enemies to be far larger than they actually were. “But what the Altaian armies lacked in numbers was made up for by their skill in surprises, their fury, their cunning, mobility and elusiveness, and the panic which preceded them, and froze the blood of all peoples. On their marvellously fleet horses they could traverse immense distances, and their scouts provided them with accurate local information as to the remotest lands, and their distances. Add to this

the enormous advantage that among them even the most insignificant news spread like wildfire from *aul* to *aul* by means of voluntary couriers surpassing any intelligence department, however well organised". The fate of the conquered populations was to be partly exterminated, partly enslaved, and sometimes transplanted from one territory to another, while the women became a prey to the lusts of the conquerors. The peasants were so systematically plundered that they were often forced to abandon the rearing of cattle and reduced to vegetarianism. This seems to have been the case with the Slavs.

Such was the horde which swept into Europe in the fourth century, encamped in Dacia and in the land between the Theiss and Danube, and held sway over the peoples in the south Russian steppes, the Ostrogoths, Heruls, and Alans. For fifty years after their establishment north of the Danube we hear little of the Huns. They made a few raids into the Roman provinces, and they were ready to furnish auxiliaries from time to time to the Empire. At the time of the death of Theodosius they were probably regarded as one more barbarian enemy, neither more nor less formidable than the Germans who threatened the Danubian barrier. We may conjecture that the organisation of the horde had fallen to pieces soon after their settlement in Europe. No one could foresee that after a generation had passed Rome would be confronted by a large and aggressive Hunnic Empire.

The first appraisal that the peoples of Europe had of the danger which menaced them through the advance of a new and formidable enemy from Asia was the news of a victory which the Huns had gained over the Alans, a people who lived north of the Caucasus and south of the river Don. This was in the year A.D. 372. The Alans were terror-stricken by the appalling nomads, and a larger portion of the nation fled westward, to be ultimately absorbed in the Germanic world, where we shall meet them again in the story of the migrations. The Huns then continued a westward course across the steppes of south Russia, initiating by their impact a movement the great historical significance of which is that it shuffled and displaced the whole East-Germanic world.

First of all the Ostrogoths were subdued. The empire of Hermanric collapsed before the onrush of the Asiatic shepherds who were to form a greater empire than his: the old king is said to have slain himself in despair. The danger was now at the gates of the Visigoths. The Visigoths, under the leadership of Athanaric, advanced to the Dniester and made a stand, but were utterly defeated. The nation as a whole were seized by panic and firmly believed that there was no safety for them north of the Danube. They determined to withdraw southward beyond that river and seek the shelter of the Roman Empire.

This was a very critical decision: it led to events which determined the course of the history of the Roman Empire. Accordingly they sent an ambassador to the Emperor Valens, who was then staying at Antioch, beseeching him to allow the nation to cross the river and grant them lands in the provinces of the Balkan peninsula. It was the year 376. In the meantime their families abandoned their homes and encamped along the shores of the lower Danube, ready to cross the moment the Romans permitted them. The situation was highly embarrassing for the Emperor and his government. It was unique: they had no experience to guide them in dealing with it. It was pressing; some decision must be come to immediately; there was no time for ripe deliberation. The opinion of ministers and councillors was naturally divided, but it was finally decided to accede to the request of the Goths and to receive them as new subjects on Roman soil. The decision was reached with much hesitation and only after many searchings of heart; but we may be certain that the Emperor and his advisers did not in the least realise or imagine the difficulties of the task to which their consent committed them. To settle peacefully within their borders a nation of perhaps 80,000 or more barbarians was a problem which could be solved only by most careful organisation requiring long preparation. In recent times Europe has had some experience of the enormous difficulties of dealing with crowds of refugees, and of the elaborate organisation which is necessary. Take, for instance,

the case of the thousands of Asiatic Greeks who fled from the Turks and sought refuge in European Greece. Here it was simply a case of affording food and shelter to people of the same race, but it taxed the whole resources of the Greek Government to solve it. The problem that met Valens was vastly different and more difficult. Quite suddenly, without any time for thinking out the problem or for any preparation, he was called on to admit into his dominions a foreign nation, of barbarous habits, armed and warlike, conscious of their national unity: to provide them with food, and to find them habitations. The Roman state was highly organised, but naturally there was no organisation to deal with an abnormal demand of this kind, which could not have been anticipated. As might have been expected, when the barbarians crossed the river and encamped in Lower Moesia (Bulgaria) all kinds of difficulties and deplorable incidents occurred. The military and civil officials were quite unequal to coping with the situation, and no wonder. War was the result, a war lasting nearly two years and culminating in A.D. 378 in the great battle of Hadrianople, which is one of the landmarks of history—one of the three most famous disasters that befell Rome in her conflicts with the Germans, the first being the battle of Teutoburg in A.D. 9, when the legions of Varus, the general of Augustus, were annihilated, the second the defeat and death of the Emperor Decius by the Goths in 251. The last Roman historian, Ammianus Marcellinus, ends his work with this battle, and after this year we have to depend—so far as Latin literature is concerned—for the record of the history of the Empire and its German invaders on meagre chronicles, rhetorical verse writers, and incidental notices in ecclesiastical annalists.

The battle of Hadrianople was fought on August 9; the leader of the Goths was Fritigern; the Romans were commanded by the Emperor Valens himself. Valens made the great error of under-estimating the enemy. He was jealous of the military reputation of his nephew and colleague Gratian, a young man who had succeeded his father Valentinian I. as ruler in the west, and had just gained a signal victory in a war against the Alamanni. Gratian was at this moment marching to help his uncle to crush the Goths, and implored him to take no risks till he arrived and they could meet the enemy with combined forces that would ensure victory. Valens decided not to wait but to win all the glory for himself. The battle resulted in the utter defeat of his legions and his own death. It was a disaster and disgrace that need not have occurred.

It is described at length by Ammianus, but it is curious and very disappointing that, though the historian was a soldier himself, he did not tell his readers definitely the number of the forces on either side. So that we do not know precisely how strong the Goths were, or how strong were the Romans. Gibbon has reproduced the account of Ammianus, and you may conveniently read it in his pages (Chap. XXVI). The point I would emphasise here is the importance of the battle in military history. Hitherto in warfare the Romans had always depended on their infantry. It was their main arm, and in regular battles the cavalry was always considered subsidiary and auxiliary to the legions. Other things being equal, the well-trained legions were almost invincible. In this battle the legions had the novel experience of being ridden down by the heavy cavalry of the German warriors. This was a lesson which showed what cavalry could do; and it had an influence on all subsequent warfare. Between the fourth and the sixth century there was a revolution in the character of the Roman armies and Roman warfare. In the fourth century infantry was the arm on which the Romans still mainly relied, and with which they won their victories in the open field; whereas in the sixth century infantry played a small part in their battles, and victories were won by cavalry. For both these centuries we have detailed descriptions of battles, so that there is no doubt on the question, and these descriptions come from exceptionally good sources, from Ammianus in the fourth and from Procopius in the sixth. Now for the intermediate period, the fifth century, we have not a single good account of any battle written by a contemporary, so that we are not able to

trace the change. But it is clear that in the course of that century this change must have come about, to meet the tactics of the East Germans with whom there was constant warfare.

This is a point of considerable interest because until quite late in the Middle Ages, both in west and east, it was cavalry and not infantry with which battles were fought and won. In the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries warfare was again revolutionised by the Swiss pikemen and English archers, who demonstrated that footmen could successfully oppose heavy horse.

After their signal triumph in the field the Goths besieged the city of Hadrianople, which they looked forward to capturing easily and plundering. They could not, however, take it; but the open country of the provinces of Thrace was exposed to their depredations for a couple of years. The war was then brought to an end, and there was a general pacification of the Goths. This was achieved through the military activity and the skilful diplomacy of Theodosius the Spaniard, who was coopted Emperor by Gratian at the beginning of A.D. 379 to take the place of the defunct Valens. The chief obstacle to a peaceful arrangement was Fritigern, who stands out in this episode as the moving anti-Roman force. He desired to wrest provinces of the Empire entirely away as his predecessors had wrested Dacia, and to found an entirely independent Gothic state south of the Danube. After his death, however, the Visigoths were induced, through the successes and skilful dealings of Theodosius, to become subjects of the Emperor—not regular provincials and Roman citizens, but allies on a footing of freedom and semi-independence, still remaining a nation but owing definite obligations to the Emperor. Lands in the province of Lower Moesia, the modern Bulgaria, were assigned to them—the same region in which Constantine had settled their Christian fellow-countrymen whom Wulfilas had led out of Dacia. They were to pay no tribute for the land; they were to receive certain pensions from the government; but they were to serve the Empire when needed as federate soldiers under their own chief. The capitulation was concluded in October 382.

In the future shaping of Europe, this series of events had considerable importance: note

(1) The reception of a whole people within the borders of the Empire, as federates, marks a new stage in the process of German encroachment. It strikes what was to be the characteristic note of the dismemberment of the Empire, namely, disintegration from within.

(2) A new destiny is heralded for Dacia and the lands between the Carpathians and the Danube. Dacia had passed from the Dacians to the Romans, from Romans to Teutons; it is now to pass under the rule of the Huns, and the Hun is the forerunner of other non-European conquerors and lords, first the Avars and afterwards the Magyars.

(3) The Gothic people, which had long ago been politically split up into Visigoths and Ostrogoths, becomes now permanently divided. They are parted for ever, each to go its own way; they will never again have to face Rome together. It was much later before the Ostrogoths began to play an important role in history; but they were to some extent mixed up in the troubles of these years. Driven before the Hun, some considerable bands crossed the Danube near its mouth and added to the confusion and disturbances in Thrace. They were defeated by Theodosius, and he, pursuing the same policy as he pursued with the Visigoths, settled them on imperial soil as federates. Not, however, on the frontier, nor in the neighbourhood of the Visigoths, nor even in Europe; he transported them to Phrygia in Asia Minor. They were, however, only a fragment of the nation, of which the greater part seems to have moved westward towards the middle Danube and the frontiers of Pannonia.

Theodosius fully appreciated the dangers of the Gothic problem, and he pursued unremittingly a policy of conciliation and friendship. He cultivated the friendship of the Gothic chiefs, whom he used constantly to entertain in his palace, and he secured devoted adherents among them, conspicuously Fravitta. There seemed a chance that if this policy were pursued the Goths might gradually become enervated, lose their old restlessness and national pride, and reconcile themselves permanently to the provincial state. But if under the panic inspired by the Hun and the dexterous dealings of Theodosius they seemed to have declined



from their old independent spirit, this spirit was far from being yet extinct; and though some of them were fully reconciled to the privileges of belonging to the Empire, there were others who thought otherwise. This division of opinion was openly manifested when a civil war in the Empire seemed imminent in A.D. 392 on the death of Valentinian II. The Gothic chieftains met and held a debate. The question was whether they would fulfil their obligations as federates and serve in the army of Theodosius in the coming war. One party, led by Eriulf, said that they should repudiate their oaths, and that their interests were not the interests of the Empire; the other party which advocated loyalty was led by Fravitta, and the dispute became so hot that in the end Fravitta killed Eriulf. The historical interest of this debate is that it may be considered the prologue to the decisive event which happened a little later, after the death of Theodosius the Great in 395. The Goths had followed Theodosius in his campaign against the usurper Eugenius, but when the great Emperor died, and was succeeded by two very young princes, they reconsidered the position. It proved to be a turning-point in their history. The parliament of the people met and deliberated. Two motives, so we are told, operated. One was dislike and distrust of the new Emperors or rather of their advisers; the other was the apprehension that if they continued as they were they would become enervated and would decline. In any case it was felt that preparation must be made for emergencies; and that the best preparation was unity and a leader. Accordingly the Visigoths chose a king. They had a family marked out to furnish a king whenever a king should be chosen, the Balthas or Bolds, and their choice fell on Alaric the Bold. This chieftain was now about thirty years old. He had been born in Peuce, an island at the mouth of the Danube. He had taken part in the recent civil war, marching with Theodosius as captain of Gothic federate troops, and had returned with high hope of promotion in the Roman army. He aspired, like other German leaders, to the post of a Roman general commanding legions. He built on promises made by Theodosius, but when that Emperor died the promises were not fulfilled, and Alaric was bitterly disappointed. Another course was opened to him when he accepted the kingship of his people in 395: he was to be a foe and not a defender of the Empire; first in the Balkan peninsula and afterwards in Italy.

Theodosius had left his two sons under the protection of Stilicho, his most trusted general, to whom he had given in marriage his sister Serena, so that Stilicho was the uncle by marriage of the two young Emperors. Their names were Arcadius and Honorius; both of them were weak (but not vicious), and the younger, Honorius, simply feeble-minded. To Arcadius fell the rule of the eastern portion of the Empire; he reigned at Constantinople. To Honorius fell the government of the western portion; Rome was his seat of government, but he generally resided at Milan. The government of the west was entirely in the hands of Stilicho, who was the Master of Both Services, and thus—as I explained before—controlled completely the entire military establishment of that portion of the Empire. For the next thirteen years Stilicho would be the most powerful man in the Roman world.

The power of Stilicho would not turn out to the advantage of the Empire ultimately. He was a German by descent; his ancestors on his father's side were Vandals. He was one of the series of able Germans who in the second half of the fourth century had risen to the highest military commands, conspicuous among whom were Merobaudes, Bauto, and Arbogastes, who was the immediate predecessor of Stilicho as Master of Both Services, and the murderer of Valentinian II. Germans now were coming very close to the throne. Stilicho, as we saw, married the sister of Theodosius, and Bauto was the father of the lady Eudoxia, who became the wife of Arcadius. Thus their son, the Emperor Theodosius II, had German blood in his veins.

The policy of the Emperors of elevating Germans to supreme posts in the army was unfortunate in its consequences. The policy was due to the necessity of making the service attractive to the ablest by the prospect of great power and wealth. But, as it turned out, it was

disastrous. Especially was it a singular misfortune that just at the moment when the Empire had to be defended not only against the Germanic peoples who were continually knocking at its gates, but also against Germanic peoples who had already gained admittance, and when there were two incapable sovrans, its defence should have devolved upon a German, attached though that German was both to the Empire and to the reigning family.

The fact that in the critical moment which the Roman state had now reached the two chief actors—the defender as well as the aggressor—Stilicho and Alaric—are both Germans best illustrates one of the many features in the history of the fourth century—a gradual Germanisation within the Empire. Yet formally—and this is important to remember, and equally characteristic of the situation—formally it is not correct to speak at this juncture of an attack upon the Empire on the part of Alaric and the Visigoths. If Alaric had been told that he was attacking the Empire and seeking to destroy it he would have repudiated the suggestion. The existence of the Roman Empire was almost a necessity of thought to Alaric and all his contemporaries. They might ravage the Roman world and try to force the government to do and give what they wanted; but all their ambitions were consistent with its continuance. The Goths aimed at gaining a satisfactory position within its borders; they did not feel like hostile outsiders. The attitude of the Goths, and of the Germans generally, towards the Empire was the direct result of the gradual Germanisation. They did not regard it as a foe to be defeated, but as a great institution in which they had a natural right to have a place, seeing that men of their own race had already a large part in it. Their hostilities, they might have argued, were less like the hostilities of external enemies and rivals, than of disfranchised classes struggling to wrest for themselves a place in the body politic. Alaric did not feel a stranger in a realm in which Germans held the highest posts and might even intermarry with ladies of the imperial house; a realm for which he had himself performed military service.

After Alaric had been elected king of the Visigoths, he lost no time in striking. He held an assembly, and in it a resolution was taken to march forth and ravage the other provinces of the Illyrian peninsula.

The career of Alaric, which is in some ways one of the strangest episodes in the dismemberment of the Empire, is enveloped in much obscurity. I refer not only to the chronological gaps in the record of what he actually did, but also to his motives and his policy. For fifteen years he was making history, and yet there is almost always room for some uncertainty as to his designs. Now we have a record, which I have mentioned already, that Alaric had aspired to a high command in the Roman army. In other words his original ambition had been to rise to the eminence of power and dignity of a Merobaudes or a Stilicho. The record is so probable that we may readily accept it; and we infer that his acceptance of the kingship of the Visigoths was in some sense a *pis aller*. Remember that the dignity of a German king must have greatly declined in value, in the eyes of the Germans themselves, through long familiarity with the far greater prestige of the Empire. They had become accustomed to see of how little account a *rex* was in the eyes of a praetorian prefect or even of a provincial governor. Starting, then, with the fact that a career in the imperial service had been Alaric's ambition, I think that the clue to his work is that he had claims and ambitions for himself, besides, and distinct from, his claims and designs for his people. For his people the only thing which they desired or claimed was more territory or larger pensions, and if that had been the only object he might probably soon have obtained it. But he had at first another aim for himself personally, and when no place was found for him either in the east or in the west, he could not rest content in the obscure peace of Moesia, but made his power felt as a hostile force in the Empire which had not satisfied his ambitions. That is the way in which I read the beginning of Alaric's career.

The Goths spread desolation in Thrace and Macedonia and advanced close to the walls of Constantinople. The government of Arcadius had no troops sufficient to take the field

against them. For the legions of the field army which were usually stationed in the neighbourhood of the capital had accompanied Theodosius to the west when he had marched against the rebel Eugenius, and had not yet returned. Stilicho, however, was already preparing to lead them back in person. He considered that his own presence in the east was necessary; for, besides the need of dealing with the barbarians, there was a political question in which he was deeply interested touching the territorial division of the Empire between its two sovrans. It is not possible to understand the history of the following years without having the importance of this question constantly in mind—it is the question of Illyricum.

The Prefecture of Illyricum had been before the reign of Theodosius the Great subject to the ruler of the west. It included Greece and the central Balkan lands of the Danube. The only part of the peninsula governed from Constantinople was Thrace. But under Theodosius the Great the prefecture was transferred from the west to the east, and the new line of division between the two halves of the Empire was a line running from Belgrade westward along the river Save and then turning southward along the river Drina and reaching the coast of the Adriatic at a point near Scutari. It was assumed at Constantinople that this arrangement would remain in force and that the prefecture would remain under the control of the eastern government. But Stilicho declared that it was the will of Theodosius that his sons should revert to the older arrangement, and that the authority of Honorius should extend to the borders of Thrace, so that only the Prefecture of the East should be left to Arcadius. Whether his assertion was true or not, his policy meant that the western realm, in which he himself was unquestionably supreme, should have a marked predominance over the eastern section of the Empire.

To change the division of Illyricum at the expense of the east was a political aim of which Stilicho never lost sight, and it is the clue to his career after the death of his master. The importance of Illyricum did not lie in its revenues, but in its men. From the third to the sixth century the most useful troops in the imperial army were recruited from the highlands of Illyricum and Thrace. It may well have seemed that a partition assigning the whole of the great recruiting ground to the east was unfair to the west. Events proved that the legions at Stilicho's disposal were quite inadequate to the defence of the west, and therefore it was not unnatural that he should have aimed at bringing the western lands of the Balkan peninsula back under the rule of the western government.

This was a question on which the government of Arcadius was not likely readily to yield, controlled as it was by a powerful and ambitious minister, Rufinus, the Praetorian Prefect of the East. Stilicho took the precaution of bringing with him some western legions of his own, as well as the eastern troops whom he was to restore to Constantinople. In Thessaly he came face to face with Alaric and his Visigoths, who had reached this country in a devastating march from the neighbourhood of Constantinople. He was just preparing to smite the Goths when messengers arrived from Arcadius, commanding him to send the eastern troops on, but himself to return to Italy. Stilicho obeyed the command, and thereby sacrificed Greece. For there is no doubt that he could easily have crushed the Goths and rendered Alaric harmless. But he sent the troops of Arcadius back to Constantinople under a captain named Gaiinas, a Goth. We cannot say whether he came to any understanding with Alaric; but he certainly had an understanding with Gaiinas. When this officer and his army arrived at Constantinople, Arcadius came forth to receive them a few miles from the city, and he was accompanied by his great minister, the Praetorian Prefect Rufinus. The soldiers of Gaiinas assassinated Rufinus, and there is no doubt that Stilicho had plotted this murder with Gaiinas. Indeed Stilicho took no trouble to conceal his complicity in the act. After the fall of Rufinus, a eunuch named Eutropius, who was the Emperor's chamberlain, became the most powerful minister at Constantinople.

This event happened at the end of A.D. 395. Meanwhile Alaric and his host moved southward into Greece. They occupied Piraeus, the port of Athens, but spared Athens itself; they plundered the great temple of Eleusia, and their visit marks the end of the celebration of the Eleusinian mysteries. Then they passed into the Peloponnese, where all the chief towns fell before them. The Peloponnese was in their hands for more than a year, the year 396, and the government of Arcadius made no attempt to dislodge them. Then in the spring of A.D. 397 Stilicho intervened again. He landed in the Peloponnese and confronted Alaric in Elis. There was some fighting, perhaps only make-believe. In any case Stilicho came to some agreement with Alaric and allowed him again to go free as in Thessaly. It seems that the eastern government intervened, and an arrangement was made that Alaric should withdraw to Epirus and should receive the title which he had long coveted, that of Master of Soldiers in Illyricum. Stilicho's expedition was futile. He was obliged to return hastily to Italy on account of the outbreak of a very serious Moorish revolt in Africa. But his presence with an army in the Peloponnese had caused great anger at Constantinople, and the eastern government declared him a public enemy.

We left Alaric in Epirus, in the summer of 397. He had been appointed by the government of Constantinople to the high command of Master of Soldiers in Illyricum, and for the time being his ambitions seem to have been satisfied. During the next four years he remained quiescent, and his presence, so far as our records go, seems hardly to have affected the course of history. We are not even quite sure where his people lived at this time, whether in Epirus or in regions nearer the Danube; possibly they were still mainly in their old homes in Moesia. In any case they did not disturb the Empire before 401. Till this year Alaric's designs apparently did not travel outside the Balkan peninsula, but from this time onward his eyes were turned towards the west.

The causes of this change are not indicated in our authorities, but there is one thing which had probably something to do with it, a thing which is even in itself of very great historical importance. The Gothic soldier Gaïnas, who was responsible for the murder of Rufinus, the praetorian prefect, aspired to being in the east what Stilicho was in the west. He rebelled against the government of Arcadius, forced it to yield to his demands, and for about six months exercised a power that was almost supreme in Constantinople. But there was a very strong and determined anti-German party there, and they gained a decisive victory over Gaïnas and his Gothic troops; and the danger, which at one moment seemed serious, of a Germanisation of the government in the east was averted. Now we may take it that Alaric had found support in the party of Gaïnas, and that the fall of that general in A.D. 400 altered his prospects. At all events, it was in the year 401 that he determined to bring pressure to bear, not upon Constantinople, but on the government in Italy. It is not improbable that he demanded a settlement and lands for his people in some of the northern provinces of the Prefecture of Italy, perhaps in Noricum.

But in threatening the west he did not act alone. He acted simultaneously, though there is no reason to think that he acted in concert, with a somewhat mysterious German named Radagaisus. Radagaisus was probably an Ostrogoth; he may have been one of the Ostrogoths who had been allowed to settle in Pannonia by Gratian; but perhaps he and his followers had taken up their abode just beyond the frontiers, on the other side of the Danube. Towards the end of 401 Radagaisus and a host of barbarians invaded Raetia and at the same time marched to the borders of Italy. It was a critical moment for Stilicho, on whom the defence of Italy devolved. He marched into the Alpine regions of Raetia against Radagaisus, who seems to have moved first, and he was successful in repelling and driving out the invaders. Then he led his troops back south of the Alps to deal with Alaric and the Visigoths, who had already been three months in north Italy, meeting no resistance and causing the utmost consternation among the Italians, who had long been accustomed to regard Italian soil as inaccessible to



foreign invasion. The young Emperor Honorius was trembling in Milan, and thought of fleeing to Gaul. Alaric had captured Aquileia and all the towns of Venetia, and was already beginning a siege of Milan, hoping to seize the Emperor's person, when Stilicho arrived just in time to relieve it. Alaric raised the siege and marched westward into Piedmont, followed by Stilicho. Finally he halted at Pollentia on the river Tanarus, and gave battle. This was not the only battle that Alaric fought against the forces of the Empire, but it was far the most famous. It was fought on Easter Day in A.D. 402 and was indecisive, but strategically it was a victory for the imperial army and Stilicho.

Alaric's position became untenable, and he marched into Tuscany. Some members of his family fell into the hands of the Romans. He was glad to make terms with Stilicho. We do not know precisely what the conditions were, but it was certainly arranged that the Visigoths should leave Italy, and there was probably an understanding that they should afterwards assist Stilicho in carrying out the plan on which he was set, of annexing the Prefecture of Illyricum to the Western Empire. Alaric left Italy by the way he had come. But for more than a year he lingered near the borders of the peninsula in Istria and Dalmatia; and then becoming impatient, and perhaps being pressed by want of provisions, he again forced his way into Italy, but was met by Stilicho near Verona and decisively repelled. This was in the autumn of 403. A new agreement was made, and Alaric seems to have withdrawn immediately to his old station in Epirus.

The Italian enterprise of Alaric had been a failure. Whatever he wanted, he had not got it. But though a failure it was an important episode in Alaric's career, and that career occupies an important, even unique, place in the story of the breaking up of the Empire.

Wonder has often been expressed that Stilicho did not follow up the check he inflicted on the Goths at Pollentia with more energy, and that when he defeated them again next year at Verona he again let them go. Why did he not strike harder, why did he leave the enemy free to organise new aggressions and prefer new demands? Stilicho was clearly determined to hold the frontiers of the western provinces against the inroads of the barbarians; he did not spare himself in attempting to perform this duty. How are we to explain his indulgence towards the Visigoths and his leniency, which his Roman contemporaries regarded as culpable?

The formation of barbarian settlements within the Empire had been a recognised principle of policy for two hundred years, and it was difficult for anyone in Stilicho's day to conceive that it would ultimately lead to the disappearance of the imperial authority. Such an idea was equally beyond the visions of Stilicho and of Alaric. We can see plainly that the federate Germans within the Empire were as powerful a force of disruption, and more insidious, than the Germans without the Empire. But for Stilicho there was a gulf fixed between the outside enemies who attacked the frontier and the inside strangers who were linked to the Empire. Against the former he was ready to be ruthless, but the latter were on a different footing; they were part of the system of the Empire, they were to be managed rather than crushed. In the heart of Stilicho this feeling would naturally have been stronger than in a minister of Roman descent; for Stilicho was himself sprung from such federate settlers. But beside this general consideration there can be no doubt that there was a particular motive. It was Stilicho's object to keep Alaric within the precincts of the eastern half of the Empire. He was not ready to admit Gothic settlements within the Prefecture of Italy; but the existence of a strong Gothic power in Illyricum suited his policy, and he foresaw that Alaric might in certain eventualities be a useful ally. I have already touched on the hostility which prevailed between the courts and ministers of the two sons of Theodosius, and pointed out that one of the difficulties and causes of discord was the boundary between the two realms. Stilicho and the western government desired to draw the line of division farther east, and to add to the dominion of Honorius, if not the whole Prefecture of Illyricum, at all events the northern portion of it—corresponding to Serbia and the western part of Bulgaria. When the moment

should come for carrying the wish into effect, Alaric's aid might be invaluable. The policy of Stilicho, therefore, was not to crush Alaric, but to keep him quiet, by negotiations and management, in the Illyrian provinces of Arcadius. And for nearly five years after the battle of Verona, 403-408, Alaric and his Goths dwelled under their rooftrees in Epirus, without attempting any new enterprise. In 405 Alaric's former ally Radagaisus descended with a great horde upon Italy; but Alaric took no part in this campaign, and Stilicho's strategy destroyed the barbarians at Fiesole without a battle. Here Stilicho showed that he had no scruples in crushing a German foe.

The invading of Italy by Alaric and Radagaisus led to some important results. The Emperor Honorius had been very nearly captured at Milan and he decided that it was not a safe place for him to live in. So he withdrew his residence and court to Ravenna on the Adriatic, a place much easier to defend against enemies and in the midst of the marshes, and from which, if the worst came, he could easily escape by sea and find refuge at Constantinople. The change was made soon after the battle of Pollentia in 402, and for five centuries Ravenna was politically the most important place in Italy, next to Rome itself.

That was one consequence of these invasions at the beginning of the fifth century. Another result was that a new disposition of the military forces of the Empire was rendered necessary; and this led inevitably to an event which was fraught with the most far-reaching and fatal consequences to the Empire, an event that occurred in A.D. 406.

Italy was no longer safe, and the troops which should have been holding the Rhine frontier were wanted for the defence of Italy and the imperial capital. In the year 406 the Rhine barrier was practically open, and the opportunity was seized by a vast mixed horde of barbarians who streamed across. This was one of the greatest events in the period of the Germanic wanderings, and it brought a larger and more sudden change in the western province than any other single barbarian movement. It begins a new period in the history of the West German peoples who dwelled along the Rhine. Had it not been for the existence of the Roman power, their natural expansion would have long ago carried them westward to the Atlantic; but they had been curbed by the Roman barrier. Now at length the Roman barrier is giving way, and the West Germans will have a chance of encroaching. The important historical fact that I would emphasise is that this change was not brought about by the West Germans themselves. It was brought about by the East Germans; and brought about through operations not on the Rhine frontier itself, but in another part of Europe. It was the movements of Alaric and his Visigoths, of Radagaisus the Ostrogoth and his mixed hosts, that forced the Roman government to denude the Gallic frontier in order to defend Italy. These were the principal causes and consequences of Alaric's first Italian campaign and the invasions of Radagaisus. The imperial power in Gaul receives a blow from which it will never recover; the influence of Italy upon Gaul is reduced and will continue to diminish.

But not only was it owing to the *East* German movements in another quarter that the Rhine frontier was left inadequately protected, but the first great irruption through the barrier was a movement which was principally *East* German. Of those hordes of barbarians who streamed across the river at the end of 406 the most important were East German peoples. The invaders consisted of *four* peoples, two of which, the most numerous and important, were Vandals. The third were Sueves; and the fourth were of non-Germanic race, the Alans. The Vandals were East Germans. They had come, like the Goths, southward from the Baltic shores.

The name Vandal was applied not to a single people, but to several closely related peoples. The two peoples which concern us were the Asdings and the Silings. The Asdings took the name of Vandals, which was doubtless an older name of their race. The Silings also took the same name, and some time in the third century a considerable number of them,

though not the whole people, migrated westward and appeared in the time of the Emperor Probus on the river Main.

The Asding Vandals were then neighbours of the Visigoths of Dacia, and throughout the fourth century there were hostilities between them, which finally resulted in a great defeat of the Vandals. And for a generation we do not hear of them. But about the year 400 their population had increased; their settlements no longer sufficed for their numbers—of this we have explicit evidence. So they determined to migrate, and in 406 took the decisive step at the favourable moment when the Roman troops had been withdrawn from the Rhine. They were joined by a West German people, probably the Quadi, who had belonged to the old Suevic confederacy and took the name of Sueves; also by a non-Germanic people, the Alans, whom we already met driven westward before the Huns. When they approached the Rhine they were further joined by their kinsfolk the Vandal Silings, who, as we saw, had formed a home on the Main. All four peoples poured across the Rhine.

This event was decisive for the future history of western Europe, though the government of Ravenna had little idea what its consequences would be. But Stilicho was at least bound to hasten to the rescue of the Gallic provincials. Instead of doing this, however, he busied himself (A.D. 407) with his designs on Illyricum which the invasion of Radagaisus had compelled him to postpone. The unfriendliness which had long existed between the eastern and western courts had come to a crisis when the ecclesiastics whom Honorius had sent to remonstrate with his brother on the treatment of Chrysostom were flung into prison. It was a sufficient pretext for Stilicho to close the Italian ports to the ships of the subjects of Arcadius and break off all intercourse between the two realms. Alaric was warned to hold Epirus for Honorius; and Jovius was appointed, in anticipation, Praetorian Prefect of Illyricum. Stilicho was at Ravenna, making ready to cross the Hadriatic, when a report reached him that Alaric was dead. It was a false report, but it caused delay; and then came the alarming news that a certain Constantine in Britain had been proclaimed Emperor and had crossed over to Gaul. Once again the design of Stilicho was thwarted. He might look with indifference on the presence of barbarian foes in the provinces beyond the Alps, but he could not neglect the duty of devising measures against a rebel.

Alaric cared not at all for the difficulties of his paymaster, and chafed under the intolerable delay. Early in A.D. 408, threatened perhaps by preparations which the eastern government was making to reassert its authority in Illyricum, he marched northward and followed the high road from Sirmium to Emona. He halted there, and, instead of marching across the Julian Alps to Aquileia and Italy, he turned northward by the road which led across the Loibl Pass to Virunum. Here in the province of Noricum he encamped, and sent an embassy to Rome demanding compensation for all the trouble he had taken in the interest of the government of Honorius. Four thousand pounds of gold (£180,000) was named. The Senate assembled, and Stilicho's influence induced it to agree to the monstrous demand. The money was paid to Alaric, and he was retained in the service against the usurper in Gaul.

But Stilicho's position was not so secure as it seemed. His daughter, the Empress Maria, was dead, but Honorius had been induced to wed her sister Aemilia Materna Thermantia, and Stilicho might think that his influence over the Emperor was impregnable, and might still hope for the union of his son with Placidia. But any popularity he had won by the victory over Gildo, by the expulsion of Alaric from Italy, by the defeat of Radagaisus, was ebbing away. The misfortunes in Gaul, which had been occupied by a tyrant and was being plundered by barbarians, were attributed to his incapacity or treachery, and his ambiguous relations with Alaric had only resulted in a new danger for Italy. It was whispered that his designs on eastern Illyricum only covered the intention of a triple division of the Empire, in which his own son Eucherius should be the third imperial colleague. Both he and his wife Serena were detested by the pagan families of Rome who still possessed predominant influence in the capital. Nor

was his popularity with the army unimpaired. While he and Honorius were at Rome in the spring of A.D. 408, a friend warned him that the spirit of the troops stationed at Ticinum was far from friendly to his government.

Honorius was at Bononia (Bologna), on his way back to Ravenna, when the news of the death of his brother Arcadius reached him (May). He entertained the idea of proceeding to Constantinople to protect the interests of his child-nephew, Theodosius; and he summoned Stilicho for consultation. Stilicho dissuaded him from this plan, urging that it would be fatal for the legitimate Emperor to leave Italy while a usurper was in possession of Gaul. He undertook himself to travel to the eastern capital, arguing that during his absence there would be no danger from Alaric, if he were given a commission to march against Constantine. The death of Arcadius had presented to Stilicho too good an opportunity to be lost for prosecuting his design on Illyricum. Honorius agreed, and official letters were drafted, signed, and sent, on the one hand to Alaric instructing him to restore the Emperor's authority in Gaul, and, on the other hand, to Theodosius regarding Stilicho's mission to Constantinople.

But Stilicho's career was at an end. The Emperor proceeded to Ticinum (Pavia), and there a plot was woven for the destruction of the powerful and unsuspecting minister. Olympius, a palace official, who had opportunities of access to Honorius on the journey, let fall calumnious suggestions that Stilicho was planning to do away with Theodosius and place his own son on the eastern throne. At Ticinum he sowed the same suspicions among the troops, who were discontented and mutinous. His efforts brought about a military revolt, in which nearly all the highest officials who were in attendance on the Emperor, including the Praetorian Prefects of Italy and Gaul, were slain (August 13).

The first thought of Stilicho—when the confused story of these alarming occurrences reached him at Bononia, and it was doubtful whether the Emperor himself had not been killed—was to march at the head of the barbarian troops who were with him and punish the mutineers. But when he was reassured that the Emperor was safe, reflexion made him hesitate to use the barbarians against Romans. His German followers, conspicuous among them Sarus the Goth, were eager to act and indignant at the change of his resolve. He went himself to Ravenna, probably to assure himself of the loyalty of the garrison; but Honorius, at the instigation of Olympius, wrote to the commander instructions to arrest the great Master of Soldiers. Stilicho under cover of night took refuge in a church, but the next day allowed himself to be taken forth and imprisoned on the assurance that the imperial order was not to put him to death, but to detain him under guard. Then a second letter arrived, ordering his execution. The foreign retainers of his household, who had accompanied him to Ravenna, attempted to rescue him, but he peremptorily forbade them to interfere, and was beheaded (August 22, A.D. 408). His executioner, Heraclian, was rewarded by the post of Count of Africa. His son Eucherius was put to death soon afterwards at Rome, and the Emperor hastened to repudiate Thermantia, who was restored a virgin to her mother. The estates of the fallen minister were confiscated as a matter of course. There had been no pretence of a trial, his treason was taken for granted; but after his execution there was an inquisition to discover which of his friends and supporters were implicated in his criminal designs. Nothing was discovered; it was quite clear that if Stilicho meditated treason he had taken no one into his confidence.

The fall of Stilicho caused little regret in Italy. For thirteen and a half years this half-Romanised German had been master of Western Europe, and he had signally failed in the task of defending the inhabitants and the civilisation of the provinces against the greedy barbarians who infested its frontiers. He had succeeded in driving Alaric out of Italy, but he had not prevented him from invading it. He had annihilated the host of Radagaisus, but Radagaisus had first laid northern Italy waste. It was while the helm of state was in his hands that, as we have yet to see, Britain was nearly lost to the Empire, and Gaul devastated far and wide by



barbarians who were presently to be lords in Spain and Africa. The difficulties of the situation were indeed enormous; but the minister who deliberately provoked and prosecuted a domestic dispute over the government of eastern Illyricum, and allowed his policy to be influenced by jealousy of Constantinople, when all his energies and vigilance were needed for the defence of the frontiers, cannot be absolved from responsibility for the misfortunes which befell the Roman state in his own lifetime and for the dismemberment of the western realm which soon followed his death. Many evils would have been averted, and particularly the humiliation of Rome, if he had struck Alaric mercilessly—and Alaric deserved no mercy—as he might have done more than once, and as a patriotic Roman general would not have hesitated to do. The Roman provincials might well feel bitter over the acts and policy of this German, whom the unfortunate favour of Theodosius had raised to the supreme command. When an imperial edict designated him as a public brigand who had worked to enrich and to excite the barbarian races, the harsh words probably expressed the public opinion.

The death of the man who had been proclaimed a public enemy at Constantinople altered the relations between the two imperial governments. Concord and friendly co-operation succeeded coldness and hostility. The edict which Stilicho had caused Honorius to issue, excluding eastern traders from western ports, was rescinded. The Empire was again really, as well as nominally, one. The Romans of the west, like the Romans of the east, had shown that they did not wish to be governed by men of German race, and the danger did not occur again for forty years.

The fall of Stilicho was the signal for the Roman troops to massacre with brutal perfidy the families of the barbarian auxiliaries who were serving in Italy. The foreign soldiers, 30,000 of them, straightway marched to Noricum, joined the standard of Alaric, and urged him to descend on Italy.

The general conduct of affairs was now in the hands of Olympius, who obtained the post of Master of Offices. He was faced by two problems. What measures were to be taken in regard to Constantine, the tyrant who was reigning in Gaul? And what policy was to be adopted towards Alaric, who, from Noricum, was urgently demanding satisfaction of his claims? The Goth made a definite proposal, which it would have been wise to accept. He promised to withdraw into Pannonia if a sum of money were delivered to him, and hostages interchanged. The Emperor and Olympius declined the proffered terms, but took no measures for defending Italy against the menace of a Gothic invasion.

I will not enter into a detailed narrative of the events of the two following years, 408-410—the three sieges of Rome by the Goths, the intrigues of the Roman ministers, the elevation and discrowning of Alaric's Emperor Attalus. I will only emphasise the points which bear upon the purpose and policy of Alaric. He still aimed at two things. He wanted a goodly and permanent territory within the diocese of Italy or Illyricum for his people; and he wished for a high military command for himself. But the first of these two aims was now by far the more important. He did not yet think of planting Gothic settlements in the heart of the Italian peninsula, but rather in the northern parts of the Prefecture of Italy; and he hoped to establish a Visigothic kingdom dependent upon the Empire. His purpose in marching through Italy and attacking Rome was to put pressure on the imperial government to give in to his demands.

Alaric acted promptly. In the early autumn of A.D. 408 he crossed the Julian Alps, and entered Italy for the third time. He marched rapidly and unopposed, by Cremona, Bononia, Ariminum, and the Flaminian Way, seldom tarrying to reduce cities; for this time his goal was the capital itself. The story was told that a monk appeared in his tent and warned him to abandon his design. Alaric replied that he was not acting of his own will, but was constrained by some power incessantly urging him to the occupation of Rome. At length he encamped before its walls, and hoped soon to reduce by blockade a city which had made no provision

for a siege. His hopes were well founded. The Senate was helpless and stricken with fear. The Visigothic host hindered provisions from coming up the Tiber from Portus, and the Romans were soon pressed by hunger and then by plague. The streets were full of corpses. Help had been expected from Ravenna; but, as none came, the Senate at length decided to negotiate. There was, however, a curious suspicion abroad that the besieging army was not led by Alaric himself, but by a follower of Stilicho who was masquerading as the Gothic king. In order to assure themselves on this point, the Senate chose as one of the envoys John, the chief of the imperial notaries, who was personally acquainted with Alaric. The envoys were instructed to say that the Romans were prepared to make peace, but that they were ready to fight and were not afraid of the issue. Alaric laughed at the attempt to terrify him with the armed populace of Rome, and informed them that he would only desist from the siege on the delivery of all the gold, silver, and movable property in the city, and all the barbarian slaves. "What will be left to us?" they asked. "Your lives", was the reply.

The pagan senators of Rome attributed the cruel disaster which had come upon them to the wrath of the gods at the abandonment of the old religion. The blockade, continued a few days longer, would force them to accept Alaric's cruel terms. The only hope lay in reconciling the angry deities, if perchance they might save the city. Encouraging news arrived at this moment that in the Umbrian town of Narnia, to which Alaric had laid siege on his march, sacrifices had been performed, and that miraculous fire and thunder had frightened the Goths into abandoning the siege. The general opinion was that the same means should be tried at Rome. The prefect of the city, Pompeianus, thought it well that the Christians should share in the responsibility for such a violation of the laws, and he laid the matter before the Pope, Innocent I. The Pope is said to have "considered the safety of the city more important than his own opinion", and to have consented to the secret performance of the necessary rites. But the priests said that the rites would not avail unless they were celebrated publicly on the Capitol in the presence of the Senate, and in the Forum. Then the half-heartedness of the Roman pagans of that day was revealed. No one could be found with the courage to perform the ceremonies in public.

After this futile interlude, nothing remained but, in a chastened and humble spirit, to send another embassy to Alaric and seek to move his compassion. After prolonged negotiations he granted tolerable terms. He would depart, without entering the city, on receiving 5000 pounds of gold (about £225,000), 30,000 of silver, 4000 silk tunics, 3000 scarlet-dyed skins, and 3000 pounds of pepper, and the Senate was to bring pressure to bear on the Emperor to conclude peace and alliance with the Goths. As the treasury was empty, and the contributions of the citizens fell short of the required amount of gold and silver, the ornaments were stripped from the images of the gods and some gold and silver statues were melted down to make up the ransom of the city. Before delivering the treasure to Alaric, messengers were despatched to Ravenna to obtain the Emperor's sanction of the terms, and his promise to hand over to Alaric some noble hostages and conclude a peace. Honorius agreed, and Alaric duly received the treasures of Rome. He then withdrew his army to the southern borders of Etruria to await the fulfilment of the Emperor's promise (December A.D. 408). The number of his followers was soon increased by the flight from Rome of a multitude of the barbarian slaves whose surrender he had formerly demanded. They flocked to his camp, and it is said that his host, thus reinforced, was 40,000 strong.

At a conference which was held with one of the imperial ministers at Ariminum he asked for the provinces of Noricum, Venetia, Istria, and Dalmatia. This was a large demand. The cession of Venetia was out of the question. It would have placed the peninsula at the mercy of the Visigoths. They would have held the gates. Alaric can hardly have hoped that his whole demand would be granted. Negotiations were broken off, but presently he reduced his extravagant demand to the province of Noricum. He also required an annual supply of food,

and a Roman official dignity which meant a Mastership of Soldiers. In the circumstances it would have been wise of the government of Honorius to yield; but they now felt themselves stronger; they had been gathering new forces, and Alaric's multitudes were probably in difficulties about their food supply. Hence the terms were refused.

Alaric then marched on Rome for the second time towards the end of 409, and forced the Senate to elect a rival Emperor, Priscus Attalus, who he hoped would be more obedient to him than Honorius. But he did not find Attalus a pliant tool, and after some months he entered into negotiations with Honorius. He could now approach the Emperor with a good chance, as he thought, of concluding a satisfactory settlement. Leaving his main army at Ariminum, he had a personal interview with Honorius a few miles from Ravenna (July A.D. 410). At this juncture the Visigoth Sarus appeared upon the scene and changed the course of history. He had been a rival of Alaric and a friend of Stilicho, and had deserted his people to enter the Roman service. Hitherto he had taken no part in the struggle between the Romans and his own nation, but had maintained a watching attitude in Picenum, where he was stationed with three hundred followers. He now declared himself for Honorius, and he resolved to prevent the conclusion of peace. His motives are not clear, but, whatever they were, he attacked Alaric's camp. Alaric suspected that he had acted not without the Emperor's knowledge, and, enraged at such a flagrant violation of the truce, he broke off the negotiations, and marched upon Rome for the third time.

Having surrounded the city and once more reduced the inhabitants to the verge of starvation, he effected an entry at night through the Salarian Gate—doubtless by the assistance of traitors from within—on August 24, A.D. 410. This time the Gothic king was in no humour to spare the capital of the world. He allowed his followers to slay, burn, and pillage at will. The sack lasted for two or three days. It is true that some respect was shown for churches; and stories were told to show that the violence of the rapacious Goths was mitigated by veneration for Christian institutions. There is no reason to suppose that all the buildings and antiquities of the city suffered extensive damage. The palace of Sallust, in the north of the city, was burnt down, and excavations on the Aventine, in the fifth century a fashionable aristocratic quarter, have revealed many traces of the fires with which the barbarians destroyed the houses they had plundered. A rich booty and numerous captives, among whom was the Emperor's sister, Galla Placidia, were taken.

On the third day Alaric led his triumphant host forth from the humiliated city, which it had been his fortune to devastate with fire and sword. He marched southward through Campania, took Nola and Capua, but failed to capture Naples. He did not tarry over the siege of this city, for his object was to cross over to Africa, probably for the purpose of establishing himself and his people in that rich country. Throughout their movements in Italy, the food supply had been a vital question for the Goths; and to seize Africa, the granary of Italy, whether for its own sake, or as a step to seizing Italy itself, was an obvious course. The Gothic host reached Rhegium; ships were gathered to transport it to Messina, but a storm suddenly arose and wrecked them in the straits. Without ships, Alaric was forced to retire on his footsteps, perhaps hoping to collect a fleet at Naples. But his days were numbered. He died at Consentia (Cosenza) before the end of the year (A.D. 410); his followers buried him in the Basentus, and diverted its waters into another channel, that his body might never be desecrated. It is related that the men who were employed on the work were all massacred, that the secret might not be divulged.

The interest of Alaric's career perhaps consists in this: he belongs to the same class of leaders as those forgotten chieftains who led the Goths from the shores of the Baltic to the shores of the Euxine, and then to Dacia. The migration which he heads is through the provinces of the Empire; we can follow his folk and their wagons, in the full light of day; and the anomaly of seeing within the lands of civilisation a movement such as we associate with

the wilds and forests of Central Europe has lent a particular fascination to the career of Alaric. He was a Christian, he had held office in the imperial service; but we feel that he ought to have been a pagan, and that he was unsuited for posts in the Roman army. He was more competent perhaps to lead a migration than to found a settlement; and he was unequal to coping with the circumstances in which he was placed, though they were exceptionally favourable. He belonged in temper and capacity to an older order of things; he was born out of his due time; but though he failed in his undertaking, he drew upon himself the regard of the whole world.

In his Italian expedition Alaric had been assisted and supported by his brother-in-law, Ataulf. The Goths elected him their king on Alaric's death, and on him it devolved to find an expedient to deliver his fold from the impasse into which Alaric had led them. The new king was different from the old in character and ideas. He at first had less reverence for Roman civilisation than Alaric; he was more devoted to the ways and manners of his own people. But he changed. We are fortunate enough to possess a remarkable testimony as to his ideals. It is preserved by Orosius, a Spaniard, who was a contemporary and who completed his work *Against the Pagans* about 418; and Orosius derived it directly from a citizen of Narbo Martius who had been on terms of intimacy with the Gothic king. This person heard Ataulf say that at one time he had aspired to abolish the Roman name, to turn Romania into Gothia, to make himself a Gothic Emperor. But experience taught him that the Goths were by themselves too lawless and unteachable to be the successors of the Romans, and so he changed his mind: he formed the idea of using Gothic vigour to restore the Roman name, and of being handed down to posterity as the *restitutor orbis Romani*. Thus from having been anti-Roman à outrance, and cherishing dreams which would not have tempted even Alaric, Ataulf became a convert to Rome.

Of his doings in Italy during the thirteen or fourteen months which elapsed between Alaric's death and the entry of Ataulf into Gaul we hear almost nothing. It is hardly probable that he visited Rome and plundered it again; but Etruria was laid waste by him.

Ataulf crossed the Alps early in A.D. 412, perhaps by the pass of Mont Genève, to play a leading part in the troubled politics of Gaul, taking with him his captive Galla Placidia and the deposed Emperor Attalus. The Goths were then involved for some time in hostile operations against a pretender named Jovinus in south-eastern Gaul; here they acted successfully in support of Honorius, and for a moment the authority of that Emperor was supreme in Gaul.

Ataulf then moved westward and established himself in Narbonensis and Aquitania. He took Narbonne, Toulouse, and Bordeaux, and determined to give himself a new status by allying himself in marriage to the Theodosian house. Negotiations with Ravenna were doubtless carried on during his military operations, but he now persuaded Placidia, against the will of her brother, to give him her hand. The nuptials were celebrated in Roman form (in January, A.D. 414) at Narbonne, in the house of a leading citizen. We are told that, arrayed in Roman dress, Placidia sat in the place of honour, the Gothic king at her side, he too dressed as a Roman. We know all too little of the personality of this lady, who was to play a considerable part in history for thirty years. She was now perhaps in her twenty-sixth year, but she may have been younger. Her personal attractiveness is shown by the passion she inspired in Constantius, and the strength of her character by various incidents of her life—such as her defiance of her brother's wishes in uniting herself to the Goth—in which she displayed marked independence. She was in later years to become the ruler of the west.

The friendly advances which were now made to Honorius by the barbarian who had forced himself upon him as a brother-in-law were rejected. Ataulf then resorted to the policy of Alaric. He caused the old tyrant Attalus to be again invested with the purple. Constantius, the Master of Soldiers, went forth for a second time to Arles to suppress the usurper and settle



accounts with the Goths. He prevented all ships from reaching the coast of Septimania, as the territory of Narbonensis was now commonly called. The Goths were thus deprived of the provisions which reached Narbonne by sea, and their position became difficult. Ataulf led them southward to Barcelona, probably hoping to establish himself in Tarraconensis (early in A.D. 415). But before they left Gaul, the Goths laid waste southern Aquitania and set Bordeaux on fire. Attalus was left behind and abandoned to his fate, as he was no longer of any use to the Goths. Indeed his elevation had been a mistake. He had no adherents in Gaul, no money, no army, no one to support him except the barbarians themselves. He escaped from Gaul in a ship, but was captured and delivered alive to Constantius.

At Barcelona a son was born to Ataulf and Placidia. They named him Theodosius after his grandfather, and the philo-Roman feelings of Ataulf were confirmed. The death of the child soon after birth was a heavy blow: the body was buried, in a silver coffin, near the city. Ataulf did not long survive him. He was slain by the private vengeance of a servant (September A.D. 415).

After a short intervening reign Wallia was elected king; and Wallia is an important person in the history of the Visigoths, for it was he who succeeded in marking out the limits of their new kingdom in Gaul. But in order to understand the position of Wallia and his people we must retrace nearly ten years and follow the fortunes of that torrent of barbarians which had poured into Gaul at the end of the year A.D. 406. You remember the names of the four peoples which participated in the invasion: the two Vandal peoples, the Asdings and the Silings, and their allies, the Sueves and the Alans. Crossing the Rhine near the point where the Main joins it, their first exploit was to plunder Mayence and massacre many of the inhabitants, who had sought refuge in a church. Then advancing through Germania Prima they entered Belgica, and following the road to Treves they sacked and set fire to that imperial city. Still continuing their westward path, they crossed the Meuse and the Aisne, and wrought their will on Reims. From here they seem to have turned northward. Amiens, Arras, and Tournay were their prey: they reached Terouanne, not far from the sea, due east of Boulogne, but Boulogne itself they did not venture to attack. After this diversion to the north, they pursued their course of devastation southward, crossing the Seine and the Loire into Aquitania, up to the foot of the Pyrenees. Few towns could resist them. Toulouse was one of the few, and its successful defence is said to have been due to the energy of its bishop Exuperius.

Such, so far as we can conjecture from the evidence of our meagre sources, was the general course of this invasion, but we may be sure that the barbarians broke up into several hosts and followed a wide track, dividing among them the joys of plunder and destruction. Pious verse-writers of the time, who witnessed this visitation, painted the miseries of the helpless provinces vaguely and rhetorically, but perhaps truthfully enough, in order to point a moral: *uno fumavit Gallia tota rogo*. The terror of fire and sword was followed by the horror of hunger in a wasted land.

In eastern Gaul, too, some famous cities suffered grievously from German foes. But the calamities of Strassburg, Speier, and Worms were perhaps not the work of the Vandals and their associates. The Burgundians seem to have taken advantage of the crisis to push down the Main, and at the expense of the Alamanni to have occupied new territory astride the Rhine. And it is probably these two peoples, especially the Alamanni dislodged from their homes, who were responsible for the havoc wrought in the province of Upper Germany.

The barbarians remained in Gaul for more than two years; then in 409 they crossed the Pyrenees and inundated Spain. I ought to observe that the Vandals, like the Visigoths, were Christians, of the Arian creed. They had embraced this religion while they lived on Roman soil in Pannonia, and, as their dialect seems to have been very close to that of the Goths, they

were able to use the scriptures of Wulfilas. It is interesting to find it mentioned that they carried with them to Spain the *Liber divinae legis* and consulted it as an oracle.

Accordingly, when Ataulf led his Goths to the confines of Gaul and Spain, he found Spain overrun by barbarian strangers of whom some, viz. the Vandals, were closely akin to his own people. Thus in Spain and the immediately adjacent regions of Gaul there were (A.D. 413-415) no less than five politically distinct peoples—the Asding Vandals, the Siling Vandals, the Sueves, the Alans, and the Visigoths themselves—seeking to form settlements.

In A.D. 415, when on Ataulf's death Wallia came to the throne, the idea of the Goths seems to have been to occupy the eastern provinces of Spain. But there they found themselves met by the same difficulty which they had to face in Italy, viz. want of food. The land had been overrun by the other barbarians, and the Roman fleet blockaded the ports. Hereupon Wallia resumed Alaric's idea, to cross over to Africa and take possession of the Roman granary. His project met a similar fate. Ships which he sent in advance to the opposite coast were destroyed by a storm, and, whether from superstitious fear or from want of transports, he relinquished his idea, and was perforce compelled to make terms with Constantius, who was near to the Pyrenees. He received a large supply of corn, and in return Galla Placidia, Ataulf's queen, who was still with the Goths, was restored to her brother Honorius. Wallia also undertook to render military service to the Empire by clearing Spain of the other barbarians.

These other barbarians had first of all devastated Spain far and wide, and had then settled down, with the intention of occupying permanently the various provinces. The Siling Vandals, under their king Fredbal, took Baetica in the south; the Alans, under their king Addac, made their abode in Lusitania, which corresponds roughly to Portugal; the Suevians, and the Asding Vandals, whose king was Gunderic, occupied the north-western province of Gallaecia north of the Douro. The eastern provinces of Tarraconensis and Carthaginiensis, though the western portions may have been seized, and though they were doubtless constantly harried by raids, did not pass under the power of the invaders.

Wallia began operations by attacking the Silings in Baetica. Before the end of the year he had captured their king by a ruse and sent him to the Emperor. The intruders in Spain were alarmed, and their one thought was to make peace with Honorius, and obtain by formal grant the lands which they had taken by violence. They all sent embassies to Ravenna. The obvious policy of the imperial government was to sow jealousy and hostility among them by receiving favourably the proposals of some and rejecting those of others. The Asdings and the Suevians appear to have been successful in obtaining the recognition of Honorius as federates, while the Silings and Alans were told that their presence on Roman soil would not be tolerated. Their subjugation by Wallia was a task of about two years. The Silings would not yield, and they were virtually exterminated. The king of the Alans was slain, and the remnant of the people who escaped the sword of the Goths fled to Gallaecia and attached themselves to the fortunes of the Asding Vandals. Gunderic thus became King of the Vandals and Alans, and the title was always retained by his successors.

After these successful campaigns the Visigoths were recompensed by receiving a permanent home. The imperial government decided that they should be settled in a Gallic, not a Spanish, province, and Constantius recalled Wallia from Spain to Gaul. A compact was made by which the whole rich province of Aquitania Secunda, extending from the Garonne to the Loire, with parts of the adjoining provinces (Narbonensis and Novempopulana), were granted to the Goths. The two great cities on the banks of the Garonne, Bordeaux and Toulouse, were handed over to Wallia. But Narbonne and the Mediterranean coast were reserved for the Empire. As federates, the Goths had no authority over the Roman provincials, who remained under the control of the imperial administration. And the Roman proprietors retained one-third of their lands; two-thirds were resigned to the Goths. Thus, from the point of view of the Empire, south-western Gaul remained an integral part of the realm.

The Visigoths had now obtained a permanent home by the shores of the Atlantic. This final settlement of the Visigoths, who had moved about for twenty years in the three peninsulas of the Mediterranean, was a momentous stage in that process of compromise between the Roman Empire and the Germans which had been going on for many years and was ultimately to change the whole face of western Europe. Constantius was doing in Gaul what Theodosius the Great had done in the Balkans. There were now two orderly Teutonic kingdoms on Gallic soil under Roman lordship, the Burgundian on the Rhine, the Visigothic on the Atlantic.

Wallia did not live to see the arrangements which he had made for his people carried into effect. He died a few months after the conclusion of the compact, and a grandson of Alaric was elected to the throne, Theodoric I. (A.D. 418). Upon him it devolved to superintend the partition of the lands which the Roman proprietors were obliged to surrender to the Goths. It must have taken a considerable time to complete the transfer. The Visigoths received the lion's share. Each landlord retained one-third of his property for himself and handed over the remaining portion to one of the German strangers. This arrangement was more unfavourable to the Empire than arrangements of the same kind which were afterwards made in Gaul and in Italy with other intruders (as we shall see in due course). For in these other cases it was the Germans who received the third, the Romans retaining the larger share. And this was the normal proportion. For the principle of these arrangements was directly derived from the old Roman system of quartering soldiers on the owners of land. On that system, which dated from the days of the Republic, and was known as *hospitalitas*, the owner was bound to give one-third of the produce of his property to the guests whom he reluctantly harboured. This principle was now applied to the land itself, and the same term was used; the proprietors and the barbarians with whom they were compelled to share their estate were designated as host and guest (*hospites*).

This fact illustrates the gradual nature of the process by which western Europe passed from the power of the Roman into that of the Teuton. Transactions which virtually meant the surrender of provinces to invaders were, in their immediate aspect, merely the application of an old Roman principle, adapted indeed to changed conditions. Thus the process of the dismemberment of the Empire was eased; the transition to an entirely new order of things was masked; a system of federate states within the Empire prepared the way for the system of independent states which was to replace the Empire. The change was not accomplished without much violence and even continuous warfare; but it was not cataclysmic.

The problem which faced the imperial government in Gaul was much larger than the mere settlement of the Gothic nation in Aquitania. The whole country required reorganisation, if the imperial authority was to be maintained effectively as of old in the provinces. The events of the last ten years—the ravages of the barbarians, and the wars with the tyrants—had disorganised the whole administrative system. The lands north of the Loire—Armorica in the large sense of the name—had in the days of the tyrant Constantine been practically independent, and it was the work of Exuperantius to restore some semblance of law and order in these provinces. Most of the great cities in the south and east had been sacked, or burned, or besieged. We saw how imperial Treves, the seat of the praetorian prefect, had been captured and plundered by the Vandals: since then it had been, twice at least, devastated by the Franks with sword and fire. The Prefect of the Gauls translated his residence from the Moselle to the Rhone, and Arles succeeded to the dignity of Treves.

What Constantius and his advisers did for the restoration of northern Gaul is unknown, but the direction of their policy is probably indicated by the measure which they adopted in the south, in the diocese of Septimania. On April 17, A.D. 418, Honorius issued an edict enacting that a representative assembly was to meet every autumn at Arles, to debate questions of public interest. It was to consist of (1) the seven governors of the seven

provinces, of (2) the highest class of the decurions, and of (3) representatives of the landed proprietors. The council had no independent powers; its object was to make common suggestions for the removal of abuses or for improvements in administration, on which the praetorian prefect might act himself or make representations to the central government. Or it might concert measures for common action in such matters as a petition to the Emperor or the prosecution of a corrupt official.

Such a council was not a new experiment. The old provincial assemblies of the early Empire had generally fallen into disuse in the third century, but in the fourth we find provincial assemblies in Africa, and diocesan assemblies in Africa and possibly in Spain. Already in the reign of Honorius, a praetorian prefect, Petronius, had made an attempt to create a diocesan assembly in southern Gaul, probably in the hope that time and labour might be saved if the affairs of the various provinces were all brought before him in the same month of the year. The Edict of A.D. 418 was a revival of this idea, but had a wider scope and intention. It was expressly urged that the object of the assembly was not merely to debate public questions, but also to promote social intercourse and trade. The advantages of Arles—a favourite city of Constantine the Great, on which he had bestowed a name based on his own or that of his eldest son, Constantina—and its busy commercial life are thus described in the Edict: “All the famous products of the rich Orient, of perfumed Arabia and delicate Assyria, of fertile Africa, fair Spain, and brave Gaul, abound here so profusely that one might think the various marvels of the world were indigenous in its soil. Built at the junction of the Rhone with the Tuscan sea, it unites all the enjoyments of life and all the facilities of trade”.

It must also have been present to the mind of Constantius that the Assembly, attracting every year to Arles a considerable number of the richest and most notable people from Aquitania Secunda and Novempopulana, would enable the provincials, surrounded by Visigothic neighbours, to keep in touch with the rest of the Empire, and would help to counteract the influence which would inevitably be brought to bear upon them from the barbarian court of Toulouse.

The prospect of a return to peace and settled life in Spain seemed more distant than in Gaul. Soon after the Visigoths had departed, war broke out between Gunderic, king of the Asding Vandals, and Hermeric, king of the Suevians. The latter were blockaded in the Nervasian mountains, but suddenly Asterius, Count of the Spains, appeared upon the scene, and his operations compelled the Vandals to abandon the blockade: at Bracara a large number were slain by the Roman forces. Then the Vandals and Alans, who now formed one nation, left Gallaecia and migrated to Baetica. On their way they met the Master of Soldiers, Castinus, who had come from Italy to restore order in the peninsula. He had a large army, including a force of Visigothic federates, but he suffered a severe defeat, partly through the perfidious conduct of his Gothic allies. The Vandals established themselves in Baetica, but it does not appear whether the recognition they had received in Gallaecia as a federate people was renewed when they took up their abode in the southern province (A.D. 422).

We have now reached what may be considered the end of the first stage in the process of the dismemberment of the Roman Empire and the establishment of German kingdoms in the west—about the year 423, the year in which the Emperor Honorius died. At this time there were three German kingdoms in Gaul, dependent on the Empire—federate kingdoms, viz. (1) That of the Visigoths in south-western Gaul. (2) That of the Burgundians towards the south-east. (3) The older federate dependency of the Salian Franks in the north-east on the lower Rhine.

In Spain there were two, viz.: (1) the Suevians in the north-west—Gallaecia. (2) The Vandals, in whom the Alans had been merged, in the south, in Baetica. Three of these five were East Germans; the Visigoths, Burgundians, and Vandals. Two were West Germans; the Salians and Sueves.



In what we may call the second period of the process of dismemberment, in which the Empire had to defend itself against the hostilities and covetousness of all these German dependencies, it was the Vandals, who had now established themselves at the western sea gate of the Mediterranean, who played the most prominent part and most seriously affected the fortunes of Rome.

Africa—far from the Rhine and Danube, across which the great East German nations had been pouring into the Roman Empire—had not yet been violated by the feet of Teutonic foes. But the frustrated plans of Alaric and Wallia were intimations that the day might be at hand when this province too would have to meet the crisis of a German invasion. The third attempt was not to fail, but it was not the Goths to whom the granaries of Africa were to fall. The Vandal people, perhaps the first of the East German peoples to cross the Baltic, was destined to find its last home and its grave in this land so distant from its cradle.

We saw how the Vandals settled in Baetica, and how King Gunderic assumed the title of King of the Vandals and the Alans. He conquered New Carthage and Hispalis (Seville), and made raids on the Balearic Islands and possibly on Mauretania Tingitana. He died in A.D. 428 and was succeeded by his brother Gaiseric, who had perhaps already shared the kingship with him. About the same time events in Africa opened a new and attractive prospect to the Vandals.

To understand the situation I must briefly explain what happened in Italy after the death of Honorius. Constantius, the great general who was supreme in conducting the government during the second half of the reign of Honorius, was, as we saw, responsible for settling the two federate kingdoms in Gaul—Visigoths and Burgundians—and also for settling Spain. He had married the Emperor's sister, Ataulf's widow, Galla Placidia, and had been afterwards crowned Augustus, and elevated to be the colleague of Honorius, but had died before he had been a year on the throne (421). When Honorius died two years later, Galla Placidia and her two infant children, a boy and a girl, were at Constantinople. The boy's name was Valentinian, the girl's Honoria. Valentinian was the natural claimant to the succession, as Honorius had had no children of his own. But meanwhile in Italy a certain civil servant, named John, was proclaimed Emperor, and it was necessary for Galla Placidia, supported by the armies of her nephew Theodosius II., who was reigning at Constantinople, to fight for the throne. John was defeated and executed, after which the child Valentinian was crowned Augustus at Rome towards the end of 425. Thus it came about that for some twelve years, *i.e.* so long as Valentinian III. was a minor (425-437), western Europe was governed by Galla Placidia (formerly queen of the Goths), as regent for her son.

Now during the struggle between the usurper John and Galla Placidia two military men had been prominent, and had taken opposite sides. One was Boniface, the other Aetius. Boniface had supported Placidia; while Aetius had enlisted a contingent of Huns to fight for John. The Huns arrived too late; John had already been captured; but Aetius was able to make terms with the regent and was given a command in Gaul, where he did good work in defending the south against the Goths and the north against encroachments of the Franks.

As for Boniface, who was the military commander in Africa, his conduct laid him open to the suspicion that he was aiming at a tyranny himself. It had been a notable part of his policy, since he assumed the military command in Africa, to exhibit deep devotion to the Church and to co-operate cordially with the bishops. He ingratiated himself with the famous Augustine, bishop of Hippo, and a letter of Augustine casts some welcome though dim light on the highly ambiguous behaviour of the count in these fateful years. Notwithstanding his professions of orthodox zeal, and hypocritical pretences that he longed to retire into monastic life, Boniface took as his second wife an Arian lady, and allowed his daughter to be baptised into the Arian communion. This apostasy shocked and grieved Augustine, but it was a more serious matter politically that, instead of devoting all his energies to repelling the incursions

of the Moors, he was working to make his own authority absolute in Africa. So at least it seemed to the court of Ravenna, and Galla Placidia—doubtless by the advice of Felix, who had been appointed Master of Soldiers—recalled him to account for his conduct. Boniface refused to come, and placed himself in the position of an enemy of the Republic. An army was immediately sent against him under three commanders, all of whom were slain (A.D. 427). Then at the beginning of A.D. 428 another army was sent under the command of Sigisvult, a Goth, who seems to have been named Count of Africa and commissioned to replace the rebel. Sigisvult appears to have succeeded in seizing Hippo and Carthage, and Boniface, despairing of overcoming him by his own forces, resorted to the plan of inviting the Vandals to come to his aid.

The proposal of Boniface was to divide Africa between himself and the Vandal king, for whom he doubtless destined the three Mauretanian provinces; and he undertook to furnish the means of transport. Gaiseric accepted the invitation. He fully realised the value of the possession of Africa, which had attracted the ambition of two Gothic kings. The whole nation of the Vandals and Alans embarked in May A.D. 429, and crossed over to Africa. If the united peoples numbered, as is said, 80,000, the fighting force might have been about 15,000.

Their king Gaiseric stands out among the German leaders of his time as unquestionably the ablest. He had not only the military qualities which most of them possessed, but he was also master of a political craft which was rare among the German leaders of the migrations. His ability was so exceptional that his irregular birth—his mother was a slave—did not diminish his influence and prestige. We have a description of him, which seems to come from a good source. “Of medium height, lame from a fall of his horse, he had a deep mind and was sparing of speech. Luxury he despised, but his anger was uncontrollable and he was covetous. He was far-sighted in inducing foreign peoples to act in his interests, and resourceful in sowing seeds of discord and stirring up hatred”. All that we know of his long career bears out this suggestion of astute and perfidious diplomacy.

The unhappy population of the Mauretanian regions were left unprotected to the mercies of the invaders, and, if we can trust the accounts that have come down to us, they seem to have endured horrors such as the German conquerors of this age seldom inflicted upon defenceless provinces. The Visigoths were lambs compared with the Vandal wolves. Neither age nor sex was spared, and cruel tortures were applied to force the victims to reveal suspected treasures. The bishops and clergy, the churches and sacred vessels, were not spared. We get a glimpse of the situation in the correspondence of St. Augustine. Bishops write to him to ask whether it is right to allow their flocks to flee from the approaching danger, and for themselves to abandon their sees. The invasion was a signal to other enemies, whether of Rome or of the Roman government, to join in the fray. The Moors were encouraged in their depredations, and religious heretics and sectaries, especially the Donatists, seized the opportunity to wreak vengeance on the society which oppressed them.

If Africa was to be saved, it was necessary that the Roman armies should be united, and Galla Placidia immediately took steps to regain the allegiance of Boniface. A reconciliation was effected by the good offices of a certain Darius, of illustrious rank, whom she sent to Africa, and he seems also to have concluded a truce with Gaiseric, which was, however, of but brief duration, for the Roman proposals were not accepted. Gaiseric was determined to pillage, if he could not conquer, the rich eastern provinces of Africa. He entered Numidia, defeated Boniface, and besieged him in Hippo (May to June A.D. 430). The city held out for more than a year. Then Gaiseric raised the siege (July A.D. 431). New forces were sent from Italy and Constantinople under the command of Aspar, the general of Theodosius; a battle was fought, and Aspar and Boniface were so utterly defeated that they could make no further effort to resist the invader. Hippo was taken soon afterwards, and the only important towns which held out were Carthage and Cirta.

During the years 425-429, the right-hand minister of Galla Placidia, the Master of Both Services, was Felix. But Aetius by 429 had won such prestige by his successes in Gaul against the Goths and Franks (though Placidia had never forgiven him for his espousal of the cause of John) that he was able to impose his own terms, and extort from her the deposition of Felix and his own elevation to the post which Felix had occupied. He was appointed Master of Both Services in A.D. 429, and it is said that he at once caused Felix to be killed on suspicion of treachery. Then Boniface returned to Italy, where Placidia received him with favour, and soon afterwards she deposed the hated Aetius, who was consul of the year (A.D. 432), and gave his military command to the repentant rebel, on whom at the same time she conferred the dignity of patrician. Aetius refused to submit. There was civil war in Italy. The rivals fought a battle near Ariminum, in which Boniface was victorious, but he died shortly afterwards from a malady, perhaps caused by a wound. Aetius escaped to Dalmatia and journeyed to the court of his friend Rugila, the king of the Huns. By his help, we know not how, he was able to reappear in Italy, to dictate terms to the court of Ravenna, and obtain for himself reinstatement in his old office and elevation to the rank of patrician (A.D. 434).

In the meantime, during this obscure struggle for power, the Vandals were extending their conquests in Numidia. In spite of his wonderfully rapid career of success, Gaiseric was ready to come to terms with the Empire. Aetius, who was fully occupied in Gaul, where the Visigoths and Burgundians were actively aggressive, saw that the forces at his disposal were unequal to the expulsion of the Vandals, and thought that it was better to share Africa with the intruders than to lose it entirely. Gaiseric probably wished to consolidate his power in the provinces which he had occupied, and knew that any compact he might make would not be an obstacle to further conquests. Hippo, from which the inhabitants had fled, seems to have been reoccupied by the Romans, and here (February 11, A.D. 435) a treaty was concluded. The Vandals were to retain the provinces which they had occupied, viz. the two Mauretaniae and a part of Numidia, but were to pay an annual tribute, thus acknowledging the overlordship of Rome.

Aetius had now firmly established his power, and Galla Placidia had to resign herself to his guidance. Valentinian was fifteen years of age, and the regency could not last much longer. The presence of the Master of Soldiers was soon demanded in Gaul, where the Visigoths were again bent on new conquests and where the Burgundians were invading the province of Upper Belgica (A.D. 435). Against the Burgundians he does not appear to have sent a Roman army; he asked his friends the Huns to chastise them. The Huns knew how to strike. It is said that 20,000 Burgundians were slain, and King Gundahar was one of those who fell (A.D. 436). Thus came to an end the first Burgundian kingdom in Gaul, with its royal residence at Worms. It was the background of the heroic legends which passed into the German epic—the Nibelungenlied. The Burgundians were not exterminated, and a few years later the Roman government assigned territory to the remnant of the nation in Sapaudia (Savoy) south of Lake Geneva (A.D. 443).

Narbonne was besieged by Theodoric, king of the Visigoths, in A.D. 436, but was relieved by Litorius, who was probably the Master of Soldiers in Gaul. Three years later the same commander drove the Goths back to the walls of their capital Toulouse, and it is interesting to find him gratifying his Hun soldiers by the performance of pagan rites and the consultation of the auspices. These ceremonies, however, did not help him. Fortune turned against him. He was defeated and taken prisoner in a battle outside the city. Avitus, the Praetorian Prefect of Gaul, who had great influence with Theodoric, then brought about the conclusion of peace. In these years there were also troubles in the provinces north of the Loire, where the Armoricans rebelled, and Aetius or his lieutenant Litorius was compelled to reimpose upon them the liberty of imperial rule.

In A.D. 437 Aetius was consul for the second time, and in that year Valentinian went to Constantinople to wed his affianced bride, Licinia Eudoxia the daughter of Theodosius. Now assuredly, if not before, the regency was at an end, and henceforward Aetius had to do in all high affairs not with Galla Placidia, who distrusted and disliked him, but with an inexperienced youth. Valentinian was weak and worthless. He had been spoiled by his mother, and had grown up to be a man of pleasure who took no serious interest in his imperial duties. He associated, we are told, with astrologers and sorcerers, and was constantly engaged in amours with other men's wives, though his own wife was exceptionally beautiful. He had some skill in riding and in archery and was a good runner, if we may believe Flavius Vegetius Renatus, who dedicated to him a treatise on the art of war.

From the end of the regency to his own death, Aetius was master of the Empire in the west, and it must be imputed to his policy and arms that imperial rule did not break down in all the provinces by the middle of the fifth century. Of his work during these critical years we have no history. We know little more than what we can infer from some bald notices in chronicles written by men who selected their facts without much discrimination. If we possessed the works of the court poet of the time we might know more, for even from the few fragments which have survived we learn facts unrecorded elsewhere. The Spaniard, Flavius Merobaudes, did for Valentinian and Aetius what Claudian had done for Honorius and Stilicho, though with vastly inferior talent.

The position of Aetius in these years as the supreme minister was confirmed by the betrothal of his son to the Emperor's daughter Placidia, an arrangement which can hardly have been welcome to Galla Placidia, the Augusta. With Valentinian himself he can hardly have been on intimate terms. The fact that he had supported the tyrant John was probably never forgiven. And it cannot have been agreeable to the young Emperor that it was found necessary to curtail his income and rob his privy purse in order to help the state in its financial straits. Little revenue could come from Africa, suffering from the ravages of the Vandals, and in A.D. 439, as we shall see, the richest provinces of that country passed into the hands of the barbarians. The income derived from Gaul, too, must have been very considerably reduced, and we are not surprised to find the government openly acknowledging in A.D. 444 that "the strength of our treasury is unable to meet the necessary expenses".

Meanwhile the treaty of A.D. 435 was soon violated by Gaiseric. He did not intend to stop short of the complete conquest of Roman Africa. In less than five years Carthage was taken (October 19, A.D. 439). If there was any news that could shock or terrify men who remembered that twenty-nine years before Rome herself had been in the hands of the Goths, it was the news that an enemy was in possession of the city which in long past ages had been her most formidable rival. Italy trembled; for with a foe master of Carthage she felt that her own shores and cities were no longer safe. And, in fact, not many months passed before it was known that Gaiseric had a large fleet prepared to sail, although its destination was unknown. Rome and Naples were put into a state of defence; Sigisvult, Master of Soldiers, took steps to guard the coasts; Aetius and his army were summoned from Gaul; and the Emperor Theodosius prepared to send help. There was indeed some reason for alarm at Constantinople. The Vandal pirates could afflict the eastern as well as the western coasts of the Mediterranean; the security of commerce was threatened. It was even thought advisable to fortify the shores and harbours of the Bosphorus. The Mediterranean was no longer a Roman lake.

From the Gothic point of view, a Gothic kingdom had been established in Aquitania, for the moment confined by restraints which it would be the task of the Goths to break through, and limited territorially by boundaries which it would be their policy to overpass. Not that at this time, or for long after, they thought of renouncing their relation to the Empire as



federates, but they were soon to show that they would seize any favourable opportunity to increase their power and extend their borders.

ONE of the most notable achievements of Gaiseric was the creation of a sea-power rival to that of Rome. Nor, after its creation, did the Empire long have to await attack. In the year A.D. 440, informed of the active preparations for defence which were being made for the protection of the Italian coasts, Gaiseric directed his first sea attack against Sicily and laid siege to Palermo. This city, however, successfully defied him. Meanwhile a large fleet had been got ready at Constantinople, and in 441 it sailed for the west with the purpose of blockading Carthage. It appeared in Sicilian waters, and Gaiseric, who had already abandoned his enterprise in Sicily and returned to Africa, was alarmed. He opened negotiations with Rome, and in the next year, 442, a new treaty was concluded. By this treaty Africa was divided anew between the two powers. The division reversed that of 435 and was far more disadvantageous to Rome. The Empire took back the two Mauretanian provinces, and ceded to the Vandals the Proconsular Province, including Carthage, the province of Byzacena (which lay farther east, between the Proconsular Province and Tripoli), and the greater part of Numidia. The most fertile and important portions of the African diocese of Tripoli remained to the Empire.

At the same time, seeing the struggle of the Vandals, and conscious of the growing decline of the imperial power in western Europe, where it was becoming increasingly difficult to defend Roman territory against the numerous enemies who in the shape of *federates* were continually trying to enlarge their own borders, Aetius, in whose hands were now centred the government and policy of the west, decided that the best policy was to cultivate friendly relations with Gaiseric, who was much the ablest of his opponents, and to avoid giving that ambitious monarch any pretext for attacking Sicily again, or Sardinia, or Italy itself; so he prevailed upon Valentinian to consent to a betrothal between his elder daughter Eudocia and Gaiseric's son Huneric. It is probable that this arrangement was discussed at the time of the treaty, though it may not then have been definitely decided. But Huneric was already married. The Visigothic king Theodoric had bestowed upon him his daughter's hand. Such an alliance between Vandals and Goths could not have been welcome to Aetius; it was far more in the interest of his policy to keep alive between these two peoples the hostility which seems to have dated from the campaigns of Wallia in Spain. The existence of the Gothic wife was no hindrance to Gaiseric, and a pretext for repudiating her was easily found. She was accused of having plotted to poison him. She was punished by the mutilation of her ears and nose, and in this plight she was sent back to her father. The incident meant undying enmity between Visigoth and Vandal. Huneric, however, was free to contract a more dazzling matrimonial alliance with an imperial princess.

In the meantime, while Africa was being lost, Aetius was busily engaged in defending Gaul against the encroachments of the Salian Franks in the north, and the Visigoths and Burgundians in the south. We will not consider the position of the Salian Franks till a later stage; nor need we go into the meagre details we have of the hostilities between Aetius and Theodoric I, the Visigothic king, for they did not lead to any noteworthy changes in the geography of Gaul. It must be imputed to the policy and ability of Aetius that imperial rule did not break down in all the provinces by the middle of the fifth century.

It had broken down in the extreme south in Africa; and it had also broken down in the extreme north, viz. in Britain; and the definite loss of these provinces should in my opinion be assigned towards about the same time. The year A.D. 442 is the date of the virtual loss of Africa, for though the Mauretanian provinces remained imperial for more than another decade, the best part of Africa was resigned. The date usually given for the abandonment of Britain is 410, but there is evidence which shows that Roman regiments and Roman officials

were in the Britannic provinces as late as 430. Now according to the native British tradition the Anglo-Saxon occupation began about 428, whereas the Anglo-Saxon tradition which we find in Bede places the beginning of their dominion in 448. But in the contemporary Gallic Chronicle we get another date, *i.e.* 442, and I believe that this is the right one for the withdrawal of the Roman administration and the definite establishment of the Saxon power in the island.

During all these years, from the middle of the reign of Honorius to the middle of the century, Britain was suffering from constant raids not only of Saxons but also of Picts and Scots, and the natives of the south were taking flight from the island to the opposite coasts of Gaul or Armorica. This was the origin of Brittany.

The difficulties which beset Aetius in defending the western provinces were very grave, and were largely of a financial kind; they prevented him from taking active military measures against the Vandals; they compelled him to abandon the defence of Britain and to leave it to its enemies. But, apart from financial difficulties, a great and alarming change in the conditions of Europe had occurred about the year 435. From that year to 454 the European situation was dominated by the power and policy of the Huns.

Hitherto Aetius had been greatly aided in waging war against the Germans by the assistance of the Huns. He was a friend of the Hunnic king, Rugila, and we have seen how Rugila helped him in 433 by subduing the Burgundians. Now the tribes of the Huns were ruled each by its own chieftain, but Rugila seems to have brought together all the tribes into a sort of political unity. He had established himself between the Theiss and the Danube. The treaty which the government of Ravenna made with Rugila, when the Huns withdrew from Italy in A.D. 425 after the subjugation of the tyrant John, seems to have included the provision that the Huns should evacuate the Pannonian province of Valeria which they had occupied for forty-five years. But soon afterwards a new arrangement was made by which another part of Pannonia—apparently a district on the lower Save, but not including Sirmium—was surrendered to them. We may conjecture that this concession was made by Aetius in return for Rugila's help in A.D. 433.

Rugila died soon after the Burgundian war and he was succeeded by his nephews Bleda and Attila, the sons of Mundzuk, as joint rulers. Bleda played no part on the stage of history. Attila was a leading actor for twenty years, and his name is still almost a household word. He was not well favoured. His features, according to a Gothic historian, "bore the stamp of his origin; and the portrait of Attila exhibited the genuine deformity of a modern Kalmuck; a large head, a swarthy complexion, small deep-seated eyes, a flat nose, a few hairs in the place of a beard, broad shoulders, and a short square body of nervous strength though of a disproportioned form. The haughty step and demeanour of the king of the Huns expressed the consciousness of his superiority above the rest of mankind, and he had the custom of fiercely rolling his eyes as if he wished to enjoy the terror which he inspired".

Of Attila himself we have, indeed, a clearer impression than of any of the German kings who played leading parts in the period of the Wandering of the Nations. The historian Priscus, who accompanied his friend Maximin, the ambassador to Attila, in A.D. 448, and wrote a full account of the embassy, drew a vivid portrait of the monarch and described his court. The story is so interesting that I will reproduce some extracts from it:

"We set out with the barbarians, and arrived at Sardica, which is thirteen days for a fast traveller from Constantinople. Halting there we considered it advisable to invite Edecon and the barbarians with him to dinner. The inhabitants of the place sold us sheep and oxen, which we slaughtered, and we prepared a meal. In the course of the feast, as the barbarians lauded Attila and we lauded the Emperor, Bigilas remarked that it was not fair to compare a man and a god, meaning Attila by the man and Theodosius by the god. The Huns grew excited and hot at this remark. But we turned the conversation in another direction, and soothed their

wounded feelings; and after dinner, when we separated, Maximin presented Edecon and Orestes with silk garments and Indian gems.... When we arrived at Naissus we found the city deserted, as though it had been sacked; only a few sick persons lay in the Churches. We halted at a short distance from the river, in an open space, for all the ground adjacent to the bank was full of the bones of men slain in war. On the morrow we came to the station of Agintheus, the commander-in-chief of the Illyrian armies (*magister militum per Illyricum*), who was posted not far from Naissus, to announce to him the imperial commands, and to receive five of those seventeen deserters, about whom Attila had written to the Emperor. We had an interview with him, and having treated the deserters with kindness, he committed them to us. The next day we proceeded from the district of Naissus towards the Danube. We entered a covered valley with many bends and windings and circuitous paths. We thought we were travelling due west, but when the day dawned the sun rose in front; and some of us unacquainted with the topography cried out that the sun was going the wrong way, and portending unusual events. The fact was that that part of the road faced the east, owing to the irregularity of the ground. Having passed these rough places we arrived at a plain which was also well wooded. At the river we were received by barbarian ferrymen, who rowed us across the river in boats made by themselves out of single trees hewn and hollowed. These preparations had not been made for our sake, but to convey across a company of Huns; for Attila pretended that he wished to hunt in Roman territory, but his intent was really hostile, because all the deserters had not been given up to him. Having crossed the Danube, and proceeded with the barbarians about seventy stadia, we were compelled to wait in a certain plain, that Edecon and his party might go on in front and inform Attila of our arrival. As we were dining in the evening we heard the sound of horses approaching, and two Scythians arrived with directions that we were to set out to Attila. We asked them first to partake of our meal, and they dismounted and made good cheer. On the next day, under their guidance, we arrived at the tents of Attila, which were numerous, about three o'clock, and when we wished to pitch our tent on a hill the barbarians who met us prevented us, because the tent of Attila was on low ground, so we halted where the Scythians desired....” (Then a message is received from Attila, who was aware of the nature of their embassy, saying that if they had nothing further to communicate to him he would not receive them, so they reluctantly prepared to return.) “When the baggage had been packed on the beasts of burden, and we were perforce preparing to start in the night time, messengers came from Attila bidding us wait on account of the late hour. Then men arrived with an ox and river fish, sent to us by Attila, and when we had dined we retired to sleep. When it was day we expected a gentle and courteous message from the barbarian, but he again bade us depart if we had no further mandates beyond what he already knew. We made no reply, and prepared to set out, though Bigilas insisted that we should feign to have some other communication to make. When I saw that Maximin was very dejected, I went to Scottas (one of the Hun nobles, brother of Onegesius), taking with me Eusticius, who understood the Hun language. He had come with us to Scythia, not as a member of the embassy, but on business with Constantius, an Italian whom Aetius had sent to Attila to be that monarch’s private secretary. I informed Scottas, Busticius acting as interpreter, that Maximin would give him many presents if he would procure him an interview with Attila; and, moreover, that the embassy would not only conduce to the public interests of the two powers, but to the private interest of Onegesius, for the Emperor desired that he should be sent as an ambassador to Byzantium, to arrange the disputes of the Huns and Romans, and that there he would receive splendid gifts. As Onegesius was not present it was for Scottas, I said, to help us, or rather help his brother, and at the same time prove that the report was true which ascribed to him an influence with Attila equal to that possessed by his brother. Scottas mounted his horse and rode to Attila's tent, while I returned to Maximin, and found him in a state of perplexity and anxiety, lying on the grass with Bigilas. I described my

interview with Scottas, and bade him make preparations for an audience of Attila. They both jumped up, approving of what I had done, and recalled the men who had started with the beasts of burden. As we were considering what to say to Attila, and how to present the Emperor's gifts, Scottas came to fetch us, and we entered Attila's tent, which was surrounded by a multitude of barbarians. We found Attila sitting on a wooden chair. We stood at a little distance and Maximin advanced and saluted the barbarian, to whom he gave the Emperor's letter, saying that the Emperor prayed for the safety of him and his".

I will give you now another extract, a description of the banquet which Attila gave:

"The cup-bearers gave us a cup, according to the national custom, that we might pray before we sat down. Having tasted the cup, we proceeded to take our seats; all the chairs were ranged along the walls of the room on either side. Attila sat in the middle on a couch; a second couch was set behind him, and from it steps led up to his bed, which was covered with linen sheets and wrought coverlets for ornament, such as Greeks (1) and Romans use to deck bridal beds. The places on the right of Attila were held chief in honour, those on the left, where we sat, were only second. Berichus, a noble among the Scythians, sat on our side, but had the precedence of us. Onegesius sat on a chair on the right of Attila's couch, and over against Onegesius on a chair sat two of Attila's sons; his eldest son sat on his couch, not near him, but at the extreme end, with his eyes fixed on the ground, in shy respect for his father. When all were arranged, a cup-bearer came and handed Attila a wooden cup of wine. He took it, and saluted the first in precedence, who, honoured by the salutation, stood up, and might not sit down until the king, having tasted or drained the wine, returned the cup to the attendant. All the guests then honoured Attila in the same way, saluting him, and then tasting the cups; but he did not stand up. Each of us had a special cup-bearer, who would come forward in order to present the wine, when the cup-bearer of Attila had retired. When the second in precedence and those next to him had been honoured in like manner, Attila toasted us in the same way according to the order of the seats. When this ceremony was over the cupbearers retired, and tables, large enough for three or four, or even more, to sit at, were placed next the table of Attila, so that each could take of the food on the dishes without leaving his seat. The attendant of Attila first entered with a dish full of meat, and behind him came the other attendants with bread and viands, which they laid on the tables. A luxurious meal, served on silver plate, had been made ready for us and the barbarian guests, but Attila ate nothing but meat on a wooden trencher. In everything else, too, he showed himself temperate; his cup was of wood, while to the guests were given goblets of gold and silver. His dress too, was quite simple, affecting only to be clean. The sword he carried at his side, the latchets of his Scythian shoes, the bridle of his horse were not adorned, like those of the other Scythians, with gold or gems or anything costly. When the viands of the first course had been consumed we all stood up, and did not resume our seats until each one, in the order before observed, drank to the health of Attila in the goblet of wine presented to him. We then sat down, and a second dish was placed on each table with eatables of another kind. After this course the same ceremony was observed as after the first. When evening fell torches were lit, and two barbarians coming forward in front of Attila sang songs they had composed, celebrating his victories and deeds of valour in war. And of the guests, as they looked at the singers, some were pleased with the verses, others reminded of wars were excited in their souls, while yet others, whose bodies were feeble with age and their spirits compelled to rest, shed tears. After the songs a Scythian, whose mind was deranged, appeared, and by uttering outlandish and senseless words forced the company to laugh. After him Zerkon, the Moorish dwarf, entered. He had been sent by Attila as a gift to Aetius, and Edecon had persuaded him to come to Attila in order to recover his wife, whom he had left behind him in Scythia; the lady was a Scythian whom he had obtained in marriage through the influence of his patron Bleda. He did not succeed in recovering her, for Attila was angry with him for returning. On



the occasion of the banquet he made his appearance, and threw all except Attila into fits of unquenchable laughter by his appearance, his dress, his voice, and his words, which were a confused jumble of Latin, Hunnic, and Gothic. Attila, however, remained immovable and of unchanging countenance, nor by word or act did he betray anything approaching to a smile of merriment except at the entry of Ernas, his youngest son, whom he pulled by the cheek, and gazed on with a calm look of satisfaction. I was surprised that he made so much of this son, and neglected his other children; but a barbarian who sat beside me and knew Latin, bidding me not reveal what he told, gave me to understand that prophets had forewarned Attila that his race would fall, but would be restored by this boy. When the night had advanced we retired from the banquet, not wishing to assist further at the potations”.

Since their entry into Europe the Huns had changed in some important ways their life and institutions. They were still a pastoral people; they did not learn to practise tillage; but on the Danube and the Theiss the nomadic habits of the Asiatic steppes were no longer appropriate or necessary. And when they became a political power and had dealings with the Roman Empire—dealings in which diplomacy was required as well as the sword—they found themselves compelled to adapt themselves, however crudely, to the habits of more civilised communities. Attila found that a private secretary who knew Latin was indispensable, and Roman subjects were hired to fill the post. But the most notable fact in the history of the Huns at this period is the ascendancy which their German subjects appear to have gained over them. The most telling sign of this influence is the curious circumstance that some of their kings were called by German names. The names of *Rugila*, *Mundzuk* (Attila's father), and *Attila* are all German or Germanised. This fact clearly points to intermarriages, but it is also an unconscious acknowledgment by the Huns that their vassals were higher in the scale of civilisation than themselves. If the political situation had remained unchanged for another fifty years the Asiatic invader would probably have been as thoroughly Teutonised as were the Alans, whom the Romans had now come to class among the Germanic peoples.

From A.D. 445 to 450 Attila was at the height of his power: his prestige and influence in Europe were enormous. Up to 448 he exercised his might mainly at the expense of the *eastern* half of the Empire, *i.e.* the provinces and subjects of Theodosius II., from whose government he extorted very large yearly payments of gold. If the western provinces of the Empire until this date escaped the depredations of the Huns, this immunity was mainly due to the personality and policy of Aetius, who always kept on friendly terms with the rulers. But a curious incident happened, when Attila was at the height of his power, which diverted his rapacity from the east to the west, and filled his imagination with a new vision of dominion.

Of the court of Valentinian, of the Emperor's private life, of his relations to his wife and his mother, we know no details. We have seen that he was intellectually and morally feeble, as unfitted for the duties of the throne as had been his uncles Honorius and Arcadius. But his sister Justa Grata Honoria had inherited from her mother some of the qualities we should expect to find in a granddaughter of Theodosius and a great-granddaughter of the first Valentinian. Like Galla Placidia, she was a woman of ambition and self-will. She had been elevated to the rank of an Augusta probably about the same time that the imperial title had been conferred on her brother. During her girlhood, and until Valentinian's marriage, her position in the court was important, but when her nieces were born she had the chagrin of realising that henceforward, from a political and dynastic point of view, she would have to play an obscure part. She would not be allowed to marry anyone except a thoroughly safe man who could be relied upon to entertain no designs upon the throne. We can understand that it must have been highly disagreeable to a woman of her character to see the power in the hands of her brother, immeasurably inferior to herself in brain and energy. She probably felt herself quite as capable of conducting affairs of state as her mother had proved herself to be.

She had passed the age of thirty when her discontent issued in action. She had a separate establishment of her own, within the precincts of the palace, and a comptroller or steward to manage it. His name was Eugenius, and with him she had an amorous intrigue in A.D. 449. She may have been in love with him, but love was subsidiary to the motive of ambition. She designed him to be her instrument in a plot to overthrow her detested brother. The intrigue was discovered, and her paramour was put to death. She was herself driven from the palace, and betrothed compulsorily to a certain Flavius Bassus Herculanus, a rich senator of excellent character, whose sobriety assured the Emperor that a dangerous wife would be unable to draw him into revolutionary schemes. The idea of this union was hateful to Honoria and she bitterly resented the compulsion. She decided to turn for help to a barbarian power. She despatched by the hands of a trustworthy eunuch, Hyacinthus, her ring and a sum of money to Attila, asking him to come to her assistance and prevent the hateful marriage. Attila was the most powerful monarch in Europe, and she boldly chose him to be her champion.

The proposal of the Augusta Honoria was welcome to Attila, and was to determine his policy for the next three years. The message probably reached him in the spring of A.D. 450. The ring had been sent to show that the message was genuine, but Attila interpreted, or chose to interpret, it as a proposal of marriage. He claimed her as his bride, and demanded that half the territory over which Valentinian ruled should be surrendered as her dowry. At the same time he made preparations to invade the western provinces. He addressed his demand not to Valentinian but to the senior Emperor, Theodosius, and Theodosius immediately wrote to Valentinian advising him to hand over Honoria to the Hun. Valentinian was furious. Hyacinthus was tortured to reveal all the details of his mistress's treason, and then beheaded. Galla Placidia had much to do to prevail upon her son to spare his sister's life. When Attila heard how she had been treated, he sent an embassy to Ravenna to protest; the lady, he said, had done no wrong, she was affianced to him, and he would come to enforce her right to a share in the Empire. Attila longed to extend his sway to the shores of the Atlantic, and he would now be able to pretend that Gaul was the portion of Honoria.

Meanwhile Theodosius had died and his successor, the warlike Marcian, refused in the autumn of A.D. 450 to continue to pay the annual tribute to the Huns. This determined attitude may have helped to decide Attila to turn his arms against the weak realm of Valentinian instead of renewing his attacks upon the exhausted Illyrian lands which he had so often wasted. There was another consideration which urged him to a Gallic campaign. The king of the Vandals had sent many gifts to the king of the Huns and used all his craft to stir him up against the Visigoths. Gaiseric feared the vengeance of Theodoric for the shameful treatment of his daughter, and longed to destroy or weaken the Visigothic nation. We are told by a contemporary writer, who was well informed concerning the diplomatic intrigues at the Hun court, that Attila invaded Gaul "to oblige Gaiseric". But that was only one of his motives. Attila was too wary to unveil his intentions. It was his object to guard against the possibility of the cooperation of the Goths and Romans, and he pretended to be friendly to both. He wrote to Toulouse that his expedition was aimed against the enemies of the Goths, and to Ravenna that he proposed to smite the foes of Rome.

Early in A.D. 451 he set forth with a large army, composed not only of his own Huns, but of the forces of all his German subjects. Prominent among these were the Gepids, from the mountains of Dacia, under their king Ardaric; the Ostrogoths under their three chieftains, Walamir, Thiudemir, and Widimir; the Rugians from the regions of the upper Theiss; the Scirians from Galicia; the Heruls from the shores of the Euxine; the Thuringians, Alans, and others. When they reached the Rhine they were joined by the division of the Burgundians who dwelled to the east of that river and by a portion of the Ripuarian Franks. The army poured into the Belgic provinces, took Metz (April 7), captured many other cities, and laid waste the land. It is not clear whether Aetius had really been lulled into security by the letter of Attila

disclaiming any intention of attacking Roman territory. Certainly his preparations seem to have been hurried and made only at the last moment. The troops which he was able to muster were inadequate to meet the huge army of the invader. The federate Salian Franks, some of the Ripuarians, the federate Burgundians of Savoy, and the Celts of Armorica obeyed his summons. But the chance of safety and victory depended on securing the cooperation of the Visigoths, who had decided to remain neutral.

Avitus was chosen by Aetius to undertake the mission of persuading Theodoric. He was successful; but it has been questioned whether his success was due so much to his diplomatic arts as to the fact that Attila was already turning his face towards the Loire. There was a settlement of Alans in the neighbourhood of Valence, and their king had secretly agreed to help Attila to the possession of that city. The objective then of Attila was Orleans, and the first strategic aim of the hastily cemented arrangement between the Romans and Goths was to prevent him from reaching it. The accounts of what happened are contradictory. The truth seems to be that the forces of the allies—the mixed army of Aetius, and the Visigothic host under Theodoric, who was accompanied by his son Thorismund—reached the city before the Huns arrived, and Attila saw that he would only court disaster if he attempted to assault their strongly fortified camp. No course was open but retreat. Aetius had won a bloodless strategic victory (summer, A.D. 451).

It is generally supposed that Attila laid siege to Orleans; but there are two versions. According to one, he was on the point of capturing it when the Roman and Gothic armies appeared, and saved it at the last moment. According to the other, the Huns were already in the town when the rescuers arrived and drove them out. Our sources for both these accounts are certainly derived from ecclesiastical tradition at Orleans; in both of them, the interest is concentrated not on the historical circumstances, but on the wonderful things which were done by the bishop of Orleans, St. Anianus. The tradition used to carry some weight as of early origin, but it was shown some years ago by Krusch to have been a compilation of the eighth century. Our two accounts are simply variants of the same ecclesiastical tradition, which glorified the deeds of St. Anianus. Are we to choose between these two variants? To my mind, it is entirely uncritical to make such a choice, seeing that the whole tradition is suspicious on account of the obvious motive which it flaunts. There is a third alternative: both accounts may be false. Now when we turn to Jordanes (who wrote a century later), we find not a single word about a siege of Orleans. Orleans comes into the story, but the story, as he tells it, not only omits but clearly excludes a siege. In Jordanes we find Aetius doing exactly what we should have expected; we find him fortifying and strengthening Orleans, before Attila's approach, before there is any collision between the two armies. The relation of Jordanes, as I read it, implies that the army of Aetius and his allies rested on Orleans to oppose the advance of the Huns; and that Attila was not only unable to attack Orleans, but did not venture to advance against a combination more powerful than he had anticipated. He retreated eastward by Tricasses (Troyes). This, I have little doubt, is the true outline of what happened. Orleans was threatened but never besieged—never attacked. But the citizens must have been for some time agitated with the excitement of dread at the approach of a great danger, and in those days of apprehension we may well believe that the bishop of Orleans, Anianus, exercised a beneficial influence in calming the minds of his fellow-citizens and sustaining their bewildered spirits with the hope of divine protection. If the conspicuous activity of the bishop at this crisis produced a deep and abiding effect on the men of Orleans, it is quite in accordance with the growth of legend, of ecclesiastical legend, that the tradition of his good work should have been enhanced, should have been made striking, sensational, and miraculous, by representing the city in the supreme agony of danger—about to be captured or even already captured—and saved by the prayers of the saint. In supporting this view, I may point out that the invasion of Gaul by the Huns stimulated not only the

mythopoeic imagination of the Germans, but the mythopoeic inventiveness of the Church. There were probably few cities that came within the actual or possible range of Attila's arm that had not some tale to tell of miraculous intervention. At Paris, which Attila did not approach at all, it was said that St. Geneviève assured the citizens that there was no danger.

It was not enough for the allies to have checked and turned back the invader: they must strike him if possible in his retreat. They overtook him at Troyes, an important meeting-place of roads, and a battle was fought north of the city at the *locus Mauriacus*—which cannot be identified with certainty, but may perhaps be near Mery. The battle, which began in the afternoon and lasted into the night, was drawn; there was immense slaughter, and king Theodoric was among the slain. Next day, the Romans found that Attila was strongly entrenched behind his wagons, and it was said that he had prepared a funeral pyre in which he might perish rather than fall into the hands of his foes. Thorismund, burning to avenge his father's death, was eager to storm the entrenchment. But this did not recommend itself to the policy of Aetius. It was not part of his design to destroy the Hunnic power, of which throughout his career he had made constant use in the interests of the Empire; nor did he desire to increase the prestige of his Visigothic allies. He persuaded Thorismund to return with all haste to Toulouse, lest his brothers should avail themselves of his absence to contest his succession to the kingship. He also persuaded the Franks to return immediately to their own land. Disembarrassed of these auxiliaries, he was able to pursue his own policy and permit Attila to escape with the remnant of his host.

This battle has been generally misnamed the battle of Chalons, but Chalons (Catalauni) is far away; it would be much more correct to call it the battle of Troyes. Both sides sustained great losses, but in the given circumstances it was a triumph for the defenders of Gaul, and it hastened the retreat of the invader. But I would have you observe that strategically it only reinforced the check which the Huns had already received, and merely accelerated their departure. It inflicted an actual blow by the losses which at the lowest estimate must have been heavy; but its chief importance was undoubtedly the moral injury which it dealt to the prestige of Attila's power. If Aetius had permitted him to retreat, unassailed and at his leisure, the moral effect of the check would have been infinitely smaller; and this was probably the main consideration which influenced Aetius in courting a battle. It is essential to realise that the battle of the *locus Mauriacus* was not a battle of despair; and I think that we may be certain that the odds were not against Aetius, or he would not have risked it.

Under this criticism, the battle cannot retain precisely the historical significance which has commonly been claimed for it. It is usually ranked among the great battles which have decided the fates of nations and determined the course of history. But the fate of Attila's invasion was decided before the battle was fought; it was decided by the strategic dispositions of Aetius. Nothing but an annihilating victory for Attila would have changed the situation, and on general grounds it is improbable that Aetius plunged into very serious risks or hazards. His strategy had already been decisively superior, and all our evidence seems to me to point to the fact that Attila had no great strategical talent. Contrast the futility of this Mongolian invasion of Gaul with the splendidly conceived and splendidly executed strategy which marked the great invasion of eastern Europe in the middle of the thirteenth century. Such a contrast illustrates the truth of what I say, that Attila was no strategist—a fact which has not been hitherto duly estimated.

But if we deny to the battle of Troyes its claim to be one of the great decisive battles of history, you will expect me to transfer to the whole campaign the significance which I have ventured to deny to the isolated engagement. But can the invasion and the campaign regarded as a whole be said to assume the proportions of an ecumenical crisis? The danger did not mean so much as has been commonly assumed. If Attila had been victorious; if he had defeated the Romans and the Goths at Orleans; if he had held Gaul at his mercy and had



translated—and we have no evidence that this was his design—the seat of his government and the abode of his people from the Theiss to the Seine or the Loire, there is no reason to suppose that the course of history would have been seriously altered. For the rule of the Huns in Gaul could only have been a matter of a year or two; it could not have survived the death of the great king on whose brains and personal character it depended. Without depreciating the achievement of Aetius and Theodoric, we must recognise that at worst the danger they averted was of a totally different order from the issues which were at stake on the fields of Plataea and the Metaurus. If Attila had succeeded in his campaign, he would probably have been able to compel the surrender of Honoria, and if a son had been born of their marriage and proclaimed Augustus in Gaul, the Hun might have been able to exercise considerable influence on the fortunes of that country; but that influence would probably not have been anti-Roman.

Attila lost little time in seeking to take revenge for the unexpected blow which had been dealt him. He again came forward as the champion of the Augusta Honoria, claiming her as his affianced bride, and invaded Italy in the following year (A.D. 452). Aquileia, the city of the Venetian march, now fell before the Huns, and was razed to the ground, never to rise again: in the next century hardly a trace of it could be seen. Verona and Vicentia did not share this fate, but they were exposed to the violence of the invader, while Ticinum and Mediolanum were compelled to purchase exemption from fire and sword.

The path of Attila was now open to Rome. Aetius, with whatever forces he could muster, might hang upon his line of march, but was not strong enough to risk a battle. But the lands south of the Po, and Rome herself, were spared the presence of the Huns. According to tradition, the thanks of Italy were on this occasion due not to Aetius, but to Leo, the bishop of Rome. The Emperor, who was at Rome, sent Leo and two leading senators, Avienus and Trygetius, to negotiate with the invader. Trygetius had diplomatic experience; he had negotiated the treaty with Gaiseric in A.D. 435. Leo was an imposing figure, and the story gives him the credit for having persuaded Attila to retreat. He was supported by celestial beings; the apostles Peter and Paul are said to have appeared to Attila and by their threats terrified him into leaving the soil of Italy.

The fact of the embassy cannot be doubted. The distinguished ambassadors visited the Huns' camp near the south shore of Lake Garda. It is also certain that Attila suddenly retreated. But we are at a loss to know what considerations were offered him to induce him to depart. It is unreasonable to suppose that this heathen king would have cared for the thunders or persuasions of the Church. The Emperor refused to surrender Honoria, and it is not recorded that money was paid. A trustworthy chronicle hands down another account which does not conflict with the fact that an embassy was sent, but evidently furnishes the true reasons which moved Attila to receive it favourably. Plague broke out in the barbarian host and their food ran short, and at the same time troops arrived from the east, sent by Marcian to the aid of Italy. If his host was suffering from pestilence, and if troops arrived from the east, we can understand that Attila was forced to withdraw. But, whatever terms were arranged, he did not pretend that they meant a permanent peace. The question of Honoria was left unsettled, and he threatened that he would come again and do worse things in Italy unless she were given up with the due portion of the imperial possessions.

Attila survived his Italian expedition only one year. His attendants found him dead one morning, and the bride whom he had married the day before sitting beside his bed in tears. His death was ascribed to the bursting of an artery, but it was also rumoured that he had been slain by the woman in his sleep.

With the death of Attila, the Empire of the Huns, which had no natural cohesion, was soon scattered to the winds. Among the dead king's numerous children there was none of commanding ability, none who had the strength to remove his brothers and step into his

father's place. Hence the sons proposed to divide the inheritance into portions. This was the opportunity of their German vassals, who did not choose to allow themselves to be allotted to various masters like herds of cattle. The rebellion was led by Ardaric, the Gepid, Attila's chief adviser. In Pannonia near the river Nedao another battle of the nations was fought, and the coalition of German vassals—Gepids, Ostrogoths, Rugians, Heruls, and the rest—utterly defeated the host of their Hun lords (A.D. 454). It is not improbable that the Germans received encouragement and support from the Emperor Marcian.

This cardinal event led to considerable changes in the geographical distribution of the barbarian peoples. The Huns themselves were scattered far and wide. Some remained in the west, but the greater part of them fled to the regions north of the lower Danube, where we shall presently find them, under two of Attila's sons, playing a part in the troubled history of the Thracian provinces. The Gepids extended their power over the whole of Dacia (Siebenburgen), along with the plains between the Theiss and the Danube which had been the habitation of the Huns. The Emperor Marcian was deeply interested in the new disposition of the German nations, and his diplomacy aimed at arranging them in such a way that they would mutually check each other. He seems to have made an alliance with the Gepids which proved exceptionally permanent. He assigned to the Ostrogoths settlements in northern Pannonia, as federates of the Empire. The Rugians found new abodes on the north banks of the Danube, opposite to Noricum, where they also were for some years federates of Rome. The Scirians settled farther east, and were the northern neighbours and foes of the Ostrogoths in Pannonia; and the Heruls found territory in the same vicinity—perhaps between the Scirians and Rugians. But from all these peoples there was a continual flow into the Roman Empire of men seeking military service. In the depopulated provinces of Illyricum and Thrace there was room and demand for new settlers. Rugians were settled in Bizye and Arcadiopolis; Scirians in Lower Moesia.

The battle of the Nedao was an arbitrament far more momentous than the battle of Troyes. The catastrophe of the Hun power was indeed inevitable, for the social fabric of the Huns and all their social instincts were opposed to the concentration and organisation which could alone maintain the permanence of their empire. But it was not the less important that the catastrophe arrived at this particular moment—important both for the German peoples and for the Empire. Although the Hunnic power disappeared, at one stroke, into the void from which it had so suddenly arisen, we shall see, if we reflect for a moment, that it affected profoundly the course of history. The invasion of the nomads in the fourth century had precipitated the Visigoths from Dacia into the Balkan peninsula, had led to the disaster of Hadrianople, and may be said to have determined the whole chain of Visigothic history. But, apart from this special consequence of the Hun invasion, the Hun empire performed a function of much greater significance in European history. It helped to retard the whole process of the German dismemberment of the Empire. It did this in two ways: in the first place, by controlling many of the East German peoples beyond the Danube, from whom the Empire had most to fear; and in the second place by constantly supplying Roman generals with auxiliaries who proved an invaluable resource in the struggle with the German enemies. The devastations which some of the Roman provinces suffered from the Huns in the last years of Theodosius II and Valentinian III must be esteemed a loss which was more than set off by the support which Hunnic arms had for many years lent to the Empire, especially if we consider that, as subsequent events showed, the Germans would have committed the same depredations if the Huns had not been there. This retardation of the process of dismemberment, enabling the imperial government to maintain itself for a longer period in those lands which were destined ultimately to become Teutonic kingdoms, was all in the interest of civilisation; for the Germans, who in almost all cases were forced to establish their footing on imperial territory as *federates*, and who then by degrees converted this dependent

relation into independent sovereignty, were more likely to gain some faint apprehension of Roman order, some slight taste for Roman civilisation, than if their careers of conquest had been less gradual and impeded.

The collapse of the Huns at the battle of Nedao (A.D. 454) was immediately followed by the settlement of the Ostrogoths in Pannonia, from which they were soon to repeat, in some sort, the part of their old brethren the Visigoths and assist in the disintegration of Roman dominion. The Gepids established their kingdom in Dacia, and we may mark this as the fifth stage in the history of that country, which had been successively submitted to the Dacians, the Romans, the Visigoths, the Huns, and now the Gepids. The Rugians, another East German people, settled along the Danube, probably between Linz and Vienna.

The forty years succeeding the collapse of the Empire of the Huns, from about 454 to 493, were marked by the gradual advance of the German power in Gaul and Spain; while before 493 Italy itself had become a German kingdom. Now the steady increase of the barbarian power, and the steady decline of the imperial power, in the west during these years was largely conditioned (as was noted in an earlier lecture) by the existence and hostility of the Vandal power in north Africa. The Vandal king Gaiseric had formed a strong fleet with which he was able to attack and plunder Italy, as well as to occupy Sicily and Sardinia. I may here make a remark on the general significance of the Vandals in European history. Their kingdom lasted for just a hundred years. Then it was reconquered by the Empire, and the Vandal name disappeared from among the nations. What, then, was the historical significance of this people? Apart from devastation and destruction, what did they contribute, did they contribute anything, towards the permanent shaping of Europe? The destinies of Spain were not seriously affected by their settlement, which in the case of that country amounted to little more than a transit. The fortunes of Spain could not have been very different if the Vandals had never set foot in the peninsula. Nevertheless I conceive that the Vandals were an important factor, though they built up no abiding kingdom. Their occupation of Africa; the strong and formidable, though only temporary power which Gaiseric established at Carthage, supported by the sea-power which he organised in the Mediterranean—these were circumstances of inestimable consequence for the development of events in Europe. The presence of this enemy in Africa—and Gaiseric proved an enemy more irreconcilable than any other German foe—immeasurably weakened the Roman power in all the western provinces. It had the direct result of controlling the corn supply of Italy, and it prevented the Roman government from acting with effectual vigour in either Gaul or Spain. If the Romans had continued to hold Africa—if the Vandals had not been there—there can be little doubt that the imperial power would have maintained itself for a far longer period in Italy, and would have offered far more effective opposition to the expansion of the Germans in Gaul and Spain. In my view, therefore, the contribution which the Vandals made to the shaping of Europe was this: the very existence of their kingdom in Africa, and of their naval power in the Mediterranean, acted as a powerful protection for the growth of the new German kingdoms in Gaul and Spain, and ultimately helped the founding of a German kingdom in Italy, by dividing, diverting, and weakening the forces of the Empire. The Vandals had got round, as it were, to the rear of the Empire; and the effect of their powerful presence there was enhanced by the hostile and aggressive attitude which they continuously adopted.

Even if there had been united councils in Italy, the task of ubiquitous defence would have been beyond the power of the government; but the government went to pieces, and thereby hastened the dismemberment. I need not here enter at all into the history of the short-reigned emperors who were set up and knocked down in Italy after the murder of Valentinian III in 455. I would invite your attention to two main points: first, the Vandal danger which embarrassed the Italian government during these years; and, secondly, the power behind the imperial throne. This power behind the throne is of great significance for our present purpose.

It was wielded by a German general, Ricimer, of Suevian race. He was the successor of the German Stilicho and of the Roman Aetius as the defender of the Empire. The circumstances in which Ricimer had to act were indeed different from the circumstances of Stilicho and of Aetius. They differed in two main particulars. First, as I have already mentioned, while the activity of Stilicho and of Aetius reached beyond Italy to the other western provinces, the activity of Ricimer was practically confined to Italy and the Italian seas: this was due to the powerful hostility of the Vandals. Secondly, Stilicho and Aetius had been the ministers of emperors who belonged to the well-established dynasty of Theodosius; and although those emperors, Honorius and Valentinian III, were personally weak and worthless, yet their legitimacy gave their thrones stability; so that Stilicho and Aetius could feel that, though they might fall themselves, they had a secure throne behind them. It was not so in the case of Ricimer. The male line of Theodosius was extinct; Valentinian III. had left no sons: and it devolved upon Ricimer to provide the imperial authority which he was to serve. He became through circumstances an emperor-maker; and his difficulty was this. If he set up too strong a man, his own power would have probably been overridden; his own fall would have been the consequence; while on the other hand weak upstarts were unable to maintain their position for any length of time, since public opinion did not respect them. In estimating the part played by Ricimer, I think that hard and unjust measure is sometimes dealt out to him. The difficulties of his position can hardly be over-stated, and he may be held to have made a serious and honest attempt to perform the task of preserving a government in Italy and defending the peninsula against its formidable enemies.

Now you must observe that the fact of Ricimer's being a German was a significant and determining factor in the situation. If he had not been a German, the situation would have been much simpler; for he could have assumed the imperial purple himself; the real and the nominal power would have been combined in the same hands; and the problem of government would have been solved. His German birth excluded this solution. This is a very remarkable thing. Germans like Stilicho and Ricimer, who attained to the highest posts in the imperial service, who might even intermarry with the imperial house, could not venture to take the last great step and mount the imperial throne. Just so much, just at the pinnacle, they were still outsiders. And they fully recognised this disability themselves. An Emperor Ricimer would have seemed to all men, and to Ricimer himself, impossible. This disability still resting upon men of pure German descent within the Empire, and their own deference to the prevailing sentiment, are highly significant.

It is also to be noted that in the intervals between the reigns of the emperors whom Ricimer set up and pulled down, when there was no emperor regnant in Italy, it did not mean that there was no emperor at all. At such times the imperial authority was entirely invested in the eastern emperor who reigned at Constantinople, the Emperor Leo; and this, too, was fully acknowledged by Ricimer, who indeed selected two of his emperors by arrangement with Leo.

Ricimer died in 472 and the march of affairs after his death shows how difficult his task had been. The events of these next few years have often been misconceived in respect of the exact nature of their importance. Ricimer's nephew Gundobad seemed marked out to succeed to the place of his uncle—as the head of the military forces in Italy, and as the power behind the throne. Gundobad belonged to the royal family of the Burgundians and was a son of the reigning Burgundian king; but he had entered the imperial service. The Emperor Olybrius, Ricimer's last creation, recognised Gundobad's position and raised him to the rank of patrician. But Olybrius died before the end of the year, and a crisis ensued. For Gundobad and the Emperor Leo could not agree as to who should succeed to the purple. Leo's candidate was Julius Nepos, and Gundobad set up an obscure person named Glycerius. This situation illustrates, I think, a great merit of Ricimer, viz. his diplomatic success in dealing with the



court of Constantinople, and in keeping on good terms with Leo. The importance of this part of his policy is conditioned by the common danger from the Vandals, which the eastern provinces had to fear as well as the western, though to a smaller extent.

But hardly had the deadlock arisen between Gundobad and the Emperor Leo, when Gundobad disappeared from the scene. A new ambition was suddenly opened to him, more alluring than the government of Italy, viz. the government of his father's Burgundian realm—a realm which was still nominally an imperial dependency. His father had died, and Gundobad withdrew to Burgundy to endeavour to secure his own election. He succeeded, and we shall meet him hereafter on the Burgundian throne. After his departure the Emperor Julius Nepos, Leo's candidate, landed in Italy and deposed Glycerius. But Nepos was not equal to the situation. He very wisely negotiated a peace with Euric, king of the West Goths, of whose reign I shall presently have to speak; and he then appointed a certain Roman, Orestes by name, to be commander-in-chief, *magister militum*, in Gaul, to defend the Roman territory there. Orestes had been in Attila's service: he had lived much with barbarians of all kinds, and Nepos thought that he was making a very clever choice in selecting Orestes to command an army of barbarian soldiers. I may point out that after the break-up of Attila's empire there had been an immense influx of barbarian mercenaries into the Roman service. The army which Orestes now commanded was composed not only of Germans drawn from families long settled in the Empire but also of these new adventurers who had drifted into Italy through Noricum and Pannonia. Nepos was deceived in Orestes; Orestes was ambitious, and instead of going to Gaul, as he had been told, he marched on Ravenna. Nepos immediately fled to Dalmatia. Italy was for the moment in the power of Orestes. He did not seize the Empire himself, he preferred the double arrangement which had prevailed in the time of Ricimer, though there was not now the same necessity for it. Keeping the military power himself, he invested his child-son Romulus Augustulus with the imperial purple. But before Orestes had established his government he was surprised by a new situation. His host of barbarian soldiers, who were largely Heruls, suddenly formulated a demand. They were dissatisfied with the arrangements for quartering them. Their wives and children lived in the garrison towns in their neighbourhood, but they had no proper homes or hearths. The idea occurred to them that arrangements might be made in their behalf in Italy similar to those which had been made in Gaul, for instance, in behalf of the Visigoths and the Burgundians. Why should not they obtain permanent quarters, abiding homes, on the large estates, the *latifundia*, of Italy? This feeling prevailed in the host, and the officers formulated a demand which they laid before Orestes. The demand simply was that the normal system of *hospitalitas* should be adopted in Italy for their benefit, *i.e.* that a third part of the Italian soil should be divided among them. The sympathies or prejudices of Orestes were too Roman to let him entertain this demand; Italy had so far been sacrosanct from barbarian settlements. He refused, and his refusal led to a revolution. The mercenary soldiers found a leader in an officer who was thoroughly representative of themselves, an adventurer who had come from beyond the Danube to seek his fortunes, and had entered the service of the Empire. This was Odovacar: he was probably a Scirian, possibly a Rugian (there is a discrepancy in the authorities), at all events he belonged to one of the smaller East German peoples who had originally come from regions on the lower Oder, had formed part of Attila's empire, and had partly settled on the middle Danube, partly entered Roman service after the fall of that empire. Odovacar now undertook to realise the claim of the soldiers, and consequently there was a revolution. Orestes was put to death, and his son the Emperor Romulus Augustulus abdicated. The power in Italy was in the hands of Odovacar. We are in the year 476.

Now what I would have you specially observe is that there was, constitutionally speaking, nothing novel in the situation. There were two legitimate emperors, the Emperor Zeno at Constantinople, and the Emperor Julius Nepos (who was in Dalmatia). In the eyes of

the government of Constantinople, Romulus Augustulus was a usurper. This usurper had now been deposed by a military revolution; the leader of that revolution, Odovacar, had shown no disloyalty to the eastern emperor, whose authority he fully acknowledged. There was no thought here of any dismemberment, or detachment, or breaking away from the Empire. Odovacar was a Roman officer, he was raised by the army into the virtual position of a *magister militum*, and his first thought, after the revolution had been carried through, was to get his position regularised by imperial authority, to gain from Zeno a formal recognition and appointment. Odovacar was in fact the successor of the series of German commanders who had supported the Empire for eighty years: and when he came to power in 476, there was not the least reason in the actual circumstances why the same kind of regime should not have been continued as in the days of Ricimer. But Odovacar had statesmanlike qualities, and he decided against the system of Ricimer, which had proved thoroughly unsatisfactory and unstable. His idea was to rule Italy under the imperial authority of Constantinople, unhampered by a second emperor in Italy, whom recent experiences had shown to be worse than useless. There would have been no difficulty for Odovacar in adopting this policy, if there had existed no second emperor at the time; but Julius Nepos was still alive, and, what was most important, he had been recognised at Constantinople. Odovacar was determined *not* to acknowledge the authority of Nepos. It is very important to understand this element in the situation, because it directly led to the peculiar position which Odovacar afterwards occupied. He first addressed himself to the Roman senate, and caused that body to send envoys to Constantinople, bearing the imperial insignia, and a letter to the Emperor Zeno. The purport of the letter was to suggest that one emperor, namely Zeno himself and his successors at Constantinople, sufficed for the needs of the whole Empire, and to ask that Zeno should authorise Odovacar to conduct the administration in Italy, and should confer on him the title of Patricius, which had been borne by Ricimer. The Emperor was not a little embarrassed. Julius Nepos was at the same time demanding his help to recover Italy, and Nepos had a legitimate claim. The Emperor wrote a very diplomatic reply. He insisted, in the most definite and correct terms, on the legal claim of Nepos; he, however, told Odovacar, whom he praised for the consideration he had shown in his dealings with the Italians after the revolution, that he would confer upon him the title of Patricius, if Nepos had not already done so.

This limited recognition was not what Odovacar had hoped for; the express reserve of the rights of Julius Nepos was most unsatisfactory; there was always a chance that those rights might at a favourable moment be enforced. Accordingly, while he accepted the patriciate from Zeno, and so legitimised his position as an imperial minister in the eyes of Italy, he fortified himself by assuming another title which must have expressed his relation to the barbarian army, *viz.* the title of king, *rex*. We do not know what solemnity or form accompanied the assumption of this title. But its effect was to give Odovacar the double character of a German king as well as an imperial officer. A close parallel to this double position is that of Alaric at the close of the fourth century. He was king of the Goths, but at the same time he was *magister militum* in Illyricum. So Odovacar was king of the Germans who through him obtained settlements in Italy, while he was also a Patricius, acting under the authority of the Emperor Zeno. There was thus theoretically no detachment of Italy from the Empire in the days of Odovacar any more than there had been a detachment of Illyricum in the days of Alaric. The position of Odovacar was still further regularised a few years later (480) by the death of Julius Nepos.

The death of Julius Nepos is an event which has some significance; it marks the cessation of a separate line of emperors in the west. But if I have made clear the circumstances of the revolution headed by Odovacar, you will perceive that this event, though of importance in the history of Italy, has not the importance and significance which has been commonly ascribed to it. The year 476 has been generally taken as a great landmark, and the

event has been commonly described as the fall of the Western Empire. This unfortunate expression conveys a wholly erroneous idea of the bearings of Odovacar's revolution. Let me observe in the first place that the expression 'Western Empire' is constitutionally improper; it may be convenient as a loose expression for the western provinces of the Empire which, since Theodosius the Great, had been ruled by an emperor at Rome or Ravenna; but there was only one empire, and at the time no one would have dreamed of talking of two. On several occasions during the fifth century the death or deposition of an emperor at Rome or Ravenna had been followed by a considerable space of time in which no successor was elected. During such time the supremacy and authority of the emperor at Constantinople were always acknowledged. Now at any of those times it would have been quite possible for the emperor at Constantinople to have asserted his authority in the western provinces, or for Italy and the western provinces to have said to him: "We do not want a second emperor; you are sufficient". And if such a thing had happened, no one could have possibly described it as a fall of the Western Empire. Yet what happened in 476 was exactly analogous. In the second place, this event concerns specially the history of Italy, in the same way as the settlements of the Visigoths and Burgundians concerned the history of Gaul; and the settlement of the Germans in Italy does not directly affect the western provinces as a whole. It is then a misleading misuse of words to speak of a fall of the Western Empire in 476: the revolution of that year marks but a stage, and that not the last stage, in the encroachments of the barbarian settlers in the western provinces.

Odovacar was not hampered, as Ricimer had been, by the nominal authority of a resident emperor; he was able to pursue his own policy without any embarrassment, and to act as an independent ruler. His policy was one of peace; he was entirely averse from aggression. It must be noted, too, that his position was much easier than that of Ricimer, because the Vandal hostilities had ceased. Gaiseric had died in 477; and two years before his death he had made peace with Rome, and Odovacar had induced him to restore Sicily in return for a yearly payment. The cessation of the Vandal danger was of immense importance for Odovacar's government; the only task before it which involved warfare was to meet a danger which threatened on the northern frontier of Italy. This danger sprang from the kingdom of the Rugians on the Danube, to the north of Noricum. The Danubian provinces were completely disorganised; government had practically ceased; and the provincials were exposed not only to the oppression of the Rugians but to the incursions of other Germans—Alamanni, Thuringians, and Heruls. There is a famous work which gives a very vivid picture of the condition of Noricum and the adjacent lands at this period. It is the *Life of St. Severinus*, written a few years later by Eugippius, and I recommend it to your attention. Severinus was the only protection the provincials had, except the walls of their towns; he was a powerful protector, for he exercised immense influence upon the barbarians. This influence, due to his strong personality and his devoted life, was increased by a belief in his miraculous powers and prophetic faculty. But though the self-sacrificing efforts of this monk did something to alleviate the condition of those lands and to restrain the cruelties of the barbarians, the miseries of the time in that quarter of Europe can hardly be exaggerated. Odovacar came to the rescue. He overthrew the Rugian kingdom, which had no elements of strength, and he removed the Roman provincials from the dangerous frontier to the shelter of Italy.

I must return to the settlement of the barbarians in Italy which was carried out by Odovacar. Two-thirds of their estates were left to the Italian proprietors; one-third was taken from them and assigned to the German soldiers, who were thus distributed throughout Italy. These soldiers were mainly East Germans; there was thus an East German colonisation of Italy. It differed from the settlements of the Visigoths and Burgundians in Gaul, in so far as the German settlers were limited to no special provinces, but were scattered throughout the peninsula among the inhabitants. Now I should like to emphasise here again the important

fact to which I have before called attention, that these divisions of land among the barbarians were simply an extension of the old Roman system of quartering soldiers. For the continuity comes out with special force in the case of Odovacar's land-division in Italy. In the time of Stilicho, and throughout the fifth century, urban householders were obliged by law to vacate a third part of their houses to the soldiers who were stationed in the towns. This law was passed by Arcadius and Honorius; it was reinforced by Theodosius II and Valentinian III; it was afterwards received into the Code of Justinian. The troops therefore who were commanded by Orestes must have been quartered in the Italian towns on this principle. When therefore they demanded a third part of the land they were simply demanding an extension of the quartering system, the *hospitas*—an extension such as had already been carried out in other provinces. This case therefore illustrates with particular clearness the great and important principle that these concessions of land are all based on the military quartering system of Rome.

It is obvious that the order of things introduced by Odovacar could hardly be permanent. His position was essentially weak. He was a patrician and he was a king, but in neither capacity had he any firm support. He had received from Constantinople only a reserved recognition; and as a German king he had no people. For the Germans to whom he owed his elevation were a mixed company of adventurers, fragments of many folks; there was no close or intimate bond among them, no national feeling. Odovacar, however, attempted and not unsuccessfully to found his power on closer co-operation with the senate.

The regime was in its very nature transitory. Its significance is twofold; on the one hand as a continuation of the regime of Ricimer—this side is represented by Odovacar in his character of patrician; on the other hand, as preparing for the foundation of a true German kingdom in Italy—this side is represented in his character as king.

AFTER the overthrow of the Hunnic Empire on the field of Nadao in A.D. 454 the Ostrogoths, who had been one of the chief members of that Empire, settled in Pannonia. Now for the first time they settled on the inner side of the Roman frontier. The settlement was made by agreement with the Emperor Marcian, and the Ostrogoths then became *federates* of the Empire. The Ostrogoths were *not* at this time under the rule of a single or predominant national king. No leader held among them the place which Hermanric had held in the fourth century. Monarchy had not developed in their case as it had developed with the Visigoths; and this is quite what we might have expected; for they had been all this time under the domination of the Huns, and it would have been obviously the policy of the Hunnic kings to encourage division rather than unity. Accordingly we find the Ostrogoths under a number of kings, prominent among whom were three brothers of the royal race of the Amals. The name of one of these brothers was Thiudemir; and the story runs that on the very day on which the news of the great victory of Nadao came to the house of Thiudemir, a son was born to him. This son was *Thiuda-reiks* ('ruler of the people'), a name which was corrupted in Greek and Roman mouths into Theuderic or Theoderic. The story reminds us of the similar anecdote that Alexander the Great was born on the day on which his father's general won a victory over the Illyrians. Whenever Alexander's birthday was—the exact date is unknown—it was certainly within a few months of that victory; and we shall not be wrong in assuming that Theoderic was born in the chronological neighbourhood of the battle of Nadao, somewhere about the year 454. He was sent in his boyhood as a hostage to Constantinople, where he learned to know and appreciate Roman civilisation and Roman institutions, although he did not abandon the Arian faith in which he had been brought up. He returned home in 470 or 471, at the age of sixteen or seventeen, and in 471 he was elected a king. We can be certain about this date, because thirty years later, in the year 500, when he was lord of Italy, he celebrated his *tricennalia*, that is the thirtieth anniversary of his election as king. But it is to be observed that



neither he nor his father, who was still alive, was king of the Ostrogothic nation; they were simply petty kings, *gaukönige*.

Immediately after this election, Thiudemir and his son Theoderic led their portion of the Ostrogothic people southward into the Balkan peninsula, and forced the Emperor Leo to grant them new settlements in Macedonia—in the original Macedonia near the sea. Their territory included the cities of Pella, Pydna, and Methone. After Thiudemir's death Theoderic reigned alone, and the next years were marked by his rivalry and struggle with another Ostrogothic chief of the same name who had also settled in the Balkan peninsula. It was a triangular struggle between the two rival Gothic chiefs and the Emperor Zeno, and the relations among the three vary and change like the figures of a kaleidoscope. I believe that the object of Theoderic's ambition, like the first object of Alaric's ambition, was to be appointed *magister militum*. In the year 483, after his rival's death, he obtained this coveted post, and was created *magister militum praesentalis*. In the following year, he was honoured by the consulship. He now, like Alaric, stood in a double relation to his people: he was not only their king; they were also bound to obey him as imperial commander-in-chief. But the new *magister militum* was still a thorn in the side of the Empire; he quarrelled with the Emperor in 487, revolted, and marched with his Ostrogoths to the walls of Constantinople. The Emperor now reached the conviction that the presence of the Ostrogoths and the Ostrogothic *magister militum* in the Illyrian provinces could never be placed on a satisfactory basis, and would be a constant source of trouble and danger. Could any expedient be found for getting rid of them? The idea occurred that a profitable and tempting task might be imposed upon the *magister militum* which would finally deliver Constantinople and the Illyrian provinces of his presence. He might be sent to Italy to conquer and displace Odovacar. Our material is too scanty to enable us to say whether Zeno adopted this resolution merely as an expedient to remove Theoderic, or whether he had already independently cherished the notion of interfering in the regime of Italy, and perhaps of resuming the peninsula under his immediate rule. Odovacar was nominally his vice-regent, a *magister militum* of the Empire; but Zeno had never given him a wholehearted or unreserved recognition. One of our chief authorities tells us that Zeno intended ultimately to go to Italy himself. The words (which some historians have failed to understand) are these: "The Emperor made a bargain with Theoderic: if he (Theoderic) overcame Odovacar, he should (as a reward for his services) rule provisionally in Italy until he (Zeno) should come (*dum adveniret*)". I see no reason for rejecting this statement, but we must be careful how we interpret it. It need not seem that Zeno had made up his mind to go to Italy or resume in his own hands the immediate government. It may have been simply the official and diplomatic way in which the bargain was expressed, so as to reserve the imperial rights, and make it clear that, while Theoderic succeeded to the quasi-imperial power wielded by Odovacar, he was still responsible to the Emperor, who would at any moment have the right to recall him or suspend him.

Theoderic accepted the mission which was destined to lead him to a great place in history. He started for Italy in 488. It is curious how the fortunes of the Ostrogoths seemed to repeat the fortunes of the Visigoths. Nearly a hundred years after the Visigoths had been temporarily settled as *federates* in the Illyrian peninsula, the Ostrogoths were for a brief period settled there too. The Visigoths had ravaged and vexed the provinces, until finally King Alaric had been made a *magister militum*; the Ostrogoths a century later did exactly the same thing, and King Theoderic, like Alaric, was in his turn made a *magister militum*. Then Theoderic, again like Alaric, migrated with his people to Italy.

It was not till the end of August (A.D. 489) that, having crossed the Julian Alps, the Ostrogoths reached the river Sontius (Isonzo), and that the struggle for Italy began. Of this memorable war we have only the most meagre outline. The result was decided within twelve

months, but three and a half years were to elapse before the last resistance of Odovacar was broken down and Theoderic was completely master of Italy.

It was perhaps where the Sontius and the Frigidus meet that Theoderic found Odovacar in a carefully fortified camp, prepared to oppose his entry into Venetia. Odovacar had considerable forces, for besides his own army he had succeeded in enlisting foreign help. We are not told who his allies were: we can only guess that among them may have been the Burgundians, who, as we know, helped him at a later stage. The battle was fought on August 28; Odovacar was defeated and compelled to retreat, his next line of defence was on the Athesis (Adige), and he fortified himself in a camp close to Verona, with the river behind him. Here the second battle of the war was fought a month later (about September 20) and resulted in a decisive victory for Theoderic. The carnage of Odovacar's men is said to have been immense; but they fought desperately and the Ostrogothic losses were severe; the river was fed with corpses. The defeated king himself fled to Ravenna. The greater part of his army, with Tufa who held the highest command, surrendered to Theoderic, who immediately proceeded to Milan.

Northern Italy was now at the feet of the Goth; Rome and Sicily were prepared to submit, and it looked as though nothing remained to complete the conquest but the capture of Ravenna. But the treachery of Tufa changed the situation. Theoderic imprudently trusted him, and sent him with his own troops and a few distinguished Ostrogoths against Odovacar. At Faventia (Faenza) Tufa espoused again the cause of his old master and handed over to him the Goths, who were put into irons.

Theoderic made Ticinum (Pavia) his headquarters during the winter, and it is said that one of his motives for choosing this city was to cultivate the friendship of the old bishop Epiphanius, who had great influence with Odovacar. In the following year Odovacar was able to take the field again, to seize Cremona and Milan, and to blockade his adversary in Ticinum. At this juncture the Visigoths came to the help of the Ostrogoths and sent an army into Italy. The siege was raised, and the decisive battle of the war was fought on the river Addua (Adda), a battle in which Odovacar was utterly defeated (August 11, A.D. 490). He fled for the second time to Ravenna. It was probably this victory that decided the Roman senate to abandon the cause of Odovacar, and to accept Theoderic. It made him master of Rome, southern Italy, and Sicily.

The agreement that Zeno made with Theoderic had been secret and unofficial. The Emperor had done nothing directly to break off his relations with Odovacar. But Odovacar seems some time before the battle of the Addua to have courted a formal rupture. He created his son Thela a Caesar, and this was equivalent to renouncing his subordination to the Emperor and declaring Italy independent. He probably calculated that in the strained relations which then existed between the Italian Catholics and the Greek East, on account of an ecclesiastical schism, the policy of cutting the rope which bound Italy to Constantinople would be welcomed at Rome and throughout the provinces. The senators may have been divided on this issue, but the battle of the Addua decided them as a body to 'betray' Odovacar, and before the end of the year Festus, the *princeps* of the senate, went to Constantinople to announce the success of Theoderic, and to arrange the conditions of the new Italian government.

Theoderic confidently believed that his task was now virtually finished. But the cause of his thrice-defeated enemy was not yet hopelessly lost. Tufa was still at large with troops at his command; and various unexpected difficulties beset the conqueror. The Burgundian king Gundobad, for example, sent an army into north Italy and laid waste the country. Theoderic had not only to drive these invaders out, but he had also to protect Sicily against the Vandals, who seized the opportunity of the war to attempt to recover it. Their attempt was frustrated,

and they were forced to surrender the fortress of Lilybaeum as well as all their claims to the island.

It seems to have been in the same year that Theoderic resorted to a terrible measure for destroying the military garrisons which held Italian towns for Odovacar. The Italian population was generally favourable to the cause of Theoderic, and secret orders were given to the citizens to slaughter the soldiers on a prearranged day. The pious panegyrist, who exultantly, but briefly, describes this measure and claims Providence as an accomplice, designates it as a “sacrificial massacre”; and Theoderic doubtless considered that the treachery of his enemy's army in surrendering and then deserting justified an unusual act of vengeance. The secret of the plot was well kept, and it seems to have been punctually executed. The result was equivalent to another victory in the field; and nothing now remained for Theoderic but to capture the last stronghold of his adversary, the marsh city of Honorius.

The siege of Ravenna lasted for two years and a half. The Gothic forces entrenched themselves in a camp in the pine-woods east of the city, but were not able entirely to prevent provisions from reaching the garrison by sea. Yet the blockade was not ineffective, for corn rose to a famine price. One attempt was made by Odovacar to disperse the besiegers. He made a sortie at night (July 10, A.D. 491) with a band of Herul warriors and attacked the Gothic trenches. The conflict was obstinate; but he was defeated. Another year wore on, and it appeared that the siege might last for ever unless the food of the garrison could be completely cut off. Theoderic managed to procure a fleet of warships—we are not told whether or not they were built for the occasion—and, making the Portus Leonis, about six miles from Ravenna, his naval base, he was able to blockade the two harbours of the city (August A.D. 492). Odovacar held out for six months longer, but early in A.D. 493 negotiations, conducted by the bishop of Ravenna, issued in a compact between the two antagonists (February 25) that they should rule Italy jointly. Theoderic entered the city a week later (March 5).

The only way in which the compact could have been carried out would have been by a territorial division. But Theoderic had no mind to share the peninsula with another king, and there can hardly be a doubt that, when he swore to the treaty, he had the full intention of breaking his oath. Odovacar's days were numbered. Theoderic, a few days after his entry into Ravenna, slew him with his own hand in the palace of Laretum (March 15). He alleged that his defeated rival was plotting against him, but this probably was a mere pretext. “On the same day”, adds the chronicler, “all Odovacar's soldiers were slain wherever they could be found, and all his kin”.

In three years and a half Theoderic had accomplished his task. The reduction of Italy cost him four battles, a massacre, and a long siege. His capital blunder had been to trust Tufa after the victory of Verona. We may be sure that throughout the struggle he spared no pains to ingratiate himself in the confidence of the Italian population. But when his rival had fallen, and when he was at last securely established, Theoderic's first measure was to issue an edict depriving of their civil rights all those Italians who had not adhered to his cause. This harsh and stupid policy, however, was not carried out, for the bishop Epiphanius persuaded the king to revoke it and to promise that there would be no executions.

The reign of Theoderic in Italy, if we date it from the battle of the Adda in 490, lasted thirty-six years, and it was, as I shall show, in its general principle, a continuation of the regime of Odovacar. Of Odovacar's government we know very little, of Theoderic's we know much; but the continuity is quite clear. One of the first things which Theoderic had to do was to settle his own people in the land, and this was done on exactly the same principle as the settlement of Odovacar. The Ostrogoths for the most part replaced Odovacar's Germans, who had been largely killed or driven out, though some of them embraced the rule of Theoderic and were permitted to remain in their lands. But the general principle was the assignment of one-third of the Roman estates to the Goths.

The Emperor Anastasius, who succeeded Zeno in 491, did not at first recognise Theoderic. But six years later they came to terms. In 497 a definite agreement was made; Anastasius recognised the position of Theoderic in Italy, subordinate to himself, on certain conditions. Then capitulation determined the constitutional position of Theoderic.

In order to understand the political aims of Theoderic, and his place as a statesman, it is indispensable to have a clear view of his constitutional position and the nature of his administration, and these matters will occupy the rest of this lecture. Fortunately there is very good material, for besides valuable notices in Procopius and a long fragment of an Italian chronicle, we have numerous state papers of Theoderic, drawn up by his state secretary, Cassiodorus.

The formal relation of Italy to the Empire, both under Odovacar and under Theoderic, was much closer and clearer than that of any other of the states ruled by Germans. Although practically independent, it was regarded officially both at Rome and at Constantinople as part of the Empire in the fullest sense. Two circumstances exhibit this theory very clearly. Odovacar and Theoderic never used the years of their own reigns for the purposes of dating, as the kings of the Visigoths did. Secondly, the right of naming one of the consuls of the year which had belonged to the emperor reigning in the west was transferred by the consent of the Emperors Zeno and Anastasius to Odovacar and Theoderic. So far as Theoderic is concerned, we have the express attestation of the historian Procopius; but Mommsen, who elucidated the whole subject, showed that the same principle applied to Odovacar. I may give a word of explanation as to the system of consular nomination in the fifth century. The rule was that the emperor reigning in the east and the emperor reigning in the west should each nominate one of the two men who were to be consuls for the one undivided Empire. But as a rule the two names were not published together. The name of the western consul was not known in the east, nor the name of the eastern in the west, in time for simultaneous publication. Hence the custom of successive publication. But there are exceptions. Between 421 and 530 there are twenty-three years in which the consular names were published together. Four of these are cases in which two emperors filled the consulship together, and as this was evidently done by prearrangement, the simultaneous publication is at once explained. But all the other cases, whether of two private persons or of an emperor and a private person, are peculiar. In more than half of them it is demonstrable that both consuls belonged to the same half of the Empire, whether east or west; thus in 437 both Aetius and Sigisvult belonged to the west: and of the other cases there is not a single one in which it can be shown that they belonged to different realms. We can infer with certainty that in these cases, one of the two nominators resigned his right in favour of the other, and that both consuls were nominated by the ruler of the half of the Empire to which they respectively belonged. This at once accounts for the simultaneous publication of the names. In the years 473 to 479 no consul was nominated in the west, owing to the unsettled conditions, but in 479 Zeno must have conceded to Odovacar the right of nominating a consul, for one of the consuls of 480, Basilius, almost certainly belonged to the west and was recognised in the east; and from this year we have a series of consuls appointed in the west up to the year of Odovacar's death, 493. This right did not immediately pass to Theoderic, because the Emperor Anastasius, Zeno's successor, did not immediately recognise him. From 494 to 497 the consular *fasti* exhibit exclusively eastern consuls. This shows Theoderic's tact. He would not widen his breach with the Emperor by assuming the right of naming a consul without his consent. But in 497 matters were arranged, and from 498 forward Theoderic named one of the consuls as Odovacar had done before him. In 522 the Emperor Justin waived his own nomination and allowed Theoderic to name both consuls—Symmachus and Boethius. It would be interesting to know whether this exceptional favour had anything to do with the anti-German and anti-Arian sentiments of these two patricians which brought about their fall.



There was one limitation which Theoderic recognised in this matter: he could not nominate a Goth; only Romans could fill the consulship, and indeed only Romans could fill the other magistracies. The rule is corroborated by the single exception: in 519 Eutharic, Theoderic's son-in-law, was consul. But it is expressly recorded that this nomination was not made by Theoderic; it was made by the Emperor. This shows that in the capitulations of Theoderic to the government of Constantinople, one article was that a Goth should not fill the consulship. And so when Theoderic desired an exception in favour of his son-in-law, the favour had to come from the Emperor.

The capitulation which excluded Goths from the consulship extended also to all the civil offices, which were maintained under Ostrogothic rule, as they had been under Odovacar's. There was still the praetorian prefect of Italy, and when Theoderic acquired Provence the office of Praetorian Prefect of Gaul was revived. There was the *vicarius urbis Romae*, as before. There were all the provincial governors, divided as before into the three ranks of *consulares*, *correctores*, and *praesides*. There were the two finance officers, the *comes sacrarum largitionum* and the *comes rerum privatarum*. Anastasius instituted a new financial officer, the *comes patrimonii*, who shared the functions of the *comes rerum privatarum*, and Theoderic followed his example. But in this case he did not conform to the rule which excluded Goths; several of his *comites patrimonii* have German names; the office does not seem to have been regarded as a regular state office; or perhaps it was treated as an exception because it was instituted after the capitulation had been made. All the *officia*, or staffs of subordinate officials, were maintained under Theoderic's regime. In the state documents we often read of *officium nostrum*; that means the bureau of the *magister officiorum*, who was the chief commander of the *scholae* of bodyguards and was at the head of all the subordinate officials of the palace. Both the praetorian prefect and the *magister officiorum* reside at Ravenna, but they have each a representative at Rome, who belongs to the same rank of illustres as themselves. The drafting of state documents, the official correspondence of the king, was carried on by the *quaestor palatii*, an office which was long filled by Cassiodorus. It may be added that the exclusion of Goths also applied to the honorary title of Patricius. Under Theoderic no Goth bore that title but Theoderic himself, who had received it from the Emperor.

But if Goths were excluded from the civil posts, it was exactly the reverse in the case of the military posts. Here it was the Romans who were excluded. The army was entirely Gothic; no Roman was liable to military service; and the officers were naturally Goths. The regiments are formed by the Goths settled in the districts of the various towns. In consequence of the confiscation of one-third of the land for the Gothic freemen, every territory in the peninsula ought to have had a garrison of these settlers; but as a matter of fact the settlements were not uniformly distributed, and the Gothic population in the south of the peninsula did not amount to much. We know practically nothing about the organisation of the army; but it seems likely that each territory in which Goths were settled had to supply men in proportion to the number of acres. The chief officers were called *priors* or *counts*. But although the old Roman troops and their organisation have disappeared (in consequence of the exclusion of Romans), it has been shown by Mommsen that the military arrangements of Theoderic were based in many respects on arrangements which had existed in Italy under imperial rule in the fifth century. Now what about the highest office of all, that of Master of Soldiers? Under Odovacar we hear of Masters of Soldiers. But under Ostrogothic rule no Master of Soldiers is mentioned. The generals employed by Theoderic are not described by this title. In the long list of the *formulae* of the various offices which existed in Italy at this time the Mastership of the Soldiers does not appear, and that cannot be explained as an oversight.

Yet the office had not ceased to exist; for we find in a letter of Cassiodorus the mention of an *officialis magistri militum*, 'a subaltern of the Master of Soldiers'. The solution, as

Mommsen has shown, is that Theoderic himself was the *magister militum*. He had, as we saw, received that title—*magister militum praesentalis*—from Zeno ten years before he conquered Italy; he bore it when he conquered Italy, and he continued to retain it while he ruled Italy. It is intelligible that he did not designate himself by this title, because his powers as ruler of Italy far exceeded the powers of the most powerful *magister militum*; but this does not mean that he gave the office up. It explains why the title was never given to any of his generals. The matter is illustrated by certain measures taken after Theoderic's death. His grandson and successor, the vicious lad Athalaric, was out of the question as commander of the forces, and his mother, Amalasantha, who acted as regent, appointed a Gothic warrior, Tuluin, and Liberius, a Roman, who was the Praetorian Prefect of Gaul, to be *patricii praesentales*. This remarkable appointment involved two deviations from existing rules. It gave the rank of Patricius to Tuluin, who as a Goth was excluded from that title; and it gave a military command to Liberius, who as a Roman was incapable of such. The office, though under this modified title, was simply that of *magister militum praesentalis*, but the circumstance that the title was modified is significant, and illustrates the fact that the office of *magister militum* had become closely united to that of king, through the long tenure of it by Theoderic.

It need hardly be said that as the Goths were excluded from civil offices, so they were excluded from the Roman senate. The senate continued to exist under the Ostrogothic kings, and to perform the same functions as it had performed throughout the fifth century. It was still formally recognised as a sovran body. Theoderic writes: *parem nobiscum reipublicae debetis adniscum*. The senate like the emperor could *leges constituere*, and the constitutional difference between a senator and the emperor was that the senator was under the law and the emperor was not. But only the senators of the highest class, the *illustres*, had the right of voting, and as this class consisted of men who held the highest state offices, and were appointed by the emperor, it was the emperor who nominated the senators. Such was the constitutional position of the senate: politically it had no power, and its functions were practically confined to the affairs of Rome.

The position of Theoderic as deputy-governor of the emperor, and the position of Italy as part of the empire is shown by the maintenance of the imperial sovran rights in coinage and in legislation. Theoderic did not claim the right of coining except in subordination to the emperor. The silver coins of his reign show the Emperor Anastasius (*dominus noster Anastasius*) on the obverse, and on the reverse Theoderic's monogram with the legend *invicta Roma*. Did he claim the right of making laws? In Procopius, it is expressly stated by representatives of the Goths, that neither Theoderic nor any of the Gothic rulers issued a law. This statement involves the admission that the right of legislation was the supreme prerogative of the emperor. And there is no formal contradiction between this statement and the fact that ordinances of Theoderic exist. None of these ordinances are designated as *leges*. They are only *edicta*. The *lex*, and the making of a *lex*, was the exclusive right of the emperor; but various high officials could issue an *edictum*. Here then, formally, the regime of Theoderic stands in marked contrast with the regime in the western kingdoms which did not depend on Constantinople. The Ostrogothic king issues edicts, the contemporary Burgundian king enacts *leges*, *mansurae in aevum leges*.

But was this difference between the law and the edict, between the right of the emperor and the right of the king, merely a formal one? Did it mean no more than the difference of a name, that Theoderic called his laws *edicta*, while the laws of Anastasius or Justin were *leges*? Theoderic certainly promulgated what Cassiodorus calls *edicta generalia*, laws which did not concern special cases, but were of a general kind permanently valid, and which, if they had been enacted by the emperor, would have been called *leges*. But it must be remembered that the highest officials of the empire, especially the praetorian prefect, had the right of issuing an *edictum generale*, provided it did not run counter to any existing law. This

may sound like a contradiction, but practically it was a very important distinction. It amounted to this, that the praetorian prefect could modify existing laws, in subordinate points, whether in the direction of mildness or severity or definition, but could not originate any new principle or institution. Now the ordinances of Theoderic which are collected in his code, known as the *Edictum Theoderici*, exhibit conformity to this rule. They introduce no new institutions; they alter no established principle. When he first appeared in Rome we are told that Theoderic addressed the people and promised that he would preserve inviolate *omnia quod retro principes ordinaverunt*. Procopius twice emphasises the fact that he preserved the laws of the empire. Theoderic himself, through the official mouthpiece of Cassiodorus, repeatedly dwells on this principle of the regime: *nescimus a legibus discrepare; sufficiens laus conscientiae est veterum decreta servare*. Thus in the matter of legislation the king is neither nominally nor really co-ordinate with the emperor. His legislative powers are those of a great official, such as a praetorian prefect, and though he employed these powers to a greater extent than any praetorian prefect could have done, owing to the circumstances of the case, yet his edicts are qualitatively on the same footing, and are qualitatively quite distinct from the laws which the emperor might make. In legislation, the position of Theoderic as an official of the empire is clear and unmistakable, and it is remarkable how loyally he adhered to the capitulations.

It is important to have a clear idea of the legal position of the Goths in Italy. The Goths settled by Theoderic, like the Germans settled by Odovacar, had legally exactly the same status as mercenaries, or travellers, or hostages who dwelled on Roman territory, but might at any time return to their homes beyond the Roman frontier. The fact that these Germans had made their homes on Roman soil, though it altered practically their position, did not alter their legal status. They were foreign soldiers, without Roman citizenship. But you must observe that this by no means implies that Roman law did not apply to them. We have to distinguish between the laws which have a territorial and those which have a personal application. To the former class belong all laws pertaining to criminal matters and to the general intercourse of life, and these were applicable to all foreigners who happened to be sojourning in Roman territory. The personal laws, which concerned only Roman citizens, were mainly those which related to marriage and inheritance. These had no application to foreigners, and one consequence was that if a foreigner died on Roman soil his property fell to the state as unowned property, there being no legal heir, the laws of inheritance not applying to him. This was the condition of the Gothic soldiers in Italy. They were not Roman citizens: Theoderic speaks of a certain Goth, who had acquired Roman culture, as *civis paene vester*, 'almost a Roman citizen'. The only Goth in Italy who possessed Roman citizenship was Theoderic himself. The Goths did not belong to any municipal community. They were not even *incolae*. When a citizen of Naples went to live at Beneventum, he became an *incola* of Beneventum; but a foreigner, a Moor or a Frank, did not become an *incola* of the place where he lived, and neither did the Goth. And here we touch on another important restriction of Theoderic's powers. He could not turn a Goth into a Roman; he could not bestow Roman citizenship; that power was reserved for the Emperor.

The Goths then were foreign soldiers. Their quality as soldiers determined the character of the courts in which they were judged. The Roman rule at this time was that the soldier could be tried by a military court only, and Theoderic instituted military courts for the Goths on this principle. But here we come to a serious and important interference on the part of Theoderic with the rights of the Romans. All processes between Goths and Romans, to whichever race the accuser belonged, were brought before these military courts. In such cases a Roman lawyer was always present as an assessor; but probably no feature of the Gothic regime was so unpopular as this. So far as the *personal* law was concerned, the Goths and Romans lived side by side, each according to their own laws. But—and this is a very

important fact—the *territorial* law, criminal jurisprudence and laws affecting general intercourse, applied to the Goths as well as to the Romans: this was the *jus commune* of which Theoderic speaks, and his Edict, which is based on Roman law, is addressed to Goths and Romans indiscriminately.

Theoderic, like the emperor, had a supreme royal court, which could withdraw any case from a lower court, or cancel its decision; and this court seems to have been much more active than the corresponding court of the emperor. It is indeed in the domain of justice, in striking contrast with the domain of legislation, that the German kings in Italy asserted their actual authority.

Besides holding the Roman office of *magister militum* in regard to the foreign soldiers, Theoderic was likewise their king. I have already called your attention to the fact that Theoderic was originally not king of the whole Ostrogothic people, but only a *gaukönig*, one among other Ostrogothic kings. On the conquest of Italy, the extent of his kingly power, that is the number of his subjects, increased through the circumstance that those of Odovacar's German settlers whom he did not extirpate or banish acknowledged him as their king; this was notably the case with the Rugians. His position in Italy then in regard to the foreign settlers is that of a German king; but those settlers are not all Ostrogoths. As a matter of fact Theoderic did not call himself king of the Goths: he designated his position by the Latin title *rex*, but he never called himself *rex Gotorum*. But his adoption of this style, *rex*, his avoidance of *rex Gotorum*, was certainly not influenced by the fact that his German subjects embraced a larger circle than the Ostrogoths whom he had led to conquer Italy. It was rather due to his relation to the Roman population. For although *formally and constitutionally* the Roman citizens of Italy were the subjects of the emperor, of whom Theoderic himself was a subject and official, yet actually and politically they were in the hands of Theoderic, who was their ruler. This actual relation of Theoderic to the Roman population was unconstitutional, or perhaps I should say extra-constitutional, and there was no constitutional term to designate it. Theoderic used the word *rex* to signify this unwritten relation; for remember that *rex* had no constitutional meaning in the empire, no place in the vocabulary of the imperial constitution. It was an extremely convenient term, when used thus without any closer definition, to designate at once his regular relation to his German subjects, and his irregular relation, his quasi-kingship, to the Romans of Italy. If he had called himself *rex Gotorum*, he would thereby have seemed to exclude the Romans from that higher authority which he possessed beyond the power of an ordinary imperial official. On the other hand, it would have been impossible for him to describe himself as *rex Gotorum et Romanorum*, for *rex Romanorum* would have been a glaring unconstitutional monstrosity. The simple and vague *rex* was the most appropriate term to suggest that actual sovran authority which he exercised over the German settlers and Roman citizens alike.

But this title, this style, *was not the invention of Theoderic*. It was the usage of his predecessor Odovacar, and was clearly taken over by Theoderic from him. Fortunately we possess one original official document from the chancery of Odovacar. It is a deed of gift, written on papyrus, and is preserved in two fragments, of which one is at Vienna and the other at Naples. Odovacar grants therein some farms at Syracuse to Pierius the Count of Domestics. The important point is that Odovacar is here officially designated as *rex*. The Ostrogothic dynasty adopted this style. And this is a noteworthy fact, because it is part of a larger fact which has not been sufficiently recognised and which I want to impress upon you, that in regard to the constitutional principle and the administrative system the Ostrogothic regime is simply a continuation of the regime of Odovacar: there is no break; the substitution of Theoderic is from this point of view simply a change of person. The historian who has most fully recognised this fact is Heinrich von Sybel. Everything points to the assumption that the capitulations of the agreement between Theoderic and Anastasius corresponded in all



essential points to the arrangement which Odovacar had made with Zeno. And I think it is not unimportant to observe a circumstance which helped to secure and facilitate administrative continuity. The first Praetorian Prefect of Italy under Theoderic's government was Liberius, who held the office for seven years from A.D. 493 to 500. Now this Liberius was one of the chief ministers of Odovacar, though we do not know what post he held. He supported his first master loyally until the final catastrophe, and he transferred his services to Theoderic, who wisely accepted them. Another minister of Odovacar was Cassiodorus—not the famous Cassiodorus whose writings are our chief authority for the Ostrogothic period, but his father. Cassiodorus, the father, was a finance minister under Odovacar. He had held both of the great financial offices; he had been Count of the Sacred Largess, and Count of the Private Estate. He stood aloof apparently in the contest between Theoderic and Odovacar; and when that contest was decided, he served under Theoderic, and in the early years of the sixth century became praetorian prefect [If I may remark in parenthesis that it would be very unreasonable to make any reflections upon the character of Cassiodorus because he stood aloof and did not support Odovacar under whom he had served against Odovacar's conqueror. You must remember that, in the eyes of the Roman citizens of Italy, Odovacar was an imperial official, and their own allegiance was due to the Emperor; thus when a new Master of Soldiers in the person of Theoderic came from the Emperor, sent by the Emperor to remove Odovacar, it was perfectly natural and reasonable that they should have stood aloof.] To return to my point: Liberius and Cassiodorus were two conspicuous instances in which the ministers of Odovacar's regime continued to take part in Theoderic's administration; and there were doubtless a great many cases of the kind. This continuity of the personnel of the civil service is significant, because it helped to secure Italy against breach or change in the administration.

I have tried to bring out the thoroughly Roman character of the Italian kingdom. The question will naturally be asked: How far did Germanic influences make themselves felt in Theoderic's administration? In the first place, of course, as I have already noted, the Germans lived, so far as their own *personal* relations were concerned, according to Germanic laws and customs. But in the general administration there are one or two cases where Germanic influence may have operated. Let us take the case of the officer called by the Gothic name of *saio*, who was always a Goth. These officers were marshals or messengers whom the king employed to intimate his commands. They were employed to summon the Gothic soldiers to arms, or to call a Roman official to a sense of duty. If a praetorian prefect attempted an act of oppression, Theoderic sent a *saio* to inform him that this kind of thing could not be allowed. Now, the office of *saio* may well represent a German institution. But it is well to insist on the fact that it *can be explained* without that assumption; there need be nothing Gothic about it but the name. For there were other officers who were called by a Roman name and had exactly similar functions. There were the *comitiaci* who were subordinate to the *magister officiorum*. Mommsen has shown that these *comitiaci* are identical with the well-known *agentes in rebus*, one whose duties was to execute special missions of the Emperor. Thus the *saiones* may merely represent a transference to the Goths of a Roman institution.

There is another institution which we find active under Theoderic, and in which I think a certain Germanic influence may have been at work. This is the *tuitio*. It is a purely Roman institution in itself. The earliest mention we have of it is in a law of A.D. 393. Any person who considered his personal safety in danger might apply for special protection, and a judge was bound to assign an officer to assist and protect him. The officer must not be a soldier, but a civil officer—an *apparitor*. Whether the Emperor ever himself granted a *tuitio* of this kind we do not know; no case is recorded, and we may assume that he was seldom or never called upon to do so. Such petitions cannot, in the ordinary course of things, have come before the highest court of all. Now this practice of *tuitio* plays a very prominent part in Ostrogothic Italy, and we find it mainly as a protection granted by the king himself. It was one of the

methods by which the king preserved peace and order among the two races; it was used to protect Roman against Goth and Goth against Roman. A Roman proprietor who felt his life or property threatened by an aggressive Gothic neighbour could apply to the royal court for an officer to protect him, and a *saiō* would be quartered in his house for that purpose. Now it seems highly probable that the quickening of this Roman custom under the Gothic government, and its special association with the king himself, may have been partly due to the influence of the Germanic idea of the king's duty of protection, the *Königsschutz*—an idea which was very important among the Franks. The old German word for it was *Munt*, now obsolete, but preserved in some compounds like *Vormund*, ‘guardian’, and *unmündig*, ‘under age’.

We have considered the regime of Theoderic from the constitutional point of view—as founded upon the capitulations agreed upon between him and the emperor. We have seen how sharply it was distinguished in this respect from the position of the other German kingdoms in the west, when they were first founded. We must now regard it briefly from a political point of view. The essential fact is that the constitutional system of administration which Theoderic adopted and observed was not a necessity to which he reluctantly or half-heartedly yielded; it was a system in which he was a convinced believer, and into the working of which he threw his whole heart and his best energies. His avowed political object was to civilise his own people in the environment of Roman civilisation. The circumstance that Roman law was applicable, under his government, to the Goths in Italy, just as far as it was applicable to *peregrini* in any part of the Empire, was an important condition in furthering this object. But Theoderic made no premature attempt to draw the two classes of his subjects nearer, by breaking down lines of division. They were divided from one another in two ways, by religion and by legal status—just as in the Visigothic kingdom. So far as religion was concerned, Theoderic was ardently tolerant, his principle was *Religionem imperare non possumus quia nemo cogitur ut credat invitus*: we cannot command religion because no one can be compelled to believe against his will. So extreme was his repugnance to influencing the religion of his fellow-creatures, that an anecdote was invented that he put to death a Catholic deacon for embracing Arianism in order to please him. If there is any truth in the tale, there must have been other circumstances; but in any case it is evidence for Theoderic's religious attitude, for if it was entirely invented it illustrates his reputation. The only people whom Theoderic desired to convert were the Jews; but to them also he extended in fullest measure his policy of toleration.

And just as he accepted the duality of religion, he accepted and maintained the dual system of Goth and Roman as two distinct and separate peoples living side by side. He accepted the government of this double population as the problem which he had to solve; he took no steps to bring about fusion; his only aim was that the two nations should live together in amity. It might be asked how far he regarded this state of things as no more than a stage; whether he thought that a day would come when the Gothic *peregrini*, assimilated by their Roman neighbours, would be admitted to Roman citizenship and intermarriage; whether he looked forward to a fusion of the two races in the future. To such a question I think we may answer, probably, No. He did not look beyond the dual system, nor comprehend that dual system could not be permanent. The Ostrogothic kingdom was overthrown before such a fusion could begin. But the development in the Visigothic kingdom, under similar conditions, suggests that some fusion would have ensued, if the Ostrogothic kingdom had endured.

In foreign politics Theoderic acted as an independent sovran, and his great aim here corresponded to his aim in his own kingdom. As his object in Italy was to maintain law and order, what he called *civilitas*, so on the wider scene of Western Europe his object was to maintain peace and the existing order of things. The four chief powers which came into account were the Visigoths, the Vandals, the Burgundians, and the Franks. It was natural that

Theoderic should look for special co-operation from the Visigoths, who besides being Arian were a kindred folk. But his policy was not to form a close, intimate alliance with the Visigoths, which could only seem a threat and a danger to the other powers. He sought to form bonds of friendship and alliance with all the reigning houses. If he wedded one of his daughters to Alaric, king of the Visigoths, the other married Sigismund, who became king of the Burgundians after his father Gundobad's death. Theoderic himself took as his second wife a Frankish princess, sister of Clovis. Moreover, his own sister married Thrasamund, king of the Vandals. Thus he formed close ties by marriage with all the chief powers of the west. In addition, his niece married a king of the Thuringians.

The character and spirit of Theoderic's policy are exhibited in his intervention in favour of the Alamanni. This people, after their defeat by Clovis, had moved southward into Baden, Württemberg, and eastern Switzerland. Some years later Clovis decided to pursue them and extirpate them. Theoderic wrote to his brother-in-law advising him not to push his victory further. "Hear the counsel of one who has experience in such matters. Those wars of mine have been successful the ending of which has been guided by moderation." The Alamanni were taken under the protection of Theoderic, being settled in the province of Rhaetia, which officially belonged to Italy; and they served there as a sort of frontier garrison.

But the family alliances of Theoderic did not avail to hinder war or to prevent the inevitable struggle between the Franks and Visigoths in Gaul. No moment in his reign perhaps caused more anxiety and vexation than when Clovis declared war against Alaric. He did all he could to avert it. We have the three letters he wrote at this crisis to Alaric, to Gundobad, and to Clovis himself. It was in vain. But the remarkable thing is that Theoderic did not render the help which he promised to his son-in-law Alaric. The probability seems to be that he had not calculated upon the Burgundians taking the side of the Franks, and that they cut him off in 507 from marching to Aquitaine in time to intervene in the struggle. But in 508 and the next two years his generals conducted campaigns in Gaul, and succeeded in rescuing the city of Arles and in saving Narbonensis for the Visigoths. These campaigns resulted also in an acquisition for Theoderic himself. Provence was wrested from the Burgundians and annexed to Italy. The power of Theoderic also received another extension. The heir of Alaric, who had fallen in the battle of Vouillé, was a child. The government of Spain was consigned to Theoderic, who was the boy's grandfather and his most powerful protector; and for the rest of his life he ruled Spain in his own name. He ruled it quite independently, and the union in the same hands of Spain, the independent kingdom, and Italy, the imperial dependency, exhibits in a striking way the contrast between them.

Theoderic died in 526, and within ten years from his death the struggle began which ended in the destruction of his work, the overthrow of the Ostrogothic kingdom. The stage was cleared for a new development. It may then seem unnecessary to have dwelt at such comparative length on the reign of Theoderic and the Ostrogothic period, seeing that it was an episode which led to nothing and had no morrow. But the importance of studying the Ostrogothic regime is not so much due to its place in the development of events, as to the light it throws, both by way of similarity and by way of contrast, on the process of the formation and on the conditions of the kingdoms into which the western half of the Empire broke up. It helps us to understand the position of the Visigothic federate kingdom and the Burgundian federate kingdom in Gaul when they were first planted; it helps us to understand how the parallel dual systems worked in other lands; it helps us to realise the problems of government which the other German kings had to solve, whether they were still federate or had ceased to be federate; it helps us to apprehend the attitude and aims of the half-Romanised Germans.

I cannot include the story of the fall of the Ostrogothic kingdom, and the resumption of Italy under the immediate government of the emperor, within the compass of these lectures. I

have only to remind you that Justinian's conquest of Africa and his conquest of Italy differed in one important point. In the case of Africa, he was recovering lost provinces from a power which was quite independent of the Empire. In the case of Italy, he was resuming the direct government of a territory which had been committed to the sway of a regent who in theory fully acknowledged the imperial authority and accepted the limitations which had been laid down by that authority. Observe also that to the Roman population of Italy the change of masters was welcome; the Goths were still aliens to them, and they were heretical aliens as well. This difference in religion was of fundamental importance.

The fall of the Ostrogothic kingdom reminds us of the comparative failure of the East German peoples to perform their early promise. It had seemed, a century earlier, that the fate of western Europe lay with them. The Vandal and the Ostrogothic kingdoms had now both disappeared. The Visigothic still survived, but at the beginning of the eighth century it was to go down before invaders from Asia. It was the only one of the three which was to have abiding effect on the country in which it was established. The fourth, the Burgundian, had already been absorbed into the Merovingian realm. Two of the sons of Clovis conquered it in 532. But it maintained an integral identity of its own within that realm; an identity which was marked by the continued use of Burgundian law.

WE must now turn from Italy to observe how the power of the barbarians had been advancing in the provinces farther west. The great growth of the Visigothic kingdom, the kingdom of Toulouse, as it was called, belongs to the time of Euric. This powerful king, son of that Theodoric who had perished in the great battle against Attila in 451, was the third of three brothers—Thorismund, Theodoric II, Euric—to ascend the Visigothic throne. He gained the throne by murdering his predecessor in 466, and he reigned till 484. He was probably the greatest of the Visigothic kings. Not only did he show conspicuous ability both in war and diplomacy, but he was also the first of the Visigothic legislators. He not only succeeded in achieving those territorial acquisitions for the kingdom which his predecessors had in vain attempted to make, but he extended the realm far beyond the bounds at which they had aimed. In Gaul he carried his frontier to the Loire and to the Rhone, A few years before his accession the Visigoths had won Narbonensis, including Narbonne but not including Arles; they acquired thereby a sea-board on the Mediterranean. Euric gained possession of Arles and Marseilles, and in 481, after the death of the Emperor Julius Nepos, the whole of Provence to the border of Italy was formally conceded to him by Odovacar, who professed to represent the imperial authority. Meantime, Euric had advanced northwards, and had won the province of Aquitania Prima, which stretched from Orleans to Vienne, and included the district of Auvergne. This district held out longest against the Visigoths, and the fierceness of the struggle of the Roman magnates against the Goths is reflected in the pages of the poet and bishop Sidonius Apollinaris,

But Euric was no less active in Spain than in Gaul. His predecessors had constantly made incursions into Spain against the Suevians, and had generally cooperated with the Romans. In fact, in these Spanish wars they might be considered as continuing the work of Wallia, as imperial federates, helping to protect Roman Spain against the Suevians. Euric continued the war against the Suevians; but it carried him much farther. He not only conquered a part of Suevo territory, but he extended his power ultimately over the whole of Roman Spain, except a few strong places on the coast. We may say that by the year 478, all Spain, except the north-western corner where the disabled and weakened Suevo kingdom continued to exist, had been incorporated in the Visigothic kingdom. By the year 481 Euric's dominion stretched from the Straits to the Loire. In Gaul it was bounded by the Atlantic, the Loire, and the Rhone, with the addition of Provence, east of the Rhone. It was now at the height of its territorial power, and it seemed in these years, from 480 onwards, far the greatest



and most promising state of western Europe. In fact, anyone surveying western Europe at that moment could hardly have failed to conclude that its destinies depended on the Visigoths.

The Roman power, however, had not yet wholly disappeared. I must go back to say that after the death of Aetius, in 454, the great bulwark of the imperial authority had been Aegidius, a native of western Gaul. For ten years, doubtless as *magister militum*, he had maintained the frontiers with varying success against the Visigoths; as to his relations with the Franks I shall have to speak later on. After his death about 464 or 465, the defence of the Gallo-Romans devolved upon his son Syagrius, who was unable to resist the advance of Euric to the Loire. But he maintained the north of Gaul, the lands of the Seine and Somme against the Goths on the south, and against the Franks on the east. The position was difficult, and it was mainly by keeping on good terms with the Franks that Aegidius had been able to maintain it. It seemed probable that the Gothic power would soon advance to the Channel, and that the remnant of Roman provincial government would be crushed out. Indeed, it actually was crushed out in a few years, but not, as everyone might have expected, by the Goths. It was crushed out by the Franks, after Euric's death, an event the treatment of which belongs to another lecture. But I would insist here on the great prospect which to all outward appearance the Visigothic kingdom possessed during the last four years of Euric's reign, 480-484. The Goths seemed almost certain to be the ultimate inheritors of all Gaul, and they had already acquired almost all Spain. It is interesting to realise this apparent probability, which the actual course of things so markedly belied.

I think it is likely that the subjugation of all Gaul was a dream which Euric dreamed, and hoped to realise. His policy is thus expressed by Jordanes, who was no doubt copying Cassiodorus: "Euric saw the frequent change of Roman Emperors and the tottering state of the Empire: so he determined to be independent and to subdue Gaul". This general statement of Euric's policy is borne out by the facts; he made very considerable steps towards carrying it out. It is possible that if he had lived longer he might have done more. But I do not believe that he or any other king of the Visigoths, however able, could have accomplished Euric's dream unless they had fulfilled one condition. I come here to what was probably the principal and radical cause of the remarkable failure of the Visigoths, notwithstanding their splendid promise. It was their religion; they were Arians. If Euric or his son Alaric had embraced the Catholic creed and brought about the conversion of his people, the course of history in Gaul might have been quite different. The weak joint in the armour of the Visigothic kings was the antagonism of the Roman population and their clergy to their heretical rulers. This cause of weakness was not confined to the Visigoths: it appears with similar effects in the case of the other great East German kingdoms. I think it is not too much to lay down the general proposition that the Arian heresy was one main cause of the striking fact that the East German peoples who had begun so brilliantly, sweeping, as it were, all before them, ended their career in failure. The three leading cases are the Vandals, the Visigoths, and the Ostrogoths. The overthrow of the Vandal kingdom by the forces of the Empire might never have been achieved but for the fanatical devotion of the Vandals to their heretical creed and their persecution of the Catholic provincials. It was the same with the still shorter lived Ostrogothic kingdom in Italy; for, although the Ostrogoths did not persecute, their rule could never establish itself on a popular basis because they were Arians; and it was the difference in faith, keeping the Goths and the Italians apart, and the rallying of the Italians to the side of an orthodox conqueror, that conduced above all to the success of the imperialist armies which reconquered Italy under Justinian. The Visigothic kingdom did not come to an untimely end like the Vandal and the Ostrogothic; yet it not only fell short of the success which it seemed likely to achieve, but it did collapse suddenly in Gaul. But before we consider that collapse we must follow the history of the Franks.

The united strength of Roman and Goth had repulsed the Hun from Gaul, but neither Roman emperor nor Gothic king was destined permanently to inherit it. We have now to trace the rise of the power of the Franks, who in less than sixty years after the deaths of King Theodoric I (451) and Aetius (454) had annexed the territory of Roman and Visigoth alike. Considering their importance, considering the fact that contemporary chroniclers were still recording events in the fifth century in Gaul, our knowledge of the rise and advance of the Salian Franks is curiously meagre. Our chief authority is the *Historia Francorum* of Gregory of Tours, the historian who is for the Franks what Cassiodorus is for the Goths, Bede for the Anglo-Saxons, Paul the Deacon for the Lombards. Gregory wrote towards the end of the sixth century, and brought his history down to his own time. From 561 to 591—the year with which his story terminates—for these thirty years he narrates events of which he was contemporary. But up to 561, from the beginning of the fifth century, his sketch of the history of the Franks is derived from sources the nature of which we are only just beginning to understand. As everything depends on Gregory of Tours, I must begin by explaining briefly his method and the value of his material. He had no Roman historians to help him. He does, it is true, at the very outset find something to his purpose in Sulpicius Severus and in Renatus Frigeridus Profuturus; but of these the former stops before the end of the fourth century, while Renatus does not come down very far into the fifth, and stops before the serious advance of the Franks begins. In the fifth century, annals take the place of histories in the Latin half of the Empire, and Gregory got what he could out of the annals which were accessible to him. Besides the annals he was able to get some information from Lives of Saints, and we find him using the *Life of St. Remigius*. But beyond these we may say with certainty that he had no written sources.

Like all the other German peoples, the Franks had their heroic songs, and these songs were not only about the remote past; they celebrated living or recently dead chieftains, together with recent and contemporary events. Historical facts were altered by popular imagination, and gradually cast into legendary moulds which conformed them to the spirit of epic poetry. The existence of poetry of this kind can be proved among all the chief German peoples. That the character and origin of these narratives have been so slowly recognised is due to the semi-critical attitude of Gregory in receiving and recording them. He did not know the Frank tongue himself, and he must have got friends who knew the songs to tell him the gist of them. He evidently distrusted these Frank traditions, but he had no other source, and was obliged to make use of them. But he shows his distrust and contempt for them, as compared with written sources, by never designating them, or referring to them by any more particular formula than *ut ferunt*, or the like. He mentions his *written* authorities because he regarded a written authority as a guarantee of correctness; but he had little respect for popular rumour or tradition, and did not consider it a guarantee at all. This is the characteristic sceptical attitude of the Roman man of letters to oral tradition. You understand, then, that the Franks of Gregory's time had their heroic songs not only of the remote past, but also of the very recent past; and that the popular imagination was still busy in Gregory's own day with the invention of new works of poetical creation.

Let us see what we can make out of this material concerning the early history of the Franks. The first Salian king of whom Gregory of Tours tells us is Chlodio, and here too it can be shown that he gained his information not from any written sources, but from the traditions, the poetical traditions, of the Franks. I may quote verbally his notice of Chlodio: it is highly important. "It is related that Chlodio, a brave man and the most noble of his race, was at that time king of the Franks. He lived in the stronghold of Dispargum, which is in the borders of the Thuringians. Chlodio sent reconnoiters to the city of Cameracum (Cambrai): they explored the whole district, and then Chlodio followed, defeated the Romans and captured the city, where he resided for some time. Then he occupied all the country as far as

the river Somme". This notice is a brief summary of the drift of a Frankish tale of which Chlodio was the hero. You observe here the land of the Thuringians means a land west of the lower Rhine on the north-east border of France. You observe too how Gregory is, in spite of himself, under the influence of his source. In such a brief notice he might better have left out the details of the sending forth of reconnoiters and the king himself following subsequently; we ought either to have more details or none at all. Fortunately for us he has left them in; for they indicate clearly, as Kurth has pointed out, that he was abbreviating from a much fuller story in which those details had interest and significance.

The stronghold of Dispargum is, no doubt, historical; we need not doubt that it was a stronghold north of the great forest, the Silva Carbonaria, which bounded the Frankish territory on the south. But what about Chlodio himself? Is he a historical person or a legendary figure? If we had no evidence but this notice of Gregory of Tours we might feel considerable doubt as to his reality. But by a lucky chance we have another piece of evidence which completely reassures us that Chlodio was a real king of the Franks, and one, moreover, which gives us a chronological date. This important testimony is found in a poem of Sidonius Apollinaris. The poet describes an episode in the career of the great Roman general Aetius, his own contemporary. He tells how Chlodio with his Franks invaded the plains of Artois. He encamped near a place called Vicus Helena, and his warriors, deeming themselves quite secure, celebrated the wedding of one of their comrades. As they are engaged in songs and festivity, Aetius is suddenly seen on the road descending into the valley. The Franks, taken unprepared, are routed, and the bride and bridegroom fall into the hands of the conquerors. This precious text assures us, in the first place, of the reality of King Chlodio; in the second place, it shows us that the Frank tradition is historically correct in representing Chlodio as trying to extend his dominion in the direction of Artois; in the third place, it gives us a date for King Chlodio's reign, since the incident recorded by Sidonius can be fixed to the year A.D. 431 or thereabouts. But how very instructive the existence of this testimony is! Sidonius was not a historian; and it was only a chance that he should have chosen to tell this story. If he had not told the story, the existence of Chlodio would have been a subject for legitimate doubt. It is a most useful warning to us, that tradition must be criticised and not merely set aside.

In the present case, Sidonius also furnishes a valuable clue for criticising the record of the Frank tradition. In the account of Gregory, Chlodio first seizes Cambrai, which implies that he penetrated through the Carbonarian forest, and then proceeds to reduce all the land as far as the Somme. These achievements are conceived in this tradition as a single great successful expedition. That this conception was not historical is shown by the story in Sidonius, from which we learn that the able Roman general was in the field against the Franks, and that he drove them back. We must therefore conclude that the conquests of Chlodio, if they did finally reach to the Somme, were achieved slowly and not in one glorious advance. That the national song should have pressed into a single enterprise events that were scattered over years is perfectly natural.

We have now *two fixed points* in the advance of the Franks; 358 for their advance from the island of Batavia into Flanders, and 430-431 for their next advance southward in the direction of the Somme. After this we lose sight of them again until the invasion of Gaul by the Huns in 451. At that crisis, as we saw, the Salians embraced the cause of Rome. They were still, of course, regarded as part of the Empire, living within its borders, and nominally subjects of the emperors. But we are not told who was king of the Salian Franks at the battle of the Mauriac plain. Now, according to the Frankish tradition as recorded by Gregory, King Chlodio was succeeded by Merovech or Meroveus, and Merovech by Childeric. About Childeric there is no difficulty or doubt; we know that he was already king in A.D. 457. But the intervening Merovech is surrounded by mystery. Our only definite notices of him are

derived from Frank legend, and they hint at some curious secret about his origin. Gregory of Tours has no doubt about his existence; but he was in doubt about his birth. He says mysteriously “*Some believe that Meroveus is of the seed of Chlodio*”; but he does not mention any rival theory. Clearly he wished to believe that Merovech was Chlodio’s son: but the Frank tradition raised such doubts that he felt himself unable to speak positively. Fredegarius teaches us what the legend was. Merovech was the son of the queen, Chlodio’s wife; but his father was a sea-god, *bistea Neptuni*. Perhaps you may think that the existence of this legend is sufficient to throw doubt on the very existence of Merovech. That would be a hasty conclusion. The fact that Merovech comes in between the historical Chlodio and the historical Childeric seems to be a certain guarantee of his reality. If he were merely, as has been supposed, the legendary founder of the Merovingian family, then legend would have placed him before, not after, Chlodio. The legend is probably simply an attempt to explain his name, which means Son of the Sea.

Childeric is a somewhat clearer figure than Chlodio, but around him too legends grew up in which popular imagination dealt freely with historical facts. These legends were known to Gregory of Tours and Fredegarius, and they have preserved not very much, but at least some indications which are of service. There was a tale which told how Childeric and his mother were led into captivity by the Huns, and how he was delivered by the loyalty and devotion of a Frank, Wiomad, who enabled him to escape. This was a common type of tale—we have other examples—escape from captivity achieved through the cunning of a faithful and crafty esquire or servant. But you observe that the historical setting is accurate; it is perfectly in accordance with probability that Childeric, then a youth, might have been captured when Attila invaded Gaul. In my opinion, so much of the story is probably true: an actual captivity of Childeric at the Hunnic court is the most likely explanation of the origin of the story, which must have had a historical motif. And if so, it will follow that it was not Childeric, but his father, Merovech, who was present at the Mauriac battle.

The other legend of Childeric to which I must refer is that of his marriage. The name of his wife was Basina; she was the mother of the great Clovis. As to her reality there can, I think, be no doubt. The name of Clovis’s mother must have been remembered, and besides we know that at a later time Basina was a name in the Merovingian family. But a curious story was set afloat as to who Basina was and how Childeric came to marry her. It was related that Childeric led such a dissolute life, and committed so many acts of violence, that the Franks were roused to indignation against him and he was forced to flee. Before he fled, one of his friends, the faithful Wiomad, undertook to appease the people during his absence and prepare the way for his return. They split a piece of gold, and Wiomad was to send his half to Childeric as a token when the favourable time had come. Childeric found refuge in Thuringia with King Basinus and his wife Basina. The Franks then chose the Roman general Aegidius as their king. Through the machinations of Wiomad, the rule of Aegidius became heavy and unpopular, so that at the end of eight years the Franks regretted their exiled monarch. Wiomad then sent the token; Childeric returned to his land and resumed his kingship. Shortly afterwards Basina left her husband and fled to the homestead of Childeric. When he asked her why she had come so far, she replied, “Because I know your bravery. If I had thought that there was one braver than you, even beyond the sea, I would have sought him”. Then Childeric took her to wife.

I need hardly point out to you the legendary shape of this narrative, whatever facts underlie it. It can be shown that two distinct legends and motifs have been combined. You observe the incongruity of the dialogue between Childeric and Basina with what goes before. Childeric has been living for eight years at her court, and yet he asks her why she has come, as if he had not the faintest suspicion. The dialogue, in fact, presumes no previous acquaintance. This suggests that originally the story of Childeric’s meeting with Basina had



no connection with the story of his exile in Thuringia. The combination of the two stories was a later thought. And of course it is an absurdity, or at the best highly improbable, to suppose that Basina was the wife of Basinus the Thuringian king. Basinus and Basina ought to be the names of brother and sister, but it was not likely to happen that they should be the names of king and queen. Basinus, or rather Bisinus, king of Thuringia, was a historical person; we have indisputable evidence of his existence; but Kurth is perhaps right in his view that it was just the resemblance of names between the historical Basina and the historical Basinus (each of whom came into a story about Childeric) that suggested the interlacing of the two stories. How much historical fact may we glean from these traditions? From the one, we can only infer that Basina was the name of Childeric's wife and Clovis's mother. The original legend represented her as coming to the king of the Franks, somewhat like the Queen of Sheba to Solomon; but we do not know whence she came. The other tradition, which represents Childeric as exile in Thuringia and the Franks submitting to the sway of the Roman general Aegidius, has undoubtedly an historical motif, and I venture to think that we can disengage its main significance. Observe, to begin with, that the introduction of Aegidius is quite in harmony with the historical circumstances of Childeric's reign, for just as Chlodio's Roman antagonist was Aetius, so Childeric's Roman antagonist was Aegidius. The story that the Franks voluntarily elected Aegidius as their ruler can be nothing more than the legendary explanation of Roman success at their expense. If Aegidius drove back the limits of their encroachment, regained for the Empire territory which they had occupied, forced them to give tokens of submission to the imperial authority, such humiliation, puzzling to national pride, was presently explained in their poetical tradition by the flight of their king and their own free choice of the Roman conqueror. The main fact which we can determine is that in the days of Childeric there was, for a brief space, a rolling back of the Frankish advance, a revival of the imperial power in north-eastern Gaul. But it is certain that the legendary exile of Childeric to Thuringia must also have had a motive. Can we determine that too? I suggest that we can. If the Franks were decisively driven back by Aegidius, what did that mean but that the territory over which Chlodio had extended his power was recovered by the Empire, and the authority of Childeric was restricted to their old seats in the land north of the Carbonarian forest, the land which the Franks themselves, as we saw, knew as Thuringia. Here, I suggest, is the clue. The repulse of the Franks into the western, the Frankish Thuringia, from their more recently acquired territory, which passed from under their king's authority, was the motive of the story of their king's exile, and the double meaning of Thuringia was the circumstance which determined the character of the legend. The Childeric of history had to retreat into Thuringia, that was the historical starting-point of the legendary invention; only Thuringia as counted as the *eastern* Thuringia; and hence the retreat of Childeric was transformed into an exile at foreign court. For this exile a motive was found in the tyrannical government of the king; and it in turn furnished a motive for the choosing of Aegidius by the Franks as their ruler.

We must now turn to consider whether anything is known of Childeric's reign from sober historical sources, unmoulded and untinged by popular fancy. Gregory of Tours is our sole informant about Childeric, unfortunately he has derived some facts from the *Annals of Angers* to which I referred above. In the first place, we learn that Childeric fought at Orleans before the death of Aegidius. Now there is no doubt what this means. It means that Childeric and his Franks fought as the *federates* of the Romans in the great battle of Orleans, at which Aegidius defeated the Visigoths, in 463 or 464. As to this, I think all good authorities are agreed. And you see how this fact harmonises with the inference which we drew on the legendary tradition—namely, that Aegidius had reasserted imperial authority over the territory on which the Franks had encroached. The Franks are now under imperial influence.

The next operations in which we find Childeric engaged are also on the Loire, after the death of Aegidius, but still as a Roman ally, a Roman *federate*. This time it is not against the

Visigoths that his aid is needed, but against another foe—a foe whom we do not associate with Gaul but with our own island. It is a notable fact that the Saxons in the fifth century attempted to found kingdoms in Gaul as well as in Britain; they sailed for the Loire as well as for the Thames. They failed in Gaul, but in other circumstances they might have succeeded, and there might have been a Gallic Saxony. It was a remarkable anticipation of what happened in the ninth century, when the Northmen did what the Saxons had tried to do and had only partly done. Yet the Saxons did leave a mark, though it was a small mark, in Gaul. Some of the settlements remained distinct until late times, especially in the Bessin, in the region of Bayeux. But in the time of Childeric they were a terror to the cities of the Loire. Soon after the battle of Orleans they seem to have plundered Angers (under a leader named Adovaerius—a name clearly the same as that of Odovacar, the ruler of Italy). On the death of Aegidius, which happened about this time, the defence of the Roman provinces in north Gaul devolved on a certain Count Paulus; and his task was to withstand the encroachments of the Visigoths and to defend the land against the Saxons. Childeric and his Franks helped Paulus as they had helped Aegidius, and fought against both Goth and Saxon. The first object was to prevent the Saxons from capturing Angers, and Childeric successfully held the city. This success was followed up by active operations against the Saxons, and finally Adovaerius was forced to submit and enter Roman service. The general fact then to remark is this: that the rise of a Saxon power in north Gaul was arrested at an early stage and frustrated by the united action of the imperial authority and Childeric.

After this, Syagrius, the son of Aegidius, is the representative of the Empire in Gaul, and we hear nothing as to the relations subsisting between him and Childeric. But we may consider it certain that there was no further territorial advance on the part of the Salian Franks so long as Childeric lived. Childeric died in 481, and he was buried at Tournai, which was his chief place. His tomb was discovered there in 1653, and in it were found the remains of his royal cloak, his arms, and many gold ornaments.

We now come to the greatest of all the Merovingian kings, the creator of the Merovingian power, the man who stands out between Julius Caesar and Charles the Great as most powerfully moulding the destinies of Gaul. It is indeed only in the reflected light of what Clovis achieved that the small successes of his great-grandfather win their importance and significance.

Clovis, son of Childeric and Basina, succeeded his father in A.D. 481. Though darkness broods over his reign of thirty years, and though, considering the greatness of his work, we know little as to how he accomplished it, we have at all events some fixed chronological points for tracing his gradual advance. His first movement was against the imperial power which still maintained itself in a portion of northern Gaul, encompassed by barbarian kingdoms. Aegidius, the protector of Gaul, had been succeeded by Syagrius. We do not know what exactly was the official title under which Syagrius represented the Emperor in Gaul. Up to 480 the Emperor he represented was Julius Nepos, after 480 the Emperor whom he represented was Zeno; but Zeno at Constantinople could do nothing to help him. He was practically, though not formally, an independent ruler, and the Franks naturally came to regard the Roman province which Syagrius governed as his own kingdom. Hence he is called in their tradition *king of the Romans*; and, what is more, he is looked upon as son and successor of Aegidius, who again is considered the son of Aetius. In fact, in Frankish tradition, the last three defenders of imperial Gaul appear as a dynasty of Roman kings, and a pedigree, mounting higher, was made out for them. That is a very interesting illustration of the form in which popular tradition expresses historical facts. Syagrius resided at Soissons, and against Soissons Clovis moved in 486. A battle was fought; it is generally called the battle of Soissons, though I do not think it was necessarily fought just at that city. Syagrius was utterly defeated, and he fled to the court of the Visigothic king at Toulouse. Alaric II, son

of Euric, was that king. He was not prepared to go to war with the Franks, and when Clovis sent a message peremptorily demanding that he should deliver up the fugitive, he complied.

A famous incident occurred in connection with this conquest which is characteristic and instructive. There was found in the booty a beautiful vessel, a work of art, belonging to a certain bishop, and the bishop sent a particular entreaty to Clovis to restore it to him. Gregory does not mention the bishop's name, but it can be shown, almost to a certainty, that it was Remigius, bishop of Reims. The king desired to do this favour to the bishop, and he told him to come to Soissons where the spoils were to be divided. At the division of the spoils, the king requested his warriors to reserve this vessel for himself, and all consented except one, who declared that the king should not have more than his legal share, and followed up his protest by breaking the vessel with a stroke of his axe. The Frank was within his rights; the king was forced to suppress his wrath. But next year Clovis held a review of his army. Singling out the offender, he found fault with something in his equipment, and snatching a weapon from him threw it on the ground. The soldier bent down to take up the weapon, and Clovis split his skull with his axe, saying, "Thus didst thou to the vessel of Soissons". Probably this incident has an historical basis; it certainly is not a Frankish legend; it was rather derived from an ecclesiastical source, as the subject indicates; and it has been conjectured with much probability that Gregory's source was the *Life of St. Remigius*, the bishop concerned, for we know that this biography was consulted by Gregory. The instructive points in the incident are two: first, the policy of Clovis, though he was still a pagan, to conciliate the Gallo-Roman bishops; secondly, the limitation of the royal power at this period; the Frank warriors are all on an equality with the king at the division of the spoils; one of them fearlessly asserts this equality, and the king cannot resent it; he can only bide his time for revenge. Such an incident would hardly have happened a generation later. Now, in respect of this limited character of the kingly power, it is important to remark that there were other kings among the Salian Franks besides Clovis, though he was pre-eminent. There was a king called Ragnachar who reigned at Cambrai, and there was another, Chararic, both kinsmen of Clovis. It has been thought by some critics that these kings must have been suppressed, and all the Salians united under the sole authority of Clovis, before he conquered Syagrius and the Roman province. I believe that this criticism is wholly from the purpose. Gregory tells us, and his authority may very well be a notice in the *Annals of Angers*, that Ragnachar co-operated with Clovis in that expedition. And the tradition which records how Clovis marched against Chararic and destroyed him records this act just after the war against Syagrius, and accounts for it by the circumstance that Chararic held aloof from that war. The truth seems to be that it was his success in that war and the heightening of his prestige that enabled Clovis to take steps to make his own authority sole and undivided over the Salians, and to get rid of the other kings. As the stories of his dealings with these kings were derived by Gregory from native legends, and as legend could be taken for fact, Clovis's character would be established as that of a cruel and bloodthirsty tyrant. But an examination of them shows that no inference can reasonably be made; the means by which he is represented to have annexed the kingdoms of his kinsmen are certainly not historical; and national epics love a perfidious and successful hero.

There is, however, one chronological indication of Clovis's authority over the Salians. We learn that at this time, 486, he attacked the Thuringians. Now, an aggression against the kingdom of Thuringia beyond the Rhine seems at this period of Clovis's reign highly improbable, in fact out of the question; and therefore we may take it that the Thuringian name here too refers to the land of the Salians, the Belgic Thuringia, and that this expedition of Clovis was one of the steps by which he became sole sovereign of the Salians.

With the conquest of Syagrius the power of Clovis, as I have said, reached to the Seine. It was followed by a further extension, of which we have no direct historical record and which

we can only infer from subsequent events, an extension to the Loire. Here the people with whom Clovis had to do were partly men of our own race—the Saxons, against whom his father and the imperial generals had fought together.

It was probably in the early 'nineties that Clovis celebrated his marriage with a Christian princess, Clotilda of Burgundy, the niece of King Gundobad, the lawgiver of Burgundy. About a generation after this espousal, a legend grew up about it—a legend of which I must speak, because it has been taken for serious history and it has thrown a shadow over the character of Clotilda, and a still darker shadow over the character of King Gundobad. The story is told in the usual abridged way by Gregory; its details have been more fully preserved by Fredegarius. Gundobad, king of Burgundy, according to the narrative, killed his brother Chilperic, and flung Chilperic's wife into the water with a stone round her neck. Chilperic had two daughters, Chrona and Clotilda. Gundobad expelled them from his court, and they lived at Geneva, where the elder became a nun. Now as Clovis often sent embassies into Burgundy, he heard about the young princess Clotilda, and he despatched a trusty Roman named Aurelian to discover and have sight of her, if by any means he could do so. At Geneva he was charitably received by the two sisters. Clotilda performed the pious duty of washing the beggar's feet, and Aurelian was able to whisper to her and arrange a private meeting. He showed Clovis's ring and told her that Clovis wished her to share his throne. Clotilda said that they must ask her hand of King Gundobad, and urged great haste, fearing the return from an embassy of Aridius, Gundobad's chief minister. "If the ambassadors do not come at once, I fear that the sage Aridius will return from Constantinople and defeat our purpose". Aurelian hurried back to Clovis, who immediately sent an embassy to the king of the Burgundians. Gundobad did not dare to refuse the request of Clovis, and the envoys returned with Clotilda. They placed her and her treasure in a car, but she foresaw the arrival of the dreaded Aridius from Constantinople, and she said to the chief of the embassy, "If you wish me to reach your master, let me leave this car and set me on horseback; then let us ride with all speed. If I stay in the car, I shall never see the king". So they did, they left the car and the treasure behind, and reached the court of Clovis safely. They were barely in tune. For Aridius had meanwhile landed at Marseilles, learned what was going on, and hurried to find Gundobad. "I have made a treaty of friendship with the Franks", said Gundobad, "by giving Clovis my niece". "That is no treaty of friendship", said Aridius, "but the seed of everlasting discord. Remember, my lord, that you killed Chilperic, Clotilda's father, drowned her mother, slew her two brothers. If she becomes powerful, she will avenge her kindred. Send an army in pursuit and overtake her". Such was the counsel of the wise Aridius, whose coming Clotilda had so greatly dreaded. Gundobad sent a host in pursuit, but it captured nothing save the car and the treasure. Clotilda, when she reached the frontier of Burgundy, had ordered her guides to devastate the country for twelve leagues round about, and when this was done she cried, "I thank thee, O God, for letting me begin my revenge for my parents and brethren".

The legendary character of the story is patent, but in this case the very basis of it is entirely fictitious. Clotilda had nothing to avenge; Gundobad had not committed the murders of which the story accuses him. His friendly relations with his brothers are, as it happens, attested in a letter which was written to him by Bishop St. Avitus to console him for a daughter's death. "On former occasions", says the saint, "you wept with unutterable emotion the loss of your brother, and your people sympathised in your grief". This passage does not refer to Godegrisil, another brother who strove with Gundobad and perished in the struggle; it must refer to Chilperic. The testimony seems definitely to exclude the hypothesis that Gundobad slew Chilperic, as the legend assumes. Besides this, the epitaph of Chilperic's wife, Clotilda's mother, has survived in a church at Lyons. Her name was Caretena, and she died in the year 506, many years after her daughter's marriage. This legend, then, of the wicked uncle is not in accordance with historical facts: how did it come to arise? It has been



shown beyond question that it originated after the great war of A.D. 523 between the Burgundians and the Franks, in which King Sigismund of Burgundy and his family tragically perished. It was to explain the origin and reason of this later war, which seemed so tragic because the royal families of the two nations were so closely allied, that popular imagination invented the story. If Clotilda were not avenging some old wrong, how could she have permitted her sons to destroy her kinsmen? Thus was suggested the story of old wrongs, a former scene in a poetical drama of injury and revenge. The connection is manifested by the mode in which the crime is made in the legend to correspond to the revenge. King Sigismund and his wife were slain and thrown into a well; accordingly, Chilperic's wife must be slain along with him and thrown into the water; again, two sons of Sigismund perished with him; therefore two sons of Chilperic (who may have never existed) must perish with *him*. We can thus safely conclude that the true Gundobad was not the sanguinary tyrant of later tradition, nor was Clotilda the bearer of tragedy and doom to the Burgundian house as she appears in the story.

A war of far greater moment, a war decisive in the growth of the Merovingian dominion, broke out in the year A.D. 496. The kingdom of the Alamanni on the upper Rhine marched on its northern boundary with the territory of the Ripuarian Franks, and the Ripuarians had to suffer or resist Alamannic aggression. Thus we find the Ripuarian king Sigebert in a battle with this enemy, receiving a wound which lamed him for life. That battle was fought at Tolbiacum, now Zulpich, in the Duchy of Ülich, west of Bonn, which shows that the Alamanni had invaded Ripuarian territory. The existence of such hostilities could easily furnish the Salian king with a pretext for attacking the Alamanni, and he may well have posed as a protector of the Ripuarians. But his determination to attack them was a resolve of the highest consequence for the historical role of the Franks. It decided that their power was to be not only Gallic but Germanic. The conquest of 486 had been the great step leading to advance to the west; the conquest of 496 was the great step leading to advance to the east. The Frank power was to bestride the Rhine, and to lay the foundations of modern Germany as well as of modern France. In historical books, up to very recent times, you will find it stated that the battle in which Clovis overthrew the Alamannic power was fought at Tolbiacum. That is a serious error, and has no shadow of authority. There was, as I just mentioned, a fight at Tolbiacum, and it was a fight between the Alamanni and a Frank king, but the Frank king was Sigebert the Ripuarian, not Clovis the Salian. The great victory of Clovis was probably won in Alamannic territory; but we must not build on the untrustworthy *Life of St. Vedastus*, where, though no definite locality is given, it seems implied that the war was waged in Alsace.

Not long after the conquest of the Alamanni an event happened of still greater moment, viz. Clovis's conversion to Christianity. Ecclesiastical tradition connected the two events, representing that Clovis had resolved to embrace his wife's religion in case he were victorious. There may indeed be a certain measure of truth in this tradition. We must, however, realise the circumstances of Clovis. Christianity had already made some progress among the Franks. His kinsman, the Salian king Chararic, seems to have been a Christian. Two of his sisters—one of whom married King Theodoric the Ostrogoth—were Christians, though of the Arian creed; another remained a pagan. His wife, Clotilda, was a Catholic, though her uncle, King Gundobad, was an Arian; possibly her father had been a Catholic. Thus in the king's own household there were warring faiths—a state of things which we so frequently find in the barbaric kingdoms—on the eve of the conversion of the king. A ruler of Clovis's intelligence could not have failed to discern the immense support he would derive from the Gallo-Roman Church by his conversion. His policy towards the Church, as illustrated by the incident of the vase of Soissons, indicates clearly that he was conscious of the importance of its support. But it was equally manifest that his Christianity would be worse

than useless if it were Christianity of the Arian form. To embrace the Arian creed might have seemed the obvious course, seeing that his German neighbours—Visigoths, Ostrogoths, Burgundians—were all Arian. That would have been a fatal mistake; and we may be sure that it was neither an accident nor his own religious preferences, but his political perceptions, that helped him to avoid it. It would be absurd to suppose that he weighed in the balance of judgement the Arian against the Catholic doctrine, and decided on grounds of reason or theory in favour of the former. That is not the way barbarians are converted. On the other hand, the influence of his wife Clotilda is supposed to have counted for much, and it might be argued that his choice of Catholicism was determined by the accident that Clotilda was not an Arian. I think we may safely impute much to Clotilda's influence in hastening Clovis's conversion—we have analogous cases in Kent and Lombardy—but I am inclined to doubt whether the existence of this influence was accidental. If we remember that the Burgundians were largely Arian, that King Gundobad was an Arian, and Clotilda was exceptionally a Catholic, it is certainly remarkable, if it were mere chance, that Clovis's choice should have fallen on one of the Catholic exceptions. I think I am not rash in suggesting that it was just because she was a Catholic that Clovis chose her out. If I am right in this conjecture the policy and conversion of Clovis appear in a new light. He still hesitated to become a Christian himself, but, appreciating the power of the Church, he saw what an enormous help it would be towards securing its confidence to have a Catholic wife; he saw of what use she could be in negotiations with the ecclesiastics. In this light his marriage to Clotilda has less bearing on Clovis's relations to Burgundy than on his relations to the Church. It was deliberately intended as a substitute for becoming a Christian himself, and it made clear what form of Christianity he would embrace, if he ever embraced any. But why did he hesitate? Here is the point where there comes in another influence, which has so often prevailed over statesmanship—the influence of superstition. Clovis had not the smallest doubt of the existence of the God of the Christians, but, believing in the existence of his own gods too, the question was, which was the more powerful? Could he safely abandon his own? It took him some years, and we need not wonder at it, to decide between two opinions, and perhaps to experiment. It was a question perhaps of testing the rival claims by what the rival claimants could do for him. It is related that the first-born son of Clotilda was baptised with the king's consent and then fell sick and died. Well, there was an experiment, and one which in the king's eyes must have seemed unfavourable to the claims of Clotilda's deity. It may well be that circumstances induced him to regard his victory over the Alamanni as secured with the help of the Christian God, and that this may have been, as tradition records, the final test which caused him to consummate his previous policy by joining the Catholic Church. Clovis was baptised, some think, in the church of St. Martin at Tours, in A.D. 496; he had recently taken that city from the Visigoths—a fact which has only recently been proved. The prevailing view, however, has been that he was baptised at Reims.

The incalculable importance of Clovis's adhesion to the Catholic faith has been fully recognised by historical writers. They emphasise it strongly as an event of ecumenical consequence—*Welthistorische Bedeutung*. What they have not seen clearly enough is that the event was not an accident or a sudden inspiration. It was, so far as I can see, the crown of a consistent, calculated policy, which displays Clovis's high intelligence and eminently statesmanlike perception. To suppose that he was not conscious of the political bearings of what he did, to believe that it was the toss of the dice or a freak of circumstance whether he became a Catholic or an Arian, is to hold an opinion of Clovis's mental power which is inconsistent with his great achievements. For observe that this was not a case of foreseeing future contingencies, or discerning the small germs of great developments; no second sight was necessary; it was simply a case of taking a wide and statesmanlike view of the political situation, estimating the conditions in which his kingdom was placed, and choosing the policy

which would best tend to its consolidation. It was the sort of problem which has often occurred and has often been solved. But it is solved by reflection and craft, not by chance or the happy hits of an unthinking ruler. What makes us prone to misapprehend and misrepresent to ourselves the intellectual calibre of a statesman like Clovis is the circumstance that the barbarians, the Franks of Clovis's time, Clovis himself, had a naive side, and that this side—a certain simplicity and childishness, combined with cunning—is what is chiefly reflected in the traditions as recorded by Gregory of Tours and Fredegarius. And so an idea is shaped of a bold warrior, primitive and childlike in his notions, capable of astuteness and cunning in his dealings, but one with whom are associated no higher qualities of statesmanship, such as become the founder of a great state. Such a conception of Clovis cannot but be untrue; the paucity of our material unfortunately has suffered the error to exist.

I have given you the usually received account of Clovis's conversion, depending on the account of Gregory of Tours. It is, I think, in the main points correct, with the explanations which I have suggested. But I have still to tell you that a document exists which is, so far as it goes, of much higher authority than Gregory of Tours, and which creates a considerable difficulty. It is nothing less than a letter from Remigius, bishop of Reims, to Clovis himself; in fact, a political document of incontrovertible authority; but we must be sure that we understand it. Two letters of this Bishop Remigius to Clovis are extant; one of them, the less important, is an epistle of condolence on the death of the king's sister, Albofledis, who was a Christian, and from its tone one would certainly never suspect that the person to whom it is addressed was not a Christian. But the other letter to which I have to direct your attention suggests very strongly that Clovis was a Christian when it was written. The bishop exhorts him always to resort to the advice and counsels of his priests: *Sacerdotibus tuis debebis deferre, et ad eorum consilia semper recurrere*. He tells him: *hoc imprimis agendum ut Domini iudicium a te non vacillet*. So long as there was nothing to determine the date of this letter, there was no difficulty, for it could be taken for granted that it was subsequent to 496 and Clovis's conversion. But it has recently been suggested that the letter contains an indication of its date. The bishop states his motive for writing to the king in his opening words. As they stand in the MSS. they are extremely obscure and indeed obviously corrupt. *Rumor ad nos magnum pervenit administrationem vos secundum bellice suscepisse. Rumor magnum*—I am not responsible for the gender, and I suspect neither was Remigius, but what the bishop meant was: “An important piece of tidings has reached us that you have undertaken the administration of”—something. *Secundum bellice* makes nonsense. The usual resort has been to insert *rei* after *bellice*, and the meaning is supposed to be “that you have undertaken for the second time the administration of military affairs”. Such a statement is unintelligible in reference to Clovis. The words *secundum bellice* have been brilliantly emended by Bethmanns into *Secunde Belgice*, “that you have undertaken the administration of the Second Belgica”. But if this simple correction is right, it would seem to follow, as Gundlach has pointed out, that the letter was dated soon after the victory of Soissons, which brought the province of Belgica Secunda under Clovis's power. That is, it would be written in 486 or 487, ten years before the date assigned by Gregory of Tours for Clovis's conversion. But the letter seems almost necessarily to imply that Clovis was a Christian when it was written. Therefore, concludes Gundlach, the story in Gregory of Tours which connects that conversion with the victory over the Alamanni is false. Clovis was a Christian before the battle of Soissons.

Now, if this view were true, we should be met by a considerable difficulty. Why should ecclesiastical tradition, which gloried in Clovis as the first Christian king of the Franks, have conceived the thought of injuring his reputation by representing him as a pagan during the first fifteen years of his reign, if he was in reality for all or most of that period a Christian? This seems to me a very grave difficulty, and I cannot help thinking that the general tenor of

the ecclesiastical tradition must be correct. How then are we to interpret the letter? Are we to say that the tone of the letter and the expressions in it which seem to imply Clovis's Christianity are delusive, and that the bishop designedly adopted that tone with the purpose of suggesting that Clovis should no longer be content with showing goodwill towards Christianity, but should now adopt that religion himself? Foreseeing the probability of the king's ultimate conversion, the bishop might have taken upon himself, proleptically as it were, to address him as if he were a Christian. This is just conceivable, but I hardly think we could without distinct evidence admit it as a probable explanation.

Of course the simplest way out is to say that, after all, *Secunde Belgice* is only an emendation. But it is an emendation of a very high order of probability. The context requires the designation of a territory or province, and as the MSS. give *Secundum bellice*, it seems quite impossible to escape the conviction that *Secunde Belgice* is what the bishop wrote, seeing that the bishop's own see of Reims was in that province. We must admit, in my opinion, that Bishop Remigius in this letter did refer to the Second Belgica, but I am not prepared to accept Gundlach's conclusion as the only possible one. On the contrary, the evidence points, I think, to another conclusion of great interest and importance. Accepting the general truth of the ecclesiastical tradition that Clovis's conversion was not brought about till 496, it follows that this letter of Remigius in which the king's Christianity is implied was written after that year. Therefore it was after that year that Clovis undertook the administration of the Second Belgica.

It follows then that after the victory at or near Soissons in 486, Clovis did not immediately take into his own hands the direct administration of the provinces included in the so-called *regnum* of Syagrius; he left the administration to the imperial functionaries; he allowed the old organisation to remain unchanged; he contented himself with exerting a controlling influence.

Now, in the first place, this conclusion is probable in itself; it would show that the growth of the Frankish power under Clovis was more gradual than is generally supposed; not until after his great victory over the Alamanni did he feel in a position to exert direct and immediate rule over the Belgic province in which he had overthrown the regime of Syagrius, and to incorporate it fully in his dominion. In the second place, this conclusion seems to me more in harmony with the contents of the letter of Remigius. I find it very difficult to believe that that letter could have been written immediately after the victory of Soissons. It does not contain a syllable of reference to the battle, or to Syagrius. It is the letter of one who sympathises with Clovis, not of one who has just received the news of a very unwelcome fact of which he has to make the best. If it were really written just after the defeat of Syagrius, we should have to believe that the bishop was a traitor to the Roman government, and secretly favoured the Frankish invader: we should have to assume that the expression "You have undertaken the administration of Belgica Secunda" is a nicely calculated euphuism for "You have defeated our general".

Once the Franks and Visigoths came into close quarters on the Loire, war between them was inevitable. The decisive struggle was postponed for twenty years after the conquest of Syagrius, but the two kingdoms were never on good terms, and serious hostilities were not lacking. The Franks seem to have been always the aggressors. They were in possession of the city of Tours in A.D. 496. They seem to have seized the city of Santones (Saintes) and also the city of Bordeaux, before the end of the century. The policy of the great Theoderic, king of the Ostrogoths and lord of Italy, was to preserve peace among the barbarian kingdoms in the west. He was allied by marriage with Alaric, king of the Visigoths, and *probably* his authority was instrumental in deferring a Franco-Gothic war. The opposition between the two kingdoms was accentuated when Clovis embraced Christianity in its Catholic form, and, when the time was ripe, he could profess to go forth as a champion of Catholic orthodoxy to drive



the Arian heretics from Gaul. It was in the year 507 that he declared war and led his army south of the Loire. The enemies met not very far from Poitiers, in the *Campus Vocladensis*; the Goths were routed, and their king, Alaric, fell; slain, it would appear, by the king of the Franks himself. Then Clovis sent his son Theodoric to subjugate all the land as far as the frontier of Burgundy. He himself seized Alaric's treasure at Toulouse, and transferred it to Bordeaux, where he spent the winter.

Such is the brief story of this most important event, so far as it can be reconstructed from the records of the annals. The lordship of Aquitaine hereby passed from the Goths to the Franks; it became part of Francia in a wide sense of the term; and the authority of Clovis extended to the Pyrenees. The Visigoths were not indeed entirely driven beyond the mountains. They continued to keep, and kept throughout the Merovingian period, the territory of Septimania, with the seaboard, as far as the mouth of the Rhone. But their centre was now transferred to Spain. Thus, with the exception of Septimania, Burgundy, and Provence, and the Breton peninsula of Armorica in the north, all Gaul was now united under the king of the Franks.

The overthrow of the Visigoths made a deep impression on the Gallo-Roman Church, and the impression is preserved in the pages of Gregory of Tours, who adorns his account of the campaign with various miraculous incidents, of which the ecclesiastical origin is apparent. The Gallo-Roman Christians, such as Gregory of Tours himself, looked upon the war as religious, and as justified by religion; the Visigoths were Arians, and therefore war against them was righteous, however unprovoked. Gregory represents Clovis as invading their kingdom without any provocation. "It vexes me", said Clovis to his followers, "to see these Arians holding a part of Gaul. Let us attack them with God's aid, and, having conquered them, subjugate their land". We need not take this story literally, but it expresses an important historical fact, viz. that Clovis's Visigothic war stands out among his other wars as one in which he had the enthusiastic support, not merely of his own Franks, but of the Gallo-Roman Christians and the Church. Soon after his return from Aquitaine, Clovis founded at Paris the Church of the Holy Apostles, afterwards the church of St. Geneviève. The tradition was that before he set out against Alaric, he made a vow to build the church if he should return victorious, and marked out the limits of the site by hurling his axe, according to the German custom of taking possession of a domain. We cannot determine, and it matters little, whether he did make such a vow; the important point is that the clergy of the Church, rightly or wrongly, connected its foundation with the victory over the Visigoths. This, like many other stories which circulated among the Gallic ecclesiastics, may have no historical actuality; but they have all collectively historical importance—we may say historical truth—in reflecting accurately the impression which the conquest of the Visigothic kingdom made upon Gaul and especially upon the Church.

The enlargement of his kingdom by the annexation of south-western Gaul altered the centre of the realm, and rendered it expedient for the king to move his residence farther west than Soissons. He fixed on Paris, which then, at the very moment when the greater part of Gaul became co-extensive with Francia, was chosen for preeminence—a preeminence soon lost amid the divisions of the kingdom, but finally reasserted in confirmation of Clovis's choice.

The kingdom of the Riparian Franks, of which the centre was at Köln, seems to have maintained its independence, or at least its separate existence, till after the Visigothic War. But at last it fell into Clovis's hands, and Clovis was elected king by the Riparian Franks. This seems to be the utmost one can say with certainty. Frankish legend described this political change as a tragic catastrophe. Sigebert, king of the Riparians, had a son named Chloderic, and Clovis secretly suggested to Chloderic to kill his old father and reign in his stead. Accordingly Sigebert was slain by his son, and then Clovis perfidiously slew the son

and caused himself to be elected king. I am only summing up a story that is handed down with details which show its legendary character; it is quite insufficient evidence on which to condemn Clovis either of fraud or of violence in this matter. It may seem probable that Sigebert did die a violent death, but the true circumstances are unknown to us.

I have still to speak of Clovis's relation to the Roman Empire and the Roman Emperor. It is generally said that the advance of the Frankish power under Clovis is distinguished from the advance of the Teutonic power, such as the Visigothic and Burgundian, by the circumstance that there was no disguise about it; that, while those other Teutons were settling within the Empire, the Franks snatched provinces from the Empire and never professed to be inside it. Now there is a certain truth in this view: there is generally a difference between the process by which the Franks formed their kingdom in Gaul and the process by which the Visigoths and Burgundians formed theirs; but this difference has been exaggerated. In the first place, remember that the Salians, like the Visigoths and Burgundians, were originally settled as federate subjects in an imperial province, and remember that Childeric throughout his reign acted as a federate and supported the imperial administration. In the second place, if my interpretation of the letter of Remigius to Clovis is right, Clovis maintained and supported the Roman administration in Belgica for a considerable time after he had overthrown Syagrius, and his attitude must have been that of the king of a federate people, not of an outsider. But the most important point is that his Gallic kingdom, when it was an accomplished fact, was recognised by the Emperor Anastasius as nominally within and not outside the Empire. This fact has been questioned. It depends on a passage of Gregory of Tours which has been largely discussed. At the end of his account of the Visigothic War and Clovis's arrival at the city of Tours, Gregory goes on to say: *Igitur ab Anastasio imperatore codicillos de consolato accepit . . . et ab die tanquam consul aut augustus est vocitatus*. That is: the Emperor Anastasius conferred the consulship on Clovis and henceforward he was styled *tanquam consul*. This statement has been rejected by some critics as a fable because the name of Clovis does not appear in the consular lists. This criticism misapprehends the meaning. Clovis is not made a *consul ordinarius*, one of the ordinary consuls of the year. He received an honorary or titular consulship, an honour that was often conferred. The technical title of such an honorary consul was *ex consule*, and this is what is meant by Gregory's expression *tanquam consul*. The word *codicilli* for the deed by which the Emperor conferred the titular consulship is technical. There is therefore no reason to question the truth of Gregory's statement, while we recognise his inaccuracy in introducing the title *augustus*, which Clovis undoubtedly never assumed.

The founder of the Frank monarchy died in 511, and for the last three years of his life he was by virtue of his consular title formally recognised by the Empire. That title was doubtless a recognition of his championship of orthodoxy against the Arian Visigoths. Actually it made no change in the situation; but it is significant as illustrative of the relation of the Empire to the Germans who were dismembering it.

THE Roman Emperor Justinian [A.D. 527-565] had hardly resumed the administration of Italy in his own hands, the Roman citizens had scarcely got rid of the foreigners who had been established in their midst, when a new host of invaders descended into Italy, to establish a dominion of a very different kind from that of Odovacar and Theoderic. The people who now appear on the scene are the Langobardi, who during the past four centuries have been moving about in central Europe in a way which it is very difficult to trace. We meet them at an early stage of German history, bestriding the banks of the lower Elbe, in the reign of Augustus. They are one of the peoples who feel the might of that emperor's stepson Tiberius. In the second century, at the time of the great migratory movements in Germany, they leave their northern home, and move southwards towards the banks of the Danube. In the time of the Marcomanni War (under Marcus Aurelius) they try to enter Pannonia, but are repelled.

From this time to the fifth century their name disappears entirely from our Roman records. But their own traditions professed to tell their history during this period. Those traditions are preserved in a document known as the *Origo gentis Langobardorum*, dating from the seventh century; and in our main authority for Lombard history, the *Historia Langobardorum* of Paul the Deacon, who wrote before the end of the eighth century. Many attempts have been made to disentangle the movements of the Langobardi from these traditions, but none of them seems very successful; and, while I do not despair that it may still be possible to determine the history which underlies those traditions, I think we must content ourselves for the present with saying that the Langobardi lived and moved in the regions north of the Danube for the three centuries after the reign of Marcus Aurelius; and that they were necessarily included in the Empire of Attila. After the destruction of the Rugian power by Odovacar (487), it is said that they occupied the Rugian land on the north bank of the Danube over against the province of Noricum; but about 505 they were subdued by the Heruls and forced to move into the *campi patentes*, which must mean some part of the low plains of Hungary (which the Hungarians call the Alföla); between the Danube and the Theiss. Here they were neighbours of the Gepids who had occupied Dacia and part of Pannonia; and here they lived tributary to the Heruls for three years, and then about 508 they rose in rebellion and in a great battle they broke utterly the power of the Heruls. This war is described by the Greek historian Procopius as well as by Paul the Deacon. The Heruli or Eruli (the name is not improbably the same as *jarl* or *earl*) a people whose wanderings are no less perplexing in those of the Langobardi themselves. After the break up of the Hun Empire they moved in the same geographical area as the Langobardi, north of the middle Danube. The war with the Langobardi almost extirpated them; the small remnant that escaped were partly settled by the Emperor in Moesia, and partly received into the kingdom of the Gepids. During the next sixty years the chief factor Langobardic history was antagonism to the Gepids, and it was this mutual hostility of these peoples which led Justinian to offer the Langobardi settlements in Noricum and western Pannonia, to be a counterpoise to the Gepids, who were continually harassing and encroaching on the imperial provinces south of the lower Danube. During this period the Langobardi appear as useful and sufficiently loyal federates of the empire, not only helping it against the Gepids but also sending auxiliaries to fight against the Ostrogoths in Italy.

I must pause to point out some changes which had taken place, in these critical years, in the *south German* lands—the lands of the upper Danube. We saw that the Alamanni, after their defeat by the Franks, had settled in Rhaetia and the land which came to be generally known as Swabia. Their eastern boundary was fixed as the river Lech, on the banks of which is the city of Augsburg.

Now the future of the lands east of the Lech, and southwards to the Brenner, was decided about the year 500. These lands were occupied then by the Marcomanni and Quadi, who had been the leading peoples in the great German war of Marcus Aurelius. Their home was in Bohemia. Bohemia was originally a Celtic land: the name Bohemia is Boio-heim, the home of the Boii, a Celtic people. This was the name given by its German neighbours; but about the time of the Christian era it became a German land, being occupied by the Marcomanni.

The German period of the history of Bohemia lasted for about five hundred years; then its German folk migrated, and it was occupied by Slavs.

When the Marcomanni and Quadi appeared in the regions of the river Inn and the upper Danube, they were designated by the people of those regions as Bojuvari or Bojovares, “people from the land of the Boii” in fact Bohemians. From this name of the German settlers, indicative of their old home, the land was called Bajovaria, Bavaria. This is the origin of Bavaria. You see how the name is curiously derived from the same Celtic people who gave their name to Bohemia.

We cannot say how the Langobardi were affected by this migration which resulted in the making of Bavaria. I must now point out an important change of another kind with which the Langobardi are connected. It was probably in the course of the fifth century that the German speech in south German lands underwent a change which produced what is known as High Dutch or High German. This change seems to have worked from Burgundy in the west to Bohemia in the east; later on it extended northwards. The chief characteristic of this linguistic change was the shifting of the consonants, known as the “second shifting”. The “first shifting”, which is emulated in Grimm’s famous rule, had affected all the Germanic tongues; the “second shifting”, formulated in the same rule, was confined to certain geographical limits, and the language, so modified, afterwards spread beyond those limits. It is in consequence of this shifting, which may have been going on about the year 500, that the Germans say *Gott*, *zehn*, and *thal*, where we say god, ten and dale. But whereas in the first ancient, prehistoric shifting *all* the explosive consonants had been affected alike, according to the same rules, the second historical shifting was only partial; some of the consonants escaped altogether.

It especially concerns us now that the Langobardi came under the influence of this change. Their language, as they spoke it in Italy, exhibits the consonantal shifting which is the characteristic mark of High German. This fact is very important, because; is one of the data which enable us to determine approximately the date of that shifting. It must have been prior to the migration of the Lombards into Italy, because the Lombard language must have been affected by it while they were still in contact with the geographical region when the change originated and was consummated. If the shifting did not begin till the end of the sixth century, till after the Lombards had departed for Italy, it is inconceivable that it could have affected their speech beyond the mountains.

Let us now resume in a few words the meagre outline of Lombard history up to the eve of their invasion of Italy. Their earliest historical seats were close to the mouth of the Elbe, between the East Germans and the West Germans. There they were neighbours of the Angles and the Saxons, and the memory of this ancient Lombardy was preserved in the Middle Ages in the name of the Bardengau on the lower Elbe. Migrating southward in the second century, they lived and moved obscurely in the regions of Austria and Hungary for more than two hundred years till they were included in the Empire of the Huns. Living in the neighbourhood of High German peoples, their tongue underwent the change which produced the High German language. At last the Emperor Justinian admitted them into the provinces which they had in vain sought to enter nearly four hundred years before when the Emperor was Marcus Aurelius. They were now *federates* and subjects of the Empire.

Towards the close of the reign of the Emperor Justinian, a hundred years after the fall of the Huns, another Asiatic people, ethnologically akin to the Huns, resembling them in character and manners, arrived on the scene to take their place. These were the Avars. They were not destined to create as great an empire as that of Attila, but they formed a strong power in the Danube lands which played towards the Empire a similar part to that which the Huns had played, and were a very important factor in the political situation during the second half of the sixth century. We first hear of the Avars in the fifth century, when they still lived beyond the Volga. In the reign of Justinian they moved westward; conquered the Sabiri and various other peoples north of the Caucasus, gradually moved across the steppes of southern Russia, till they reached the Dnieper and then the Danube. But in the course of this movement they seem to have left a portion of their people in the region between the Caspian, the Black Sea, and the Caucasus. There is at the present day a people called Avars in Lesghistan. It is a remarkable fact that these Lesghian or Caucasian Avars have a number of names and words which are identical with the names used by the ancient Huns, and this is an argument for the otherwise probable view that the Avars were a people very closely related to the Huns.



The first embassy of the Avars to Constantinople was in the last years of Justinian. Their chief at this time was Baian—the Attila of the Avars. He was determined to push his power and conquest very much farther to the west. When he reached the Danube, his way was blocked by the imperial power to the south, and by the power of the Gepids in Dacia. But he pushed forward in the north, and perhaps extended his power over the Slavonic peoples who during the past centuries had been steadily pressing westward to the Elbe. Certain it is that about the year 562 an Avar host invaded Thuringia and was defeated by the Franks. The Gepids were the great obstacle to Baian's designs; they showed no signs of fleeing before the Avars as the Visigoths had fled before the Huns. But their days were numbered. They had on both sides foes who desired their destruction—the Avars on the east, the Langobardi on the west.

It was about the year of Justinian's death (565) that Alboin succeeded to the kingship of the Lombards. Alboin saw in the power of the Avars a means of crushing the Gepids. He proposed a compact to Baian. He said: "Let us join hands and destroy these Gepids who lie between your lands and mine. If we conquer them, you shall have their lands and half the spoils". This alliance sealed the fate of the Gepids. They were conquered in a great battle, of which the date is about 567, and politically annihilated. This was the end of another of the great East German peoples, who, though less famous than Goths and Vandals, had played a considerable part in the Danubian lands. A new period in the history of Dacia ensued. That country now passed into the hands of the Avars, who soon extended their power farther west.

The destruction of the Gepids seems to have been, on the part of the Lombard king, prompted by hatred and vindictiveness, not by policy. He slew Cunimund, the Gepid king, in the battle with his own hand; afterwards he took Rosamund, his daughter, to wife, and, according to a doubtful tale, fashioned her father's skull into a drinking cup to be used at solemn banquets. But no sooner had the extirpation of his hated neighbours been completed and his passion of vengeance satisfied than he determined to leave his home in Pannonia and seek a new home in Italy. He may perhaps have come to the conclusion that the Avars would not be more agreeable neighbours than the Gepids had been. He is said to have made the Avars the conditional inheritors of his Pannonian territory. He said: "If we Lombards conquer Italy, you shall have all our territory in Pannonia; but you must promise that, if we fail, you will restore it to us". However this may be, Pannonia, on the departure of the Lombards, was occupied by the Avars apparently without consulting the Emperor.

Our authorities tell us that the Lombards were always few in numbers, and this fact explains some circumstances in their history. When they decided to attempt the conquest of Italy, they did not go forth alone. They took to themselves partners and allies. Men of various races followed their standards, but their chief allies were Saxons—a host, it is said, of 20,000 Saxons with their wives and children. The historian calls the Saxons their old friends—referring to the fact that they had in ancient days lived in proximity on the lower Elbe. It would seem to be implied that they had maintained relations with one another in the intervening period. It may be observed that in law and custom there were many points of community between the Lombards and the Saxons. After the conquest of Italy, the Saxons wished to live in their portion of the conquered territory independently and according to their own laws. But the Lombards would not tolerate this arrangement. They insisted that their confederates should live subject to Lombard rule and Lombard laws. Rather than submit to abandoning the laws and customs of their fathers, the Saxons left Italy, returned north, and sought to settle in Swabia, where after a protracted struggle they were nearly extirpated by the Franks.

The first thing to be noticed about the Lombard conquest in Italy, which began in 568, is, of course, the fact that it was only partial. The Lombards never ruled the whole of Italy, like the Ostrogoths. They never held Rome or Naples; they never held Ravenna until just

before the fall of their own kingdom. Italy, throughout the Lombard period, was divided between the Imperial and the Lombard powers. In the second place, the territories of the two powers were not compact and continuous; they were scattered through each other; the Imperial possessions were not confined to the south nor the Lombards to the north. The main outline of this distribution of the peninsula between the Empire and the invaders was decided almost immediately. Alboin entered Italy in 568 and died in 572; during these four years the Lombards occupied, roughly speaking, the north of Italy, including both inland Liguria and inland Venetia; in the centre they conquered Tuscany and a large territory along the Apennines which became known as the Duchy of Spoleto; in the south they won also a large territory which became the Duchy of Benevento. But in the north the sea-coast of Liguria remained imperial, and likewise the sea-coast of Venetia, including the island settlements, which were soon to grow into Venice. After the death of Alboin very little further extension of Lombard power was made until the reign of Agilulf at the beginning of the seventh century. His reign may be considered the second period of conquest; but his acquisitions were chiefly cities in the north, such as Padua and Mantua, which were within the lines of the Lombard realm, as marked out by Alboin. The third period of conquest comes forty years later, in the reign of Rothari, who won maritime Liguria. Some thirty or forty years later again—the date is not quite certain—a Duke of Benevento conquered Otranto and the heel of Italy. This is the general outline of the extension of Lombard territorial dominion. Imperial Italy consisted of: in the north-east, Venice and a district reaching from north of Ravenna to the south of Ancona; in the centre, the Ducatus or Duchy of Rome; in the south, the Duchy of Naples, the toe of the peninsula, and for a long time the heel. Ravenna continued to possess the importance which it had held under the later emperors and under the Ostrogoths; it was the seat of government of the exarch, the imperial governor who controlled imperial Italy, uniting military and civil powers. It is to be observed that the north-eastern territory, which may be called in a special sense the exarchate of Ravenna, is separated by the Apennines from the Duchy of Rome, and at this point the two Lombard duchies of Tuscany and Spoleto met. This circumstance marks a weak point in the Imperialists' position, but it was partly mitigated by the fact that they held the strong and important citadel of Perugia on this line, and it helped to link the two frontiers of their territory.

The failure of the Lombards to win the whole of Italy is in all probability to be attributed largely to the smallness of their numbers, to which I have already referred. But there is another very important consideration. The Lombards seem to have been born landlubbers, though they had once lived near the mouth of the Elbe. They never took to the sea; they never created even the most modest fleet. This put them at a hopeless disadvantage for attacking such towns as Rome and Ravenna. The Lombards could reduce a strong inland town like Ticinum by blockade. Alboin took Ticinum after a blockade of three years. Theoderic reduced Ravenna, when it was held by Odovacar, in three years, but he did it with the help of a fleet of cutters. If the Lombards had had the instinct and sense to make themselves even a small fleet, their successes might have been considerably greater. This defect explains the fact that they never made any conquest in the island of Sicily. I may observe here that since the fall of the Vandals, the sea-power of the Roman Empire held complete control over the western basin of the Mediterranean up to the beginning of the eighth century, when the Saracens began to dispute it.

Having seen the limits of the Lombard conquest, we must now briefly examine their social and political system. In the first place, how did they deal with the Italian population, how did they deal with the proprietorship of the soil? These questions have been variously answered. I must emphasise the fact that the Lombards, though they were *federates* of the Emperor in Pannonia, nevertheless, when they invaded Italy, did so without any regard to the federal bond. They came as undisguised enemies; they made no pretence of forming

settlements as *federati*. In this respect, they are strongly contrasted with the East German peoples: even the Vandals made a compact with the imperial government. We might then expect to find that the rule and administration of the Lombards would be similarly out of relation to Roman institutions, and this indeed is what we find in Lombard legislation. The Edict or law code of King Rothari, which was drawn up in the middle of the seventh century, is like the Salian law—and in contrast with the Visigothic and Burgundian law—thoroughly Germanic from beginning to end. But the question is: Was there a dual system? While the Lombard conquerors lived by the law as laid down in Rothari's lawbook, did the Roman subjects live by their own Roman law, as they had lived under the Ostrogothic regime, and as the Gallo-Romans lived under the government of the Merovingians? There is no doubt that this was partly the case so far as personal law was concerned: the evidence is meagre, but there are one or two passages in the laws which can hardly be otherwise explained. In Rothari's law code there is hardly a reference to Roman subjects, hardly an indication of any difference of nationality, no provision for mixed suits. The inference is that mixed suits would come before a Lombard court and be judged by Lombard law. Troya and others hold the view that all the Roman population was reduced by the conquerors to the condition of serfs, or *aldii*. There were three classes in Lombard society: freemen; *aldii*, or half-free, who were bound to the soil, and correspond to the *leti* among the Franks; and thirdly slaves. The theory in question holds that all the Roman freemen were reduced to the condition of *aldii* and included in the second class. This view sounds very improbable. The solution which I believe to be the right one has been given by Professor Vinogradov in a book which he published a good many years ago at St. Petersburg, but of which the results are still little known in western Europe. I will summarise them.

In the first place Alboin took no general measures respecting the treatment of the conquered population: he died before he had completed the work of conquest. His successor Cleph contented himself apparently with the drastic measure of slaying or driving from Italy many powerful men among the Romans. After his death there was an interregnum of ten years, during which power was in the hands of the dukes; and they found it necessary to organise the conquest. What they did is thus described by Paul: *Reliqui vero per hospites divisi ut tertiam partem suarum frugum Langobardis persolverent, tributarii efficiuntur*. "The rest of the Roman population are distributed among the Lombard *hospites*, and have to pay them a tribute one-third of the produce of their lands." In other words, the institution of *hospitalitas* is revived in its older form; the proprietors yield a third of their *produce*, they have not to give up a third of their *land*. When he comes to the end of the interregnum, the historian Paul again deals with the condition of the subject population in a short sentence which has been much discussed and variously explained. *Populi tamen adgravati per Langobardos hospites partiuntur*. There can, I think, be no doubt that this expresses in an abridged form the same fact which was stated in the previous passage. "The subject peoples are distributed among the Lombard *hospites*"—*i.e.* among the Lombards whom they have to maintain as guests. The simple meaning is that when the royal power was revived at the end of the interregnum, the same thing was done as had been arranged before by the dukes in the several duchies. In other words, the plan of dealing of the Roman proprietors, adopted by the dukes, is organised anew, systematically, throughout the kingdom.

These general measures affected all the Roman land proprietors directly. They themselves, not their lands, were divided among the Lombards, to whom they had give a certain part of the produce, which was regarded as a *tributum*. Thus they remained proprietors; but they were *tributarii*. They were not bound to the soil: this is proved by the position of the *tertiatores*, descendants of these proprietors in the Terra di Lavoro in the eighth century. Hence the view that the Roman possessors passed into the class of Lombard *aldii* or serfs cannot be correct. They must have belonged to the class of Lombard freemen. It

is possible that, as Vinogradov suggests, they formed a class of freemen known as *homines pertinentes*, mentioned in some of the Lombard laws and distinguished from the *aldii*. While the Roman proprietors were included in the free class, their *coloni* or serfs would naturally be included in the Lombard serf class, the *aldii*, and the Roman slaves would pass into the same class as the Lombard slaves.

To sum up: the main principle of the Lombard system was uniformity of government; the same territorial laws and administration applied to the conquered as to the conquerors, and these territorial laws and administrative institutions were Lombard, not Roman. The Roman population (while their personal relations were regulated by Roman law) passed according to their various social classes into the corresponding classes of the Lombard society, there was, however, one important difference. The free Roman proprietors had to pay a tribute of a third their produce to those Lombards to whom they had been assigned, and as *tributarii* they were dependent. You see then that the condition of the Romans under Lombard rule, though it was not so bad as some investigators have held, was very much harder than in those German kingdoms which were federate states, or had commenced as federate states, the Ostrogothic, the Visigothic, and the Burgundian.

Were there then no Lombard landed proprietors in the Lombard kingdom? Was all the land in the hands of the Italian natives? No. In cases where the proprietors had been slain or banished—and there were many such cases—the estates passed into the hands of the dukes or the king. These rulers made grants to their followers to reward their services and secure their loyalty. The principle on which these grants were made was in the interests of those who received rather than of those who granted. They were grants in perpetuity; no limits of time were imposed. Hence every estate granted by a duke tended to exhaust his capital. Moreover no conditions were attached to the grants, which conferred full proprietary rights. In the course of time the Lombard rulers came to recognise the defects of this system. Accordingly we find King Liutprand in the eighth century granting lands on long leases. We also find him conceding the practical enjoyment of an estate without any legal agreement or prescription. Such an estate could be resumed at any moment unless the occupier could prove that his actual tenure exceeded sixty years. From its very nature this mode of tenure left few traces of its existence—for its basis and essence was the absence of legal documents.

The Lombard kingdom, like the Ostrogothic kingdom in Italy was governed by a common and uniform administration, and it was subject to a territorial law which applied to all subjects, Roman and Lombard alike; the great distinction being that in the case of the Ostrogoths the territorial law and the administrative institutions were Roman, in the case of the Lombards the territorial law and the administrative machinery were Lombard. The independence of the Lombards from Roman influence is manifested conspicuously in the fact that they had no general system of taxes on imports. The absence of direct taxation was a characteristic of the Lombard regime. There was no staff for collecting taxes, and our authorities give no indication of any administrative difficulties connected with taxation, no complaints, no laws, such as are frequent under both the imperial and the Ostrogothic rule.

The first law code of the Lombards, the Edict of Rothari, exhibits no sign of Roman influence. Issued in A.D. 643—seventy-six years after the conquest of Italy—its general spirit and character seem to take us back into the forests of Germany. We have here largely the same laws and customs which must have regulated the Lombard folk when it dwelled by the banks of the Elbe, modified at one or two points by the fact that they had embraced the Christian faith. The document itself opens with *In nomine Domini*. “In the name of the Lord beginneth the Edict which the Lord Rothari, King of the race of the Lombards, hath renewed, in conjunction with the chief men who are his judges”.

The preface of the Edict goes on to say: “How great has been, and is, our care and solicitude for the weal of our subjects, the tenor of the following Code shows. We have been



especially affected by the constant oppression of the poor and by the excessive extortions from those who are known to have larger property, having discovered that they are exposed to violence. So considering the mercy of Almighty God, we have seen the necessity of issuing the present improved law, which corrects and renews former laws, adding what is necessary and cutting out what is superfluous. We have embraced in one volume all that is required for providing that each man may live quietly, according to law and justice, and defend himself and his borders”.

The first sections of the Code are devoted to offences against the king's peace. They deal with conspiracy against the king's life, with harbouring brigands, with exciting soldiers to mutiny, with the case of an officer who deserts his soldiers in a battle: all these acts are punished with death. “If any man take counsel with the king concerning the death of another or kill a man by the king's authority, he shall not be held guilty, either he or his heirs; because since we believe the hearts of kings to be in the hand of God, it is not possible for a man to escape whom a king shall have ordered to be slain”. This important law, strengthening the royal power, basing it on a sort of divine right, is of course not ancient, but due to the recent growth of the royal power in Italy. The Edict goes on to enumerate various cases of life-taking: all of which are made good by the payment of a *guidrigild*, which is the Lombard name for *weregild*. Further laws provide for cases of annoyance or obstruction on the king's highway. Then we meet the crime of *walapauz*—that is of the thief who stealthily clothes himself in the dress of another man or disguises his face or head for the purpose of committing a theft.

It was dangerous to be found in another man's courtyard at night. “If a free man be found there and do not give his hands to be tied, and if he be killed, no compensation shall be claimed by his kinsfolk. And if he give his hands to be tied and be bound, then let him pay on his own behalf 80 solidi: because it is not reasonable that a man should enter another's yard at night in silence or secretly; but if he has any proper business, let him shout before he enters”. This law strikes us as remarkable because the fine is so heavy: 80 solidi means £48, a sum which represented of course a much higher value then. A slave found in the same situation paid only half the amount.

Cases of sacrilege in churches next claim the attention of the legislator: then he goes on to enumerate, in a long list, all sorts of bodily injuries, in which the compensations are carefully assessed to the supposed gravity of the damage. This is one of the most primitive parts of the Code. If a man knocks out his neighbour's front teeth, he has to pay twice as much as if he knocked out his grinders. If you wished to cut off somebody's finger or toe, it would have been well for you first to refer to Rothari's list of fines; for if you cut off a great toe or a second toe, you would have to pay about £3: 12s., whereas if you contented yourself with the third or fourth you would get off with £1: 16s.; and, if you only cut off a little toe, you would not have to pay more than 24 shillings. But, as a matter of fact, Rothari had introduced a change in this tariff. In old days, the compositions were not so high. Rothari raised them; in order, he says, “that the feud may be postponed after the payment of these compositions, and more may not be required, but let the cause be ended between the parties, and friendship remain”. Such were the means which Rothari adopted to attempt to mitigate feuds and private war. The next matters considered are injuries done to *aldii* or serfs, to household slaves, and to rural slaves. In all these cases the composition was paid to the lord of the injured dependent; and it is interesting to observe that in the case of some serious wounds the offender has to pay not only the fixed composition, but also a compensation for the loss which the master sustained by the man's labour, and the doctor's fee (*mercedes medici*). The treatment of accidents in the felling of trees is interesting. If several men are felling a tree and if it falls upon a passer-by and kills or hurts him, the men have to pay the composition in equal proportion. But if it fall upon one of the tree-cutters themselves and kill him, then one

portion is reckoned for the dead man, and the others pay the rest in equal proportion. Thus if there are three men and one is killed, he is supposed to bear himself one-third of the responsibility, and the two others are only liable for two-thirds of the composition, *i.e.* each pays one-third. There is special legislation for poisoning cases. A free man or free woman who mixes a cup of poison, but has not been able to administer it, is liable for a composition of 20 solidi. If the poison is administered but is not fatal, the culprit must pay half the compensation that would have been due if fatal consequences had ensued. If a slave administer the poison, he is to be put to death, his master to pay the composition in money, but minus the market value of the slave.

Passing from criminal law, we come to the law of inheritance. The general principle was that of equal division among sons. So long as there was legitimate male issue, the daughters inherited nothing. But the peculiar feature of the legislation is the provision made for male children born out of wedlock. If there was one legitimate son, and also illegitimate sons, then the legitimate son inherited two-thirds, and the illegitimate sons, irrespective of number, inherited one-third. If there were two legitimate sons, they inherited four-fifths, and the natural sons got one-fifth. If there were three legitimate sons, the natural sons got one-seventh and so forth. But suppose there were illegitimate sons, and the only legitimate child was a girl, then the inheritance was divided into three parts; the daughter got one part, the natural sons one, and the remaining third went to the next of kin.

No man could disinherit his son except for certain crimes of a heinous kind, nor could any man convey his property to another if he had a son to inherit it. The laws about the donation of property are interesting. They take us into the ancient popular assembly, or *thing*: for the gathering of the people, which the Saxons called *gemot* and the Franks *mallus*, was known to the Lombards, just as to the Norsemen, by the name *thing*. Every donation of property had to be made in the assembled *thing*, and the Lombards in Italy coined the hybrid Latin verb *thingare* to denote the act of making a donation. The donation itself was called *gaire-thinx*. *Gaire* means a spear and must refer to some solemn form, in which a spear was used, for this mode of transferring property. A law of Rothari says: "If any man wishes to transfer his property to another (*res suas alii thingare*) let him not do it secretly, but let him make the donation—*gaire-thinx*—in the presence of free men, that no difficulty may afterwards arise". It was only men who had no legitimate sons who could *thing* their property. If such a childless man then wished to leave his property away from his next of kin, to an outsider, his only plan under the Lombard law (as there was no such thing as testamentary disposition) was to convey it in the form of a donation or *gaire-thinx*, with the specific condition that it was not to be actually transferred till the day of his death. There was a special form provided for this case: the donor had to pronounce the obscure word *lidin laib*. But the worst of it was that by this donation made publicly in the *thing* he limited his own power over his property for the rest of his life. He was bound for the future to enjoy his property reasonably, not to waste it or to dissipate it. Only if, being childless at the time of the *thingatia*, he had sons afterwards, then the act of transfer became thereby null and void.

We next come to the laws about marriage. Rothari formulates a general statement respecting the position of women in the following law: "No free woman, living in our kingdom under the *lex Langobardorum*, shall live *selpmundia*, *i.e.* according to her own freewill: she must remain always under the power of men, and if of no one else, under the power of the king: Nor shall she have the power of transferring or granting any movable or immovable property without the consent of him in whose *mundium* or guardianship she is" [I may remark on the incidental importance of this law, in its special reference to a *lex Langobardorum*, which implies that there were free women in Lombard territory living according to other laws].

The principle here enounced was of course common to the ancient German peoples, but nowhere do we find it so clearly stated or its consequences so fully considered as in the Edict of Rothari. The system was of course a great advantage to the women, in days when the blood-feud was an accepted social institution; and if the *mund* or protector of a woman was responsible for her acts, it was only reasonable that he should also have a voice in the disposition of her property.

The marriage laws have largely to do with the money which changed hands on such occasions. There were three different sums involved—the *meet*, the *faderfio*, and the *morgincap*. The suitor purchased the bride from her father or guardian, and the price he promised to give was called the *meed*—or, for the Lombards made *d* into *t*, the *meet*; in making this covenant, the suitor required the assistance of a friend who guaranteed that he would fulfil it. Then the father had to give the bride a dowry, which was called the *faderfio*—father's fee. Then, after the marriage, the husband gave the wife a large present known as the *morgengebe* or in Lombard the *morgincap*. The laws provide what is to happen to these different sums in all sorts of contingencies. The lawyer has then to consider the cases of unequal marriage, between free men and free women, and serfs, or slaves, and the social status of the offspring in such cases. The only unequal union which was strictly forbidden was that between a free woman and a slave. A slave who marries a free woman incurs death, and the kinsfolk of the woman have the right of killing or banishing her and seizing her property. If they do not take action, the king's officer is to take her to his court and she is to be put to work at the loom with the slave-girls. On the other hand, if a man chooses to marry one of his own slaves he may do so, but he must first enfranchise her.

This leads to the subject of the manumission of slaves, and we learn of a very interesting process which must be Old Germanic. Let us take the case I have just referred to. A man decides to marry a female slave, and must therefore make her a free woman: how is he to set about it? He must take her to the Assembly and there he must transfer her by a donation, or *gaire-thinx*, to some other free man. *He* in turn must transfer her to another, and that other to a fourth, by the same process. The fourth owner will then lead her to a place where four roads meet, and there in the presence of witnesses will give her an arrow, the sign of freedom, saying the words, "You may take whichever of these four roads you will, you have free power". This done, the slave will be *folkfree*, entirely out of her master's power. In connexion with this, the question might arise whether a *Roman* slave of a *Lombard* master, thus manumitted, would live as a free man according to Roman or according to Lombard personal law. This case is dealt with by Rothari, who lays down that all freed-men who have been emancipated by Lombard masters should live according to Lombard law. This text is one of the clearest proofs that the Roman personal law existed side by side with the Lombard.

The laws dealing with fugitive slaves have considerable importance for the history of the decline of slavery. All men were bound to hinder the slave who was trying to escape. If a ferryman rowed him across a stream, being aware of his servile condition, he was required, on detection, to join in the search for the fugitive, and if the fugitive were not found he had to pay the value of the slave and any property he might have stolen to the owner, and moreover a fine of 20 solidi into the king's court. If the slave sought refuge in a private house, the owner was justified in breaking into it, in consideration of his *furor in servum suum*. If anyone harboured the fugitive or gave him food or showed him the way, he was when detected bound to search for him, and if he failed to find him had to pay the value of the slave and compensation for any work that had suffered through the slave's flight. Anyone to whose house the slave came was bound to give notice to his owner within nine days. The Church could afford no protection to runaway slaves. If a slave fled to a church or the house of a bishop or priest, he must be surrendered; and if he were not surrendered on the third demand, the bishop or priest who harboured him was compelled not only to give him up, but to supply

at his own expense another slave of the same value. But it is most significant of all, perhaps, that a similar law is specially directed against connivance of this kind on the part of royal officers. The general inference to be drawn from this series of stringent laws—from which I have selected only some—is that general public opinion in the Lombard kingdom sympathised with the slaves. The laws strike us as an attempt to maintain the ancient legal institution of slavery, which is threatened by a modification or revolution in the feelings of the people at large. It is significant that the ferryman has to pay, besides compensation, a fine into the king's court. This suggests the interest of the king and the state in maintaining the institution.

The method of Lombard litigation is thoroughly Germanic. When a dispute arose between two free men, there were two recognised ways of deciding it, viz. the very ancient method by wager of battle which still survived, and the peaceable method of the oath, which is called in the Lombard Code the *sacramentum*. The mode of legal procedure was as follows. The plaintiff asked the defendant to give security for his claim, if it could be made good. The defendant gave a pledge, and also found a friend to act as a surety. Twelve nights were then allowed him within which to appear and repudiate the claim by oath. If illness or any other impediment occurred, twelve more nights were allowed. He might go on alleging excuses and postponing for a whole year, but at the end of a year, judgement would be made against him by default. The plaintiff on his part had within twelve days to choose six men from among the kindred of the defendant; but he must not choose any man who was known to be an enemy of the defendant. These seven, namely the defendant himself and his six kinsmen whom the plaintiff selected, chose five other free men, thus making twelve; and these twelve men were the oath-takers or *sacramentales*. They took an oath either on consecrated arms or on the Gospel—here Christianity introduces a modification of ancient forms—as to the rights of the case, and this oath was considered decisive.

This was the ordinary way of deciding disputes. But wager of battle, called *camfio*, still existed. The kings, however, tried to restrict it. It is enacted that such questions as the murder of a wife by her husband, the legitimacy of a son, the right to be guardian of a married woman are to be decided by the oath of *sacramentales*, because these matters are too important to be entrusted to one man's shield. But a man who calls a woman a witch or a vampire has to prove it by wager of battle. I may mention that there is an interesting law bearing on vampires, which shows Christian influence. "Let no man (it is enacted) take upon himself to slay another man's *aldia* (female serf) or maidservant, on the ground that she is a witch such as they call *masca*; for Christian minds cannot believe or conceive it to be possible that a woman could eat a living man from inside him."

The next great Lombard lawgiver after Rothari was King Liutprand in the eighth century. His laws were issued in successive years between 713 and 735, and are preserved in a collected form. Their great interest lies in the indications they give us of the advance which the Lombards had made in civilisation during the two intervening generations, a period of seventy years. In the first place it may be remarked that the Christian religion of the nation is more clearly and emphatically reflected in the laws of Liutprand than in the laws of Rothari. It is expressed in the king's own title *Liutprand excellentissimus Christianas Langobardorum rex*, and in his prologue, which is marked by scriptural quotations. In one ordinance he acknowledges the direct influence of the bishop of Rome: having forbidden marriage between first cousins with the extraordinarily heavy penalty of confiscation of property, he states that he does so on the injunction of the pope of the city of Rome *qui in omni mundo caput ecclesiarum dei et sacer-dotum est*.

The stringent laws against soothsayers and idolaters—laws which may seem to us quite disproportionally severe—are doubtless also due to ecclesiastical influence. The unfortunate man who is foolish enough to consult a male or female soothsayer has to pay a fine of half his



own *guidrigild*, i.e., half the sum which would be due to his relatives in the event of his being slain. And if any governor or officer fails to discover and arrest soothsayers who are living in his district, he is liable to a fine of the same amount. When a soothsayer is arrested, he is to be sold as a slave.

Laws respecting homicide and murder are generally supposed to be a good test of a people's civilisation. In this matter, the laws of Liutprand show a remarkable advance on the Edict of Rothari in the direction of severity. According to the old laws, a murderer had only to pay the *guidrigild* to the kinsfolk of the victim. On that system a wealthy man might murder seventy-four men without seriously diminishing his fortune. Liutprand enacted that in the case of murder (as distinguished from homicide, accidental or in self-defence) the culprit should be punished by confiscation of his whole property. If his property exceeded the amount of the *guidrigild* of the murdered man, the *guidrigild* should be subtracted and paid to the kinsfolk; the rest should go to the king's treasury. If the property was less than the *guidrigild*, then the murderer should be handed over to the kinsfolk to be used as a slave.

Liutprand applied the system of *guidrigilds* in a new and quite artificial way. He fixed it as a penalty for a number of miscellaneous offences; such as when a scribe ignorant of law presumed to draw up a legal document; the crime of forgery; the giving to one man of a bride betrothed to another; or if a guardian consented to his ward's marriage in case she were a nun; or if a man married a woman whose husband was alive; in these and other cases the guilty person had to pay as a penalty the amount of his own *guidrigild*, whether to the king's court or to someone whom his offence had injured. You see that this is a completely artificial and unnatural system. There is no natural connexion between such offences and the sum at which the perpetrator's life was valued supposing he were slain. The justification of it in the eyes of the legislator was no doubt that it visited these offences more severely on members of the higher classes, who had higher *guidrigilds*.

The custom of wager of battle had not yet disappeared. We saw that in the Edict of Rothari there were some signs of distrust of this method of settling a suit. The distrust is greater, and is more emphatically uttered in Liutprand's laws. He says that evil-minded persons would sometimes challenge a man in order to vex him, and he considers cases where a man who was defeated in the battle is afterwards proved innocent of the charge. His attitude to the wager of battle is most clearly expressed in a law about the charge of poisoning. "Certain men have charged the relatives of a man who has died in his bed of poisoning him, and have, according to the old custom, challenged them to single combat. As the punishment of the murder of a free man is now, according to our law, the loss of the whole of the murderer's property, it seems to us a grave thing that a man should lose the whole of his property *sub uno scuto* through the weakness of one shield. We therefore provide that in such a case the accuser shall swear by the Gospels that he does not bring the charge in malice. On this condition he may proceed in his cause by battle. But if defeat shall befall him against whom the charge is made or his hired champion, then he is not to forfeit his whole property, but only to pay the appropriate composition according to the old law. For we are uncertain concerning the judgement of God, and we have heard of a man losing his suit by combat unjustly; but we cannot forbid the custom of combat, because it is an old custom of our Lombard race".

To show further how things were tending, it may be noticed that the position of women was improving, as shown by the law which gave a daughter the whole of her father's property when she had no legitimate brother, and by the enactments for protecting women against oppression and injuries from their *mandvalds* or guardians.

Also in regard to slaves, we find that a new and simpler method of manumission has been introduced, in addition to the old cumbrous process of repeated *thingations*. If the owner

gives the slave into the hands of the king, and the king bids a priest take him round an altar, then the slave shall be free, just as if he had been made *folkfree* by the old process.

I may quote one curious case which came before King Liutprand, to illustrate what might happen in a Lombard village. "It has been brought to our notice", he says, "that some treacherous and malicious men, who would not venture themselves to enter with violence into a strange village or a strange house, through fear of having to pay the compositions which are imposed by the law, these men got together all the women over whom they had power, both slave and free, and sent them to a village to attack men who were a much weaker body. And the women attacking the men of that place beat them, inflicted violent injuries upon them with far more cruelty than men would have used. But when the matter was investigated, the men who were attacked had to answer for their violent resistance to the women. Accordingly we lay down that those men shall not have to pay any composition to the women or their male guardians, in case they have injured or killed any of them. Moreover, the public officer of the place shall arrest the women, and shave their heads, and distribute them among the neighbouring villages that in future women may not venture to commit such wickedness. And whatever injuries the women have inflicted on the men whom they assaulted, their husbands or guardians shall pay the legal composition. We have made this special judgement as to the punishment of the women and as to the composition, because we cannot bring the occurrence under the heading of an *arascild* or party fight, nor yet a sedition of peasants, because such things are done not by women but by men".

You may be interested by the following decision of Liutprand. "It has been reported to us that a certain man lent his mare to another man to draw a wagon, and the man had an untamed colt which followed its mother. As the man who borrowed it was driving through a village, some small children were standing in the street, and the colt kicked one of them with its heel and killed it. The parents of the child sued for compensation for its death, and the case was referred to us. Consulting with our judges, we gave judgement that the owner of the foal should pay two-thirds of the *guidrigild* of the infant, and that the man who borrowed the mare should pay one-third. We know of course that in the Edict of Rothari it is laid down: 'If a horse shall cause injury by its heel, his owner shall pay for the injury': but seeing that in this case the horse was borrowed, and the man who borrowed it was a reasonable being and might have called out to the child to mind itself and avoid the danger, we have decided that on account of this negligence he should pay the third part".

I do not know whether you will think that pure justice was done by this decision, but you may observe how the king acts here as a court of equity, modifying the operation of the law when justice seems to require it.

I may point out an important contrast between the state of the Lombards in Italy and the Anglo-Saxons in England. We find that the Lombard *people* had no influence in political affairs; the power of the popular assembly had entirely disappeared; but this is not all; the people had no influence even in local matters, and hardly any part in the administration of justice. The *thing* might assemble for the purely formal purpose of witnessing donations of property, but beyond such formalities no influence lay with the people. Justice was administered by the officers of the king. This is a very instructive fact, showing how far a German folk could travel from their old Germanic constitution, though they were not affected by the institutions of the Roman Empire, which in the case of the Franks and the Visigoths had a direct tendency in promoting centralisation, and diminishing the political rights of the people. It is contrasted, as I say, with the case of the German invaders of Britain, among whom local institutions were so important and so tenacious.

## CHAPTER I

### CONSTANTINE AND HIS CITY

THE first question that has to be considered in laying down the plan of a Medieval History is, Where to begin? Where shall we draw the line that separates it from Ancient History? Some would fix it at the death of Domitian, others at that of Marcus. Some would come down to Constantine, to the death of Theodosius, to the great barbarian invasion of 406, or to the end of the Western Empire in 476; and others again would go on to Gregory I, or even as late as Charlemagne. There is even something to be said for beginning with Augustus, or at the destruction of Jerusalem, though perhaps these epochs are not seriously proposed. However, they all have their advantages. If for example we consider only the literary merit of the historians, we must draw the line after Tacitus; and if we fix our eyes on the feud of Roman and barbarian, we cannot stop till the coronation of Charlemagne. Curiously enough, the epoch usually laid down at the end of the Western Empire in 476, is precisely the one for which there is least to be said. We should do better than this by dividing in the middle of the Gothic War (535-553). We have in quick succession the closing of the Schools of Athens, the Code of Justinian, the great siege of Rome, and the abolition of the consulship. The Rome which Belisarius delivered was still the Rome of the Caesars, while the Rome which Narses entered sixteen years later is already the Rome of the popes. It is the same in Gaul. The remains of the old civilization still found under the sons of Clovis are mostly obliterated in the next generation. Procopius witnessed as great a revolution as did Polybius.

But even this would not be satisfactory. We cannot cut in two the Gothic War and the reign of Justinian; and in any case we can draw no sharp division after Constantine without ignoring the greatest power of the world that Eastern Roman Empire which carried down the old Greco-Roman civilization almost to the end of the Middle Ages. In truth, the precise beginning of Medieval History is as indefinite as the precise beginning of the fog. There is no point between Augustus and Charlemagne where we can say, "The old is finished, the new not yet begun". Choose where we will, medieval elements are traceable before it, ancient elements after it. Thus Theodoric's government of Italy is on the old lines, while the Frankish invasion of Gaul belongs to the new order. If in the present work we begin with Constantine, we do not mean that there is any break in history at this point, though we see important changes in the adoption of Christianity and the fixing of the government in the form it retained for centuries. The chief advantage of choosing this epoch is that as the medieval elements were not strong before the fourth century, we shall be able to trace nearly the whole of their growth without encroaching too much on Ancient History. At the same time, we shall hold ourselves free to trace them back as far as may be needful.

We begin with an outline of Constantine's life. Its significance we can discuss later.

Flavius Valerius Constantinus was born at Naissus in Dacia, about the year 274. His father Constantius was already a man of some mark, though still in the lower stages of the career which brought him to the purple. On his father's side Constantius belonged to the great families of Dardania, the hilly province north of Macedonia, while his mother was a niece of the emperor Claudius Gothicus. But Constantine's own mother Helena was a woman of low

rank from Drepanum in Bithynia, though there is no reason to doubt that she had the legal (and quite moral) position of *concupina* or *monargatic* wife to Constantius.

Of Constantine's early years we know only that he had no learned education; and we may presume from his hesitating Greek that he was brought up in Latin lands, perhaps partly Dalmatia, where his father was at one time governor. In 293 Constantius was made Caesar, and practically master of Gaul, with the task assigned him of recovering Britain from Carausius. But as a condition of his elevation he was required to divorce Helena and marry Theodora, a stepdaughter of Maximian. Constantine was taken to the court of Diocletian, partly as a hostage for his father, and partly with a view to a future place for him in the college of emperors. So he went with Diocletian to Egypt in 296, and made acquaintance on the way with Eusebius, the future historian and bishop of Caesarea. Next year he seems to have seen service with Galerius against the Persians. About this time he must have taken Minervina (most likely as a *concupina*), for her son Crispus was already a young man in 317. Early in 303 the Great Persecution was begun with the demolition of the church at Nicomedia: and there was a tall young officer looking on with thoughts of his own, like Napoleon watching the riot of June 1792.

When Diocletian and Maximian abdicated (1 May 305) it was generally believed that Constantine would be one of the new Caesars. There was reason for this belief. He had been betrothed to Fausta, the daughter of Maximian, as far back as 293, when she was a mere child; and daughters of emperors were not common enough to be thrown away on outsiders. Moreover, money had recently been coined at Alexandria with the inscription CONSTANTINUS CAESAR. But at the last moment Diocletian passed him over. Perhaps he was over-persuaded by Galerius: more likely he was reserving him to succeed his father in Gaul. After this, however, the court of Galerius was no place for Constantine. Presently he managed to escape, and joined his father at Boulogne. After a short campaign in Caledonia, Constantius died at York (25 July 306) and the army hailed Constantine Augustus. He was a good officer, the sons of Theodora were only boys, and the army of Britain (always the most mutinous in the Empire) had no mind to wait for a new Caesar from the East. Its chief mover was Crocus the Alemannic king (according Gregory of Tours this Crocus overran Gaul and the north of Italy in the year 268): and this would seem to be the first case of a barbarian king as a Roman general, and also the first case of barbarian action in the election of an emperor. Willingly or unwillingly, Galerius recognized Constantine, though only as Caesar. It mattered little: he had the power, and the title came a couple of years later.

Thus Constantine succeeded his father in Gaul and Britain. We hear little of his administration during the next six years (306-312), but we get a general impression that he was a good ruler, and careful of his people. Such fighting as he had to do was of the usual sort against the Franks, mostly inside the Rhine, and against the Alemanni and the Bructeri beyond it. The war however was merciless, for even heathen feeling was shocked when he gave barbarian kings to the beasts, along with their followers by thousands at a time. But Gaul had never recovered from the great invasions (254-285) and his remissions of taxation gave no permanent relief to the public misery. In religion he was of course heathen; but he grew more and more monotheistic, and the Christians always counted him friendly like his father.

The last act of Galerius (Apr. 311) was an edict of toleration for the Christians. It was not encumbered with any 'hard conditions', but it was given on the heathen principle that every god is entitled to the worship of his own people, whereas the persecution hindered the Christians from rendering that worship. A few days after this Galerius died. There were now four emperors. Constantine held Gaul and Britain, Maxentius Italy, Spain and Africa, while Licinius (more properly Licinian) ruled Illyricum, Greece and Thrace, and Maximin Daza (or Daia) held everything beyond the Bosphorus. Their political alliances were partly determined by their geographical position, Constantine reaching over Maxentius to Licinius, while



Maximin reached over Licinius to Maxentius; partly also by their relation to the Christians, for this was now the immediate question of practical politics. Constantine was friendly to them, and Licinius had never been an active persecutor; whereas Maximin was a cruel and malicious enemy, and Maxentius, standing as he did for Rome, could not but be hostile to them. So Maxentius was to crush Constantine, and Maximin to deal with Licinius.

Constantine did not wait to be crushed. Breaking up his camp at Colmar, he pushed rapidly across the Alps. In a cavalry fight near Turin, the Gauls overcame the formidable *cataphracti*—horse and rider clad in mail—of Maxentius. Then straight to Verona, where in Ruricius Pompeianus he found a foeman worthy of his steel. Right well did Pompeianus defend Verona; and if he escaped from the siege, it was only to gather an army for its relief. Then another great battle. Pompeianus was killed, Verona surrendered, and Constantine made straight for Rome.

Still Maxentius gave no sign. He had baffled invasion twice before by sitting still in Rome, and Constantine could not have besieged the city with far inferior forces. At the last moment Maxentius came out a few miles, and offered battle (28 Oct. 312) at Saxa Rubra. A skillful flank march of Constantine forced him to fight with the Tiber behind him, and the Mulvian bridge for his retreat. His Numidians fled before the Gaulish cavalry, the Praetorian Guard fell fighting where it stood, and the rest of the army was driven headlong into the river. Maxentius perished in the waters, and Constantine was master of the West.

This short campaign, the most brilliant feat of arms since Aurelian's time, was an epoch for Constantine himself. To it belongs the story of the Shining Cross. Somewhere between Colmar and *Saxa Rubra* he saw in the sky one afternoon a bright cross with the words *Hoc Vince*, and the army saw it too; and in a dream that night Christ bade him take it for his standard. So Constantine himself told Eusebius, and so Eusebius recorded it in 338; and there is no reason to suspect either the one or the other of deceit. The evidence of the army is in any case not worth much; but that of Lactantius in 314 and of the heathen Nazarius in 321 puts it beyond reasonable doubt that something of the sort did happen. But we need not therefore set it down for a miracle. The cross observed may very well have been a halo, such as Whymper saw when he came down after the accident on the Matterhorn in 1865—three crosses for his three lost companions. The rest is no more than can be accounted for by Constantine's imagination, inflamed as it must have been by the intense anxiety of the unequal contest. Yet after all, the cross was not an exclusively Christian symbol. The action was ambiguous, like most of Constantine's actions at this period of his life. He was quite clear about monotheism; but he was not equally clear about the difference between Christ and the Unconquered Sun. The Gauls had fought of old beneath the Sun-god's cross of light: so while the Christians saw in the labarum the cross of Christ, the heathens in the army would only be receiving an old standard back again. Such was the origin of the Byzantine Labarum.

Constantine remained two months in Rome, leaving in the first days of 313 for Milan, where he gave his sister Constantia in marriage to Licinius, and conferred with him on policy generally, and on the hostile attitude of Maximin in particular. That ruler had not published the edict of Galerius, but merely sent a circular to the officials that actual persecution was to be stopped for the present. A few months later (about Nov. 311) he resumed it, with less bloodshed and more statesmanship. It was far more skillfully planned than any that had gone before. Maximin's endeavor was to stir up the municipalities against the Christians, to organize a rival church of heathenism, and to give a definitely antichristian bias to education. Even the fall of Maxentius had drawn from him only a rescript so full of inconsistencies that neither heathens nor Christians could make head or tail of it, except that Maximin was a prodigious liar. He even denied that there had been any persecution during his reign. At all events, this was not the complete change of policy needed to save him. Constantine and Licinius saw their advantage, and issued from Milan a new edict of toleration. Its text is lost,

but it went far beyond the edict of Galerius. For the first time in history, the principle of universal toleration was officially laid down: that every man has a right to choose his religion and to practice it in his own way without any discouragement from the State. No doubt it was laid down as a political move, for neither Constantine nor Licinius kept to it. Constantine tried to crush Donatists and Arians, and Licinius fell back even from toleration of Christians. Still the old heathen principle, that no man may worship gods who are not on the official list, was rejected for the present, and toleration became the general law of the Empire, till the time of Theodosius.

The wedding festivities were rudely interrupted by the news that Maximin had made a sudden attack without waiting for the end of the winter, and met with brilliant success, capturing Byzantium and pushing on towards Adrianople. There, however, Licinius met him with a very inferior force, and completely routed him (30 April 313). Maximin fled to Nicomedia, and soon found that it would be as much as he could do to hold the line of Mount Taurus. Now he had no choice—the Christians were strong in Egypt and Syria, and must be conciliated at any cost. So he issued a new edict, explaining that the officials had committed many oppressions very painful to a benevolent ruler like himself; and now, to make further mistakes impossible, he lets all men know that everyone is free to practice whatever religion he pleases. Maximin gives the same liberty as Constantine and Licinius—he could not safely offer less—but he states no principle of toleration. However, it was too late now. Maximin died in the summer, and Licinius issued a rescript carrying out the decisions of Milan, and restoring confiscated property to “the corporation of the Christians”. It was published at Nicomedia 13 June 313. Constantine sent out similar letters in the West.

The defeat of Maximin ends the long contest of Church and State begun by Nero. Former persecutions had died out of themselves, and even Gallienus had only restored the confiscated property; but now the Christians had gained full legal recognition, of which they were never again deprived. Licinius and Julian might devise annoyances and connive at outrages, and work the administration in a hostile spirit; but they never ventured to revoke the Edict of Milan. Heathenism was still strong in its associations with Greek philosophy and culture, with Roman law and social order, and its moral character stood higher than it had done. It hardly looked like a beaten enemy: yet such it was. Its last real hope was gone.

Religious peace was assured, but the unity of the Empire was not yet restored. Constantine and Licinius were both ambitious, and war between them was only a question of time. They were not unequally matched. If Constantine had the victorious legions of Gaul, Licinius ruled the East from the frontier of Armenia to that of Italy, so that he was master of the Illyrian provinces, which furnished the best soldiers of the Roman army. Every emperor from Claudius to Licinius himself was an Illyrian, except Tacitus and Carus. And if Constantine had done a splendid feat of arms, Licinius was a fine soldier too, and (with all his personal vices) not less careful of his subjects.

Constantine was called away from Milan by some incursions of the Franks, who kept him busy during the summer of 313. When things were more settled, he proposed to institute a middle domain for his other brother-in-law Bassianus. The plan seems to have been that while Constantine gave him Italy, Licinius should give him Illyricum. Licinius frustrated it by engaging Bassianus in a plot for which he was put to death, and then refused to give up to Constantine his agent Senecio, the brother of Bassianus. This meant war. Constantine took the offensive as he had done before, pushing into Pannonia with no more than 20,000 men, and attacking Licinius where he was endeavoring to cover Sirmium. He had 35,000 against him, but a hard-fought battle (8 Oct. 314) ended in a complete victory, and the capture of Sirmium. Licinius fled towards Adrianople, deepening the quarrel on the way by giving the rank of Caesar to his Illyrian general Valens. A new army was collected; but another great battle on the Mardian plain was indecisive. Constantine won the victory; but Licinius and Valens were

able to take up a threatening position in his rear at Beroea. So peace had to be made. First Valens was sacrificed: then Licinius gave up Illyricum from the Danube to the extremity of Greece, retaining in Europe only Thrace, which, however, in those days reached north to the Danube. So things settled down. Constantine returned to Rome in the summer to celebrate his *Decennalia* (25 July 315), and in 317 the succession was secured by the nomination of Caesars, Crispus and Constantine the sons of Constantine, and Licinianus the son of Licinius. Crispus was grown up, but Constantine was a baby.

The treaty might be hollow, but it kept the peace for nearly eight years. If Constantine was evidently the stronger, Licinius was still too strong to be rashly attacked. So each went his own way. It soon appeared which was the better statesman. Constantine drew nearer to the Christians, while Licinius drifted into persecution, devising annoyances enough to make them enemies but not enough to make them harmless. Thus Constantine allows manumission in church, judges the Donatists, closes the courts on Sundays, loads the churches with gifts, and, at last (May 323), frees Christians from all pagan ceremonies of state. Licinius drove the Christians from his court, forbade meetings of bishops, and meddled vexatiously with their worship. This gave the war something of a religious character; but its occasion was not religious. The Goths had been pretty quiet since Aurelian had settled them in Dacia. It was not till 322 that Rausimod their king crossed the Danube on a foray. Constantine drove them back, chased them beyond the Danube, slew Rausimod, and settled thousands of Gothic serfs in the adjacent provinces. But in the pursuit he crossed the territory of Licinius; and this led to war. Constantine's army was 130,000 strong, and his son Crispus had a fleet of 200 sail, in the Piraeus. Licinius awaited him with 160,000 men near Adrianople, while his admiral Amandus was to hold the Hellespont with 350 ships. There was no idea of using the fleet to take Constantine in the rear.

After some difficult maneuvers, Constantine won the first battle (3 July 323), but was brought to a stop before the walls of Byzantium. Licinius was safe there, so long as he held the sea; so he chose Martinianus his *magister officiorum* for the new Augustus of the West. Meanwhile Constantine strengthened his fleet, and his son Crispus completely defeated Amandus in the Hellespont. Licinius left Byzantium to defend itself—it had held out two years against Severus—and prepared to maintain the Asiatic shore. Constantine left Byzantium on one side and landed near Chrysopolis, where he found the whole army of Licinius drawn up to meet him. The battle of Chrysopolis (18 or 20 Sept. 323) was decisive. Licinius fled to Nicomedia, and presently Constantia came out to ask for her husband's life. It was granted, and Constantine confirmed his promise with an oath. Nevertheless Licinius was put to death in October 325 on a charge of treasonable intrigue. The charge is unlikely: but Licinius was quite capable of it, and his execution does not seem to have estranged Constantia from her brother. But perhaps the matter is best connected with the family tragedy which we shall come to presently.

As a general, Constantine ranks high among the emperors. Good soldiers as they mostly were, none but Severus and Aurelian could boast of any such career of victory as had brought Constantine from the shores of Britain to the banks of the Tiber and the walls of Byzantium. But after the "crowning mercy" of Chrysopolis there was no more fighting, except with the Goths. The last fourteen years of Constantine (323-337) were years of peace: and the first question which then confronted him was the question of religion. By what road did he approach Christianity, and how far did he come on the journey?

Two fables may be dismissed at once—the heathen fable told by Zosimus in the fifth century, that the Christians were complaisant when the philosophers refused to absolve him for the murder of his son Crispus; and the papal fable of the eighth century, that he was healed of leprosy by Pope Sylvester, and thereupon gave him dominion over "the palace, the city of Rome, and the entire West". These legends are summarily refuted by the fact that he was

baptized in 337, not as they tell us in 326. Turning now to history, we have no reason to suppose that he owed Christian impressions to his mother's teaching: but Constantius was an eclectic of the better sort, and a man of some culture; and his memory contrasted well with that of his colleagues. Constantine seems to have begun where his father left off, as more or less monotheistic and averse to idols, and more or less friendly to the Christians; and all these things grew upon him. The last of them may not have meant much at first, for even hostile emperors like Severus and Diocletian had sense enough to keep on good terms with the Christians when they were not prepared to crush them. But Constantine was drawn to them personally as well as politically; by his pure life and genuine humanity as well as by his shrewd statesmanship. Their lofty monotheism and austere morals attracted the man, their strong organization arrested the attention of the ruler.

When Diocletian threw down his challenge to the Church, he made religion the urgent question of the time: and the persecution was a visible failure before Constantine was well settled in Gaul. If Diocletian had failed to crush the Church, others were not likely to succeed. Maximin or Licinius might hark back to the past; but Constantine saw clearly that the Empire would have to make some sort of terms with the Church, so that the only question was how far it would be needful or safe to go. For the moment, a little friendliness to the Gaulish bishops was enough to secure the good will of the Christians all over the Empire. Then came the wars of 312-3, which forced on Constantine and Licinius the championship of the Christians, and made it plain good policy to give them full legal toleration. Licinius stopped there, and Constantine did not make up his mind without anxiety. The God of the Christians had shown great power, and might be the best protector; and in any case a firm alliance with their strong hierarchy would not only remove a great danger, but give the very help which the Empire needed. On the other hand, it was a serious thing to break with the past and brave the terrors of heathen magic. Moreover, the Christians were a minority even in the East, and he could not openly go over to them without risk of a pagan reaction. So he moved cautiously. Christianity differed forsooth very little from the better sort of heathenism. They could both be brought under the broad shield of monotheism, if the heathens would give up their idols and immoral worships, and the Christians would not insist too rudely on that awkward doctrine of the deity of Christ. On these terms the lion of Christianity might lie down with the lamb of Eclecticism, and the guileless emperor would be the little child to lead them both.

The problem of Church and State was new, for the old religion of Rome was never more than a department of the State, and the worshippers of Isis and Mithras readily "conformed to the ceremonies of the Roman people". But when Christianity made a practical distinction between Caesar's things and God's, the relation of Church and State became a difficult question. Constantine handled it with great skill and much success. He not only made the Christians thoroughly loyal, but won the active support of the churches, and obtained such influence over the bishops that they seemed almost willing to sink into a department of the State. But he forgot one thing. The surface thought of his time, Christian as well as heathen, tended to a vague monotheism which looked on Christ and the sun as almost equally good symbols of the Supreme: and this obscured the deeper conviction of the Christians that the deity of Christ is as essential as the unity of God. After all, Christianity is not a monotheistic philosophy, but a life in Christ.

When this conviction asserted itself with overwhelming power at the Council of Nicaea, Constantine gave way with a good grace. As it had been decided at Saxa Rubra that the Empire was to fight beneath the cross of God, so now it was decided at Nicaea that the cross was to be the cross of Christ, and not the Sun-god's cross of light.

We may doubt whether Constantine took in the full meaning of the decision: but at any rate it meant that the Christians refused to be included with others in a monotheistic state religion. If the Empire was to have their full friendship, it must become definitely Christian:



and this is the goal to which Constantine seems to have looked forward in his later years, though he can hardly have hoped himself to reach it. Heathenism was still strong, and he continued to use vague monotheistic language. Only in his last illness did he feel it safe to throw off the mask and avow himself a Christian. “Let there be no ambiguity”, said he, as he asked for baptism; and then he laid aside the purple, and passed away in the white robe of a Christian neophyte (22 May 337).

This would seem to be the general outline of Constantine’s religious life and policy. We can now return to the morrow of Chrysopolis, and take it more in detail. Now that he was master of the empire, he made his alliance with the Christians as close as he could without abandoning the official neutrality of his monotheism. His attitude is well shown by his coins. *Mars and Genius P. R.* disappear after Saxa Rubra, or at latest by 317: *Sol invictus* by 315, or at any rate 313. Coins of *Jupiter Aug.* seem to have been struck only for Licinius. Later on, the heathen inscriptions are replaced by phrases as neutral as the cross itself, like *Beata tranquillitas* or *Providentia Augg.*, or *Instinctu Divinitatis* on his triumphal arch at Rome. His laws keep pace with the coins. In form they are mostly neutral; an increasing leaning to Christianity. Thus his edict for the observance of “the venerable day of the Sun” only raised it to the rank of the heathen *feriae* by closing the law-courts; and the Latin prayer he imposed on the army (the first case known of prayer in an unknown tongue) is quite indeterminate as between Christ and Jupiter. So too when before 316 he sanctioned manumissions in churches, he was only taking a hint from the manumissions in certain temples. Yet again, when in 313 (and by later law) he exempted the clergy of the Catholic Church—not those of the sects—from the decurionate and other burdens, he gave them only the privileges already enjoyed by some of the heathen priests and teachers. But the relief was great enough to cause an ungodly rush for holy Orders, and with it such a loss of taxpayers that in 320 he had to forbid the ordination of anyone qualified for the curia of his city. None but the poor (and an occasional official) could now be ordained, and those only to fill vacancies caused by death. The second limitation may not have been enforced, but the first remained. To save the revenue, the Church was debased at a stroke.

Other laws however lean more to a side, like the edict of 319 which threatens to burn the Jews if they stone “a convert to the worship of God”. No doubt such converts needed protection; and Roman law was not squeamish about burning criminals, if they were of low rank. Upon the whole, this policy of official neutrality and personal favor powerfully stimulated the growth of the churches. The time-servers were all Christians now, and Eusebius plainly denounces their “unspeakable hypocrisy”. At least in later years, Constantine himself had to rebuke bishops for flattery. The defeat of Licinius enabled him to come forward more openly as the patron of the churches. His letter to the provincials of the Empire (Eusebius naturally gives the copy which went to Palestine) begins with high praise of the confessors and strong denunciation of the persecutors, whose wickedness is shown by their miserable ends. They would have destroyed the republic, if the Divinity had not raised up me, Constantine, from the far West of Britain to destroy them. He then restores rank and property to all the victims of persecution in the islands, the mines, and the houses of forced labor, and finishes with an earnest exhortation to the worship of the one true God.

But after all, the Church was not quite what Constantine wanted it to be. He was not more attracted to it by its lofty monotheism than by the imposing unity which promised new life to the weary State. For six hundred years the world had been in quest of a universal religion. Stoicism was no more than a philosophy for the few, the worship of the emperor was debased by officialism, and by this time quite outworn, and even Mithraism had never shown such living power as Christianity. Here then was something that could realize the religious side of the Empire in a nobler form than Augustus or Hadrian had ever dreamed of—a universal Church that could stand beside the universal Empire and worthily support its labors

for the peace and welfare of the world. But for this purpose unity was essential. If the Church was divided against itself, it could not help the Empire. Worse than this; it could hardly be divided against itself without being also divided against the Empire. One of the parties was likely to appeal to the emperor; and then he would have to decide between them and make an enemy of the defeated party; and if he tried to enforce his decision, they were likely to resist him as stubbornly as the whole Church had resisted the heathen emperors. This would bring back the whole difficulty of the persecutions, though possibly on a smaller scale. To put it shortly, the Christians had a conscience in matters of religion, and sometimes mistook self-will for conscience.

Constantine had experience of Christian self-will in Africa soon after the defeat of Maxentius. When Diocletian commanded the Christians to give up their sacred books, all parties agreed in refusing to obey. Those who did obey were called *traditores*. But the officers did not always care what books they took: might apocryphal books be given up? So thought Mensurius of Carthage, while others counted it apostasy to give up any books at all. The controversy became acute at the death of Mensurius in 311, when Felix of Aptunga consecrated his successor Caecilian. But that right was claimed by Secundus of Tigisis, the senior bishop of Numidia, who consecrated a rival bishop of Carthage. It was some time before the Donatists (as they soon came to be called) got their position clear. They held that Felix was a *traditor*, that the ministrations of a *traditor* are null and void, and that a church which has communion with a *traditor* is apostate.

After the battle of Saxa Rubra Constantine sent money to Caecilian for the clergy “of the catholic church”; and as he “had heard that some evil-disposed persons were troubling them”, he directed Caecilian to refer them to the civil authorities for punishment. Thereupon they appealed to him. Constantine seems to have contemplated a small court to try the case—Miltiades of Rome, three Gaulish bishops, and apparently the archdeacon of Rome: but a small council met instead (Oct. 313) at Rome, which pronounced for Caecilian. The Donatists were furious and appealed again. This time Constantine summoned as many bishops as he could, directing each to bring so many clergy and servants with him, and giving him power to use the state post for the journey. So a large council of the Western churches met at Arles in August 314 (possibly 315). Even Britain sent bishops from London, York, and some other place. It destroyed the Donatist contention by deciding that Felix was not a *traditor*. It also settled some more outstanding controversies, in favor of the Roman date of Easter, and the Roman custom of not repeating heretical baptism, if it had been given in the name of the Trinity. The decisions were sent to Sylvester of Rome for circulation—not for confirmation. We can recognize in Arles the pattern of the Nicene Council. Still the Donatists were not satisfied. They asked the emperor to decide the matter himself, and he unwillingly consented. He heard them at Milan (Nov. 316) and once more decided against them. Then they turned round and said, “What business has the emperor to meddle with the Church?”

A vigorous persecution was begun, but with small success. A band of Donatist fanatics called *Circumcelliones* ranged the country, committing disorders and defying the authorities to make martyrs of them. Even in 317 Constantine ordered that their outrages were not to be retaliated; and when they sent him a message in 321 that they would in no way communicate with “that scoundrel, his bishop”, he stopped the persecution as useless, and frankly gave them toleration. Africa was fairly quiet for the rest of his reign.

After the defeat of Licinius, Constantine found several disputes in the Eastern churches. The old Easter question was still unsettled, the Meletian schism was dividing Egypt, and there was no knowing how far the Arian controversy would spread. Unity must be restored at once, and that by the old plan of calling a council. The churches had long been in the habit of conferring together when difficulties arose. They could refuse to recognize an unsatisfactory bishop; and cir. 269 a council ventured to depose Paul of Samosata, and Aurelian had

enforced its decision. The weak point of this method was that rival councils could be got up, so that every local quarrel had an excellent chance of becoming a general controversy. Arianism in particular was setting council against council. Constantine determined to go a step beyond these local meetings. As he had summoned the Western bishops to Arles, so now he summoned all the bishops of Christendom. If he could bring them to a decision, it was not likely to be disputed; and in any case he could safely give it the force of law. An ecumenical council would be a grand demonstration, not only of the unity of the Church, but of its close alliance with the Empire. So he issued invitations to all Christian bishops to meet him at Nicaea in Bithynia in the summer of 325, to make a final end of all the disputes which rent the unity of Christendom. The programme was even wider than at Arles; but the Donatists were not included in it. Constantine could let sleeping dogs lie. We note here the choice of Nicaea for its auspicious name—the city of victory—and convenience of access; and we see in it one of many signs that the true centre of the Empire was settling down somewhere near the Bosphorus.

We need not closely analyze the imposing list of bishops present from almost every province of the Empire, with a few from beyond its frontiers in the Far East and North. Legend made them 318, the holy number of the cross of Jesus. We have lists in sundry languages, none of them giving more than 221 names; but these are known to be incomplete. The actual number may have been near 300. All the thirteen great dioceses of the Empire were represented except Britain and Illyricum, though only single bishops came from Africa, Spain, Gaul and Dacia. Only one came in person from Italy, though two presbyters appeared for the bishop of Rome. So the vast majority came from the Eastern provinces of the Empire. The outsiders were four or five—Theophilus bishop of the Goths beyond the Danube, Cathirius (the name is corrupt) of the Crimean Bosphorus, John the Persian, and Restates the Armenian, the son of Gregory the Illuminator, with perhaps another Armenian bishop. Eusebius is full of enthusiasm over his majestic roll of churches far and near, from the extremity of Europe to the furthest ends of Asia. It was a day of victory for both the Empire and the Church. The Empire had not only made peace with the stubbornness of its enemies, but been accepted as its protector and guide. The Church had won the greatest of all its victories when Galerius issued his edict of toleration: but its mission to the whole world has never been so vividly embodied as by that august assembly. We miss half the meaning of the Council if we overlook the tremulous hope and joy of those first years of worldwide victory. Athanasius shows it even more than Eusebius. One thing at least was clear. The new world faced the old, and the spell of the Holy Roman Empire had already begun to work.

Constantine took up at once the position of a moderator. He began by burning unread the budget of complaints against each other which the bishops had presented to him. He then preached them a sermon on unity; and unity was his text all through. He was much more anxious to make the decisions unanimous than to influence them one way or another. His one object was to make an end of division in the churches. So whatever pleased the bishops pleased the emperor too. Easter was fixed according to the custom of Rome and Alexandria for the Sunday after the full moon following the vernal equinox. It is the rule we have now, and though it did not produce complete unity till the lunar cycle was quite settled, it secured that Easter should come after the Passover, “for” said Constantine, “how can we who are Christians keep the same day as those ungodly Jews?” The Meletian schism was peacefully settled—to the disgust of Athanasius in later years —by giving the Meletian clergy a status next to the orthodox, with a right of succession if found worthy. So far well: but the condemnation of Arianism may have been something of a trial to Constantine, who could not quite see why they thought it worthwhile to be so hot on such a trifling question as the deity of Christ. However that may be, Arianism was politically impossible. He must have known already from Hosius that the West would not accept it, and the first act of the Council meant

its almost unanimous rejection by the East. As soon as there was no doubt what the decision would be, he did his best to make it quite unanimous. All the arts of imperial persuasion were tried on the waverers, till in the end only two stubborn recusants remained to be sent into exile.

To some wider aspects of the Council we shall return hereafter. For the moment it may be enough to say that Constantine had won a great success. He had not only got his questions settled, but had himself taken a conspicuous part in settling them. More than this. He had established formal relations, no longer with bishops or groups of bishops, but with a great confederacy of churches. The churches had long been tending to organize themselves on the lines of the Empire, as we see in Cyprian's theories; and now Constantine made the Church an alter ego of the State, and gave it a concrete unity of the political sort which it never had before. Henceforth the holy Catholic Church of the creeds was more and more limited to the confederation of churches recognized by the State, so that it only remained to compel all men to come into these, and prevent the formation of any other religious communities. In this way the Church became much more useful to the State, and also perhaps fitter to resist the shock of the barbarian conquests which followed; but surely something was lost in freedom and spirituality, and therefore also in practical morality.

We pass from the Council of Nicaea to a family tragedy. So far Constantine may pass as fairly merciful to the plotters of his own house. Maximian, Bassianus and Licinius had all tried to assassinate him; and if he put to death Bassianus, he had spared Maximian till he plotted again, and so far he had spared Licinius also. But now in a few months from Oct. 325 he puts to death not only Licinius but his own son Crispus and the younger Licinius, then his own wife Fausta, and then a number of his friends. The facts are certain, but their exact meaning is obscure. It must however be noticed that the dynastic policy of Diocletian had given a new political importance to members of an imperial family. The widows of the third century emperors fall into obscurity; but the widow of Galerius is first sought in marriage by Maximin Daza, then executed by Licinius, who also put to death the children of Severus, Daza and Galerius. Now Constantine married twice; and there may well have been a bitter division in his family. Minervina was the mother of Crispus, whom we have seen greatly distinguishing himself in the war with Licinius: and there seems no serious doubt that the three younger sons were children of Fausta, though the eldest of them was not born till 315-6, eight years after her marriage. So we come to the questions we cannot answer. Was Constantine jealous of his eldest son, or anxious to get him out of the way of the others? Or was Crispus a plotter justly put to death? And how came Fausta to share his fate a little later? They are not likely to have been accomplices in a plot or connected by a guilty passion, though the story of Zosimus is not impossible, that she accused him falsely, and was herself put to death for it when Helena convicted her. We have not material enough for any decided opinion. The worst point, it may be, against Constantine is that he did not spare the young Licinius. If he was the son of Constantia, he cannot have been more than twelve years old. But the allusions to him suggest that he was something more than a boy, and we know that Constantia was on the best of terms with her brother when she died a couple of years later. If Constantine suspected the elder Licinius, the new sultanism would involve the younger in his fate; and if Crispus had married Helena his daughter, suspicion might attach to him too. Fausta's fate is the mystery. Or was Constantine more or less out of his mind that winter, as despots occasionally are? One or two of his laws may point that way, and the possibility may help to explain a good deal.

Constantine kept his Vicennalia at Rome in the summer of 316. It was an unhappy visit, even if the domestic tragedy had already taken place. Rome was the focus of heathenism, and of Roman pride. She expected to see her sovereigns at the ceremonies, and to treat them with something of republican familiarity. Constantine scandalized her with his Eastern pomp, and



gave deep offence to the senate and people by refusing to join the immemorial procession of the knights of Rome to the Capitol. When he left the city in September, he left it forever.

Rome indeed had long ceased to be a good capital. It was too far from the frontier for military purposes, too full of republican survivals for such sultans as the emperors had now become, too heathen for Christian Caesars. So Maximian held his court at Milan, while Diocletian gradually shifted his chief resort eastward from Sirmium to Nicomedia. There were many signs now that the seat of empire ought it to be somewhere near the Bosphorus. The chief dangers had always come from the Danube and the Euphrates; and about the Bosphorus was the only point which commanded both. If these were watched by the emperor himself, the Rhine might be left in charge of a Caesar. This was much the best course for the present; but in the long run the problem was insoluble. The Rhine and the Danube might be guarded, or the Danube and the Euphrates; but now that Rome had failed to make a solid nation of her empire, she could not permanently guard all three together. Sooner or later it must come to a choice between the Rhine and the Euphrates, between Italy and Greece, between Europe and Asia. Constantine is not likely to have seen clearly all this; but he did see that he commanded more important countries from the Bosphorus than he could from Rome or Milan. These might control the Latin West and the upper Danube; but at the Bosphorus he had at his feet the Greek world from Taurus to the Balkans, flanked northward by the warlike peoples of Illyricum, and eastward by the great barbarian fringe of Egypt, Syria and Armenia, reaching from the Caucasus to the cataracts of the Nile. Nobody could yet foresee that by the seventh century nothing but the Greek world would be left. But where precisely was the new capital to be placed? Nicomedia would have been Diocletian's city, not Constantine's, and in any case it lay at the far end of a gulf, some fifty miles from the main line of traffic. Constantine may at one time have dreamed of his own birthplace Naissus, or of Sardica, and at another he began buildings on the site of Troy, before he fixed upon the matchless position of Byzantium.

Europe and Asia are separated by the broad expanses of the Euxine and Aegean seas, together stretching nearly a thousand miles from the Crimea to the mountains of Crete, and in ancient times almost fringed round with Greek cities. It is not all a land of the vine and the olive, even in Aegean waters, for the Russian wind sweeps over the whole region except in sheltered parts, as where Trebizond is protected by the Caucasus, Philippi by the Rhodope, or Sparta by Taygetus, or where Ionia hides behind the Mysian Olympus and the Trojan Ida. For all its heat in summer, Constantinople is quite as cold in winter as London, and the western ports of the Black Sea are more cumbered with ice than the north of Norway. But the Aegean and the Euxine are not a single broad sheet of water. In the narrows between them the coasts of Europe and Asia draw so close together that we can sail for more than two hundred miles in full view of both continents. Leaving the warm South behind at Lesbos (Mitylene) we pass from the Aegean to the Propontis (Marmora) by the Hellespont (Dardanelles) a channel of some fifty miles in length to Gallipoli, and two or three miles broad. Then a voyage of a hundred and forty miles through the more open waters of the Propontis brings us to the Bosphorus, which averages only three-quarters of a mile wide, and has a winding course of sixteen miles from Byzantium to the Cyanean rocks at the entrance of the Euxine. It follows that a city on the Propontis is protected north and south by the narrow passages of the Bosphorus and the Dardanelles, and that all traffic between the Aegean and the Euxine must pass its walls. Moreover, the Bosphorus lay more conveniently than the Dardanelles for the passage from Europe to Asia. Thus two of the chief trade-routes of the Roman world crossed each other at Byzantium.

The Megarians may have had some idea of these things when they colonized Chalcedon (674 BC) just outside the south end of the Bosphorus, on the Asiatic side of the Propontis. But the site of Chalcedon has no special advantages, so that its founders became a proverb of

blindness for overlooking the superb position of Byzantium across the water, which was not occupied till 657 *BC*. At the south end of the Bosphorus, but on the European side, a blunt triangle is formed by the Propontis and the Golden Horn, a deep inlet of the Bosphorus running seven miles to the north-west. On the rising ground between them was built the city of Byzantium. Small as its extent was in Greek times, it played a great part in history. Its command of the corn trade of the Euxine made it one of the most important strategic positions in the Greek world, so that its capture by Alexander (it had repulsed Philip) was one of the chief steps of his advance to empire. It formed an early alliance with the Romans, who freed it from its perpetual trouble with the barbarians of Thrace, whom neither peace nor war could keep quiet. Vespasian (73 *AD*) took away its privileges and threw it into the province of Thrace. In the civil wars of Septimius Severus it took the side of Pescennius Niger, and held out for two years after Niger's overthrow at Issus in 194. Severus destroyed its walls, and made it a subject-village of Perinthus. Caracalla made it a city again, but it was sacked afresh by Gallienus. Meanwhile the Gothic Vikings came sailing past its ruined walls to spread terror all over the Aegean and to the shores of Italy. Under the Illyrian emperors it was fortified again. Even then it was taken first by Maximin Daza and then by Constantine in the first Licinian war, so that its full significance only came out in the second. Licinius was a good general, and pivoted the whole war upon it after his defeat at Adrianople. He might have held his ground indefinitely, if the destruction of his fleet in the Hellespont had not driven him from Byzantium.

The lesson was not lost on Constantine. He began the work some time after his visit to Rome, and pushed it forward with impatience. He traced his walls to form a base two and a half miles from the apex of the triangle. Byzantium stood on a single hill, but he took in five, and his successors counted seven, according to the number of the hills of Rome. The market-place was on the second hill, where his camp had been during the siege. He erected great buildings, and gathered works of art from all parts to adorn it. The temples of Byzantium remained, though they were overshadowed by the great cathedral of the Twelve Apostles. Some heathen ceremonies also were used, for Constantinople was the last and greatest colony of Rome, and for centuries retained the flavor of a Latin city. He gave it a senate also, and brought over many of the senators of Rome to be senators of the New Rome—for such was its official title, though it has always been known as the City of Constantine. The Northmen called it simply *Miklagard*, the Great City. It never had much in the way of amphitheatre or beast-fights: amusement more Christian and humane was provided by a circus and horse-races. Its corn largesses were like those of Rome, and the corn of Egypt was diverted to its use, leaving that of Sicily and Africa for Rome. The New Rome stood next to the Old in rank and dignity, being separated from the province of Europa, and governed by proconsuls till it received a Praefectus Urbi like Rome in 359. The bishop also soon shook off his dependence on Perinthus, and was recognized as standing next to the bishop of Rome, "because Constantinople is New Rome", by the Council of 381. This ousted Alexandria from the second place, and the jealousy thereupon arising had important ecclesiastical consequences. The work was complete, so far as the hasty building would allow, by the spring of 330: and 11 May of that year is the official date for the foundation of Constantinople.

It would be hard to overestimate the strength given to the Empire by the new capital. So long as the Romans held the sea, the city was impregnable. If it was attacked on one side, it could draw supplies from the other; and when it was attacked on both sides in 628, Persians and Avars could not join hands across the Bosphorus. Even when the command of the sea was lost, it still remained a fortress of uncommon strength. So stood Constantinople for more than a thousand years. Goths and Avars, Persians and Saracens, Bulgarians and Russians, dashed in vain upon its walls, and even the Turks failed more than once. It was often enough taken in civil war by help from within; but no foreign enemy ever stormed its walls till the Fourth

Crusade (1204 *AD*). The Arian controversy first made it clear that the heart of the Empire was in the Greek world, or more precisely in Asiatic Greece between the Taurus and the Bosphorus; and of the Greek world Constantinople was the natural capital. It did not however at once become the regular residence of the emperors. Constantine himself died in a suburb of Nicomedia, Constantius led a wandering life, Jovian never reached the city, and Valens in his later years avoided it. Theodosius was the first emperor who made it his usual residence. But the commercial supremacy of Constantinople was assured from the outset. The centre of gravity of Asia Minor had shifted northward since the first century, and the Bosphorus gave an easier passage to Europe than the Aegean. So the roads which had converged on Ephesus now converged on Constantinople. It dominated the Greek world; and the Greek world was the solid part of the Empire which resisted all attacks for ages. The loss was more apparent than real when first the Slavic lands were torn away, then Syria and Egypt, and lastly Sicily and Italy. The Empire was never struck in a vital part till the Seljuks rooted out Greek civilization from the highland of Asia Minor in the eleventh century. Even after that it was still a conquering power under the Comnenians and the house of Lascaris; and its fate was never hopeless till its last firm ground in Asia was destroyed by the corrupt and selfish policy of Michael Palaeologus.

We know little of Constantine's declining years, except that they were generally years of peace. The civil wars were ended at Chrysopolis: now there was not even a pretender, unless we count as such Calocerus the camel-driver in Cyprus, who was put down without much difficulty, and duly burned in the market-place of Tarsus (335). If the Rhine was not entirely quiet, the troubles there were not serious. The Jews, to be sure, were never loyal, and the Christian Empire had already shown marked hostility to them. A rising mentioned only by Chrysostom is most likely a legend: but there may have been already some signs of the great outbreak put down by Ursicinus in 352. However, upon the whole there was peace. The old emperor never again took the field in person. His last war was with the Goths; and that was conducted by the younger Constantine.

On a broad view, the legions of the Danube faced the Germans in its upper course and the Goths lower down, with the Sarmatians between them; and each of these names stands for sundry tribes and groups of tribes, whose mutual enmities were diligently fostered by the policy of Rome. In 331 the Sarmatians and the Vandals had somehow got mixed up together, and suffered a great defeat from the Goths. They asked Constantine for help, and he was very willing to check the growth of the Gothic power. Araric the Gothic king replied by carrying the war into the Roman province of Moesia, from which he was driven out with heavy loss. The younger Constantine gained a great victory over him, 20 April 332; and when peace was made, the Goths returned to their old position as servants and allies of Rome. But when the Sarmatians themselves made inroads on Roman territory, Constantine left them to their fate. They were soon in difficulties with Geberic the new Gothic king, and with their own slaves the Limigantes, who drove them out of their country. Some fled to the Quadi, some found refuge among the Gothic tribes, but 300,000 of them sought shelter in the Empire, and were given lands by Constantine, chiefly in Pannonia.

The most interesting circumstance of the Gothic war is the help Constantine received from Cherson, the last of the Greek republics. It stood where Sebastopol now stands. The story is told only by Constantine Porphyrogenitus (911-959), but the learned emperor was an excellent antiquarian, and used original authorities. Cherson and the Goths were old enemies, Rome and Cherson old allies. The republic decided for war, and its first magistrate Diogenes struck a decisive blow by attacking the rear of the Goths. Cherson received a rich reward from Constantine, and remained in generally friendly relations to the Empire till its annexation in 829, and even till its capture by the Russians in 988.

The settlement of the Danube was the last of Constantine's great services to the Empire. The Edict of Milan had removed the standing danger of Christian disaffection in the East, the defeat of Licinius had put an end to the civil wars, the reform of the administration completed Diocletian's work of reducing the army to permanent obedience, the Council of Nicaea had secured the active alliance of the Christian churches, the foundation of Constantinople made the seat of power safe for centuries; and now the consolidation of the northern frontier seemed to enlist all the most dangerous enemies of Rome in her defense. The Empire gained three hundred thousand settlers for the wastes of the Gothic march, and a firm peace of more than thirty years with the greatest of the northern nations. Henceforth the Rhine was guarded by the Franks, the Danube covered by the Goths, and the Euphrates flanked by the Christian kingdom of Armenia. The Empire was already dangerously dependent on barbarian help inside and outside its frontiers; but the Roman peace never seemed more secure than when the skilful policy of Constantine had formed its chief barbarian enemies into a covering ring of friendly client states.

At all events, the years of peace were not a time of healthful recovery. The Empire had not gained strength in the long peace of the Antonines; and it had gone a long way downhill since the second century. When Diocletian came to the throne in 284, he found three great problems before him. The first was military—how to stop the continual mutinies which cut off the emperors before they could do their work. This he solved, though at the cost of leaving behind him a period of civil war. The second was religious—how to deal with the Christians. Diocletian went wrong on this, and left his mistake to be repaired by Constantine. The third and hardest was mainly economic—to restore the dwindled agriculture, commerce, and population of the Empire. On this Diocletian and Constantine went wrong together. They not only failed to cure the evil, but greatly increased it. Not much was gained by remitting taxes that could not be paid, and settling barbarian colonists and barbarian serfs in the wasted provinces. Serious economic difficulties have moral causes, and there was no radical cure short of a complete change in the temper of society. Yet much might have been done by a permanent reduction of taxation and a reform of its incidence and of the methods of collection. Instead of this, the machinery of government (and its expense) was greatly increased. The army had to be held in check by courts of Oriental splendor and a vast establishment of corrupt officials. We can see the growth of officialism even in the language, if we compare the Latin words in Athanasius with those in the New Testament. So heavier taxes had to be levied from a smaller and poorer population. Taxation under the Empire had never been light; in the third century it grew heavy, under Diocletian it was crushing, and in the later years of Constantine the burden was further increased by the enormous expenditure which built up the new capital like the city in a fairy tale. We are within sight of the time when the whole policy of the government was dictated by dire financial need. We have already reached a state of things like that we see in Russia. The strongest of the emperors had never been able to put down brigandage; and now disorder was rampant in the mountains, and often elsewhere. The great army of officials was all-powerful for oppression, and very little controlled by the emperor. He might displace an official at a moment's notice, or “deliver him to the avenging flames”; but he could enforce no reform against the passive resistance of the officials and the landowners. So things drifted on from bad to worse.

Nor can we doubt that Constantine himself grew slacker in the years of peace. Nature had richly gifted him with sound health, strong limbs, and a stately presence. His energy was untiring, his observation keen, his decision quick. He was a splendid soldier, and the best general since Aurelian. If he had no learned education, he was not without interest in literature, and in practical statesmanship he may fairly rank with Diocletian. His general humanity stands out clear in his laws, for no emperor ever did more for the slave, the foundling, and the oppressed. If he began by giving the Frankish kings to the beasts, he went



on (325) to forbid the games of the amphitheatre. In private life he was chaste and sober, moderate and pleasant. Yet he was given to raillery, and his nearest friends could not entirely trust him. His ambition was great, and he was very susceptible to flattery. So freely was it ministered to him that he sometimes had to check it himself: but in his later years he was more or less influenced by unworthy favorites, as Ablabius and Sopater seem to have been. No doubt his Christianity is of itself an offence to Zosimus and Julian, so that we may discount their charges of sloth and luxury: but upon the whole, the judgment of Eutropius would seem impartial, that Constantine was a match for the best emperors in the early part of his reign, and at its end no more than average.

As Constantine had won the Empire, so now he had to dispose of it. Constantine, Constantius, and Constans, his three sons by Fausta, were born in 316, 317, 320, and received the title of Caesar in 317, 323, 333. In 335 their inheritance was marked out. Constantine was to have the Gaulish prefecture, Constantius the Eastern, Constans the Italian and Illyrian. This is the partition actually made after the emperor's death; but for the present it was complicated by some obscure transactions. Constantine had made honorable provision for his half-brothers Delmatius and Julius Constantius, the sons of Theodora, and they never gave him political trouble. Of their sisters, he married Constantia to Licinius, Anastasia to Bassianus and Nepotianus, of whom the second certainly was a great Roman noble, so that they too suffered no disparagement. Basilina also, the wife of Julius Constantius and mother of the emperor Julian, belonged to the great Anician family. Now Delmatius left two sons, Delmatius and Hanniballianus. Of these Delmatius must have been a man of mark, for he held the high office of *magister militum*, and was made Caesar in 335, while Hanniballianus was the husband of Constantine's daughter Constantina. But they had no proper claim to any share in the succession, and we do not know why they were given it. There may have been parties in the palace; and if so, Ablabius is likely to have had a share in the matter, for he was put to death along with them in the massacre which followed Constantine's death. Certain it is that shares were carved out for them from the inheritance of their cousins. Delmatius was to have the Gothic march, while Hanniballianus received Pontus, with the astonishing title of *rex regum*—for no Roman since the Tarquins had ever borne the name of king.

The strange title may point to some design upon Armenia, for the whole Eastern Question of the day was raised when Persia threatened war. Four emperors in the third century had met with disaster on the Persian frontier, but there had been forty years of peace since the victory of Galerius in 297. The Empire gained Mesopotamia to the Aboras, and the five provinces which covered the southern slopes of the Armenian mountains; and in Armenia itself, Roman supremacy was fully recognized by its great king Tiridates (287-314). If his adoption of Christianity led to a short war with Maximin Daza, it only drew Armenia closer to Constantine. But if the royal house was Christian and leaned on Rome, there was a large heathen party which looked to Persia: and Persia was an aggressive power under Sapor II (309-380). A vigorous persecution of Christians was carried on, and war with Rome was only a question of time. Sapor demanded back the five provinces and attacked Mesopotamia, while a revolution in the palace threw Armenia into his hands.

How much of this was done during Constantine's lifetime is more than we can say: but at all events a Persian war was plain in sight by the spring of 337; and a war with Persia was too serious a matter to be left to Caesars like a Frankish foray or a Gothic inroad, so the old emperor prepared to take the field in person. He never set out. Constantine fell sick soon after Easter, and when the sickness grew upon him, he took up his abode at Ancyrona, a suburb of Nicomedia. As his end drew near, he received the imposition of hands, for up to that time he had not been even a catechumen. He then applied for baptism, explaining that he had hoped some day to receive it in the waters of the Jordan like the Lord himself. After the ceremony he laid aside the purple, and passed away in stainless white (22 May 337). As all his sons were

absent, the government was carried on for three months in the dead emperor's name, till they had made their arrangements, and the soldiers had slaughtered almost the entire house of Theodora. Constantine was buried on the spot he had himself marked out in the cathedral of the Twelve Apostles in his own imperial city. The Greek Church still calls him *isapostolos* - an equal of the Apostles.

## CHAPTER II

### THE REORGANIZATION OF THE EMPIRE

IT is natural to think of Diocletian as the projector and of Constantine as the completer of a new system of government for the Roman Empire, which persisted with mere changes of detail until it was laid in ruins by the barbarians. But in reality the imperial institutions from the time of Augustus onwards had passed through a course of continuous development. Diocletian did but accelerate processes which had been in operation from the Empire's earliest days, and Constantine left much for his successors to accomplish. Still these two great organizers did so far change the world which they ruled as to be rightly styled the founders of a new type of monarchy. We will first sketch rapidly the most striking aspects of this altered world, and then consider them one by one somewhat more closely. But our survey must be in the main of a general character, and many details, especially when open to doubt, must be passed over. In particular, the minutiae of chronology, which in this region of history are especially difficult to determine, must often be disregarded.

The ideal of a balance of power between the Princeps and the Senate, which Augustus dangled before the eyes of his contemporaries, was never approached in practice. From the first the imperial constitution bore within it the seed of autocracy, and the plant was not of slow growth. The historian Tacitus was not far wrong when he described Augustus as having drawn to himself all the functions which in the Republic had belonged to magistrates and to laws.

The founder of the Empire had studied well the art of concealing his political art, but the pressure of his hand was felt in every corner of the administration. Each Princeps was as far above law as he chose to rise, so long as he did not strain the endurance of the Senate and people to the point of breaking. When that point was passed there was the poor consolation of refusing him his apotheosis, or of branding with infamy his memory. As the possibility of imperial interference was ever present in every section of the vast machine of government, all concerned in its working were anxious to secure themselves by obtaining an order from above. This anxiety is conspicuous in the letters written by Pliny to his master Trajan. Even those emperors who were most citizen-like (*civiles* as the phrase went) were carried away by the tide. Tacitus exhibits the Senate as eagerly pressing Tiberius to permit the enlargement of his powers—Tiberius who regarded every precept of Augustus as a law for himself. The so-called *lex regia Vespasiani* shows how constantly the admitted authority of the emperor advanced by the accumulation of precedents. Pliny gave Trajan credit for having reconciled the Empire with 'liberty'; but 'liberty' had come to mean little more than orderly and benevolent administration, free from cruel caprice, with some external deference paid to the Senate. Developed custom made the rule of Marcus Aurelius greatly more despotic than that of Augustus. Even the emperors of the third century who, like Severus Alexander, made most of the Senate, could not turn back the current. It was long, however, before the subjects of the Empire realized that the ancient glory had departed. Down to the time of the Emperor Tacitus (275-276 AD) pretenders found their account in posing as senatorial champions, and rulers used the Senate's name as a convenient screen for their crimes.

But the natural outcome of the anarchy of the third century was the unveiled despotism of Diocletian. He was the last in a line of valiant soldiers sprung from Illyrian soil, who accomplished the rescue of Rome from the dissolution with which it had been threatened by forces without and by forces within. To him more than to Aurelian, on whom it was bestowed, belonged by right the title "restorer of the world." For three centuries the legions had been a standing menace to the very existence of Greco-Roman civilization. They made emperors and unmade them, and devoured the substance of the State, exacting continually lavish largess at the sword's point. One hope of Diocletian when, following in the steps of Aurelian, he hedged round the throne with pomp and majesty, was that a new awe might shield the civil power from the lawless soldiery. In place of an Augustus, loving to parade as a bourgeois leader of the people, there comes a kind of Sultan, with trappings such as the men of the West had been used to associate with the servile East, with the Persians and Parthians. The ruler of the Roman world wears the oriental diadem, the mere dread of which had brought Caesar to his end. He is approached as a living god with that adoration from which the souls of the Greeks revolted when they came into the presence of the Great King, though Alexander bent them to endure it. Eunuchs are among his greatest officers. Lawyers buttress his throne with an absolutist theory of the constitution which is universally accepted.

From Augustus to Diocletian the trend of the government towards centralization had been incessant. The new monarchy gave to the centralization an intensity and an elaboration unknown before. In the early days of conquest, whether within Italy or beyond its boundaries, the Roman power had attempted no unification of its dominions. As rulers, the Romans had shown themselves thorough opportunists. They tolerated great varieties of local privilege and partial liberty. Their government had followed, almost timidly, the line of least resistance, and had adapted itself to circumstance, to usage, and to prejudice in every part of the Empire. Even taxation had been elastic. Before the age of despotism, few matters had ever been regulated by one unvarying enactment for every province. To this great policy the Romans chiefly owed the rapidity of their successes and the security of their ascendancy.

The tendency towards unity was of course manifest from the first. But it sprang far less from the direct action of the central government than from the instinctive and unparalleled attraction which the Roman institutions possessed for the provincials, particularly in the West. In part by the extension of Roman and Italian rights to the provinces, in part by the gradual depression of Italy to the level of a province, and in part by interference designed to correct misgovernment, local differences were to a great extent effaced. Septimius Severus (145-211 *AD*) by stationing a legion in Italy removed one chief distinction between that favored land and the subject regions outside. Under his successor, Caracalla (211-217 *AD*), all communities within the Empire became alike Roman. By Diocletian and by Constantine, control from the centre was made systematic and organic. Yet absolute uniformity was not attained. In taxation, in legal administration, and in some other departments of government, local conditions still induced some toleration of diversities.

Centralization brought into existence with its growth a vast bureaucracy. The organization of the Imperial side of the administration, as opposed to the Senatorial, became more and more complex, while the importance of the Senate in the administrative machinery continually lessened. The expansion and organization of the executive engaged the attention of many emperors, particularly Claudius, Vespasian, Trajan, Hadrian, and Septimius Severus. When the chaos of the third century had been overcome, Diocletian and his successors were compelled to reconstruct the whole service of the Empire, and a great network of officials, bearing for the most part new titles and largely undertaking new functions, was spread over it.

Along with the development of absolutism and the extension of bureaucracy, and the unification of administration had gone certain tendencies which had cut deeply into the constitution of society at large. The boundaries between class and class tended more and more



to become fixed and impassable. As the Empire decayed society stiffened, and some approximations were made to the oriental institution of caste. Augustus had tried to give a rigid organization to the circle from which senators were drawn, and had constituted it as an order of nobility passing down from father to son, only to be slowly recruited by imperial choice. Many duties owed to the State tended to become hereditary, and it was made difficult for men to rid themselves of the status which they acquired at birth. The exigencies of finance made membership of the local senates in the municipalities almost impossible to escape.

The frontier legions, partly by encouragement and partly by ordinance, were largely filled with sons of the camp. Several causes, the chief of which was the financial system, gave rise to a kind of serfdom (*colonatus*) which at first attached the cultivators of the soil, and as time went on, approximated to a condition of actual slavery. The provisioning of the great capitals, Rome and Constantinople, and the transportation of goods on public account, rendered occupations connected with them hereditary. And many inequalities between classes became pronounced. The criminal law placed the *honestiores* and the *tenuiores* in different categories.

The main features of the executive government as organized by Diocletian and his successors, must now be briefly described. For the first time the difference between the prevalently Latin West and the prevalently Greek East was clearly reflected in the scheme of administration. Diocletian ordained (286) that two Augusti with equal authority should share the supreme power, one making his residence in the Eastern, the other in the Western portion. The Empire was not formally divided between them; they were to work together for the benefit of the whole State. This association of Augusti was not exactly new; but it had I never been before formalized so completely.

The separation of West from East had been foreshadowed from the early days of the Empire. In the first century it had been found necessary to have a Greek Secretary of State as well as a Latin Secretary. The civilization of the two spheres, in spite of much interaction, remained markedly different. The municipal life of the Eastern regions in which Greek influence predominated was fixed in its characteristics before the Romans acquired their ascendancy, and the impression they made on it was not on the whole great. But they spread their own municipal institutions all over Western lands.

Although Diocletian's arrangement of the two Augusti was overthrown by Constantine, the inherent incompatibility between the two sections of the Empire continued to assert itself, and the separation became permanent in fact if not in form on the death of Theodosius (379-395 AD).

The establishment of Constantinople as the capital rendered the ultimate severance inevitable. Another problem which Diocletian attacked was that of the succession to the throne. Each 'Augustus' was to have assigned to him (293) a 'Caesar' who would assist him in the task of government and succeed him on his retirement or death. The transference of power would thus be peaceful and the violent revolutions caused by the claims of the legions to nominate emperors would cease. But in the nature of things this device could not prosper. The Empire followed the course it had taken from the beginning. The dynastic principle strove time after time to establish itself, but dynasties were ever threatened with catastrophe, such as had ensued on the deaths of Nero, of Commodus, and of Severus Alexander. But new emperors frequently did homage to heredity by a process of posthumous and fictitious adoption, whereby they grafted themselves on to the line of their predecessors. Apparently even this phantom of legitimacy had some value for the effect it produced on the public mind.

The theory of government now became, as has been said, frankly autocratic. Even Aurelian, a man of simple and soldierly life, had thought well to take to himself officially the title of "lord and god" which private flattery had bestowed upon Domitian. The lawyers established a fiction that the Roman people had voluntarily resigned all authority into the

hands of the monarch. The fable was as baseless and as serviceable as that of the "social compact," received in the eighteenth century. No person or class held any rights against the emperor. The revenues were his private property. All payments from the treasury were 'sacred largesses' conceded by the divine ruler. So far as the State was concerned, the distinction between the senatorial exchequer (*aerarium*) and the imperial exchequer (*fiscus*) disappeared. Certain revenues, as for instance those derived from the confiscated estates of unsuccessful pretenders, were labeled as the emperor's private property (*res privata*), and others as belonging to his "family estate" (*patrimonium*). But these designations were merely formal and administrative. The emperor was the sole ultimate source of all law and authority. The personnel by which he was immediately surrounded in his capital was of vast extent, and the palace was often a hotbed of intrigue. Even in the time of the Severi the 'Caesareans', as Dio Cassius names them, were numerous enough to imperil often the public peace. Another class of imperial servants, the workers at the mint, had, in the reign of Aurelian, raised an insurrection which led to a shedding of blood in Rome such as had not been witnessed since the age of Sulla. The military basis of imperial power, partly concealed by the earlier emperors, stood fully revealed.

Septimius Severus had been the first to wear regularly in the capital the full insignia of military command, previously seen there only on days of triumph. Now every department of the public service was regarded as 'militia' and 'camp' (*castra*) is the official name for the court. All high officers, with the exception of the *praefectus urbi*, wore the military garb. It is needless to say that officials who were nominally the emperor's domestic servants easily gathered power into their own hands and often became the real rulers of the Empire. The line between domestic offices and those which were political and military was never strictly drawn. All higher functions whose exercise required close attention on the emperor's person were covered by the description *dignitates palatinae*.

Under the early emperors the great ministers of state were largely freedmen, whose status was rather that of court servants than of public administrators. The great departments of the imperial service were gradually freed from their close attachment to the emperor's person. The natural result was that direct personal influence over the ruler often passed into the hands of men whose duties were in name connected only with the daily life of the palace. From the third century onwards the Eastern custom of choosing eunuchs as the most trusted servants prevailed in the imperial household as in the private households of the wealthy. The greatest of these was the *praepositus sacri cubiculi* or Great Chamberlain. This officer often wielded the power which had been enjoyed by such men as Parthenius had been under Domitian. The office grew in importance, as measured by dignity and precedence, until in the time of Theodosius the Great it was one of four high offices which conferred on their holders membership of the Imperial Council (*Consistorium*), and a little later was made equal in honor to the other three.

The 'Palatine' servants, high and low, formed a mighty host, which required a special department for their provisioning and another for their tendance in sickness. But exactly how many of them were under the immediate direction (*sub dispositione*) of the *praepositus sacri cubiculi* cannot be determined. Some duties fell to him which are hardly suggested by his title. He was in control of the emperor's select and intimate bodyguard, which bore the name of *silentarii*, thirty in number, with three *decuriones* for officers. Curiously, he superintended one division of the vast imperial domains, that considerable portion of them which lay within the province of Cappadocia. Dependent probably on the *praepositus sacri cubiculi* was the *primicerius sacri cubiculi*, who appears in the *Notitia Dignitatum* as possessing the quality of a proconsular. Whether the *castrensis sacri palatii* was independent or subordinate, cannot be determined. Under his rule were a host of pages and lower menials of many kinds, and he had

to care for the fabric of the imperial palaces. Also he had charge of the private archives of the imperial family.

The service of the officers described was rather personal to the emperor than public in character. We now turn to the civil and military administration as it was refashioned under the new monarchy.

The chaos of the period preceding Diocletian's supremacy had finally effaced some of the leading features of the Augustan Principate which had become fainter and fainter as the Empire ran its course. The Senate lost the last remnant of real power. Such of its surviving privileges and dignities as might carry back the mind to the days of its glory were mere shadows without substance. All provinces had become imperial. All functionaries of every class owed obedience to the autocrat alone, and looked to him for their career. The old state-treasury, the *aerarium*, retained its name, but became in practice the municipal exchequer of Rome, which ceased to be the capital of the Empire and was merely the first of its municipalities. The army and the civil service alike were filled with officers whose titles and duties would have seemed strange to a Roman of the second century of the Empire.

The aspect of the provincial government, as ordered by the new monarchy, differed profoundly from that which it had worn in the age of the early Principate. To diminish the danger of military revolutions Diocletian carried to a conclusion a policy which had been adopted in part by his predecessors. The great military commands in the provinces which had often enabled their holders to destroy or to imperil dynasties or rulers were broken up; and the old provinces were severed into fragments. Spain, for example, now comprised six divisions, and Gaul fifteen. Within these fragments, still named provinces, the civil power and the military authority were, as a rule, not placed in the same hands. The divisions of the Empire now numbered about a hundred and twenty, as against forty-five which existed at the end of Trajan's reign. Twelve of the new sections lay within the boundaries of Italy, and of the old contrast between Italy and the provinces of the Principate, few traces remained. Egypt, hitherto treated as a land apart, was brought within the new organization.

The titles of the civil administrators were various. Three, who ruled regions bearing the ancient provincial names of Asia, Africa, and Achaia were distinguished by the title of proconsul, which had once belonged to all administrators of senatorial provinces. About thirty-six were known as *consulares*. This designation ceased to indicate, as of old, the men who had passed the consulship: it was merely connected with the government of provinces. The *consularis* became technically a member of the Roman Senate, though he ranked below the ex-consul. So also with the provincial governors who bore the common title of *praeses*, and the rarer name of *corrector*. This last appellation belonged, in the fourth century, to the chiefs of two districts in Italy, Apulia, and Lucania, and of three outside. It denoted originally officers who began to be appointed in Trajan's reign to reform the condition of municipalities. The precedence of the *correctores* among the governors seems to have placed them, in the West, after the *consulares*, in the East after the *praesides*. Sometimes the title of proconsul was for personal reasons bestowed on a governor whose province was ordinarily ruled by an officer of lower dignity. But such an arrangement was temporary. The old expressions *legatus pro praetore* or *procurator*, in its application to provincial rulers, went out of use. After the age of Constantine new and fanciful descriptions of the provincial governors, as of other officers, tended to spring into existence. A few frontier districts were treated (as was the case under the Principate) in an exceptional manner. Their chiefs were allowed to exercise civil as well as military functions and were naturally described by the ordinary name for an army commander (*dux*).

The proconsuls possessed some privileges of their own. Two of them, the proconsul of Africa and the proconsul of Asia were alone among the provincial governors entitled to receive their orders from the emperor himself; and the Asian proconsul was distinguished by

having under him two deputies, who directed a region known as Hellespontus and the *Insulae* or islands lying near the Asiatic coast. All other administrators communicated with the emperor through one or other of four great officers of state, the *Praefecti Praetorio*. Their title had been originally invented to designate the commander of the Praetorian Cohorts, whom Augustus called into existence. The control of these was usually vested in two men. Now and then three commanders were appointed. Some emperors, disregarding the danger to themselves, allowed a single officer to hold command. Men like Sejanus under Tiberius and Plautianus under Septimius Severus were practically vice-emperors. As time went on, the office gradually lost its military character. Sometimes one of the commanders was a soldier and the other a civilian. During the reign of Severus Alexander the great lawyer Ulpian was in sole charge, being the first senator who had been permitted to hold the post. The legal duties of the Praefect continued to grow in importance. When the Praetorian Cohorts brought destruction on themselves by their support of Maxentius against Constantine, the Praefectus Praetorio became a purely civil functionary. The four Praefecti were distinguished as Praefectus Praetorio, Galliarum, Italiae, Illyrici and Orientis respectively. The first administered not only the ancient Gaul, but also the Rhine frontier and Britain, Spain, Sardinia, Corsica and Sicily. The second in addition to Italy had under him Rhaetia, Noricum, Dalmatia, Pannonia, and some regions on the upper Danube, also most of Roman Africa; the third Dacia, Achaia, and districts near the lower Danube besides Illyricum, properly so called; the fourth all Asia Minor, in so far as it was not subjected to the proconsul of Asia, with Egypt and Thrace, and some lands by the mouth of the Danube. It will be seen that three out of the four had the direction of provinces lying on or near the Danube. Probably on their first institution and for some time afterwards all the Praefecti retained in their own hands the administration of some portions of the great territories committed to their charge. Later the Illyrian praefect alone had a district, a portion of Dacia, under his own immediate control. Apart from this exception, the Praefecti conducted their government through officials subordinated to them.

Each praefectal region was divided into great sections called *dioceses*. Each of these was formed by combination of a certain number of provinces; and each was comparable to the more important of the old provinces of the age of the Republic and early Principate. The word *diocesis* had passed through a long history before the time of Diocletian. The Romans found it existent in their Asiatic dominions, where it had been applied by earlier rulers to an administrative district, especially in relation to legal affairs. The Roman government extended the employment of the term both in the East and in the West and connected it with other sides of administration besides the legal. Diocletian marked out ten great divisions of the Empire to be designated by this title. The number of the divisions and their limits were somewhat altered by his successors. At the head of each *Dioecesis* was placed an officer who bore the name *vicarius*, excepting in the Eastern praefecture. Here the Vicarius was after a while replaced by a *Comes Orientis*, to whom the governor of Egypt was at first subject, though he acquired independent authority later. The treatment of Italy (in the new and extended sense) was peculiar. It constituted a single Dioecesis, but possessed two *vicarii*, one of whom had his seat at Milan, the other at Rome. This bisection of the Italian praefecture depended on differences in taxation, to which we must recur later. In the Dioecesis Asiana, and the Dioecesis Africae, the Vicarius was of course responsible not to the Praefectus, but to the proconsul.

Such were, in broad outline, the features which the civil administration of the Empire wore after Diocletian's reforms. Some rough idea must be conveyed of the mode in which the scheme was applied to the practical work of government. It must be premised that now, as heretofore, there was no point in the vast and complex machinery of bureaucracy at which the direct interposition of the emperor might not be at any moment brought into play. There was therefore no mechanical subordination of officer to officer, such as would produce an



unbroken official chain, passing down from the emperor to the lowest official. And even apart from imperial intervention we must not conceive of the different grades of functionaries as arranged in absolutely systematic subjection one grade to another. This would have interfered with one principal purpose of the new organization, which aimed at providing the emperor with information about the whole state of his dominions, through officers immediately in touch with him at the centre of the government.

The emperor could not afford to restrict himself to such reports as might reach him through a Praefectus Praetorio or a proconsul. Thus the Vicarii were never regarded as mere agents or deputies of the Praefecti, and the same may be said of other officials. All might be called on to leave the beaten track. The Praefecti Praetorio, though each had his allotted sphere, were still in some sense colleagues, and were required on occasion to take common action. One great aim of the new system was to prevent administrators from accumulating influence by long continuance in the same post, or in any other way. Therefore functionaries were passed on rapidly from one position to another. Therefore, also, except in rare instances, no man was allowed to hold office in the province of his birth. All offices were now paid and the importance of many was discernible from the amount of the stipend received by the holder. As in earlier times, certain offices conferred on their incumbents what may be regarded as patents of nobility. The nobiliary status arising from office was not hereditary as in an earlier age; yet the halo of the title to some extent covered the official's family. New appellations were invented to decorate the higher offices, whose tenants were graded as *illustres*, *spectabiles*, and *clarissimi*. To the last designation all senators were entitled. Other expressions as *comes*, *patricius*, were less closely bound up with office. The use of these titles spread gradually. Before the end of the first century *vir clarissimus* (v.c. on inscriptions) began to denote the senator. The employment of distinctive titles for high officers of equestrian rank, *vir eminentissimus*, *vir perfectissimus*, *vir egregius*, began with Hadrian, and developed in the time of Marcus Aurelius. The designation *vir egregius* fell out of use during or soon after Constantine's reign. The tendency of the new organization was to detach many offices from their old connection with the equestrian body, whose importance in the State diminished and then rapidly died away. Many changes in the application of these titles to the different offices took place from time to time.

The Praefectus Praetorio was the most exalted civil officer in the new Empire. His duties were executive, legal, financial, of every description in fact excepting the military. His only service for the army lay in the supply of its material requirements in pay, food, and equipment. He became in the end one of the highest of the *virii illustres*. The Praefectus in whose district the emperor resided was for the time being of enhanced importance, and was denoted as *Praefectus Praetorio praesens*. The office had even before the time of Diocletian attracted to itself a good deal of criminal jurisdiction. The Praefectus was now not a judge of first instance, but heard appeals from the courts below, within his sphere of action, with the exception of the court of the Vicarius, from whom the appeal went straight to the emperor. On the other hand, after 331 there was in the ordinary way no appeal against a sentence passed by the Praefectus, who was held to sit as the alter ego of the emperor (*vice sacra iudicans*). No other official possessed this privilege. The whole administration of the regions committed to him was passed under review by the Praefectus. His supervision of the provincial governors was of the most general kind. Each was compelled to send in twice a year a report on the administration of his province, and particularly on his exercise of jurisdiction. In the selection of governors the Praefectus had a large share, and he exercised disciplinary power over them. Erring functionaries both military and civil could be suspended by him till the emperor's pleasure was known. He usually advised the emperor concerning appointments. His control of finance both on the side of receipts and on that of expenditure formed a most important part of his duties. All difficulties in the incidence of taxation and in the collection of the taxes

came under his consideration, but no officer of the Empire, however highly placed, could diminish or increase taxation without the emperor's express sanction. The Praefectus was also responsible for the due transport of corn and other necessaries destined for the supply of Rome and Constantinople. Many other functions fell to his lot, among them the superintendence of the state Post (*cursus publicus*).

If we may adapt an ecclesiastical phrase which describes the Archdeacon as the *oculus Episcopi*, we may say that the Vicarius was the *oculus Praefecti*. He gave a closer eye to details than was possible for his superior within his Dioecesis. At first he was *perfectissimus*, afterwards *spectabilis*. The tendency of the rulers after Constantine was to increase his importance at the expense of the Praefectus; rather however in the field of jurisdiction than in other fields. The Vicarius had but little disciplinary power over the *rector provinciae*. The governor could in a difficult case seek advice from the emperor without having recourse to either of his superior officers, though he was bound to inform the Vicarius, and the latter could on occasion go straight to the monarch. The court of the Vicarius, like that of the Praefectus, was an appeal court only. The provincial governor was judge of first instance in all civil and criminal matters, except in the cases of some privileged persons, and in those minor affairs which were left to the magistrates of the municipalities within the province. The small size of the province made it unnecessary that its ruler should travel about to administer justice, as in the earlier time. Causes were heard at the seat of government. Much of the time of the governor was occupied in seeing that imposts were duly collected and that no irregularities were practiced by subordinates. Responsibility for public order rested primarily with him.

The lower grades of civil servants in the provinces were to a very large extent in connection with and controlled by the great departments of the imperial service whose chief offices were in the capital. Early in the imperial period three great bureaux were established, whose presidents were named *ab epistulis*, *a libellis*, and *a memoria*. These phrases survived into the age of Constantine and after, but denoted the offices and not their chiefs, whose title was *magister*. The departments themselves were now described by the word *scrinium*, which had originally denoted a box or desk for containing papers. The word had therefore undergone a change of meaning similar to that which had passed over *fiscus*, whereby from a basket for holding coin, it came to mean the imperial exchequer. The demarcation of business allotted to the three great *scrinia* was not always the same. The *magister memoriae* gradually encroached on the functions of the other two heads of departments and became much the most influential of the three. A fourth *scrinium*, called the *scrinium dispositionum*, was added. Its *magister* (later called *comes*) was at first inferior to the other three, who belonged to the class of the *spectabiles*, but was afterwards placed on a level with them. All these *magistri* on being promoted became *vicarii*. All four were subject to an exalted personage known as *magister officiorum*, who was a *vir illustris*.

The department known as *ab epistulis* was early divided into two sections distinguished as *ab epistulis Latinis* and *ab epistulis Graecis*. It was originally the great Secretariat of the Empire. Here were managed all communications touching foreign affairs, and the general correspondence of the government, excepting in so far as it related to the legal and other multifarious petitions addressed to the emperor, appealing for his interference or his favor. These would come not only from officials, but also from private persons, and all fell within the functions of the office *a libellis*. This bureau absorbed into itself another which had been specially devoted to legal inquiries, and was called *a cognitionibus*. Hence the *magister libellorum* is described in the Digest by the fuller title *magister scrinii libellorum et sacrarum cognitionum*. The department had famous lawyers, like Papinian and Ulpian, connected with it, and it must often have sought the aid of specialists in other matters belonging to the public

service, as revenue and finance: for many of the petitions addressed to the ruler sought relief from taxation.

The name of the department *a memoria* implies that its head was the keeper of the “emperor's memory”. It was therefore a Record Office, but it was much more. It assisted other offices in putting documents into their final shape, and not only recorded the documents but issued them. The accounts we have of the office make it clear that it took to itself much important business which originally was transacted by other departments. Thus the *Notitia* describes the *magister memoriae* as dictating and issuing *adnotationes*, that is to say brief pronouncements running in the emperor's name; also as giving answers to supplications (*preces*). Further he gave to the emperor's letters, speeches, and general announcements their final form, and sent them forth. The *magister libellorum* and the *magister epistularum* must have become in fact, though not in form, his inferiors. From his office emanated diplomas of appointments, the permission to use the imperial post, and countless other official permits. The *scrinium dispositionum* kept in order all the emperor's engagements, and made the innumerable arrangements necessary for his journeys, and took count of many matters with which he was in touch, being of such a nature as not to come definitely within the purview of other bureaux

All these *scrinia* were under the control of one of the greatest functionaries of the Empire, the *magister officiorum*. His importance grew over a long space of time from small beginnings. His functions encroached greatly on those of the *Praefecti Praetorio*, and their development is a measure of the jealousy entertained by the emperors for these great officers. The word *officium* indicates a group of public servants placed at the disposal of a state functionary. The *magister officiorum* is the general master of all such groups. Naturally he is *vir illustris*. He selected from the *scrinia*, in accordance with elaborate rules of service, the clerks who were required to carry out many sorts of business in the capital and in the provinces. His duties were of many different kinds, through which no connected thread of principle ran; they evidently reached their full compass by an agglomeration which followed lines of convenience merely. One of the most prominent occupations of the magister lay in his direction of what may be called the Secret Service of the Empire. He had under him the very important *schola agentum in rebus*, which was organized by Constantine or possibly by Diocletian, and replaced a body of men called *frumentarii*, drawn originally from the corps which had in charge the provisioning of the army. These had acted as secret agents of the government. They were the men by whose means Hadrian, as his biographer says, “wormed out all hidden things”. The vast extension of the Secret Service in the age of Constantine and later was a consequence of the huge increase in the number of officials, and of the suspicion which an autocratic ruler naturally entertains towards his subordinates: in part also of a genuine but ineffectual desire to check misgovernment. The term *schola* is closely connected with the army, and implies a service which is regarded as military in trend, like that of the *other scholae palatinae*. The duties assigned to this *schola* opened of course wide doors through which corruption entered, and it became one of the greatest scourges from which the subjects of the Empire suffered. All attempts to keep it in order failed. The number of the officers attached to it was generally enormous. Julian practically disbanded it, retaining only a few of its members; but it soon grew again to its former proportions. The officers belonging to the *schola* were arranged in five classes, with more or less mechanical promotion, such as generally prevailed through the imperial service. The members themselves seem to have had some voice in the selection of men for the highest and most responsible duties. The standing of the *schola* became continually more honorable; and members of it rose to provincial governorships and even to still higher positions. The *agens in rebus* was ubiquitous, but only some of the more momentous forms of his activity can be mentioned here.

An officer called *princeps*, drawn from the *schola*, was sent to every Vicarius and into every province, where he was the chief of the governor's staff of assistants (*officium*). This officer had gone through a course of espionage in lower situations, and his relation to the *magister officiorum* made his proximity uncomfortable for his nominal superior. Indeed the *princeps* came to play the part of a sort of Maitre du Palais to the *rector provinciae*, who tended to become a merely nominal ruler. The *princeps* and the *officium* were quite capable of conducting the affairs of the province alone. Hence we hear of youths being corruptly placed in important governorships, and of these offices being purchased, as in the days of the Republic, only in a different manner. After this provincial service, the *princeps* usually became governor of a province himself.

At an earlier stage of his career, the *agens in rebus* would be despatched to a province to superintend the imperial Post-service there, and see that it was not in any way abused. This title was then *praepositus cursus publici*, or later *curiosus*. This service would enable him to play the part of a spy wherever he went. The burden of providing for the Post was one of the heaviest which the provincials had to bear, and those who contravened the regulations concerning it were often highly-placed officials. That the *curiosi* by their espionage could make themselves intolerable there is much evidence to show.

The *agentes in rebus* were also the general messengers of the government, and were continually dispatched on occasions great or small, to make announcements in every part of the emperor's dominions. While performing this function they were often the collectors of special donations to the imperial exchequer, and made illegitimate gains of their own, owing to the fear which they inspired. A regulation which is recorded forbidding any *agens in rebus* from entering Rome without special permission, is eloquent testimony to the reputation which the *schola* in general had earned.

Among the other miscellaneous duties of the *magister officiorum* was the supervision of formal intercourse between the Empire and foreign communities and princes. Also the general superintendence of the imperial factories and arsenals which supplied the army with weapons. The corps of guards (*scholae scutariorum et gentium*) who replaced the destroyed Praetorians were under his command, so that he resembled the Praefectus Praetorio of the earlier empire. And connected with this was a responsibility for the safety for the frontiers (*limites*) and control over the military commanders there. Further the servants who attended to the court ceremonial (*officium admissionis*) were under his direction, as were some others who belonged to the emperor's state. His civil and criminal jurisdiction extended over the immense mass of public servants at the capital, with few exceptions, and his voice in selecting officials for service there was potent. In short, no officer had more constant and more confidential relations with the monarch than the *magister officiorum*. He was the most important executive officer at the centre of government.

The greatest judicial and legal officer was the *quaestor sacri palatii*. The early history of this officer is obscure and no acceptable explanation has been found for the use of the title *quaestor* in connection with it. The dignity of the Quaestor's functions may be understood from descriptions given in literature. Symmachus calls him "the disposer of petitions and the constructor of laws". The poet Claudian says that he "issued edicts to the world, and answers to suppliants" while Corippus describes him as "the Champion of justice, who under the emperor's auspices controls legislation and legal principles" (*iura*). The Quaestor's office, like many others, advanced in importance after its creation, which appears to have taken place not earlier than Constantine's reign. In the latter part of the fourth century he took precedence even of the *magister officiorum*, and with one brief interruption, he maintained this rank. The requirements for the office were above all skill in the law and in the art of legal expression. On all legal questions, whether questions of change in law, or questions of its administration, the emperor gave his final decision by the voice of the Quaestor. No body of servants



(official) was specially allotted to him, but the *scrinia* were at his service. Indeed he may be said to have been the intermediary between the *scrinia* and the emperor. His relations with the heads of the departments *a libellis* and *a memoria*, and particularly with the latter, must have been very close; but their work was preparatory and subordinate to his so far as legal matters were concerned. The instances in which the *magister memoriae* succeeded in acting independently of the Quaestor were exceptional. A share in the appointment to certain of the lesser military offices was also assigned to the Quaestor, who kept a record of the names of their holders, which was known as *laterculum minus*. In this duty he was assisted by a high official of the *scrinium memoriae*, whose title was *laterculensis*.

There was another body called *tribuni et notarii*, not attached to the *scrinia*, which was of considerable importance. The service of these functionaries was closely connected with the deliberations of the great Imperial Council, the Consistorium, which is to be described presently. They had to see that the proper officers carried out the decisions of the Council. Their business often brought them into close and confidential relation with the emperor himself. The officer at the head is *primicerius* (literally, one whose name is written first on a wax tablet). The title is given to many officers serving in other departments and indicates usually, but not always, high rank. This particular *primicerius* ranked even higher than the chiefs of the *scrinia* and the *castrensis sacri palatii*. According to the Notitia he has “cognizance of all dignities and administrative offices both military and civil”. He kept the great list known as *laterculum maius*, in which were comprised not only the actual tenants of the greater offices, but forms for their appointment, schedules of their duties, and even a catalogue of the different sections of the army and their stations, including the *scholae* which served as imperial guards.

The reorganization of Finance brought into existence a host of officials who either bore new names or old titles to which new duties had been assigned. The great and complex system of taxation initiated by Diocletian and carried further by his successors can here be only sketched in broad outline. Although, like all the institutions of the new monarchy, the scheme of taxation had its roots in the past, the new development in its completed form stands in such marked contrast to old conditions, that there is not much to be gained by detailed references to the earlier Empire. Before Diocletian's time the old *aerarium Saturni* had ceased to be of imperial importance, and the *aerarium militare* of Augustus had disappeared. The general census of Roman citizens, carried out at Rome, is not heard of after Vespasian's time. Of the ancient revenues of the State very many were swept away by Diocletian's reform, even the most productive of all, the five per cent tax on inherited property (*vicesima hereditatum*) by which Augustus had subjected Roman citizens in general to taxation. The separate provincial census, of which in Gaul, for example, we hear much during the early Empire, was rendered unnecessary. The great and powerful *societates publicanorum* had dwindled away, though *publicani* were still employed for some purposes. Direct collection of revenue had gradually taken the place of the system of farming. Where any traces of the old system remained, it was subject to strict official supervision. Before Diocletian the incidence of taxation on the different parts of the Empire had been most unequal. The reasons for this lay partly in the extraordinary variety of the conditions by which in times past the relation of different portions of the Empire to the central government had been fixed when they first came under its sway; partly in Republican or Imperial favor or disfavor as they afterwards affected the burdens to be endured in different places; partly by the evolutions of the municipalities of different types throughout the Roman dominions. Towns and districts which once had been immune from imposts or slightly taxed had become tributary and *viceversa*. The reforms instituted by Augustus and carried further by his successors did something towards securing uniformity, but many diversities continued to exist. Some of these were produced by the gift of *immunitas* which was bestowed on many civic communities scattered

over the Empire. Without this gift even communities of Roman citizens were not exempt from the taxation which marked off the provinces from Italy.

In order to understand the purpose of Diocletian's changes in the taxation of the Empire, it is necessary to consider the struggle which he and Constantine made to reform the imperial coinage. The difficult task of explaining with exactness the utter demoralization of the currency at the moment when Diocletian ascended the throne cannot be here attempted. Only a few outstanding features can be delineated. The political importance of sound currency has never been more conspicuously shown than in the century which followed on the death of Commodus (180 AD). Augustus had given a stability to the Roman coinage which it had never before possessed. But he imposed no uniform system on the whole of his dominions. Gold (with one slight exception) he allowed none to mint but himself. But copper he left in the hands of the Senate. Silver he coined himself, while he permitted many local mints to strike pieces in that metal also as well as in copper. Subsequent history extinguished local diversities and brought about by gradual steps a general system which was not attained till the fourth century. Aurelian deprived the Senate of the power which Augustus had left it.

Although the imperial coins underwent a certain amount of depreciation between the time of Augustus and that of the Severi, it was not such as to throw out of gear the taxation and the commerce of the Empire. But with Caracalla a rapid decline set in, and by the time of Aurelian the disorganization had gone so far that practically gold and silver were demonetized, and copper became the standard medium of exchange. The principal coin that professed to be silver had come to contain no more than five per cent of that metal, and this proportion sank afterwards to two per cent. What a government gains by making its payments in corrupted coin is always far more than lost in the revenue which it receives. The debasement of the coinage means a lightening of taxation, and it is never possible to enhance the nominal amount receivable by the exchequer so as to keep pace with the depreciation. The effect of this in the Roman Empire was greater than it would have been at an earlier time, since there is reason to believe that much of the revenue formerly payable in kind had been transmuted into money. A measure of Aurelian had the effect of multiplying by eight such taxes as were to be paid in coin. As the chief (professing) silver coin had twenty years earlier contained eight times as much silver as it had then come to contain, he claimed that he was only exacting what was justly due, but his subjects naturally cried out against his tyranny. No greater proof of the disorganization of the whole financial system could be given than lies in the fact that the treasury issued sackloads (*folles*) of the Antoniani, first coined by Caracalla, which were intended to be silver, but were now all but base metal only. These *folles* passed from hand to hand unopened.

Diocletian's attempts to remove these mischiefs were not altogether fortunate. He made experiment after experiment, aiming at that stability of the currency which had, on the whole, prevailed for two centuries after the reforms of Augustus, but never reaching it. Finally, discovering that the last change he had made led to general raising of prices, he issued the celebrated edict of 301 AD by which the charges for all commodities were fixed, the penalty for transgression being death.

Constantine was forced to handle afresh the tangled problem of the currency. The task was rendered especially difficult by the fresh debasement of coinage which was perpetrated by Maxentius while he was supreme in Italy. It may be said at once that the goal of Diocletian's efforts was never reached by Constantine. He did indeed alter the weight of the gold piece, which now received the name of solidus, and it continued in circulation, practically unchanged, for centuries. But this gold piece was to all intents and purposes not a coin, for when payments were made in it, they were reckoned by weight. The solidus was in effect only a bit of bullion, the fineness of which was conveniently guaranteed by the imperial stamp. The same is true of Constantine's silver pieces. The only coins which could be paid

and received by their number, without weighing, were those contained in the *follis*, of which mention was made above, and the word *follis* was now applied to the individual coins, as well as to the whole sack. It had proved to be impossible to restore the monetary system which had prevailed in the first and second centuries of the Empire. But the tide of innovation was at length stayed; and this in itself was no small boon.

The line taken by the reform of Diocletian in the scheme of taxation was partly marked out for him by the anarchy of the third century, which led to the great debasement of the coinage described above and to many oppressive exactions of an arbitrary character. The lowering of the currency had disorganized the whole revenue and expenditure of the government. Where dues were receivable or stipends payable of a fixed nominal amount, these had largely lost their value. A natural consequence was that payments both to be made and to be received were ordered by Diocletian to be reckoned in the produce of the soil, and not in coin. During the era of confusion a phrase, *indictio*, had come into use to denote a special requisition made upon the provincials over and above their stated dues. What Diocletian did was to make what had been irregular into a regular and general impost, subjecting all provincials to it alike, and abolishing the unequal tributes of different kinds which had been previously required. The result was an enormous leveling of taxation throughout the provinces. And to some extent the immunity of Italy itself was withdrawn. But the sum to be raised from year to year was not uniform. It depended on an announcement to which the word *indictio* was applied, issued by the emperor for each year. Hence the number of *indictiones* proclaimed by an emperor became a convenient means for denoting the years of his reign.

The assessment of communities and individuals was managed by an elaborate process. The newly arranged burdens fell on land. The *territorium* attached to every town was surveyed and the land classified according to its use for growing grain or producing oil or wine. A certain number of acres (*iugera*) of arable land was called a *iugum*. The number varied, partly according to the quality of the soil, which was roughly graded, partly according to the province in which it was situated. In the case of oil, the taxable unit was often arrived at by counting the number of olive trees; and this was sometimes the case with vines. The *iugum* was however supposed to be fixed in accordance with the limits of one man's labor, and therefore caput (person) and *iugum*, from the point of view of revenue, became convertible terms. But men and women and slaves and cattle were taxed separately, and in addition to the tax on the land. Each man or slave on a farm counted as one caput and each woman as half a caput. A certain number of cattle constituted also a *iugum* and thus there was no need to divide up the pasture lands as the arable lands were divided. Meadows were rated for the supply of fodder. The total requirements of the government were stated in the *indictio*, and every community had to contribute in accordance with the number of taxable units which the survey had disclosed. All the produce which the taxpayers handed over was stored in great government barns (*horrea*).

The system of collection, though decentralized, was bad. The decurions or senators of each town, or the ten chief men of each town (*decemprimi*) were responsible for handing over to the government all that was due. A revision took place every five years, and was generally carried through with much unfairness and oppression of the poorer landholders. Apparently a fresh survey was not made, but evidence taken by the town-officers in the town itself. From 312 onwards we find a fifteen-year indiction-period, which came to be largely used as a chronological instrument. It would seem that every fifteenth year a re-allotment of taxes was made which was based on actual survey. But evidence for this is scanty. An imperial revenue officer called *censitor* was restricted to the duty of receiving the dues from a community as a whole. Outside imperial officers were called in to assist in the collection of dues from recalcitrant taxpayers. This happened at first occasionally, then regularly. Naturally another

door was thus opened to oppression, from which the rich would manage to escape more lightly than the poor. The special arrangement made by Diocletian for Italy will be explained later; also the exemptions accorded to privileged classes of individuals.

Along with the payment of government dues in kind went the payment of stipends in kind. A certain amount of corn, wine, meat, and other necessities, grouped together, constituted a unit to which the name *annona* was applied, and salaries, military and civil, were largely calculated in *annonae*. Where allowance was made for horses, the amount granted for each was called *capitum*. When stability was in some degree secured for the currency, these *annonae* were again expressed in money, by a valuation called *adaeratio*. The government, to be on safety's side, of course exacted as a rule more produce from the soil than was needed for use, and the excess was turned into money, naturally at low prices.

In addition to the burdens on the land, many other imposts were levied. The maintenance of the Post Service along the main roads was most oppressive. In the towns every trade was taxed, the contribution bearing the name of *lustralis collatio* or *chrysargyrum*. The customs dues at the ports and transit dues at the frontier were maintained. Revenues were derived from government monopolies in mines, forests, salt factories, and other possessions. Some of the old Republican imposts, such as the tax on manumitted slaves, still survived. Persons of distinction were subject to special exactions. Imperial senators paid several dues, especially the so-called *aurum oblativium*, which like many inevitable forms of taxation, professed in its name to be a free-will offering. Senators of municipal towns (*decuriones*) were weighted both by local and by imperial burdens. Every five years of his reign the emperor celebrated a festival, at which he dispensed large sums to the army and to civil functionaries. At the same time the *decuriones* of the municipalities had to pay an oppressive tax known as *aurum coronarium*, the beginnings of which go right back to the time of the Republic. As is shown below, certain trading corporations were hereditarily bound to assist in the provisioning of the two capitals; and some other miscellaneous services were similarly treated.

From the third century the officer who in each province looked after the imperial revenue, whose earlier title was procurator, began to be called *rationalis*. But under Diocletian's system, each governor became the chief financial officer in his province. For each Diocesis there was appointed a *rationalis summae rei*, in which name *summae rei* refers to the complex of provinces forming the Diocesis. The great Imperial minister of finance at the centre bore the same name at first; *summa res* in his case indicated the whole Empire. But the title *sacrarum largitionum* came into use in the reign of Constantine. This officer advanced from the rank of *perfectissimus* to a high place among the *illustres*. The appellation *comes* came to be given to all the chief financial officers in the Dioceses of the East and to some of those in the West, while others continued to bear the name *rationalis*. Disputes between taxpayers and the lower government financial officers were doubtless decided in the last resort by the *comes sacrarum largitionum*. A number of treasury officials and officers of the mint were under his orders. In certain places (Rome, Milan, Lugdunum, London and others) sub-treasuries of the government were maintained. There were also factories for the supply to the Court of many fabrics; all these the *comes* had under his charge. And he was in touch with the administrators of all public income and expenditure throughout the Empire.

The emperor had revenues which he distinguished as personal to himself rather than public, although they doubtless were largely expended on imperial administration. These personal revenues were derived from two sources distinguished as *res privata* and *patrimonium*, and administered to some extent by different staffs. In theory the *patrimonium* consisted of property which might be regarded as belonging to the emperor apart from the crown, while the *res privata* attached to the crown itself. But these distinctions were of no great practical value. The imperial estates and possessions had come to be enormous, and



covered large parts of knife—provinces. We have seen that the control of the imperial domains in one province, Cappadocia, was entrusted to the *quaestor sacri cubiculi*. The concentration of these immense estates in the hands of the ruler had an important effect upon the general evolution of society in the Empire. These properties had largely accrued by confiscation, mainly as a consequence of struggles for the supreme power. The head of the administration of the *res privata*, designated as *comes rei privatae* or *rerum privatarum*, had a whole army of subordinates scattered over the provinces, and the staff which managed the *patrimonium* under an officer usually called procurator *patrimonii*, though smaller, must have been considerable.

The new hierarchy of office was swollen in its dimensions also by the reorganization of the army, which placed a series of new *dignitates militares* beside the *dignitates civiles*. Diocletian completed the severance of military from civil duties, excepting in some frontier districts, where they were still combined. The regular title for a commanding officer is *dux*; and the army, like the Empire, was broken up into smaller sections than of old, and for the same reason, jealousy of the concentration of much power in private hands. The whole force of the army was considerably increased. The distinction between the legions and the *auxilia* was maintained. The senatorial legatos who had been the commander of the legion since Caesar's day, was replaced by a praefectus of equestrian rank, and other changes were made in the legionary officers. To the older *auxilia* were added new detachments to which the same name was given, but filled chiefly with soldiers from beyond the bounds of the Empire, free Germans, Franks, and others. The barbarian chiefs who came into the service became very prominent, and more and more frequently as time went on rose to the highest commands in the whole army. Other barbarian forces were within the Empire, recruited from peoples who had been deliberately planted there to defend the frontiers, and owing no other duty to the government. The general term for these auxiliaries is *laeti*, but in the region of the Danube their designation was *gentiles*. They were commanded sometimes by men of their own race, sometimes by Roman praefecti. The tendency also to compose the cavalry of barbarians was conspicuous, and new designations for the different detachments came into use. The common title for the more regular corps was *vexillationes*; the frontier forces passed under the names of *cunei*, *alae*, or sometimes *equites* only.

The greatest military reform introduced by the new monarchy lay in the construction of a mobile army. The want of this had been early felt in the imperial period, when war on any frontier compelled the removal of defensive forces from other frontiers. The difficulty had been one of the causes which led Septimius Severus to station a legion at Alba near Rome, thus breaking with the tradition that Italy was not governed like the provinces. So long as the old Praetorian Cohorts existed, their military efficiency as a field force was not great, and they were destroyed in consequence of the rising of Maxentius. Diocletian created a regular field army, the title for which was *comitatenses*. The name indicates the practice under the new system, whereby the emperor himself took command in all important wars, and therefore these troops were his retinue (*comitatus*). The description *comitatenses* applied both to the foot-soldiers (*legiones*), and the cavalry (*vexillationes*). In the later fourth century a section of the *comitatenses* appear as *palatini*; and another body is named *pseudo-comitatenses*, probably detachments not forming a regular part of the field army, but united with it temporarily, and recruited from the frontier forces. The designation *riparienses* denotes the garrisons of the old standing camps on the outside of the Empire. These are distinct from the newer *limitanei*, who cultivated lands along the *limites*, and held them by a kind of military tenure. The *castriciani* and *castellani* seem to have held lands close to the *castra* and *castella* respectively, and did not differ essentially from the *riparienses* and *limitanei*. Their sons could not inherit the lands unless they entered the same service. The *comitatenses* were in

higher honor than the soldiers stationed on the outmost edges of the Empire, and their quarters were usually in the inner regions. The whole strength of the army under Diocletian, Constantine, and their successors is difficult to calculate. The number of men in the legion seems to have steadily diminished and by the end of the fourth century to have sunk to two, or even one thousand. An estimate based on the *Notitia* gives 250,000 infantry and 110,000 cavalry on the frontiers, while the *comitatenses* comprise 150,000 foot and 46,000 horse. But the calculation is dubious, probably excessive. Generally speaking, the burden of army service fell chiefly on the lowest class. Though every subject of the Empire was in theory liable to service, the wealthier, when any levy took place, were not only allowed, but practically compelled, to find substitutes, lest the finances of the Empire should suffer.

In addition to the forces already mentioned, there grew up some corps which may be described as Imperial Guards. From the early Empire the practice of surrounding the emperor with an intimate bodyguard composed of barbarians, principally Germans, had prevailed. Augustus possessed such a force, which he disbanded after the disaster suffered by Varus in Germany, but it was reestablished by his successors down to Galba. A little later came the *equites singulares*, also mainly recruited from Germans, who had a special camp in the capital, and were an appendage to the Praetorians. Probably when Constantine abolished the Praetorians the *equites singulares* also disappeared. But before this happened, a new bodyguard had come into existence, bearing the name of the *protectores divini lateris*. It included Germans (often of princely origin), and Romans of several classes high and low. Diocletian added a new set of *protectores*, composed partly of infantry and partly of cavalry, which formed a sort of *corps d'élite*, and served for the training of officers. In it were found officers' sons, men of different ranks, promoted from the regular army, and young members of noble or wealthy families. The distinction between the two sets of *protectores* was not maintained, and the later title was *domestici* only. They served in close proximity to the emperor, who thus made personal acquaintance with men among them who were destined to hold commands, often important commands, in the regular army. The members of the body were raised far above the ordinary soldier by their personnel, their privileges, their pay, in some cases equal to that of civil officials of a high grade, by their equipment, and by the estimation in which they were held. The historian Ammianus Marcellinus served in their ranks. They were divided into sections called *scholae*.

Still another corps of Imperial Guards was created by Constantine, consisting of *scholae palatinae*, distinguished as *scholae scutariorum*, who were Romans, and *scholae gentilium*, who were barbarians. They were detached from the general army organization and were under the orders of the *magister officiorum*. Their history was not unlike that of the Praetorians; they became equally turbulent, and equally inefficient as soldiers.

With the new organization of the army, there sprang up new military offices of high importance, with new names. Constantine created two high officers as chief commanders of the mobile army, a *magister equitum* and a *magister peditum*. Their position resembled that of the Praefecti Praetorio of the early Empire in several respects. They were immediately dependent on the emperor, and also, from the nature of their commands, on one another. But circumstances in time changed their duties and their numbers. They had sometimes to take the field when the emperor was not present, and the division between the infantry command and the cavalry command thus broke down. Hence the titles *magister equitum et peditum*, and *magister utriusque militiae*, or *magister militum* simply. The jealousy which the emperors naturally entertained for all high officers caused considerable variations in the position and importance of these *magistri*. After the middle of the fourth century the necessary connection of the *magistri* with the emperor's person had ceased, and the command of a *magister* generally embraced the Dioecesis, within which war occurred or threatened. Where the emperor was, there would be two *magistri* called *praesentales*, either distinguished as

commanders of infantry and cavalry, or bearing the title of *magistri utriusque militiae praesentales*. But in the fifth century the emperor was generally in practice a military nonentity, and was in the hands of one magister who was not unfrequently the real ruler of the Empire. As was the case with all high officials the *magistri* exercised jurisdiction over those under their *dispositio*, not only in matters purely military, but in cases of crime and even to some extent in connection with civil proceedings. The lower commanders also possessed similar jurisdiction, but the details are not known. Appeal was to the emperor, who delegated the hearing as a rule to one or other of the highest civil functionaries.

No view of the great imperial hierarchy of officials would be complete which did not take account of the new title *comes*. Its application followed no regular rules. In the earlier Latin it was used somewhat loosely to designate men who accompanied a provincial governor, and were attached to his staff (*cohors*), especially such as held no definite office connected with administration, whether military or civil. Such unofficial members of the staff seem especially to have assisted the governor in legal matters, and in time they were paid, and were punishable under the laws against extortion in the provinces. In the early Empire the title *comes* begins to be applied in no very precise manner to persons attached to the service of the emperor or of members of the imperial family; but only slowly did it acquire an official significance. Inscriptions of the reign of Marcus Aurelius show a change; as many persons are assigned the title in this one reign as in all the preceding reigns put together. Probably at this time began the bestowal of the title on military as well as legal assistants of the emperor, and soon its possessors were chiefly military officers, who after serving with the emperor, took commands on the frontier. Then from the end of the reign of Severus Alexander to the early years of Constantine the description *Augusti* was abolished for human beings, but attached to divinities. Constantine restored it to its mundane employment, and used it as an honorific designation for officers of many kinds, who were not necessarily in the immediate neighborhood of an Augustus or Caesar, but were servants of the Augustus or Augusti and Caesars generally, that is to say might occupy any position in the whole imperial administration. Constantine seems to have despatched *comites*, not all of the same rank or importance, to provinces or parts of the Empire concerning which he wished to have confidential information. Later they appear in most districts, and the ordinary rulers are in some degree subject to them, and they hear appeals and complaints which otherwise would have been laid before the Praefecti Praetorio. The *comites provinciarum* afford a striking illustration of the manner in which offices were piled up upon offices, in the vain attempt to check corruption and misgovernment.

In the immediate neighborhood of the Court the name *comes* was attached to four high military officers; the *magister equitum* and *magister peditum*, and the commanders of the *domestici equites* and the *domestici pedites*. Also to four high civil officers, the High Treasurer (*comes sacrarum largitionum*) and the controller of the Privy Purse (*comes rerum privatarum*); also the *quaestor sacri palatii* and the *magister officiorum*. These high civil functionaries appear as *comites consistoriani*, being regular members of the Privy Council (*consistorium*). Before the end of Constantine's reign the words connecting the *comes* with the emperor and the Caesars drop out, possibly because the imperial rulers were deemed to be too exalted for any form of companionship. A man is now not *comes Augusti* but *comes* merely or with words added to identify his duties, as for instance when the district is stated within which a military or civil officer acts, on whom the appellation has been bestowed. The former necessary connection of the *comes* with the Court having ceased, the name was vulgarized and connected with offices of many kinds, sometimes of a somewhat lowly nature. In many cases it was not associated with duties at all, but was merely titular. As a natural result, *comites* were classified in three orders of dignity (*primi, secundi, tertii ordinis*). Admission to the lowest rank was eagerly coveted and often purchased, because of the

immunity from public burdens which the boon carried with it. Constantine also adapted the old phrase *patricius* to new uses. The earlier emperors, first by special authorization, later merely as emperors, had raised families to patrician rank, but the result was merely a slight increase in social dignity. From Constantine's time onwards, the dignity was rarely bestowed and then the *patricii* became a high and exclusive order of nobility. They had precedence next to the emperor, with the exception of the consuls actually in office. Their titles did not descend to their sons. The best known of the *patricii* are some of the great generals of barbarian origin, who were the last hopes of the crumbling Empire. The title lasted long; it was bestowed on Charles Martel, and was known later in the Byzantine Empire.

At the centre of the great many-storeyed edifice of the bureaucracy was the Consistorium or Most Honorable Privy Council. There was deep rooted in the Roman mind the idea that neither private citizen nor official should decide on important affairs without taking the advice of those best qualified to give it. This feeling gave rise to the great advising body for the magistrates, the Senate, to the jury who assisted in criminal affairs, to the bench of counselors, drawn from his staff, who gave aid to the provincial governor, and also to the loosely constituted gathering of friends whose opinion the *pater familias* demanded. To every one of these groups the word *consilium* was applicable. It was natural that the early emperors should have their *consilium*, the constitution of which gradually became more and more formal and regular. Hadrian gave a more important place than heretofore to the jurisconsults among his advisers. For a while a regular paid officer called *consiliarius* existed. In Diocletian's time the old name *consilium* was supplanted by *consistorium*. The old advisers of the magistrates sat on the bench with them and therefore sometimes bore the name *adsessores*. But it was impious to be seated in the presence of the new divinized rulers; and from the practice of standing (*consistere*) the Council derived its new name. From Constantine the Council received a more definite frame. As shown above, certain officers became *comites consistoriani*. But these officers were not always the same after Constantine's reign, and additional persons were from time to time called in for particular business. The Praefectus *Praetorio praesens* or *in comitatu* would usually attend. The Consistorium was both a Council of State for the discussion of knotty imperial questions, and also a High Court of Justice, though it is difficult to determine exactly what cases might be brought before it. Probably that depended on the emperor's will.

It is necessary that something should be said of the position which the two capitals, Rome and Constantinople, held in the new organization, and of the traces which still hung about Italy of its older historical privileges. The old Roman Senate was allowed a nominal existence, with a changed constitution and powers which were rather municipal than imperial. Of the old offices whose holders once filled the Senate, the Consulship, Praetorship, and Quaestorship survived, while the Tribunate and the Aedileship died out. Two *consulares ordinarii* were named by the emperor, who would sometimes listen to recommendations from the senators. The years continued to be denoted by the consular names, and, to add dignity to the office, the emperor or members of the imperial family would sometimes hold it. The tenure of the office was brief, and the *consules suffecti* during the year were selected by the Senate, with the emperor's approval. But to be *consul suffectus* was of little value, even from a personal point of view. A list of nominations for the Praetorship and Quaestorship was laid by the *Praefectus urbi* before the emperor for confirmation. Apart from these old offices, many of the new *dignitates* carried with them membership of the *ordo senatorius*. Ultimately all officials who were *clarissimi*, that is to say who possessed the lowest of the three noble titles, belonged to it. Thus it included not merely the highest functionaries, as the principal military officers, the civil governors, and the chiefs of bureaux, but many persons lower down in the hierarchy of office, for example all the *comites*. The whole body must have comprised some



thousands. But a man might be a member of the *ordo* without being actually a senator. Only the higher functionaries and priests and the *consulares* described above, with possibly a few others, actually took part in the proceedings. The actual Senate and the *ordo* were distinguished by high-sounding titles in official documents, and emperors would occasionally send communications to the Senate about high matters, and make pretence of asking its advice, out of respect for its ancient prestige, but its business was for the most part comparatively petty, and chiefly confined to the immediate needs of the city. But every now and then it was convenient for the ruler to expose the Senate to the odium of making unpopular decisions, as in cases of high treason; and when pretenders rose, or changes of government took place, the favor of this ancient body still carried with it a certain value. Among the chief functions of the senators was the supervision of the supply of *panis et circenses*, provisions and amusements, for the capital. The games were chiefly paid for by the holders of the Consulship, Praetorship, and Quaestorship. The obligation resting on the Praetorship was the most serious, and therefore nomination to this magistracy took place many years in advance, that the money might be ready. Naturally these burdens became to a large extent compulsory; and so even women who had inherited from a senator had to supply money for such purposes. Rich men of course exceeded the minimum largely with a view to display. The old privilege still attached to Rome of receiving corn from Africa. Diocletian divided Italy into two districts, of which the northern (*annonaria regio*) paid tribute for support of the Court at Milan, while the southern (*dioecesis Romae*, or *suburbicaria regio*) supplied wine, cattle, and some other necessaries for the capital.

Senators as such and the *senatorius ordo* were subject to special taxation, as well as the ordinary taxation of the provinces (with exception perhaps of the *aurum coronarium*). The *follis senatorius* was a particular tax on senatorial lands, and even a landless senator had to pay something. The *aurum oblativum*, already mentioned, was especially burdensome.

The most important officer connected with the Senate was the *Praefectus urbi*. His office had grown steadily in importance during the whole existence of the Empire. From the time of Constantine its holder was *vir illustris*. He was the only high official of the Empire who continued to wear the toga and not the military garb. He was at the head of the Senate and was the intermediary between that body and the emperor. The powers of his office were extraordinary. The members of the Senate resident in Rome were under his criminal jurisdiction. There was an appeal to him from all the lesser functionaries who dealt with legal matters in the first instance, not only in the capital, but in a district extending 100 miles in every direction. His control spread over every department of business. He was the chief guardian of public security and had the *cohortes urbanae*, as well as the *praefectus vigilum* under his command. The provisioning of the city was an important part of his duty, and the *praefectus annonae* acted under his orders. A whole army of officials, many of them bearing titles which would have been strange to the Republic and early Empire, assisted him in looking after the water-supply, controlling trade and the markets, and the traffic on the river, in maintaining the river banks, in taking account of the property of senators and in many other departments of affairs. It is difficult to say how far his position was affected by the presence in the city of a Corrector, and a Vicarius of the *Praefectus Praetorio*. The material welfare of Rome was at least abundantly cared for by the new monarchy. The city had already grown accustomed to the loss of dignity caused by the residence of the emperors in cities more convenient for the purposes of government. But the foundation of Constantinople must have been a heavy blow. The institutions of the old Rome were to a great extent copied in the new. There was a Senate subject to the same obligations as in Rome. Most of the magistracies were repeated. But until 359 no *Praefectus urbi* seems to have existed at Constantinople. Elaborate arrangements were made for placing the new city on a level with the old as regards tributes of

corn, wine, and other necessities from the provinces. The more frequent presence of the ruler gave to the new capital a brilliance which the old must have envied.

So far the machinery of the new government in its several parts has been described. We must now consider in outline what was its total effect upon the inhabitants of the Empire. The inability of the ruler to assure good government to his subjects was made conspicuous by the frequent creation of new offices, whose object was to curb the corruption of the old. The multiplication of the functionaries in close touch with the population rendered oppression more certain and less punishable than ever. Lactantius declares, with pardonable exaggeration, that the number of those who lived on the taxes was as great as the number who paid them. The evidence of official rapacity is abundant. The laws thundered against it in vain. Oftentimes it happened that illegitimate exactions were legalized in the empty hope of keeping them within bounds. Penalties expressed in laws were plain enough and numerous enough. For corruption in a province not only the governor but his whole *officium* were liable to make heavy recompense. And the comparative powerlessness of the governor is shown by the fact that the *officium* is more heavily mulcted than its head. But a down-trodden people rarely will or can bring legal proof against its oppressors. Nothing but extensive arbitrary dismissal and punishment of his servants by the emperor, without insistence on forms of law, would have met the evil. As it was, corruption reigned through the Empire with little check, and the illicit gains of the emperor's servants added to the strain imposed by the heavy imperial taxation. Thus the benefit which the provincials had at first received by the substitution of Imperial for Republican government was more than swept away. Their absorption into the Roman polity on terms of equality with their conquerors, brought with it degradation and ruin.

During the fourth century that extraordinary development was completed whereby society was reorganized by a demarcation of classes so rigid that it became extremely difficult for any man to escape from that condition of life into which he was born. In the main, but not altogether, this result was brought about by the fiscal system. When the local Senates or their leaders were made responsible for producing to the government the quota of taxation imposed on their districts, it became necessary to prevent the members (*decuriones* or *curiales*) from escaping their obligations by passing into another path of life, and also to compel the sons to walk in their fathers' footsteps. But the maintenance of the local *ordo* was necessary also from the local as well as the imperial point of view. The magistracies involved compulsory as well as voluntary payments for local objects, and therefore those capable of filling them must be thrust into them by force if need were. Every kind of magistracy in every town of the Empire, and every official position in connection with any corporate body, whether priestly college or trade guild or religious guild, brought with it expenditure for the benefit of the community, and on this, in great part, the ordinary life of every town depended. The Theodosian Code shows that the absconding *decurio* was in the end treated as a runaway slave; five gold pieces were given to anyone who would haul him back to his duties.

In time the members also of all or nearly all professional corporations (*collegia* or *corporata*) were held to duties by the State, and the burden of them descended from father to son. The evolution by which these free unions for holding together in a social brotherhood all those who followed a particular occupation were turned into bodies with the stamp of caste upon them, is to be traced with difficulty in the extant inscriptions and the legal literature. Here as everywhere the fiscal system instituted by Diocletian was a powerful agent. A large part of the natural fruits of the earth passed into the hands of government, and a vast host of assistants was needed for transport and distribution. And the organization for maintaining the food-supply at Rome and Constantinople became more and more elaborate. For the *annona* alone many corporations had to give service, in most cases easily divined from their names, as *navicularii*, *frumentarii*, *mercatores*, *olearii*, *suarii*, *pecuarii*, *pistores*, *boarii*, *porcinarii* and

numerous others. Similar bodies were connected with public works, with police functions, as the extinction of fires, with government operations of numerous kinds, in the mints, the mines, the factories for textiles and arms and so on. In the early Empire the service rendered to the State was not compulsory, and partly by rewards, such as immunity from taxation, partly by pay, the government was willingly served. But in time the burdens became intolerable. State officers ultimately controlled the minutest details connected with these corporations. And the tasks imposed did not entirely proceed from the imperial departments. The *curiales* of the towns could enforce assistance from the local *collegia* within their boundaries. And the tentacles of the great octopus of the central government were spread over the provinces. In the fourth and later centuries the restrictions on the freedom of these corporations were extraordinarily oppressive. Egress from inherited membership was inhibited by government except in rare instances. Ingress, as into the class of *curiales*, was, directly or indirectly, compulsory. The colleges differed greatly in dignity. In some, as in that of the *navicularii*, even senators might be concerned, and office-holders might obtain, among their rewards, the rank of Roman knight. On the other hand, the bakers (*pistores*) approached near the condition of slavery. Marriage, for instance, outside their own circle was forbidden, whereas, in other cases, it was only rendered difficult. Property which had once become subject to the duties required of a *collegium* could hardly be released. The end was that *collegiati* or *corporati* all over the Empire took any method they could find of escaping from their servitude, and the law's severest punishments could not check the movement. If we may believe some late writers, thousands of citizens found life in barbarian lands more tolerable than in the Roman Empire.

The status of other classes in the community also tended to become hereditary. This was the case with the *officiales* and the soldiers, though here compulsion was not so severe. But the tillers of the ground (*coloni*) were more hardly treated than any other class. It became impossible for them, without breach of the law, to tear themselves away from the soil of the locality within which they were born. The evolution of this peculiar form of serfdom, which existed for the purposes of the State, is difficult to trace. Many causes contributed to its growth and final establishment, as the extension of large private and especially of vast imperial domains, the imitation of the German half-free land-tenure when barbarians were settled as *laeti* or *inquilini* within the Empire, the influence of Egyptian and other Eastern land-customs, but above all the drastic changes in the imperial imposts which Diocletian introduced. The cultivator's principal end in life was to insure a contribution of natural products for the revenue. Hence it was a necessity to chain him to the ground, and in the law-books *adscripticius* is the commonest title for him. The details of the scheme of taxation, given above, show how it must have tended to diminish population, for every additional person, even a slave, increased the contribution which each holding must pay. The owners of the land were in the first instance responsible, but the burdens of course fell ultimately and in the main on the agricultural workers. The temporary loss of provinces to the invader, the failure of harvest in any part of the Empire, the economic effects of pestilence, and other accidents, all led to greater sacrifices on the part of those provinces which were not themselves affected. The exactions became heavier and heavier, the punishments for attempts to escape from duty more and more severe, and yet flight and disappearance of *coloni* took place on a large scale. By the end of the fourth century it was possible for lawyers to say of this unhappy class that they were almost in the condition of slaves, and a century or so later that the distinction between them and slaves no longer existed; that they were slaves of the land itself on which they were born.

In many other ways, under the new monarchy, the citizens of the Empire were treated with glaring inequality. The gradations of official station were almost as important in the general life of the Empire as they now are in China, and they were reflected in titular phrases,

some of which have been given above. Etiquette became most complicated. Even the emperor was bound to exalted forms of address in his communications with his servants or with groups of persons within his Empire. 'Your sublimity', 'Your magnificence', 'Your loftiness', were common salutations for the greater officers. The ruler did not disdain to employ the title *parens* in addressing some of them. The innumerable new titles which the Empire had invented were highly valued and much paraded by their possessors, even the titles of offices in the municipalities. Great hardship must have been caused to the lower ranks of the taxpayers by the extensive relief from taxation which was accorded to hosts of men in the service of the government (nominal or real) as part payment for the duties which they performed or were supposed to perform. With these immunities, as with everything else in the Empire, there was much corrupt dealing. The criminal law became a great respecter of persons. Not only was the jurisdiction over the upper classes separated at many points from that over the lower, but the lower were subject to punishments from which the upper were free. Gradually the Empire drifted farther and farther away from the old Republican principle, that crimes as a rule are to be punished in the same way, whoever among the citizens commits them. A sharp distinction was drawn between the 'more honorable' (*honestiores*) and the 'more humble' (*humiliores* or *plebeii*). The former included the imperial *ordo senatorius*, the *equites*, the soldier-class generally and veterans, and the local senators (*decuriones*). The *honestiores* could not be executed without the emperor's sanction, and if executed, were exempt from crucifixion (a form of punishment altogether abolished by the Christian emperors). They could not be sentenced to penal servitude in mines or elsewhere. Nor could they be tortured in the course of criminal proceedings, excepting for treason, magic, and forgery.

A general survey of Roman government in the fourth and late centuries undoubtedly leaves a strong impression of injustice, inequality and corruption leading fast to ruin. But some parts of the Empire did maintain a fair standard of prosperity even to the verge of the general collapse. The two greatest problems in history, how to account for the rise of Rome and how to account for her fall, never have been, perhaps never will be, thoroughly solved.



### CHAPTER III

#### CONSTANTINE'S SUCCESSORS TO JOVIAN: AND THE STRUGGLE WITH PERSIA

DEATH had surprised Constantine when preparing to meet Persian aggression on the Eastern frontier and it seems certain that the Emperor had made no final provision for the succession to the throne, though later writers profess to know of a will which parceled out the Roman world among the members of his family. During his lifetime his three sons had been created Caesars and while for his nephew Hanniballianus he had fashioned a kingdom in Asia, to his nephew Delmatius had been assigned the Ripa Gothica. Possibly we are to see in these latter appointments an attempt to satisfy discontent at Court; it may be that Optatus and Ablabius, espousing the cause of a younger branch of the imperial stock, had forced Constantine's hand and that it was for this interference that they afterwards paid the penalty of their lives. But it would seem a more probable suggestion that the Persian danger was thought to demand an older and more experienced governor than Constantius, while the boy Constans was deemed unequal to withstand the Goths in the north. At least the plan would appear to have been in substance that of a threefold division of spheres itself suggested by administrative necessity; Constantine was true to the principle of Diocletian, and it was only a superficial view which saw in this devolution of the central power a partition of the Roman Empire. Thus on the Emperor's death there followed an interregnum of nearly four months. Constantine had, however, been successful in inspiring his soldiers with his own dynastic views; they feared new tumult and internal struggle and in face of the twenty year old Constantius felt themselves to be the masters. The armies agreed that they would have none but the sons of Constantine to rule over them, and at one blow they murdered all the other relatives of the dead Emperor save only the child Julian and Gallus the future Caesar; in the latter's case men looked to his own ill health to spare the executioner. At the same time perished Optatus and Ablabius. On 9 September 337 Constantius, Constantine II, and Constans each assumed the title of Augustus as joint Emperors.

His contemporaries were unable to agree how far Constantius was to be held responsible for this assassination. He alone of the sons of Constantine was present in the capital, it was he who stood to gain most by the deed, the property of the victims fell into his hands, while it was said that he himself regarded his ill-success in war and his childlessness as Heaven's punishment and that this murder was one of the three sins which he regretted on his death-bed. In later times some, though considering the slaughter as directly inspired by the Emperor, have yet held him justified and have viewed him as the victim of a tragic necessity of state. Certainty is impossible but the circumstances suggest that inaction and not participation is the true charge against Constantius; the army which made and unmade emperors was determined that there should be no rival to question their choice. The massacre had fatal consequences; it was the seed from which sprang Julian's mistrust and ill-will: in a panegyric written for the Emperor's eye he might admit the plea of compulsion, but the deep-seated conviction remained that he was left an orphan through his cousin's crime.

In the summer of 338 the new rulers assembled in Pannonia (or possibly at Viminacium in Dacia, not far from the Pannonian frontier) to determine their spheres of government. According to their father's division, it would seem, Spain, Britain, and the two Gauls fell to Constantine: the two Italics, Africa, Illyricum, and Thrace were subjected to Constans, while southward from the Propontis, Asia and the Orient with Pontus and Egypt were entrusted to Constantius. It was thus to Constantius that, on the death of Hanniballianus, Armenia and the neighboring allied tribes naturally passed, but with this addition the eastern Augustus appears to have remained content. The whole of the territory subject to Delmatius, i.e. the Ripa Gothica which probably comprised Dacia, Moesia I and II, and Scythia (perhaps even Pannonia and Noricum) went to swell the share of Constans who was now but fifteen years of age.

But though both the old and the new Rome were thus in the hands of the most youthful of the three emperors, the balance of actual power still seemed heavily weighted in favor of Constantine, the ruler of the West; indeed, he appears to have assumed the position of guardian over his younger brother. It may be difficult to account for the moderation of Constantius, but Julian points out that a war with Persia was imminent, the army was disorganized, and the preparations for the campaign insufficient; domestic peace was the Empire's great need, while Constantius himself really strengthened his own position by renouncing further claims: to widen his sphere of government might have only served to limit his moral authority. Further he was perhaps unwilling to demand for himself a capital in which his kinsmen had been so recently murdered: his self-denial should prove his innocence. During the next thirteen years three great and more or less independent interests absorbed the energies of Constantius: the welfare and doctrine of the Christian Church, the long drawn and largely ineffective struggle against Persia and lastly the assertion and maintenance of his personal influence in the affairs of the West.

It was to Asia that Constantius hastened after his meeting with his co-rulers. Before his arrival Nisibis had successfully withstood a Persian siege (autumn 337 or spring 338), and the Emperor at once made strenuous efforts to restore order and discipline among the Roman forces. Profiting by his previous experience he organized a troop of mail-clad horsemen after the Persian model—the wonder of the time—and raised recruits both for the cavalry and infantry regiments; he demanded extraordinary contributions from the eastern provinces, enlarged the river flotillas and generally made his preparations for rendering effective resistance to Persian attacks.

The history of this border warfare is a tangled tale and our information scanty and fragmentary. In Armenia the fugitive king and those nobles who with him were loyal to Rome were restored to their country, but for the rest the campaigns resolved themselves in the main into the successive forays across the frontier of Persian or Roman troops. Though *Ludi Persici* (13-17 May) were founded, though court orators could claim that the Emperor had frequently crossed the Tigris, had raised fortresses on its banks and laid waste the enemy's territory with fire and sword, yet the lasting results of these campaigns were sadly to seek: now an Arab tribe would be induced to make common cause with Rome (as in 333) and to harry the foe, now a Persian town would be captured and its inhabitants transported and settled within the Empire, but it was rare indeed for the armies of both powers to meet face to face in the open field. Constantius persistently declined to take the aggressive; he hesitated to risk any great engagement which even if successful might entail a heavy loss in men whom he could ill afford to spare. Of one battle alone have we any detailed account. Sapor had collected a vast army; conscripts of all ages were enlisted, while neighboring tribesmen served for Persian gold. In three divisions the host crossed the Tigris and by the Emperor's orders the frontier guards did not dispute the passage. The Persians occupied an entrenched camp at Hileia or Ellia near Singara, while a distance of some 150 stades lay between them and the Roman

army. Even on Sapor's advance Constantius true to his defensive policy awaited the enemy's attack; it may be, as Libanius asserts, that Rome's best troops were absent at the time. Beneath their fortifications the Persians had posted their splendid mailed cavalry and upon the ramparts archers were stationed. On a midsummer morning, probably in the year 344 (possibly 348), the struggle began. At midday the Persians feigned flight in the direction of their camp, hoping that thus their horsemen would charge upon an enemy disorganized by long pursuit. It was already evening when the Romans drew near the fortifications. Constantius gave orders to halt until the dawn of the new day; but the burning heat of the sun had caused a raging thirst, the springs lay within the Persian camp and the troops with little experience of their Emperor's generalship refused to obey his commands and resumed the attack. Clubbing the enemy's cavalry, they stormed the palisades. Sapor fled for his life to the Tigris, while the heir to his throne was captured and put to death. As night fell, the victors turned to plunder and excess, and under cover of the darkness the Persian fugitives reformed and won back their camp. But success came too late; their confidence was broken and with the morning the retreat began.

Turning to the history of the West after the meeting of the Augusti in 338, it would appear that Constantine forthwith claimed an authority superior to that of his co-rulers; he even legislated for Africa although this province fell within the jurisdiction of Constans. The latter, however, soon asserted his complete independence of his elder brother and in autumn (338?) after a victory on the Danube assumed the title of Sarmaticus. At this time (339) he probably sought to enlist the support of Constantius, surrendering to the latter Thrace and Constantinople. Disappointed of his hopes, it would seem that the ruler of the West now demanded for himself both Italy and Africa. Early in 340 he suddenly crossed the Alps and at Aquileia rashly engaged the advanced guard of Constans who had marched from Naissus in Dacia, where news had reached him of his brother's attack. Constantine falling into an ambush perished, and Constans was now master of Britain, Spain, and the Gauls (before 9 April 340). He proved himself a terror to the barbarians and a general of untiring energy who travelled incessantly, making light of extremes of heat and cold. In 341 and 342 he drove back an inroad of the Franks and compelled that restless tribe "for whom inaction was a confession of weakness" to conclude a peace: he disregarded the perils of the English Channel in winter, and in January 343 crossed from Boulogne to Britain, perhaps to repel the Picts and Scots. His rule is admitted to have been at the outset vigorous and just, but the promise of his early years was not maintained: his exactions grew more intolerable, his private vices more shameless, while his favorites were allowed to violate the laws with impunity. It would seem, however, to have been his unconcealed contempt for the army which caused his fall.

A party at Court conspired with Marcellinus, Count of the sacred largesses, and Magnentius, commander of the picked corps of Joviani and Herculeani, to secure his overthrow. Despite his Roman name Magnentius was a barbarian: his father had been a slave and subsequently a freedman in the service of Constantine. While at Augustodunum, during the absence of the Emperor on a hunting expedition, Marcellinus on the pretext of a banquet in honor of his son's birthday feasted the military leaders (18 January 350); wine had flowed freely and the night was already far advanced, when Magnentius suddenly appeared among the revelers, clad in the purple. He was straightway acclaimed Augustus: the rumor spread: folk from the countryside poured into the city: Illyrian horsemen who had been drafted into the Gallic regiments joined their comrades, while the officers hardly knowing what was afoot were carried by the tide of popular enthusiasm into the usurper's camp. Constans fled for Spain and at the foot of the Pyrenees by the small frontier fortress of Helene was murdered by Gaiso, the barbarian emissary of Magnentius. The news of his brother's death reached Constantius when the winter was almost over, but true to his principle never to sacrifice the

Empire to his own personal advantage he remained in the East, providing for its safety during his absence and appointing Lucillianus to be commander-in-chief.

The hardships and oppression which the provinces had suffered under Constans were turned by Magnentius to good account. A month after his usurpation Italy had joined him and Africa was not slow to follow. The army of Illyricum was wavering in its fidelity when, upon the advice of Constantia sister of Constantius, Vetranio, *magister peditum* of the forces on the Danube, allowed himself to be acclaimed Emperor (1 March, at Mursa or Sirmium) and immediately appealed for help to Constantius. The latter recognized the usurper, sent Vetranio a diadem and gave orders that he should be supported by the troops on the Pannonian frontier. Meanwhile in Rome, the elect of the mob, Flavius Popilius Nepotianus, cousin of Constantius, enjoyed a brief and bloody reign of some 28 days until, through the treachery of a senator, he fell into the hands of the soldiers of Magnentius, led by Marcellinus the newly appointed *magister officiorum*.

In the East, Nisibis was besieged for the third and last time: Sapor's object was, it would seem, permanently to settle a Persian colony within the city. The siege was pressed with unexampled energy; the Mygdonius was turned from its course, and thus upon an artificial lake the fleet plied its rams but without effect. At length under the weight of the waters part of the city wall collapsed; cavalry and elephants charged to storm the breach, but the huge beasts turned in flight and broke the lines of the assailants. A new wall rose behind the old, and though four months had passed, Jacobus, Bishop of Nisibis, never lost heart. Then Sapor learned that the Massagetae were invading his own country and slowly the Persian host withdrew. For a time the Eastern frontier was at peace (A.D. 350).

In the West while Magnentius sought to win the recognition of Constantius, Vetranio played a waiting game. At last, the historians tell us, the Illyrian Emperor broke his promises and made his peace with Magnentius. A common embassy sought Constantius: let him give Magnentius his sister Constantia to wife, and himself wed the daughter of Magnentius. Constantius wavered, but rejected the proposals and marched towards Sardica. Vetranio held the pass of Succi—the Iron Gate of later times—but on the arrival of the Emperor gave way before him. In Naissus, or as others say in Sirmium, the two Emperors mounted a rostrum and Constantius harangued the troops, appealing to them to avenge the death of the son of the great Constantine. The army hailed Constantius alone as Augustus and Vetranio sought for pardon. The Emperor treated the usurper with great respect and accorded him on his retirement to Prusa in Bithynia a handsome pension until his death six years later. Such is the story, but it can hardly fail to arouse suspicion. The greatest blot on the character of Constantius is his ferocity when once he fancied his superiority threatened, and here was both treason and treachery, for power had been stolen from him by a trick. All difficulties are removed if Vetranio throughout never ceased to support Constantius, even though the Emperor may have doubted his loyalty for a time when he heard that the prudent general had anticipated any action on the part of Magnentius by himself seizing the key-position, the pass of Succi. It is obvious that their secret was worth keeping: it is ill to play with armies as Constantius and Vetranio had done; while the clemency of an outraged sovereign offered a fair theme to the panegyrists of the Emperor.

Marching against one usurper in the West, Constantius was anxious to secure the East to the dynasty of Constantine: the recent success of Lucillianus may have appeared dangerously complete. The Emperor's nephew Gallus had, it would seem, for some time followed the Court, and while at Sirmium Constantius determined to create him Caesar. At the same time (15 March 351) his name was changed into Flavius Claudius Constantius, he was married to Constantia and became *frater Augusti*; forthwith the prince and his wife started for Antioch. Meanwhile Magnentius had not been idle; he had raised huge sums of money in Gaul, while



Franks, Saxons, and Germans trooped to the support of their fellow-countryman, whose army now outnumbered that of Constantius. The latter however took the offensive in the spring of 351 and uniting Vetrico's troops with his own marched towards the Alpine passes. An ambush of Magnentius posted in the defiles of Atrians inflicted severe loss on his advance guard and the Emperor was compelled to withdraw. Elated by this success, the usurper now occupied Pannonia and passing Poetovio made for Sirmium.

Throughout his reign the policy of Constantius was marked by an anxious desire to husband the military forces of the Empire, and even now he was ready to compromise and to avoid the fearful struggle between the armies of Gaul and Illyricum. He dispatched Philippus, offering to acknowledge Magnentius as co-Augustus in the West, if he would abandon any claim to Italy. The ambassador was detained, but his proposals after some delay rejected; the usurper was so certain of victory that his envoy the Senator Titianus could even counsel Constantius to abdicate. An attack of Magnentius on Siscia was repulsed and an effort to cross the Save was also unsuccessful. Constantius then retired, preferring to await the enemy in open country where he could turn to the best advantage his superiority in cavalry. At Cibalae the army took up an entrenched position, while Magnentius advanced on Sirmium, hoping to meet with no resistance. Foiled in this he marched to Mursa in the rear of Constantius' army. The latter was forced to relieve the town and here on 28 September the decisive battle was fought. Behind Constantius flowed the Danube and on his right the Drave: for him flight must mean destruction. On both wings he posted mounted archers and in the forefront the mailed cavalry which he had himself raised after the Persian model; in the centre the heavy armed infantry were stationed and in the rear the bowmen and slingers. Before the struggle Silvanus with his horsemen deserted Magnentius.

From late afternoon till far into the night the battle raged; the cavalry of Constantius routed the enemy's right wing and this drew the whole line into confusion. Magnentius fled but Marcellinus continued the fight; the Gauls refused to acknowledge defeat; some few escaped through the darkness, but thousands were driven into the river or cut down upon the plain. It is said that Magnentius lost 24,000 men, Constantius 30,000. The usurper took refuge in Aquileia and garrisoned the passes of the Alps; although his overtures were rejected and though his schemes to murder the Caesar Gallus and thus to raise difficulties for Constantius in the East were foiled, yet the exhaustion of his enemies and the approach of winter made pursuit impossible. Constantius forthwith proclaimed an amnesty for all the adherents of Magnentius except only those immediately implicated in his brother's murder; many deserted the pretender and escaped by sea to the victor. In the following year (352), Constantius forced the passes of the Julian Alps, while his fleet dominated the Po, Sicily, and Africa. At the news Magnentius fled to Gaul and by November the Emperor was already in Milan, abrogating all the fugitive's measures. In 353 Constantius crossed the Cottian Alps and at length, three years and a half after his assumption of the purple, Magnentius was surrounded in Lyons by his own troops, and finding his cause hopeless committed suicide, while his Caesar Decentius also perished by his own hand.

The importance and significance of this unsuccessful bid for empire may easily be overlooked. A Roman civil official at the head of some discontented spirits at the Court hatches a plot against his sovereign, and in order to win the support of the army alienated by the contempt of Constans induces a barbarian general to declare himself Emperor. But though the Roman world was willing enough that Germans should fight the Empire's battles in their defense, they were not prepared to see another Maximin upon the throne; they refused to be reconciled to Magnentius even by the admitted justice of his rule.

The lesson of his failure was well learned: the barbarian Arbogast caused not himself but the Roman civilian Eugenius to be elected Emperor. Further, while in this struggle the eastern and western halves of the Empire are seen falling naturally and almost unconsciously

asunder, the most powerful force working for unity is the dynastic sentiment: Constantius claims support as the legitimate successor of the house of Constantine and as the avenger of the death of his son. His claim is not merely as the chosen of senate or army but far more as the rightful heir to the throne. This struggle throws into prominence the growth of the hereditary principle and the warmth of the response which it could evoke from the sympathies of the subjects of the Empire. No student of the history of the fourth century can indeed afford to neglect the battle of Mursa; contemporaries were staggered at the appalling loss of life, for while it is said that the Roman dead numbered 40,000 at Adrianople (*AD* 378), at Mursa 54,000 are reported to have been slain. It is hardly too much to say that the defense of the Empire in the East was crippled by this blow, and it must have been largely through the slaughter at Mursa that Constantius was forced to make his fatal demand that the troops of Gaul should march against Persia. Neither must the military significance of the battle be forgotten: it lies in the fact that this was the first victory of the newly formed heavy cavalry, and the result of the impact of their charge, which carried all before it, showed that it was no longer the legionary who was to play the most important part in the campaigns of the future.

Meanwhile in Antioch Gallus was ruling as an oriental despot; there was in his nature a strain of savagery, and his appointment as Caesar seems to have awakened within him a brutal lust for a naked display of unrestrained authority. His passions were only fed by the violence of Constantia. The unsuccessful plot of Magnentius to assassinate the Caesar aroused the latter's suspicions and a reign of terror began; judicial procedure was disregarded and informers honored, men were condemned to death without trial and the members of the city council imprisoned; when the populace complained of scarcity it was suggested that the responsibility lay with Theophilus governor of Syria: the mob took the hint and the governor perished. The feeling of insecurity was rendered more intense by a rising among the Jews, who declared a certain Patricius their King, and by the raids of Saracens and Isaurians upon the country-side. The loyalty of the East was jeopardized. The reports of Thalassius, the praetorian praefect, and of Barbatio, the Caesar's Count of the guard, at length moved Constantius to action. On the death of Thalassius (winter 353-4) Domitian was sent to Antioch as his successor, directions being given him that Gallus was to be persuaded to visit the Emperor in the West. The praefect's studied discourtesy and overbearing behavior enraged the Caesar; Domitian was thrown into prison and the populace responding to the appeal of Gallus tore in pieces both the praefect and Montius the quaestor of the palace. The trials for treason which followed were but a parody of justice; fear and hate held sway in Antioch. Constantius himself now wrote to Gallus praying his presence in Milan. In deep foreboding the Caesar started; on his journey the death of his wife, the Emperor's masterful sister, further dismayed him, and after passing through Constantinople his guard of honor became his gaolers; stripped of his purple by Barbatio in Poetovio, he was brought near Pola before a commission headed by Eusebius, the Emperor's chamberlain, and bidden to account for his administration in the East. The Court came to the required conclusion, and Gallus was beheaded.

Thus of the house of Constantine there only remained the Emperor's cousin Julian. Born in all probability in April 332, the child spent his early years in Constantinople; his mother Basilina, daughter of the praetorian praefect Anicius Julianus, died only a few months after the birth of her son, while his father Julius Constantius, younger brother of Constantine the Great, perished in the massacre of 337. From this Julian was spared by his extreme youth and was thereupon removed to Nicomedia and entrusted to the charge of a distant relative, by name Eusebius, who was at the time bishop of the city. When seven years of age, his education was undertaken by Mardonius, a 'Scythian' eunuch—perhaps a Goth—who had been engaged by Julian's grandfather to instruct Basilina in the works of Homer and Hesiod. Mardonius had a passionate love for the classical authors, and on his way to school the boy's

imagination was fired by the old man's enthusiasm. Already Julian's love for nature was aroused; in the summer he would spend his time on a small estate which had belonged to his grandmother; it lay eight stades from the coast and contained springs and trees with a garden. Here, free from crowds, he would read a book in peace, looking up now and again upon the ships and the sea, while from a knoll, he tells us, there was a wide view over the town below and thence beyond to the capital, the Propontis and the distant islands. Suddenly (in 341?) both he and his brother Gallus were banished to Marcellum, a large and lonely imperial castle in Cappadocia, lying at the foot of Mount Argaeus.

Here for six years the two boys lived in seclusion, for none of their friends were allowed to visit them. Julian chafed bitterly at this isolation: in one of his rare references to this period he writes "we might have been in a Persian prison with only slaves for our companions". For a time the suspicions of Constantius seem to have gained the upper hand. At length Julian was allowed to visit his birthplace Constantinople. Here, while studying under Christian teachers as a citizen among citizens, his natural capacity, wit, and sociability rendered him dangerously popular: it was rumored that men were beginning to look upon the young prince as Constantius' successor. He was bidden to return to Nicomedia (349?), where he studied philosophy and came under the influence of Libanius, although he was not allowed to attend the latter's lectures. The rhetorician dates Julian's conversion to Neoplatonism from this period:—"the mud-bespattered statues of the gods were set up in the great temple of Julian's soul". At last, in 351, when Gallus was created Caesar, the student was free to go where he would, and the Pagan philosophers of Asia Minor: seized their opportunity. One and all plotted to secure the complete conversion of the young prince. Aedesius and Eusebius at Pergamum, Maximus and Chrysanthius at Ephesus could hardly content Julian's hunger for the forbidden knowledge. It was at this time (351-2) when he was twenty years of age (as he himself tells us) that he finally rejected Christianity and was initiated into the mysteries of Mithras. The fall of Gallus, however, implicated the Caesar's brother and Julian was closely watched and conducted to Italy. For seven months he was kept under guard, and during the six months which he spent in Milan he had only one interview with Constantius which was secured through the efforts of the Empress Eusebia. When at length he was allowed to leave the Court and was on his way to Asia Minor, the trial of the tribune Marinus and of Africanus, governor of Pannonia Secunda, on a charge of high treason inspired Constantius with fresh fears and suspicions. Messages reached Julian ordering his return. But before his arrival at Milan Eusebia had won from the Emperor his permission for Julian to retire to Athens, love of study being a characteristic which might with safety be encouraged in members of the royal house. Men may have seen in this visit to Greece (355) but a banishment; to Julian, nursing the perilous secret of his new-found faith, the change must have been pure joy. In Hellas, his true fatherland, he was probably initiated into the Eleusinian mysteries, while he plunged with impetuous intensity into the life of the University. It was not to be for long, for he was soon recalled to sterner activities.

Since the death of Gallus, the Emperor had stood alone; although no longer compromised by the excesses of his Caesar, he was still beset by the old problems which appeared to defy solution. At this time the power of the central government in Gaul had been still further weakened. Here Silvanus, whose timely desertion of Magnentius had contributed to the Emperor's success at the battle of Mursa, had been appointed *magister peditum*. He had won some victories over the Alemanni but, driven into treason by Court intrigues, had assumed the purple in Cologne and fallen after a short reign of some 28 days a victim to treachery (August-September 355?). In his own person Constantius could not take the command at once in Rhaetia and in Gaul, and yet along the whole northern frontier he was faced with danger and difficulty. He was haunted by the continual fear that some capable

general might of his own motion proclaim himself Augustus, or like Silvanus be hounded into rebellion. A military triumph often advantaged the captain more than his master and might have but little influence towards kindling anew the allegiance of the provincials. A prince of the royal house could alone with any hope of success attempt to raise the imperial prestige in Gaul. It was thus statecraft and no sinister machination against his cousin's life which led Constantius to listen to his wife's entreaties. He determined to banish suspicion and disregard the interested insinuations of the Court eunuchs: he would make of the philosopher scholar a Caesar, in whose person the loyalty of the West should find a rallying-point and on whom its devotion might be spent. In the Emperor's absence Julian once more arrived in Milan (summer 355), but to him imperial favor seemed a thing more terrible than royal neglect; Eusebia's summons to be of good courage was of no avail, only the thought that this was the will of Heaven steeled his purpose. Who was he to fight against the Gods?—After some weeks on 6 November 355 Julian was clothed with the purple by Constantius and enthusiastically acclaimed as Caesar by the army. Before leaving the Court the Caesar married Helena, the youngest sister of Constantius; the union was dictated by policy and she would seem never to have taken any large place in the life or thought of Julian. The position of affairs in Gaul was critical. Magnentius had withdrawn the armies of the West to meet Constantius, and horde after horde of barbarians had swept across the Rhine. In the north the Salii had taken possession of what is now the province of Brabant; in the south the Alemanni under Chnodomar had defeated the Caesar Decentius and had ravaged the heart of Gaul. The rumor ran that Constantius had even freed the Alemanni from their oaths and had given them a bribe to induce them to invade Roman territory, allowing them to take for their own any land which their swords could win. The story is probably a fabrication of Julian and his friends, but the fact of the barbarian invasion cannot be doubted. In the spring of 354 Constantius crossed the Jura and marched to the neighborhood of Basel, but the Alemanni under Gundomad and Vadomar withdrew and a peace was concluded. In 355 Arbitio was defeated near the Lake of Constance and the fall of Silvanus had for its immediate consequence the capture of Cologne by the Franks. Forty-five towns, not to speak of lesser posts, had been laid waste and the valley of the Rhine was lost to the Romans. Three hundred stades, from the left bank of the river the barbarians were permanently settled and their ravages extended for three times that distance. The whole of Alsace was in the hands of the Alemanni, the heads of the municipalities had been carried into slavery, Strasburg, Brumath, Worms, and Mainz had fallen, while soldiers of Magnentius, who had feared to surrender themselves after their leader's death, roamed as brigands through the country-side and increased the general disorder.

On 1 December 355, Julian left Milan with a guard of 360 soldiers; in Turin he learnt of the fall of Cologne and thence advanced to Vienne where he spent the winter training with rueful energy for his new vocation of a soldier. For the following year a combined scheme of operations had been projected: while the Emperor advancing from Rhaetia attacked the barbarians in their own territory, Julian was to act as lieutenant to Marcellus with directions to guard the approaches into Gaul and to drive back any fugitives who sought to escape before Constantius. The neutrality of the Alemannic princes in the north had been secured in 354, while internal dissension among the German tribes favored the Emperor's plans. The army in Gaul was ordered to assemble at Rheims and Julian accordingly marched from Vienne, reaching Autun on 24 June. That the barbarians should have constantly harried the Caesar's soldiers as they advanced through Auxerre and Troyes only serves to show how completely Gaul had been flooded by the German tribesmen. From Rheims, where the scattered troops were concentrated, the army started for Alsace pursuing the most direct route by Metz and Dieuze to Zabern. Two legions of the rear-guard were surprised on the march and were only with difficulty saved from annihilation. At this time Constantius was doubtless advancing



upon the right bank of the Rhine, for Julian at Brumath drove back a body of the Alemanni who were seeking refuge in Gaul. The Caesar then marched by Coblenz through the desolated Rhine valley to Cologne. This city he recovered and concluded a peace with the Franks. The approach of winter brought the operations to a close and Julian retired to Sens. Food was scarce and it was difficult to provision the army; the Caesar's best troops—the Scutarii and Gentiles—were therefore stationed in scattered fortresses. The Alemanni had been driven by hunger to continue their raids through Gaul and hearing of the weakness of the garrison they suddenly swept down upon Sens. In his heroic defense of the town Julian won his spurs as a military commander. For thirty days he withstood the attack, until the Alemanni retired discomfited. Marcellus had probably already experienced the ambition and vanity of the Caesar, his independence and intolerance of criticism: an imperial prince was none too agreeable a lieutenant. The general may even have considered that the Emperor would not be deeply grieved if the fortune of war removed a possible menace to the throne. Whatever his reasons may have been, he treacherously failed to come to the relief of the besieged. When the news reached the Court he was recalled and deprived of his command. Eutherius, sent by Julian from Gaul, discredited the calumnies of Marcellus, and Constantius silenced the malignant whispers of the Court; accepting his Caesar's protestations of loyalty, he created him supreme-commander over the troops in Gaul. The actual gains won by the military operations of the year 356 may not have been great but that their moral effect was considerable is demonstrated by the campaign of 357 and by the spirit of the troops at the battle of Strasburg; above all, Julian was no longer an imperial figure-head, he now begins an independent career as general and administrator.

In the spring of 357 Constantius, wishing to celebrate with high pomp and ceremony the twentieth year of his rule since the death of Constantine, visited Rome for the first time (28 April-29 May). The city filled him with awe and wonder and he caused an obelisk to be raised in the Circus Maximus as a memorial of his stay in the capital. But to the historian the main interest of this visit lies in the fact that as a Christian Emperor Constantius removed from the Senate-house the altar of Victory. To the whole-hearted Pagans this altar came to stand for a symbol of the Holy Roman Empire as they conceived it: it was an outward and visible sign of that bond which none might lose between Rome's hard-won greatness as a conquering nation and her loyalty to her historic faith. They clung to it with passionate devotion as to a time-honored creed in stone—a creed at once political and religious—and thus again and again they struggled and pleaded for its retention or its restoration. The deeper meaning of what might seem a matter of trifling import must never be forgotten if we are to understand the earnest petition of Symmachus or the scorn of Ambrose. The Pagan was defending the last trench: the destruction of the altar of Victory meant for him that he could hold the fortress no longer.

From Rome the Emperor was summoned to the Danube to take action against the Sarmatians, Suevi, and Quadi; he was unable to cooperate with Julian in person, but dispatched Barbatio, *magister peditum*, to Gaul in command of 25,000 troops. Julian was to march from the north, Barbatio was to make Angst near Basel his base of operations, and between the two forces the barbarians were to be enclosed. The choice of a general, however, foredoomed the plan of campaign to failure. Barbatio, one of the principal agents in the death of Gallus, was the last man to work in harmony with Julian. The Caesar leaving Sens concentrated his forces only 13,000 strong at Rheims, and as in the previous year marched south to Alsace. Finding the pass of Zabern blocked, he drove the barbarians before him and forced them to take refuge in the islands of the Rhine. Barbatio had previously allowed a marauding band of Laeti laden with booty to pass his camp and to cross the Rhine unscathed, and later by false reports he secured the dismissal of the tribunes Bainobaudes and the future emperor Valentinian, whom Julian had ordered to dispute the robbers' return. He now refused

to supply the Caesar with boats; light-armed troops, however, waded across the Rhine to the islands and seizing the barbarians' canoes massacred the fugitives. After this success Julian fortified the pass of Zabern and thus closed the gate into Gaul; he settled garrisons in Alsace along the frontier line and did all in his power to supply them with provisions, for Barbatio withheld all the supplies which arrived from southern Gaul. Having now secured his position, Julian received the amazing intelligence that Barbatio had been surprised by the Germans, had lost his whole baggage train and had retreated in confusion to Angst, where he had gone into winter quarters.

It must be confessed that this defeat of 25,000 men by a sudden barbarian foray seems almost inexplicable, unless it be that Barbatio was determined at all costs to refuse in any way to co-operate with the Caesar and was surprised while on the march to Angst. Julian's position was one of great danger: the Emperor was far distant on the Danube, the Alemanni previously at variance among themselves, were now reunited, Gundomad, the faithful ally of Rome, had been treacherously murdered and the followers of Vadomar had joined their fellow-countrymen. Barbatio's defeat had raised the enemy's hopes; while Julian was unsupported and had only some 13,000 men under his command. It was at this critical moment that a host of Alemannic tribesmen crossed the Rhine under the leadership of Chnodomar and encamped, it would seem, on the left bank of the river, close to the city of Strasburg which the Romans had apparently not yet recovered. On the third day after the passage of the stream had begun, Julian learned of the movement of the barbarians, and set out from Zabern on the military road to Brumath, and thence on the highway which ran from Strasburg to Mainz towards Weitbruch; here after a march of six or seven hours the army would reach the frontier fortification and from this point they had to descend by rough and unknown paths into the plain. On sight of the enemy despite the counsels of the Caesar, despite their long march and the burning heat of an August day, the troops insisted on an immediate attack. The Roman army was drawn up for battle, Severus on rising ground on the left wing, Julian in command of the cavalry on the right wing in the plain. Severus from this point of vantage discovered an ambush and drove off the barbarians with loss, but the Alemanni in their turn routed the Roman horse; although Julian was successful in staying their flight, they were too demoralized to renew the conflict. The whole brunt of the attack was therefore borne by the Roman centre and left wing, and it was a struggle of footmen against footmen. At length the stubborn endurance of the Roman infantry carried the day, and the Alemanni were driven headlong backwards toward the Rhine. Their losses were enormous—6000 left dead on the field of battle and countless others drowned: Chnodomar was at last captured, and Julian sent the redoubtable chieftain as a prisoner to Constantius. The victory meant the recovery of the upper Rhine and the freeing of Gaul from barbarian incursions. There would even seem to have been an attempt aid after the battle to hail Julian as Augustus, but this he immediately repressed.

The booty and captives were sent to Metz and the Caesar himself marched to Mainz, being compelled to subdue a mutiny on the way; the army had apparently been disappointed in its share of the spoil. Julian at once proceeded to cross the Rhine opposite Mainz and to conduct a campaign on the Main. His aim would seem to have been to strike still deeper terror into the vanquished, and to secure his advantage in order that he might feel free to turn to the work which awaited him in the north. Three chieftains sued for peace after their land had been laid waste with fire and sword, and to seal this success Julian rebuilt a fortress which Trajan had constructed on the right bank of the Rhine. The great difficulty which faced the Caesar was the question of supplies, and one of the terms of the ten months' armistice granted to the Alemanni was that they should furnish the garrison of the *Munimentum Trajani* with provisions. It was this pressing necessity which demanded both an assertion of the power of Rome among the peoples dwelling about the mouths of the Meuse and Rhine, and also the re-

establishment of the regular transport of corn from Britain. During the campaign on the Main, Severus had been sent north to reconnoiter; the Franks now occupied a position of virtual independence in the district south of the Meuse, and in the absence of Roman garrisons and with the Caesar fully occupied by the operations against the Alemanni a troop of 600 Frankish warriors were devastating the country-side. They retired before Severus and occupied two deserted fortresses. Here for 54 days in December 357 and January 358 they were besieged by Julian who had marched north to support the *magister equitum*. Hunger compelled them at last to yield, for the relief sent by their fellow-tribesmen arrived too late.

Julian spent the winter in Paris, and in early summer advanced with great speed and secrecy, surprised the Franks in Toxandria and forced them to acknowledge Roman supremacy. Further north the Chamavi had been driven by the pressure of the Saxons in their rear to cross the Rhine and to take possession of the country between that river and the Meuse. The co-operation of Severus enabled Julian to force them to submission, and it would appear that in consequence they retired to their former homes on the Yssel. The lower Rhine was now once more in Roman hands; the generalship of Julian had achieved what the praefect Florentius had deemed that Roman gold could alone secure, and the building of a fleet of 400 sea-going vessels was at once begun. The lower Rhine secured, Julian forthwith (July-August) returned to his unfinished task in the south. It was imperative that the ravaged provinces of Gaul should be re-peopled: their desolation and the honor of the Empire alike demanded that the prisoners in the hands of the barbarians should be restored. The remorseless ravaging of his land compelled Hortarius to yield, to surrender his Roman captives and to furnish timber for the rebuilding of the Roman towns. The winter past, Julian once more left Paris and with his new fleet brought the corn of Britain to the garrisons of the Rhine. Seven fortresses, from Castra Herculis in the land of the Batavi to Bingen in the south, were reconstructed, and then in a last campaign against the most southerly tribes of the Alemanni, those chieftains who had taken a leading part in the battle of Strasburg were forced to tender their submission. It was no easy matter to secure the release of the Roman prisoners, but Julian could claim to have restored 20,000 of these unfortunates to their homes. The Caesar's work was done: Gaul was once more in peace and the Rhine the frontier of the Empire.

When we turn to Julian's action in the civil affairs of the West, our information is all too scanty. It is clear that he approached his task with the passionate conviction that at all costs he would relieve the lot of the oppressed provincials. He took part in person in the administration of justice and himself revised the judgments of provincial governors; he refused to grant 'indulgences' whereby arrears of taxation were remitted, for he well knew that these imperial acts of grace benefited the rich alone, for wealth when first the tribute was assessed could purchase the privilege of delay and thus in the end enjoy the relief of the general rebate. He resolutely opposed all extraordinary burdens, and when Florentius persistently urged him to sign a paper imposing additional taxation for war purposes he threw the document indignantly to the ground and all the remonstrances of the praefect were without avail. In Belgica the Caesar's own representatives collected the tribute and the inhabitants were saved from the exactions alike of the agents of the praefect and of the governor. So successful was his administration that where previously for the land-tax alone twenty-five *aurei* had been exacted seven *aurei* only were now demanded by the State.

But reform was slow and in Julian's character there was a strain of restless impatience: he was intolerant of delays and of the irrational obstacles that barred the highway of progress; it galled him that he could not appoint as officials and subordinates men after his own heart. Admitted that Constantius sent him capable civil servants, yet these men who were to be the agents of reform were themselves members of the corrupt bureaucracy which was ruining the provinces. Indeed, might these nominees of his cousin be withstood? The undefined limits of his office might always render it an open question whether the assertion of the Caesar's right

were not aggression upon imperial privilege. Julian's conscious power and burning enthusiasm felt the cruel curb of his subordination. Constantius wished loyally to support his young relative, had given him the supreme command in Gaul after the first trial year and was determined that he should be supported by experienced generals, but Julian was far distant and his enemies at Court had the Emperor's ear; for them his successes and virtues but rendered him the more dangerous; the eunuch gang, says Ammianus, only worked the harder at the smithies where calumnies were forged. At times they mocked the Caesar's vanity and decried his conquests, at others they played upon the suspicions of Constantius: Julian was victor today, why not another Victorinus—an upstart Emperor of Gaul—tomorrow. Imperial messengers to the West were careful to bring back ominous reports, and Julian, who knew how matters stood and was not ignorant of his cousin's failings, may well have feared the overmastering influence of the Emperor's advisers. Thus constantly checked in his plans of reform alike religious and political, already, it may be, hailed as Augustus by his soldiery and dreading the machinations of courtiers, he began, at first perhaps in spite of himself, too long for greater independence; in 359 he was dreaming of the time when he should be no longer Caesar. The war in the East gave him his opportunity.

While Julian had been recovering Gaul, Constantius had been engaged in a series of campaigns on the Danube frontier, and for this purposes had removed his court from Milan to Sirmium. An unimportant expedition against the Suevi in Rhaetia in 357 was followed in 358 by lengthy operations in the plains about the Danube and the Theiss against the Quadi and various Sarmatian tribes who had burst plundering across the border. The barbarian territory was ravaged, and through the Emperor's successful diplomacy one people after another submitted and surrendered their prisoners. They were in most cases left in possession of their lands under the supremacy of Rome, but the Limigantes were forced to settle on the left instead of the right bank of the Theiss, while the Sarmatae Liberi were given a king by Constantius in the person of their native prince Zizais, and were themselves restored to the district which the Limigantes had been compelled to leave. The latter however in the following year (359), discontented with their new homes, craved that they might be allowed to cross the Danube and settle within the Empire. This Constantius was persuaded to permit, hoping thus to gain recruits for the Roman army and thereby to lighten the burdens of the provincials. The Limigantes, once admitted upon Roman territory, sought to avenge themselves for the losses of the previous year by a treacherous onslaught upon the Emperor. Constantius escaped and a general massacre of the faithless barbarians ensued. The pacification of the northern frontier was now complete.

Meanwhile in the East hostilities with Persia had ceased on any large scale since 351, and in 356-7 the praefect Musonianus had been carrying on negotiations for peace (through Cassianus, military commander in Mesopotamia) with Tampsapor a neighboring satrap. But the moment was inopportune. Sapor himself had at length effected an alliance with the Chionitae and Gelani and now (spring 358) in a letter to the Emperor demanded the restoration of Mesopotamia and Armenia; in case of refusal he threatened military action in the following year. Constantius proudly rejected the shameful proposal, but sent two successive embassies to Persia in the hope of concluding an honorable peace. The effort was fruitless. Court intrigue deprived Ursicinus, Rome's one really capable general in the East, of the supreme command, and in spite of the prayers of the provincials he was succeeded by Sabinianus, who in his obscure old age was distinguished only by his wealth, inefficiency and credulous piety. During the entire course of the war inactivity was the one prominent feature of his generalship. On the outbreak of hostilities in 359 the Persians adopted a new plan of campaign. A rich Syrian, Antoninus by name, who had served on the staff of the general commanding in Mesopotamia, was threatened by powerful enemies with ruin. Having compiled from official sources full information alike as to Rome's available ammunition and



stores and the number of her troops he fled with his family to the court of Sapor; here, welcomed and trusted, he counseled immediate action: men had been withdrawn from the East for the campaigns on the Danube, let the King no longer be content with frontier forays, let him without warning strike for the rich province of Syria unravaged since the days of Gallienus! The deserter's advice was adopted by the Persians. On the advance of their army, however, the Romans, withdrawing from Charrae and the open country-side burned down all vegetation over the whole of northern Mesopotamia. This devastation and the swollen stream of the Euphrates forced the Persians to strike northward through Sophene; Sapor crossed the river higher in its course and marched towards Amida. The city refused to surrender, and the death of the son of Grumbates, king of the Chionitae, provoked Sapor to abandon his attack on Syria and to press the siege. Six legions formed the standing garrison, a force which probably numbered some 6000 men in all. But at the time of the Persian advance the country-folk had all assembled for the yearly market, and when the peasantry fled for refuge within the city walls Amida was densely overcrowded. None however dreamed of surrender; Ammianus, one of the besieged, has left us a vivid account of those heroic seventy-three days. In the end the city fell (6 Oct.) and its inhabitants were either slain or carried into captivity. Winter was now approaching and Sapor was forced to return to Persia with the loss of 30,000 men.

The sacrifice of Amida had saved the eastern provinces of the Roman Empire, but the fall of the city also convinced Constantius that more troops were needed if Rome was to withstand the enemy. Accordingly the Emperor sent by the tribune Decentius his momentous order that the auxiliary troops, the Aeruli Batavi Celtae and Petulantes, should leave Gaul forthwith, and with them 300 men from each of the remaining Gallic regiments. The demand reached Julian in Paris where he was spending the winter (January? 360); for him the serious feature of the despatch was that the execution of the Emperor's command was entrusted to Lupicinus and Gintonius, while Julian himself was ignored. The transference of the troops was probably an imperial necessity, but this could not justify the form of the Emperor's despatch. The unrelenting malice of the courtiers had carried the day; Constantius seems to have a lost confidence in his Caesar. At first Julian thought to lay down his office; then he temporized: he professed that obedience to the Emperor would imperil the safety of the province, he raised the objection that the barbarians had enlisted on the understanding that they should never be called upon to serve beyond the Alps, Lupicinus was in Britain fighting the Picts and Scots, while Florentius, to whose influence rumor ascribed the Emperor's action, was absent in Vienne. Julian summoned him to Paris to give his advice, but the praefect pleaded the urgency of the supervision of the corn supply and remained where he was. While Julian played a waiting game, a timely broadsheet was found in the camp of the Celtae and Petulantes.

The anonymous author complained that the soldiers were being dragged none knew whither, leaving their families to be captured by the Alemanni. The partisans of Constantius saw the danger; should Julian still delay, they insisted, he would but justify the Emperor's suspicions. His hand was forced; he wrote a letter to Constantius, ordered the soldiers to leave their winter quarters and gave permission for their families to accompany them; Sintula, the Caesar's tribune of the stable, at once set out for the East with a picked body of Gentiles and Scutarii. Unwisely, as events proved, the court party demanded that the troops should march through Paris: there, they thought, any disaffection could be repressed. Julian met the men outside the city and spoke them fair, their officers he invited to a banquet in the evening. But when the guests had returned to their quarters, there suddenly arose in the camp a passionate shout, and crowding tumultuously to the palace the soldiers surrounded its walls, raising the fateful acclamation, 'Julianus Augustus'. Without the army clamored, within his room its leader wrestled with the gods until the dawn, and with the break of a new day he was assured

of Heaven's blessing. When he came forth to face his men he might attempt to dissuade them, but he knew that he would bow to their will. Raised upon a shield and crowned with a standard bearer's torque, the Caesar returned to his palace an Emperor. But now that the irrevocable step was taken, his resolution seemed to have failed, and he remained in retirement—perhaps for some days. The adherents of Constantius took heart and a group of conspirators plotted against Julian's life. But the secret was not kept, and the soldiers once more encircled the palace and would not be contented until they had seen their Emperor alive and well. From this moment Julian stifled his scruples and accepted accomplished fact. After the flight of Decentius and Florentius he dispatched Eutherius and his *magister officiorum* Pentadius as ambassadors to Constantius, while in his letter he proposed the terms which he was prepared to make the basis of a compromise. He would send to the East troops raised from the *dediticii* and the Germans settled on the left bank of the Rhine—to withdraw the Gallic troops would be, he professed, to endanger the safety of the province—while Constantius should allow him to appoint his own officials, both military and civil, save only that the nomination of the praetorian praefect should rest with the elder Augustus, whose superior authority Julian avowed himself willing to acknowledge. When the news from Paris reached Caesarea, Constantius hesitated: should he march forthwith against his rebellious Caesar and desert the East while the Persians were threatening to renew the attack of the previous year, or should he subordinate his personal quarrel to the interests of the State? Loyalty to his conception of an Emperor's duty carried the day and he advanced to Edessa. The fact that the Persians in this year were able to recover Singara, once more fallen into Roman hands, and to capture and garrison Bezabde, a fortress on the Tigris in Zabdicene, while the Emperor remained perforce inactive, serves to show how very earnest was his need of troops. Even the attempt to recover Bezabde in the autumn was unsuccessful.

Meanwhile Constantius, ignoring Julian's proposals, made several nominations to high officers in the West, and dispatched Leonas to bid the rebel lay aside the purple with which a turbulent soldiery had invested him. The letter, when read to the troops, served but to inflame their enthusiasm for their general, and Leonas fled for his life. But Julian still hoped that an understanding between himself and Constantius was even now not impossible. To save his army from inaction he led them—not towards the East, but against the Attuarian Franks on the lower Rhine. The barbarians, unwarned of the Roman approach, were easily defeated and peace was granted on their submission. The campaign lasted three months, and thence by Basel and Besancon Julian returned to winter at Vienne, for Paris, his beloved Lutetia, lay at too great a distance from Asia. Letters were still passing between himself and Constantius, but his task lay clear before him: he must be forearmed alike for aggression and defense. By a display of power he sought to wrest from his cousin recognition and acknowledgment, while, with his troops about him, he could at least sustain his cause and escape the shame of his brother's fate. Recruits from the barbarian tribes swelled his forces, and large sums of money were raised for the coming campaign. In the spring of 361 Julian by the treacherous capture and banishment of Vadomar removed all fears of an invasion by the Alemanni, and about the month of July set out from Basel for the East. By this step he took the aggressive and himself finally broke off the negotiations; this was avowed by his appointment of a praefect of Gaul in place of Nebridius, the nominee of Constantius, who had refused to take the oath of allegiance to Julian. Germanianus temporarily performed the praefect's duties but retired in favor of Sallust, while Nevitta was created *magister armorum* and Jovius *quaestor*.

As soon as he was freed from the Persian War, Constantius had thought to hunt down his usurping Caesar and capture his prey while Julian was still in Gaul; he had set guards about the frontiers and had stored corn on the Lake of Constance and in the neighborhood of the Cottian Alps. Julian determined that he would not wait to be surrounded, but would strike the first blow, while the greater part of the army of Illyricum was still in Asia. He argued that

present daring might deliver Sirmium into his hands, that thereupon he could seize the Pass of Succi, and thus be master of the road to the West. Jovius and Jovinus were ordered to advance at full speed through North Italy, in command, it would appear, of a squadron of cavalry. They would thus surprise the inhabitants into submission, while fear of the main army, which would follow more slowly, might overawe opposition. Nevitta he commanded to make his way through Rhaetia Mediterranea, while he himself left Basel with but a small escort and struck direct through the Black Forest for the Danube. Here he seized the vessels of the river fleet, and at once embarked his men. Without rest or intermission Julian continued the voyage down the river, and reached Bononia on the eleventh day. Under the cover of night, Dagalaiphus with some picked followers was despatched to Sirmium. At dawn his troop was demanding admission in the Emperor's name; only when too late was the discovery made that the Emperor was not Constantius. The general Lucilianus, who had already begun the leisurely concentration of his men for an advance into Gaul, was rudely aroused from sleep and hurried away to Bononia. The gates of Sirmium, the northern capital of the Empire, were opened and the inhabitants poured forth to greet the victor of Strasburg. Two days only did Julian spend in the city, then marched to Succi, left Nevitta to guard the pass and retired to Naissus, where he spent the winter awaiting the arrival of his army. Julian's march from Gaul meant the final breach with Constantius; present task was to justify his usurpation to the world. Thus the imperial pamphleteer was born. One apologia followed another, now addressed to the senate, now to Athens as representing the historic centre of Hellenism, now to some city whose allegiance Julian sought to win. But he overshot the mark; the painting of the character of Constantius men felt to be a caricature and the scandalous portraiture unworthy of one who owed his advancement to his cousin's favors. Meanwhile Julian strained every nerve to raise more troops for the coming campaign. He was not yet strong enough to advance into Thrace to meet the forces under Count Martianus, and the news from the West forced him to realize how critical his position might become.

Two legions and a cohort stationed in Sirmium he did not dare to trust and so gave the command that they should march to Gaul to take the place of those regiments which formed part of his own army. On the long journey the men's discontent grew to mutiny: refusing to advance, they occupied Aquileia and were supported by the inhabitants who had remained at heart loyal to Constantius. The danger was very real; the insurgents might form a nucleus of disaffection in Italy and thus imperil Julian's retreat. He gave immediate orders to Jovinus to return and to employ in the siege of Aquileia the whole of the main force now advancing through Italy.

In the East Constantius had marched to Edessa (spring 361), where he awaited information as to the plans of Sapor. It was only on the news of Julian's capture of the pass of Succi that he felt that the war in the West could be no longer postponed. At the same time Constantius learned of Sapor's retreat, since the auspices forbade the passage of the Tigris. The Roman army assembled at Hierapolis greeted the Emperor's harangue with enthusiasm, Arbitio was dispatched in advance to bar Julian's progress through Thrace, and when Constantius had made provision in Antioch for the government of the East he started in person against the usurper. Fever however attacked him in Tarsus and his illness was rendered still more serious by the violent storms of late autumn. At Mopsucrenae, in Cilicia, he died on 3 November 361 at the age of 44.

Ammianus Marcellinus has given us a definitive sketch of the character of Constantius. His faults are clear as day. To guard the Emperor from treason, Diocletian had made the throne unapproachable, but this severance of sovereign and people drove the ruler back on the narrow circle of his ministers. They were at once his informants and his advisers: their lord learned only that which they deemed it well for him to know. The Emperor was led by his favorites; Constantius possessed considerable influence, writes Ammianus in bitter irony,

with his eunuch chamberlain Eusebius. The insinuations of courtiers ultimately sowed mistrust between his Caesar Julian and himself. They played upon the suspicious nature of the Emperor, their whispers of treason fired him to senseless ferocity, and the services of brave men were lost to the Empire lest their popularity should endanger the monarch's peace. Even loyal subjects grew to doubt whether the Emperor's safety were worth its fearful price. To maintain the extravagant pomp of his rapacious ministers and followers, the provinces labored under an overwhelming weight of taxes and impositions which were exacted with merciless severity, while the public post was ruined by the constant journeying of bishops from one council to another.

Yet though these dark features of the reign of Constantius are undeniable, below his inhuman repression of those who had fallen under the suspicion of treason lay a deep conviction of the solemnity of the trust which had been handed down to him from father and grandfather. For Constantius the consciousness that he was representative by the grace of Heaven of a hereditary dynasty carried with it its obligation, and the task of maintaining the greatness of Rome was subtly confused with the duty of self-preservation, since a usurper's reign would never be hallowed by the seal of a legitimate succession. With a sense of this responsibility Constantius always sought to appoint only tried men to important offices in the State, he consistently exalted the civil element at the expense of the military and rigidly maintained the separation between the two services which had been one of the leading principles of Diocletian's reforms. Sober and temperate, he possessed that power of physical endurance which was shared by so many of his house. In his early years he served as lieutenant to his father alike in East and West and gained a wide experience of men and cities. Now on this frontier, now on that, he was constantly engaged in the Empire's defense; a soldier by necessity and no born general, he was twice hailed by his men with the title of Sarmaticus, and in the usurpations of Magnentius and of Julian he refused to hazard the safety of the provinces and loyally sacrificed all personal interests in face of the higher claims of his duty to the Roman world. He was naturally cold and self-contained; he fails to awake our affection or our enthusiasm, but we can hardly withhold our tribute of respect. He bore his burden of Empire with high seriousness; men were conscious in his presence of an overmastering dignity and of a majesty which inspired them with something akin to awe.

By the death of Constantius the Empire was happily freed from the horrors of another civil war: Julian was clearly marked out to be his cousin's successor, and the decision of the army did not admit of doubt; Eusebius and the Court party were forced to abandon any idea of putting forward another claimant to the throne. Two officers, Theolaifus and Aligildus, bore the news to Julian; fortune had intervened to favor his rash adventure, and he at once advanced through Thrace by Philippopolis to Constantinople. Agilo was dispatched to Aquileia and at length the besieged were convinced of the Emperor's death and thereupon their stubborn resistance came to an end. Nigrinus, the ringleader, and two other men were put to death, but soldiers and citizens were fully pardoned. When on 11 December 361 Julian, still but 31 years old, entered as sole Emperor his eastern capital, all eyes were turned in wondering amazement on the youthful hero, and for the rest of his life upon him alone was fixed the gaze of Roman historians; wherever Julian is not, there we are left in darkness, of the West for example we know next to nothing. The history of Julian's reign becomes perforce the biography of the Emperor. In that biography three elements are all-important: Julian's passionate determination to restore the Pagan worship; his earnest desire that men should see a new Marcus Aurelius upon the throne, and that abuses and maladministration should hide their heads ashamed before an Emperor who was also a philosopher, and, in the last place, his tragic ambition to emulate the achievements of Alexander the Great and by a crushing blow to assert over Persia the pre-eminence of Rome.



Innumerable have been the explanations which men have offered for the apostasy of Julian. They have pointed to his Arian teachers, have suggested that Christianity was hateful to him as the religion of Constantius whom he regarded as his father's murderer, while rationalists have paradoxically claimed that the Emperor's reason refused to accept the miraculous origin and the subtle theologies of the faith. It would be truer to say that Christianity was not miraculous enough—was too rational for the mystic and enthusiast. The religion which had as its central object of adoration the cult of a dead man was to him human, all too human: his vague longings after some vast imaginative conception of the universe felt themselves cabined and confined in the creeds of Christianity. With a Roman's pride and a Roman's loyalty to the past as he conceived it, the upstart faith of despised Galilean peasants aroused at one moment his scorn, at another his pity: a Greek by education and literary sympathies, the Christian Bible was but a faint and distorted reflex of the masterpieces which had comforted his solitary youth: a mystic who felt the wonder of the expanse of the heavens, with a strain in his nature to which the ritual excesses of the Orient appealed with irresistible fascination, it was easy for him to adopt the speculations of Neoplatonism and to fall a victim to the thaumaturgy of Maximus. The causes of Julian's apostasy lie deep-rooted in the apostate's inmost being.

His first acts declared his policy: he ordered the temples to be opened and the public sacrifices to be revived; but the Christians were to be free to worship, for Julian had learned the lesson of the failure of previous persecutions, and by imperial order all the Catholic bishops banished under Constantius were permitted to return. Those privileges, however, which the State had granted to the churches were now to be withdrawn: lands and temples which had belonged to the older religion were to be surrendered to their owners, the Christian clergy were no longer to claim exemption from the common liability to taxation or from duties owed to the municipal senates. With Julian's accession Christianity had ceased to be the favored religion, and it was therefore contended that reason demanded alike restitution and equality before the law. Meanwhile a Court was sitting at Chalcedon to try the partisans of Constantius. Its nominal president was Sallust (probably Julian's friend when in Gaul), but the commission was in reality controlled by Arbitio, an unprincipled creature of Constantius. Julian may perhaps have intended to show impartiality by such a choice, but as a result justice was travestied, and though public opinion approved of the deaths of Paul the notary and of Apodemius, who were principally responsible for the excesses committed in the treason trials of the late reign, and may have welcomed the fate of the all-powerful chamberlain Eusebius, men were horror-struck at the execution of Ursulus, who as treasurer in Gaul had loyally supported Julian when Caesar; his unpopularity with the troops was indeed his only crime, and the Emperor did not mend his error by raising the weak plea that he had been kept in ignorance of the sentence. Julian's next step was the summary dismissal of the horde of minor officials of the palace who had served to make the Court circle under Constantius a very hot-bed of vice and corruption. The purge was sudden and indiscriminate; it was the act of a young man in a hurry. The feverish ardor of the Emperor's reforming energy swept before it alike the innocent and the guilty. Such impatience appeared unworthy of a philosopher, and so far from awaking gratitude in his subjects served rather to arouse discontent and alarm.

But already Julian was burning to undertake his great expedition against Persia, and refused to listen to counselors who suggested the folly of aggression now that Sapor was no longer pressing the attack. The Emperor's preparations could best be made in Antioch and here he arrived probably in late July 363. On the way he had made a detour to Visit Pessinus and Ancyra; the lukewarm devotion of Galatia had discouraged him, but in Antioch where lay the sanctuary of Daphne he looked for earnest support in his crusade for the moral regeneration of Paganism. The Crown of the East (as Ammianus styles his native city) welcomed the Emperor with open arms, but the enthusiasm was short-lived. The populace

gay, factious, pleasure-loving, looked for spectacles and the pomp of a Court; Julian's heart was set on a civil and religious reformation. He longed for amendment in law and administration, above all for a remodeling of the old cult and the winning of converts to the cause of the gods. He himself was to be the head of the new state church of Paganism; the hierarchy of the Christians was to be adopted—the country priests subordinated to the high priest of the province, the high priest to be responsible to the Emperor, the *pontifex maximus*.

A new spirit was to inspire the Pagan clergy; the priest himself was to be no longer a mere performer of public rites, let him take up the work of preacher, expound the deeper sense which underlay the old mythology and be at once shepherd of souls and an ensample to his flock in holy living. What Maximin Daza had attempted to achieve in ruder fashion by forged acts of Pilate, Julian's writings against the Galileans should effect: as Maximin had bidden cities ask what they would of his royal bounty, did they but petition that the Christians might be removed from their midst, so Julian was ready to assist and favor towns which were loyal to the old faith. Maximin had created a new priesthood recruited from men who had won distinction in public careers: his dream had been to fashion an organization which might successfully withstand the Christian clergy; here too Julian was his disciple. When pest and famine had desolated the Roman East in Maximin's days, the helpfulness and liberality of Christians towards the starving and the plague-stricken had forced men to confess that true piety and religion had made their home with the persecuted heretics: it was Julian's will that Paganism should boast its public charity and that an all-embracing service of humanity should be reasserted as a vital part of the ancient creed. If only the worshippers of the gods of Hellas were once quickened with a spiritual enthusiasm, the lost ground would be recovered. It was indeed to this call that Paganism could not respond.

There were men who clung to the old belief, but theirs was no longer a victorious faith, for the fire had died upon the altar. Resignation to Christian intolerance was bitter, but the passion which inspires martyrs was nowhere to be found. Julian made converts—the Christian writers mournfully testify to their numbers—but he made them by imperial gold, by promises of advancement or fear of dismissal. They were not the stuff of which missionaries could be fashioned. The citizens were disappointed of their pageants, while the royal enthusiast found his hopes to be illusions. Mutual embitterment was the natural result. Julian was never a persecutor in the accepted meaning of that word: it was the most constant complaint of the Christians that the Emperor denied them the glory of martyrdom, but Pagan mobs knew that the Emperor would not be quick to punish violence inflicted on the Galileans: when the Alexandrians brutally murdered their tyrannous bishop, George of Cappadocia, they escaped with an admonition; when Julian wrote to his subjects of Bostra, it was to suggest that their bishop might be hunted from the town. If Pessinus was to receive a boon from the Emperor, his counsel was that all her inhabitants should become worshippers of the Great Mother; if Nisibis needed protection from Persia, it would only be granted on condition that she changed her faith. In the schools throughout the Empire Christians were expounding the works of the great Greek masters; from their earliest years children were taught to scorn the legends which to Julian were rich with spiritual meaning. He that would teach the scriptures must believe in them, and given the Emperor's zealous faith, it was but reasonable that he should prohibit Christians from teaching the classic literature which was his Bible. If Ammianus criticized the edict severely, it was because he did not share the Emperor's belief; the historian was a tolerant monotheist, Julian an ardent worshipper of the gods. The Emperor's conservatism and love of sacrifice alike were stirred by the records of the Jews. A people who in the midst of adversity had clung with a passionate devotion to the adoration of the God of their fathers deserved well at his hands. Christian renegades should see the glories of a restored temple which might stand as an enduring monument of his reign. The architect Alypius planned the work, but it was never completed. The earth at this time was troubled by strange upheavals,

earthquakes, and ocean waves, and by some such phenomenon Jerusalem would seem to have been visited; perhaps during the excavations a well of naphtha was ignited. We only know that Christians, who saw in Julian's plan a defiance of prophecy, proclaimed a miracle, and that the Emperor did not live to prove them mistaken.

Thus in Antioch the relations between the sovereign and his people were growing woefully strained. Julian removed the bones of Saint Babylas from the precinct of Daphne and soon after the temple was burned to the ground. Suspicion fell upon the Christians and their great church was closed. A scarcity of provisions made itself felt in the city and Julian fixed a maximum price and brought corn from Hierapolis and elsewhere, and sold it at reduced rates. It was bought up by the merchants, and the efforts to coerce the senate failed. The populace ridiculed an Emperor whose aims and character they did not understand. The philosopher would not stoop to violence but the man in Julian could not hold his peace. The Emperor descended from the awful isolation which Diocletian had imposed on his successors; he challenged the satirists to a duel of wits and published the *Misopogon*. It was to sacrifice his vantage-ground. The chosen of Heaven had become the jest of the mob, and Julian's pride could have drained no bitterer cup. When he left the city for Persia, he had determined to fix his court, upon his return, at Tarsus, and neither the entreaties of Libanius nor the tardy repentance of Antioch availed to move him from his purpose.

Here but the briefest outline can be given of the oft-told tale of Julian's Persian expedition. Before it criticism sinks powerless, for it is a wonder-story and we cannot solve its riddle. The leader perished and the rest is silence: with him was lost the secret of his hopes. Julian left Antioch on 5 March 363 and on the 9th reached Hierapolis. Here the army had been concentrated and four days later the Emperor advanced at its head, crossed the Euphrates and passing through Batnae halted at Charrae. The name must have awakened gloomy memories and the Emperor's mind was troubled with premonitions of disaster; men said that he had bidden his kinsman Procopius mount the throne should he himself fall in the campaign. A troop of Persian horse had just burst plundering across the frontier and returned laden with booty; this event led Julian to disclose his plan of campaign. Corn had been stored along the road towards the Tigris, in order to create an impression that he had chosen that line for his advance; in fact the Emperor had determined to follow the Euphrates and strike for Ctesiphon. He would thus be supported by his fleet bearing supplies and engines of war. Procopius and Sebastianus he entrusted with 30,000 troops—almost half his army—and directed them to march towards the Tigris. They were for the present to act only on the defensive, shielding the eastern provinces from invasion and guarding his own forces from any Persian attack from the north. When he himself was once at grips with Persia in the heart of the enemy's territory, Sapor would be forced to concentrate his armies, and then, the presence of Julian's generals being no longer necessary to protect Mesopotamia, should a favorable opportunity offer, they were to act in concert with Arsaces, ravage Chiliocomum, a fertile district of Media, and advance through Corduene and Moxoene to join him in Assyria. That meeting never took place: from whatever reason Procopius and Sebastianus never left Mesopotamia. Julian reviewed the united forces—65,000 men—and then turned south following the course of the Belias (Belecha) until he reached Callinicum (Ar-Rakka) on 27 March.

Another day's march brought him to the Euphrates, and here he met the fleet under the command of the tribune Constantianus and the Count Lucillianus. Fifty warships, an equal number of boats designed to form pontoon bridges, and a thousand transports—the Roman armada seemed to an eyewitness fitly planned to match the magnificent stream on which it floated. Another 98 miles brought the army to Diocletian's bulwark fortress of Circesium

(Karkisiya). Here the Aboras (Khabfir) formed the frontier line; Julian harangued the troops, then crossed the river by a bridge of boats and began his march through Persian territory. In spite of omens and disregarding the gloomy auguries of the Etruscan soothsayers, the Emperor set his face for Ctesiphon; he would storm high Heaven by violence and bend the gods to his will. From its formation the invading army was made to appear a countless host, for their marching column extended over some ten miles, while neither the fleet nor the land forces were suffered to lose touch with each other. Some of the enemy's forts capitulated, the inhabitants of Anatha being transported to Chalcis in Syria, some were found deserted, while the garrisons of others refusing to surrender professed themselves willing to abide by the issue of the war. Julian was content to accept these terms and continued his unrelenting advance.

Historians have blamed this rash confidence, whereby he endangered his own retreat. It is however to be remembered that a siege in the fourth century might mean a delay of many weeks, that the Emperor's project was clearly to dismay Persia by the rapidity of his onset and that it would seem probable that his plan of campaign had been from the first to return by the Tigris and not by the Euphrates. The Persians had intended a year or two before to leave walled cities untouched and strike for Syria, Julian in his turn refused to waste precious time in investing the enemy's strongholds, but would deal a blow against the capital itself.

The march was attended with many difficulties: a storm swept down upon the camp, the swollen river burst its dams and many transports were sunk, the passage of the Narraga was only forced by a successful attack on the Persian rear which compelled them to evacuate their position in confusion, a mutinous and discontented spirit was shown by the Roman troops and the Emperor was forced to exert his personal influence and authority before discipline was restored; finally the Persians raised all the sluices and, freeing the waters, turned the country which lay before the army into a widespread marsh. Difficulties however vanished before the resource and promptitude of the Emperor, and the advance guard under Victor brought him news that the country up to the walls of Ctesiphon was clear of the enemy.

On the fall of the strong fortress of Maiozamalcha, the fleet followed the Naharmalcha (the great canal which united Euphrates and Tigris), while the army kept pace with it on land. The Naharmalcha, however, flows into the Tigris three miles below Ctesiphon, and thus the Emperor would have been forced to propel his ships up stream in his attack on the capital. The difficulty was overcome by clearing the disused Canal of Trajan, down which the fleet emerged into the Tigris to the north of Ctesiphon. From the triangle thus formed by the Naharmalcha, the Tigris, and the canal of Trajan, Julian undertook the capture of the left bank of the river. Protected by a palisade, the Persians offered a stubborn resistance to the Roman night attack. The five ships first dispatched were repulsed and set on fire; on the moment "it is the signal that our men hold the bank", cried the Emperor, and the whole fleet dashed to their comrades' support. Julian's inspiration won a field of battle for the Romans. Underneath a scorching sun the armies fought until the Persians—elephants, cavalry, and foot—were fleeing pell-mell for the shelter of the city walls; their dead numbered some 2500. Had the pursuit been pressed, Ctesiphon might perhaps have been won that day, but plunder and booty held the victors fast. Should the capital be besieged or the march against Sapor begun?

It would almost seem that Julian himself wavered irresolute, while precious days were lost. Secret proposals of peace led him to underestimate the enemy's strength, while men, playing the part of deserters, offered to lead him through fertile districts against the main Persian army. Should he weary his forces and damp the spirit of his men by an arduous siege, he might not only be cut off from the reinforcements under Procopius and Sebastianus, but might find himself caught between two fires—Sapor's advance and the resistance of the garrison. To conclude a peace were unworthy of one who took Alexander for his model better with his victorious troops to strike a final and conclusive blow, and possibly before the encounter effect a junction with the northern army. Crews numerous enough to propel his



fleet against the stream he could not spare, and if he were to meet Sapor, he might be drawn too far from the river to act in concert with his ships: they must not fall into the enemy's hands, and therefore they must be burned. The resolution was taken and regretted too late; twelve small boats alone were rescued from the flames. Julian's plans miscarried, for the army of the north remained inactive, perhaps through the mutual jealousy of its commanders, and Arsaces withheld his support from the foe of Sapor. The Persians burned their fields before his advance, and the rich countryside which traitorous guides had promised became a wilderness of ash and smoke. Orders were given for a retreat to Corduene; amidst sweltering heat, with dwindling stores, the Romans beheld to their dismay the cloud of dust upon the horizon which heralded Sapor's approach. At dawn the heavy-armed troops of Persia were close at hand and only after many engagements were beaten off with loss. After a halt of two days at Hucumbra, where a supply of provisions was discovered, the army advanced over country which had been devastated by fire, while the troops were constantly harassed by sudden onsets. At Maranga the Persians were once more reinforced; two of the king's sons arrived at the head of an elephant column and squadrons of mailed cavalry. Julian drew up his forces in semicircular formation to meet the new danger; a rapid charge disconcerted the Persian archers, and in the hand-to-hand struggle which followed the enemy suffered severely. Lack of provisions, however, tortured the Roman army during the three days' truce which ensued. When the march was resumed Julian learned of an attack upon his rear. Unarmed he galloped to the threatened point, but was recalled to the defense of the vanguard. At the same time the elephants and cavalry had burst upon the centre, but were already in flight when a horseman's spear grazed the Emperor's arm and pierced his ribs. None knew whence the weapon came, though rumor ran that a Christian fanatic had assassinated his general, while others said that a tribesman of the Taieni had dealt the fatal blow. In vain Julian essayed to return to the field of battle; his soldiers magnificently avenged their Emperor, but he could not share their victory. Within his tent he calmly reviewed the past and uncomplaining yielded his life into the keeping of the eternal Godhead. Death in mercy claimed Julian. The impatient reformer and champion of a creed outworn might have become the embittered persecutor. Rightly or wrongly after generations would know him as the great apostate, but he was spared the shame of being numbered among the tyrants. He was born out of due time and therein lay the tragedy of his troubled existence; for long years he dared not discover the passionate desires which lay nearest his heart, and when at length he could give them expression, there were few or none fully to understand or sympathize. His work died with him, and soon, like a little cloud blown by the wind, left not a trace behind.

The next day at early dawn the heads of the army and the principal officers assembled to choose an Emperor. Partisans of Julian struggled with followers of Constantius, the armies of the West schemed against the nominee of the legions of the East, Christianity and Paganism each sought its own champion. All were however prepared to sink their differences in favor of Sallust, but when he pleaded ill-health and advanced age, a small but tumultuous faction carried the election of Jovian, the captain of the imperial guard. Down the long line of troops ran the Emperor's name, and some thought from the sound half-heard that Julian was restored to them. They were undeceived at the sight of the meager purple robe which hardly served to cover the vast height and bent shoulders of their new ruler. Chosen as a whole-hearted adherent of Christianity, Jovian was by nature genial and jocular, a gourmand and lover of wine and women—a man of kindly disposition and very moderate education. The army by its choice had foredoomed itself to dishonor; its excuse, pleads Ammianus, lay in the extreme urgency of the crisis. The Persians, learning of Julian's death and of the incapacity of his successor, pressed hard upon the retreating Romans; charges of the enemy's elephants broke the ranks of the legionaries while on the march, and when the army halted their entrenched camp was constantly attacked. Saracen horsemen took their revenge for Julian's

refusal to give them their customary pay by joining in these unceasing assaults. By way of Sumere, Charcha, and Dara the army retired, and then for four whole days the enemy harassed the rear-guard, always declining an engagement when the Romans turned at bay. The troops clamored to be allowed to cross the Tigris: on the further bank they would find provisions and fewer foes, but the generals feared the dangers of the swollen stream. Another two days passed—days of gnawing hunger and scorching heat. At last Sapor sent Surenas with proposals of peace. The king knew that Roman forces still remained in Mesopotamia and that new regiments could easily be raised in the Eastern provinces: desperate men will sell their lives dearly and diplomacy might win a less costly victory than the sword. Four days the negotiations continued, and then when suspense had become intolerable the Thirty Years' Peace was signed. All but one of the five satrapies which Rome under Diocletian had wrested from Persia were to be restored, Nisibis and Singara were to be surrendered, while the Romans were no longer to interfere in the internal affairs of Armenia.

“We ought to have fought ten times over”, cries the soldier Ammian, “rather than to have granted such terms as these!” But Jovian desired (by what means it mattered not) to retain a force which should secure him against rivals—Was not Procopius who, men said, had been marked out by Julian as his successor, at the head of an army in Mesopotamia? Thus the shameful bargain was struck, and the miserable retreat continued. To the horrible privations of the march were added Persian treachery and the bitter hostility of the Saracen tribesmen. At Thilsaphata the troops under Sebastianus and Procopius joined the army, and at length Nisibis was reached, the fortress which had been Rome's bulwark in the East since the days of Mithridates. The citizens prayed with tears that they might be allowed single-handed to defend the walls against the might of Persia; but Jovian was too good a Christian to break his faith with Sapor, and Bineses, a Persian noble, occupied the city in the name of his master. Procopius, who had been content to acknowledge Jovian, now bore the corpse of Julian to Tarsus for burial, and then, his mission accomplished, prudently disappeared. The army in Gaul accepted the choice of their eastern comrades, but Jovian's success was short-lived. In the depth of winter he hurried from Antioch towards Constantinople and with his infant son, Varronianus, assumed the consulship at Ancyra. At Dadastana he was found dead in his bedroom (16 Feb. 364), suffocated some said by the fumes of a charcoal stove.

Many versions of his death were current, but apparently no contemporary suspected other than natural causes. On his accession the Pagan party had looked for persecution, the Christians for the hour of their retaliation. But though the Christian faith was restored as the religion of the Empire, Jovian's wisdom or good nature triumphed and he issued an edict of toleration: he had thereby anticipated the policy of his successor.

## CHAPTER IV

### THE TRIUMPH OF CHRISTIANITY

THE old or official religions of Greece and of Rome had lost most of their power long before Constantine first declared that Christianity was henceforth to be recognized as a *religio licita* and then proceeded to bestow the Imperial favor on the faith which his predecessors had persecuted. Hellenism had destroyed their influence over the cultivated classes, and other religions, coming from the East, had captivated the masses of the people. If temples, dedicated to the gods of Olympus, were still standing open; if the time-honored rites were still duly and continuously celebrated; if the official priesthood, recognized and largely supported by the state, still performed its appointed functions; these things no longer compelled the devotion of the crowd. The Imperial cult of the *Divi* and *Divae* once so popular, had also lost its power to attract and to charm; the routine of ceremonial worship was still performed; the well-organized priesthood spreading all over the Empire maintained its privileged position; but crowds no longer thronged the temples, and the rites were neglected by the great mass of the population.

Yet this did not mean, as has often been supposed, the universal triumph of Christianity. It may almost be said that Paganism was never so active, so assertive, so combative, as in the third century. But this paganism, for long the successful rival of Christianity and its real opponent, was almost as new to Europe as Christianity itself. Something must be known about it and its environment ere the reaction under Julian and the final triumph of Christianity can be sympathetically understood.

During the earlier centuries of the Roman Empire the process of disintegration was completed which had begun with the conquests of Alexander the Great. Instead of a system of self-contained societies, solidly united internally and fenced off from all external social, political, and religious influences, which characterized ancient civilization, this age saw a mixing of peoples and a cosmopolitan society hitherto unknown.

If fighting went on continuously somewhere or other on the extended frontiers of the great Empire, peace reigned within its vast domains. A system of magnificent roads, for the most part passable all the year round, united the capitals with the extremities, from Britain and Spain on the west to the Euphrates on the east. The Mediterranean had been cleared of pirates, and lines of vessels united the great cities on its shores. Travelling, whether for business, health, or pleasure, was possible under the Empire with a certainty and a safety unknown in after centuries until the introduction of steam. It was facilitated by a common language, a coinage universally valid, and the protection of the same laws. Men could start from the Euphrates and travel onwards to Spain using one *lingua-franca* everywhere understood. Greek could be heard in the streets of every commercial town—in Rome, Marseilles, Cadiz, and Bordeaux, on the banks of the Nile, of the Orontes, and of the Tigris.

With all these things to favor it, the movements of peoples within the Empire had become incalculably great, and all the larger cities were cosmopolitan. Families from all lands, of differing religions and social habits, dwelt within the same walls. National, social, intellectual, and religious differences faded insensibly. Thinking became eclectic as it had never been before.

This growing community in habit of thought and even of religious belief was fed by something peculiar to the times. The soldier of many lands, the travelled trader, the tourist in search of pleasure, and the invalid wandering in quest of health were common then as now. But a special characteristic of the end of the third and the beginning of the fourth century was the widely wandering student, the teacher far from the land of his birth, and the itinerant preacher of new religions.

The Empire was well provided with what we should now call universities. Rome, Milan, and Cremona were seats of higher learning for Italy; Marseilles, Bordeaux, and Autun for Gaul; Carthage for North Africa; Athens and Apollonia for Greece; Tarsus for Cilicia; Smyrna for Asia; Beyrout and Antioch for Syria; and Alexandria for Egypt. The number of foreign students to be found at each was remarkable. Young Romans enrolled themselves at Marseilles and Bordeaux. Greeks crossed the seas to attend lectures at Antioch, and found as their neighbors men from Assyria, Phoenicia, and Egypt. At Alexandria the number of students from distant parts of the Empire exceeded largely those from the neighborhood. At Athens, whose schools were the most famous in the beginning of the fourth century, the crowds of Barbarians (for so the citizens called those foreign students) were so great that it was said that their presence threatened to spoil the purity of the language. Everywhere, in that age of wandering, the student seemed to prefer to study far from home and to flit from one place of learning to another.

Nor were the professors much different. They commonly taught far from their native land. Even at Athens it became increasingly rare to find a teacher who belonged by birth to Greece. They too travelled from one university seat to another. Lucian, Philostratus, Apuleius, all who portray the age and the class, describe their wanderings.

Missionaries of new cults went about in the same way. Bands of itinerant devotees, the prophets and priests of Syrian, Persian, possibly of Hindu cults, passed along the great Roman roads. Solitary preachers of Oriental faiths, with all the fire of missionary enthusiasm, tramped from town to town, drawn by an irresistible impulse to Rome, the centre of power, the protectress of the religions of her myriad subjects, the tribune from which, if a speaker could only ascend it, he might address the world. The end of the third and the beginning of the fourth century was an age of religious excitements, of curiosity about strange faiths, when all who had something new to teach about the secrets of the soul and of the universe, hawked their theories as traders their merchandise.

This mixture of peoples, this new cosmopolitanism, this hurrying to and fro of religious teachers, brought it about that Oriental faiths, at first only the religions of groups of families who had brought their cults with them into the West, made numerous converts and spread themselves over the Roman Empire. These Oriental religions prospered the more because from the middle of the third century onwards Rome was looking to the East for many things. From it came the deftest artisans and mechanics who gave to life most of its material comforts. It largely contributed to feed Rome with its grain. Its philosophy (for most of the greatest stoical thinkers were not Greeks but Orientals) gave the substructure to Roman Law; and the most famous Law School in the third, fourth, and fifth centuries was not in Rome but at Beyrout. Ulpian came from Tyre and Papinian from Syria. The greatest non-Christian thinkers of these centuries were neither Greeks nor Romans but Orientals. Plotinus was an Egyptian; Iamblichus, Porphyry, and Libanius were Syrians; Galen was an Asiatic. Oriental ideas were slowly changing Rome's political institutions themselves, and the *Princeps* of a Republic, as was Octavius, became, in the persons of Diocletian and Constantine, an Oriental monarch. Rome, by the discipline of its legions, by the mingled severity and generosity of its rule, by the justice of its legislation, had conquered the East. Eastern thought, wedded to Hellenism, was in its turn subjugating the Empire. Its religions had their share in the conquest.



Among those Oriental faiths which spread themselves over civilized Europe some were much more popular than others. All entered the Empire at an early date and won their way very slowly at first. Most of them seem to have made some alliance with the survivals of such Greek mysteries as those of Eleusis and of Dionysos. All of them, save that of Alithras, had been affected and to some extent changed by Hellenism before they entered into the full light of history in the beginning of the third century.

From Asia Minor came the worship of Cybele with its hymns and dances, its mysterious ideas of a deity dying to live again, its frenzies and trances, its soothsayings, and its blood-baths of purification and sanctification. From Syria came the cult of the Dea Syra, described by Lucian the skeptic, with its sacred prostitutions, its more than hints of human sacrifices, its mystics and its pillar saints. Persia sent forth the worship of Mithras, with its initiations, its sacraments, its mysteries, and the stern discipline which made it a favorite religion among the Roman legionaries. Egypt gave birth to many a cult. Chief among them was the worship of Isis. Before the end of the second century it had far outstripped Christianity and could boast of its thousands where the religion of the Cross could only number hundreds. It had penetrated everywhere, even to far-off Britain. A ring bearing the figure of the goddess' constant companion, the dog-headed Anubis, has been discovered in a grave in the Isle of Man. Votaries of Isis could be found from the Roman Wall to Land's End.

The worship of Isis may be taken as a type of those Oriental faiths before whose presence the official gods of Olympus were receding into the background. The cult had a body of clergy, highly organized, a book of prayers, a code of liturgical actions, a tonsure, vestments, and an elaborate impressive ceremonial. The inner circle of its devotees were called 'the religious', like the monks of the Middle Ages; those who were altogether outside the faith were termed 'pagans'; the service of the goddess was a 'holy war', and her worshippers of all grades were banded together in a 'militia'. Apuleius, himself converted to the faith, has, in his *Metamorphoses*, described its ceremonies of worship and enabled us to see how desires after a better life drew men like himself to reverence the deity and enroll himself among her followers. He has described, with a vividness that makes us see them, the stately processions which moved with deliberate pace through the crowded narrow streets of oriental towns, and drew after them to the temple many a hitherto unattached inquirer. We can enter the temple with him and listen to the solemn exhortation of the high-priest; hear him dwell upon the past sins and follies of the neophyte and the unfailing goodness and mercy of the goddess whose eyes had followed him through them all and who now waited to receive him if he truly desired to become her disciple and worshipper. The initiation was a secret rite and Apuleius is careful not to profane it by description; but we learn that there was a baptism, a fast of ten days, a course of priestly instruction, sponsors given to the neophyte, and, in the evening, a reception of the new brother by the congregation, when everyone greeted him kindly and presented him with some small gift. We can penetrate with him into the secret chamber reserved for the higher initiation where he was taught that he would endure a voluntary death which he was to look upon as the gateway into a higher and better life. We can dimly see him excited with wild anticipations, dizzy with protracted fasting, almost suffocated by surging vapors, blinded by sudden and unexpected flashes of light, undergo his hypnotic trance during which he saw unutterable things. "I trod the confines of death and the threshold of Proserpine; I was swept round all the elements and back again; I saw the sun shining at midnight in purest radiance; gods of heaven and gods of hell I saw face to face and adored in presence". We can understand how such an hypnotic trance marked a man for life.

Isis worship, humanized by Hellenism, extracted from the crude wild legends of Egypt the thought of a suffering and all-merciful Mother-Goddess who yearned to ease the woes of mankind. It raised the beast-gods of the Nile and the tales about them into emblems and parables. It captured the common man by its thaumaturgy. For the more cultured intelligences

it had a more sublime theology which appealed to the philosophy of the day. In all this it was a type, perhaps the best, of those Oriental cults which were permeating the Empire.

All those religions, whatever their special form of teaching or variety of cult, brought with them thoughts foreign to the old official worships of Greece and Rome; though not altogether strange to the Mysteries which had for long been the real people's religion in Greece nor to the cult of Dionysus which in various forms had preserved its vitality.

They taught (or perhaps it would be more correct to say that the action of the subtle Greek intellect, playing upon the crude ideas which these Oriental religions presented to it, evolved from them) a series of religious conceptions foreign to the old paganism, and these became common parts of the newer non-Christian intelligence which was powerful in the third and fourth centuries.

A sharp distinction, much more definite than anything previous, was drawn between the soul and the body. The soul belonged to a different sphere and was more estimable than the body. The former was the inhabitant of a higher and better world and was therefore immortal. The thoughts of individuality and personality became much clearer. In the same way the thoughts of Godhead as a whole and of the world as a whole—conceptions scarcely separate before—were distinguished more or less clearly. Godhead became what the world was not, and yet something good and great which was the primal basis of all things.

The earlier philosophical depreciation of the world of matter became more emphatic, and raised the question whether the creation of the whole material world and of the body which belonged to it was not after all a mistake; whether the body was not a prison or at least a house of correction in which the soul was grievously detained; whether the soul could ever become what it really was until it had undergone a deliverance from the body. Such deliverance was called salvation, and much practical thinking was expended on the proper means of effecting it. Might not knowledge and the means it suggested of living purely or with as little bodily contamination as possible while this life lasted, be the beginnings of entrance into the real and eternal life of the soul? Was it not most likely that souls had been *gradually* confined in bodies, and must not the process of delivery be gradual also? The *gradual Way of Return* to God became a feature in almost all those Eastern cults, by whatever means they sought to accomplish it.

Perhaps however the most novel thought was the conviction that something more than knowledge, beyond any means of living purely which human wisdom could suggest, something outside man and belonging to the sphere of *divinity*, was needed to start the soul on this gradual *Way of Return* and sustain his faltering footsteps along the difficult path. Contact with the Godhead was needed to save and redeem. Such contact was to be found in a consecration (*mysterium, sacramentum, initiation*) wherein the soul, in some hypnotic trance, was possessed by the deity who overpowered it and forever afterwards led it step by step along the path of salvation or *Way of Return*. Perhaps something more than any such consecration was needed; might not some surer way be found if only diligently sought for? It might be in one of the older cults whose inner meaning had never been rightly understood; or in some mystery not yet completely accessible; or in a divinely commissioned man who had not yet appeared. It might even be found within the soul itself, if men could only discover and use the true powers of the human soul (Higher Thought). At all events it was held that true religion really implied a detachment from the world, and included a strict discipline of soul and body while life lasted.

Such a paganism was very different from the polytheism with its furred, feathered, and scaly deities which first confronted Christianity and was attacked by the early Christian apologists. The later ones recognized its power. Firmicus Maternus, writing in the time of Constantine, dismisses with good-humored scorn the deities of Olympus and their myths, but criticizes with thorough earnestness the Oriental religions. It had, in spite of its external

multiformity, a natural cohesion in virtue of the circle of common thoughts above described. It hardly deserves the name of polytheism; for its idea of one abstract divinity, separate from the world of matter, made it monotheism of kind; and evidence shows that its votaries regarded Isis, Cybele, and the rest more as the representatives and impersonations of the one godhead than as individual deities. Inscriptions from tombstones reveal that worshippers did not attach themselves to one cult exclusively.

The varying forms of initiation were all separate methods of attaining to union with the one divinity, the different ceremonies of purification were all ways of reaching the same end, and, as one might succeed where another failed, they could be all tried impartially. Just as we find men and women in the beginning of the sixteenth century enrolling themselves in several religious associations of different kinds (witness Dr. Pfeffinger, a member of thirty-two religious confraternities), so in the third and fourth centuries members of both sexes were initiated into several cults and performed the lustrations prescribed by very different worships, in order to miss no chance of union with divinity and to leave no means of purification and sanctification untried. The tombstone of Vettius Agorius Praetextatus, the friend of Symmachus, who took part in the *Saturnalia* of Macrobius, records that he had been initiated into several cults and that he had performed the *taurobolium*. His wife, Aconia Paulina, was more indefatigable still. This lady, a member of the exclusive circle of the old pagan nobility of Rome, went to Eleusis and was initiated with baptism, fasting, vigil, hymn-singing into the several mysteries of Dionysus, of Ceres, and Koré. Not content with these, she went on to Lerna and sought communion with the same three deities in different rites of initiation. She travelled to Aegina, was again initiated, slept or waked in the porches of the small temples there in the hope that the divinities of the place in dream or waking vision might communicate to her their way of salvation. She became a hierophant of Hecate with still different and more dreaded rites of consecration. Finally, like her husband, she submitted herself to the dreadful, and to us disgusting, purification won in the *taurobolium*. A great pit was dug into which the neophyte descended naked; it was covered with stout planks placed about an inch apart; a young bull was led or forced upon the planks; it was stabbed by the officiating priest in such a way that the thrust was mortal and that the blood might flow as freely as possible. As the blood poured down on the planks and dripped into the pit the neophyte moved backwards and forwards to receive as much as possible of the red warm shower and remained until every drop had ceased to drip. Inscription after inscription records the fact that the deceased had been a *tauroboliatus* or a *tauroboliata*, hid gone through this blood-bath in search of sanctification. Evidence from inscriptions seems to show that in the declining days of paganism, the energy of its votaries drove them in greater numbers to accumulate initiations and to undergo the more severe rites of purification.

This multiform and yet homogeneous paganism had the further support of a system of philosophy expounded and enforced by the greatest non-Christian thinkers of the age. Neo-Platonism, the last birth of Hellenic thought, not without traces of Oriental parentage, has the look of a philosophy of hesitation and expectancy. It had lost the firm tread of Plato and Aristotle, and feared that the human intelligence unaided could not penetrate and explain all things. The intellectual faculty of man was reduced to something intermediate between mere sense perception and some vague intuition of the supernatural, and the whole energy of the movement was concentrated on discovering the means to follow out this intuition and to attain by it not only communion but union with what was completely and externally divine.

Its great thinker was Plotinus (d. 269). His disciples Porphyry (233-304) and Iamblichus (d. circa 330) made it the basis and buttress of paganism when it was fighting for its life against a conquering Christianity. If the Universe of things seen and unseen be an emanation from Absolute Being, the Primal Cause of all things, the fountain from which all existence flows and the haven to which everything that has reality in it will return when its cycle is

complete, then every heathen deity has its place in this flow of existence. Its cult, however crude, is an obscure witness to the presence of the intuition of the supernatural. The legends which have gathered round its name, if only rightly understood, are mystic revelations of the divine which permeates all things. Its initiations and rites of purification are all meant to help the soul on the same path of return by which it completes its cycle of wanderings. The new paganism can be represented to be the collected flower and fruit of all the older faiths presented and ready to satisfy the deeper desires of the spirit of man. Neo-Platonism could present itself as a naturalistic, rational polytheism, retaining all the old structures of tradition, of thought and of social organization.

The 'common man' was not asked to forsake the deities he was wont to reverence. The Roman was not required to despise the gods who, as his forefathers believed, had led them to the conquest of the world. The cultured Hellenist was taught to overstep, without disturbing, creeds which for him were worn out and to seek and find communion with the Divine which lies behind all gods. The very conjuror was encouraged to cultivate his magic. Pantheism, that wonder-child of thought and of the fantasy, included all within the wide sweep of its sheltering arms and made them feel the claim of a common kinship. Jesus Himself, had His followers allowed, might have had a place between Dionysus and Isis; but Christianity, which according to Porphyry had departed widely from the simple teaching of the mystic of Galilee, was sternly excluded from the Neo-Platonist brotherhood of religions. Its idea of a creation in time seemed irreligious to Porphyry; its doctrine of the Incarnation introduced a false conception of the union between God and the world; its teaching about the end of all things he thought both irreverent and irreligious; above all things its claim to be the one religion, its exclusiveness, was hateful to him. He was too noble a man (*philosophus nobilis*, says Augustine) not to sympathize with much in Christianity, and seems to have appreciated it more and more in his later writings. Still his opinion remained unchanged: "The gods have declared Christ to have been most pious; he has become immortal, and by them his memory is cherished. Whereas the Christians are a polluted set, contaminated and enmeshed in error". Christianity was the one religion to be fought against and if possible conquered.

What Neo-Platonism did theoretically the force of circumstances accomplished on the practical side. The Oriental creeds had not merely gained multitudes of private worshippers; they had forced their way among the public deities of Rome. Isis, Mithra, Sol Invictus, Dea Syra, the Great Mother, took their places alongside of Jupiter, Venus, Mars, etc., and the *Sacra peregrina* appeared on the calendar of public festivals. As most of these Oriental cults contained within them the monotheist idea it is possible that they might have fought for pre-eminence and each aspired to become the official religion of the Empire. But they all recognized Christianity to be a common danger, and M. Cumont has shown that this feeling united them and made them think and act as one.

Such was the paganism which faced Christianity in the fourth century—a marvelous mixture of philosophy and religion, not without grandeur and nobility of thought, feeling keenly the unity of nature, the essential kinship of man with the Divine, and knowing something of the yearning in man's heart for redemption and for communion with God. It was able to fascinate and enthrall many of the keenest intellects and loftiest natures of the time. It laid hold on Julian.

Christianity was the common opponent of all these cults. It had entered the field last and seemed easily outstripped in the race. In its beginning it was but a ripple on the surface of a Galilean lake. Now, in the fourth century, it had compelled Imperial recognition and alliance. In strength and in weakness its claim had been always the same. It was the *one*, the only true, the universal religion.

From its beginning it had never lacked at least a few wealthy and cultured adherents, but during the first two centuries the overwhelming majority of its converts had come from



the poorer classes—slaves, freedmen, laborers. It had early drawn upon itself the contempt of society and the hatred of the populace. It was held to be something inhuman. Its votaries were “the third race”. They had all the unsocial vices of the Jews and even worse vices of their own. Christians had appropriated the epithet flung at them in scorn. They were “the third race”, a peculiar people, separate from the rest of mankind, a nation by themselves.

The last decade of the second century witnessed the beginnings of a change. Men of all ranks and classes became converts—members of the Senatorial and Equestrian Orders, distinguished pleaders, physicians, officers in the army, officials in the civil service, judges, even governors of provinces. Their wives, sisters, and daughters accompanied or more frequently preceded them. Then the tone of society began to change, gradually and insensibly. Scorn and contempt gave place to feelings of toleration. Before the end of the third century no one gave credit to the old scandalous reproaches which had been flung at the followers of Jesus, even when an Emperor tried to revive them. Statesmen were compelled to consider the movement—not now because it affected a town or a province, but as something pervading the Empire. They found that it possessed two characteristic were enormous sources of strength—a peculiar power of assimilation and a compact organization.

From the first Christianity had proclaimed that the whole life of man belonged to it. This meant that everything that made man's life wider, deeper, fuller; whatever made it more joyous or contented; whatever sharpened the brain, strengthened and taught the muscles, gave full play to man's energies, could be taken up into and become part of the Christian life. Sin and foulness were sternly excluded; but, that done, there was no element of the Greco-Roman civilization which could not be appropriated by Christianity. So it assimilated Hellenism or the fine flower and fruit of Greek thought and feeling; it appropriated Roman law and institutions; it made its own the simple festivals of the common people. All were theirs; and they were Christ's and Christ was God's.

Then the Christian churches were compactly organized. Their polity had been a natural growth. Its power of assimilation had enabled Christianity to absorb what was best in Roman civil and temple organization, to exclude the worst elements of the bureaucracy, and to preserve much democratic popular life. Its local rulers belonged to the people they at once ruled and served. No over-centralization crushed the local and provincial life. Christian societies formed themselves into groups, more or less compact, and made use of the *synod* to effect the grouping. One common life throbbled through the network of synods. The feeling of brotherhood did not exhaust itself in sentiment. If one part were attacked all the others were swift to help. Nothing within the Empire save the army could compare with the compact organization of the Christian Church.

In the middle of the third century the Emperor and the Empire learnt to dread this organized force within their midst. The despised “third race” had become indeed a *nation* within the Empire. The first impulse was to exterminate what seemed to be a source of danger. One well-organized universal persecution followed another. From each Christianity emerged with sadly diminished numbers (for the lapsed were always a larger body than the martyrs), but with spirit unbroken and with organization intact and usually strengthened.

Constantine himself had watched the last, the most prolonged and relentless of all—that under Diocletian and his successors—and had marked its failure. From his entrance into public life he made it plain that, while his rivals clung to the method of repression, he had completely abandoned it. Christianity won toleration and then Imperial patronage.

It cannot have been difficult for Constantine to carry out his policy towards the Christian religion. We cannot ascertain the proportion of Christians to pagans at the close of the second decade of the fourth century, but it may be assumed that, when their organization is taken into account, they were able to control public opinion in the most populous and important provinces of the Empire. All he had to do “was to let the leading provinces have the

religion they desired”; the rest of the Empire would follow in their wake. He was content to adopt the principle of toleration; though for himself Christianity became more and more the one religion in which “crowning reverence is observed towards the holiest powers of heaven”. He probably carried the public opinion of the Empire with him. The paganism of the fourth century was for the most part quiet and desired only to be left in peace. Perhaps Ammianus Marcellinus, himself a pagan, expressed the general opinion of his co-religionists when he praised the Emperor Valentinian because he tolerated all creeds, gave no orders that any one divinity should be worshipped, and did not strive to bend the necks of his subjects to adore what he did.

The sons of Constantine changed all this. They proposed to destroy paganism by legislation. Their laws, doubtless, inflicted much injury on individual pagans, and, in the hands of such unprincipled Imperial sycophants as Paulus and Mercurius, were the pretexts for many executions, banishments, and confiscation of goods; but they remained inoperative in all the greater pagan centers. The worship of the gods went on as before in Rome, Alexandria, Heliopolis, and in many other cities. But they could not fail to irritate. If the laws were inoperative, they remained to threaten. Proposed destruction of temples and prohibition of heathen ceremonies meant in many cases the abandonment of the games and spectacles to which the careless multitude were strongly attached. Scholars saw in the advancing power of the Church the destruction of the old learning which gave its charm to their lives. Christianity itself, troubled by the meddling of the heads of the State, seemed to be rent in pieces by its controversies, to have lost its original purity and simplicity, and to have degenerated into “old-wife superstitions” (Ammianus). So wherever paganism abounded, and in places too where it only lingered, there was a general feeling of discontent ready to welcome the first signs of a reaction and eagerly listening to whispers that the last of the race of Constantine, if he lived to assume the Imperial purple, would undo what his kinsmen had accomplished.

At the death of Constantine his nephew, Flavius Claudius Julianus, was six years old. The child escaped, almost by accident, the massacre of his family connived at if not ordered by Constantius. He lived for more than twenty years in constant peril, in the power of that suspicious cousin who scarcely knew whether he wished to slay or to spare him. He was kept secluded, now in one or other of the great cities of the East, for long in a palace far from the haunts of men, solacing himself with hard uninterrupted studies. Then for seven brief years he startled the Roman world by his meteor-like career, and died from wounds received in battle against the Persians at the age of thirty-two. Two things about him filled the imagination of his contemporaries and have drawn the attention of succeeding generations: that he a recluse, suddenly snatched from his loved studies in poetry and philosophy, proved himself all at once not merely an intrepid soldier but a skilful general, and a born leader of men; and that he, a baptized Christian, who had actually been accustomed to read the lessons at public worship, threw off like a mask the Christianity he had professed and spent the last years of his short life in a feverish attempt to restore the old and expiring paganism. It is this last fact that made him the object of undying hate and unconquerable love to his contemporaries, and still excites the interest of mankind.

His own writings which have survived make it plain that from his earliest years he looked at Christianity and Christians through the blood-red mist of the massacre of his relations—father, brother, uncles, cousins. His education did little to remove the impression. The lonely, imaginative, lovable child had never known his mother's care, but he inherited her fondness for Homer, Hesiod, and the masters of Greek poetry. Mardonius, who had been his mother's tutor, was his also, and the boy went through the same course of study. The tutor was passionately fond of Greek literature and especially of Homer, and he imbued mother and son with his own tastes. For the rest he was something of a martinet. The young Julian had the

strictest moral training and never forgot those early lessons. He was taught to be temperate and self-restrained; to look with dislike on pantomimes, races, and the other more or less licentious amusements of the populace. His tutor made him read in Plato, Aristotle, Theophrastus, and other pagan moralists, and was unwearied in enforcing pure living after these examples of antiquity. Julian was all his life a puritan pagan, and this puritanism of his was perhaps his greatest obstacle in accomplishing the task to which he subsequently dedicated himself. He never entered a theatre save when he was commanded to do so by the Emperor, and was seldom on a race-course in his life. He was naturally a dreamy, sensitive child, full of yearning fancies, which he kept to himself. He tells us that from early boyhood he felt a strange elevation of soul when he watched the sun and saw it dispensing light and heat; that he worshipped the stars and understood their whispered thoughts. He was filled with enthusiasm for everything Greek and the very word Hellas sent a thrill through him when he pronounced it. Seven years were spent under the care of the kindly, stern preceptor, and the impress they made was lasting.

In 344 Constantius suddenly sent Julian into obscurity. His elder brother, Gallus, who had escaped the massacre of 337 because he was so sickly that he was not expected to live, accompanied him. They were sent to Macellum, a palace in a remote part of Cappadocia—splendid enough with its baths, its springs, and its gardens, but which Julian looked upon as a prison. There he was supplied with teachers in abundance, Christian clergy who were supposed to teach the faith to the young princes, and from whose instructions Julian doubtless acquired that superficial knowledge of the Scriptures he afterwards showed that he possessed. Books were granted him, and he seems to have been permitted to send to Alexandria for what Greek literature he desired. He mentions specially volumes from the library of Bishop George because, along with many treatises on Christianity for which he did not care, they included the writings of philosophers and rhetoricians. But he bitterly complained that neither he nor his brother were allowed to see any suitable companions, and he believed that all their attendants were imperial spies. The boy, reserved before, shrank further into himself. Outwardly he was a pattern of devotion. He received Christian instruction; was taught the “evidences of Christianity” and used the knowledge later to expose its weaknesses; was trained to give alms, to observe fasts, to venerate the shrines of saints to the extent of aiding to build them with his own hands; and occasionally to officiate as reader at public worship. Privately he fed his mind on the lessons of Mardonius and studied such books of philosophy and rhetoric as he could command. Ammianus Marcellinus, who knew him well, says that from his early years he felt attracted to the worship of the gods.

After six years in the gilded prison of Macellum the brothers were summoned to Constantinople—Gallus to be made Caesar or Vice-Emperor, to misgovern frightfully the province entrusted to his care, and in consequence to meet a not undeserved death, though to his brother it was another crime to be charged against Constantius, a Christian and the murderer of kinsmen; Julian to meet soon the supreme moment of his religious life. He was set at first to pursue his studies in the capital city and the scholar appointed to take charge of him was Hecebolius, the fourth century Vicar of Bray, whose religion was always that of the reigning Emperor. But too many admiring eyes followed the princely student, and Constantius ordered him to Nicomedia, the centre of the cultured paganism of the East and the home of its acknowledged leader, the great rhetorician Libanius. Julian had promised not to attend the lectures of Libanius; he kept his pledge in the letter and broke it in the spirit. He got notes written out for him and pored over them day and night. But more important than all lectures was the intercourse with men such as he had never met before. At Nicomedia, Julian first came in touch with those for whom the old gods were living, who had the gift of “seers”, to whom prophecies and prodigies were matters of fact. He saw and conversed with men who “had easy access to the ears of the gods”, who could “command winds, waves, and

earthquakes”. He knew Aedesius who was said to receive oracles from the deities by night, and whose wife Sosipatra had “lived from girlhood amid prodigies of all kinds”. He was told of the wonderful séances presided over by Maximus and of the marvels which occurred at them. This Maximus was one of the most celebrated theurgics or “mediums” of fourth century Neo-Platonism. His favorite occupation, he said, was to live in constant communion with the gods. He had long white hair, brilliant magnetic eyes, and his disciples boasted that his influence was irresistible over all those with whom he came in contact. Eusebius of Myndus, also a Neo-Platonist, told Julian of his powers. “He made a number of us descend into the temple of Hecate. There he saluted the goddess. Then he said: ‘Be seated, friends, see what happens, then judge whether I am not superior to most men’. We all sat down. He burnt a grain of incense and chanted a whole hymn in a low voice. The statue began to smile, then to laugh. We were afraid at the sight. ‘Do not be alarmed,’ he said, ‘you will see that the lamps which the goddess holds in her hands will light of themselves.’ As he spoke the light streamed from the lamps”.

Julian eagerly begged to be introduced to the man who was so powerful with the gods, and Maximus was even more ready to gain one who stood so near the Imperial throne. No accounts survive of the spiritualistic séances at which he assisted; but their effect on the nervous, sensitive young man was irresistible. Maximus converted him heart and soul to the new paganism and was the confidential adviser of Julian from that time onwards. The young man entered into a new life. The religion which Homer and Hesiod had sung, which Plato and Aristotle had speculated upon, which he had known as a student from books, became all at once living to him. His day-dreams of the past vanished, or rather changed into an actual present. The passion for Greece which had gradually grown to be the ruling force in his character had now the support of every-day experience. The gods sung by the old Greek poets, and many a passionate Oriental deity unknown to them, could be seen and their presence felt. He could himself have communion with them through mysterious rites of divination. They had created the noblest thing on earth, Greek civilization; they were even now molding and controlling events; they could give courage and inspiration to their votaries. From his sojourn at Nicomedia onwards, Julian believed that all his actions were determined by divine voices which he heard and obeyed. This natural religion was not the crude polytheism his Christian teachers had said. Hellenism had made it a unity. A great First Cause, the Father and King of all men, had parceled out the lands and peoples among the deities, His viceroys. They were the real rulers of provinces and cities and governed them according to their natural habits and dispositions. What was Christianity when compared with this ancient and universal worship, supported by the wealth of civilization which had come down from the past? It was a cult of barbarian origin, born in an obscure province, ignorant of Hellenic culture, its very Scriptures written in a barbarous Greek offensive to the ears of elicited men. Was Greece to abdicate in favor of Galilee? Perish the thought! So Julian believed, and longed to steep himself in Hellenism at its purest source—the Schools at Athens.

He gained his wish through the sisterly kindness of the Empress Eusebia. At Athens, as at all the schools of higher learning, the majority of the teachers were pagans, and Julian with more than his usual eagerness devoted himself to their lectures and to all the benefits of the place. “He was continually seen surrounded by crowds of youths, old men, philosophers, and rhetoricians”. Outwardly he was still a Christian, for his life depended on his conformity to the Imperial creed; but inwardly he had consecrated himself heart and soul to paganism, had already “became conscious that he had a divine mission, and that he was a favorite of the gods. The double life he had to live, the knowledge that he was surrounded by spies ready to report anything compromising to his Imperial cousin, must have acted upon his naturally nervous and emotional temperament and betrayed itself in many outward ways”. His portrait



drawn by a fellow-student, Gregory of Nazianzus, though the work of an enemy, needs only a little toning down—twitching shoulders, eyes glancing from side to side, something conceited in nostrils and face, feet that were never still, hasty laugh, sentences begun and never finished, irrelevant answers. Julian had more to do at Athens than study philosophy; he had to penetrate to the centre of Greek religion. He was secretly initiated into the ancient mysteries of Eleusis; and there are hints of other initiations either there or afterwards—of the worship of Mithras, of the purifying rite of the *taurobolium*.

Constantius was childless—the punishment of the gods whose temples he had despoiled, said the pagans; a retribution for the slaughter of his kinsmen, his own conscience sometimes whispered. The needs of the Empire demanded assistance. It is hard to say whether the Emperor or the student was the more unwilling, the one to summon and the other to obey the call. Julian was ordered to Milan where the Court was. He was made Caesar, was married to Helena, the Emperor's sister, and sent to Gaul to protect the province from invading Germans. The recluse bookworm, the man whose emotional nature had succumbed without suspicion to the suggestions of spiritualist séances, was suddenly confronted with one of the hardest tasks that practical life could offer. He had to restore a half-ruined province and to overcome an enemy grown bold by success. He was totally ignorant of the arts of war and of administration. It need not cause surprise that he proved an intrepid soldier. He was the last of a race of warriors, and the blood spoke. His studies had taught him the need of concentration and thoroughness; he set himself to learn and speedily mastered the elements of drill and discipline. But what the world did wonder at was that, hampered as he was by the assistants whom the jealousy of the Emperor had forced upon him, he showed himself a general who defeated his foes as much by strategy as by fighting.

The Germans had been driven back; the administration of Gaul was improved and its finances reformed, when the legions, irritated at commands from the distant Emperor, mutinied and called upon their general to assume the purple (Jan. 360). After long hesitation Julian consented. It meant civil war. But the gods encouraged him, his mission called him, the soldiers rallied round him, and he marched against Constantius.

There was no battle. Constantius died before the armies met, and Julian became sole ruler over the Roman Empire.

During the whole of Julian's five years' stay in Gaul he publicly professed the Christian religion which privately he had repudiated. He allowed his name to be attached to the persecuting edicts of Constantius, while in secret he began the day with a prayer to Hermes. His dissimulation went the length of joining with Constantius in threatening anyone with torture who took part in the very ceremonies of divination which he himself was all the while practicing in private. The only trace of his real feelings is that no Christian emblems appear on the coins which he struck in Gaul. This double life did not cease—when he assumed the purple. He ostentatiously joined in the public devotions of the people during the festival of Epiphany (361), while in private he was practicing all manner of secret incantations and divinations aided by an adept in the mysteries of Eleusis. It may be that he waited until he was sure of the sympathies of the army. He seems to have taken care that most of the soldiers who followed him from Gaul were pagans; and that the Christian troops were left behind to guard the province. At all events it was not until he reached Sirmium on the lower Danube, where the magistrates, citizens, and soldiers received him with acclamations, that he declared himself a pagan, and could write to Maximus: “We worship the gods openly; most of the soldiers who follow me reverence them! We have thanked the gods in the sight of men with many hecatombs”. He entered Constantinople a professed pagan, believing himself commissioned by the gods to restore the ancient religion, a Dionysus and a Hercules in one, the prophet and king of a pagan revival.

In his treatment of Christianity he believed that he showed impartiality and refrained from persecution, and, if due allowance be made for his private hatred of those whom he contemptuously called Galileans, it is possible to believe that he was sincere in his professions.

His first act was to issue an edict permitting all bishops, exiled by Constantius for their attachment to the Nicene theology, to return and resume possession of their confiscated property but not their sees. More than once the leaders, clerical and laic, of the various parties into which Christianity was then divided, were summoned to his palace and told that they were at liberty to follow and advocate any form of belief they pleased. Ammianus Marcellinus, himself a pagan and a devoted admirer of Julian, declares that the Emperor did this in the firm belief that the Christians were so thoroughly divided that this liberty would end in their destroying each other by their mutual quarrels. If so the intention shows how little Julian understood the faith he despised. The bishops who had thronged the antechambers of Constantius and used backstairs intrigues against their rivals were very poor specimens of Christianity. The freedom of discussion which Julian permitted, the absence of Imperial interference, were the means of uniting not destroying the Church.

The greater part of the Emperor's edicts against Christianity were undoubtedly meant by him to make restitution to paganism and to the State of property and privileges which had been wrongly bestowed. The churches were commanded to restore the temple-sites and lands which had been given them for ecclesiastical purposes. If churches had been erected they were ordered to be demolished and the temples rebuilt at the expense of the Christians. The clergy and Christian poor had been granted sums of money from municipal treasuries; and these grants were to cease. Constantine's legislation had given to the Christian clergy privileges enjoyed by the heathen priesthood. To Julian's mind paganism was the religion of the State and alone it carried privileges with it. So the special laws guaranteeing to the Church rights of inheritance, and laws exempting the clergy from personal taxation and freeing them from the obligation to serve on municipal councils, were abrogated. Ammianus Marcellinus probably expresses the popular opinion when he declares that this legislation, however just in theory, was harsh in practice from its cumulative weight and the haste with which it was enforced.

No edict of Julian's excited the indignation of the Christians so thoroughly as that upon education. It enacted that no Christian was to be allowed to teach in schools where the literature of Greece and Rome formed the basis of education; that all teachers must expound and insist upon the religion of the authors studied; but that Christian children might attend the schools. Perhaps the Emperor's reasons for his legislation increased their wrath; for pedantry is more irritating than force, and Julian's pedantic nature is displayed in his reasonings. "Homer, Hesiod, Demosthenes, Thucydides, Isocrates, Lysias, all founded their learning on the gods. Did not some of them believe themselves to be consecrated to Hermes and others to the muses? It seems therefore absurd to me that those who explain their works should not worship the gods they revered". He did not like to remember that Mardonius, his own honored teacher, had been a Christian. His fixed idea was that Christianity could have no connection with Hellenic thought or civilization, that its affectation of interest in ancient Greek literature was hypocrisy, and that it was his duty as ruler to keep men from occasions of practicing such a vice. From one point of view the edict seemed to affect the Christians but slightly. They had long been accustomed to send their children to schools in which the most famous teachers were pagans; but now they believed that the Emperor desired to use all the public schools throughout the Empire for proselytizing purposes. In the end this edict did more good than harm to Christianity. It showed in a striking way both the steadfastness and the resources of the Christians. The two most distinguished Christian teachers, Prohaeresius of Athens and C. Marius Victorinus of Rome, at once resigned their appointments. The former

was the most esteemed teacher in the East, Libanius only excepted. Julian did his utmost to win him over to paganism. When he remained firm, the Emperor offered to make him an exception to his rule; but the Christian refused to accept any concession which was not to be shared by his humbler brethren. Christian teachers all over the East assiduously devoted themselves to acquire the elegancies of the Greek tongue and to write school-books in that language which could serve as substitutes for the authors they were forbidden to use.

The Emperor naturally abolished the *Labarum*, and changed all other Christian into pagan emblems. He permitted, encouraged, the worship of his statues; he purged the Praetorian guard (not the whole army) of Christians. He also dismissed from his service all Christian attendants, and endeavoured to make the civil service completely pagan.

At least one distinguished Christian had little cause to thank Julian for his toleration, and his treatment of Athanasius almost suggests that the Emperor felt that the great bishop was the opponent from whom his plans had most to fear. On Julian's edict restoring to their homes and properties Christian bishops who had been banished by Constantius, Athanasius naturally returned to Alexandria and was warmly welcomed by his people. Julian was indignant. He insisted that his edict had not authorized the banished bishops to resume their ecclesiastical work, and ordered Athanasius to be sent away from the city and then from Egypt. "By all the gods", he wrote to the governor of Egypt, "nothing could give me more pleasure than that thou should expel from every corner of Egypt that criminal Athanasius, who has dared, during my reign, to baptize Greek wives of illustrious citizens. He must be persecuted".

Julian's efforts to restore and put new life into paganism are much more interesting than his attempts to damage Christianity. He called the religion he had so fervently adopted Hellenism, and his co-religionists Hellenes: Christianity was a barbarian cult, its supporters Galileans.

But in reality the Christianity of the fourth century had absorbed much of what was best and most enduring in Hellenism; while the religion of Julian drew more of its contents from Oriental than from Hellenist sources. One cult into which he had been initiated and which he greatly esteemed, Mithraism, was the only one of those Oriental religions which seems to have been entirely unaffected by Hellenist thought.

The religion which Julian attempted to force on the Empire was a mosaic of decadent philosophy, bloody sacrifices, rituals old and new, 'spiritualism', and divinations of all sorts. Its piety came from the cult of the Mysteries. It contained so much that was new that it was much more an attempted reconstruction or reformation than a revival of paganism.

Julian was quick to see that no religion could be universally accepted which had not behind it some common stable truths, and that Christianity had gained enormously from that compact system of doctrine which it had laboriously built up during the three centuries of its existence. If critics, like Celsus, had made capital out of the intellectual differences within Christianity, paganism was in a worse case. Heathenism had no basis of intellectual certainty; it had no universally accepted or acknowledged system of doctrine. If pagan philosophy were appealed to, it was anything but an harmonious system—one teacher said one thing only to be refuted by another. The *Hermotimus* of Lucian had somewhat wickedly shown that the opinions of philosophy were as various as the thinkers were numerous. But the philosophic thinking of the age of Julian was eclectic, and Neo-Platonism was supposed to reconcile all sorts of opinions. By ignoring some and rounding off the sharp corners of others it might be plausibly made out that all philosophies really meant to say the same things if they were only rightly understood. So Julian went to Neo-Platonism for the intellectual basis or dogmatic theology of his new catholic State Religion. His philosophical acumen was by no means equal to that of his masters and he modestly confessed it. Iamblichus had taught him all that he knew, and that philosopher, in the opinion of Julian, had so explored the heights and depths of

human and divine thought that nothing remained for any man save to accept his conclusions. The Neoplatonic thought of a Trinity of existence took the central place of the Christian in this new pagan theology.

Three worlds exist. First and highest is the realm of pure ideas where the Supreme Principle, the One, the Highest Good, the Great First Cause, lives and reigns. Below it is the intellectual world over which presides the same Supreme Principle, but now represented by an emanation from Itself, wholly spiritual, the Logos of the Platonic philosophy. The third is the world of sense existence, the universe of things seen and handled, and there, as befits its surroundings, the ruler, the emanation from the Supreme Principle, assumes a visible form and can be seen while

The 'common man', of course, could not be expected to understand or care for such high matters; but pagan philosophy had never thought much of the 'common man' (which was its weakness), and he had always the gods nearest him to worship in that instinctive way which was alone possible for an intelligence such as his. Yet Julian, with more sympathetic feeling for his needs than most pagan-thinkers, made provision that even he should be taught the underlying unity and catholicity of his ancestral faith. Just as in Christianity, Jesus was the revealer of the Father, and men were taught to see the One Supreme God in the Son Incarnate, the Mediator, so Julian called on all men to see in the great orb of day the visible Manifestation of the Supreme Principle, the First Cause, Who has begotten him and placed him in the heavens, the medium through which He dispenses His benefits throughout the universe of men and things. Even Christians, Julian thinks, might come to see this if their minds were not so darkened. They believe in Jesus, whom neither they nor their fathers have ever seen; but they do not believe that the God Helios is the true revealer of God, Helios whom the whole human race from the beginning of time has seen and has honored as their munificent and potent benefactor, Helios the living animated beneficent image of the Supreme Father, Who is exalted above all the powers of reason. Man has body as well as soul, he has senses as he has capacities for intellectual thinking, therefore he needs visible gods to represent the gods invisible whom the Supreme Principle has sent forth from Himself and who suit the religious needs not merely of the different nations and tribes of mankind but also of the various divisions of men such as shopkeepers, tax-gatherers, dancers, etc. These thousands of deities are all in their places representatives of the One Supreme Principle, Who has sent them forth and on Whom they depend. The sun among the stars is an emblem of this divine unity in diversity.

Having thus demonstrated, as he believed, by exhortations and treatises, the unity which underlay the surface diversity of polytheism, Julian gave full scope to his desire to honor every manifestation of the one Supreme Principle, and to make use of every means whereby man could both show his reverence for and seek communion with the divine. His first care was to make it clear to all that the worship of the old gods was to be the privileged cult. Bishops were banished from the antechambers and audience halls of the palace and in their stead came pagan priests and Neoplatonic philosophers—chief among them being Maximus the 'medium'. The Emperor was unwearied in issuing decrees that all the ancient temples were to be thrown open and that the ceremonies of all the ancient cults were to be duly performed. It might be said that he converted his palace into a temple—so determined was he that every heathen festival should be observed and every detail of appropriate rite and sacrifice duly attended to—and it was said that his knowledge of the various rituals surpassed that of the priests themselves. His devotion to the whole sacrificial system of paganism has been recorded both by enemies and friends. We are told of one solemn sacrifice at which the victims included one hundred bulls, rams, sheep, and goats, as well as innumerable white birds from land and sea. He issued minute directions about the number of the sacrifices which were to be offered by day and by night in the reopened temples. He wished that all the old



gods should be invoked—Saturn, Jupiter, Apollo, Mars, Pluto, Bacchus, Silenus, Aesculapius, Castor and Pollux, Rhea, Juno, Minerva, Latona, Venus, Hecate, the Muses, etc., etc.; but personally, like the pagans of the age he lived in, he was more devoted to the deities of Oriental origin—to the Attis cult, to Mithras, and most of all to Isis and Serapis. Dionysus, whose cult had many of the Oriental characteristics, seems to have been his most favored among the gods of Greece.

The office of Pontifex Maximus was an Imperial prerogative and the one most prized by Julian. He was unwearied in the performance of all the duties it required and he used it in his attempt to create that Catholic Pagan State Church. The very conception is decisive proof that Julian aimed, not at the revival but at a thorough reconstruction of paganism. He had the thought of a great independent spiritual community, wide as the Empire—a community so holy and separated that men and women who abandoned Christianity could only be admitted into it after the performance of prescribed purifying rites. This community was to be ruled over by a priesthood set apart for the service and forming a graded hierarchy. At the head of all was the Pontifex Maximus; next came pagan metropolitans or the high-priests of provinces; under them were high-priests who had rule over the temples and priests within the districts assigned to them. It is improbable that Julian had completed the hierarchical organization of the Empire before his death, but large parts of the East had been put in order. We have some briefs which he, as supreme pontiff, sent down to his metropolitans in which he regulated many things from the dress and morals of the clergy to the training of temple choirs—so minute was the interference of the Pontifex Maximus. Now it is possible that one form of paganism, the Imperial cult, had been strictly organized in the West and its provincial priests may have had some jurisdiction over the ministers of other cults; Maximin Daza had attempted to do something similar in the East; but the attempt to gather every cult of polytheism into one organized communion was not merely new, it was a startling novelty. Julian's conception of a pagan priesthood entirely devoted to the service of religion was certainly not Hellenist; nor was it Roman; it was Oriental; the cults of Egypt, of Syria, and of Asia had separated priesthoods. It was a new thing to be introduced into a universal State Church whose religion called itself Hellenism.

Julian thought a great deal about this priesthood of his and recognized its supreme importance for the reformation he dreamt of making. As the priest, from the office he fills, ought to be an example to all men, he should be selected with care — if possible a man of good family, neither very rich, nor very poor; but the indispensable qualifications are that he loves God and his neighbor. Love to God may be tested by observing whether the members of his family attend the temple services with regularity (Julian was very indignant when he discovered that the wives and daughters of some pagan priests were actually Christians), and love to one's neighbor by charity to the poor. Julian further insisted that the priest must be careful about what he reads. He is to shun all lascivious writings such as the old comedies or the contemporary erotic novels. He is to be equally circumspect in his conduct. He must not go to the theatre, nor to spectacles, and is not to frequent wine-shops. He is not to consort with actors nor to admit them to his house, he is even recommended not to accept too many invitations to dinner. On the other hand he is to see that he is master within his temple. He is to wear within it gorgeous vestments in honor of the gods whom he serves; but outside the sanctuary, when he mingles with men, he is to wear the ordinary dress. He is not to permit even the commander of the forces or the governor of the province to enter the temple with ostentation. He is to know the service thoroughly and to be able to repeat all the divine hymns. Occasionally he is to deliver addresses on philosophical subjects for the instruction of the multitude.

Julian also desired that the priests should organize schemes of charitable relief, more especially for the poor who attend the temple services. He thought that some such widely

organized scheme might help to counteract the popularity of the *Galileans*. He seems also to have contemplated the institution of religious communities of men and women vowed to a life of chastity and meditation—another proof that his so-called Hellenism was based much more on Oriental religions than on those of Greece.

The Emperor in all this legislation or advice was at pains to declare that he was acting, not as Emperor, but as “Pontifex Maximus of the religion of my country”.

One feature of Julian’s attempt to make the worship of the gods the universal and privileged religion of the Empire is too characteristic of the age to be entirely passed over. In the opening pages of this chapter, in which the living paganism of the third and fourth centuries is briefly described, it is shown that the old official worships of Greece and Rome lingered as mere simulacra and that the real religious life of the times was fed by Oriental faiths which had introduced such thoughts as redemption, salvation, purification, the *Way of Return*, etc. It is not too much to say that whatever of the old pagan piety remained in the middle of the fourth century had attached itself to the worship of the Mysteries; and that pious men, if educated, looked on the different initiations and rites of purification taught in the various cults to be ways of attaining the same redemption, or finding the same Way of Return. Julian belonged to his age. He was a pure-hearted and deeply pious man. His piety was in a real sense heart religion, and, like that of his contemporaries, clothed itself in the cult of the Mysteries; while his nervous, sensitive character inclined him personally to the theurgic or magical side of the cult, and especially to what reproduced the old Dionysiac ecstasy. Hence the dominating thought in Julian's mind was to reform the whole public worship of paganism by impregnating it with the real piety and heart religion of the Mysteries cult. The one thing really reactionary in the movement he contemplated was the return to the worship of the old official deities, but he proposed to attempt this in a way which can only be called revolutionary. He endeavored to put life into the old rituals by bringing to their aid and quickening them with that sincere fervor which the Mysteries cult demanded from its votaries. This is what makes Julian such an interesting figure in the history of paganism; while it in part accounts for his complete failure to do what he attempted. He tried to unite two things which had utterly separate roots, whose ideals were different, and which could not easily blend. For the religion of the Mysteries was essentially a private cult, into which men and women were received, one by one, by rites of initiation which each had to pass through personally, and, when admitted, they became members of coteries, large or small, of like-minded persons. They had entered because their souls had craved something which they believed the initiations and purifications would give. It was a common saying among them that as sickness of the body needed medicine, so the sickness of the soul required those rites to which they submitted. What had this to do with the courteous recognition due to bright celestial beings which was the central thought of the official religion of Greece, or the punctilious performance of ceremonies which was believed to propitiate the sterner deities of Rome? Mysteries and participation in their rites may exist along with a belief in the necessity and religious value of the public services of a state religion; but whenever the latter can only be justified, even by its own votaries, on the ground of traditional and patriotic propriety, Mystery worship may take its place but can never quicken it. When the whole piety of paganism disappeared in the Mysteries cult, it estranged itself from the national and official religion; and the Mysteries could never be used to recall the gods of Olympus for whose banishment they had been largely responsible

No edicts of an Emperor could change the bright deities of Olympus into saviours, or transform their careless votaries into men who felt in their hearts the need of redemption and a way-of return. Yet that was what Julian had to do when he proposed to impregnate the old official worship with the fervor of the Mysteries cult. It was equally in vain to think that the Mysteries cult, which owed its power to its spontaneity, to its independence, to its

individuality, could be drilled and organized into the national religion of a great Empire. It was a true instinct that led Julian to see that the real and living pagan piety of his generation had taken refuge within the circles of the Mysteries, and that the hope of paganism lay in the spread of the fervor which kindled their votaries; his mistake lay in thinking that it could be used to requicken the official worship. It would have been better for his designs had he acted as did Vettius Agorius Praetextatus, the model of genuine pagan piety in the Roman senatorial circle (*princeps religiosorum*, Macrobius calls him). Praetextatus contented himself with a dignified and cool recognition of the official deities of Rome but sought outlet for his piety elsewhere, in initiations at Eleusis and other places and in the purifying rite of the *taurobolium*. The sentimental side of Julian's nature led him astray. He could not forget his early studies in Homer and Hesiod (he quotes Homer as frequently and as fervently as a contemporary Christian does the Holy Scriptures) and he had to introduce the gods of Olympus somewhere. He tried to unite the passionate Oriental worships with the dignified Greek and the grave Roman ceremonies where personal faith was superfluous. The elements were too incongruous.

In spite of all the signs of a reaction against Christianity Julian failed; and for himself the tragedy of his failure lay in the apathy of his co-religionists. In spite of his elaborate treatise against Christianity and his other writings; notwithstanding his public orations and his private persuasions, Julian did not succeed in making many converts. We hear of no Christians of mark who embraced Hellenism, save the rhetorician Hecebolius and Pegasus, a bishop with a questionable past. The Emperor boasted that his Hellenism made some progress in the army, but at his death the legions selected a Christian successor.

It is almost pathetic to read Julian's accounts of his continual disappointments. He could not find in "all Cappadocia a single man who was a true Hellenist". They did not care to offer sacrifice, and those who did so, did not know how. In Galatia, at Pessinus where stood a famous temple erected to the Great Mother, he had to bribe and threaten the inhabitants to do honor to the goddess. At Beroea he harangued the municipal council on the duty of worshipping the gods. "They all warmly praised my discourse", he says somewhat sadly, "but none were convinced by it save the few who were convinced before hearing". So it was wherever he went. Even pagan admirers like Ammianus Marcellinus were rather bored with the Emperor's Hellenism and thought the whole thing a devout imagination not worth the trouble he wasted on it. The senatorial circle at Rome had no sympathy with Julian's Hellenic revival. No one showed any enthusiasm but the narrow circle of Neo-Platonist sophists, and they had no influence with the people.

Yet Julian's attempt to stay the progress of Christianity and to drive back the tide which was submerging the Empire, was, with all its practical faults, by far the ablest yet conceived. It provided a substitute and presented an alternative. The substitute was pretentious and artificial, but it was probably the best that the times could furnish. Hellenism, Julian called it; but where in that golden past of Hellas into which the Imperial dreamer peered, could be found a puritan strictness of conduct, a prolonged and sustained religious fervor, and a religion independent of the State? The three strongest parts of his scheme had no connection with Hellenism. Religions may be used, but cannot be created by statesmen, unless they happen to have the prophetic fire and inspiration—and Julian was no prophet. He may be credited with seizing and combining in one whole the strongest anti-Christian forces of his generation—the passion of Oriental religion, the patriotic desire to retain the old religion under which Greece and Rome had grown great, the glory of the ancient literature, the superstition which clung to magic and divinations, and a philosophy which, if it lacked independence of thought, at least represented that eclecticism which was the intellectual atmosphere which all men then breathed. He brought them together to build an edifice which was to be the temple of his Empire. But though the builder had many of the qualities which go

to make a religious reformer—pure in heart and life, full of sincere piety, manly and with a strong sense of duty—the edifice he reared was quite artificial, lacked the living principle of growth, and could not last. Athanasius gave its history in four words when he said “It will soon pass”. The world had outgrown paganism.

Whatever faults the Christianity of the time exhibited, whatever ills had come to it from Imperial patronage and conformity with the world, it still retained within it the original simplicity and profundity of its message. Nothing in its environment could take that from it. It proclaimed a living God, Who had made man and all things and for Whom man was made. That God had manifested Himself in Jesus Christ and the centre of the manifestation was the Passion of our Lord—the Cross. Whatever special meanings attach themselves to the intellectual apprehension of this manifestation, it contains two plain thoughts which can be grasped as easily by the simplest as by the most cultured intelligence, and was therefore universal as no previous religion had ever been. It gave a new revelation of God—a personal Deity, whose chiefest manifestation was a sympathy with all who were beneath Him and a yearning to deliver them at all costs to Himself. It gave, at the same time, a new revelation of man, made in the image of God and therefore capable of a far-off imitation; his life no longer ruled by the precepts of a calculating utilitarianism nor curbed by a statutory morality, freed from the chains of all taboos and rituals, inspired by the one principle “You shall love thy neighbour as yourself”, and this thought made vivid by the vision of a pure active Divine Life which spent itself in the service of mankind.

Some of the Oriental religions, notably those of Mithras and Isis, were groping after this idea of “brother man”; the Imperial world was, in a vague way, advancing towards it; but the Cross of Christ showed its highest and clearest manifestation. Therefore Christianity teaching that every follower of Christ, in so far as he was really a disciple, should imitate the Master, could set the stamp of the Cross on every portion of human life and on every social institution. It was the religion of the Cross, the religion whose watchword was "brother man." It was therefore universal and to it the future belonged.

If such things can be dated, the death of Julian marks the triumph of Christianity in the Roman world, eastern and western. The exclamation, “Galilean, you has conquered”, is a fable which clothes a fact. Yet it would be a grave mistake to say that paganism disappeared suddenly either from the East or from the West.

In the East it never recovered its position as a state religion, but it existed as a private cult practiced by not inconsiderable proportion of the people. It did not offer the strenuous resistance to Imperial anti-pagan legislation which was to be seen in the West. The number of Christians had always been much larger and it is more than probable that many of the laws against pagans were supported by public opinion. Julian’s immediate successors practiced a policy of toleration for all religions, and contented themselves with professing and favoring Christianity. It was the religion of the Imperial household and of the great majority of the population—nothing more. Pagans lived on free to worship what divinities they pleased. Even when Valens and emperors who came after him renewed and enforced laws against pagan worship no traces are to be found of anything like a general persecution. Accusations were listened to and procedure taken against numbers of wealthy persons in the hope of filling the Imperial treasury; but the mass of the people remained untouched. Whole districts, which were notoriously poor, were exempted from the operation of the laws. During the reign of Valens a large number of temples fell into ruins, but probably it was not the operation of the law which caused their destruction. The more celebrated temples were often in possession of large yearly revenues derived from lands and other endowments and in charge of the hereditary priesthood who presided over the worship. As paganism decayed these priesthoods frequently secularized the revenues, took possession of them, and were content to see the



edifices fall into ruin. Still, paganism remained rooted in many of the old noble families of the East, and in such aristocratic households the place of private chaplain was filled by a Neoplatonic philosopher. As many of the members of this nobility were called to occupy high places in the civil administration of the Empire, they were able to protect their co-religionists and took care to see that the anti-pagan laws were not enforced within their jurisdictions. Optatus, praefect of Constantinople in 404 was a pagan.

In AD 467 Isokasios, the quaestor of Antioch, was accused of paganism. Phocas took poison to prevent himself being obliged to embrace Christianity as late as the time of Justinian. Many of the more famous literary men—Eunapius, Zosimus, perhaps Procopius—were strongly anti-Christian. Pamprepius, a Neoplatonist, famed for his power of divination, an avowed pagan, drew a salary from the public revenues and, along with distinguished generals like Marsus and Leontius, aided Illus in his revolt against the Emperor Zeno in 484. But by the end and indeed throughout the whole of the fifth century thoughtful paganism had become a sort of Quietism and exercised no influence on the public life of the population. When Theodosius the Great succeeded in uniting the orthodox Church with the Imperial administration, when the great bishops were placed in possession of powers almost equal to those of the governors of provinces, the Church became the guardian of the rights of the people and the interpreter of its wishes. The Church, in that age of bureaucracy, had a popular constitution; its clergy came from the people; the services were in the language of the district; its bishops were the natural and sympathetic leaders of the people; and the whole population gradually became included within the Christian Church.

Athens and Achaia long remained the last stronghold of paganism in the East. The Eleusinian and other mysteries, the great heathen festivals celebrated in Athens and in other cities of Hellas, attracted crowds of strangers from all parts of the Empire. Religious beliefs, patriotic associations, thoughts of material prosperity, combined to make the people of the towns and districts resolute to maintain and defend them. So strong were the popular feelings that it would have led to riots, probably to attempted insurrection, to enforce the Imperial legislation against temples, sacrifices, and the celebration of pagan ceremonies by night. The emperors found it necessary either to exempt Hellas from the operation of these laws altogether or to suffer their non-enforcement. The Eleusinian Mysteries continued until the famous temple was destroyed by the Goths under Alaric. The Olympic Games were celebrated until the reign of Theodosius I (394). The great and venerated statue of Minerva remained to protect the city of Athens until about 480. The great temple of Olympia remained open until its destruction—whether by the Goths or by command of Theodosius II is unknown.

In the fourth and fifth centuries Athens remained the most distinguished intellectual centre of the time. The teachers in its schools, for the most part Neo-Platonist who resolutely refused to accept Christianity, maintained the old pagan traditions. Their influence was recognized and feared. Theodosius II forbade private teachers to give public lectures under pain of banishment. Justinian, determined to crush the last remains of paganism, confiscated the funds which furnished the salaries of the professors, seized on the endowments of the Academy of Plato, and closed the schools. The persecuted philosophers fled to Persia to avoid imprisonment or death and remained there until King Chosroes obtained from the Emperor a promise that they would be unmolested if they returned to their homes.

In the West paganism showed itself much stronger. It displayed its greatest tenacity in Rome itself, and there were many reasons why it should do so. The old paganism had been closely connected with the State and when it ceased to be the privileged religion it had no common centre round which to rally. In Rome it was otherwise. Its stronghold was the Senate, and all the elements of opposition to Christianity could group themselves round that venerable assembly. The Senate had lost its powers but its prestige remained, and the Emperors were

chary of attacking its dignity. It represented the ancient grandeur of Rome and was the heir and defender of old Roman traditions. The city was full of monuments of Rome's past greatness. They were, for the most part, temples built to commemorate signal victories, and were visible signs of the old religion under which Rome had grown to greatness. The Senate took pride in preserving these witnesses of the past splendors of the Imperial city and in seeing that the old ceremonial rites were duly in spite of anti-pagan legislation. During the second half of the fourth century and into the fifth, the pagan senators of Rome flaunted their religion in the face of the world. They were at pains to record on their family tombstones and other private monuments that they had been hierophants of Hecate, had been initiated at Eleusis, had been priests of Hercules, Attis, Isis, or Mithras. In spite of the edicts and efforts of the sons of Constantine and of successors of Julian paganism was the state religion of Rome down to 383. Its worship was performed according old rites. The days consecrated to the old gods, and others added in honor of the newer Oriental deities, were the Roman holidays. Every year on 27 January the Praefectus urbi went down to Ostia and presided over "games" in honour of Castor and Pollux. All these costly ceremonies, sacrifices, and shows were provided for out of the Imperial treasury. They were part of the state religion, and the Senate were determined that they should be so regarded. The Emperor might be a Christian, but he was nevertheless Pontifex Maximus, the official head of the old pagan religion, and they believed themselves justified in performing its rites in his name.

The Emperor Gratian delivered the first effectual blow against this state of matters. He refused to assume the office of Pontifex Maximus, probably in 375. In 382 he ordered that the great pagan ceremonies and sacrifices should no longer be defrayed out of the Imperial treasury, and saw that he was obeyed. He took from the ancient priesthods of Rome the emoluments and immunities which they had enjoyed for centuries. He removed from the Senate House the statue of Victory and its altar on which incense had been duly burnt since the days of Octavius. The last great battle for the official recognition of paganism raged over these decrees. It lasted about ten years. Symmachus and Ambrose, both representatives of old Roman patrician families, were the leaders on the pagan and on the Christian side. The pagan party in the Senate fought every inch of ground against the advancing tide of Christianity. Its leading members enrolled themselves in the ancient priesthods and assumed the dignities of the *sacra peregrina*. They provided for the sacrifices and other sacred rites at their own expense. They spent their means in restoring ancient temples and in building new ones. They had high hopes of a pagan reaction under Maximus, who had defeated and slain Gratian; under the short-lived Emperor Eugenius, who promised on his leaving Milan to meet Theodosius in battle that, on his return, he would stable his horses in Christian basilicas. The victory of Theodosius (394) on the Frigidus ended these hopes. They revived again for the last time when Alaric made Attalus a rival emperor to Honorius and when that ruler gathered round him counselors who were for the most part pagans professed or secret. But paganism was not destined to obtain even a temporary victory. Perhaps, as Augustine said, it only desired to die honorably. Its political defeats did not quench the zeal of its lessening number of votaries. They engaged in polemical contests with their opponents. They wrote books to prove that the invasions of the barbarians and the weakness of the Empire were punishments sent by the gods for the abandonment of the ancient religion, and called forth such replies as *the Historia adversus paganos* of Paulus Orosius and the *De Civitate Dei* of St Augustine.

The tenacity of paganism in the West was not confined to Rome. The poems of Rutilius, the *Homilies* of Maximus of Turin and of Martin of Bracara, the *Epistles* of St Augustine, the history of Gregory of Tours, and the series of facts collected in the *Anecdota* of Caspari, all show that paganism lingered long in Italy, Gaul, Spain, and North Africa, and that neither the persuasions of Christian preachers nor the penalties threatened by the State were able to uproot it altogether. The records of district ecclesiastical councils tell the same tale.

Literature may almost be called the last stronghold of paganism for the cultivated classes all over the Empire. It is hard for us to sympathize with the feelings of Christians in the fifth century for whom cultivated paganism was a living reality possessed of a seductive power; who could not separate classical literature from the religious atmosphere in which it had been produced; and who regarded the masterpieces of the Augustan age as beautiful horrors from which they might hardly escape. Jerome had fears for his soul's salvation because he could not conquer his admiration for Cicero's Latin prose, and Augustine shrank within himself when he thought on his love for the poems of Vergil. Had not his classical tastes driven him in youth from the uncouth Latinity of the copies of the Holy Scriptures when he tried to read them? Christianity had mastered their heart, mind, and conscience, but it could not stifle fond recollection nor tame the imagination. In some respects paganism ruled over literature. The poet Claudian, whether he was heathen or Christian, lived and moved and had his being in the world of pagan thought. Sidonius Apollinaris could not string verses without endless mythological allusions. Rutilius, a hater of Christians and of their religion, adored with heart and soul the *Dea Roma, Urbs Aeterna*. Perhaps the dread of the power which seemed to lurk in literature was heightened by the courteous and kindly intercourse of Christians with pagans during the years of the last struggle. The Church owed much to the schools and was almost afraid of the debt. Basil and Gregory had been fellow-students with Julian at Athens. Chrysostom had been a pupil of Libanius, and acknowledged how much he owed to the great anti-Christian leader. Synesius had sat in the class-room of Hypatia at Alexandria, and never forgot some of the lessons he had learned there. And paganism never showed itself to greater advantage than during its last years of heroic but unavailing struggle. Its leaders, whether in the Schools of Athens or among the Senatorial party at Rome, were for the most part men of pure lives with a high moral standard of conduct—men who commanded esteem and respect. Immorality abounded, but the pagan standard had become much higher. Christians and heathen were full of mutual esteem for each other. The letters exchanged between Symmachus and Ambrose reveal the intimacy in which the nobler pagans and earnest-minded Christians lived. Even the caustic Jerome seems to have a lurking but sincere affection for some of the leaders of the pagan Senatorial party. It is curious too to find that many of those stalwart supporters of the old religion of Rome were married to Christian wives, and that their daughters were brought up as Christians while the sons followed the father's faith. Jerome has drawn no more charming picture than that of the old heathen pontiff Albinus, the leader of the anti-Christian party in Rome, sitting in his study with his small granddaughter on his knees, listening to the child while she repeated to him a Christian hymn she had just been taught by her mother. Theodosius II, most theological of emperors, married the daughter of a pagan who had taught philosophy in the Schools of Athens.

Yet however near pagans and Christians might approach each other in life and standard of conduct, a great gulf separated them. In the grey twilight of that fifth century, when men whose sight seemed furthest looked forward to the coming of a night of chaos, the Christian whisper of consolation was better than the pagan thought of destiny. The difference went further than ideals. If it be strange to find practical statesmen like Ambrose and Augustine, able to see that the pressing need of the times was upright citizenship, defending that ascetic life which threw aside all civic duties and responsibilities, surely it is stranger still to find those pure-minded, noble pagans forced by religious partisanship to be the zealous defenders of the bloody gladiatorial spectacles and the untiring opponents of all attempts to better the unhappy lot of actors and actresses condemned to life-long slavery in a calling which then could not fail to be disgraceful. If the dying world was to be requickened, it was not paganism that could bring salvation. So it slowly, almost unconsciously, passed away before the advancing tide of Christianity.

Means were found of reconciling many festivals to which the populace was devoted, both in town and in country, with the prevailing Christian sentiment. It was evil to fete Bacchus or Ceres, but there could be no harm in rejoicing publicly over the vintage and the harvest. The Lupercalia themselves were changed into a Christian festival by Pope Gelasius. Many a tutelary deity became a patron saint. The people retained their rustic processions, their feasts, and their earthly delights. The temples were left standing. They became public halls where the citizens could meet, or exchanges where the merchants could congregate, while the statues of the gods looked down from their niches undisturbed and unheeded.

So when the Teutonic invasion seemed to overwhelm utterly the ancient civilization, the Church with its compact organization was strong enough to sustain itself amid the wreck of all things, and was able to teach the barbarian conquerors to assimilate much of the culture, many of the laws and institutions of the conquered, and in the end to rear a new and Holy Roman Empire on the ruins of the old.



## CHAPTER V

### ARIANISM

ARIANISM finds its place in history as one of the four great controversies which have done so much to shape the growth of Christian thought. They all put the central question but they put it from different points of view. For Gnosticism—Is the Gospel history; or is it an edifying parable? For Arianism—Is it the revelation of a divine Son, which must be final; or is it something short of this, which cannot be final? For the Reformation—Is its meaning to be declared by authority; or is it to be investigated by sound learning? The scientific (or more truly philosophical) scepticism of our own time accepts the decision of the Reformation, but raises afresh the issues of Gnosticism and Arianism as parts of the deeper question, whether the reign of law leaves any freedom to either God or man.

The Arian controversy arose on this wise. Both Greece and Israel had long been tending in different ways to a conception of God as purely transcendent. If the Stoics made him the immanent principle of reason in the world, they only helped the forces which made for transcendence by their utter failure to show that the things in the world are according to reason. As the Christians also accepted any current beliefs which did not evidently contradict their doctrine of a historic incarnation, all parties were so far generally agreed by the end of the second century. In times of disillusion God seems far from men, and in the deepening gloom of the declining Empire he seemed further off than ever. But a transcendent God needs some sort of mediation to connect him with the world. There was no great difficulty in gathering this mediation into the hand of a Logos, as was already done by Philo the Jew in our Lord's time, and to assign him functions as of creation; and of redemption, as Christians and Gnostics added. But then came the question, Is the Logos fully divine, or not? If no, how can he create—much less redeem? If yes, then the purely transcendent God acts for himself, and ceases to be transcendent. The dilemma was hopeless. A transcendent God must have a mediator, and yet the mediator cannot be either divine or undivine. Points were cleared up, as when Tertullian shifted the stress of Christian thought from the Logos doctrine to the Sonship, and when Origen's theory of the eternal generation presented the Sonship as a relation independent of time: but the main question was as dark as ever at the opening of the fourth century. There could be no solution till the pure transcendence was given up, and the Sonship placed inside the divine nature: and this is what was done by Athanasius. There was no other escape from the dilemma, that if the Son is from the divine will, he cannot be more than a creature; if not, God is subject to necessity.

The controversy broke out about 318. Arius was no bustling heresiarch, but a grave and blameless presbyter of Alexandria, and a disciple of the learned Lucian of Antioch; only—he could not understand a metaphor. Must not a son be later than the father, and inferior to him? He forgot first that a divine relation cannot be an affair of time, then that even a human son is essentially equal to his father. However, he concluded that the Son of God cannot be either eternal or equal to the Father. On both grounds then he cannot be more than a creature—no doubt a lofty creature, created before all time to be the creator of the rest, but still only a creature who cannot reveal the fullness of deity. “Begotten” can only mean created. He is not truly God, nor even truly man, for the impossibility of combining two finite spirits in one person made it necessary to maintain that the created Son had nothing human but a body.

Arius had no idea of starting a heresy: his only aim was to give a commonsense answer to the pressing difficulty, that if Christ is God, he is a second God. But if the churches did worship two gods, nothing was gained by making one of them a creature without ceasing to worship him, and something was lost by tampering with the initial fact that Christ was true man. As Athanasius put it, one who is not God cannot create much less restore—while one who is not man cannot atone for men. In seeking a *via media* between a Christian and a Unitarian interpretation of the Gospel, Arius managed to combine the difficulties of both without securing the advantages of either. If Christ is not truly God, the Christians are convicted of idolatry, and if he is not truly man, there is no case for Unitarianism. Arius is condemned both ways.

The dispute spread rapidly. At the first signs of opposition, Arius appealed from the Church to the people. With commonsense doctrine put into theological songs, he soon made a party at Alexandria; and when driven thence to Caesarea, he secured more or less approval from its learned bishop, the historian Eusebius, and from other conspicuous bishops, including Constantine's chief Eastern adviser, Eusebius of Nicomedia, who was another disciple of Lucian. As it appeared later, few agreed with him; but there were many who saw no reason for turning him out of the Church. So when Constantine became master of the East in 393, he found a great controversy raging, which his own interests compelled him to bring to some decision. With his view of Christianity as essentially monotheism, his personal leaning might be to the Arian side: but if he was too much of a politician to care greatly how the question was decided, he could quite understand some of its practical aspects. It was causing a stir in Egypt: and Egypt was not only an especially important province, but also a specially troublesome one—witness the eighty years of disturbance from Caracalla's massacre in 216 to the suppression of Achillaeus in 296. More than this, Arianism imperiled the imposing unity of the Church, and with it the support which the Empire expected from an undivided Church. The State could deal with an orderly confederation of churches, but not with miscellaneous gatherings of schismatic's. So he was quite sincere when he began by writing to Arius and his bishop Alexander that they had managed to quarrel over a trifle. The dispute was really childish, and most distressing to himself.

This failing, the next step was to invite all the bishops of Christendom to a council to be held at Nicaea in Bithynia (an auspicious name!) in the summer of 325, to settle all the outstanding questions which troubled the Eastern churches. If only the bishops could be brought to some decision, it was not likely to be disobeyed; and the State could safely enforce it if it was. Local councils had long been held for the decision of local questions, like Montanism or Paul of Samosata; but a general council was a novelty. As it could fairly claim to speak for the churches generally, it was soon invested with the authority of the ideal Catholic Church; and from this it was an easy step to make its decisions *per se* infallible. This step however was not taken for the present: Athanasius in particular repudiates any such idea.

As we have already discussed the council as sealing the alliance of Church and State, we have now to trace only its dealings with Arianism. Constantine was resolved not only to settle the question of Arianism, but to make all future controversies harmless; and this he proposed to do by drawing up a test creed for bishops, and for bishops only. This was a momentous change, for as yet no creed had any general authority. The Lord's Baptismal Formula was variously expanded for the catechumen's profession at Baptism, and some churches further expanded it into a syllabus for teaching, perhaps as long as our Nicene Creed; but every church expanded it at its own discretion. Now however bishops were to sign one creed everywhere. Whatever was put into it was binding; whatever was left out remained an open question. The council was to draw it up.

The bishops at Nicaea were not generally men of learning, though Eusebius of Caesarea is hardly surpassed by Origen himself. But they had among them statesmen like Hosius of

Cordova, Eusebius of Nicomedia, and the young deacon Athanasius from Alexandria; and men of modest parts were quite able to say whether Arianism was or was not what they had spent their lives in teaching. On that question they had no doubt at all. The Arianizers mustered a score or so of bishops out of about 300—two from Libya, four from the province of Asia, perhaps four from Egypt, the rest thinly scattered over Syria from Mount Taurus to the Jordan valley. There were none from Pontus or from any part of Europe or Africa north of Mount Atlas. The first act of the council was the summary rejection of an Arian creed presented to them. The deity of Christ was not an open question in the churches. But was it needful to put the condemnation of Arianism into the creed? Athanasius had probably but few decided supporters. Between them and the Arianizers floated a great conservative centre party, whose chief aim was to keep things nearly as they were. These men were not Arians, for the open denial of the Lord's true deity shocked them: but neither would they go with Athanasius. Arianism might be condemned in the creed, if it could be done without going beyond the actual words of Scripture, but not otherwise. As they would have said, Arianism was not all false, though it went too far. It maintained the Lord's pre-mundane and real personality, and might be useful as against the Sabellianism which reduced him to a temporary appearance of the one God. Athanasius and Marcellus of Ancyra were mistaken in thinking Arianism a pressing danger, when it had just been so decisively rejected. Only five bishops now supported it. So the conservatives hesitated. Then Eusebius of Caesarea presented the catechetical creed of his own church, a simple document couched in Scripture language, which left Arianism an open question. It was universally approved: Athanasius could find nothing wrong in it, and the Arians were glad now to escape a direct condemnation. For a moment, the matter seemed settled.

Never was a more illogical conclusion. If the Lord's full deity is false, they had done wrong in condemning Arianism: if true, it must be vital. The one impossible course was to let every bishop teach or disown it as he pleased. So Athanasius and his friends were on firm ground when they insisted on revising the Caesarean creed to remove its ambiguity. After much discussion, the following form was reached:

We believe in one God, the Father all-Sovereign,  
maker of all things, both visible and invisible:  
And in one Lord Jesus Christ,  
the Son of God,  
begotten of the Father, an only-begotten  
that is, from the essence of the Father  
—God from God,  
Light from light,  
true God from true God,  
begotten, not made,  
being of one essence with the Father;  
by whom all things were made,  
both things in heaven and things on earth;  
who for us men and for our salvation came down and was made flesh,  
was made man, suffered, and rose again the third day,  
ascended into heaven,  
cometh to judge quick and dead:  
And in the Holy Spirit.  
But those who say  
that “there was once when he was not”,  
and “before he was begotten he was not”,

and “he was made of things that were not”,  
or maintain that the Son of God  
is of a different essence,  
or created or subject to moral change or alteration  
—These doth the Catholic and Apostolic Church anathematize.

It will be seen at once that the creed of the council differs a good deal from the Nicene Creed now in use, which is a revision of the catechetical creed of Jerusalem, made about 362. That is not the work of the Council of Constantinople in 381, but displaced the genuine Nicene Creed partly by its merits, and partly through the influence of the capital. However, it will be noted further that (apart from the anathemas) the stress of the defense against Arianism rests on the two clauses *from the essence of the Father*, and *of one essence with the Father*; to which we may add that *begotten, not made* contrasts the words which the Arians industriously confused, and that the clause *was made man* meets the Arian denial that he took anything human but a body. Now the *essence* of a thing is that by which it is—whatever we are supposing it to be. It is not the general ground of all attributes, but the particular ground of the particular supposition we are making. As we are here supposing that the Father is God, the statement will be first that the Son is from that essence by which the Father is God, then that he shares the possession of it with the Father, so that the two together allow no escape from the confession that the Son is as truly divine and as fully divine as the Father. The existence of the Son is not a matter of will or of necessity, but belongs to the divine *nature*. Two generations later, under Semiarian influences, a similar result was reached by taking *essence* in the sense of *substance*, as the common ground of all the attributes, so that if the Son is *of one essence with the Father*, he shares all the attributes of deity without exception.

The conservative centre struggled in vain. The decisive word (of one essence with) is not found in Scripture. But there was no dispute about the Canon, so that the Arians had their own interpretations for all words that are found in Scripture. Thus to, The Son is eternal, they replied, “So are we, for We which live are always” (2 Cor. IV. 11, delivered unto death). The bishops were gradually forced back on the plain fact that no imaginable evasion of Scripture can be forbidden without going outside Scripture for a word to define the true sense: and of one essence with was a sentence which could not be evaded. No doubt it was a revolution to put such a belief into the creed: but now that the issue was fairly raised by Constantine’s summons, they could not leave the Lord’s full deity an open question without ceasing to be Christians. Given the unity of God and the worship of Christ—and even the Arians agreed to this—there was no escape from the dilemma, of one essence with or creature-worship. So they yielded to necessity. Eusebius of Caesarea signed with undisguised reluctance, though not against his conscience. To his mind the creed was not untrue, though it was revolutionary and dangerous, and he was only convinced against his will that it was needed. The emperor’s influence counted heavily in the last stage of the debates—for Constantine was too shrewd to use it before the question was nearly settled—and in the end only two bishops refused to sign the creed. These he promptly sent into exile along with Arius himself; and Eusebius of Nicomedia shared their fate a few months later. If he had signed the creed at last, he had opposed it too long and been too intimate with its enemies.

Let us now look beyond the stormy controversies of the next half century to the broad issues of the council. The two fundamental doctrines of Christianity are the deity of Christ and the unity of God. Without the one, it merges in philosophy or Unitarianism; without the other, it sinks into polytheism. These two doctrines had never gone very well together; and now the council reconciled them by giving up the purely transcendental conception of God which brought them into collision with each other and with the historical facts of the Incarnation. The question was ripe for decision, as we see from the prevalence of such an



unthinkable conception as that of a secondary God: and if the conservatives had been able to keep it unsettled, one of the two fundamental doctrines must before long have overcome the other. Had the unity of God prevailed, Christianity would have sunk into a very ordinary sort of Deism, or might possibly have become something like Islam, with Jesus for the prophet instead of Mahomet. But it is much more likely that the deity of Christ would have effaced the unity of God, and in effacing it have opened a wide door for polytheism, and itself sunk to the level of heathen hero-worship. As a matter of history, the churches did sink into polytheism for centuries, or common people made no practical difference between the worship of saints and that of the old gods. But because the Council of Nicaea had made it impossible to think of Christ simply as one of the saints, the Reformers were able to drop the saint-worship without falling into Deism

Further, the recognition of eternal distinctions in the divine nature establishes within that nature a social element before which despotism or slavery in earth or heaven stands condemned. It makes illogical the conception of God as inscrutable Power in whose acts we must not presume to seek for reason—a conception common to Rome, Islam, and Geneva. Yet more, if God himself is not a despot, but a constitutional sovereign who rules by law and desires his subjects to see reason in his acts, this is an ideal which must profoundly influence political thought. True, there was little sign for centuries of any such influence. The Empire did not grow less despotic, and such ideas of freedom as the Teutons brought in did not come out of the Gospel: and if Islam and the Papacy lean to despotism, the Unitarians have done honorable work in the cause of liberty. But thoughts which color the whole of life may have to work for ages before they are clearly understood. The Latin Church of the Middle Ages was not a mere apotheosis of power like Islam; and when Teutonic Europe broke away from Latin tutelage, the way was prepared for the slow recognition of a higher ideal than power, and our own age is beginning to see better the profound and far-reaching significance of the Nicene decision, not for religion only, but for political, scientific, and social thought.

The victory won at Nicaea was decisive. Arianism started vigorously, and seemed for awhile the winning side; but the moment it faced the council, it collapsed before the all but unanimous reprobation of the Christian churches. Only two bishops from the edge of the African desert ventured to deny that it contradicts essentials of the Gospel. The decision was free, for Constantine would not risk another Donatist controversy by putting pressure on the bishops before he could safely crush the remnant; and it was permanent, for words deliberately put into a creed cannot be removed without admitting that the objection to them is valid on one ground or another. Thus Arianism was not only condemned, but condemned in the most impressive way by the assembly which comes nearer than any other in history to the stately dream of a concrete catholic church speaking words of divine authority. No later gathering could pretend to rival the august assembly where Christendom had once for all pronounced the condemnation of Arianism, and no later movements were able definitely to reverse its decision.

But if the conservatives (who were the mass of the Eastern bishops) had signed the creed with a good conscience, they had no idea of making it their working belief. They were not Arians—or they would not have torn up the Arianising creed at Nicaea; but if they had been hearty Nicenes, no influence of the Court could have kept up an Arianising reaction for half a century. Christendom as a whole was neither Arian nor Nicene, but conservative. If the East was not Nicene, neither was it Arian, but conservative: and if the West was not Arian, neither was it Nicene, but conservative also. But conservatism was not the same in East and West. Eastern conservatism inherited its doctrine from the age of subordination theories, and dreaded the Nicene definition as needless and dangerous. But the Westerns had no great interest in the question and could scarcely even translate its technical terms into Latin, and in any case their minds were much more legal than the Greek; so they simply fell back on the

authority of the Great Council. Shortly, “East and West were alike conservative; but while conservatism in the East went behind the council, in the West it was content to start from it”.

The Eastern reaction was therefore mainly conservative. The Arians were the tail of the party; they were not outcasts only because conservative hesitation at the Nicene Creed kept open the back door of the Church for them. For thirty years they had to shelter themselves behind the conservatives. It was not till 357 that they ventured to have a policy of their own; and then they broke up the anti-Nicene coalition at once. The strength of Arianism was that while it claimed to be Christian, it brought together and to their logical results all the elements of heathenism in the current Christian thought. So the reaction rested not only on conservative timidity, but on the heathen influences around. And heathenism was still a living power in the world, strong in numbers, and still stronger in the imposing memories of history. Christianity was still an upstart on Caesar's throne, and no man could yet be sure that victory would not sway back to the side of the immortal gods. So the Nicene age was pre-eminently an age of waverers; and every waverer leaned to Arianism as a *via media* between Christianity and heathenism. The Court also leaned to Arianism. The genuine Arians indeed were not more pliant than the Nicenes; but conservatives are always open to the influence of a Court, and the intriguers of the Court (and under Constantius they were legion) found it their interest to unsettle the Nicene decisions—in the name of conservatism forsooth. To put it shortly, the Arians could have done nothing without a formidable mass of conservative discontent behind them, and the conservatives would have been equally helpless if the Court had not supplied them with the means of action. The ultimate power lay with the majority, which was at present conservative, while the initiative rested with the Court, which leaned on Asia, so that the reaction went on as long as both were agreed against the Nicene doctrine. It was suspended when Julian's policy turned another way, became unreal when conservative alarm subsided, and came to an end when Asia went over to the Nicenes.

The contest (325-381) falls into two main periods, separated by the Council of Constantinople in 360, when the success of the reaction seemed complete. We have also halts of importance at the return of Athanasius in 346 and the death of Julian in 363.

The first period is a fight in the dark, as Socrates calls it, but upon the whole the conservative coalition steadily gained ground till 357, in spite of Nicene reactions after Constantine's death in 337 and the detection of Stephen's plot in 344. First the Arianising leaders had to obtain their own restoration, then to depose the Nicene chiefs one after another. By 341 the way was open for a series of attempts to replace the Nicene Creed by something that would let in the Arians. But this meant driving out the Nicenes, for they could not compromise without complete surrender; and the West was with the Nicenes in refusing to unsettle the creed. Western influence prevailed at Sardica in 343, and Western intervention secured an uneasy truce which lasted till Constantius became master of the West in 353. Meanwhile conservatism was softening into a less hostile Semiarian form, while Arianism was growing into a more offensive Anomoean doctrine. So the conservatives were less interested when Constantius renewed the contest, and took alarm at the open Arianism of the Sirmian manifesto in 357. This brought things to a deadlock, and gave rise to a Homoean or professedly neutral party supported by the Anomoeans and the Court. They were repulsed at Seleucia by a new alliance of Semiarians and Nicenes, and at Ariminum by the conservative West; but their command of the Court enabled them to exile the Semiarian leaders after the Council of Constantinople in 360.

The second period of the reaction opens with a precarious Homoean supremacy. It was grievously shaken at the outset by Julian's restoration of the exiles. The Nicenes were making rapid progress, and might have restored peace if Julian had lived longer. But Valens, with a feebler character and a weaker position, returned to the policy of Constantius. For the moment it may have been the best policy; but the permanent forces were for the Nicenes, and their

issue was only a question of time. There were misunderstandings in abundance, but a fairly united party hailed in Theodosius (379) an orthodox emperor from the West. The Arians were first put out of the churches, then formally condemned by the Council of Constantinople in 381. Henceforth Arianism ceased to be a power except among its Teutonic converts. Now we return to the morrow of the great council.

When the bishops returned home, they took up their controversies just where the summons to the council had interrupted them. The creed was signed and done with, and we hear no more of it. Yet both sides had learned caution at Nicaea. Marcellus disavowed Sabellianism and Eusebius avoided Arianism, and even directly controverted some of its main positions. Before long however a party was formed against the council. Its leader was Eusebius of Nicomedia, who had returned from exile and recovered his influence at Court. Round him gathered the bishops of the school of Lucian, and round these again all sorts of malcontents. The conservatives in particular gave extensive help. Charges of heresy against the Nicene chiefs were sometimes more than plausible. Marcellus was practically Sabellian, and Athanasius at least refused to disavow him. Some even of the darker charges may have had truth in them, or at least a semblance of truth.

So in the next few years we have a series of depositions of Nicene leaders. By 335 the Church was fairly cleared of all but the two chief of them, Marcellus of Ancyra, and Athanasius of Alexandria (since 328). Marcellus was already in middle life when he refuted the Arians at Nicaea; and in a diocese full of the strife and debate of endless Gaulish sects and superstitions he had learned that the Gospel is wider than Greek philosophy, and that simpler forms may better suit a rude flock. So his system is an appeal from Origen to St. John. He begins with the Logos as impersonal—as at once the thinking principle which is in God and the active creating principle which comes forth from God, and yet remains with God. Thus the Logos came forth from the Father for the work of creation, and in the fullness of time descended into human flesh, becoming the Son of God in becoming the Son of Man. Only in virtue of this humiliating separation did the Logos acquire personality for a time: but when the work is done, the human flesh will be thrown aside, and the Logos will return to the Father and be immanent and impersonal as before. Marcellus has got away from Arianism as far as he can: but he is involved in much the same difficulties. If for example the idea of an eternal Son is polytheistic, nothing is gained by transferring the eternity to an impersonal Logos; and if the work of creation is unworthy of God, it matters little whether it is delegated to a created Son or to a transitory Logos. Marcellus misses as completely as Arius the Christian conception of the Incarnation.

Then they turned to a greater than Marcellus. Athanasius was a Greek by birth and education; Greek also in subtle thought and philosophic insight, in oratorical power and skilful statesmanship. Of Coptic influence he scarcely shows a sign. His very style is clear and simple, without a trace of Egyptian involution and obscurity. Athanasius was born about 297, so that he must have well remembered the last years of the Great Persecution, which lasted till 313. He may have been a lawyer for a short time, and seems to have known Latin; but his main training was Greek and scriptural. As a man of learning or a skilful party-leader Athanasius was not beyond the reach of rivals. But he was more than this. His whole spirit is lighted up with vivid faith in the reality and eternal meaning of the Incarnation. His small work *de Incarnatione*, written before the rise of Arianism, ranks with the *Epistle to Diognetus* as the most brilliant pamphlet of early Christian times. Even there he rises far above the level of Arianism and Sabellianism; and throughout his long career we catch glimpses of a spiritual depth which few of his contemporaries could reach. And Athanasius was before all things a man whose life was consecrated to a simple purpose. Through five exiles and fifty years of controversy he stood in defense of the great council. The care of many churches rested on him, the pertinacity of many enemies wore out his life; yet he is never soured but for a

moment by the atrocious treachery of 356. At the first gleam of hope he is himself again, full of brotherly consideration and respectful sympathy for old enemies returning to a better mind. Even Gibbon is awed for once before “the immortal name of Athanasius”.

Marcellus had fairly exposed himself to a doctrinal attack, but against Athanasius the most convenient charge was that of episcopal tyranny. In 335 the Eastern bishops gathered to Jerusalem to dedicate the splendid church which Constantine had built on Golgotha. First however a synod was held at Tyre to restore peace in Egypt. The Eusebians had the upper hand, and they used their power shamelessly. Scandal succeeded scandal, till the iniquity culminated in the dispatch of an openly partisan commission (including two young Pannonian bishops, Ursacius and Valens) to get up evidence in Egypt. Moderate men protested, and Athanasius took ship for Constantinople. The council condemned him by default and the condemnation was repeated at Jerusalem, where also proceedings were commenced against Marcellus. They also restored Arius; but his actual reception was prevented by his sudden death the evening before the day appointed. Meanwhile Athanasius had appealed to Constantine in person, who summoned the bishops at once to Constantinople. They dropped the charges of sacrilege and tyranny, and brought forward a new charge of political intrigue. Athanasius was allowed no reply, but sent into exile at Trier in Gaul, where he was honorably received by the younger Constantine. The emperor seems as usual to have been aiming at peace and unity. Athanasius was evidently a centre of disturbance, and the Asiatic bishops disliked him: he was therefore best kept out of the way for the present.

Constantine died 22 May 337, and his sons at once restored the exiles. Presently things settled down in 340 with the second son Constantius master of the East, and Constans the youngest holding the three Western prefectures. So Eusebian intrigues were soon resumed. Constantius was essentially a little man, weak and vain, easy-tempered and suspicious. He had also a taste for church matters, and without ever being a genuine Arian, he hated first the Nicene Council, and then Athanasius personally. The intriguers could scarcely have desired a better tool.

They began by raising troubles at Alexandria, and deposing Athanasius afresh (late in 338) for having allowed the civil power to restore him. In Lent 339 Athanasius was expelled, and Gregory of Cappadocia installed by military violence in his place. The ejected bishops—Athanasius, Marcellus and others—fled to Rome. Bishop Julius at once took up the high tone of impartiality which became an arbiter of Christendom. He received the fugitives with a decent reserve, and invited the Easterners to the council they had asked him to hold. After long delay, it was plain that they did not mean to come; so a council of fifty bishops met at Rome in the autumn of 340, by which Athanasius and Marcellus were acquitted. As Julius reported to the Easterners, the charges against Athanasius were inconsistent with each other and contradicted by evidence from Egypt, and the proceedings at Tyre were a travesty of justice. It was unreasonable to insist on its condemnation of Athanasius as final. Even the great council of Nicaea had decided (and not without the will of God) that the acts of one council might be revised by another: and in any case Nicaea was better than Tyre. As for Marcellus, he had denied the charge of heresy and presented a sound confession of his faith (our own Apostles’ Creed, very nearly) and the Roman legates at Nicaea had borne honorable witness to the part he had taken in the council. If they had complaints against Athanasius, they should not have neglected the old custom of writing first to Rome, that a legitimate decision might issue from the apostolic see.

The Eusebians replied in the summer of 341, when some ninety bishops met to consecrate the Golden Church of Constantine at Antioch. Hence it is called the Council of the Dedication. Like the Nicene, it seems to have been in the main conservative; but the active minority was Arianising, not Athanasian; and it was not quite so successful. The bishops began as at Nicaea by rejecting an Arian creed. They next approved a creed of a conservative



sort, said to be the work of Lucian of Antioch, the teacher of Arius. The decisive clause however was rather Nicene than conservative. It declared the Son “morally unchangeable, the unvarying image of the deity and essence of the Father”. The phrase declares that there is no change of essence in passing from the Father to the Son, and is therefore equivalent to of one essence with. Athanasius might have accepted it at Nicaea, but he could not now; and the conservatives did not mean of one essence with—only the illogical of one essence with, of like essence. So they were satisfied with the Lucianic creed: but the Arianizers endeavored to upset it with a third creed, and the council seems to have broken up uncertainly, though without revoking the Lucianic creed. A few months later, another council met at Antioch and adopted a fourth creed, more to the mind of the Arianizers. In substance it was less opposed to Arianism than the Lucianic, its form is a close copy of the Nicene. In fact, it is the Nicene down to the anathemas, but the Nicene with every sharp edge taken off. So well did it suit the Arianizers that they reissued it (with ever-growing anathemas) three times in the next ten years.

Western suspicion became a certainty, now that the intriguers were openly tampering with the Nicene faith. Constans demanded a general council, and Constantius was too busy with the Persian war to refuse him. So it met at Sardica, the modern Sofia, in the summer of 343. The Westerns were some 96 in number “with Hosius of Cordova for their father”. The Easterners, under Stephen of Antioch, were about 76. They demanded that the condemnation of Athanasius and Marcellus should be taken as final, and retired across the Balkans to Philippopolis when the Westerns insisted on reopening the case. So there were two contending councils. At Sardica the accused were acquitted, while the Easterners confirmed their condemnation, denounced Julius and Hosius, and reissued the fourth creed of Antioch with some new anathemas.

The quarrel was worse than ever. But next year came a reaction. When the Western envoy Euphrates of Cologne reached Antioch, a harlot was let loose upon him; and the plot was traced up to bishop Stephen. The scandal was too great: Stephen was deposed, and the fourth creed of Antioch reissued, but this time with long conciliatory explanations for the Westerns. The way was clearing for a cessation of hostilities. Constans pressed the decrees of Sardica, Ursacius and Valens recanted the charges against Athanasius, and at last Constantius consented to his return. His entry into Alexandria (31 Oct. 346) was the crowning triumph of his life.

The next few years were an interval of suspense, for nothing was decided. Conservative suspicion was not dispelled, and the return of Athanasius was a personal humiliation for Constantius. But the mere cessation of hostilities was not without influence. The conservatives were fundamentally agreed with the Nicenes on the reality of the Lord's divinity; and minor jealousies abated when they were less busily encouraged. The Eusebian phase of conservatism, which dreaded Sabellianism and distrusted the Nicenes, was giving place to the Semiarian, which was coming to see that Arianism was the more pressing danger, and slowly moving towards an alliance with the Nicenes. We see also the rise of a more defiant Arianism, less patient of conservative supremacy, and less pliant to imperial dictation. The Anomoean leaders emphasized the most offensive aspects of Arianism, declaring that the Son is *unlike* the Father, and boldly maintaining that there is no mystery at all in God. Their school was presumptuous and shallow, quarrelsome and heathenizing, yet not without a directness and firm conviction which compares well with the wavering and insincerity of the conservative chiefs.

Meanwhile new troubles were gathering in the West. Constans was deposed (Jan. 350) by Magnentius. After a couple of minor claimants were disposed of, the struggle lay between Magnentius and Constantius. The decisive battle was fought (28 Sept. 351) near Mursa in Pannonia, but the destruction of Magnentius was not completed till 353. Constantius remained

the master of the world. The Eusebians now had their opportunity. Already in 351-2, they had reissued the fourth creed of Antioch from Sirmium, with its two anathemas grown into twenty-seven. But as soon as Constantius was master of Gaul, he determined to force on the Westerns an indirect condemnation of the Nicene faith in the person of Athanasius. A direct approval of Arianism was out of the question, for Western conservatism was firmly set against it by the Nicene and Sardican councils. The bishops were nearly all resolute against it. Liberius of Rome followed in the steps of Julius, Hosius of Cordova was still the patriarch of Christendom, and the bishops of Trier, Toulouse and Milan proved their faith in exile. So doctrine was kept in the background. Constantius came forward personally before a council at Arles (Oct. 353) as the accuser of Athanasius, while all the time he was giving him solemn and repeated promises of protection. The bishops were not unwilling to take the emperor's word, if the Court party would clear itself of Arianism; and at last they gave way, the Roman legate with the rest. Only Paulinus of Trier had to be exiled. For the next two years Constantius was busy with the barbarians, so that it was not till the autumn of 355 that he was able to call another council at Milan, where Julian was made Caesar for Gaul. It proved quite unmanageable, and only yielded at last to open violence. Three bishops were exiled, including Lucifer of Calaris in Sardinia.

Lucifer's appearance is a landmark. The lawless despotism of Constantius had roused an aggressive fanaticism. Lucifer had all the courage of Athanasius, but nothing of his wary self-respect and moderation. He scarcely condescends to reason, but revels in the pleasanter work of denouncing the fires of damnation against the disobedient emperor. A worthier champion was Hilary of Poitiers, the noblest representative of Western literature in the Nicene age. Hilary was by birth a heathen, coming before us in 355 as an old convert and a bishop of some standing. In massive power of thought he was a match for Athanasius; but he was rather student and thinker than orator and statesman. He had not studied the Nicene Creed till lately; but when he found it true, he could not refuse to defend it. He was not at the council, but was exiled to Asia a few months later, apparently on the charge of immorality, which the Eusebians usually brought against obnoxious bishops.

When Hosius of Cordova had been imprisoned, there remained but one power in the West which could not be summarily dealt with. The grandeur of Hosius was personal, but Liberius claimed the universal reverence due to the apostolic and imperial see of Rome. Such a bishop was a power of the first importance, when Arianism was dividing the Empire round the hostile camps of Gaul and Asia. Liberius was a staunch Nicene. When his legates yielded at Arles, he disavowed their action. The emperor's threats he disregarded, the emperor's gifts he cast out of the Church. It was not long before the world was scandalized by the news that Constantius had arrested and exiled the bishop of Rome.

Attempts had already been made to dislodge Athanasius from Alexandria, but he refused to obey anything but written orders from the emperor. As Constantius had given his solemn promise to protect him in 346, and three times written to repeat it since his brother's death, duty as well as policy forbade him to credit officials. The most pious emperor could not be supposed to mean treachery; but he must say so himself if he did. The message was plain enough when it came. A force of 5000 men surrounded the church of Theonas on a night of vigil (8 Feb. 356). The congregation was caught as in a net. Athanasius fainted in the tumult: yet when the soldiers reached the bishop's throne, its occupant had somehow been conveyed away.

For six years Athanasius disappeared from the eyes of men, while Alexandria was given over to military outrage. The new bishop George of Cappadocia (formerly a pork-contractor) arrived in Lent 357, and soon provoked the fierce populace of Alexandria. He escaped with difficulty from one riot in 358, and was fairly driven from the city by another in October. Constantius had his revenge, but it shook the Empire to its base. The flight of Athanasius

revealed the power of religion to stir up a national rising, none the less real for not breaking out in open war. In the next century the councils of the Church became the battlefield of nations, and the victory of Hellenic orthodoxy at Chalcedon implied sooner or later the separation of Monophysite Egypt and Nestorian Syria.

Arianism seemed to have won its victory when the last Nicene champion was driven into the desert. But the West was only terrorized, Egypt was devoted to its patriarch, Nicenes were fairly strong in the East, and the conservatives who had won the battle would never accept Arianism. However, this was the time chosen for an open declaration of Arianism, by a small council of Western bishops at Sirmium, headed by Ursacius and Valens. They emphasize the unity of God, condemn the words essence, and lay stress on the inferiority of the Son, limit the Incarnation to the assumption of a body, and more than half say that he is only a creature. This was clear Anomoean doctrine, and made a stir even in the West, where it was promptly condemned by the Gaulish bishops, now partly shielded from Constantius by the Caesarship of Julian. But the Sirmian manifesto spread dismay through the ranks of the Eastern conservatives. They had not put down Sabellianism only in order to set up the Anomoeans; and the danger was brought home to them when Eudoxius of Antioch and Acacius of Caesarea convened a Syrian synod to approve the manifesto. The conservative counterblow was struck at Ancyra in Lent 358. The synodical letter is long and clumsy, but we see in it conservatism changing from its Eusebian to a Semiarian phase—from fear of Sabellianism to fear of Arianism. They won a complete victory at the Court, and sent Eudoxius and the rest into exile. This however was too much. The exiles were soon recalled, and the strife began again more bitterly than ever.

Here was a deadlock. All parties had failed. The Anomoeans were active enough, but pure Arianism was hopelessly discredited throughout the Empire. The Nicenes had Egypt and the West, but they could not overcome the Court and Asia. The Eastern Semiarians were the strongest party, but such men of violence could not close the strife. In this deadlock nothing was left but specious charity and colorless indefiniteness; and this was the plan of the new Homoean party, formed by Acacius and Eudoxius in the East, Ursacius and Valens in the West.

A general council was decided on; but it was divided into two — the Westerns to meet at Ariminum, the Easterners at Seleucia in Cilicia, the headquarters of the army then operating against the Isaurians. Meanwhile parties began to group themselves afresh. The Anomoeans went with the Homoeans, from whom alone they could expect any favor, while the Semiarians drew closer to the Nicenes, and were welcomed by Hilary of Poitiers in his conciliatory *de Synodis*. The next step was a small meeting of Homoean and Semiarian leaders, held in the emperor's presence on Pentecost Eve (22 May 359) to draw up a creed to be laid before the councils. The dated creed (or fourth of Sirmium) is conservative in its appeals to Scripture, in its solemn reverence for the Lord, in its rejection of essence as not found in Scripture, and in its insistence on the mystery of the eternal generation. But its central clause gave a decisive advantage to the Homoeans. "We say that the Son is like the Father in all things as the Scriptures say and teach". Even the Anomoeans could sign this. "Like the Father as the Scriptures say—and no further; and we find very little likeness taught in Scripture. Like the Father if you will, but not like God, for no creature can be. Like the Father certainly, but not in essence, for likeness which is not identity implies difference—or in other words, likeness is a question of degree". Of these three replies, the first is fair, the third perfectly sound.

The reception of the creed was hostile in both councils. The Westerns at Ariminum rejected it, deposed the Homoean leaders, and ratified the Nicene Creed. In the end however they accepted the Sirmian, but with the addition of a stringent series of anathemas against Arianism, which Valens accepted — for the moment. The Easterners at Seleucia rejected it

likewise, deposed the Homoean leaders, and ratified the Lucianic creed. Both sides sent deputies to the emperor, as had been arranged; and after much pressure, these deputies signed a revision of the dated creed on the night of 31 Dec. 359. The Homoeans now saw their way to final victory.

By throwing over the Anomoeans and condemning their leader Aetius, they were able to enforce the prohibition of the Semiarian of one essence with: and then it only remained to revise the dated creed again for a council held at Constantinople in Feb. 360, and send the Semiarian leaders into exile.

The Homoean domination never extended beyond the Alps. Gaul was firmly Nicene, and Constantius could do nothing there after the mutiny at Paris in Jan. 360 had made Julian independent of him. The few Western Arians soon died out. But in the East, the Homoean power lasted nearly twenty years. Its strength lay in its appeal to the moderate men who were tired of strife, and to the confused thinkers who did not see that a vital question was at issue. The dated creed seemed reverent and safe; and its defects would not have been easy to see if the Anomoeans had not made them plain. But the position of parties was greatly changed since 356. First Hilary of Poitiers had done something to bring together conservatives and Nicenes; then Athanasius took up the work in his own *de Synodis*. It is a noble overture of friendship to his old conservative enemies. The Semiarians, or many of them, accepted of the essence and the Nicene anathemas, and doubted only of one essence with. Such men, says he, are not to be treated as enemies, but reasoned with as brethren who differ from us only in the use of a word which sums up their own teaching as well as ours. When they confess that the Lord is a true Son of God and not a creature, they grant all that we are contending for. Their own creed without of the essence does not shut out Arianism, but the two together amount to The Creed. If they accept our doctrine, sooner or later they will find that they cannot refuse its necessary safeguard. But if Nicenes and Semiarians drew together, so did Homoeans and Anomoeans. Any ideas of conciliating Nicene support were destroyed by the exile of Meletius, the new bishop of Antioch, for preaching a sermon carefully modeled on the dated creed, but substantially Nicene in doctrine. A schism arose at Antioch; and henceforth the leaders of the Homoeans were practically Arians.

The mutiny at Paris implied a civil war: but just as it was beginning, Constantius died at Mopsucrenae beneath Mount Taurus (3 Nov. 361) and Julian remained sole emperor. We are not here concerned with the general history of his reign, or even with his policy towards the Christians—only with its bearing on Arianism. In general, he held to the toleration of the Edict of Milan. The Christians are not to be persecuted—only deprived of special privileges—but the emperor's favor must be reserved for the worshippers of the gods. So the administration was unfriendly to the Christians, and left occasional outrages unpunished, or dismissed them with a thin reproof. But these were no great matters, for the Christians were now too strong to be lynched at pleasure. Julian's chief endeavor was to put new life into heathenism: and in this the heathens themselves hardly took him seriously. His only act of definite persecution was the edict near the end of his reign, which forbade the Christians to teach the classics; and this is disapproved by “the cool and impartial heathen” Ammianus.

Every blow struck by Julian against the Christians fell first on the Homoeans whom Constantius had left in power; and the reaction he provoked against Greek culture threatened the philosophical postulates of Arianism. But Julian cared little for the internal quarrels of the Christians, and only broke his rule of contemptuous impartiality when he recognized one greater than himself in “the detestable Athanasius”. Before long an edict recalled the exiled bishops, though it did not replace them in their churches. If others were in possession, it was not Julian's business to turn them out. This was toleration, but Julian had a malicious hope of still further embroiling the confusion. If the Christians were left to themselves, they would “quarrel like beasts”. He got a few scandalous wrangling, but in the main he was mistaken.



The Christians only closed their ranks against the common enemy: the Arians also were sound Christians in this matter— blind old Maris of Chalcedon came and cursed him to his face.

Back to their cities came the survivors of the exiled bishops, no longer travelling in pomp and circumstance to their noisy councils, but bound on the nobler errand of seeking out their lost or scattered flocks. It was time to resume Hilary's interrupted work of conciliation. Semiarian violence had discredited in advance the new conservatism at Seleucia: but Athanasius had things more in his favor, for Julian's reign had not only sobered partisanship, but left a clear field for the strongest moral force in Christendom to assert itself. And this force was with the Nicenes. Athanasius reappeared at Alexandria 22 Feb. 362, and held a small council there before Julian drove him out again. It was decided first that Arians who came over to the Nicene side were to retain their rank on condition of accepting the Nicene council, none but the chiefs and active defenders of Arianism being reduced to lay communion.

Then, after clearing up some misunderstandings of East and West, and trying to settle the schism at Antioch by inducing the old Nicenes, who at present had no bishop, to accept Meletius, they took in hand two new questions of doctrine. One was the divinity of the Holy Spirit. Its reality was acknowledged, except by the Arians; but did it amount to co-essential deity? That was still an open question. But now that attention was fully directed to the subject, it appeared from Scripture that the theory of eternal distinctions in the divine nature must either be extended to the Holy Spirit or abandoned. Athanasius took one course, the Anomoeans the other, while the Semiarians tried to make a difference between the Lord's deity and that of the Holy Spirit: and this gradually became the chief obstacle to their union with the Nicenes. The other subject of debate was the new system of Apollinarius of Laodicea—the most suggestive of all the ancient heresies. Apollinarius was the first who fairly faced the difficulty, that if all men are sinners, and the Lord was not a sinner, he cannot have been truly man. Apollinarius replied that sin lies in the weakness of the human spirit, and accounted for the sinlessness of Christ by putting in its place the divine Logos, and adding the important statement that if the human spirit was created in the image of the Logos (Gen. i. 28) Christ would not be the less human but the more so for the difference. The spirit in Christ was human spirit, although divine. Further, the Logos which in Christ was human spirit was eternal. Apart then from the Incarnation, the Logos was archetypal man as well as God, so that the Incarnation was not simply an expedient to get rid of sin, but the historic revelation of that which was latent in the Logos from eternity. The Logos and man are not alien beings, but joined in their inmost nature, and in a real sense each is incomplete without the other. Suggestive as this is, Apollinarius reaches no true incarnation. Against him it was decided that the Incarnation implied a human soul as well as a human body—a decision which struck straight enough at the Arians, but quite missed the triple division of body, soul, and spirit on which Apollinarius based his system.

Athanasius was exiled again almost at once: Julian's anger was kindled by the news that he had baptized some heathen ladies at Alexandria. But his work remained. At Antioch indeed it was marred by Lucifer of Calaris, who would have nothing to do with Meletius, and consecrated Paulinus as bishop for the old Nicenes. So the schism continued, and henceforth the rising Nicene party of Pontus and Asia was divided by this personal question from the older Nicenes of Egypt and the West. But upon the whole the lenient policy of the council was a great success. Bishop after bishop gave in his adhesion to the Nicene faith. Friendly Semiarians came in like Cyril of Jerusalem, old conservatives followed, and at last (in Jovian's time) the archenemy Acacius himself gave in his signature. Even creeds were remodeled in all directions in a Nicene sense, as at Jerusalem and Antioch, and in Cappadocia and Mesopotamia. True, the other parties were not idle. The Homoean coalition was even more unstable than the Eusebian, and broke up of itself as soon as opinion was free. One party

avored the Anomoeans, another drew nearer to the Nicenes, while the Semiarians completed the confusion by confirming the Seleucian decisions and reissuing the Lucianic creed. But the main current set in a Nicene direction, and the Nicene faith was rapidly winning its way to victory when the process was thrown back for nearly twenty years by Julian's death in Persia (26 June 363).

Julian's death seemed to leave the Empire in the gift of four barbarian generals: but while they were debating, a few of the soldiers outside hailed a favorite named Jovian as emperor. The cry was taken up, and in a few minutes the young officer found himself the successor of Augustus. Jovian was a decided Christian, though his personal character did no credit to the Gospel. But his religious policy was one of genuine toleration. If Athanasius was graciously received at Antioch, the Arians were told with scant courtesy that they could hold meetings as they pleased at Alexandria. So all parties went on consolidating themselves. The Anomoeans had been restive since the condemnation of Aetius at Constantinople, but it was not till now that they lost hope of the Homoeans, and formed an organized sect. But all these movements came to an end with the sudden death of Jovian (16-17 Feb. 364). This time the generals chose; and they chose the Pannonian Valentinian for emperor. A month later he assigned the East from Thrace to his brother Valens.

Valentinian was a good soldier and little more, though he could honor learning and carry forward the reforming work of Constantine. His religious policy was toleration. If he refused to displace the few Arian bishops he found in possession, he left the churches free to choose Nicene successors. So the West soon recovered from the strife which Constantius had introduced. It was otherwise in the East. Valens was a weaker character — timid and inert, but not inferior to his brother in scrupulous care for the interests of his subjects. No soldier, but more or less good at finance. For awhile events continued to develop naturally. The Homoean bishops held their sees, but their influence was fast declining. The Anomoeans were forming a schism on one side, the Nicenes were recovering power on the other. On both sides the simpler doctrines were driving out the compromises. It was time for even the Semiarians to bestir themselves. A few years before they were beyond question the majority in the East; but this was not so certain now. The Nicenes had made a great advance since the Council of Ancyra, and were now less conciliatory. Lucifer had compromised them in one direction, Apollinarius in another, and even Marcellus had never been disavowed; but the chief cause of suspicion to the Semiarians was now the advance of the Nicenes to a belief in the deity of the Holy Spirit.

It was some time before Valens had a policy to declare. He was only a catechumen, perhaps cared little for the questions before his elevation, and inherited no assured position like Constantius. It was some time before he fell into the hands of the Homoean Eudoxius of Constantinople, a man of experience and learning, whose mild prudence gave him just the help he needed. In fact, a Homoean policy was really the easiest for the moment. Heathenism had failed in Julian's hands, and an Anomoean course was even more hopeless, while the Nicenes were still a minority outside Egypt. The only alternative was to favor the Semiarians; and this too was full of difficulties. Upon the whole, the Homoeans were still the strongest party in 365. They were in possession of the churches and had astute leaders, and their doctrine had not yet lost its attraction for the quiet men who were tired of controversy.

In the spring of 365 an imperial rescript commanded the municipalities to drive out from their cities the bishops who had been exiled by Constantius and restored by Julian. At Alexandria the populace declared that the rescript did not apply to Athanasius, whom Julian had not restored, and raised such dangerous riots that the matter had to be referred back to Valens. Then came the revolt of Procopius, who seized Constantinople and very nearly displaced Valens. Athanasius was restored, and could not safely be disturbed again. Then after the Procopian revolt came the Gothic war, which kept Valens occupied till 369: and

before he could return to church affairs, he had lost his best adviser, for Eudoxius of Constantinople was ill replaced by the rash Demophilus.

The Homoean party was the last hope of Arianism. The original doctrine of Arius had been decisively rejected at Nicaea, the Eusebian coalition was broken up by the Sirmian manifesto, and if the Homoean union also failed, its failure meant the fall of Arianism. Now the weakness of the Homoean power is shown by the growth of a new Nicene party in the most Arian province of the Empire. Cappadocia was a country district: yet Julian found it incorrigibly Christian, and we hear very little of heathenism from Basil. But it was a stronghold of Arianism; and here was formed the alliance which decided the fate of Arianism. Serious men like Meletius had only been attracted to the side of the Homoeans by their professions of reverence for the Person of the Lord, and began to look back to the Nicene council when it appeared that Eudoxius and his friends were practically Arians after all. Of the old conservatives also, there were many who felt that the Semiarian position was unsound, and yet could find no satisfaction in the indefinite doctrine professed at Court. Thus the Homoean domination was threatened with a double secession. If the two groups of malcontents could form a union with each other and with the older Nicenes of Egypt and the West, they would be much the strongest of the parties.

This was the policy of the man who was now coming to the front of the Nicene leaders. Basil of Caesarea—the Cappadocian Caesarea—was a disciple of the Athenian schools, and a master of heathen eloquence and learning, and man of the world enough to secure the friendly interest of men of all sorts. His connections lay among the old conservatives, though he had been a decided opponent of Arianism since 360. He succeeded to the bishopric of Caesarea in 370. The crisis was near. Valens moved eastward in 371, reaching Caesarea in time for the great midwinter festival of Epiphany 372. Many of the lesser bishops yielded, but threats and blandishments were thrown away on their metropolitan, and when Valens himself and Basil met face to face, the emperor was overawed. More than once the order was prepared for his exile, but it was never issued. Valens went forward on his journey, leaving behind a princely gift for Basil's poorhouse. Thenceforth he fixed his quarters at Antioch till the disasters of the Gothic war called him back to Europe in 378.

Armed with spiritual power which in some sort extended over Galatia and Armenia, Basil was now free to labor at his plan. Homoean malcontents formed the nucleus of the league, but old conservatives came in, and Athanasius gave his patriarchal blessing to the scheme. But the difficulties were enormous. The league was full of jealousies. Athanasius might recognize the orthodoxy of Meletius, but others almost went the length of banning all who had ever been Arians. Others again were lukewarm or sunk in worldliness, while the West stood aloof. The confessors of 355 were mostly gathered to their rest, and the Church of Rome cared little for troubles that were not likely to reach herself. Nor was Basil quite the man for the work. His courage indeed was indomitable. He ruled Cappadocia from a sick-bed, and bore down opposition by sheer force of will; and to this he joined an ascetic fervor which secured the devotion of his friends, and often the respect of his enemies. But we miss the lofty self-respect of Athanasius. The ascetic is usually too full of his own purposes to feel sympathy with others, or even to feign it like a diplomatist. Basil had worldly prudence enough to dissemble his belief in the Holy Spirit, not enough to shield his nearest friends from his imperious temper. Small wonder if the great scheme met with many difficulties.

The declining years of Athanasius were spent in peace. Heathenism was still a power at Alexandria, but the Arians were nearly extinct. One of his last public acts was to receive a confession presented on behalf of Marcellus, who was still living in extreme old age at Ancyra. It was a sound confession so far as it went; and though Athanasius did not agree with Marcellus, he had never thought his errors vital. So he accepted it, refusing once again to sacrifice the old companion of his exile. It was nobly done; but it did not conciliate Basil.

The school of Marcellus expired with him, and if Apollinarius was forming another, he was at any rate a resolute enemy of Arianism. Meanwhile the churches of the East seemed in a state of universal dissolution. Disorder under Constantius became confusion worse confounded under Valens. The exiled bishops were so many centers of strife, and personal quarrels had full scope. When for example Basil's brother Gregory was expelled from Nyssa by a riot got up by Anthimus of Tyana, he took refuge under the eyes of Anthimus at Doara, where another riot had driven out the Arian bishop. Creeds were in the same confusion. The Homoeans had no consistent principle beyond the rejection of technical terms. Some of their bishops were substantially Nicenes, while others were thoroughgoing Anomoeans. There was room for all in the happy family of Demophilus. Church history records no clearer period of decline than this. The descent from Athanasius to Basil is plain; from Basil to Cyril it is rapid. The victors of Constantinople are but the Epigoni of a mighty contest.

Athanasius passed away in 373, and Alexandria became the prey of Arian violence. The deliverance came suddenly, and in the confusion of the greatest disaster that had ever yet befallen Rome. When the Huns came up from the Asiatic steppes, the Goths sought refuge beneath the shelter of the Roman eagles. But the greed and peculations of Roman officials drove them to revolt: and when Valens himself with the whole army of the East encountered them near Hadrianople (9 Aug. 378) his defeat was overwhelming. Full two-thirds of the Roman army perished in the slaughter, and the emperor himself was never heard of more. The blow was crushing: for the first time since the days of Gallienus, the Empire could place no army in the field.

The care of the whole world now rested on the Western emperor, Gratian the son of Valentinian, a youth of nineteen. Gratian was a zealous Christian, and as a Western he held the Nicene faith. His first step was to proclaim religious liberty in the East, except for Anomoeans and Photinians—a small sect supposed to have pushed the doctrine of Marcellus too far. As toleration was still the general law of the Empire (though Valens might have exiled individual bishops) the gain of the rescript fell almost entirely to the Nicenes. The exiles found little difficulty in resuming the government of their flocks, or even in sending missions to the few places where the Arians were strong, like that undertaken by Gregory of Nazianzus to Constantinople. The Semiarians were divided. Numbers of them joined the Nicenes, while the rest took an independent position. Thus the Homoean power in the provinces collapsed of itself, and almost without a struggle, before it was touched by persecution.

Gratian's next step was to share his heavy burden with a colleague. The new emperor came from the far West of Cauca near Segovia, and to him was entrusted the Gothic war, and with it the government of all the provinces east of Sirmium. Theodosius was therefore a Western and a Nicene, with a full measure of Spanish courage and intolerance. The war was not very dangerous, for the Goths could do nothing with their victory, and Theodosius was able to deal with the Church long before it ended. A dangerous illness early in 380 led to his baptism by Acholius of Thessalonica; and this was the natural signal for a more decided policy. A law dated 27 Feb. 380 commanded all men to follow the Nicene doctrine, "committed by the apostle Peter to the Romans, and now professed by Damasus of Rome and Peter of Alexandria," and threatened heretics with temporal punishment. In this he seems to abandon Constantine's test of orthodoxy by subscription to a creed, returning to Aurelian's requirement of communion with the chief bishops of Christendom. But the mention of St Peter and the choice both of Rome and Alexandria, are enough to show that he was still a stranger to the state of parties in the East.

Theodosius made his formal entry into Constantinople 24 Nov. 380, and at once required the bishop either to accept the Nicene faith or to leave the city. Demophilus honorably refused to give up his heresy, and adjourned his services to the suburbs. But the



mob of Constantinople was Arian, and their stormy demonstrations when the cathedral of the Twelve Apostles was given up to Gregory of Nazianzus made Theodosius waver. Not for long. A second edict in Jan. 381 forbade all heretical assemblies inside cities, and ordered the churches everywhere to be given up to the Nicenes. Thus was Arianism put down as it had been set up, by the civil power. Nothing remained but to clear away the wrecks of the contest.

Once more an imperial summons went forth for a council of the Eastern bishops to meet at Constantinople in May 381. It was a sombre gathering: even the conquerors can have had no more hopeful feeling than that of satisfaction to see the end of the long contest. Only 150 bishops were present — none from the west of Thessalonica. The Semiarians however mustered 36, under Eleusius of Cyzicus. Meletius of Antioch presided, and the Egyptians were not invited to the earlier sittings, or at least were not present. Theodosius was no longer neutral as between the old and new Nicenes. After ratifying the choice of Gregory of Nazianzus as bishop of Constantinople, the next move was to sound the Semiarians. They were still a strong party beyond the Bosphorus, so that their friendship was important. But Eleusius was not to be tempted. However he might oppose the Anomoeans, he could not forgive the Nicenes their doctrine of the Holy Spirit. Those of the Semiarians who were willing to join the Nicenes had already done so, and the rest were obstinate. They withdrew from the council and gave up their churches like the Arians.

Whatever jealousies might divide the conquerors, the contest with Arianism was now at an end. Pontus and Syria were still divided from Rome and Egypt on the question of Meletius, and there were germs of future trouble in the disposition of Alexandria to look to Rome for help against the upstart see of Constantinople. But against Arianism the council was united. Its first canon is a solemn ratification of the Nicene creed in its original form, with an anathema against all the Arianising parties. It only remained for the emperor to complete the work of the council. An edict in the middle of July forbade Arians of all sorts to build churches even outside cities; and at the end of the month Theodosius issued an amended definition of orthodoxy. The true faith was henceforth to be guarded by the demand of communion, no longer with Rome and Alexandria, but with Constantinople, Alexandria, and the chief sees of the East: and the choice of cities is significant. A small place like Nyssa might be included for the personal eminence of its bishop; but the omission of Hadrianople, Perinthus, Ephesus and Nicomedia shows the determination to leave a clear field for the supremacy of Constantinople.

So far as numbers went, the cause of Arianism was not hopeless even yet. It was fairly strong in Asia, could raise dangerous riots in Constantinople, and had on its side the Western empress-mother Justina. But its fate was only a question of time. Its cold logic generated no fiery enthusiasm, its recent origin allowed no venerable traditions to grow up round it, and its imperial claims cut it off from any appeal to provincial feeling. So when the last overtures of Theodosius fell through in 383, Arianism soon ceased to be a religion in the civilized world. Such existence as it kept up for the next three hundred years was due to its barbarian converts.

## CHAPTER VI

### THE ORGANISATION OF THE CHURCH

CHRISTIAN organization was the means of expressing that which is behind and beneath all its details, namely the underlying and penetrating consciousness of the oneness of the Christian body and the Christian life. It was the process by which the separate charismata could be developed and differentiated, while at the same time the unity of the whole was safeguarded. Looked at in this light, the history of organization in the Christian Church is, in its main stream, the history of two processes, partly successive, partly simultaneous, but always closely related: the process by which the individual communities became complete in themselves, sufficient for their own needs, microcosms of the Church at large; and the process by which the communities thus organized as units proceeded to combine in an always more formal and more extensive federation.

But these two processes were not merely successive. Just as there never had been a time when the separate communities, before they became fully organized, were devoid of outside ministrations or supervision, so there never came a period when the fully organized communities lived only to themselves: unity was preserved by informal means, till the growing size and number of the communities, and the increasing complexity of circumstances, made informal means inadequate and further formal organization imperative. And again, though the formal self-expression of the individual community necessarily preceded the formal self-expression of the federation of communities, yet the history of organization within the single community does not come to an abrupt end as soon as the community becomes complete in itself: all functions essential for the Christian life are henceforth there, but as numbers increase and needs and duties multiply, the superabundant vitality of the organism shows itself in the differentiation of new, though always subordinate, functions. And therefore, side by side with the well-known history of the federation of the Christian churches, it will be our business to trace also the obscurer and less recognized, but perhaps not less important, processes which were going on, simultaneously with the larger processes of federation, in the individual churches and especially in those of them which were most influential as models to the rest.

(A) In the early days of Christianity the first beginnings of a new community were of a very simple kind: indeed the local organization had at first no need to be anything but rudimentary, just because the community was never thought of as complete in itself apart from its apostolic founder or other representatives of the missionary ministry. 'Presbyters' and 'deacons' no doubt existed in these communities from the first: 'presbyters' were ordained for each church as it was founded on St Paul's first missionary journey; 'bishops and deacons' constitute, together with the 'holy people', the church of Philippi. These purely local officials were naturally chosen from among the first converts in each district, and to them were naturally assigned the duties of providing for the permanently recurring needs of Christian life, especially the sacraments of Baptism—St Paul indicates that baptism was not normally the work of an apostle—and the Eucharist. But the evidence of the earlier epistles of St Paul is decisive as to the small relative importance which this local ministry enjoyed: the true ministry of the first generation was the ordered hierarchy, "first apostles, secondly

prophets, thirdly teachers”, of which the apostle speaks with such emphasis in his first epistle to the Corinthians. Next in due order after the ranks of the primary ministry came the gifts of miracles—“then powers, then gifts of healing”— and only after these, wrapped up in the obscure designation of “helps and governments”, can we find room for the local service of presbyters and deacons.

Even without the definite evidence of the Acts and the Pastoral Epistles and St. Clement of Rome it would be already clear enough that the powers of the local ministry were narrowly limited, and that to the higher ministry, the exercise of whose gifts was not confined to any one community but was independent of place altogether, belonged not only the general right of supervision and ultimate authority over local churches, but also in particular the imparting of the gift of the Spirit, whether in what we call Confirmation or in what we call Ordination. In effect the Church of the first age may almost be said to have consisted of a laity grouped in local communities, and a ministry that moved about from place to place to do the work of missionaries to the heathen and of preachers and teachers to the converts. Most of St Paul's epistles to churches are addressed to the community, the holy people, the brethren, without any hint in the title of the existence of a local clergy: the apostle and the Christian congregation are the two factors of primary account. The *Didache* shows us how right down to the end of the first century, in remoter districts, the communities depended on the services of wandering apostles, or of prophets and teachers, sometimes wandering sometimes settled, and how they held by comparison in very light esteem their presbyters and deacons. Even a well-established church, like that of Corinth, with half a century of history behind it, was able, however unreasonably, to refuse to recognize in its local ministry any right of tenure other than the will of the community: and when the Roman church intervened to point out the gravity of the blow thus struck at the principle of Christian order, it was still the community of Rome which addressed the community of Corinth. And this custom of writing in the name, or to the address, of the community continued, a relic of an earlier age, well into the days of the strictest monarchical episcopacy: it was not so much the bishop's headship of the community as the multiplication of the clergy which (as we shall see) made the real gap between the bishop and his people.

Most of our documents then of the first century show us the local churches neither self-sufficient nor self-contained, but dependent for all special ministries upon the visits of the superior officers of the Church. On the other hand most of our documents of the second century—in its earlier years the Ignatian letters, and an ever-increasing bulk of evidence as the century goes on—show us the local churches complete in themselves, with an officer at the head of each who concentrates in his hands both the powers of the local ministers and those also which had at first been reserved exclusively for the "general" ministry, but who is himself as strictly limited in the extent of his jurisdiction to a single church as were the humbler presbyter-bishops from whom he derived his name. When we have explained how the supreme powers of the general ministry were made to devolve on an individual who belonged to the local ministry, we have explained the origin of episcopacy. With that problem of explanation we have not here to deal in detail: we have only to recognize the result and its importance, when in and with the bishop the local church sufficed in itself for the extraordinary as well as for the ordinary functions of church government and Christian life.

In those early days of episcopacy, among the diminutive groups of Christian “strangers and sojourners” which were dotted over the pagan world of the second century, we must conceive of a quite special closeness of relation between a bishop and his people. Regularly in all cities—and it was in the provinces where city life was most developed that the Church made quickest progress—a bishop is found at the head of the community of Christians: and his intimacy with his people was in those primitive days unhindered by the interposition of any hierarchy of functionaries or attendants his flock was small enough for him to carry out to

the letter the pastoral metaphor, and to “call his sheep by name”. If the consent of the Christian people had always been, as Clement of Rome tells us, a necessary preliminary to the ordination of Christian ministers, in the case of the appointment of their bishop the people did not consent merely, they elected: not till the fourth century did the clergy begin to acquire first a separate and ultimately a predominant share in the process of choice. Even though the “angel of the church” in the Apocalypse may not have been, in the mind of the seer, at all intended to refer to the bishop, yet this quasi-identification of the community with its representative exactly expresses the ideal of second century writers. “The whole number of you I welcome in God's Name in the person of Onesimus”, “in Polybius I beheld the whole multitude of you”, writes Ignatius to the Christians of Ephesus and Tralles: “be subject to the bishop and to one another” is his injunction to the Magnesians: the power of Christian worship is in “the prayer of the bishop and the whole church”. So too to Justin Martyr, “the brethren as we are called” and “the president” are the essential figures in the portraiture of the Christian society.

If it is true that in the first century the apostle-founder and the community as founded by him are the two outstanding elements of Christian organization, it is no less true that in the second century the twin ideas of bishop and people attain a prominence which throws all subordinate distinctions into the background. Even as late as the middle of the third century we see Cyprian—who is quite misunderstood if he is looked on only as an innovator in the sphere of organization—maintaining and emphasizing at every turn the intimate union, in normal church life, of bishop and laity, while he also recognizes the duty of the laity, in abnormal circumstances, to separate from the communion of the bishop who had proved himself unworthy of their choice: “it is the people in the first place which has the power both of electing worthy bishops and of spurning the unworthy”. Similar witness for the East is borne in the same century by the *Didascalia Apostolorum*, where bishop and laity are addressed in turn, and their mutual relations are almost the main theme of the writer.

But this personal relation of the bishop to his flock, which was the ideal of church administrators and thinkers from Ignatius to Cyprian, could only find effective realization in a relatively small community: the very success of the Christian propaganda, and the consequent increase everywhere of the numbers of the Christian people, made some further development of organization imperative. Especially during the long peace between Severus and Decius (211-249) did recruits pour in. In the larger towns at least there could be now no question of personal acquaintance between the president of the community and all its members. No doubt it might have been possible to preserve the old intimacy at the cost of unity, and to create a bishop for each congregation. But the sense of civic unity was an asset of which Christians instinctively availed themselves in the service of religion. If practical convenience sometimes dictated the appointment of bishops in villages, these were only common in districts where, as in Cappadocia, cities were few, and where consequently the extent of the territory of each city was unduly large for supervision by the single bishop of the city. Normally, even in days before there was any idea of the formal demarcation of territorial jurisdiction, the city or civitas with all its dependent lands was the natural sphere of the individual bishop's authority. And within the walls of the city it was never so much as conceivable that the ecclesia should be divided. When the Council of Nicaea was making provision for the reinstatement in clerical rank of Novatianist clergy willing to be reconciled with the Church, the arrangement was subject always to the maintenance of the principle that there should not be “two bishops in the city”. The very rivalries between different claimants of one episcopal throne serve to bring out the same result—witness the earliest instances of pope and anti-pope of which we have documentary knowledge, those of Cornelius and Novatian in 251, and of Liberius and Felix about 357. In the latter case Constantius, with a politician's eye to compromise, recommended the joint recognition of both claimants: but the Roman people—Theodoret, to



whose History we owe the details, is careful to note that he has recorded the very language used—saluted the reading of the rescript in the circus with the mocking cry that two leaders would do very well for the factions at the games, but that there could be only "one God, one Christ, one bishop." Exactly the same reason had been given a century earlier in almost the same words, by the Roman confessors when writing to Cyprian, for their abandonment of Novatian and adhesion to Cornelius: "we are not unaware that there is one God, and one Christ the Lord whom we have confessed, one Holy Spirit, and therefore only one true bishop in the communion of the Catholic Church". Both in East and West, in the largest cities as well as in the smallest, the society of the faithful was conceived of as an indivisible unit; and its oneness was expressed in the person of its one bishop. The parish of Christians in any locality was not like a hive of bees, which, when numbers multiplied inconveniently, could throw off a part of the whole, to be henceforward a complete and independent organism under separate control. The necessity for new organization had to be met in some way which would preserve at all costs the oneness of the body and its head.

It followed that the work and duties which the individual bishop could no longer perform in person must be shared with, or deputed to, subordinate officials. New offices came into being in the course especially of the third century, and the growth of this clerus or clergy, and its gradual acquisition during the fourth and fifth centuries of the character of a hierarchy nicely ordered in steps and degrees, is a feature of ecclesiastical history of which the importance has not always been adequately realized.

Of such a hierarchy the germs had no doubt existed from the beginning; and indeed presbyters and deacons were, as we have seen, older component parts of the local communities than were the bishops themselves. In the Ignatian theory bishop, presbyters, and deacons are the three universal elements of organization, "without which nothing can be called a church". And the distinction between the two subordinate orders, in their original scope and intention, was just the distinction between the two sides of clerical office which in the bishop were in some sort combined, the spiritual and the administrative: presbyters were the associates of the bishop in his spiritual character, deacons in his administrative functions.

Our earliest documents define the work of presbyters by no language more commonly than by that which expresses the "pastoral" relation of a shepherd to his flock: "the flock in which the Holy Ghost hath set you as overseers to shepherd the Church of God", "the presbyters I exhort . . . shepherd the flock of God among you . . . not as lords of the ground but as examples of the flock, until the Great Shepherd shall appear". But in proportion as the local organization became episcopal, the pastoral idea concentrated itself upon the bishop. To Ignatius the distinctive function of the presbyters is rather that of a council, gathered round the bishop as the apostles were gathered round Christ—an idea not unconnected perhaps with the position of the presbyters in the Christian assembly; for there is no reason to doubt that primitive tradition underlies the arrangement of the early Christian basilicas, where the bishop's chair stood in the centre of the apse behind the altar, and the *consessus presbyterorum* extended right and left in a semicircle, as represented in the Apocalypse. So too in the *Didascalia Apostolorum* (Syriac and Latin) the one definite function allotted to presbyters is that of "consilium et curia ecclesiae". Besides pastoral duties, however, the Pauline epistles bring presbyters into definite relation also with the work of teaching. If 'teachers' were originally one grade of the general ministry, they would naturally have settled down in the communities earlier than the itinerant apostles or prophets: 'pastors and teachers' are already closely connected in the epistle to the Ephesians: and the first epistle to Timothy shows us that 'speaking and teaching' was a function to which some at least of the presbyters might aspire. It is probable enough that the second-century bishop shared this, as all other functions of the presbyterate: St Polycarp is described by his flock as an 'apostolic and prophetic teacher': but, as differentiation progressed, teaching was one of the duties less

easily retained in the bishop's hands, and our third-century authorities are full of references to the class known as presbyteri *doctores*.

If presbyters were thus the bishop's counsellors and advisers where counsel was needed, his colleagues in the rites of Christian worship, his assistants and representatives in pastoral and teaching duties, the prototypes of the diaconate are to be found in the Seven of the Acts, who were appointed to disburden the apostles of the work of poor relief and charity and to set them free for their more spiritual duties of 'prayer and ministering of the Word'. Quite similarly in the 'servants' of the local church, the bishop found ready to hand a personal staff of clerks and secretaries. The Christian Church in one not unimportant aspect was a gigantic friendly society: and the deacons were the relieving officers who, under the direction of the 'overseer', sought out the local members of the society in their homes, and dispensed to those who were in permanent or temporary need the contributions of their more fortunate brethren. From their district-visiting the deacons would derive an intimate knowledge of the circumstances and characters of individual Christians, and of the way in which each was living up to his *professio*: by a very natural development it became part of their recognized duties, as we learn from the *Didascalia*, to report to the bishop cases calling for the exercise of the penitential discipline of the Church. Throughout all the early centuries the closeness of their personal relation with the bishop remains: but what had been spread over the whole diaconate tends to be concentrated on an individual, when the office of archdeacon—*oculus episcopi*, according to a favorite metaphor—begins to emerge: the earliest instances of the actual title are c. 370-380, in Optatus (of Caecilian of Carthage) and in the *Gesta inter Liberium et Felicem*, (of Felix of Rome).

Originally, as it would seem, deacons were not ministers of worship at all: the earliest subordinate office in the liturgy was that of reader. We need not suppose that deacon in the New Testament means a distinct official in the Church any more than in the Synagogue: but the same phrase in Justin's Apology has more of a formal sound, and by the end of the second century the first of the minor orders had obviously an established place in church usage. While Ignatius names only bishop, presbyters, and deacons, Tertullian, contrasting the stable orders of Catholics with the unsettled arrangements of heretics, speaks of bishop, presbyter, deacon, and reader. And in remote churches or backwardly organized provinces the same four orders were the minimum recognized long after Tertullian, as in the so-called Apostolic Church Order (third century, perhaps for Egypt) and in the canons of the Council of Sardica (343, for the Balkan peninsula: the canon is proposed by the Spaniard Hosius of Cordova).

But the process of transformation by which the diaconate became more and more a spiritual office began early, and one of its results was to degrade the readership by ousting it from its proper functions. It was as attendants on the bishop that the deacons, we may well suppose, were deputed from the first to take the Eucharist, over which the bishop had offered the prayers and thanksgivings of the Church, to the absent sick. In Rome, when Justin wrote, soon after 150, they were already distributing the consecrated "bread and wine and water" in the Christian assembly. Not very much later the reading of the Gospel began to be assigned to them: Cyprian is the last writer to connect the Gospel still with the reader; by the end of the third century it was a constant function of the deacon, and the reader had sunk proportionately in rank and dignity.

But this development of the diaconate is only part of a much larger movement. In the greater churches at least an elaborate differentiation of functions and functionaries was in course of process during the third century. Under the pressure of circumstances, and the accumulation of new duties which the increasing size and importance of the Christian communities thrust upon the bishop, much which he had hitherto done for himself, and which long remained his in theory, came in practice to be done for him by the higher clergy. As they moved up to take his place, they in turn left duties to be provided for: as they drew more and

more to the spiritual side of their work, they left the more secular duties to new officials in their place. Evidence for Carthage and Rome in the middle of the third century shows us that, besides the principal orders of bishop, presbyters, and deacons, a large community would now complete its *clerus* by two additional pairs of officers, subdeacon and acolyte, exorcist and reader, making seven altogether. The church of Carthage, we learn from the Cyprianic correspondence, had exorcists and readers, apparently at the bottom of the clergy; and it had also *hypodiaconi* and *acoliiti*, who served as the bearers of letters or gifts from the bishop to his correspondents. Subdeacons and acolytes were now in fact what deacons had earlier been, the personal and secretarial staff of the bishop, while exorcists and readers were the subordinate members of the liturgical ranks. The combination of all these various officers into a single definitely graduated hierarchy was the work of the fourth century: but it is at least adumbrated in the enumeration of the Roman *clerus* addressed by Pope Cornelius, Cyprian's contemporary, to Fabius of Antioch in 251. Besides the bishop, there were at Rome forty-six presbyters, seven deacons, seven subdeacons, forty-two acolytes; of exorcists and readers, together with doorkeepers, there were fifty-two; of widows and afflicted over fifteen hundred: and all this "great multitude" was "necessary in the church".

Promotion from one rank of the ministry to another was of course no new thing. In particular the rise from the diaconate to the presbyterate, from the more secular to the more spiritual office, was always recognized as a legitimate reward for good service. "They that have served well as deacons", wrote St Paul, "purchase for themselves an honorable step"; though when the Apostolic Church Order interprets place of a presbyter or that of a bishop is meant. But it was a serious and far-reaching development when, in the fourth century, the idea grew up that the Christian clergy consisted of a hierarchy of grades, through each of which it was necessary to pass in order to reach the higher offices. The Council of Nicaea had contented itself with the reasonable prohibition (canon 2) of the ordination of neophytes as bishops or presbyters. The Council of Sardica in 343 prescribes for the episcopate a "prolixum tempus" of promotions through the "munus" of reader, the *officium* of deacon, and the *ministerium* of presbyter. But it was in the church of Rome that the conception of the *cursus honorum*—borrowed, we may suppose, consciously or unconsciously from the civil magistracies of the Roman State—took deepest root. Probably the oldest known case of particular clerical offices held in succession by the same individual is the record, in an inscription of Pope Damasus, of either his own or his father's career—there are variant readings "pater" and "puer", but even the son's career must have begun early in the fourth century—"exceptor, lector, levita, sacerdos". Ambrosiaster, a Roman and younger contemporary of Damasus, expresses clearly the conception of grades of order in which the greater includes the less, so that not only are presbyters ordained out of deacons and not vice versa, but a presbyter has in himself all the powers of the inferior ranks of the hierarchy. The earliest of the dated disciplinary decretals that has come down to us, the letter of Pope Siricius to Himerius of Tarragona in 385 (its prescriptions are repeated with less precision in that of Zosimus to Hesychius of Salona in 418), emphasizes the stages and intervals of a normal ecclesiastical career. A child devoted early to the clerical life is made a reader at once, then acolyte and subdeacon up to thirty, deacon for five years, and presbyter for ten, so that forty-five is the minimum age for a bishop: even those who take orders in later life must spend two years among the readers or exorcists, and five as acolyte and subdeacon. But the requirements of Siricius and Zosimus are moderate when brought into comparison with the pseudo-papal documents which came crowding into being at the beginning of the sixth century: of the apocryphal councils fathered on Pope Sylvester the one gives a *cursus* of 52 years, the other of 55, before the episcopate.

Two considerations indeed must be borne in mind which qualify the apparent rigor of the fourth and fifth century *cursus*. In the first place we have already traced the beginning of

the depreciation of the readership. In days when liturgical formulae were still unwritten, the reader's office was the only one that was mechanical: what it had necessarily implied was a modicum of education, and all who had passed through the office had at least learned to read. Thus it came about, from the fourth century onwards, that the readers were the boys who were receiving training and education in the schools of the Church: according to the canons, for instance, of the Council of Hippo in 393 readers on attaining the age of puberty made choice between marriage and permanent readership on the one hand, celibacy and rise through the various grades of clerical office on the other. And the second thing to be remembered is that all these prescriptions of canons or decretals represented a theoretical standard rather than a practice regularly carried out. Canon Law in the fourth century could still be put aside, by bishop or people, when need arose, without scruple. Minor orders might be omitted. St Hilary of Poitiers wanted to ordain Martin a deacon straight off, and only made him an exorcist instead because he reckoned that Martin's humility would not allow him to refuse so low an office. Augustine and Jerome were ordained presbyters direct. Even the salutary Nicene rules about neophytes were on emergency violated: Ambrose of Milan and Nectarius of Constantinople were both elected as laymen (the former indeed as a catechumen), and were rushed through the preliminary grades without appreciable delay; St Ambrose passed from baptism to the episcopate in the course of a week.

But in spite of any occasional reassertions of the older freedom, it did nevertheless remain true that the curses and all it stood for was gradually establishing itself as a real influence: and it stood for a body continually growing in size, in articulation, in strength, in dead weight, which drove in like a wedge between bishop and people, and fortified itself by encroachments on both sides. Doubtless it would have been natural in any case that bishop and people, no longer enjoying the old affectionateness of personal intercourse, should lose the sense of community and imperceptibly drift apart: but the process was at least hastened and the gap widened by the interposition of the clerus. It was no longer the laity, but the clergy alone, who were in direct touch with the bishop. Even the fundamental right of the people to elect their bishop slipped gradually from their hands into the hands of the clergy. Within the clerical class a continual and steady upward pressure was at work. The minor orders take over the business of the diaconate: deacons assert themselves against presbyters: presbyters in turn are no longer a body of counselors to the bishop acting in common, but, having of necessity begun to take over all pastoral relations with the laity, tend as parish priests to a centrifugal independence. The process of entrenchment within the parochial freehold was still only in its first beginnings: but already in the fourth century—when theologians and exegetes were feeling after a formal and scientific basis for what had been natural, instinctive, traditional—we find presbyters asserting the claim of an ultimate identity of order with the episcopate.

Such are the summary outlines of the picture, which must now be filled in, here and there, with more detail. And the details will serve to reinforce the conclusion that the principal features of the history of church organization in the fourth and fifth centuries are not unconnected accidents, but are to a large extent just different aspects of a single process, the multiplication and development of the Christian clergy.

1. The people had originally chosen their bishop without serious possibility of interference from the clergy. Voting by orders in the modern sense was hardly known: in so far as any check existed on the unfettered choice of the laity, it lay in the hands of the neighboring bishops from whom the bishop-elect would naturally receive consecration. Cyprian, it is clear from his whole correspondence, was made bishop of Carthage by the laity against the decided wishes of his colleagues in the presbyterate. After the death of Anteros of Rome in 236, we learn from the story in Eusebius that “all the brethren were gathered



together for the appointment of a successor to the bishopric". And this was still the practice after the middle of the fourth century: the description of the election of St Ambrose in 374 by his biographer mentions the people only. Another biography, that of St Martin of Tours by Sulpicius Severus, depicts a similar scene about the same date: Martin was elected, in the face of opposition from some of the assembled bishops, by the persistent vote of the people. The laity too, at least in some churches, still selected even the candidates for the priesthood. Possidius, the biographer of St Augustine, relates how Valerius of Hippo put before the "plebs dei" the need for an additional presbyter, and how the Catholic people, "knowing Saint Augustine's faith and life," seized hold of him, and presented him to the bishop for ordination. In Rome however the influence of the clergy was already predominant. The episcopal elections, during the troubled decade that followed the exile of Liberius in 355, are described in the *Gesta inter Liberium et Felicem*: the clergy first pledge their loyalty to Liberius and then accept Felix in his place: the opposition, who clung all through to Liberius and after his death elected Ursinus as his successor, are represented as mainly a lay party—*multitudo fidelium, sancta plebs, fidelis populus, dei populus*—yet even in their electoral assembly the clergy receive principal mention, "presbyteri et diacones ... cum plebe sancta". And though there are some indications that the party of Ursinus had strong support in the local episcopate, it was Damasus, the candidate of the majority of the clergy, who secured recognition by the civil power. At the end of the fourth century a definite place is accorded to the clergy in the theory of episcopal appointments. The eighth book of the Apostolic Constitutions distinguishes the three steps of election by the people, approval by the clergy, consecration by the bishops. Siricius of Rome, in his decretal letter to Himerius, puts the clergy before the people, "si eum deri ac plebis edecumarit election": the phrase "cleri plebisque" became normal in this connection, and ultimately meant that it was for the clergy to elect and for the people to approve.

Fundamental as these changes were, no doubt each stage of them seemed natural enough at its time. Indirect election was an expedient unknown as yet: real election by the laity, in view of the dimensions of the Christian population, became more and more difficult, and the pretence of it tumultuous and unsatisfactory. The members of the clergy on the other hand were now considerable enough for a genuine electing body, yet not too unwieldy for control: and the people were gradually ousted from any effective participation. So far as the influence of the laity still continued to make itself felt, it was through the interference of the State. Under either alternative Christian feeling had to content itself with a grave deflection from primitive ideals.

2. The earlier paragraphs of this chapter have already given us reason to anticipate the developments of the diaconate in the fourth century. We have seen how the intimate relations of the deacons with the bishop as his personal staff caused the business of the churches to pass more and more, as numbers multiplied, through their hand; we have seen also how from their attendance on the bishop, in church as well as outside of it, they gradually acquired what they did not originally possess, a status in Christian worship. It is just on these two lines that their aggrandizement still proceeded. In Rome and in some of the Eastern churches (witness the last canon of the Council of Neocaesarea in Pontus, c. 315), the deacons were limited, on the supposed model of the Acts, to seven, while the presbyterate admitted of indefinite increase, "and the mere disproportion in numbers exalted the individual deacon" says Jerome bitterly. But if complaint and criticism focused itself on the affairs of the church of Rome, where everything was on a larger scale and on a more prominent stage than elsewhere, the indications all suggest that the same thing was in lesser measure happening in other churches.

The legislation of the earliest councils of the fourth century supplies eloquent testimony to the ambition of deacons in general and Roman deacons in particular. The Spanish canons

of Elvira, c. 305, show that a deacon might be in the position of "regens plebem", in charge, no doubt, of a village congregation: he might (exceptionally) baptize, but he might not do what in many places the bishops of the Council of Arles, in 314, learnt that he did, namely "offer" the Eucharist. By a special canon of the same Council of Arles, the deacons of the (Roman) City are directed not to take so much upon themselves, but to defer to the presbyters and to act only with their sanction. Both these canons of Arles are combined and repeated in the 18th canon of Nicaea: but the reference to Rome is omitted, and the presumptions of the diaconate—we must suppose that existing conditions in the Eastern churches are now in view—take the form of administering the Eucharist to presbyters, receiving the Eucharist before bishops, and sitting down among the presbyters in church. Later on in the century we find the Roman deacons wearing the vestment called "dalmatic", which elsewhere was reserved to the bishop: and one of them—probably the Mercury who is mentioned in one of Pope Damasus' epigrams—had asserted the absolute equality of deacons and priests. Ambrosiaster, who may be confidently identified with the Roman ex-Jew Isaac, the supporter of the Anti-pope Ursinus, treats in the hundred and first of his *Quaestiones de iactantia Romanorum levitarum*: Jerome, in his epistle ad *Evangelium presbyterum*, appropriates the arguments of Ambrosiaster and clothes them with his own incomparable style. The Roman deacons, they tell us, arrogate to themselves the functions of priests in saying grace when asked out to dinner, and in getting responses made to themselves in church instead of to the priests: and this arrogance is made possible because of their influence with the laity and in the administration of ecclesiastical affairs. But the mind of the Church is clear: even at Rome presbyters sit, while deacons stand, and if at Rome deacons do not carry the altar and its furniture or pour water over the hands of the priest — as they do in every other church—that is only because at Rome there is a "multitude of clerks" to undertake these offices in their place. We do not know that these indignant remonstrances of Ambrosiaster and Jerome had any practical results: we do know that in the second half of the fourth and the beginning of the fifth century three deacons, Felix, Ursinus, and Eulalius, made vain attempts upon the papal throne—the successful rivals of the two latter were priests, Damasus and Boniface—while by the middle of the fifth century, as illustrated in the persons of St Leo and his successor Hilarius, the archdeacon almost naturally became pope.

3. As the deacon thus pressed hard on the heels of the presbyter, so the presbyter in turn put himself into competition with the bishop. Ambrosiaster and Jerome not only deny any parity of deacon and presbyter, but assert in opposition a fundamental parity of order between presbyter and bishop. Both were commentators on St Paul. Exegesis was one of the most fertile forms of that astonishing intellectual efflorescence, which, bursting out at the beginning of the fourth century in the schools of Origen and of Lucian, and in the West fifty years later, produced during several generations a literary harvest unequalled throughout the Christian centuries. And the two Latin presbyters found in the Pastoral Epistles just the historical and scriptural basis for the establishment of the claims of the presbyterate, that the instinct of the times called for. The apostle had distinguished clearly enough between deacons and presbyters or bishops: but he had used—so they rightly saw—the terms presbyter and bishop for the same order of the ministry, and it was an easy deduction that presbyter and bishop must be still essentially one. So Ambrosiaster (on 1 Timothy) and so Jerome (on Titus) explains that in the apostolic age presbyters and bishops were the same, until as a safeguard against dissensions one was chosen out of the presbyters to be set over the reste. The exegesis of Ambrosiaster and Jerome was undeniably sound: their historical conclusions were, if the picture given in the earlier pages of this chapter is correct, not so just to the facts as those of another commentator of the time, perhaps the greatest of them all, Theodore of Mopsuestia. No doubt the New Testament bishop was a presbyter: but "those who had authority to ordain,

the officers we now call bishops, were not limited to a single church but presided over a whole province and were known by the title of apostles. In this way blessed Paul set Timothy over all Asia, and Titus over Crete, and doubtless others separately over other provinces ... so that those who are now called bishops but were then called apostles bore then the same relation to the province that they do now to the city and villages for which they are appointed": Timothy and Titus "visited cities, just as bishops today visit country parishes".

"Uterque enim sacerdos est". In these words lies perhaps the real inwardness of the movement for equating presbyters with bishops and of its partial success: "Priesthood" was taking the place of "Order". In the first centuries, to St Ignatius for instance and to St Cyprian, the essential principle was that all things must be done within the Unity of the Church, and of that unity the bishop was the local centre and the guardian. That alone is a true Eucharist, in the language of Ignatius, which is under the authority of the bishop or his representative. No rite or sacrament administered outside this ordered unity had any reality. Baptism or Laying on of hands schismatically conferred, whether without the Church among the sects or without the bishop's sanction by any intruder in his sphere, were simply as though they had not been. Under the dominance of this conception the position of the bishop was unique and unassailable. But, as time went on, the single conception of Order, intense and overmastering as to those early Christians it had been, was found insufficient: other considerations must be taken into account, "lest one good custom should corrupt the world". Breaches were made in the theory first at one point, then at another. Christian charity rebelled against the thought of wholly rejecting what was intended, however imperfectly, to be Christian Baptism: iteration of such Baptism was felt, and nowhere more clearly than at Rome, to be intolerable. As with Baptism, so, though much more gradually and uncertainly, with Holy Orders. The distinction between validity and regularity was hammered out: *quod fieri non debuit, factum valet* was the expression of the newer point of view. Augustine, in his writings against the Donatists, laid down the principles of the revised theology, and later ages have done little more than develop and systematize his work.

It is obvious that in this conception less stress will be set on the circumstances of the sacrament, more on the sacrament itself: less on the jurisdiction of the minister to perform it, more on his inherent capacity: less, in other words, on Order, more on Priesthood. We are not to suppose that earlier thought necessarily differed from later on the question, for instance, to what orders of the ministry was committed the conduct of the characteristic action of Christian worship, or as to its sacrificial nature, or as to the priestly function of the ministrants. But earlier language did certainly differ from later as to the direction in which sacerdotal terminology was most freely employed. In the general idea of primitive times the whole congregation took part in the priestly office: when a particular usage of "sacerdos" first came in, and for several generations afterwards, it meant the bishop and the bishop only. The phraseology in this respect of St Cyprian is repeated by a whole chain of writers down to St Ambrose. No doubt the hierarchical language of the Old Testament was applied to the ministry of the Church long before the fourth century: but it was either transferred in quite general terms from the one hierarchy to the other as a whole, or it was concentrated upon the bishop.

Thus in the *Didascalia Apostolorum* it is the bishops who inherit the Levites' right to material support, the bishops who are addressed as "priests to your people and levites who serve in the house of God, the holy catholic Church", the bishop again who is "the levite and the high priest" (contrast the language of the *Didache*). But the detailed comparison of the three orders of the Jewish ministry and the Christian was so obvious that it can only have been the traditional use of *sacerdos* for the bishop that retarded the parallelism. We find *levita* for deacon in the *egiprams* of Damasus and in the *de Officiis* of St Ambrose: but the complete triad of *levita, sacerdos, summus sacerdos* for deacon, presbyter, and bishop meets us first in

the pages of the ex-Jew Ambrosiaster. And while Ambrose employs the Old Testament associations of the levite to exalt the dignity and calling of the Christian deacon, Ambrosiaster contrasts the “hewers of wood and drawers of water” with the priests, and paraphrases the titles *sacerdos* and *summus sacerdos* as presbyter and primus presbyter. *Summus sacerdos* is freely used of bishops by Jerome, though the title was forbidden even to metropolitans by an African canon. But in any case the new extension of *sacerdos* to the Christian presbyter was too closely in harmony with existing and not to take root at once. It is common in both St Jerome and St Augustine: Pope Innocent speaks of presbyters as *secundi sacerdotes*: and from this time onward bishop and priest tend more and more to be ranked together as joint possessors of a common *sacerdotium*.

This new emphasis on the *sacerdotium* of Christian presbyters is perhaps to be connected with the new position which in the fourth and following centuries they were beginning to occupy as parish priests. It was the necessity of the regular administration of the Eucharist which dictated the commencements of the parochial system. While the custom of daily Eucharists was neither universal nor perhaps earlier than the third century—it arose partly out of Christian devotion, partly out of the allegorical interpretation of the daily bread—the weekly Eucharist was both primitive and universal, and the needs in this respect of the Christian people could ultimately be met only by a wide extension of the independent action of the presbyterate. Though in the larger cities it can never have been possible, even at the first, for the Christian people to meet together at a single Eucharist, the bishop, as Ignatius tells us, kept under his own control all arrangements for separate services, and the presbyters, like the head-quarters staff of a general, were sent hither and thither as occasion demanded. It may have been as definite localities came to be permanently set apart for Christian worship, that the custom grew up of attaching particular presbyters to particular churches.

Probably it was during the long peace 211-249 that ground was first acquired for churches within the walls at Rome: cemeteries were constructed by the ecclesiastical authorities as soon as the beginning of the third century, but the earliest mention of church property in the City is when the Emperor Alexander Severus (222-235), as we learn from Lampridius, decided a question of disputed ownership of land between the *christiani* and the *popinari* in favor of the former, because of the religious use which they were going to make of it. Certainly by the time of Diocletian Christian churches throughout the Empire were of sufficient number and prominence to become, with the sacred vessels and the sacred books, a special mark for the edict of persecution in 303. And just as the restoration of peace produced an outburst of calligraphic skill devoted to the Bible, of which the Vatican and Sinaitic codices are the enduring monuments, so, too, the ruined buildings were replaced by others more numerous and more magnificent. Constantine erected churches over the graves of the Apostles on the Vatican hill and the Ostian Way, while inside the walls the Lateran basilica of the Savior and the Sessorian basilica of the Holy Cross testified further to the policy of the emperor and the piety of his mother. When Optatus wrote, fifty years later, there were over forty Roman basilicas, all of them open to the African Catholics and closed to the Donatists. But this number perhaps includes the cemetery churches, for the parish churches of the City appear to have been exactly twenty-five under Pope Hilary (461-468), in its life of whom the *Liber Pontificalis* enumerates a service of altar vessels for use within the City, one golden bowl for the “station” and twenty-five silver bowls (with twenty-five *amae* or cruets, and fifty chalices) for the parish churches, *scyphus stationarius*, *scyphi per titulos*. The station thus opposed to the parishes is the reunion, on certain days of the year, of the whole body of the Roman clergy and faithful under the pope at some particular church: it was a corrective to the growth of parochial separatism, like the custom of sending round every Sunday, from the pope's mass to the mass of every church within the walls, the *fermentum* or portion of the consecrated bread.



It was part of the same careful guard against the over-development of parochial independence, that, though there were parish clergy at Rome in the fourth and fifth centuries, there was as yet no parish priest. When Ambrosiaster wrote, it was the custom to allot two priests to each church. At a council under Pope Symmachus in 499, sixty-seven priests of the City subscribe, each with his title, "Gordianus presbyter tituli Pammachii" and so on: but the *tituli* are not more than thirty, some of them having as many as four or five priests attached to them. Indeed, thirty is perhaps too high a figure, for some *tituli* may appear under more than one name—an original name from the donor or the reigning pope, and a, supplementary name in honor of a saint. Of the fourth century popes Damasus had named a church after St Lawrence, and Siricius after St Clement: the basilica built under Pope Liberius became St Mary Major under Xystus III (432-440), and the two basilicas founded under Pope Julius (337-352) became in time the Holy Apostles and St Mary across Tiber.

But if the parochial system with its single rector was thus no part of Roman organization as late as the end of the fifth century, it was in full vigor at Alexandria two centuries earlier. Epiphanius tells us that, though all the churches belonging to the catholic body in Alexandria (he gives the names of eight) were under one archbishop, presbyters were appointed to each of them for the ecclesiastical necessities of the inhabitants in the several districts. The history of Arius takes the parochial system fifty or sixty years behind Epiphanius: it was as parish priest of the church and quarter named Baucalis that he was enabled to organize his revolt against the theology dominant at head-quarters under the bishop Alexander. The failure of the presbyter and victory of the bishop may have reacted unfavorably upon the position of the Alexandrine presbyters generally; the historian Socrates expressly tells us that after the Arian trouble presbyters were not allowed to preach there. At any rate it is just down to the time of Alexander and his successor, Athanasius, that those writers who testify to peculiar privileges of the Alexandrine presbyterate in the appointment of the patriarch suppose them to have survived. The most precise evidence comes from a tenth century writer, Eutychius, who relates that by ordinance of St Mark twelve presbyters were to assist the patriarch, and at his death to elect and lay hands upon one of themselves as his successor, Athanasius being the first to be appointed by the bishops. Severus of Antioch, in the sixth century, mentions that "in former days" the bishop was "appointed" by presbyters at Alexandria. Jerome (in the same letter that was cited above, but independent for the moment of Ambrosiaster) deduces the essential equality of priest and bishop from the consideration that the Alexandrine bishop "down to Heraclas and Dionysius" (232-265) was chosen by the presbyters from among themselves without any special form of consecration. Earlier than any of these is the story told in connection with the hermit Poemen in the Apophthegms of the Egyptian monks. Poemen was visited one day by heretics who began to criticize the archbishop of Alexandria as having only presbyterian ordination. Unfortunately the hermit declined to argue 'with them, gave them their dinner, and promptly dismissed them.

It is clear that an Alexandrine bishop of the fourth century slandered by heretics can be no one but Athanasius; and therefore this, the earliest evidence for presbyterian ordination at Alexandria, is just that which is most demonstrably false. For Athanasius was neither elected nor consecrated by presbyters: not more than ten or twelve years after the event, the bishops of Egypt affirmed categorically that the electors were "the whole multitude and the whole people" and that the consecrators were "the greater number of ourselves". Yet this very emphasis on the part of the supporters of Athanasius reveals one line of the Arian campaign against him; and the conjecture may be therefore hazarded that it was by Arian controversialists that the allegations of Alexandrine *presbyterianism* were first circulated, and that their real origin lay in the desire to turn the edge of any argument that might be based upon the solidarity of the episcopate. If the Catholics called upon the bishops of the East not to champion a rebellious presbyter, their opponents would, on this view, "go one better" in

their enthusiasm for episcopacy, and answer that Athanasius was no more than a presbyter himself. It is difficult for us, who have to reconstruct the history of the fourth century out of Catholic material, to form any just conception either of the mass of the lost Arian literature—exegetical and historical, as well as doctrinal and polemical—or of its almost exclusive vogue for the time being throughout the East, and of the influence which, in a thousand indirect ways, it must have exerted upon Catholic writers of the next generations. Jerome, writing amid Syrian surroundings, would eagerly accept the there current presentation of the Alexandrine tradition, though his knowledge of the later facts caused him to throw back the dates from the known to the unknown, from Athanasius and Alexander to Dionysius and Heraclas. Of course there is no smoke without fire; and presumably the Alexandrine presbyterate, in the generations immediately preceding the Council of Nicaea, must have possessed some unusual powers in the appointment of their patriarch. But it seems as likely that these were the powers which elsewhere belonged to the people as that they were the powers which elsewhere belonged to the bishops.

The explanation here offered would no doubt have to be disallowed, if it were true, as has sometimes been alleged, that Arianism all the world over stood for the rights of presbyters, while the cause of Athanasius was bound up with the aggrandizement of the episcopate. But the connection was purely adventitious at Alexandria, or at any rate local, and the conditions did not reproduce themselves elsewhere. There is no reason at all to suppose any general alliance between presbyters and Arianism, or between the episcopate and orthodox: on the contrary, all the evidence goes to show that in Syria and Asia Minor, and perhaps elsewhere, the bishops were less Catholic than their flocks. At Antioch, for instance, where Arian bishops were dominant during half a century, orthodox zeal was kept alive by the exertions of Flavian and Diodorus, originally as laymen, afterwards as priests. In so far as the doctrinal issue affected the development of organization at all, it must on the whole, both because of the general confusion of discipline and also because of the ill repute which the tergiversations of so many bishops earned for their order, have enhanced the tendency towards the emancipation of presbyters from episcopal control.

Whatever special conditions may have affected the course of development at Rome or Alexandria, it may be taken as generally true that, by the end of the fourth century the Christian presbyter's right to celebrate the Eucharist was coming to be regarded as inherent in his *sacerdotium* rather than as devolved upon him by the bishop. With this right went also the right to be served by deacons as *ministri*, and ultimately the right to preach. While the 18th canon of Nicaea still regards the deacons as ministers of the bishop only, later in the fourth century the eighth book of the Apostolic Constitutions speaks of “their service to both bishops and priests”, and Ambrosiaster is aghast at the audacity of trying to put presbyters and their servants on a par.

The right to preach had never been formally associated with any order of the Christian ministry: Ambrosiaster was certainly interpreting the documents on his own account. It is clear that in early times even a layman, like Origen, might at the bishop's request expound Scripture to the congregation. Nevertheless, though the right might be thus deputed, the sermon was part of the Eucharistic service, and Justin Martyr no doubt describes the normal practice when he makes the president of the assembly in person expound and apply the lections just read from Prophets or Gospels. In the fourth century it was treated as axiomatic that the right to preach, as part of the liturgy, could not even be deputed save to those to whom could also be deputed the right to offer the Eucharist itself. It is true that in many parts of the West the archdeacon did compose and pronounce a solemn thanksgiving once a year, at the lighting of the Paschal candle on Easter Even: but even this extralitururgical sermon de *laudibus cerei* was unknown at Rome, and Jerome, or whoever was the author of the letter addressed in 384 to a deacon of Piacenza (printed in the appendix to Vallarsi's edition), finds

in it a gross violation of Church order. Even the rights of presbyters in this respect were inchoate and still strictly circumscribed. In the Eastern churches it was customary for some of them to preach in the presence of the bishop and for the bishop to preach after them: and Valerius of Hippo was consciously introducing an Eastern use into Africa—he was himself a Greek, and therefore unable to speak fluently to his Latin flock—when he commissioned his presbyter Augustine “against the custom of the African churches” to expound the Gospel and preach frequently in his presence. To Jerome, familiar with the Eastern custom, it was *pessimae consuetudinis* that in some (doubtless Western) churches presbyters kept silence in the presence of their bishop: their right to preach attached directly to the pastoral office which they held, according to him, in common with the bishop.

But because presbyters might preach in the bishop's church, where he could note and correct at once any defects in their teaching, it does not necessarily follow that they might preach in the parish churches, and there does not seem to be any clear indication in the fourth and fifth centuries that they did in fact do so. For Rome indeed this is hardly surprising: we have seen how jealously parochial independence was there limited, and even at the bishop's mass, if we may believe the historian Sozomen, there were no sermons either by priest or bishop. In fact St Leo's sermons—he became pope just about the time that Sozomen published his Church History—are the first of which we hear after Justin's time in Rome. But in Gaul too, and as late as the beginning of the sixth century, only the city priests, the priests, that is, who served in the bishop's church, had the right to preach: the second canon of the second Council of Vaison in 529 extends the right, apparently for the first time, to country parishes; if the priest is at any time unable to preach through illness, the deacon is to read to the people “homilies of the holy fathers”.

It is perhaps surprising at first sight to find that in the fourth and fifth centuries presbyters are establishing a new independence in face of the bishop, rather than bishops exerting a new and stricter authority over presbyters. The conclusion has been reached by direct evidence; but it is also the conclusion clearly indicated by the analogy of the whole upward movement which we have seen at work in respect both to the minor orders and to the diaconate.

But if this movement exerted so powerful an influence on the one hand upon minor orders and diaconate, and on the other hand upon the priesthood, we could not expect that bishops should be exempt from it. How and where it led in their case it will be part of our business, in the second half of this chapter, to trace. It was outside their own borders that the bishops of the great churches were tempted to look for a wider field of activity and a more commanding position. From the very first the bishop of each community had represented it in its relation to other Christian communities, had been, so to say, its minister for foreign affairs.

The Visions of Hermas were to be communicated to “the cities outside” by Clement, for that function belongs to him. The complex developments of this function, from the second century to the fifth, must now engage our attention.

So far we have been dealing only with the internal development of the individual Christian community. But there is an external as well as an internal development to trace; the separate communities were always in intimate touch with one another, and the common feeling of the mass of them formed an authority which, from the beginning, the law of Christian brotherhood made supreme. “If one member suffer, all the members suffer”, “we have no such custom, neither the churches of God”: the principles are laid down in our earliest Christian documents, and the organization of the Catholic Church was an attempt to work them out in practice. No doubt the result only imperfectly embodied the idea, and in the process of translation into concrete form the means came sometimes to appear of more value than the end.

The history of the second century shows how naturally the formal processes of federation grew out of what was at first the spontaneous response to the calls of membership of the great Society, the natural effort to express the reality of Christian union and fellowship. The Roman community, under the leadership of St Clement, writes a letter of expostulation when the traditions of stability and order are threatened by the dissensions between the Corinthian community and its presbyters.

St Ignatius addresses separate epistles to the churches of several cities in Asia Minor, on or near his road to Rome, exhorting them to hold fast to the traditional teaching and worldwide organization of the Christian Society. The church of Smyrna announces to the church of Philomelium the martyrdom of its bishop Polycarp: the churches of Lyons and Vienne send to their brethren in Asia and Phrygia an account of the great persecution of 177, and the confessors from the same cities intervene with Pope Eleutherus in favor of a sympathetic treatment of the Montanist movement. Correspondence was reinforced by personal intercourse: Polycarp journeyed to Rome to discuss the Easter difficulty with Pope Anicetus; Hegesippus, Melito and Abercius travelled widely among different churches; Clement of Alexandria had sat at the feet of half-a-dozen teachers. Never was the impulse to unity, the desire to test the doctrine of one church or of one teacher by its agreement with the doctrine of the rest, stronger than in the days when formal methods of arriving at the general sense of the scattered communities had not as yet been hammered out. The Christian statesmen of the age of the councils were only attempting to provide a more scientific means of attaining an end which was vividly before the minds of their predecessors in the sub-apostolic generations.

The crucial step in the direction of organized action was taken when the bishops of neighboring communities began to meet together for mutual counsel. Such *concilia* were no doubt, in the first instance, called for specific purposes and at irregular times. Tertullian alludes to decisions of church councils unfavorable to the canonicity of the Shepherd of Hermas, and makes special mention on another occasion of councils in Greece. The earliest notice of separate councils held simultaneously to discuss a pressing problem of the day is also the earliest indication of the sort of area from which any one of such councils would naturally be drawn; for when, about 196, tension became acute in regard to the attitude of the bishops of proconsular Asia, who refused to come into line with the Paschal observances of other churches, councils were held, as we learn from Eusebius, of the bishops in Palestine and in Pontus and in Gaul and in Osrhoene. During the course of the third century these local or provincial councils became more and more a regular and essential feature of church life and government. But there was as yet very little that was stereotyped about the system. It was Cyprian beyond all others who succeeded, during his brief ten years of episcopate, 248-258, in forging a very practical weapon for the needs of the time out of the conciliar movement: and of Cyprian's councils some represented (proconsular) Africa alone, some Africa and Numidia, some Africa, Numidia, and Mauretania combined; the meetings were more or less annual, but the extent of the area from which the bishops were summoned depended apparently upon the gravity of the business to be dealt with. Again, if the civil province was in ordinary cases the natural model to follow, there was no necessary dependence upon its boundary lines, where these were artificial or arbitrary. For reasons of State the senatorial province of proconsular Africa and the imperial province of Numidia were so arranged that the more civilized districts and the seaboard belonged to the one, the more backward interior to the other: but the Numidia of ecclesiastical organization was the ethnic Numidia, the country of the Numidians, not the Numidia of political geography. Perhaps it was just for this reason, because ethnic and ecclesiastical Numidia was shared between two civil provinces, that in assemblies of the Numidian bishops the president was not, as elsewhere, the bishop of the capital of the province, but the bishop senior by consecration.



Not the least important result of the new direction given by Constantine to the relations of Church and State was the authorization and encouragement of episcopal assemblies on a larger scale than had in earlier days been possible. Where difficulties, disciplinary or doctrinal, proved beyond the power of local effort to resolve, councils were planned of a more than provincial type. The Council of Arles in 314 was a general council, *concilium plerarium*, of the Western Church, summoned by Constantine as lord of the Western Empire, to terminate the quarrel in Africa between the partisans of Caecilian and the partisans of Donatus. Judgment went in favor of Caecilian, whose party, because they alone now remained in communion with the churches outside Africa, were henceforward the Catholics, while the others became a sect known after the name of their leader as the Donatists. The dispute between Alexander and Arius at Alexandria was in its beginning as purely local as that between Caecilian and Donatus, but the issue soon came to involve the comparison of the fundamental theologies of the two great rival schools of Alexandria and Antioch. From a council such as Arles it was but a step to the conception of a general council of the whole Church, where bishops from all over the world should meet for comparison of the forms which the Christian tradition had taken in their respective communities, for open ventilation of points of controversy, and for the removal of misunderstanding by personal intercourse. Constantine, now master of an undivided empire, organized the first ecumenical council at Nicaea in 325. The great experiment was not an immediate success: the Nicene council rather opened than closed the history of Arianism on the larger stage, and it was not till after the lapse of half a century that wisdom was seen to be justified of its works, though the very keenness of the struggle made the long delayed and hardly won triumph more complete in the end. No council ever fastened its hold on Christian imagination in quite the same way as the Council of Nicaea.

Not that there was ever any quarrel between the supporters and the opponents of the *Homousion* as to the rightness of the procedure which had been called into being. The weapons with which the council and the creed were fought were rival councils and rival creeds: the verdict of the court was to be set aside by renewed trials and multiplied appeals in the hope of modifying somehow the original judgment. Of all these supplementary councils none was strictly general, though on three occasions—at Sardica and Philippopolis in 343, at Ariminum and Seleucia in 359, at Aquileia and Constantinople in 381—councils representing separately the Greek and the Latin episcopate were held more or less at the same time in East and West. Others, like that of Sirmium in 351, were held, wherever the emperor happened to be in residence, by the bishops attached at the moment to the court: others again were local and provincial. The atmosphere of Rome was never perhaps quite congenial to councils: yet even the Roman Church was swept into the movement, and the pronouncements of Pope Damasus (366-384) came before the world under the guise of conciliar decisions.

The experience of the fifty years that followed the Council of Tyre in 335 taught the lesson that it was possible to have too much even of a good thing. Pagan historian and Christian saint from different starting-points arrived at the same conclusion. Ammianus Marcellinus, criticizing the character and career of the Emperor Constantius, noted caustically that he threw the coaching system quite out of gear because so many of the relays were employed in conveying bishops to and from their councils at the expense of the State. And Gregory of Nazianzus, in the year 382, refused to obey the summons to a new council, because, he says, he never saw “any good end to a council nor any remedy of evils, but rather an addition of more evil as its result. There are always contentions and strivings for dominion beyond what words can describe”.

Perhaps it was partly by a natural reaction against councils, in those districts especially where they had followed most quickly upon one another, that the tendency to aggrandize the important sees at the expense of other bishops—and at the expense therefore of the conciliar

movement, since in a council all bishops had an equal vote—seems about this time to take a sudden leap forward. Valens the Arian and Theodosius the Catholic alike made communion with some leading bishop the test of orthodoxy for other bishops. A first edict of Theodosius on his way from the West to take up the Eastern Empire in 380 expresses Western conceptions by naming in this connection only Damasus of Rome and Peter of Alexandria: a later edict from Constantinople in 381 places Nectarius of Constantinople before Timothy of Alexandria, and adds half-a-dozen bishops in Asia Minor and a couple in the Danube lands as centres of communion for their respective districts.

Here then we must pause for a moment to take into account the second main element in the history of the federation of the Christian churches. Every federation has to face this primary problem—the reconciliation of the equal rights of all participating bodies with the proportional rights of each according to their greater or less importance. The difficulty which modern constitutions have tried to solve by the expedient of a dual organization, the one part of it giving to all constituent units an equal representation, the other part of it a proportionate representation according to population (or whatever other criterion of value may be selected), was a difficulty which lay also before the early Church. The unit of the Christian federation was the community, whose growth and development is described in the first half of this chapter; and that description has shown us that the necessary and only conceivable representative of the individual community was its bishop. But some communities were small and insignificant and unknown in history, others were larger in numbers, or more potent in influence, or more venerable in traditions: were the bishops of these diverse communities all to enjoy equal weight?

Such a question was no doubt not consciously put until the scientific and reflective period of Christian thought began, nor before the complex process of federation was approaching completeness: that is to say, not before the end of the fourth century. But in so far as it was put, it could receive but one answer. In the theory of Christian writers from St Irenaeus and St Cyprian onwards, all bishops were equal, for they were all appointed, to the same order and invested with the same powers, whether the sphere in which they exercised them were great or small; and this theory was given its sharpest expression in Jerome's assertion (in the same 146th letter) that the bishop of Gubbio had the same dignity as the bishop of Rome, seeing that both were equally successors of the Apostles. But in fact, and side by side with the fullest recognition of this theoretical equality, the bishops of the greater or more important churches were recognized, as the rules of the federation were gradually crystallized, to hold positions of privilege, so that the ministry of the Church came to consist not only of a hierarchy within each local community, at the head of which stood the bishop, but of a further hierarchy among the bishops themselves, at the head of which, in some sense, stood the bishop of Rome. The first steps towards such a hierarchy were on the one hand the traditional influence and privileges which had grown up unnoticed round the greater sees, and on the other hand the position acquired by metropolitans in the working out of the provincial system.

The canons of the same councils which first provide for regular meetings of the bishops of each province, reveal also the rapid aggrandizement of the bishop of the metropolis, who presided over them. If at Nicaea the 'commonwealth of bishops' is the authority according to one canon, by another the 'ratification of the proceedings' belongs to the metropolitan. The canons of Antioch, sixteen years later, lay it down that the completeness of a synod consists in the presence of the metropolitan, and, while he is not to act without the rest, they in turn must recognize that the care of the province is committed to him and must be content to take no step of any sort outside their own diocese apart from him. Traditional sanction is already claimed for these prerogatives of the metropolitan: they are "according to the ancient and still governing canon of the fathers".

Things were not so far advanced in this direction, it is true, in the West. At any point in the first five centuries the Latin Church lagged far behind the pitch of development attained by its Greek contemporaries. Christianity had had a century's start in the East, and at the conversion of Constantine it is probable that if the proportion of Christians in the whole population was a half, or nearly a half, among Greek-speaking peoples, it was not more than a fifth, in many parts not more than a tenth, in the West. The Latin canons of Sardica in 343 show how little was as yet known of metropolitans. Although many of the enactments deal with questions of jurisdiction and judicature, the bishop of the metropolis is mentioned only once, and then in general terms. The name *metropolitan* is as foreign to these canons as to the earliest versions of the Nicene canons.

With this backwardness of development among the Latins went also a much smaller degree of subservience to the State: and it resulted from these two causes combined that their church organization in the fourth and fifth centuries reflected the civil polity much less closely than was the case in the East. The "province" of the Nicene or Antiochene canons is the civil province, its metropolitan is the bishop of the civil metropolis, and it is assumed that every civil province formed also a separate ecclesiastical unit. It followed logically that the division of a civil province involved division of the ecclesiastical province as well. When the Arian emperor Valens, about 372, divided Cappadocia into Prima and Secunda, it was with the particular object of annoying the metropolitan of Caesarea, St Basil, and of diminishing the extent of his jurisdiction by raising Anthimus of Tyana to metropolitan rank; and though Basil resisted, Anthimus succeeded in the end in establishing his claim. Before the end of the fourth century not only every province but every group of provinces formed an ecclesiastical as well as a civil unit: the provinces of the Roman Empire had by subdivision become so numerous that Diocletian had grouped them into some dozen dioceses with an exarch at the head of each, and the Council of Constantinople in 381 forbids the bishops of one diocese or exarchate to interfere with the affairs of "the churches beyond their borders." So wholly modeled upon civil lines was the ecclesiastical organization throughout the East, that in the middle of the fifth century the canons of Chalcedon assume an absolute correspondence of the one with the other. Every place which by imperial edict might be raised to the rank of a city, gained ipso facto the right to a bishop (canon 17). Every division for ecclesiastical purposes of a province which remained for civil purposes undivided was null and void—even if backed up by an imperial edict—the *real* metropolis being alone entitled to a metropolitan (canon 12). Civil and public lines must be followed in the arrangement of ecclesiastical boundaries.

This conception summed itself up in the claim put forward on behalf of the see of Constantinople at the councils of 381 and 451. The bishops of these councils, deferring, perhaps not unwillingly, to the pressure of the local authorities, civil and ecclesiastical, gave to the bishop of Constantinople the next place after the bishop of Rome, on the ground that Constantinople was New Rome, and that "the fathers had assigned precedence to the throne of Old Rome because it was the Imperial City".

Nothing was better calculated than such a claim to bring out the latent divergences of East and West. Both in Church and State the rift between the Latin and the Hellenic element had begun to widen perceptibly during the course of the fourth century. Diocletian's drastic reorganization of the Imperial government gave the first official recognition to the bipartite nature of the Roman realm, and after the death of Julian in 363 the two halves of the Empire, though they lived under the same laws, obeyed with rare and brief exceptions separate masters. Parallel tendencies in the ecclesiastical world were working to the surface about the same time. The Latinization of the Western Churches was complete before Constantine: no longer clothed in the medium of a common language, the ideas and interests of Latin-speaking and Greek-speaking communities grew unconsciously apart. The rival ambitions of Rome and Constantinople expressed this antinomy in its acutest form.

The right of the civil government to be in its own sphere the accredited representative of Divine power on earth, the duty of the Christian Society to preserve at all costs its separateness and independence as the salt of mankind, the city set upon a hill—these were fundamental principles which could both appeal to the sanction of the Christian Scriptures. To hold the balance evenly between them has been, through the long centuries since Christianity began to play a leading part upon the political stage, the worthy task of philosophers and statesmen. That one scale should outweigh the other was perhaps inevitable in the first attempts, and it was at least instructive for future generations that the experiment of an overstrained allegiance to each of the two theories should have been given full trial in one part or another of Christendom.

To Byzantine churchmen the vision of the Christian State and the Christian Emperor proved so dazzling that they transferred to them something of the religious awe with which their ancestors had venerated the genius of Rome and Augustus. The memory of Constantine was honored as of a ‘thirteenth apostle’. The resentment of the native Monophysite churches of Syria and Egypt against such of their fellow-countrymen as remained in communion with Constantinople concentrated itself in the scornful epithet of Melkite or King’s man.

The Latins were more moved by the sentiment of the Roman name, and less by its incarnation in the Emperor. As Romans and Roman citizens, they felt the majesty of the Roman Republica to attach to place even more than to person. If Rome was no longer the abode of emperors, it was in their eyes not Rome but emperors who lost thereby. The event which stirred men in the West to the depths of their being was not the conversion of Constantine but the fall of Rome. When Alaric led his Goths to the storm of the City in 410, there seemed to be need for a new theory of life and for revision of first principles. The great occasion was greatly met. St Augustine wrote his twenty-two books *de Civitate Dei* to answer the obvious objection that Rome, inviolate under her ancestral gods, perished only when she turned to Christ. True it was that the City of the World had fallen: but it had fallen in the Divine providence, when the times were ripe for a new and higher order of things to take its place. The reign of the City of God had been ushered in.

It was a natural corollary of the principles of Western churchmen that the Divine Society could not possibly be bound to imitate the organization of the earthly society which it was to supplant. Pope Innocent, in direct opposition to the practice of the East, wrote to Alexander of Antioch in 415 that the civil division of a province ought not to carry ecclesiastical division with it; the world might change, not so the Church. Pope Leo refused his assent to the so-called 28th "canon" of Chalcedon, not merely as an innovation, but because its deduction of the ecclesiastical primacy of Rome from her civil position was quite inconsistent with the doctrine cherished by the popes upon the subject since at least the days of Damasus .

Here then we have a bifurcation of Eastern and Western ideas, leading to a clear-cut issue, in which both sides appealed to the truth of facts. Which of them represented the genuine Christian tradition? Certainly the case of provincial organization favored the Eastern view, for it was taken over bodily from the State. But then it was relatively modern; a far higher antiquity attached to the privileged position of the greater sees, and it was upon the origin and history of their privileges that the answer really turned.

Of course there never had been a time when some churches had not stood out above the rest, and the bishops of those churches above other bishops. The Council of Nicaea, side by side with the canons that prescribed the normal organization by provinces and metropolitans, recognized at the same time certain exceptional prerogatives as guaranteed by "ancient custom. In Egypt especially, Alexandria eclipsed its neighbor cities to a degree unparalleled elsewhere in the East; and while it might not have been easy to sanction the authority of the Alexandrine bishop over the whole of "Egypt Libya and Pentapolis," if it had been quite



unique in its extent, the Nicene fathers could shelter themselves under the plea that "the same thing is customary at Rome." A gloss in an early Latin version of the canons interprets the Roman parallel to consist in the "care of the suburbicarian churches," that is to say, the churches of the ten provinces of the Vicariate of Rome—central and southern Italy with the islands of Sicily and Sardinia. Over these wider districts the Roman and Alexandrine popes respectively exercised direct jurisdiction, to the exclusion in either case of the ordinary powers of metropolitans. The further prescription of the Nicene canon that "in the case of Antioch and in the other provinces" the churches were to keep their privileges, was understood by Pope Innocent to cover similar direct jurisdiction of Alexander of Antioch over Cyprus; and a version of the canons "transcribed at Rome from the copies" of the same pope defines the sphere of Antioch as "the whole of Coele-Syria".

What was it then that had given these three churches of Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch the special position to the antiquity of which the Nicene council witnesses? Roman theologians from Damasus onwards would have answered unhesitatingly that the motive was deference to the Prince of the Apostles, who had founded the churches of Rome and Antioch himself, and the church of Alexandria through his disciple Mark. But this answer is open to two fatal retorts: it does not explain why Alexandria, the see of the disciple, should rank above Antioch, a see of the master, and it does not explain why our earliest authorities, both Roman and non-Roman, so persistently couple the name of St Paul with the name of St Peter as joint patron of the Roman Church. Cyprian is the first writer to talk of the "chair of Peter" only.

Therefore we are driven back upon the secular prominence of the three cities as the obvious explanation of their ecclesiastical dignity. Yet if the appeal to history of the two councils which elevated Constantinople to the second place was thus not without a large measure of justification, their bald expression of Byzantine theory does not really, any better than the contemporary Roman view, cover the whole of the facts. If rank and influence in the ecclesiastical sphere depended, more than on anything else, on rank and influence in the civil sphere, it did not depend on it entirely. The personality and memory of great churchmen went for something. Carthage was no doubt the civil capital of the diocese of Africa, and Milan of the diocese of Italy: but it would be rash to assert that the inheritance which St Cyprian left to Carthage and St Ambrose to Milan was quite worthless or ephemeral. And if this was true of the great bishops of the third and fourth centuries, it was still more true of the apostles whom the whole Church united in venerating. Legends of apostolic foundation were often baseless enough, but their very frequency testified to the value set upon the thing claimed. Throughout the course of the long struggle with Gnosticism, the teaching of the apostles was the unvarying standard of Christian appeal: and evidence of that teaching was found not only in the written Creed and Scriptures but in the unwritten tradition of the churches and episcopal successions founded by apostles.

From the second century onwards a catena of testimony makes and acknowledges the claim of the Roman Church to be, through its connection with St Peter and St Paul, in a special sense the depository and guardian of an apostolic tradition, a type and model for other churches.

The pontificate of Damasus (366-384) has been more than once mentioned in the preceding pages as the period of the first definite self-expression of the papacy. The continuous history of Latin Christian literature does not commence till after the middle of the fourth century; the dogmatic and exegetical writings of Hilary in Gaul (c. 355) and Marius Victorinus in Rome (c. 360) are the first factors in a henceforward unbroken series. On the beginnings of this new literary development followed quickly the movement, of which we have already noticed symptoms in other directions, for interpreting existing conditions and constructing out of them a coherent and scientific scheme. These conditions had grown up

gradually, naturally, and almost at haphazard: it now seemed time to try to put them on to a firm theological basis, and in the process much that had been fluid, immature, tentative, was crystallized into a hard and fast system. It fell to the able and masterful Damasus, in the last years of a long life and a troubled pontificate, to attempt what his predecessors had not yet attempted, and to formulate in brief and incisive terms the doctrine of Rome upon Creed and Bible and Pope. A council of 378 or 379, after reciting the Nicene symbol, laid down the sober lines of Catholic theology as against the various forms of one-sided speculation, Eunomian and Macedonian, Photinian and Apollinarian, to which the confusions of the half-century since Nicaea had given birth; and the East could do no better than accept the Tome of Damasus, as seventy years later it accepted the Tome of Leo. Another council in 382 published the first official Canon of Scripture in the West—the influence of Jerome, at that time papal secretary, is traceable in it—and the first official definition of papal claims. Roman primacy is grounded, with obvious reference to the vote of the council of 381 in favor of Constantinople, on “no synodal decisions” but directly on the promise of Christ to Peter recorded in the Gospel. Respect for Roman tradition imposes next a mention of “the fellowship of the most blessed Paul”; but the dominant motif reappears in the concluding paragraph, and the three sees whose prerogative was recognized at Nicaea are transformed into a Petrine hierarchy with its *prima sedes* at Rome, its *secunda sedes* at Alexandria, and its *tertia sedes* at Antioch.

St Augustine’s theory of the *Civitas Dei* was, in germ, that of the medieval papacy, without the name of Rome. In Rome itself it was easy to supply the insertion, and to conceive of a dominion still wielded from the ancient seat of government, as world-wide and almost as authoritative as that of the Empire. The inheritance of the imperial traditions of Rome, left begging by the withdrawal of the secular monarch, fell as it were into the lap of the Christian bishop. In this connection it is a significant coincidence that the first description which history has preserved to us of the outward habit of life of a Roman pontiff belongs to the same period, probably to the same pope, as the formulation of the claim to spiritual lordship. Ammianus was a pagan, but not a bigoted one. He professes, and we need not doubt that he felt, a genuine respect for simple provincial bishops, whose plain living and modest exterior “commended them to the Deity and His true worshippers.” But the atmosphere of the capital, the *ostentatio rerum Urbanarum*, was fatal to unworldliness in religion. After relating that in the year 366 one hundred and thirty-seven corpses were counted at the end of the day in the Liberian basilica, on the occasion of the fight between the opposing factions of Damasus and Ursinus, the historian grimly adds that the prize was one which candidates might naturally count it worth any effort to obtain, seeing that an ample revenue, showered on the Roman bishop by the piety of Roman ladies, enabled him to dress like a gentleman, to ride in his own carriage, and to give dinner-parties not less well-appointed than the Caesar’s.

Some forty or fifty years after Damasus the Roman author of the original form of the so-called Isidorian collection of canons, incorporating in his preface the substance of the Damasine definition on the subject of the three Petrine sees, adds to Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch mention also of the honor paid, for the sake of James the brother of the Lord and of John the apostle and evangelist, to the bishops of Jerusalem and Ephesus. Mere veneration of the pillars of the apostolic Church is not enough to account for this modification of the original triad; the reasons must be sought in the circumstances of the day. If Ephesus is said to “have a more honorable place in synod than other metropolitans”, it may be merely that Ephesus, the most distinguished church of those over which Constantinople, from the time of St John Chrysostom, asserted jurisdiction, was a convenient stalking-horse for the movement of resistance to Constantinopolitan claims; but it is also possible that the phrase was penned after the ecumenical Council of Ephesus in 431, where Memnon of Ephesus was seated next after the bishops of Alexandria and Jerusalem. If the bishop of Jerusalem is “accounted

honorable by all for the reverence due to so hallowed a spot”, and nevertheless “the first throne”, *sedes prima*, “was never by the ancient definition of the fathers reckoned to Jerusalem, lest it should be thought that the throne of our Lord Jesus Christ was on earth and not in heaven”, we cannot help suspecting that at the back of the writer's mind hovers an uneasy consciousness that the apostolic traditions of Rome, which were so readily brought into play against Constantinople, might find an inconvenient rival in Jerusalem. Not that at Jerusalem, apart from a certain emphasis on the position of James the Lord's brother, there was ever any conscious competition with Rome: but it was true that, about the time that this canonical collection was published, the see of Jerusalem was just pushing a campaign of aggrandizement, carried on for over a century, to a triumphant conclusion.

The claims of Jerusalem were comparatively modest at the start, and it did not occur to Damasus for instance that they need be taken into serious consideration. Two initial difficulties hampered their early course. Although Jerusalem was the mother church of Christendom, and the home and centre of the first apostolic preaching, *Aelia Capitolina*, the Gentile city founded by Hadrian, had no real continuity with the Jewish city on the ruins of which it rose. The church of Jerusalem had been a church of Jewish Christians, the church of *Aelia* was a church of Gentile Christians, and for a couple of generations too obscure to have any history. A probably spurious list of bishops is all the record that survives of it before the third century. Then came the taste for pilgrimages—in *AD* 333 a pilgrim made the journey all the way from Bordeaux—and the growing cult of the Holy Places: Jerusalem was the scene of the most sacred of Christian memories, and locally at any rate *Aelia* was Jerusalem. From the time of Constantine onwards the identification was complete. The second difficulty was of a less archaic kind, and took longer to circumvent. *Aelia*-Jerusalem did not even dominate its own district, but was quite outshone by its near neighbor at Caesarea. Politically Caesarea was capital of the province: ecclesiastically it was the home of the teaching and the library of Origen, and the Origenian tradition was kept alive by Pamphilus the confessor and by Eusebius, bishop of the church at the time of the Nicene council. It was hardly likely that the council would do anything derogatory to the friend of Constantine, the most learned ecclesiastic of the age: and in fact all the satisfaction that the bishop of Jerusalem obtained at Nicaea was the apparent right to rank as the first of the suffragans of the province—like Autun in the province of Lyons, or London in the province of Canterbury. Local patriotism felt the sop thus thrown to it to be quite unsatisfying, and for a hundred years the sordid strife “for the first place” went on between the bishop of Jerusalem and the bishop of Caesarea. In the confusion of the doctrinal struggle it was easy enough for an orthodox bishop to refuse allegiance to an Arianising metropolitan: and Caesarea being in close relations with Antioch, it was natural for the bishops of Jerusalem to turn to their neighbors at Alexandria, nor, we may suppose, was Alexandria disinclined to favor encroachment upon the territory of its Antiochene rival. Western churchmen, with their profound belief in the finality of every decision of Nicaea, looked coldly on the movement, and it is one of the counts in Jerome's catalogue of grievances against John of Jerusalem. But at the first Council of Ephesus, with Cyril of Alexandria in the chair and John of Antioch absent, Juvenal of Jerusalem secured the second place, though he still failed to abrogate the metropolitan rights of Caesarea. At the Latrocinium of Ephesus in 449, again under Alexandrine presidency, he managed to sit even above Domnus of Antioch. The business of the Council of Chalcedon was to reverse the proceedings of the Latrocinium, and it might have been anticipated that with the eclipse of Alexandrine influence the fortunes of Jerusalem would also suffer. But a timely tergiversation on the doctrinal issue saved something for Juvenal and his see: the council decreed a partition of patriarchal rights over the “East” between the churches of Antioch and Jerusalem.

Very similar were the proceedings which established the “autocephalous” character of the island church of Cyprus. The Cypriots too began by renouncing the communion of the

Arian bishops of Antioch: they too espoused the cause of Cyril against John at the Council of Ephesus, and were rewarded accordingly: and just as the Empress Helena's discovery of the Cross served the claims of the church of Jerusalem, so the discovery of the coffin containing the body of Barnabas the Cypriot, with the autograph of St Matthew's Gospel, was held to demonstrate finally the right of the Cypriots to ecclesiastical isolation.

With this evidence before us, it is hard to deny that the history of the generations which first experienced the "fatal gift" of Constantine supplied only too good ground for St Gregory's complaint of contentions and strivings for dominion among Christian bishops. But though these contentions disturbed the work of councils, councils did not create them and Gregory was hardly fair if he laid on councils the responsibility for them: rather, in this direction lay the remedy and counterpoise, seeing that councils represented the parliamentary and democratic side of church government—stood, that is to say, in idea at least, for free and open discussion as against the untrammelled decrees of authority, and for the equality of churches as against the preponderance of metropolitan or patriarch or pope. No more grandiloquent utterance of these principles could indeed possibly be found than the words with which the Council of Ephesus concludes its examination of the Cypriot claim. "Let none of the most reverend bishops annex a province which has not been from the first under the jurisdiction of himself and his predecessors; and so the canons of the fathers shall not be overstepped, nor pride of worldly power creep in under the guise of priesthood, nor we lose little by little, without knowing it, that freedom which our Lord Jesus Christ, the Liberator of all men, purchased for us with his blood."

And councils really were, at any rate in two main departments of their activity, the organ through which the mind of the federated Christian communities did arrive at some definite and lasting self-expression, namely in the Creed and in the Canon Law. In both directions, it is true, East and West moved only a certain part of the way together: in both too, while the impulse was given by councils, the influence of the great churches added something to the completeness of the work: in the case of the Creed, what became a universal usage in the liturgy was at first only a usage of Antioch and Constantinople; in the case of the Canon Law the collective decisions of councils were supplemented by the individual judgments of popes or doctors before the corpus of either Western or Eastern Law was complete. Nevertheless it remains the fact that it was from and out of the conciliar movement that Church Law, as such, came into being at all; that the canons of certain fourth and fifth century councils are the only part of this Law common to both East and West; and that again the only common formulation of Christian doctrine was also the joint work of councils, which for that very reason enjoy the name of ecumenical, Nicaea, Constantinople, and Chalcedon.

1. The origins of the Christian Creed or Symbolum are lost in the obscurity which hangs over the sub-apostolic age. We know it first in a completed form as used in the Roman church about the middle of the second century. From Rome it spread through the West, taking the shape ultimately of our Apostles' Creed; and one view of its history would make this Roman Creed the source of all Eastern Creeds as well.

But a summary statement of Christian belief for the use of catechumens must have been wanted from very early times, and it is possible that what St Paul "handed over at the first" to his Corinthian converts (1 Cor. xv. 3) was nothing else than a primitive form of the Creed. Anyhow, from whatever source it was derived, a common nucleus was expanded or modified to meet the needs of different churches and different generations, so that a family likeness existed between all early Creeds, but identity between none of them.

At the Council of Nicaea the Creed was for the first time given an official and authoritative form, and was at the same time put to a novel use. The baptismal Creed of the church of Palestinian Caesarea, itself a much more technically theological document than any corresponding Creed in the West, was propounded by Eusebius: out of this Creed the Council



constructed its own confession of faith, no longer for baptismal and general use, but as the "form of sound words" by acceptance of which the bishops of the churches throughout the world were to exclude the Arian conception of Christianity. The example of the Creed of Nicaea on the orthodox side was followed in the next generation by numerous conciliar formularies expressing one shade or another of opposing belief. When the Nicene cause finally triumphed, the Nicene Creed was received all the world over as the expression of the Catholic Faith; and the Council of Ephesus condemned as derogatory to it the composition of any new formula, however orthodox.

The Council of Ephesus represented the Alexandrine position: at Constantinople, however, a new Creed was already in use, which was like enough to the Nicene Creed to pass as an expanded form of it, and was destined in the end to annex both its name and fame. This Creed of Constantinople had been developed out of some older Creed, probably that of Jerusalem, by the help of the test phrases of the Nicaenum and of further phrases aimed at the opposite heresies of the semi-Sabellian Marcellus and the semi-Arian Macedonius. It may be supposed that this Creed had been laid before the fathers of the council of 381: for at the Council of Chalcedon, where of course Constantinopolitan influences were dominant, it was recited as the Creed of the 150 fathers of Constantinople, on practically equal terms with the Creed of the 318 fathers of Nicaea. In another fifty years the two Creeds were beginning to be hopelessly confused, at least in the sphere of Constantinople, and the *Constantinopolitanum* was introduced into the liturgy as the actual Creed of Nicaea. In the course of the sixth century it became not only the liturgical but also the baptismal Creed throughout the East. In the West it never superseded the older baptismal Creeds—except apparently for a time under Byzantine influence in Rome—but as a liturgical Creed it was adopted in Spain on the occasion of the conversion of King Reccared and his Arian Visigoths in 589, and spread thence in the course of time through Gaul and Germany to Rome.

2. Canon Law, even more clearly than the Creed, Sowed its development to the work of councils.

The conception of a Church Law, *ius ecclesiasticum*, *ius canonicum*, was not matured till the fourth century, and then largely as a result of the new position of the Church in relation to the State, and in conscious or unconscious imitation of the Civil Law. Down to the close of the era of persecutions the discipline of the Church was administered under consensual jurisdiction without any written code other than the Scriptures, in general subordination to the unwritten or *regula*, the "rule of truth", "the ecclesiastical tradition". Primitive books like the *Didascalia Apostolorum* and the Apostolic Church Order give us a naive picture of the unfettered action of the bishop as judge with his presbyters as assessors. But as time went on the questions to be dealt with grew more and more complex; it became no longer possible to keep the world at arm's length, and the relations of Christians with the heathen society round them required an increasingly delicate adjustment; the simplicity of the rigorist discipline, by which in the second century all sins of idolatry, murder, fraud, and unchastity were visited with lifelong exclusion from communion, yielded at one point after another to the demands of Christian charity and to the need of distinctions between case and case. The problem became pressing when the persecution of Decius suddenly broke up the long peace, and multitudes of professing Christians were tempted or driven to a momentary apostasy. The Novatianist minority seceded rather than hold out to these unwilling idolaters the hope of any readmission to the sacraments: the Church was forced to face the situation, and it was obviously undesirable that individual bishops should adjudicate upon similar circumstances in wholly different ways. It was here that St Cyprian struck out his successful line: his first councils were called to deal with the disorganization which the persecution left behind it, and the bishops at least of Africa were induced to agree upon a common policy worked out on a uniform scale of treatment.

There is, however, nothing to show that at Cyprian's councils any canons were committed to writing, to serve as a permanent standard of church discipline. That crucial step was only taken fifty years later, as the persecution initiated by Diocletian relaxed and the bishops of various localities could meet to take common counsel for the repair of moral and material damage. During the decade 305-315 the bishops of Spain met at Elvira, the bishops of Asia Minor at Ancyra and at Neocaesarea, the Western bishops generally at Arles; and the codes of these four councils are the earliest material preserved in later Canon Law.

The decisions of such councils had however no currency, in the first instance, outside their own localities, and even the Council of Arles was a *concilium plerarium* only of the West; but the feeling was already gaining strength, and it was quite in accordance with the ecclesiastical policy of Constantine, that uniformity was desirable even in many matters where it was not essential, and an ecumenical council offered unique opportunities of arriving at a common understanding. So we find the Council of Nicaea issuing, side by side with its doctrinal definition, a series of disciplinary regulations, among which are incorporated, often in a greatly modified form, some canons of the Eastern Council of Ancyra and some canons of the Western Council of Arles.

These Nicene canons are the earliest code that can be called Canon Law of the whole Church, and at least in the West they enjoyed something like the same finality in the realm of discipline that the Nicene Creed enjoyed in the realm of doctrine. "Other canon than the Nicene canons the Roman church receives not, the Nicene canons alone is the Catholic Church bound to recognize and to follow," writes Innocent of Rome in the cause of St Chrysostom. Leo does not exclude quite so rigorously the possibility of additions to the Church's code: but the Nicene fathers still exercise an authority unhampered by time or place.

The principle was simplicity itself, but it came to be worked out with a naive disregard of facts. On the one hand the genuine Nicene code was not accepted quite entire, and where Western tradition and Nicene rules were inconsistent, it was not always the tradition that went under: the canon against kneeling at Eastertide is, in all early versions that we can connect with Rome, entirely absent; the canon against the validity of Paulianist baptism was misinterpreted to mean that the Paulianists did not employ the baptismal formula. On the other hand many early codes that had no sort of real connection with the Nicene councils sheltered themselves under its name and shared its authority. The canons of Ancyra, Neocaesarea and Gangra, possibly also those of Antioch, were all included as Nicene in the early Gallican collection. The canons of Sardica, probably because of the occurrence in them of the name of Hosius of Cordova, are in most of the oldest collections joined without break to the canons of Nicaea: and a rather acrimonious controversy was carried on between Rome and Carthage in the years 418 and 419, because Pope Zosimus cited the Sardican canons as Nicene, and the Africans neither found these canons in their own copies nor could learn anything about them in the East. The original form of the collection known as Isidore's was apparently translated from the Greek under Roman auspices at about this time: the canons of Nicaea are those *quas sancta Romana recipit ecclesia*, the codes of the six Greek councils Ancyra, Neocaesarea, Gangra, Antioch, Laodicea, and Constantinople follow, and then the Sardican canons. A Gallican editor of this version, later in the fifth century, combines the newer material with the older tradition in the shape of a canon proposed by Hosius, giving the sanction of the Nicene or Sardican council to the three codes of Ancyra, Neocaesarea, and Gangra.

We must not suppose that all this juggling with the name Nicene was in the strict sense fraudulent: we need not doubt the good faith of St Ambrose when he quoted a canon against digamous clergy as Nicene, though it is really Neocaesarean, or of St Augustine when he concludes that the followers of Paul of Samosata did not observe the 'rule of baptism', because the Nicene canons ordered them to be baptized, or for that matter of popes Zosimus

and Boniface because they made the most of the Sardican prescriptions about appeals to Rome, which their manuscripts treated as Nicene. The fact was that the twenty canons of Nicaea were not sufficient to form a system of law: the new wine must burst the old bottles, and by hook or by crook the code of authoritative rules must be enlarged, if it was to be a serviceable guide for the uniform exercise of church discipline. In the fourth century the councils had committed their canons to writing. In the fifth century came the impulse to collect and codify the extant material into a corpus of Canon Law.

The first steps were taken, as might be expected, in the East. Somewhere about the year 400, and in the sphere of Constantinople-Antioch, the canons of half-a-dozen councils, held in that part of the world during the preceding century, were brought together into a single collection and numbered continuously throughout. The *editio princeps*, so to say, of this Greek code contained the canons of Nicaea (20), Ancyra (25), Neocaesarea (14), Gangra (20), Antioch (25), and Laodicea (59): it was rendered into Latin by the Isidorian collector, and it was used by the officials of the church of Constantinople at the Council of Chalcedon, for in the fourth session canons 4 and 5 of Antioch were read as canon 83 and canon 84, and in the eleventh session canons 16 and 17 of Antioch as canon 95 and canon 96. The canons of Constantinople were the first appendix to the code: they are translated in the Isidorian collection, and they are cited in the acts of Chalcedon, but in neither case under the continuous numeration. When Dionysius Exiguus, early in the sixth century, made a quasi-official book of Canon Law for the Roman church, he found the canons of Constantinople numbered with the rest, bringing up the total to 165 chapters: his two other Greek authorities, the canons of the Apostles and the canons of Chalcedon, were numbered independently. The earliest Syriac version adds to the original nucleus only those of Constantinople and Chalcedon, with a double system of numeration, the one separate for each council, the other continuous throughout the whole series. And in the digest of Canon Law, published about the middle of the sixth century by John Scholasticus of Antioch (afterwards intruded as patriarch of Constantinople), the "great synods of the fathers after the apostles" are ten in number--i.e. not counting the Apostolic Canons the councils proper are brought up to ten by the inclusion of Sardica, Constantinople, Ephesus, and Chalcedon—and "besides these, many canonical rules were laid down by Basil the Great."

Two features in the work of John the Lawyer illustrate the transition from earlier to later Canon Law. In the first place the list of authorities is no longer confined strictly to councils, to whose decrees alone canonical validity as yet attached in the fourth and fifth centuries: a new element is introduced with the Canons of St Basil, and by the time we arrive at the end of the seventh century, when the constituent parts of Eastern Canon Law were finally settled at the Quinisextine council in Trullo, the enumeration of Greek councils is followed by the enumeration of individual doctors of the Greek Church, and an equal authority is attributed to the rules or canons of both. In the second place John represents a new movement for the arrangement of the material of Church Law, not on the older historical and chronological method, by which all the canons of each council were kept together, but on a system of subject-matter headings, so that in every chapter all the appropriate rules, however different in date or inconsistent in character, would be set down in juxtaposition. Three of John's contemporaries were doing the same sort of thing for Latin Church Law that he had done for Greek—the deacon Ferrandus of Carthage in his *Breviatio Canonum*, Cresconius, also an African, in his *Concordia Canonum*, and Martin, bishop of Braga in north-western Spain, in his *Capitula*. But the day of the great medieval systematisers was not yet: these tentative efforts after an orderly system seem to have met at most with local success, and the business of canonists was still directed in the main to the enlargement of their codes, rather than to the co-ordination of the diverse elements existing side by side in them.

Early Greek Church Law was simple and homogeneous enough, for it consisted of nothing but Greek councils: even the first beginnings of the corpus of Latin Church Law were more complex, because not one element but three went to its composition. We have seen that its nucleus consisted in the universal acceptance of the canons of Nicaea, and in the grafting of the canons of other early councils on to the Nicene stock. Thus, whereas Greek canon law admitted no purely Latin element (and in that way had no sort of claim to universality), Latin canon law not only admitted but centred round Greek material. Of course, as soon as the idea of a corpus of ecclesiastical law took shape in the West, a Latin element was bound to add itself to the Greek; and this Latin element took two forms. The natural supplement to Greek councils were Latin councils: and every local collector would add to his Greek code the councils of his own part of the world, Gallic, Spanish, African, as the case might be. But just about the same time with the commencement of the continuous series of councils whose canons were taken up into our extant Latin codes, commences a parallel series of papal decretals: the African councils begin with the Council of Carthage in 390 and the Council of Hippo in 393, the decretals with the letter of Pope Siricius to Himerius of Tarragona in 385. Such decretal letters were issued to churches in most parts of the European West, Illyria included, but not to north Italy, which looked to Milan, and not to Africa, which depended on Carthage. As their immediate destination was local, not one of them is found in the early Western codes so universally as the Greek councils; on the other hand their circulation was larger than that of any local Western council, and some or others of them are found in almost every collection. It would even appear that a group of some eight decretals of Siricius and Innocent, Zosimus and Celestine, had been put together and published as a sort of authoritative handbook before the papacy of Leo (441-461). Outside Rome, there were thus three elements normally present in a Western code, the Greek, the local, and the papal. In a Roman collection, the decretals were themselves the local element: thus Dionysius Exiguus' meditation consists of two parts, the first containing the Greek councils (and by exception the Carthaginian council of 419), the second containing papal letters from Siricius down to Gelasius and Anastasius II. But even the code of Dionysius, though superior to all others in accuracy and convenience, was made only for Roman use, and for more than two centuries had only a limited vogue elsewhere. Each district in the West had its separate Church Law as much as its separate liturgy or its separate political organization; and it was not till the union of Gaul and Italy under one head in the person of Charles the Great, that the collection of Dionysius, as sent to Charles by Pope Hadrian in 774, was given official position throughout the Franklin dominions.



## CHAPTER VII

### EXPANSION OF THE TEUTONS

THE race which played the leading part in history after the break-up of the Roman Empire was the race known as the Teutons. Their early history is shrouded in obscurity, an obscurity which only begins to be lightened about the end of the second century of our era. Such information as we have we owe to Greeks and Romans; and what they give us is almost exclusively contemporary history, and the few fragmentary statements referring to earlier conditions, invaluable as they are to us, do not go far behind their own time. Archaeology alone enables us to penetrate further back. Without its aid it would be vain to think of attempting to answer the question of the origin and original distribution of the Germanic race.

The earliest home of the Teutons was in the countries surrounding the western extremity of the Baltic Sea, comprising what is now the south of Sweden, Jutland with Schleswig-Holstein, the German Baltic coast to about the Oder, and the islands with which the sea is studded as far as Gothland. This, not Asia, is the region which, with a certain extension south, as far, say, as the great mountain chain of central Germany, may be described as the cradle of the Indo-Germanic race. According to all appearance, this was the centre from which it impelled its successive waves of population towards the west, south, and south-east, to take possession, in the end, of all Europe and even of a part of Asia. A portion of the Indo-Germanic race, however, remained behind in the north, to emerge after the lapse of two thousand years into the light of history as a new people of wonderful homogeneity and remarkable uniformity of physical type, the people which we know as the Teutons. The expansion of the Indo-Germanic race and its division into various nations and groups of nations had in the main been completed during the Neolithic Period, so that in the Bronze Age—roughly, for the northern races, 1500-500 *BC*—the territories which we have indicated above belonged exclusively to the Teutons who formed a distinct race with its own special characteristics and language.

The distinctive feature of the civilization of these prehistoric Teutons is the working of bronze. It is well known that in the North a region where the Bronze Age was of long duration—a remarkable degree of skill was attained in this art. The Northern Teutonic Bronze Age forms therefore in every respect a striking phenomenon in the general history of human progress. On the other hand, the advance in culture which followed the introduction of the use of iron was not at first shared by the Northern peoples. It was only about 500 *BC*, that is to say quite five hundred years later than in Greece and Italy, in the South of France and the upper part of the Danube basin, that the use of iron was introduced among the Teutons. The period of civilization usually known as the Hallstatt period, of which the latter portion (from about 600 *BC* onwards) was not less brilliant than the Later Bronze Age, remained practically unknown to the Teutons.

The nearest neighbours of the Teutons in this earliest period were, to the south the Celts, to the east the Baltic peoples (Letts, Lithuanians, Prussians) and the Slavs, in the extreme north the Finns. How far the Teutonic territories extended northward, it is difficult to say. The southern extremity of Scandinavia, that is to say the present Sweden up to about the lakes, certainly always belonged to them. This is put beyond doubt by archaeological discoveries. The Teutons therefore have as good a claim to be considered the original inhabitants of

Scandinavia as their northern neighbours the great Finnish people. It is certain that even in the earliest times they were expanding in a northerly direction, and that they settled in the Swedish lake district, as far north as the Dal Elf, and the southern part of Norway, long before we have any historical information about these countries. Whether they found them unoccupied, or whether they drove the Finns steadily backward, cannot be certainly decided, although the latter is the more probable. The *Sitones* whom Tacitus mentions along with the *Suiones* as the nations dwelling furthest to the north were certainly Finns.

On the east, the Teutonic territory, which as we saw did not originally extend beyond the Oder, touched on that of the Baltic peoples who were later known collectively, by a name which is doubtless of Teutonic derivation, as *Aists* (*Aestii* in Tacitus, Germ. 45). To the south and east of these lay the numerous Slavonic tribes (called *Venedi* or *Veneti* by ancient writers). The land between the Oder and the Vistula was therefore in the earliest times inhabited, in the north by peoples of the Letto-Lithuanian linguistic group, and southward by Slavs. On this side also the Teutons in quite early times forced their way beyond the boundaries of their original territory. In the sixth century B.C., as can be determined with considerable certainty from archaeological discoveries, the settlement of these territories by the Teutons was to a large extent accomplished, the Baltic peoples being forced to retire eastward, beyond the Vistula, and the Slavs towards the south-east. It is likely that the conquerors came from the north, from Scandinavia; that they sought a new home on the south coast of the Baltic and towards the east and south-east. To this points also the fact (otherwise hard to explain) that the tribes which in historic times are settled in these districts, Goths, Gepidae, Rugii, Lemovii, Burgundii, Charini, Varini and Vandals, form a separate group, substantially distinguished in customs and speech from the Western Teutons, but showing numerous points of affinity, especially in language and legal usage, to the Northern Teutons. When, further, a series of Eastern Teutonic names of peoples appear again in Scandinavia, those for instance of the Goths: *Gauthigoth* (Gautar, Gothland); Greutungi: *Greotingi*; Rugians: *Rugi* (Rygir, Rogaland); Burgundiones: *Borgundarholmr*; and when we find in Jordanes the legend of the Gothic migration asserting that this people came from Scandinavia (*Scandza insula*) as *the officina gentium aut certe velut vagina nationum* the evidence in favour of a gradual settlement of eastern Germany by immigrants from the north seems irresistible.

By the year 400 BC, at latest, the Teutons must have reached the northern base of the Sudetes. It was only a step further to the settlement of the upper Vistula; and if the Bastarnae, the first Germanic tribe which comes into the light of history, had their seat here about 300 BC, the settlement of the whole basin of the upper Vistula, right up to the Carpathians, must have been carried out by the Teutons in the course of the fourth century BC.

It was with Celts that the Teutons came in contact towards the sources of the Oder in the mountains which form the boundary of Bohemia. Now there is no race to which the Teutons owe so much as to the Celts. The whole development of their civilization was most strongly influenced by the latter—so much so that in the centuries next before the Christian era the whole Teutonic race shared a common civilization with the Celts, to whom they stood in a relation of intellectual dependence; in every aspect of public and private life Celtic influence was reflected. How came it then that a people whose civilization shows such marked characteristics as that of the Teutons of the Later Bronze Age could lose these with such surprising rapidity—perhaps in the course of a single century?

The earliest habitat of the Teutons extended, as we have seen, on the south as far as the Elbe. This river also marks the northern boundary of the Celts. All Germany west of the Elbe from the North Sea to the Alps was in the possession of the Celts, at the time when the Teutons occupied the western shores of the Baltic basin. The vigorous power of expansion which this race displayed in the last thousand years of the prehistoric age has left its traces

throughout Europe, and even in Asia; and that is what gives it such importance in the history of the world. The whole of Western Europe—France with Belgium and Holland, the British Isles and the greater part of the Pyrenean peninsula, in the south the region of the Alps and the plains of the Po—has been at one time or another subject to their rule. Eastward, migratory swarms of Celts pushed their way down the Danube to the Black Sea and even into Asia Minor.

The starting-point of this movement was probably in what is now north-western Germany and the Netherlands, and this region is therefore to be regarded as the original home of the Celtic race. Place-names and river-names, the study of which is a most valuable means of elucidating prehistoric conditions, enable us to prove the existence in many districts of this original Celtic population. They are scattered over the whole of western Germany and as far as Brabant and Flanders, but occur with especial frequency between the Rhine and the Weser. In the north the Wörpe-Bach (north-east of Bremen) marks the limits of their distribution, in the east the course of the Leine, down to Rosoppe; in the south they extend as far as the Main where the Aschaff (anciently Ascapha) at Aschaffenburg forms the last outpost of their territory. They are not found on the strip of coast along the North Sea, occupied later by the Chauci and Frisians, nor on the western side of the Elbe. From this we may safely conclude that these districts were abandoned by their original Celtic population earlier, indeed considerably earlier, than those to the west of the Weser, and also that the expansion of the Teutons westwards proceeded along two distinct lines, though doubtless almost contemporaneously one westward along the North Sea and one in a more southerly direction up the Elbe along both its banks.

With this view the results of prehistoric archaeology are in complete agreement. We have determined the area of distribution of the Northern Bronze Age—which we saw to be specifically Teutonic—as consisting, in the earlier period (up to c. 1000 *BC*), of Scandinavia and the Danish islands, and also Schleswig-Holstein, Mecklenburg and West Pomerania, and therefore bounded on the south-west by the Elbe. But in the Later Bronze Age (c. 1000-600 *BC*) this territory is enlarged in all directions. On the south and west especially, to judge from the evidence of excavations, it extends from the point at which the Wartha flows into the Oder, in a south-westerly direction through the Spreewald and Fläming districts to the Elbe; then further west to the Harz, and from there northwards along the Oker and Aller to about the estuary of the Weser, and finally along the coast-line as far as Holland. In Thuringia the Celtic peoples maintained their hold somewhat longer. The northern part of it—above the Unstrut—may have received a Teutonic population in the course of the fifth century *BC*; the southern in the course of the fourth. On the other hand, the whole region westward from the Weser and the Thuringian Forest as far as the Rhine was still in the possession of the Celts about the year 300 *BC*, and was only conquered by the Teutons in the course of the following century. It may be taken as the assured result of all the linguistic and archaeological data, that only about the year 200 *BC* the whole of north-western Germany was held by the Teutons, who had now reached the frontier-lines formed by the Rhine and the Main.

About the close of the fifth century *BC*, a new civilization appears in the Celtic domain, a civilization which, from the fine taste and technical perfection of its productions, deserves in more than one respect to rank with that of the classical nations. This is the so-called La Tène Civilization, which takes its name from a place on the north side of the Lake of Neuchatel where especially numerous and varied remains of it have come to light. Where its centre is to be located we do not know—somewhere, we may conjecture, in the South of France or in Switzerland. Starting from this point it spread through all the parts of Europe, which were not under the sway of the Greek and Roman civilization. Following the course of the Rhone, of the Rhine, and of the Danube, it rapidly conquered all the countries in which Gallic tongues

were spoken and maintained its supremacy until the Graeco-Roman civilization deposed it from its primacy.

It was with this highly developed civilization—so far superior, especially in its highly advanced knowledge of the working of iron, to the Northern, which still only made use of bronze—that the Teutons came in contact in their advance towards the south-west. It is quite intelligible that the Teutons in the course of their two hundred years of struggle with the Celts for the possession of north-western Germany, should have eagerly adopted the higher civilization of the Celts.

Vague reminiscences of the former supremacy of the Keltic race survived into historic times. *Ac fuit antea tempus cum Germanos Galli virtute superarent, ultro bella inferrent, propter hominum multitudinem agrigue inopiam trans Rhenum colonias mitterent*, writes Caesar—a piece of information which he must have derived from Gaulish sources. Here belongs also the Gallic tradition reported by Timagenes according to which a part of the nation was said *ab insulis extimis confluisse et tractibus Transrhenanis crebritate bellorum et adluvione fervidi maris sedibus suis expulsos*. Caesar himself mentions a Celtic tribe, the Menapii, on the right bank of the lower Rhine.

It is impossible to avoid the conclusion that the Celtic Teuriscans of northern Hungary were originally settled in south-central Germany between the Erzgebirge and the Harz, but later (about 400 BC) were forced out of this district by the pressure of the advancing Germans, and retired in two sections towards the south and south-east.

About the year 200 BC the Teuton occupation of north-west Germany was, as we have seen, completed, having reached the Rhine on the west and the Main on the south. But the great forward movement towards the south-west was not to be stayed by these rivers. Vast waves of population kept pressing downward from the north, and giving fresh impetus to the movement. The whole Germanic world must at that time have been in constant ferment and unrest. Nations were born and perished. Everywhere there was pressure and counter-pressure. Any people that had not the strength to maintain itself against its neighbours, or to strike out a new path for itself, was swept away. The tension thus set up first found relief on the Rhenish frontier. About the middle of the second century BC. Teutonic hordes swept across the river and occupied the whole country westward of the lower Rhine as far as the Ardennes and the Eifel. These hordes were the ancestors of the later tribes and clans which meet us here in the first dawn of history, the *Eburones*, *Condrusi*, *Caeroesi*, *Paemani*, *Segni*, *Nervii*, *Grudii*, and also of the *Texuandri*, *Sunuci*, *Baetusii*, *Caraces*, who appear later, as well as of the *Tungri*, who after the annihilation of the *Eburones* by Caesar succeeded to their territory and position of influence. The *Treveri*, on the other hand, who had their seat further to the south beyond the Eifel, were doubtless Celts.

The Teutonic invasion of Gaul must have taken place mainly in the second half of the second century BC, but it was still in progress in Caesar's time. It may suffice briefly to recall in this connection the successful campaign of Ariovistus; the incursion immediately before Caesar entered upon his province, of 24,000 Harudi into the country of the Sequani; the invasion of the Suebi under Nasua and Cimberius in the year 58; and of the Usipetes and Tencteri at the beginning of the year BC 55. That there were even later immigrations of Teutonic hosts into north-eastern Gaul may be conjectured from the absence of any mention by Caesar of several of the tribes which were settled here in the time by the Empire, and this conjecture is raised almost to a certainty by the known instance of the *Tungri*.

It was only later, in the time of the migrations of the Cimbri, and doubtless in connection therewith, that the frontier formed by the Main was crossed. It was—to the best of our information—a portion of the Suebi, previously settled on the northern bank of this river, who were the first to push across it, and after driving out the Helveti, established themselves firmly to the south of the river, and were here known under the name of Marcomanni (Men of



the Marches)—the name first meets us in Caesar, in the enumeration of the peoples led by Ariovistus. Their country, the *Marca*, extended south to the Danube. That the Tulingi (mentioned by Caesar as *finetini* of the Helveti) were of Germanic origin is put beyond doubt by their name, which is good German and forms a pendant to that of the Thuringi. But it will doubtless be near the truth to see in them not the whole nation of the Marcomanni, but only a tribe or *local division* of it, and doubtless its advance guard towards the south. In any case it is evident from Caesar's account that numbering as they did a round 36,000, of whom about 8000 were warriors, they formed a united whole with a definite territory and were not merely a migratory body of Marcomanni gathered together ad hoc.

A remnant of the old Marcomanni of South Germany, who in the year 9 *BC* migrated to Bohemia, is doubtless to be found in the *Suebi Nicretes* whom we meet with in the time of the Empire on the lower Neckar. Further to the north, on the southern bank of the Main, near Mittenberg, we find the name of the *Toutoni* in an inscription which came to light in the year 1878. Hereupon certain scholars have arrived at the conviction that this locality was the original home of the *Teutones* whom we hear of in association with the *Cimbri*, and so that they were not of Germanic but of Celtic origin, being of Helvetic race and identified with the Helvetic local clan of the *Touyev* of Strabo. This hypothesis must be absolutely rejected. There must have been some connection between those *Toutoni* and the *Teutoni* of history. But to conclude without more ado that the *Teutoni* were Helveti, South-German Celts, is to do direct violence to the whole body of ancient tradition, which consistently represents the *Teutoni* as a people whose original home was in the North. The simplest solution of the difficulty is that the *Mittenberg Teutoni* were a fragment which split off from the Teutonic peoples during their migration southward, and settled in this district, just as in north-eastern Gaul a portion of the *Cimbri* and *Teutones* maintained itself as the tribe of the *Aduatuci*.

The whole process of the expulsion of the Celts from South Germany must have been accomplished between 100 *BC* and 70 *BC*, for Caesar knows of no Gauls on the right bank of the upper Rhine, and the Helveti had been living for a considerable time to the south of the head-waters of the river which, as Caesar tells us, divides Helvetic from German territory.

The first collision between the Teutons and the Graeco-Roman world took place far to the east of Gaul. It resulted from a great migration of the eastern Teutonic tribes in the neighbourhood of the Vistula, which had carried some of them as far as the shore of the Black Sea. The chief of these tribes was that of the *Bastarnae*. Settled, it would seem, before their exodus near the head-waters of the Vistula they appear, as early as the beginning of the second century *BC*, near the estuary of the Danube. The whole region north of the Pruth, from the Black Sea to the northern slope of the Carpathians, was in their possession and remained so during all the time that they are known to history. Another Germanic tribe, doubtless dependent upon them, meets us in the same district, namely the *Sciri* from the lower Vistula. The well-known and much discussed 'psephisma' of the town of Olbia in honour of Protogenes mentions them as allied with the *Galatai*, and there has been much debate as to what nation is to be understood by these *Galatai*, and they have sometimes been conjectured to be Illyrian Kelts (*Scordisci*), sometimes Thracian, sometimes the—also Celtic—*Britolages*, or the Teutonic *Bastarnae*, or even the *Goths*. The majority of scholars has however decided that these "*Galatians*" are the *Bastarnae*, whose presence in the neighbourhood of Olbia in the year 182 *BC* is attested by Polybius. There is, indeed, much in favor of this hypothesis and nothing against it. The inscription then, which is proved by the character of the writing to be one of the oldest found in this locality, would have been written about the time of the arrival of the *Bastarnae* at the estuary of the Danube, that is to say, about 200–180 *BC*, and would therefore be the earliest documentary evidence for the entrance of the Germanic tribes on the field of general history.

As early as the year 182 *BC* we find the Bastarnae in negotiations with Philip of Macedon. Philip's plan was to get rid of the Dardanians, and after settling his allies on the territory thus vacated to use it as a base for an expedition against Italy. After long negotiations, the Bastarnae in 179 abandoned their lately-won territory, crossed the Danube and advanced into Thrace. At this point King Philip died, and after an unsuccessful battle with the Thracians the Bastarnae began a retreat to the settlement which they had abandoned; but a detachment of some 30,000 men under Clondicus pressed on into Dardania. With the aid of the Thracians and Scordiscans and with the connivance of Philip's successor, Perseus, he pressed the Dardanians hard for a time, but at last in the winter of 175 he also decided to retire. In Rome the intrigues of the Macedonian kings had been watched with growing mistrust and displeasure, which found expression in the dispatch of a commission to investigate the situation in Macedonia and especially on the Dardanian border. This, therefore, is the first occasion on which the Roman State had to concern itself with Teutonic affairs. At that time, it is true, the racial difference between Celts and Teutons was not yet recognized and the Bastarnae were therefore supposed to be Gauls. Before very long (168), we find the Bastarnae again in relations with the King of Macedon. Twenty thousand men, again under the command of Clondicus, were to join him in his struggle with the Romans in Paeonia. But Perseus was blinded by avarice, and failed to keep his promises. Clondicus therefore, who had already reached the country of the Maedi, promptly turned to the right-about and marched home through Thrace. From this point they disappear from history for a time, only to reappear in the Mithradatic wars as allies of that King, and they consequently appear also in the list of the nations over whom Pompey triumphed in the year 61.

In the East, on the frontiers of Europe and Asia, the Germanic race attracted little notice; but in the West, about the close of the second century *BC*, it shook the edifice of the Roman State to its foundations and spread the terror of its name over the whole of Western Europe. It was the Cimbri, along with their allies the Teutones and Ambrones, who for half a score of years kept the world in suspense. All three peoples were doubtless of Germanic stock. We may take it as established that the original home of the Cimbri was on the Jutish peninsula, that of the Teutones somewhere between the Ems and the Weser, and that of the Ambrones in the same neighbourhood, also on the North Sea coast. The cause of their migration was the constant encroachment of the sea upon their coasts, the occasion being an inundation which devastated their territory, great stretches of it being engulfed by the sea. This is the account given by ancient writers and we have no reason to doubt its truth. The exodus of all three peoples took place about the same time, and obviously in such a way that from the first they went forward in close touch with one another. First they turned southwards, probably following the line of the Elbe, crossed the Erzgebirge and pressed on into Bohemia, the land of the Boii. Driven back by the latter, they seem to have made their way along the valley of the March, southwards to the Danube, and then through Pannonia into the country of the Scordisci. Here, too, they encountered (in the year 114) such vigorous opposition that they preferred to turn westwards. That brought them into contact with the Taurisci who had just (115 *BC*) formed a close alliance with the Romans. In the Carnic Alps was stationed a Roman army under the command of the Consul Cn. Papirius Carbo, which immediately advanced into Noricum. Carbo's attempt by means of a treacherous attack to annihilate the Teutons ended in a severe defeat. The way into Italy now lay open to the victors. But so great was the awe in which they still held the Roman name, that they promptly turned away towards the north. Their route led them to the territory of the Helveti, which then extended from the Lake of Constance as far as the Main. The Helveti do not seem to have offered any resistance; indeed a considerable section of the Helveti—the Tigurini and Toygeni—attached themselves to the Teutonic migrants. The Germanic hosts then crossed the Rhine and pressed on southwards, plundering as they went.

In 109 *BC* they halted in the valley of the Rhone, on the frontier of the Roman province of Transalpine Gaul, for the protection of which a strong army under the Consul M. Junius Silanus had taken the field. The Romans attacked, but were defeated for the second time. Again the Germans shrank from invading Roman territory and preferred to plunder and ravage the Gallic districts, which they completely laid waste. Finally, in the year 105 they appeared once more on the frontier of 'the Province', this time resolved to attack the Romans. Of the three armies which opposed them that of the Legate M. Aurelius Scaurus was first defeated in the territory of the Allobroges. On 6 October followed the bloody battle of Arausio in which the other two armies, under the Consul Cn. Mallius Maximus and the Proconsul Q. Servilius Caepio, in all some 60,000 troops, were completely annihilated. But instead of marching into Italy, the barbarians once again let the favourable moment slip, and thus lost the fruits of their victory. They divided their forces. The Cimbri marched away westwards, first into the country of the Volcae, then on over the Pyrenees into Spain where they carried on a desultory and indecisive struggle with the Celtiberi; the Teutons and Helveti turned northwards to continue the work of plundering Gaul. In 103 the Cimbrian hosts made their way back to Gaul and reunited, in the territory of South-Belgic Veliocasses, with their comrades who had remained behind.

Now at last they prepared a march upon Italy. In the spring of 102 the main mass of the united hordes began to move southwards. Only one section, of about 6000 men—the nucleus of the later tribe of the Aduatuci—remained behind in Belgica to guard the spoils. Doubtless with a view to the difficulties of the passage of the Alps, especially in the matter of supply, the invading host was before long divided into three columns. The plan was that the Teutones and Ambrones should make their way into the plain of the Po from the western side, crossing the Maritime Alps, while the Cimbri and the Tigurini should make a wide flanking movement and enter from the north, the former by way of the Tridentine, the latter by way of the Noric Alps. But the attempt was planned on too vast a scale, and was wrecked by the military skill of Marius. The Ambrones and Teutones were annihilated in the double battle near Aquae Sextiae (summer 102), while the fate of the Cimbri overtook them in the following year. They had already reached the soil of Italy, into which they had forced their way after a victorious encounter with Quintus Lutatius Catulus on the Adige, when (30 July 101), on the plains of Vercellae, the so-called *Campi Raudii*, they were utterly routed by the united forces of Marius and Catulus. The Tigurini, who were to form the third invading force, received the news of the defeat of the Cimbri when they were still on the Noric Alps, and immediately turned round and retired to their own country. Thus the great invasion of the northern barbarians was defeated, and Western Europe could once more breathe freely.

We saw above that about 100 *BC*, doubtless in connection with the appearance of the Cimbri and Teutones in South Germany, the line of the Main was crossed by the Germanic peoples, and the settlement of the territory between that and the Danube began. Less than a generation later there was another attempt to extend the Germanic sphere of influence westward over Gaul. About the year 71 *BC* on the invitation of the powerful tribe of the Sequani, Ariovistus chief of the Suebi crossed the Rhine with 15,000 warriors to serve as mercenaries to the Sequani against their neighbours the Aedui. But after the victory was won, the strangers did not return to their own land but remained on the western side of the Rhine and established themselves in the territory of their employers, taking possession of about a third of it, presumably at its northern extremity. Strengthened by large accessions from the homeland this Germanic settlement on Gaulish territory—it consisted of the Vangiones, Nemetes and Tribocci, and finally extended over the whole of the left side of the Rhine valley, eastward of the Vosges—soon became a menace to all the surrounding tribes. A united attempt, in which the Aedui took a leading part, to expel the intruders by force of arms ended after months of indecisive fighting in a crushing defeat of the Gauls (at Admagetobrgia),

apparently in the year 61 *BC* Gaul lay defenceless at the feet of the victors, and they did not fail to make the most of their success. The Aedui and all their adherents were forced to give hostages and to pay a yearly tribute. None dared to oppose the conquerors, who already regarded the whole of Gaul as their prey. They pursued their work deliberately and systematically, constantly bringing in new swarms of their compatriots, chiefly Suebi and Marcomanni, and assigning them lands in the territories which they had subjugated. Settlers came even from Jutland, Endusi and Harudes 24,000 strong, and on their arrival the Sequani were forced to give up another third of their territory to the new-comers. Thus the power of Ariovistus became very formidable. The establishment of a great Germanic Empire over the whole of Gaul seemed not far distant.

At other points also the Teutons were preparing to cross the Rhine. It seemed as if the example set by Ariovistus would lead to a general invasion of Gaul, flood the whole country with Germans, and overwhelm the Gaulish race. The movement began on the upper Rhine, on the Helvetic border. The Helveti had been obliged, as we have already seen, to retire further and further before the pressure of the Germans, until finally all the country north of the Lake of Constance was lost to them, and the Rhine became their northern frontier. Even here they were not allowed to rest. A short time after the appearance of Ariovistus the Teutons had again endeavoured to enlarge their border towards the south, and there ensued a long struggle upon the Rhine frontier. It was only by their utmost efforts that the Helveti were able to beat off the attacks of their opponents. Weary of the constant struggle, they at last resolved to leave their territory. This, as we have seen, they did three years later, when some smaller tribes, among them the Germanic Tulingi., threw in their lot with them. The Jura region, the entrance to southern Gaul, thus lay open to the Teutons. In the same year there appeared on the middle Rhine, probably in the Taunus region, a powerful Suebian army—a hundred ‘gau's’ under the leadership of two brothers named Nasua (perhaps Masua) and Cimberius—and threatened to invade from this point the territory of the Treveri on the opposite bank. Finally, there was great restlessness also on the lower Rhine, among the tribes inhabiting the right bank, especially among the Usipetes and Tencteri, in consequence especially of the repeated aggressions of the warlike Suebi.

This was the condition of affairs when Caesar (58 *BC*) took up his command in Gaul. He was well aware of the danger to the Roman occupation which lay in these wholesale immigrations of Germanic hordes into Gaulish territory, and it was consequently his first care to take prompt measures to meet the Teutonic peril. It is well known how he performed this task, how he removed the haunting dread of a general irruption of the Germanic peoples into Celtic territory, and at the same time established security and order upon the Rhine frontier. The restoration of the conquered Helveti to their abandoned territory in order that they might continue to serve, but now in the Roman interest, as a buffer-state, secured Gaul, and especially the valley of the Rhone, against incursions from the direction of the upper Rhine. His victory over Ariovistus destroyed the latter's vast levies and with them his ascendancy, but not—and herein we see again the far-sighted policy of the conqueror—the work of colonization begun by the Germanic ruler. The tribes of the Vangiones, Nemetes and Tribocci which he had settled in Gaul were allowed to remain where they were, and, like the Helveti, were placed under the Roman suzerainty while retaining their racial independence. But while Caesar allowed these settlements to remain, he repressed with all the greater energy all further efforts of expansion on the part of the dwellers on the upper Rhine. True, the Suebian bands which in 58 had mustered on the right bank of the river, had retired on receiving news of the defeat of Ariovistus, so that there was no fighting with them, but the attempt of Usipetes and Tencteri, in the following year, to find a new home for themselves in Gaul led to a battle, in which a large portion of them perished, and the rest were flung back across the Rhine.



Augustus assumed the offensive against the Teutons. Even though the extension of the Roman dominion as far as the Elbe effected by the brilliant military successes of the two stepsons of the Emperor was of short duration—the year 9 *AD* witnessed the loss of the territory won by the expenditure of so much blood, of which it had been proposed to make a new province of *Germania Magna*—yet the Rhine frontier was secured for a considerable time to come by a belt of fortresses garrisoned by an army of nearly 80,000 men. This frontier was not seriously threatened for two hundred years thereafter. Throughout that period, except for a few insignificant raids, Gaul's eastern neighbour remained quiescent. It was only in the third century that unrest showed itself again, thereafter steadily increasing as time went on. And the cause of this was the appearance of two powerful confederacies which thenceforward dominated the history of the Rhineland—the Alemans and the Franks.

While the expansion of the Teutons towards the west was thus barred by the Romans, it proceeded the more vigorously in a southward and south-eastward direction. It is true that but little certain information has come down to us. The movements of population, implied by the appearance of the Marcomanni in Bohemia, of the Quadi in Moravia, of the Naristi between the Böhmer-Wald and the Danube, of the Bun, Lacringi, Victovali in the north of the Hungarian lowlands, are all more or less shrouded in obscurity, and it is but rarely possible to find a clue to their relations. About 60 *BC* the Boii had been forced by the advance of the Germanic races from the north to abandon their ancestral possessions. A portion of them found a dwelling-place in Pannonia, another portion, on its way from Noricum, joined the Helvetic migration. The north of the country thus left unoccupied was immediately taken up by Hermunduric, Semnonic, and Vandalic bands, offshoots of the three great tribes which flanked Bohemia on the north. From them were doubtless sprung the peoples who at a later time are met with here at the southern base of the Sudetes, the *Sudini*, *Bativi*, and *Corconti*. They were followed by the Marcomanni, who, doubtless in consequence of the military successes of Drusus in Germany, made their way, under the lead of their chief Marbod, to the further side of the Böhmer-Wald and occupied the main portion of the former country of the Boii.

The powerful kingdom which this Germanic prince established by bringing in further masses of settlers and by subjugating the surrounding tribes—even the powerful Semnones, the Langobards, the Goths, and the Lugi (Vandals) are said to have acknowledged his suzerainty—had no rival in northern Europe, and with its trained army of 70,000 footmen and 4000 horse soon became a menace to the Roman Empire. The importance which was attached to it, and to the commanding personality of its ruler by the Romans themselves, is evident from the extraordinary military preparations which Tiberius set on foot (6 *AD*). As is well known, the intervention of the Roman arms was not in the end called for. But what even they might not have been able to accomplish was effected by inner dissension. In the struggle for the supremacy of Germany against Arminius at the head of the Cherusci, and of all the other peoples who flocked to the standard of the *liberator Germaniae*, Marbod was defeated, and the fate of his kingdom was thereby decided. First the Semnones and Langobards ranged themselves on the side of his adversaries, then one tribe after another, so that he found his dominions in the end reduced to their original extent, the country of the Marcomanni. With the ruin of his Empire his own fate overtook him. Treachery in his own camp forced him to seek the protection of the Romans. The fall of its founder did not, however, affect the stability of the Bohemian kingdom of the Suebi. Although the Marcomanni were never afterwards able to regain their ascendancy, they held their own far on into the decline of the ancient world, in the country which they had occupied under Marbod's leadership. Indeed after a time their power was so far revived that, in alliance with the Quadi, they were able to dominate the upper Danube frontier for fully a century.

The earliest mention of the Quadi occurs in the geographer Strabo. He names them among the Suebian tribes who settled within the Hercynian Forest, the mountains which form the frontier of Bohemia. The country which they inhabited is nearly the present Moravia. Its eastern frontier was formed by the March, the ancient Marus. That they were of Suebian origin is clear from the express testimony of Strabo, as well as on linguistic grounds. The only point which remains doubtful is whether even before their coming into Moravia they had formed a political unit, or whether they were a migratory band sent out by one of the great Suebian peoples, perhaps the Semnones, which only developed into a united and independent national community after settling in Moravia. The former, however, is the more probable.

Like their western neighbours the Marcomanni, the Quadi were the successors of a Celtic people. As the Boii had been settled in Bohemia, so in Moravia, from a remote period and down to Caesar's day had been settled the *Volcae Tectosages*. Seeing that about 60 BC, the advance of the Teutons from the north over the Erzgebirge and Sudetes caused the Boii to leave their territory, it is probable that at the same time, or a little later, the peoples further to the east became involved in a struggle with the invaders. But whereas the Boii by their prompt retirement escaped the danger, the Tectosages, it would appear, were utterly destroyed. We find the Quadi soon after in possession of their territory; and since we get no hint of the fate of the Moravian Tectosages, the Romans cannot yet have been in possession of the neighbouring country of Noricum. Their destruction must therefore have fallen before 15 BC, when Noricum passed under the dominion of Rome. If this hypothesis is correct the irruption of the Quadi into Moravia took place shortly after the Boii had left Bohemia; in any case a considerable time before the occupation of that country by the Marcomanni.

To the west of the Marcomanni, between the Böhmer-Wald and the Danube as far up as the river Naab, were settled the Naristi. It is equally uncertain whence they came and when they appeared in this region. It is possible, though that is the most that can be said, that like their eastern neighbours they belonged to the Suebian confederacy—Tacitus certainly counts them as members of it—and that they are to be numbered among those peoples which, according to Strabo, Marbod had settled in the region of the *Hercynia Sylva*.

Guarding the flanks, as it were, of the southern territories of the Teutons lay two settlements planted by the Romans; in the west the Hermunduri between the upper Main and the Danube, and in the east the Vannianic kingdom of the Suebi. The former came into being 62 BC, the Roman general, L. Domitius Ahenobarbus, having assigned to a band of Hermunduri the eastern part of the territory left free by the migration of the Marcomanni into Bohemia; the latter was created by the settlement of bands of Suebian warriors belonging to the following of the fallen Suebian leaders, Marbod and Casvalda.

The *Marus* is of course the March, the *Cusus*, as this Suebian settlement cannot have been very extensive, was probably the Waag, though it may have been the Gran, which lies further to the east. The *Batizot* of Ptolemy are probably identical with these Suebians of northern Hungary, who come into notice several times in the course of the first century. As they disappear later, they were probably absorbed by the Quadi. Further towards the north-east, in the Hungarian Erzgebirge, and beyond in the upper region of the Vistula, we find in the first century of our era the Buri and Sidones. The former, who are mentioned as early as Strabo, were probably of Bastarnian, and the latter of Lugian origin; further still, abutting on the eastern flank of the Sidones, were the Burgiones, Ambrones, and Frugundiones, doubtless also Bastarnian.

If we now review the ethnographic situation in ancient Germany about the close of the first century AD, we find on its western frontier, in the eastern basin of the lower Rhine, the Chamavi, the Bructeri, the Usipii, the Tencteri, the Chattuarii and Tubantes; further in the interior, on both sides of the Weser, the great tribes of the Chatti and Cherusci; further to the

north, the Angrivarii; and, on the North Sea coast, the Chauci and Frisians. In the heart of the country three powerful Suebian populations have their seat: on the western bank of the middle Elbe, extending as far south as the Rhaetian frontier, the Hermunduri; north of them, on the western bank of the lower Elbe, the Langobards, and beyond that river, in the basins of the Havel and the Spree, the Semnones, who were held to be the primitive stock of the Suebi. The eastern part of the country was mainly occupied by the Lugii. The tribes too which appear later, in the wars of the Marcomanni (the Victovali, Asdingi, and Lacingi), were doubtless also Vandalic. Northward in the region of the Wartha and Netze, dwelt the Burgundiones or Burgundi; further north still, on the Pomeranian Baltic coast, the Rugii and Lemovi, next to whom on the western side came (with some other smaller tribes) the Saxons. North of these again, on the Jutish peninsula, lay the Anglii and Varini. Turning back to the Vistula again, we find on its eastern bank the Goths, who, apparently by the beginning of our era, had spread from the shores of its estuary to its upper waters. In the south, the portion of the Hermunduri which had its seat between the Main and the Danube formed the first link in a long chain consisting of Naristi, Marcomanni, Quadi, Buri, and finally, beyond the *confinium Germanorum*, the numerous branches of the Bastarnae.

It was therefore a vast territory which the Germanic races claimed for their own, and yet, as was soon to appear, it was too narrow for the energies of these young and vigorous nations. On their north foamed the sea, to the east yawned the desert steppes of southern Russia: thus any further expansion could only take a westward or southward direction. But on the one side as on the other lay the unbroken line of the Roman frontier. Any attempt at expansion in either of these directions must inevitably lead to an immediate collision with the Roman Empire.

The storm which lowered upon the Bohemian mountains was soon to burst. Mighty forces were doubtless at work in the interior of Germany which shortly after the accession of Marcus Aurelius stirred up the whole mass of nations from the Böhmer-Wald to the Carpathians, and let loose a tempest such as the Roman Empire had never before encountered on its frontiers. In the summer of 167 hosts of barbarians mustered along the line of the Danube, ready to make an inroad into Roman territory. The Praetorian Praefect, Furius Victorinus, was defeated, and slain with most of his troops; and the invading flood poured forward over the unprotected provinces. Not until the two Emperors reached the seat of war (spring 168) was the plundering and ravaging stopped. The barbarians then withdrew to the further side of the Danube and declared their readiness to enter into negotiations. There, in the winter of 168-9 the plague broke out with fearful violence in the Roman camp, and at once the complexion of events changed for the worse. In the spring, in the absence of the Emperors, who on the outbreak of the epidemic had returned to the capital, the army, weakened and disorganized by disease, suffered another severe defeat, and the Praetorian Praefect, Macrinus Vindex, met his death. Following up their victory, the Teutons assumed the offensive all along the line. A surging mass of peoples—Hermunduri, Naristi, Marcomanni, Quadi, Lacingi, Buri, Victovali, Asdingi and other tribes Germanic and Iazygic—swept over the provinces of Rhaetia, Noricum, Pannonia, and Daeid. Some detached bands even pushed their way into North Italy, laid siege to Aquileia, and destroyed Opitergium, further to the west.

But the danger passed as quickly as it had arisen. Effective measures were instantly taken. The flood of invasion was stemmed, and as it receded the Romans, led by the Emperor in person, took the aggressive. All the Teutons and Iazyges who remained on the south bank were forced back across the river. So successful were the Roman arms that by the year 171 the Quadi sued for peace. In the following year the Roman army crossed the Danube, and laid waste the country of the Marcomanni. Thus the two most dangerous adversaries had been subdued and the war seemed over. But by the year 174 the Emperor again found himself

obliged to return to Germany. Scarcely had he entered the country of the Quadi, when the army was placed in a highly dangerous position by an enveloping movement of the enemy, and by want of water. Suddenly a torrent of rain descended, and legionaries saw in the “miracle” a proof of the favour of the gods, and were inspired to fight with splendid valour, and gained a complete victory. This broke the resistance of the Quadi, and the Marcomanni also were forced to make peace. In 176 the Emperor returned to Rome, and there celebrated, along with his son Commodus, a well-deserved triumph. In 177 Marcus rejoined his army with the purpose of completing the work of conquest. Two new provinces, Marcomania and Sarmatia, were to be added to his Empire and were to round off his northern boundary. The war began (apparently before the end of 177) with an attack upon the Quadi, after which the Marcomanni were to be dealt with. In the course of the three-years' war both peoples were so thoroughly exhausted that when the Emperor suddenly died (17 March 180) their military strength was already broken.

One of the first acts of Commodus, an unworthy successor of his father, was to make peace which surrendered to the all but beaten enemy every advantage that had been wrested from them. The struggle for the lands to the north of the Danube was at an end. Meanwhile the Romans were confronted, about the close of the century, with a new and dangerous enemy in the west, in the angle between the Main and the frontier of upper Germany and Rhaetia — by the Alemans. As their name indicates, the Alemans were not a single tribe but a union of tribes—a confederacy. We hear (somewhat later) the names of several of the component tribes, the *Juthungi*, the *Brisigavi*, the *Bucinobantes*, and the *Lentienses*. Whence did they come? No doubt the nucleus of this confederacy was formed by the southern divisions of the Hermunduri. To these there may have attached themselves various fragments of peoples which had split off before and after the Marcomannic war, just as later, towards the middle of the third century, the Semnones, in the course of a migration southward, probably joined this confederacy and were absorbed by it.

Before long—as early as 213 —the new nation came in contact with the Romans. So far as can be made out from the confused account which is given us of their first appearance they had invaded Rhaetia, whereupon the Emperor Caracalla took the field against them, flung them back across the frontier and advanced into their territory carrying all before him. Before twenty years had passed the Teutons—presumably the Alemans again —renewed the attack upon the Roman frontier defenses. So threatening was the situation that the Emperor Severus Alexander felt himself obliged to break off his campaign against the Persians, and take over in person the direction of the operations on the Rhine. Negotiations had already begun before his assassination (March 235), but his successor, the rough and soldierly Maximin, brought new life into the campaign. Advancing by forced marches into the country of the Alemans he drove the barbarians before him without serious resistance, laid waste their fields and dwellings far and wide, and finally defeated them far in the interior of their territory.

The result of this campaign, the last war of offence on a large scale which the Romans waged on the Rhine, was the restoration of security to the frontier for a period of twenty years. Under Gallienus—probably about the year 258—the storm broke. With irresistible force the armies of the Alemans broke through the great chain of frontier fortifications between the Main and the Danube, and after overpowering the scattered Roman garrisons, poured like a flood across the whole of the *Agri Decumates*, and established themselves permanently in the conquered territory. At the same time Rhaetia became a prey to them; nay more, a strong force even crossed the Alps and penetrated as far as Ravenna. The invaders were, it is true, defeated by Gallienus near Milan, and forced to retreat, but the country at the northern base of the Alps was lost, and its loss threw open to the Germanic hordes the gates of Italy.



In addition to the Alemans of the upper Rhine, there now appeared, on the lower course of that river, another dangerous enemy, namely the Franks. The frontier had scarcely ever been seriously threatened at this point since the days of Augustus, but now under Gallienus the situation was altered. Here also there had quietly grown up a confederacy which, under the name of Franci, the Free, presumably comprised the tribes formerly met with in these regions, the Chamavi, Sugambri, and other smaller clans. Their name, first heard in the time of Gallienus, was soon to become even more terrible in the ears of the Romans than that of the Alemans. The first attack of the new league of peoples upon the Rhine frontier occurred in 253. The districts on the Gaulish bank of the Rhine soon fell into the hands of the enemy. With great difficulty Gallienus succeeded in forcing them back across the Rhine. But others followed them, and there ensued a series of desperate struggles which lasted till 258. On the whole the Romans had the best of it, even though their army was not large enough to prevent isolated bands of Franks from establishing themselves upon the left bank of the Rhine.

In 258 Gallienus was called away to the lower Danube, which urgently demanded his presence. The confusion which was created in the Rhine district by the assassination in the following year of the Emperor's son Valerian who had been left behind as Imperial Resident at Cologne, by the ambitious general Cassianus Postumus, gave the Franks a welcome opportunity to make a new inroad into Gaul. Their bands ranged almost unresisted through the whole country from the Rhine to the Pyrenees, devastating as they went. Then they pushed on, as the Cimbri had done before them, across the mountains into Spain, and made havoc of that country for several years, reducing to subjection even great cities like Tarraco, while, like the Vandals after them, they also made a foray into Africa. As at the time of the Cimbrian war, the terror of the Germans spread through all the countries of Western Europe. Only after a considerable time Postumus—a capable soldier and a well-intentioned administrator—was able to force the Germanic hordes out of Gaul and restore peace and security. But the Rhine became the frontier of the Empire and remained so as long as the Empire lasted.

From this time onward begins a period of incessant fighting with the Teutons of the Rhine-country: with the Alemans in the south and the Franks in the north. The weakness and exhaustion of the Empire caused by inner dissensions becomes manifest. If Postumus succeeded in keeping the Roman possessions on the Gaulish bank of the Rhine essentially intact, his immediate successors were less successful. The country was left defenceless, and large portions of it were plundered and drained of their resources. Probus indeed, whose short reign (276-282) is a ray of light in these gloomy times, succeeded in clearing them out of Gaul, and even ventured to assume the offensive on the upper Rhine, in a brilliant campaign forcing the Alemans back to the further side of the Neckar. But such successes were but temporary. Only in the time of Diocletian does a durable improvement on the Rhine frontier set in, an improvement which was maintained for the next two or three generations. During this period a third set of invaders, in addition to the Franks and Alemans, appeared towards the close of the century in the Saxons, the terror of the British and Gaulish coasts. In the main, however, Gaul was suffered to enjoy peace; and with peace returned prosperity.

Meanwhile on the shores of the Euxine, there emerges a people with whose name the world was to ring for centuries, the Goths. Their original home had been, it would appear, in Scandinavia, and after their migration to the German Baltic coast they had at first established themselves about the estuary of the Vistula, then in course of time they had moved further southward along the right bank of that river, so that at the beginning of our era they appear as far south as the neighbourhood of the Bohemian kingdom of the Marcomanni. How long they remained in this region we do not know, but it is not unlikely that their eastward migration falls about the time of the great Marcomannic war. We are equally ignorant of the time

occupied by this migration and the details of its progress; the only thing certain is that it reached its close not later than c. 230-240.

(The Gutones on the North Sea coast mentioned by Pytbeas in the fourth century BC may have been a branch of this people which had wandered westward, and were absorbed probably by the Frisians.)

The territory where the Goths at last took up their abode embraced the whole of the northern coast of the Black Sea. In the east it was separated by the Don from that of the Alani, in the west it bordered on the tract of country northward of the Danube Delta and the Dacian frontier which had been settled four hundred years earlier by the Bastarnae and the Sciri. Here the Goths divided into two sections soon after their immigration, that dwelling more to the west being known as the Tervingi, 'the inhabitants of the forest region', while the eastern division was known as the Greutungi, 'the inhabitants of the Steppes'. For the former the name Visigoths (Vesegoti) came into use, at latest c. 350, for the latter the name Ostrogoths, designations however of which the meaning is not absolutely certain, although 'the western Goths' and 'the eastern Goths' was an interpretation already known to Jordanes. The boundary between them was formed by the Dniester. Before long there appear alongside of them other Germanic peoples, the Gepidae, Taifali, Borani, Urugundi, and Heruli. The two first of these had some original link of connection with them. The Gepidae indeed appear in the Gothic legend of their migrations as an actual part of the Gothic nation. Whether they migrated to the Black Sea region at the same time as the Goths, or followed them later, must remain an open question.

Towards the end of the reign of Severus Alexander (222-235) the first indications of the appearance on the northern shores of the Black Sea of a new and powerful barbarian race, of a most warlike temper, had already become manifest, when the Greek towns of Olbia and Tyras fell victims to the sudden descent of an unknown enemy from the North. A little later, under Gordian III (238-244), its name is found. In the spring of 238 Gothic war-bands marched southwards, crossed the Danube with the connivance of the Dacian Carpi and broke into the province of Lower Moesia, where they captured and plundered the town of Istrus. The Procurator of the province, Tullius Menophilus (238-241), being unable to repel the invasion by force of arms, induced the Goths to retire by the promise of a yearly subsidy. But by 248 they had renewed their attacks on the Roman frontier in alliance with the Taifali, Asdingi, and Bastarnae. Under the leadership of Argaith and Gunterich their bands again broke into Lower Moesia, assailed without success the fortified town of Marcianople and plundered the unfortunate province again.

But these first exploits of the Goths were completely thrown into the shade by the great invasion of Roman territory made at the beginning of 250 by the half-legendary King Kniwa at the head of a powerful army. While the Carpi flung themselves upon Dacia, the Gothic attack was directed as before upon Moesia. Thence a strong detachment pressed onward over the undefended passes of the Balkans into Thrace, laid siege to Philippopolis, and even dispatched a plundering party into Macedonia. One division of the Gothic army, after vainly assaulting Novae and Nicopolis, was defeated in the neighbourhood of the latter town by the Emperor Decius in person, but this success was immediately counterbalanced by a reverse. The Goths, while retiring southwards by way of Beroë (Augusta Traiana), the present Eski-Zaghra, on the southern slope of the Balkans, defeated the Roman troops who were pursuing them. After this battle the victorious Goths effected a junction with their countrymen who were investing Philippopolis, and that city fell into their hands. The Romans, however, were now making extensive preparations, in view of which the barbarians began their retreat. Decius, eager to wipe out the failure at Beroë, sought to bar their path, and, in the hope of inflicting a crushing defeat upon them, engaged them near Abrittus, about 30 miles south-east of Durostorum (Silistria) in June 251. The day, which began well for the Romans, ended in a

fearful disaster, a great part of their army was destroyed, and the Emperor himself and one of his sons were among the slain. The country from which the barbarians had just retired now lay once more defenceless before them. They were finally bought off by the promise of a yearly subsidy.

The Gothic war of 250-251 had revealed in its full extent the danger which had lain hidden behind the mountains of Dacia. Later events did little to remove the terrible impression which the invasion of Kniwa had left behind. On the contrary, the history of the eastern half of the Empire in the reigns of Valerian and Gallienus, Claudius, Aurelian, and Probus is filled with incessant struggles against the Goths and their allies. For even Asia Minor was not exempt from their ravages; besides the bands which swept down by the Balkans and back again there were now others which came by sea from the Crimea and Lake Maeotis to ravage a constantly widening area of the coasts of Asia Minor and which even penetrated to the inland districts. Especially prominent in these piratical raids were the Borani and Heruli, two peoples who here appear in history for the first time side by side with the Goths. The first of these expeditions, made by the Borani in 256 against the town of Pityus (on the eastern shore of the Black Sea), ended in failure, but by the following year these same Borani succeeded in capturing and sacking Pityus and Trapezus. Even more destructive was the expedition which (spring 258) was undertaken by the West Goths, starting by sea and land from the port of Tyras. The whole western coast of Bithynia with the cities of Chalcedon, Nicomedia, Nicaea, Apamea, and Prusa was ravaged. The years 263, 264, and 265 also witnessed the vasting of the coast lands of Asia Minor by similar expeditions of the Pontic Teutons. Ilium, Ephesus with its renowned temple of Artemis, and Chalcedon were this time the victims of the barbarians.

But all these exploits were far surpassed in importance by the great plundering expedition of the Heruli in the year 267. From Lake Maeotis a fleet, said to have been five hundred strong, sailed along the western shore of the Euxine, then through the Bosphorus, where they made a successful *coup-de-main* against Byzantium, through the Propontis, where Cyzicus was captured, and the Hellespont, and onward past Lemnos and Scyros across the Aegean to Greece. Here on the classic soil of Attica, Argolis, and Laconia the wild hosts of these barbarians made fearful havoc, and it was long enough before the bewildered provincial government ventured to oppose them. The defenders, in whose ranks the historian Dexippus of Athens played a leading part, gradually gained confidence, and when they had succeeded in destroying the ships, the invaders were obliged to retreat by the land route. Beaten by the Roman troops their hosts rolled northwards through Boeotia, Epirus, Macedonia, towards their home, which they succeeded in reaching although hard pressed by their pursuers and at the very last compelled by the Emperor Gallienus to fight a battle, in which they incurred heavy losses, at the river Nestus, on the boundary between Macedonia and Thrace.

We have seen above how the Danube had been constantly threatened since the appearance of the Goths on the Black Sea, how invasion after invasion had descended on Dacia and Moesia. Soon after the accession of Gallienus (probably 256-7), Dacia with the exception of the narrow strip between the Temes and the Danube, which continued to be held down to the time of Aurelian, together with the portion of Lower Moesia which lay to the north of the Danube (the present Great Wallachia), became the prey of the barbarians. Some of the West Goths settled in Great Wallachia and the Taifali in the Banat; the northern districts, especially Transylvania, were occupied by the Victovali and Gepidae, who at this time make their appearance among the enemies of Rome. The consequence of the loss of Dacia and Trans-Danubian Moesia was that the Teutons now became on the lower Danube as well as elsewhere the immediate neighbours of the Empire, their territory being divided from it only by the river.

Only once in this whole period of inward decay did the imperial power succeed in winning a decisive victory. That was the achievement of the Emperor Claudius, whom his grateful contemporaries and successors have rightly adorned with the honourable title of 'Gothicus'. In the spring of 269 the Teutons made yet another attack upon the Empire, surpassing all former ones in violence. East Goths and West Goths, whom tradition here first distinguishes, Bastarnae (Peucini), Gepidae, and Heruli united their forces and advanced with a mighty army and fleet—estimated in the sources at 300,000 fighting-men and 2000 ships—against the Danubian frontier. Once more the province of Lower Moesia bore the brunt of their attack. The land army of the Teutons, in which lay their main strength, first made an unsuccessful attempt to take Tomi and Marcianople, then swept like a flood over the interior of the country, wasting and plundering as they went. Meanwhile the fleet, which was manned chiefly by Heruli, sailed past Byzantium and Cyzicus into the Aegean, and appeared before Thessalonica. Part of it remained there and blockaded the city; the remainder made a great plundering expedition which bears eloquent testimony to the seamanship and daring of these Teutons, along the coasts of Macedonia, Greece, and Asia Minor, extending even as far as Crete and Cyprus.

This was the situation when the Emperor Claudius reached the scene of war. At his approach the besiegers of the hard-pressed Thessalonica had hastily drawn off northwards and effected a junction with their kinsmen in Upper Moesia. The hostile forces met near Naissus. In the desperate struggle which ensued the Teutons suffered a crushing defeat. What remained of their army was in part cut to pieces in the pursuit, in part driven into the inhospitable recesses of the Balkans, where the survivors surrendered. They were partly enrolled in the Roman army, partly, in pursuance of a policy initiated by the Emperor Marcus, settled as *coloni* in the devastated frontier districts.

Thus the danger was averted from the Empire, and the desire of its restless neighbours beyond the Danube to make expeditions on the great scale was damped for nearly a hundred years. No doubt the inroads and piratical voyages of smaller Gothic war-bands continued; indeed, in the next fourteen years (270–284), there was fighting with bands of this kind under Quintillus, Aurelian, Tacitus, and Probus, but all these incursions were easily repelled by the imperial government, which gained strength under Aurelian and Probus. Just at this time, too, there broke out a severe internal struggle between the Teutons of the Euxine and those of the Danube. The first aid called in by the Goths against the Tervingi was that of the Bastarnae, but the outcome of the struggle was that the Bastarnae were defeated and compelled to abandon the territory which they had held so tenaciously for more than five hundred years. The expelled Bastarnae, said to have numbered 100,000 men, were taken under his protection by the Emperor Probus and settled in Thrace. After that the Tervingi, supported by the Taifali, made war on the allied Gepidae and Vandals, while the East Goths fought with their eastern neighbours the Urugundi, who on their defeat were taken under the protection of the Alani. We can see that the whole of the eastern Germanic world was in a state of wild uproar.

On the middle Danube there had been no fighting worth mention since the Marcomannic war. We hear indeed of an incursion of the Marcomanni in the reign of Valerian, but, broadly speaking, the name of this once so warlike nation may be said to disappear from history. Their old comrades the Quadi often appear in association with the lazyges, from the time of Gallienus, when they made a descent upon Pannonia. There was further fighting with them in 283, as is proved by a coin of Numerian. However, they are in this period thrown into the shade by the other more dangerous assailants of the Empire; indeed, with the appearance of the Goths the main struggle between the Roman and Germanic powers had shifted from the middle to the lower Danube.

Shortly after the death of Probus (Oct. 282), the Alemans on the upper Rhine, and the Franks and Saxons on the lower Rhine, had begun their forays again. The eastern districts of



Gaul were again overrun, while the coasts of the Channel were harried by Saxon pirates. The Burgundians also had left their home between the Oder and the Vistula, and forced their way through the heart of Germany to the Main. When the government had been taken over by Diocletian, his colleague and (after April 286) co-Emperor Maximian entered Gaul in the beginning of that year; it was his first care, so soon as he had suppressed the insurrection of the Bagaudae, to put a stop to the piracy of the Saxons and Franks. He first cleared the left bank of the Rhine, drove the Heruli and Chaivones, two Baltic tribes who had invaded Gaul, right out of the country, and, basing himself on Mainz, conducted a successful defensive campaign against Alemans and Burgundians. The defense of the coasts was entrusted to a capable officer, Carausius the Menapian, with a strong command and extensive authority. But when Carausius set up for Emperor in Britain towards the end of 286 the Teutons found a fresh opportunity. The usurper even made common cause with the enemies of the Empire and openly helped them. Maximian, indeed, repeatedly (287 and 291) gained successes against them, but the first decided improvement on the Rhine frontier was due to a new development of imperial organization by which Gaul and Britain became a distinct administrative department with a governor of their own in the person of the general Flavius Constantius (March 293), who was at the same time appointed Caesar. The Franks were decisively defeated within their own borders (summer 293), Britain was reconquered for the Empire (spring 296)—Carausius himself had fallen a victim to a conspiracy in 293—and finally by two great victories over the Alemans on the upper Rhine peace was at length restored (298-9), and the Rhine was made secure, especially as regards the upper part of its course, by the building of forts and the restoration of the defensive works which had been destroyed by the enemy or had fallen into decay. Following the example of Maximian, Constantius settled large numbers of prisoners of war, Franks, Frisians, and Chamavi, as *laeti* and *coloni*, in the wasted and depopulated districts of north-east Gaul. Here they were to cultivate the fields that had been lying fallow, to supply the labour that was sorely needed, and to aid in the defense of the frontier. The country rapidly recovered, trade and commerce began to flourish again, and the ancient prosperity returned.

It was in this hopeful condition that the Western provinces came into the hands of Constantine when (25 July 306) he was called by the will of the army to take up the reins of government. During a reign of thirty-one years he thoroughly fulfilled the promise of his youth. From the first day of his rule he devoted all his efforts to the securing and wellbeing of the provinces. The Franks who were again on the move were energetically repressed; in the process two of their chiefs were taken prisoners, and given to the beasts. Similarly four years later a combined attack of the Bructeri, Chamavi, Cherusci, Lanciones, Alemans, and Tubantes was repulsed with heavy loss. These were the only occasions during Constantine's long reign on which the Germanic peoples of the Rhine-district made any expeditions on a large scale.

As regards the actual defense of the frontier, the number of troops was increased, the flotilla on the Rhine was reorganized and raised to a considerable strength, and the belt of fortresses along the frontier was improved. In this connection took place the reoccupation and refortification of Divitia (Deutz), the old bridge-head of Cologne, which once more gave the Romans a firm foothold on the right bank of the Rhine on what had now become Frankish soil.

The coast defense of Gaul and Britain likewise underwent further improvements. The establishment of a special military command in the latter country, mentioned in the *Notitia Dignitatum* under the title *comes litoris Saxonici per Britanniam*, most probably goes back to Constantine. When the Emperor towards the end of 316 left Gaul for the last time, the land was in the enjoyment of complete peace, and this happy state of affairs continued so long as

the internal peace of the Empire was preserved. The enemy on the further side of the Rhine was thoroughly overawed, and ventured on nothing more than small violations of the frontier.

Nevertheless the peace did not endure. When Magnentius, a Frank by race, set himself up as Emperor (350), the security of the Rhine was immediately imperiled, since the eastern Emperor Constantius himself incited the Teutons to attack the usurper and so to invade the Empire. All that had been accomplished by Constantine was rapidly lost in the disastrous years of civil war between 351 and 353. The left bank of the Rhine was again overrun by the Teutons, the fortified positions, denuded of their garrisons, were almost all captured and destroyed and the open country far into the interior of the province was plundered till there was nothing left to plunder. Although Constantius, after the suppression of the *pestifera tyrannis*, himself made two campaigns against the Alemans, in the first (spring 354) against the kings Gundomad and Vadomar, in the second (summer 355) against the Lentienses, he effected practically nothing. It was only when the young Caesar Julian took up the command in Gaul that the situation began to improve. The whole year 356 was taken up in fighting against the Alemans, who were driven back on all sides. A great number of towns, including Cologne, which had been captured by the Franks, were won back again. A serious defeat incurred in 357 by the *magister peditum* Barbatio was retrieved by the brilliant victory of the Caesar over the united forces of Chnodomar, Serapio, Vestralp, and other kings—in all 35,000 men under seven ‘kings’ (*reges*) and ten ‘sub-kings’ (*regales*)—at Argentoratum (Strasbourg). Two further campaigns against the Alemans, in 359 and 361, were equally successful. On the lower Rhine also Julian defeated the Franks, the Chauci, and the Chamavi (358-360); the tracts between the Scheldt and the Meuse were cleared of the enemy, seven towns, among them the old fortresses of Bingium, Antunnacum, Bonna, Novaesium, and Vetera (all on the Rhine) were retaken, and again put in a state of defense. Thus the young Caesar seemed in the way of bringing about a complete pacification of the Rhine country, when he was compelled to leave Gaul by the outbreak of the conflict with Constantius (361).

Once again the country was left defenseless before the barbarians, who did not fail to profit by the situation. It was indeed high time when, after the death of Jovian (Feb. 364), the new Emperor Valentinian entered the threatened province in the late autumn of 365, and took up his headquarters at Paris. So much had the situation altered for the worse since the departure of Julian that the Alemans could venture in January 366 to cross the frozen Rhine, and penetrate to the neighbourhood of Chalons-sur-Marne. Here, indeed, they were defeated by the general Jovinus who had hastened from Paris to intercept them, and were compelled to beat a retreat. But the danger was not done with. The guerrilla warfare continued on the frontier, with its forays and surprises. Several years of vigorous action were needed before any change was apparent. Following the old and well-tried maxim that attack is the best defense, Valentinian in 368 himself crossed the Rhine at the head of a considerable army reinforced by contingents of Illyrian and Italian troops. Advancing into the country of the Alemans he came upon the enemy at Solicinium (Sulz on the upper Neckar?) and defeated them in a bloody battle. Two smaller expeditions beyond the Rhine followed in the years 371 and 374. The result of this successful assumption of the aggressive by the Romans was, broadly speaking, the recovery of the Rhine frontier, which remained for the present exempt from serious attack.

During this time of military activity the defenses along the whole line of the Rhine were strengthened. The existing castles and watchtowers were improved and many new ones were built; indeed a vigorous development of this old and well-tried system of frontier defense is the special merit of Valentinian. Taken generally, his reign marks a revival of the strength of the Empire, inward as well as outward, and the results of his work upon the Rhine could be felt for a generation after his death. Thus his son and successor, Gratian (375-383), found for the most part his ways made plain and a more peaceful situation obtaining on his arrival in

Gaul than that which had confronted his father ten years earlier. Nevertheless he too had to draw the sword against the Alemans, who—mainly the tribe of the Lentienses—in the spring of 378 crossed the Rhine with a considerable force. A battle took place near Argentaria (Horburg near Colmar) in which the Romans gained a complete victory, destroying the greater part of the enemy. Thus, here on the Rhine frontier the year 378 brought the Romans once more a complete success—the same year which in the East witnessed the breakdown of the Roman military power and the disastrous fall of the Emperor Valens.

In contrast to the Rhine countries, the Danubian provinces had, since the death of the Emperor Probus, enjoyed comparative peace. The power of the most dangerous neighbour of the Empire, the Goths, had been crippled for a long time, as we have seen, by Claudius and Aurelian, and more especially by the dissensions and struggles between the different tribes. The East Goths in particular had, since the close of the third century, been fully occupied with their own affairs, and completely disappear for nearly a century. In the fourth century it is always the western division, the Tervingi, of whom we hear; as is indeed natural, seeing that their conquest of Trans-Danubian Moesia under Gallienus had made them the immediate neighbours of the Empire.

No events of any great importance on the Danubian frontier are recorded down to the time of Constantine. True, an inscription of Diocletian and his colleagues of a date shortly before 301, celebrates a victory over hostile tribes on the lower Danube, which doubtless means the Goths, but these battles can hardly have been of any considerable importance. On the other hand Constantine frequently had trouble with the Goths. After some inroads in 314 the frontier defenses were strengthened by the building of the fortress *Tropaeum Traiani* (Adamelissi). The removal of troops from the frontier during preparations of Licinius for another civil war gave the signal at the beginning of 323 for a new incursion of the Goths. Thanks to the rapid advance of Constantine—which brought him into his colleague's territory—the invaders were intercepted before they had done any great damage, and after severe losses, including the death of their leader, Rausimod, were forced back across the Danube.

After the end of the civil war Constantine strove with unwearying zeal to improve the defenses of the frontier. The line was protected by castles, and although the number of the frontier troops to whom was especially assigned the duty of garrisoning them—the *milites limitanei* or *riparienses*—was considerably reduced, there was no diminution, but, on the contrary, a distinct increase of military security, gained by the creation at the same time of a mobile field force. So strong did the Roman Empire feel itself at this period that towards the close of the reign of Constantine it even ventured to interfere in events on the further side of the Danube where the Goths and Taifali were encroaching on the Sarmatians who occupied the tract between the Theiss and the Danube. In response to an appeal of the Sarmatians for help, the Emperor's eldest son Constantine crossed the river at the head of an army and, in conjunction with the Sarmatians, thoroughly routed the Teutons (20 April 332).

Doubtless in consequence of this defeat, which clearly brought home to them the military superiority of the Empire, the warlike ardour of the Tervingi and Taifali was extinguished for a long time. Their impulse to expand, the driving force of all their undertakings, was exhausted for the present. The barbarians began to busy themselves with agriculture and cattle-raising. As regards their relation to the Empire, former conditions were reversed. By the treaty of peace concluded after their defeat they nominally surrendered their independence and recognized the suzerainty of the Roman government, being pledged as *foederati*, in return for yearly subsidies (*annonae foederaticae*), to share in the defense of the frontier, and in case of war to serve as auxiliary troops. The peace continued for more than thirty years. From time to time there may have been slight disturbances of the peace—of this,

indeed, there is inscriptional evidence from the period of the joint rule of the three sons of Constantine (337-340), but on the whole both sides strictly observed their compact.

During this long period of peace the West Goths underwent a revolution, primarily religious but one which in its consequences affected the whole mental, social, and political life of the people—the introduction of Christianity. As early as the second half of the third century Christian teaching had obtained an entrance among them through Cappadocian prisoners, taken in the sea-expeditions against Asia Minor. There is no reason to doubt this fact; and it is equally certain that a century later there were among the Goths representatives of the most various schools of belief, Catholics, Arians, and (since about 350) Audians. Accordingly, the beginnings of Christianity among the Goths of the Danube reach far back, and its diffusion among them took place under the most various and independent influences. Of a conversion of the nation there can be no question, at least as far down as the middle of the fourth century. Their conversion only begins with the appearance of Ulfila.

Born of Christian parents about the year 310-11 in the country of the Goths, he grew up as a Goth among the Goths, although Greek blood flowed in his veins. One or other of his parents came of a Christian family from the neighbourhood of Parnasus in Cappadocia which had been carried into captivity by the Goths in the time of Gallienus (264?). First employed as a Reader, he was, at the age of about 30, that is to say about the year 341, consecrated as bishop of the Christian community in the land of the Goths, by Eusebius (of Nicomedia), the famous leader of the Arian party, at that time bishop of Constantinople. Equally efficient as missionary and as organizer, Ulfila gathered and united the scattered confessors of the Christian faith, and, by his enthusiastic preaching of the Gospel he won for it many new adherents. For seven years he worked with great success among his fellow-countrymen, and then he was suddenly obliged (c. 348) to interrupt his work. A “godless and impious prince”, probably Athanarich, inflicted cruel persecution on the Christians who dwelt within his dominion, by which the newly organized church was scattered and its bishop compelled to leave his home. Ulfila gathered together his adherents or as many of them as had escaped the persecution and fled with them across the Danube into Roman territory, where the Emperor Constantius gave him shelter. Here he lived and worked (in the neighbourhood of Nicopolis) as the priestly, and also as the political, head of the Goths who had accompanied him in his flight, until 380 or 381—in very truth the apostle of the Goths, and not least so in virtue of his great work of translating the Bible, by which he transmitted to his people the knowledge of the Holy Scriptures for all time; and although his missionary activity in his native land had early been brought to a close, yet the conversion of the whole Gothic race to Arian Christianity was nothing else than the harvest of that seed which he had sown in those first years of his work among them.

Soon after the death of Constantius (361) the friendly relations between the West Goths and the Empire began to change. Scarcely had Valentinian and Valens ascended the throne when there was an open rupture. First, towards the end of 364, predatory bands of Goths devastated Thrace—at the same time there was an incursion of the Quadi and Sarmatians into Pannonia—then in the spring of 365 the whole Gothic nation prepared for a great expedition against the Roman territory. Once more the danger was averted; Valens, although he was on the march for Syria and had already reached Bithynia, at once took vigorous measures to cope with it. Two years later however came the long-expected collision. Valens himself advanced to the attack. He found a pretext in the ambiguous attitude of the Goths in recent years, especially in their having aided the usurper Procopius with a contingent of 3000 men (winter of 365-6). In the summer of 367 the Roman army crossed the Danube. Yet no events of decisive importance took place, either in this or the two following years—for the war lasted till 369. The Goths, who had chosen as their leader Athanarich, skilfully avoided a pitched battle, and they withdrew into the fastnesses of the Transylvanian highlands. In the end both



sides were weary of the war and negotiations were set on foot, which resulted in a treaty of peace whereby the alliance with the Tervingi was formally annulled and the Danube was established as the boundary between the two powers.

Immediately after the war, which had restored the *status quo* of the beginning of the century,—and therewith the complete liberty of the Goths,—the Romans set to work on a thorough restoration of the frontier defenses. Numerous *burgi* (barrier-forts) were erected along the line of the Danube, as we learn in part from the evidence of inscriptions. Yet at first the frontier remained undisturbed. Internal dissensions and strife (chiefly due to a general persecution of the Christians stirred up by Athanarich about the year 370) withdrew his attention from external affairs. The Gothic prince showed the utmost ferocity against all Christians, without distinction of high or low, Arian, Catholic, or Audian, with the avowed intention of extirpating Christianity as dangerous to the State and deleterious to the strength and vigor of the nation.

Probably in connection with this, there arose (c. 370) a violent conflict between the two most influential chiefs, Athanarich and Fritigern, which finally led to an open schism between two portions of the race. Fritigern was worsted, retired with his whole following into Roman territory, and placed himself under the protection of the Emperor, who readily accorded him all possible succor and support. This step had an important result for the cause of the persecuted Christians, inasmuch as Fritigern with all his followers went over to Christianity and adopted the Arian creed. This conversion of Fritigern to Christianity, and, moreover, to Arian Christianity, powerfully influenced the further development of events, since, on the one hand, it prepared the way for the wider extension and final victory of Christianity among the Goths, and on the other hand it became a serious danger to the political existence of the nation when Arianism had been suppressed among the Romans, for it had acquired a virtually national significance for the Goths.

The sojourn of Fritigern in Roman territory was not of long duration. Confident in the support of the Roman government, he returned with his followers to his own country and succeeded in maintaining his position against Athanarich; there seems indeed to have been a reconciliation between the rivals. Alongside of them, though doubtless inferior to them in power and influence, a whole series of important chiefs are mentioned by name in this period, among them Alavio, Munderich, Eriwulf, and Fravitta. At the same time, however, Athanarich continued to exercise a certain primacy, although his position was not in any sense constitutionally defined—among the Romans he always bears the title of *judex* not *rex*.

The East Goths, of whom we have so long lost sight, had in the meantime extended their dominions far and wide. A mighty empire extending from the Don to the Dniester, from the Black Sea to the marshes of the Pripet and the head-waters of the Dnieper and the Volga, had emerged from their continual wars of conquest against their neighbours, Germanic (such as the Heruli), Slavonic, and Finnish. The main portion of these conquests is doubtless to be ascribed to King Ermanarich, who had ruled over the Greutungi since the middle of the century. In contrast with the West Goths who, as we have seen, down to the end of their residence on the Danube, were ruled according to ancient Germanic custom by *principes* or local chiefs, the East Goths had early developed a monarchy embracing the whole nation. It is doubtless to the inner strength which belongs to a firm and undivided exercise of authority, that we are to attribute the rapid rise of the young Ostrogothic State under its kings from Ostrogotha to Ermanarich, a monarch under whose vigorous rule it enjoyed its period of greatest prosperity—and also met its fall.

Such was the state of affairs when a nation of untamed savages, horrible in aspect and terrible from their countless numbers and ferocious courage, broke forth from the interior of Asia and threatened the whole of the West with destruction. These were the Huns. They were

doubtless of Mongolian race, and were probably natives of the great expanse of steppes which lies to the north and east of the Caspian Sea. Soon after 370 they penetrated into Europe, and threw themselves with irresistible fury upon the peoples which came in their way. The Alani, who had to bear the first brunt of their attack, were soon overpowered, and compelled to join their conquerors, and the same fate befell the smaller peoples whose settlements lay further north, on the right bank of the Volga.

The fate of the Ostrogothic Empire was now imminent. For a considerable time they succeeded in holding the enemy at the sword's point, but finally their strength broke down before the weight of the Asiatic hordes. Ermanarich himself died by his own hand rather than live to see the downfall of his kingdom; his successor, Withimir, after several bloody defeats, met his death on the field of battle. All resistance ceased, and the whole people surrendered itself to the Huns.

The invading flood rolled westward to encounter the Tervingi (375). At the first tidings of the events in the neighbouring country, Athanarich called his people to arms and marched with a part of his forces to meet the Huns. The Gothic leader took his stand on the bank of the Dniester; but finding himself compelled to abandon this position by a crafty turning-movement of the enemy, Athanarich gave up thenceforward all thought of resistance in the field, and betook himself to the impenetrable ravines of the Transylvanian highlands. But only some of the Goths followed him thither. The mass of the people, weary of hardship and privation, separated themselves and resolved to abandon their country. Under the leadership of their local chiefs Alavio and Fritigern they mustered their forces in the spring of 376 on the north bank of the Danube and besought permission to enter the Roman Empire, in the hope of finding a dwelling-place in the rich plains of Thrace. The Emperor Valens graciously received their request and gave orders to the commanders on the frontier to take measures for the shelter and provisioning of this huge mass of people. The Goths passed the river. In boats, and rafts, and hollowed tree-trunks they made their way across and covered all the country round "like the rain of ashes from an eruption of Etna". At first all went well. The new-comers maintained an exemplary attitude: not so the Roman officials—the chief of whom was the Thracian *comes* Lupicinus. They used the precarious position of the barbarians to their own profit, taking advantage of them in every possible way. It was not long before their shameless injustice aroused the deep resentment of the Goths, among whom famine had already set in.

Things soon came to open rupture. In the immediate neighbourhood of Marcianople a bloody battle was fought between the infuriated Goths and the soldiers of Lupicinus. The Romans were almost annihilated, their leader took refuge behind the strong walls of the town, which was immediately invested by the main body of the Tervingian forces. Other divisions scattered over the plains, plundering as they went. All attempts of the barbarians failed to take the town by storm. So Fritigern "made his peace with stone walls". A strong force remained before the place as an army of observation, while the main body turned, as detachments of it had done before, to the plundering of the adjoining districts of Moesia. Once more the country suffered fearfully, and to complete its misery other bands of plunderers now joined the Goths. Taifali, Alani, and even Huns were drawn across the Danube by the hope of plundering and ravaging these fertile provinces. This was in the summer of 377.

Troops were hurried up from all sides for the defense of the threatened provinces; even Gratian sent aid from the West. Meanwhile the Goths had overrun all Moesia. Not only had the bloody battle fought at a place called Salices (late summer 377) been indecisive and cost the Romans heavy losses, but a strong detachment of Roman troops under the tribune Barzimeres, a Teuton by race, had been cut to pieces at Dibaltus. A success which the dux Frigeridus, likewise of Teutonic birth, gained over the Taifali and a company of the Greutungi under their chief Farnobius was not much to balance this and did not alter the fact that Thrace, which after the battle of Salices had been overrun by the Teutons, remained a prey to them.

Finally (30 May 378) Valens arrived at Constantinople. As soon as Fritigern, who lay in the neighbourhood of Hadrianople, heard of the Emperor's arrival, he gave the order for the widely scattered Gothic forces to unite. From this point onward events followed in quick succession. At first the fortune of war seemed to smile upon the Romans. Making Hadrianople his base, Sebastianus, the commander of reinforcements sent by Gratian, succeeded in inflicting a reverse upon the Goths. Fritigern thereupon retired to the neighbourhood of Cabyle and there concentrated his forces. Thereupon Valens, on his part, advanced to Hadrianople, resolved to venture upon a decisive stroke. He had set his heart upon meeting his nephew Gratian, who was hastening up from the West, with the news of a great victory. And so (9 Aug. 378) battle was joined near Hadrianople. It resulted in a terrible defeat of the Romans, in which the Emperor himself was slain. More than two-thirds of his army, the flower of the military forces of the East, was left upon the field of battle.

## CHAPTER VIII

### THE DYNASTY OF VALENTINIAN AND THEODOSIUS THE GREAT

THE imperial throne was once more vacant (16-17 February 364), but the army had learned the danger of a tumultuous election, and after the troops had advanced by an eight days' march to Nicaea, both the civil and military authorities weighed with anxious deliberation the rival claims of possible candidates. Aequitius, tribune of the first regiment of the *scutarii*, men knew to be harsh and uncultured, Januarius, a relative of Jovian in supreme command in Illyricum, was too far distant, and at length one and all agreed to offer the diadem to Valentinian. The new Emperor had not marched from Ancyra with the army, but had received orders to follow in due course with his regiment, the second *schola of scutarii*; thus, while messengers hastened his journey, the Roman world was for ten days without a master. Valentinian was a native of Pannonia; his father Gratian, a peasant rope-seller of Cibalae, had early distinguished himself by his strength and bravery. Risen from the ranks he had become successively *protector*, tribune, and general of the Roman forces in Africa; accused of peculation, he remained for a time under a cloud, only to be given later the command of the legions of Britain. After his retirement, hospitality shown to Magnentius led to the confiscation of Gratian's property by Constantius, but the services of the father made advancement easy for Valentinian. In Gaul, however, when acting under Julian's orders he was dismissed from the army by Barbatio, but on Julian's accession he re-enlisted. Valentinian's military capacity outweighed even in the eyes of an apostate emperor his pronounced Christianity, and an important command was given him in the Persian War. Later he had been sent on a mission to the West, bearing the news of Jovian's election, and from this journey he had but recently returned. The life story of Gratian and Valentinian is one of the most striking examples of the splendid career which lay open to talent in the Roman army. The father, a peasant unknown and without influence, by his ability rises to supreme command over Britain, while his son becomes Emperor of Rome. It is hardly surprising that barbarians were ready to enter a service which offered to the capable soldier such prospects of promotion. It may also be noticed in passing that in the council at Nicaea only military officers were considered as successors of Jovian: we do not hear of any civil administrator as a possible candidate for the vacant throne.

From the very day of his accession the character of Valentinian was declared. When the crowd bade him name at once a co-Augustus, he replied that but an hour before they had possessed the right to command, but that right now belonged to the Emperor of their own creation. From the first the stern glance and majestic bearing of Valentinian bowed men to his will. Through Nicomedia he advanced to Constantinople, and here in the suburb of the Hebdomon on 28 March 364 he created his brother Valens co-Emperor; he looked for loyal subjection and personal dependence, and he was not disappointed; with the rank of Augustus, Valens was content in effect to play the part of a Caesar. At Naissus the military forces of the Empire were divided, and many Pannonians were raised to high office. The new rulers were, however, careful to retain in their posts men who had been chosen both by Julian and Jovian; they wished to injure no susceptibilities by open partisanship. But even though Valentinian



remained true to his constant principle of religious toleration and refused to favor the nominees either of a Christian or a Pagan Emperor, yet men traced a secret distrust and covert jealousy of those who had been Julian's intimates; Sallust, the all-powerful praefect, was removed, and accusations were brought against the philosopher Maximus. When both Emperors were attacked with fever, a commission of high imperial officials was appointed to examine whether the disease might not be due to secret arts. No shred of evidence of any unholy design was discovered, but the common rumour ran that the only object of the inquiry was to bring into disrepute the memory and the friends of Julian. Those who had been loyal to the old dynasty began to seek a leader.

At Sirmium the brothers parted, Valentinian for Milan, Valens for Constantinople; they each entered on their first consulship in the following year (365), and as soon as the winter was past Valens travelled with all speed for Syria; it would seem that already the terms of the Thirty Years' Peace were giving rise to fresh difficulties; too many questions remained open between Rome and Persia.

But as yet it was not foreign invasion but domestic rebellion which was to endanger the life and throne of Valens. When Procopius had laid the corpse of Julian to rest in Tarsus, he himself discreetly vanished from the sight of kings and courtiers: it was a perilous distinction to have enjoyed the peculiar favor of the dead Emperor. Before long however he grew weary of his fugitive existence: life as a hunted exile in the Crimea was too dearly bought. In desperation he sailed secretly for the capital where he found shelter in the friendly house of a senator Strategius, while a eunuch, Eugenius by name, recently dismissed from the imperial service, put unlimited funds at his disposal. As he wandered unrecognized through the streets, on every hand he heard men muttering of the cruelty and avarice of Petronius, the father-in-law of Valens. The Emperor himself was no longer in Constantinople, and popular discontent seemed only to need its champion. The regiments of the Divitenses and the Tungritani Juniores, on their march from Bithynia for the defense of Thrace, were at the moment in the city. For two days Procopius negotiated with their officers; his gold and promises won their allegiance and in their quarters at the Anastasian Baths the soldiers met under cover of night and swore to support the usurpation. "Leaving the inkpot and stool of the notary" so ran the scornful phrase of the Court rhetorician, this stage figure of an emperor, hesitating to the last, assumed the purple and with stammering tongue harangued his followers. Any sensation was grateful to the populace, and they were content to accept without enthusiasm their new ruler. Those who had nothing to lose were ready enough to share the spoils, but the upper classes generally held aloof or fled to the Court of Valens; none of them met Procopius as he entered the deserted senate house. He relied for support upon men's devotion to the family of Constantine; as reinforcements bound for Thrace reached the capital, he came before them with Faustina, the widow of Constantius, by his side, while he himself bore her little daughter in his arms. He pleaded his own kinship to Julian and the troops were won. Gumoarius and Agilo who had served Constantius well were recalled from retirement and put at the head of the army, while to Julian's friend Phronemius was given the charge of the capital. Valentinian had advanced Pannonians, Procopius chose Gauls, for the Gallic provinces had most reason to remember Julian's services to the Empire. Nebridius, recently created praetorian praefect through the influence of Petronius, was held a prisoner and forced to write dispatches recalling Julius who was in command in Thrace; the stratagem succeeded and the province was won without a blow. The embassy to Illyricum, however, bearing the newly minted coinage of Procopius, was defeated by the vigilance of Aequitius, every approach, whether through Dacia, Macedonia, or the pass of Succi, being effectually barred.

The news of the revolt reached Valens as he was leaving Bithynia for Antioch, and he was only recalled from abject despair by the counsels of his friends. Procopius with the Divitenses and a hastily collected force had advanced to Nicaea, but before the approach of

the Jovii and Victores he retreated to Mygdus on the Sangarius. Once more the soldiers yielded when he appealed to their loyalty to the house of Constantine: the troops of Valens deserting “the degenerate Pannonian”, “the drinker of miserable barley beer”, went over to the usurper. One success followed another: Nicomedia was surprised by the tribune Rumitalca, who forthwith marched to the north; Valens who was besieging Chalcedon was taken unawares and forced to fly for his life to Ancyra. Thus Bithynia was won for Procopius. His fleet under Marcellus attacked Cyzicus and when once the chain across the harbour’s mouth was broken the garrison surrendered. With the fall of Cyzicus, Valens had lost the mastery of the Hellespont, while he could expect no help from his brother, since Valentinian had determined that the safety of the whole Roman Empire demanded his presence on the western frontier. Thus during the early months of 366, while Procopius endeavored to raise funds for the future conduct of the war, Valens could only await the arrival of Lupicinus. The Emperor’s final victory was indeed mainly due to an ill-considered act of his rival. Arbitio, the retired general of Constantius, had supported the usurper, but had declined an invitation to his court, pleading the infirmities of old age and ill-health. Procopius replied by an order that the general's house should be pillaged, thereby turning a friend into a bitter foe. Arbitio on the appeal of Valens joined the camp of Lupicinus; his arrival at once inspired the Emperor with fresh hope and courage, and gave the signal for wholesale defections from the usurper's forces. In an engagement at Thyatira, Gumoarius procured his own capture and carried with him many of his men. After the march of Valens into Phrygia, Agilo in his turn deserted when the armies met at Nacolia. The soldiers refused to continue the struggle (26 May 366). Procopius was betrayed to the Emperor by two of his own officers and was immediately put to death. Imperial suspicion and persecution had once again goaded a loyal subject to treason and to ruin. His severed head was borne beneath the walls of Philippopolis, and the city surrendered to Aequitius. The ghastly trophy was even carried to Valentinian through the provinces of Gaul, lest loyalty to the memory of Julian should awake treason in the West. Valens could now avenge his terror and sate his avarice. The suppression of the rebellion was followed by a train of executions, burnings, proscriptions, and banishments which caused men to curse the victory of the lawful Emperor.

The plea of kinship with the family of Constantine had induced some thousands of the Gothic tribesmen on the Danube to cross the Roman frontier in support of Procopius. Valens refused to recognize their defense, and depriving them of their weapons settled them in the cities along the northern boundaries of the Empire. When discontent declared itself, in fear of a general attack he acted on his brother's advice, and marched in person to the Danube, and for the three succeeding years (367-369) the Gothic campaign absorbed his attention. With Marcianople as his base of operations, he crossed the river in 367 and 369; in the latter year he conquered Athanarich, and during the autumn concluded an advantageous peace. The Emperor and the Gothic *judex* met on a ship in mid-stream, for Athanarich professed himself bound by a fearful oath never to set foot upon Roman soil. During these years Valens, pursuing in the East his brother's policy, strengthened the whole of the Danube frontier line with forts and garrisons.

Valentinian may indeed be styled the frontier Emperor; his title to fame is his restoration of the defenses of Rome in the West against the surging barbarian hordes. He was a hard-worked soldier prince, and the one purpose which inspires his reign is his fixed determination never to yield an inch of Roman territory. He had always before his eyes the terrible warning of his predecessor. In the year 364, when the Emperor was still at Milan, ambassadors from the Alemanni came to greet him on his accession, and to receive the tribute which Roman pride disguised under the fairer name of gifts. Valentinian would not squander state funds in bounty to barbarians; the presents were small, while Ursatius, the *magister officiorum*, who took his cue from his master, treated the messengers with scant courtesy.

They returned indignant to their homes, and in the early days of the new year, 365 AD, the Alemanni burst plundering and ravaging across the frontier. Charietto, the count commanding in both Germanies, and the aged general Servianus, stationed at Cabillona (Châlons-sur-Saône), both fell before the barbarian onset. Gaul demanded Valentinian's presence; the Emperor started for Paris in the month of October; and while on the march, news reached him of the revolt of Procopius. The report gave no details—he did not know whether Valens were alive or dead. But with that strong sense of imperial duty which dignifies the characters of the fourth century emperors, he subordinated utterly the personal interest to the common weal: “Procopius is but my brother's enemy and my own” he repeated to himself; “the Alemanni are the foes of the Roman world”.

Arrived at Paris, it was from that city that he *despatched* Dagalaiphus against the Alemanni. Autumn was fast giving place to winter, the tribesmen had scattered, and the new general was dilatory and inactive; he was recalled to become consul with the Emperor's son Gratian (Jan. 366) and Jovinus, as *magister equitum*, took his place at the head of the Roman troops. Three successive victories virtually concluded the campaign; at Scarponna (Charpeigne) one band of barbarians was surprised and defeated, while another was massacred on the Moselle. In negligent security the Alemanni on the river bank were drinking, washing, and dyeing their hair red, when from the fringe of the forest the Roman legionaries poured down upon them. Jovinus then undertook a further march and pitched his camp at Châlons-sur-Marne; here there was a desperate engagement with a third force of the enemy. The withdrawal during the battle of the tribune Balchobaudes seriously endangered the army's safety, but at length the day was won. The Alemanni lost six thousand killed and four thousand wounded; of the Romans two hundred were wounded and twelve hundred killed; in the pursuit Ascarii in the Roman service captured the barbarian king, and in the heat of the moment he was struck dead. After a few lesser encounters resistance was for the time at an end. It was probably his interest in this campaign which had led Valentinian to spend the early months of 366 at Rheims. He now returned to Paris and from the latter city advanced (end of June 366?) to meet his successful general, whom he nominated for the consulship in the succeeding year. At the same time the head of Procopius reached him from the East. But in the high tide of success he was struck down with a serious illness (winter 366-7).

The Court was already considering possible candidates for the purple when Valentinian recovered, but, realizing the dangers for the West which might arise from a disputed succession, at Amiens on 24 August 367 he procured from the troops the recognition of the seven year old Gratian as co-Augustus. It may well have been the necessity for defending the northern coast against raids of Franks and Saxons which had summoned Valentinian to Amiens; and now on his way from that town to Trier tidings reached him of a serious revolt in Britain. Fullofaudes, the Roman general, together with Nectaridus, the commander of the coast line (count of the Saxon shore?), had both met their deaths. In the autumn of 367 Severus, count of the imperial guards, was dispatched to the island only to be recalled. Jovinus, appointed in his place, sent Provertides in advance to raise levies, while in view of the constant reports of fresh disasters the Count Theodosius (the father of Theodosius the Great) was ordered to sail for Britain at the head of Gallic reinforcements. From Boulogne he landed at Rutupiae (Richborough: spring 368) and was followed by the Batavi, Heruli, Jovii, and Victores. Scenes of hopeless confusion met him on his arrival; Dicalydones and Verturiones (the two divisions of the Picts), Attacotti and Scotti (Irish) all ranged pillaging over the countryside, while Frank and Saxon marauders swept down in forays on the coast. Theodosius marched towards London, and it would seem made this city his head-quarters. Defeating the scattered troops of spoil-laden barbarians, he restored the greater part of the booty to the harassed provincials, while deserters were recalled to the standard by promises of pardon. From London, where he spent the winter, Theodosius prayed the Emperor to appoint

men of wide experience to govern the island— Civilis as pro-praefect and Dulcitus as general; in this year too, he probably co-operated with imperial troops on the continent in the suppression of Frank and Saxon pirates in the Low Countries and about the mouths of the Rhine and Waal. Valentinian himself advanced as far north as Cologne in the autumn of 368. In the year 369 Theodosius everywhere surprised the barbarians and swept the country clear of their robber bands. Town-fortifications were restored, forts rebuilt, and frontiers regarrisoned, while the Areani, a treacherous border militia, were removed. Territory in the north was recovered, and a new fifth province of Valentia or Valentinia created. The revolt of Valentinus, who had been exiled to Britain on a criminal charge, was easily crushed by Theodosius, who repressed with a strong hand the treason trials which usually followed the defeat of an unsuccessful usurper. When he sailed for Gaul, probably in the spring of 370, he left the provincials “leaping for very joy”. On his return to the Court he was appointed to succeed Jovinus as *magister equitum* (before end of May 370).

While his lieutenant had been restoring order in Britain, Valentinian had been actively engaged in Gaul. The winter of 367-8 the Emperor spent at Rheims preparing for his vengeance upon the disturbers of the peace in the West. But the new year opened with a disaster, for while the Christian inhabitants of Mainz were keeping festival (Epiphany? 368) the Aleman prince Rando surprised and sacked the town. The Romans, however, gained a treacherous advantage by the murder of King Withicab, and in the summer of the same year the Emperor together with his son invaded the territory between Neckar and Rhine. Our authorities give us no certain information as to his route, perhaps he advanced by the Rhine road and then turned off by Ettlingen and Pforzheim. Solicinium (near Rottenburg on the left bank of the Neckar) was the scene of the decisive struggle. The barbarians occupied a strong position on a precipitous hill; the Romans experienced great difficulty in dislodging them but were at length successful, and the enemy fled over the Neckar by Lopodunum towards the Danube. The advantage thus gained was secured by the building of a strong fort, apparently at Altrip, and for its erection it seems possible that the ruins of Lopodunum were employed. The Emperor spent the winter in Trier, and with the new year (369) began his great work of frontier defense extending from the province of Rhaetia to the ocean. Valentinian even sought to plant his fortresses in the enemy's territory. This was regarded by the Alemanni as a breach of treaty rights, and the Romans suffered a serious reverse at the Mons Piri (Heidelberg?). The Emperor accordingly entered into negotiations with the Burgundians, who were to attack the Alemanni with the support of the Roman troops. The Burgundians, long at feud with their neighbours over the possession of some salt springs on their borders, gladly accepted the Emperor's overtures and appeared in immense force on the Rhine: the confederate seemed more terrible than the foe. Valentinian was absent superintending the building of his new forts, and feared either to accept or refuse the assistance of such dangerous allies. He sought to gain time by inaction, and the Burgundians, infuriated at this betrayal, were forced to withdraw, since the Alemanni threatened to oppose their homeward march. Meanwhile Theodosius, newly arrived in Gaul from Britain, swept upon the distracted Alemanni from Rhaetia, and after a successful campaign was able to settle his captives as farmers in the valley of the Po. Macrian, king of the Alemanni, had been the heart and soul of his people's resistance to Rome; with the intention therefore of capturing this dangerous enemy by a sudden surprise, in September 371 Valentinian accompanied by Theodosius left Mainz for Aquae Mattiacae; but with the troops the opportunities for pillage outweighed the Emperor's strictest orders. The smoke of burning homesteads betrayed the Roman approach; the army advanced some fifty miles, but the purpose of the expedition was defeated and the Emperor returned disappointed to Trier.

Meanwhile in the East time only served to show the futility of Jovian's peace with Persia. Rome had sacrificed much but had settled nothing. Sapor claimed that under the treaty



he could do as he would with Armenia, which still remained the apple of discord as before, and that Rome had relinquished any right to interfere. But it was precisely this claim that Rome could never in the last resort allow—Armenia under Persian rule was far too great a menace. The chronology of the events which followed the treaty must remain to some extent a matter of conjecture, but from the first Sapor seems to have enforced his conception of his rights, seeking in turn by bribes and forays to reduce Armenia to Persian vassalage. Valens as early as 365 was on his way to the Persian frontier when he was recalled by the revolt of Procopius. At the close of the year 368, or at the beginning of 369, Sapor got possession of King Arsaces, whom he put to death some years later. In 369, it would appear, Persia interfered in the affairs of Hiberia: Sauromaces, ruling under Roman protection, was expelled, and Aspacures, a Persian nominee, was made king. In Armenia the fortress of Artagherk (Artogerassa) where the queen Pharrantsem had taken refuge was besieged (369), while her son Pap, acting on his mother's counsel, fled to the protection of Valens; in his flight he was assisted by Cylaces and Artabannes, Armenian renegades, who now proved disloyal to their Persian master.

The exile was well received, and accorded a home at Neocaesarea. But when Muschegh, the Armenian general, prayed that the Emperor would take effective action and stay the ravages of Persia, Valens hesitated: he felt that his hands were tied by the terms of the peace of Jovian. Terentius, the Roman *dux*, accompanied Pap on his return to Armenia, but without the support of the legions the prince was powerless. Artagherk fell in the fourteenth month of the siege (winter 370), Pharrantsem was hurried away to her death, and Pap was forced to flee into the mountains which lay between Lazica and the Roman frontier. Here he remained in hiding for five months; Persian pillage and massacre proceeded unchecked, until Sapor could leave his generals in command of the army, while two Armenian nobles were entrusted with the civil government of the country and with the introduction of the Magian religion. At length Valens took action, and the Count Arinthaeus, acting in concert with Terentius and Addaeus, was sent to Armenia to place Pap upon the throne and to prevent the commission of further outrage by Persia. In May 371 the Emperor himself left Constantinople, slowly journeying towards Syria. Sapor's next move was an attempt to win Pap by promises of alliance, counselling him to be no longer the puppet of his ministers; the ruse was successful and the king put to death both Cylaces and Artabannes. Meanwhile a Persian embassy complained that the protection of Armenia by Rome was a breach of her obligations under the treaty. In April 372 Valens reached Antioch. His answer to Persia was further interference in Hiberia. While Muschegh invaded Persian territory, Terentius with twelve legions restored Sauromaces as ruler over the country bordering on Lazica and Armenia, Sapor on his side making great preparations for a campaign in the following spring, raising levies from the surrounding tribes and hiring mercenaries. In 373 Trajan and Vadomar marched to the East with a formidable army, having strict orders not to break the peace but to act on the defensive. The Emperor himself moved to Hierapolis in order to superintend the operations from that city. At Vagobanta (Bagavan) the Romans were forced to engage and in the result were victorious. A truce was concluded at the end of the summer, and while Sapor retired to Ctesiphon, Valens took up his residence in Antioch.

Here in the following year 374, so far as we can judge from the vague chronology of our authorities, a widespread conspiracy was discovered in which Maximus, Julian's master, Eutropius the historian, and many other leading philosophers and heathens were implicated. Anxious to discover who was to succeed Valens, some daring spirits had suspended a ring over a consecrated table upon which was placed a round metal dish; about the rim of the dish was engraved the alphabet. The ring had spelt out the letters THEO, when with one voice all present exclaimed that Theodorus was clearly destined for empire. Born in Gaul of an old and honourable family, he had enjoyed a liberal education and already held the second place

among the imperial notaries; distinguished for his humanity and moderation, in every post alike his merits outshone his office. Absent from Antioch at the time, he was at once recalled, and the enthusiasm of his friends seems to have shaken his loyalty. The life of Valens had previously been threatened by would-be assassins, and when the conspirators' secret was betrayed the Emperor's vengeance knew no bounds; he swept the whole of the Roman East for victims and, as at the fall of Procopius, so now his avarice ruled unchecked. If the accused's life was spared, proscription in bitter mockery posed as clemency and the banishment of the innocent as an act of royal grace. For years the trials continued: "We all crept about as though in Cimmerian darkness" writes an eyewitness, "the sword of Damocles hung suspended over our heads".

Of Western affairs during those years when the long drawn game of plot and counterplot was being played between Valens and Sapor we know but little. Valentinian remained in Gaul (autumn 371—spring 373), doubtless busied with his schemes for the maintenance of security upon the frontiers, but detailed information we have none. Where Valentinian governed in person we hear of no rebellions: the constitutions even show that a limited relief was granted from taxation and that measures were taken to check oppression, but elsewhere on every hand the Emperor's good intentions were betrayed by his agents. In Britain a disorganized army and a harassed population could offer no effective resistance to the invader: gross misgovernment in the Pannonian provinces made it doubtful whether the excesses of imperial offices or the forays of the barbarian enemy were more to be dreaded, while the story of the woes of Africa only serves to show how terrible was the cost which the Empire paid for its unscrupulous bureaucracy. Under Jovian (363-4) the Austoriani had suddenly invaded the province of Tripolis, intending to avenge the death of one of their tribesmen who had been burned alive for plotting against the Roman power. They laid waste the rich countryside around Leptis, and when the city appealed for help to the commander-in-chief, Count Romanus, he refused to take any action unless supplied with a vast store of provisions and four thousand camels. The demand could not be met, and after forty days the general departed, while the despairing provincials at the regular annual assembly of their city council elected an embassy to carry statues of victory to Valentinian and to greet him upon his accession. At Milan (364-5) the ambassadors gave (as it would seem) a full report of the sufferings of Leptis, but Remigius, the *magister officiorum*, a relative and confederate of Romanus, was forewarned and contradicted their assertions, while he was successful in securing the appointment of Romanus upon the commission of inquiry which was ordered by the Emperor. The military command was given for a time to the governor Ruricius, but was shortly after once more put into the hands of Romanus. It was not long before news of a fresh invasion of Tripolis by the barbarians reached Valentinian in Gaul (365 AD). The African army had not yet received the customary donative upon the Emperor's accession; Palladius was accordingly entrusted with gold to distribute amongst the troops, and was instructed to hold a complete and searching inquiry into the affairs of the province. Meanwhile for the third time the desert clansmen had spread rapine and outrage through Roman territory, and for eight days had laid formal siege to the city of Leptis itself. A second embassy consisting of Jovinus and Pancratius was sent to the Emperor who was found at Trier (winter 367). On the arrival of Palladius in Africa, Romanus induced the officers to relinquish their share of the donative and to restore it to the imperial commissioner, as a mark of their personal respect. The inquiry then proceeded; much evidence was taken and the complaints against Romanus proved up to the hilt; the report for the Emperor was already prepared when the Count threatened, if it were not withdrawn, to disclose the personal profit of Palladius in the matter of the donative. The commissioner yielded and went over to the side of Romanus; on his return to the Court he found nothing to criticize in the administration of the province. Pancratius had died at Trier but Jovinus was sent back to Africa with Palladius, the latter

being directed to hold a further examination as to the truth of the allegations made by the second embassy. Men who on the showing of the Emperor's representative had given false witness on the inquiry were to have their tongues cut from their mouths. By threats, trickery, and bribes Romanus once more achieved his end. The citizens of Leptis denied that they had ever given any authority to Jovinus to act on their behalf, while he, endeavouring to save his life, was forced to confess himself a liar. It was to no purpose: together with Ruricius the governor and others he was put to death by order of the Emperor (369?).

Not even this sacrifice of innocent lives gave peace to Africa. Firmus, a Moorish prince, on the death of his father Nebul, had slain his brother; that brother however had enjoyed the favour of Romanus, and the machinations of the Roman general drove Firmus into rebellion. He assumed the purple, while persecuted Donatists and exasperated soldiers and provincials gladly rallied round him. Theodosius, fresh from his successes in Britain and Gaul, was dispatched to Africa by (Valentinian as commander-in-chief, charged with the task of reasserting imperial authority. On examining his predecessor's papers, a chance reference caused the discovery of the plots of the last eight years, but it was not till the reign of Gratian that the subsequent inquiries were concluded. Palladius and Remigius both committed suicide, but the arch-offender Romanus was protected by the influence of Merobaudes. The whole story needs no comment: before men's eyes the powerlessness of the Emperor and the might of organized corruption stood luridly revealed.

For at least two years Theodosius fought and struggled against odds in Africa; at length discipline was restored amongst the troops, the Moors were defeated with great loss, and the usurper driven to take his own life: the Roman commander entered Sitifis in triumph (374?). Hardly however was his master Valentinian removed by death when Theodosius fell a victim to the intrigues of his enemies (at Carthage, AD 375-6); baptized at the last hour and thus cleansed of all sin, he walked calmly to the block. We do not know the ostensible charge upon which he was beheaded, nor do our authorities name his accuser. But the evidence points to Merobaudes, the all-powerful minister of Gratian. Theodosius had superseded Romanus and disclosed his schemes, and Romanus was the friend and protégé of Merobaudes, while it is clear that Gratian held in his own hands the entire West including Africa, for as yet (376) the youthful Valentinian II was not permitted to exercise any independent authority. Possibly Merobaudes may have been assisted in the attainment of his ends by timely representations from the East, for the general's name began with the same letters which had only recently (374?) proved fatal to Theodorus.

In 373 Valentinian had left Gaul for Milan, but returned in the following year (May 374), and after a raid upon the Alemanni, while at the fortress of Robur near Basel, he learned in late autumn that the Quadi and Sarmatae had, burst across the frontier. The Emperor with his passion for fortress-building had given orders for a garrison station to be erected on the left bank of the Danube within the territory of the Quadi, while at the same time the youthful Marcellianus through the influence of his father Maximinus, the ill-famed praefect of Illyricum, had succeeded the able general Aequitius as *magister armorum*. Gabinius, king of the Quadi, came to the Roman camp to pray that this violation of his rights might cease. The newly appointed general treacherously murdered his guest, and at the news the barbarians flew to arms, poured across the Danube upon the unsuspecting farmers, and all but captured the daughter of Constantius who was on her journey to meet Gratian her future husband. Sarmatae and Quadi devastated Moesia and Pannonia, the praetorian praefect Probus was stupefied into inactivity, and the Roman legionaries at feud between themselves were routed in confusion. The only successful resistance was offered by the younger Theodosius—the future Emperor—who compelled one of the invading Sarmatian hosts to sue for peace. Valentinian desired to march eastward forthwith, but was dissuaded by those who urged the hardships of a winter campaign and the danger of leaving Gaul while the leader of the

Alemanni was still unsubdued. Both Romans and barbarians were, however, alike weary of the ceaseless struggle, and during the winter Valentinian and Macrian concluded an enduring peace. In the late spring of 375 the Emperor left Gaul; from June to August he was at Carnuntum, endeavouring to restore order within the devastated province, and thence marched to Acincum, crossed the Danube, and wasted the territory of the invading tribesmen. Autumn surprised him while still in the field: he retired to Sabaria and took up his winter quarters at Bregetio. The Quadi, conscious of the hopelessness of further resistance, sent an embassy excusing their action and pleading that the Romans were in truth the aggressors. The Emperor, passionately enraged at this freedom of speech, was seized in the paroxysm of his anger with an apoplectic fit and carried dying from the audience hall (17 November 375).

High-complexioned, with a strong and muscular body cast in a noble and majestic mould, his steel-blue eyes scanning men and things with a gaze of sinister intensity, the Emperor stands before us as an imposing and stately figure. Yet his stern and forbidding nature awakes but little sympathy, and it is easy to do less than justice to the character and work of Valentinian. With a strong hand Diocletian had endeavoured by his administrative system and by the enforcement of hereditary duties to weld together the Roman Empire which had been shattered by the successive catastrophes of the third century; to Valentinian it seemed as though the same iron constraint could alone check the process of dissolution. If it were possible, he would make life for the provincials worth the living, for then resistance to the invader would be the more resolute: he would protect them with forts and garrisons upon their frontiers, would lighten (if he dare) the weight of taxation, would accord them liberty of conscience and freedom for their varied faiths, and would to the best of his power appoint honest and capable men as his representatives: but a spirit of dissatisfaction and discontent among his subjects was not merely disloyalty, it was a menace to the Empire, for it tended to weaken the solidarity of governors and governed: to remove an official for abusing his trust was in Valentinian's eyes to prejudice men's respect for the State, and thus the strain of brutality in his nature declared itself in his refusal to check stern measures or pitiless administration: to save the Roman world from disintegration it must be cowed into unity. Without mercy to others he never spared himself; as a restless and untiring leader with no mean gifts of generalship and strategy it was but natural that he should give preferment to his officers, till contemporaries bitterly complained that never before had civilians been thus neglected or the army so highly privileged. It could indeed hardly be otherwise, for with every frontier threatened it was the military captain who was indispensable.

The Emperor's efforts to suppress abuses were untiring; simplicity characterized his Court and strict economy was practiced. His laws in the Theodosian Code are a standing witness to his passion for reform. He regulated the corn supply and the transport of the grain by sea, he made less burdensome the collection of the taxes levied in kind on the provincials, he exerted himself to protect the curials and the members of municipal senates, he settled barbarians as colonists on lands which were passing out of cultivation, he endeavoured to put a stop to the debasement of the coinage, while in the administration of justice he attempted to check the misuse of wealth and favour by insisting upon publicity of trial and by granting greater facilities for appeals. As a contemporary observes, Valentinian's one sore need was honest agents and upright administrators, and these he could not secure: men only sought for power in order to abuse it. Had the Emperor been served by more men of the stamp of Theodosius, the respect of posterity might have given place to admiration. Even as it was, in later days when men praised Theodoric they compared him with two great Emperors of the past, with Trajan—and Valentinian.

At the time of the Emperor's death, Gratian was far distant at Trier, and there was a general fear that the fickle Gallic troops now encamped on the left bank of the Danube might claim to raise to the throne some candidate whom they themselves had chosen, perhaps



Sebastianus—a man by nature inactive but high in the favour of the army. Merobaudes, the general in command, was therefore recalled as though by order of Valentinian on a pretext of fresh disturbances upon the Rhine, and after prolonged consultation it was decided to summon the late Emperor's four year old son Valentinian. The boy's uncle covered post-haste the hundred Roman miles which lay between Bregetio and the country house of Murocincta, where the young prince was living with his mother Justina. Valentinian was carried back to the camp in a litter, and six days after his father's death was solemnly proclaimed Augustus. Gratian's kindly nature soon dispelled any fear that he would refuse to recognize this hurried election: the elder brother always showed towards the younger a father's care and affection. No partition of the West however took place at this time, and there could as yet be no question of the exercise of independent power by Valentinian II; Gratian ruled over all those provinces which had been subject to Valentinian I, and his infant colleague's name is not even mentioned in the constitutions before the year 379. Of the government of Gratian however we know but little; its importance lies mainly in the fact that he was determined to be first and foremost an orthodox Christian Emperor, and even refused to wear the robe or assume the title of Pontifex Maximus (probably 375).

Meanwhile in the East the fidelity of Pap grew suspect in the eyes of Rome. The unfavourable dispatches of Terentius, the murder of the Katholikos Nerses, and the consecration of his successor by the king without the customary appeal to Caesarea (Mazaca) led Valens to invite Pap to Tarsus, where he remained virtually a prisoner. Escaping to his own country he fell a victim to Roman treachery (375?). Still Rome and Persia negotiated, and at length (376) Valens dispatched Victor and Arbicius with an ultimatum; the Emperor demanded that the fortresses which of right belonged to Sauromaces should be evacuated by the beginning of 377.

The claims of Rome were ignored, and Valens was planning at Hierapolis (July—August 377) a great campaign against Persia when the news from Europe made it imperative to withdraw the Roman army of occupation from Armenia. For several years the European crisis engaged all the Emperor's energies, and he was unable to interfere effectually in Eastern affairs. The Huns had burst into Europe; had conquered the Mans, subjected the East Goths (Ostrogoths) and driven the West Goths (Visigoths) to crave admission within the territory of Rome. Athanarich and Fritigern had become leaders of two distinct parties among the West Goths; Athanarich, driven before the Huns, had lost much of his wealth, and, as he was unable to support his followers, the greater number deserted their aged leader and joined Fritigern.

It seems possible too that religious differences may have played their part in these dissensions: Athanarich may have stood at the head of those who were loyal to the old religion, Fritigern may have been willing to secure any advantage which the profession of the Christian faith might win from a devout Emperor. Whether this be so or not, it was the tribesmen of Fritigern who appealed to Valens. It was no unusual request: the settling of barbarians as colonists on Roman soil was of frequent occurrence, while the provision of barbarian recruits for the Roman army was a constant clause in the treaties of the fourth century. Valens and his ministers congratulated themselves that, without their seeking, so admirable an opportunity had presented itself of infusing new life and vigour into the northern provinces of the Empire. The conditions for the reception of the Goths were that they should give up their arms and surrender many of their sons as hostages. The church historians add the stipulation that the Goths should adopt the Christian faith, but this would seem to have been only a pious hope and not a condition for the passage of the Danube, although it was only natural that the Goths should affect to have assumed the religion of their new fellow-countrymen. The conditions were stern enough, but the fate which threatened the barbarians at the hands of the Huns seemed even more unrelenting. The Goths accepted the terms: but

for the Romans the enforcement of their own requisitions was a work which demanded extraordinary tact and unremitting forethought.

In face of this immense and sobering responsibility, which should have summoned forth all the energy and loyalty of which men were capable, the ministers of Valens (so far as we can see) did nothing—they left to chance alone the feeding of a multitude which none could number. It is not in their everyday speculations, nor in their habitual violence and oppression of the provincials, that the degradation of the bureaucracy of the Empire is seen in its most hideous form: the weightiest count in the indictment is that when met by an extraordinary crisis which imperilled the existence of the Empire itself the agents of the State, with the danger in concrete form before their very eyes, failed to check their lust or bridle their avarice. Maximinus and Lupicinus kept the Goths upon the banks of the Danube in order to wring from them all they had to give—except their arms. Provisions failed utterly: for the body of a dog a man would be bartered into slavery. As for the Goths who remained north of the river, Athanarich, remembering that he had declined to meet Valens on Roman soil, thought it idle to pray for admission within the Empire and retired, it would seem, into the highlands of Transylvania; now however that the imperial garrisons had been withdrawn to watch the passage of the followers of Fritigern, the Greutungi under Alatheus and Saphrax crossed the Danube unmolested, although leave to cross the frontier had previously been refused them. Meanwhile Fritigern slowly advanced on Marcianople, ready if need be to join his compatriots who were now encamped on the south bank of the river. Still the Goths took no hostile step, but their exclusion from Marcianople led to a brawl with Roman soldiers outside the walls; within the city the news reached Lupicinus who was entertaining Alavio and Fritigern to a feast. Orders were hurriedly given for the massacre of the Gothic guardsmen who had accompanied their leaders. Fritigern at the head of his men fought his way back to camp, while Alavio seems to have fallen in the fray, for we hear of him no more.

The peace was at an end: nine miles from Marcianople Lupicinus was repulsed with loss; the criminal folly of the authorities of Hadrianople forced into rebellion the loyal Gothic auxiliaries who were stationed in the town; barbarians bartered as slaves rejoined their comrades, while laborers from the imperial gold mines played their part in spreading havoc throughout Thrace. Thus at last the Goths took their revenge, and only the walls of cities could resist their onset. From Asia Valens dispatched Profuturus and Trajan to the province, and they at length succeeded in driving back the barbarian host beyond the Balkans. The Roman army occupied the passes. Gratian had sent reinforcements from the West under Frigeridus and Richomer, and the latter was associated with the generals of Valens; the barbarians drawing together their scattered bands formed a huge wagon laager (*carrago*) at a spot called Ad Salices, not far from Tomi. The Romans were still much inferior in numbers, and anxiously awaited an opportunity to pour down upon the enemy while on the march. For some time however the Goths made no move; when at length they attempted to seize the higher ground the battle began. The Roman left wing was broken and the legionaries were forced to retreat, but neither side gained any decisive advantage: the Goths remained for seven days longer within the shelter of their camp while the Romans drove other troops of barbarians to the north of the mountain chain (early autumn 377). At this time Richomer returned in order to secure further help from Gratian, while Saturninus arrived from Asia with the rank of *magister equitum*, in command, it would seem, of reinforcements. But the tide of fortune which had favoured the Romans during the previous months now ebbed. The Goths, despairing of breaking the cordon or piercing the Balkan passes, by promises of unlimited booty won over hordes of Huns and Alans to their side. Saturninus found that he could hold his position no longer, and was thus forced to retire on the Rhodope chain. Save for a defeat at Dibaltus near the sea-coast he successfully masked his retreat, while Frigeridus, who was stationed in the neighbourhood of Beroea, fell back before the enemy upon Illyricum, where

he captured the barbarian leader Farnobius and defeated the Taifali; as in Valentinian's day the captives were settled in the depopulated districts of Italy. The help however which was expected from the West was long delayed; in February 378 the Lentienses chanced to hear from one of their fellow-tribesmen who was serving in the Roman army that Gratian had been summoned to the East. Collecting allies from the neighboring clans, they burst across the border some 40,000 strong (panegyrist said 70,000). Gratian was forced to recall the troops who had already marched into Pannonia, and in command of these as well as of his Gallic legionaries he placed Nannienus and the Frankish king Mallobaudes. At the battle of Argentaria, near Colmar in Alsace, Priarius the barbarian king was slain and with him, it is said, more than 30,000 of the enemy: according to the Roman estimate only some 5000 escaped through the dense forests into the shelter of the hills. Gratian in person then crossed the Rhine and after laborious operations among the mountains starved the fugitives into surrender; by the terms of peace they were bound to furnish recruits for the Roman army. The result of the campaign was a very real triumph for the youthful Emperor of the West.

Meanwhile Sebastian, appointed in the East to succeed Trajan in the command of the infantry, was raising and training a small force of picked men with which to begin operations in the spring. In April 378 Valens left Antioch for the capital at the head of reinforcements drawn from Asia: he arrived on 30 May. The Goths now held the Schipka Pass and were stationed both north and south of the Balkans at Nicopolis and Beroea. Sebastian had successfully freed the country round Hadrianople from plundering bands, and Fritigern concentrating the Gothic forces had withdrawn north to Cabyle. At the end of June Valens advanced with his army from Melanthias, which lay some 15 miles west of Constantinople. Against the advice of Sebastian the Emperor determined upon an immediate march in order to effect a junction with the forces of his nephew, who was now advancing by Lauriacum and Sirmium. The eastern army entered the Maritza Pass, but at the same time Fritigern would seem to have dispatched some Goths southwards. These were sighted by the Roman scouts, and in fear that the passes should be blocked behind him and his supplies cut off, the Emperor retreated towards Hadrianople. Fritigern himself meanwhile marched south over the pass of Bujuk-Derbent in the direction of Nike, as though he would intercept communication between Valens and his capital. Two alternative courses were now open to the Emperor: he might take up a strong position at Hadrianople and await the army of the West (this was Gratian's counsel brought by Richomer who reached the camp on 7 August), or he might at once engage the enemy. Valens adopted the latter alternative; it would seem that he underestimated the number of the Goths, and it is possible that he desired to show that he too could win victories in his own strength as well as the western Emperor; Sebastian, who had at his own request left the service of Gratian for that of Valens, may have sought to rob his former master of any further laurels. At dawn on the following morning (9 August) the advance began; when about midday the armies came in sight of each other (probably near the modern Demeranlija) Fritigern, in order to gain time, entered into negotiations, but on the arrival of his cavalry he felt sure of victory and struck the first blow. We cannot reconstruct the battle: Valens, Trajan, and Sebastian all fell, and with them two-thirds of the Roman army. In the open country no resistance could be offered to the victorious barbarians, but they were beaten back from the walls of Hadrianople, and a troop of Saracen horsemen repelled them from the capital. Victor bore the news of the appalling catastrophe to Gratian.

In the face of hostile criticism Valentinian had chosen Valens as his co-Augustus, intending that he should carry out in the East the same policy which he himself had planned for the West. His judgment was not at fault, for in the sphere of religion alone did the two Emperors pursue different ends. Like an orderly, with unfailing loyalty Valens obeyed his brother's instructions. He too strengthened the frontier with fortresses and lightened the burden of taxation, while under his care magnificent public buildings rose throughout the

eastern provinces. But Valentinian's masterful decision of character was alien to Valens: his was a weaker nature which under adversity easily yielded to despair. Severity, anxiously assumed, tended towards ferocity, and a consciousness of insecurity rendered him tyrannical when his life or throne was threatened. His subjects could neither forget nor forgive the horrible excesses which marked the suppression of the rebellion of Procopius or of the conspiracy of Theodorus. He was hated by the orthodox as an Arian heretic and by the Pagans as a Christian zealot, while it was upon the Emperor that men laid the responsibility for the overwhelming disaster of Hadrianople. Thus there were few to judge him with impartial justice, and it is probable that even later historians have been unduly influenced by the invectives of his enemies. His imperious brother had made of an excellent civil servant an Emperor who was no match for the crisis which he was fated to meet.

On the news of the defeat at Hadrianople Gratian at once turned to the general who had shown such brilliant promise a few years before in the defence of Moesia. The young Theodosius was recalled from his retirement in Spain and put in command of the Roman troops in Thrace. Here, it would appear, he was victorious over the Sarmatians, and at Sirmium in the month of January 379 (probably 19 January 379) Gratian created him co-Augustus. It was only after long hesitation that Theodosius accepted the heavy task of restoring order in the eastern provinces, but the decision once taken there was no delay. Before the Emperors parted company their joint forces seem to have defeated the Goths; Gratian then relinquished some of his troops in favour of Theodosius and himself started with all speed for Gaul, where Franks and Vandals had crossed the Rhine. After defeating the invaders Gratian went into winter quarters at Trier. Theodosius was left to rule the Eastern prefecture, while it must perhaps remain a doubtful question whether eastern Illyricum was not also included within his jurisdiction.

The course of events which led up to the final subjection of the Gothic invaders by Theodosius is for us a lost chapter in the story of East Rome. Some few disconnected fragments can, it is true, be recovered, but their setting is too often conjectural. Many have been the attempts to unravel the confused tangle of incidents which Zosimus offers in the place of an ordered history, but however the ingenuity of critics may amaze us, it rarely convinces. Even so bald a statement as that of the following paragraphs is, it must be confessed, in large measure but a hypothetical reconstruction.

A pestilence had broken out among the barbarians besieging Thessalonica, and plague and famine drove them from the walls. The city could therefore be occupied without difficulty by Theodosius, who chose it for his base of operations. Its natural position made it an admirable centre: from it led the high roads towards the north to the Danube and towards the east to Constantinople. Its splendid harbour offered shelter to merchant ships from Asia and Egypt, and thus the army's stores and provisions could not be intercepted by the Goths; while from this point military operations could be undertaken alike in Thrace and in Illyricum. The first task to which Theodosius directed his commanding energy was the restoration of discipline among his disorganized troops; no longer did the Emperor hold himself aloof—an unapproachable being hedged about with awe and majesty: the conception which had since Diocletian become a court tradition gave place to the liberality and friendliness of a captain in the midst of his men. Early in June Theodosius reached Thessalonica, and dispatched Modares, a barbarian of royal blood, to sweep the Goths from Thrace. Falling upon the unsuspecting foe, the Romans massacred a host of marauders laden with the booty of the provinces. The legionaries recovered confidence in themselves, and the main body of the invaders was driven northwards. The Emperor himself, with Thessalonica secured and garrisoned, marched north towards the Danube to Scupi (Uskub: 6 July 379) and Vicus Augusti (2 August). From the first he was determined to win the victory, if it were possible,



rather by conciliation than armed force. It would seem probable that even in the year 379 he was enrolling Goths among his troops and converting bands of pillagers into Roman subjects. But in his winter quarters at Thessalonica the Emperor was struck down by disease, and for long his life hung in the balance (February 380). He prepared himself for his end by baptism—the magical sacrament which obliterated all sin and was therefore postponed till the hour when life itself was ebbing. Military action was paralyzed, and the fruits of the previous year's campaign were lost. The Goths took fresh courage; Fritigern led one host into Thessaly, Epirus, and Achaia, another under Alatheus and Saphrax devastated Pannonia, while Nicopolis was lost to the Romans. Gratian hastened perforce to the help of his disabled colleague; Baufo and Arbogast were dispatched to check the Goths in the north, and in the summer Gratian himself marched to Sirmium, where he concluded a truce with the barbarians under which the Romans were to supply provisions, while the Goths furnished recruits for the army. It is probable that Gratian and Theodosius met in conference at Sirmium in September. The danger in the south was averted by the death of Fritigern; without a leader the Gothic host turned once more northwards. In the autumn Theodosius was back in Thessalonica, and in November he entered Constantinople in triumph. This fact of itself must signify that the immediate peril was past.

Fortune now favored Theodosius: Fritigern his most formidable opponent was dead, and, at length, the pride of the aged Athanarich was broken. Wearing out by feuds among his own people he, together with his followers, sought refuge amongst his foes. On 11 January 381 he was welcomed beyond the city walls by Theodosius and escorted with all solemnity and kingly pomp into the capital. Fourteen days later he died, and was buried by the Emperor with royal honours. The magnanimity of Theodosius and the respect paid to their great chieftain did more than many military successes to subdue the stubborn Gothic tribesmen. We hear of no more battles, and in the following year peace was concluded. Saturninus was empowered to offer the Goths new homes in the devastated districts of Thrace, and the victors of Hadrianople became the allies of the Empire, pledged in the event of war to furnish soldiers for the imperial army. Themistius, the Court orator, could express the hope that when once the wounds of strife were healed Rome's bravest enemies would become her truest and most loyal friends.

Peace was hardly won in the East before usurpation and murder threw the West into turmoil. In the early years of the reign of Gratian Christian and Pagan alike had been captivated by the grace and charm of their youthful ruler. His military success against the Lentienses, his heroic efforts to bring help to the East in her darkest hour and the loyal support which he had given to Theodosius only served to heighten his popularity. The orthodox found in him a fearless champion of their cause: the incomes of the vestal virgins were appropriated in part for the relief of the imperial treasury and in part for the purposes of the public post; in future the immemorial sisterhood was to hold no real property whatever. The altar and statue of Victory which Julian had restored to the senate house and which the tolerance of Valentinian had permitted to stand undisturbed were now ordered to be removed (332). Damasus, bishop of Rome, and Ambrose, bishop of Milan, claiming to represent a Christian majority in the senate, prevailed upon the Emperor to refuse to receive an embassy, headed by Symmachus, of the leading Pagans in Rome, and the church was overjoyed at the uncompromising zeal of their Emperor. But the radiant hopes which men had formed of Gratian were not fulfilled; his private life remained blameless, and he was still liberal and humane, but affairs of state failed to interest him and he devoted his days to sport and exercise. His love for the chase became a passion, and he would take part in person in the wild-beast hunts of the amphitheatre. Emergencies which, in the words of a contemporary, would have taxed the statesmanship of a Marcus Aurelius were disregarded by the Emperor; he alienated Roman sentiment by his devotion to his German troops, and although he might

court popularity amongst the soldiers by permitting them to lay aside breastplate and helm and to carry the *spiculum* in place of the weighty *pilum*, yet the favors shown to the Alans outweighed all else and jealousy awoke disaffection amongst the legionaries. The malcontents were not long in finding a leader. Magnus Clemens Maximus, a Spaniard who claimed kinship with Theodosius and had served with him in Britain, won a victory over the Picts and Scots. In spite of his protests the Roman army in Britain hailed him as Augustus (early in 383?) and leaving the island defenseless he immediately crossed the Channel, determined to strike the first blow. From the mouth of the Rhine where he was welcomed by the troops Maximus marched to Paris, and here he met Gratian. For five days the armies skirmished, and then the Emperor's Moorish cavalry went over to the usurper in a body. Gratian saw his forces melting away, and at length with 300 horsemen fled headlong for the Alps; nowhere could he find a refuge, for the cities of Gaul closed their gates at his approach. The accounts of his death are varied and inconsistent, but it would seem that Andragathius was sent by Maximus hot-foot after the fugitive; at Lugdunum by a bridge over the Rhone Gratian was captured by means of a stratagem and was murdered within the city walls. Assured of his life by a solemn oath and thus lulled into a false security, he was treacherously stabbed by his host while sitting at a banquet (25 August 383). The murderer (who was perhaps Andragathius himself) was highly rewarded by Maximus.

Forthwith the usurper sent his chamberlain to Theodosius to claim recognition and alliance. The historian notices as a remarkable exception to the customs of the time that this official was not a eunuch, and further states that Maximus would have no eunuchs about his court. Theodosius had planned a campaign of vengeance for the death of the young ruler to whom he owed so much, but on the arrival of the embassy he temporized. It would be dangerous for him to leave the East: in Persia Ardaschir (379-383) had just died and the policy of the new monarch Sapor III (383-388) was quite unknown; troubles had arisen on the frontier: the nomad Saracens had broken their treaty of alliance with Rome, and Richomer had marched on a punitive expedition. Although the Goths were now peacefully settled on Haemus and Ilebrus and had begun to cultivate their allotted lands, although it was once more safe to travel by road and not only by sea, yet for many years the Scyri, the Carpi, and the Huns broke ever and again across the boundaries of the Empire and gave work to the generals of Theodosius; the newly won quiet and order in Thrace might easily have been imperiled by the absence of the Emperor. With the deliberate caution that always characterized his action save when he was seized by some gust of passion, Theodosius acknowledged his co-Augustus and ordered statues to be raised to him throughout the East. Africa, Spain, Gaul, and Britain, it would seem, acknowledged Maximus, while even in Egypt the mob of Alexandria shouted for the western Emperor.

Meanwhile upon his brother's death Valentinian II began his personal rule in Italy. For the next few years Ambrose and Justina fight a long-drawn duel to decide whether mother or bishop shall frame the young Emperor's policy: on Justina's death there remained no rival to challenge the influence of Ambrose. The latter was indeed throughout Valentinian's reign the power behind the throne; born probably in 340, the son of a praetorian praefect of Gaul, he had been educated in Rome until in the year 374 he was appointed consularis of Aemilia and Liguria. In this capacity he was present at the election (autumn 374) of a new bishop in Milan; while he was taking anxious precautions lest the contest between Arian and orthodox should end in bloodshed, a child's cry (says the legend) of Bishop Ambrose! suggested a candidate whom both factions agreed to accept. The city would take no refusal: against his will the statesman governor became the statesman bishop. Thus in the winter of 383-4, although Valentinian looked to Theodosius for help and counsel, Constantinople seemed to the Court at Milan to lie at a hopeless distance, while Maximus in Gaul was perilously near. The Emperor instinctively turned to Ambrose, his one powerful protector, while even Arianism forgot its

feud with orthodoxy. At Justina's request the bishop started on an embassy to secure peace between Gaul and Italy. Maximus, however, desired that Valentinian should leave Milan and that together they should consider the terms of their agreement. Ambrose objected that it was winter: how in such weather could a boy and his widowed mother cross the Alps? His own authority was only to treat for peace — he could promise nothing. Accordingly Maximus sent his son Victor (shortly afterwards created Caesar) to Valentinian to request his presence in Gaul. But the net had been spread in the sight of the bird, and Victor returned from his mission unsuccessful; when he arrived at Mogontiacum, Ambrose left for Milan and met on the journey Valentinian's envoys bearing a formal reply to the proposals of Maximus. If the bishop's diplomacy had achieved nothing else, precious time had been gained, for Bauto had occupied the Alpine passes and thus secured Italy from invasion.

In the year 384 the Pagan party in Rome had taken fresh heart; the Emperor had raised two of their number to high office—Symmachus had been made urban praefect and Praetextatus praetorian praefect. Men began to hope for a repeal of the hostile measures of Gratian, and a resolution of the senate empowered Symmachus to present to Valentinian their plea for toleration and in especial for the restoration of the altar of Victory. Gratian had thought (the praefect contended) that he was fulfilling the senate's own desires, but the Emperor had been misled; the senate, nay Rome herself, prayed to retain that honored symbol of her greatness before which her sons for countless generations had pledged their faith. It was the loyalty to their past and to that Godhead before whom their ancestors had bowed that had made the Romans masters of the world and had filled their lands with increase. It was a high and noble argument, but it availed nothing before the scornful taunts of Ambrose, and Valentinian dismissed the ambassadors with a refusal.

At this time a Persian embassy arrived in Constantinople (384) announcing the accession of Sapor III (383-388), and bringing costly gifts for Theodosius—gems, silk, and even elephants—while in 385 the Emperor secured the submission of the revolted eastern tribes. In the following years the disputed question of predominance in Armenia was revived: Stilicho was sent to represent Rome at the Persian Court and in 387 a treaty between the two great powers was concluded, whereby Armenia was partitioned. Some districts were annexed by Rome and some by Persia, while two vassal kings were in future to govern the country, some four-fifths of which was to acknowledge the supremacy of Persia, and the remaining one-fifth the lordship of Rome. Modern historians have condemned Theodosius for his acceptance of these terms, but he needed peace on the eastern frontier if he were to march against his western rival, and his predecessors had all experienced the extreme difficulty of retaining the loyalty of Armenian kings: better a disadvantageous partition with security, he may have argued, than an independent State in secret alliance with the enemy. The Emperor was, in fact, forced to recognize the strength of Persia's position. In the West Ambrose once more travelled to Gaul at Valentinian's request upon a diplomatic mission probably at the end of 385 or in 386. He sought the consent of Maximus to the burial of Gratian's corpse in Italian soil, but permission was refused. Maximus was heard to regret that he had not invaded Italy on Gratian's death: Ambrose and Bauto, he muttered, had foiled his schemes. When the bishop returned to Milan he was convinced that the peace could not endure.

Indeed, events showed the profound suspicion and mistrust which underlay fair-seeming concord. Bauto was still holding the Alpine passes when the Juthungi, a branch of the Alemanni, entered Rhaetia to rob and plunder. Bauto desired that domestic pillage should recall the tribesmen to their homes. And at his instigation the Huns and Alans who were approaching Gaul were diverted and fell upon the territory of the Alemanni. Maximus complained that hordes of marauders were being brought to the confines of his territory, and Valentinian was forced to purchase the retreat of his own allies.

Preparations for the coming struggle with Maximus absorbed the attention of Theodosius in the East, and the exceptional expenditure placed a severe strain upon his resources. In one and the same year, it would seem (January 387), the Emperor celebrated his own *decennalia* and the *quinquennalia* of his son Arcadius who had been created Augustus in the year 383. On the occasion of this double festival heavy sums in gold were needed for distribution as donatives among the troops. In consequence, an extraordinary tax was laid upon the city of Antioch, and the magnitude of the sum demanded reduced the senators and leading citizens to despair. But with the inherited resignation of the middle classes of the Roman Empire they yielded to inexorable fate. Not so the populace: turbulent spirits with little to lose and led by foreigners clamoured round the bishop Flavian's house; in his absence, their numbers swollen by fresh recruits from the city mob, they burst into the public baths intent on destruction, and then overturning the statues of the imperial family dashed them to pieces. One house was already in flames and a move had been made towards the imperial palace when at length the authorities took action, the governor (or *comes orientis*) interfered and the crowd was dispersed.

Immediately the citizens were seized with hopeless dismay as they realized the horror of their crime. A courier was forthwith dispatched with the news to the Emperor, while the authorities, attempting to atone by feverish violence for past neglect, began with indiscriminate haste to condemn to death men, women, and even children: some were burned alive and others were given to the beasts in the arena. The glory of the East saw her streets deserted and men awaited in shuddering terror the arrival of the imperial commissioners. While Chrysostom in his Lenten homilies endeavoured to rouse his flock from their anguish of dread, while Libanius strove to stay the citizens from headlong flight, the aged Flavian braving the hardships of winter journeyed to Constantinople to plead with Theodosius. On Monday of the third week of the fast the commissioners arrived—*Caesarius magister officiorum* and *Hellebicus magister militiae*—bearing with them the Emperor's edict: baths, circus, and theatres were to be closed, the public distribution of grain was to cease, and Antioch was to lose her proud position and be subjected to her rival Laodicea. On the following Wednesday the commission began its sittings; confessions were wrung from the accused by torture and scourgings, but to the unbounded relief of all no death sentences were passed, and judgment upon the guilty was left to the decision of Theodosius. Caesarius himself started with his report for the capital: sleepless and unresting, he covered the distance between Antioch and Constantinople in the incredibly short space of six days. The prayers of Flavian had calmed the Emperor's anger and the passionate appeal of Caesarius carried the day: already the principal offenders had paid the forfeit of their lives, the city in its agony of terror had drained its cup of suffering: let Theodosius have mercy and stay his hand! The news of a complete amnesty was borne hot-foot to Antioch, and to the joy of Easter were added the transports of a pardoned city.

At length in the West the formal peace was broken, and in 387 the army of Gaul invaded Italy. Of late Justina's influence had gained the upper hand in Milan, and the Arianism of Valentinian afforded a laudable pretext for the action of Maximus; he came as the champion of oppressed orthodoxy:—previous warnings had produced no effect on the heretical Court; it must be chastened by the scourge of God. It would seem that Valentinian's opposition to Ambrose had for the time alienated the bishop, and the Emperor no longer chose him as his ambassador. Domninus sought to strengthen good relations between Trier and Milan, and asked that help should be given in the task of driving back the barbarians who threatened Pannonia. The cunning of Maximus seized the favourable moment; he detached a part of his own army with orders to march to the support of Valentinian. He himself however at the head of his troops followed close behind, and was thus able to force the passes of the Cottian Alps unopposed. This treacherous attack upon Valentinian was marked by the murder



of Merobaudes, the minister who had carried through the hasty election at Bregetio (autumn 387). From Milan Justina and her son fled to Aquileia, from Aquileia to Thessalonica, where they were joined by Theodosius, who had recently married Galla, the sister of Valentinian II. Here it would seem that the Emperor of the East received an embassy from Maximus, the latter doubtless claiming that he had only acted in the interests of the Creed of Nicaea, of which his co-Augustus was so staunch a champion. The action of Theodosius was characteristic; he gave no definite reply, while he endeavoured to convert the fugitive Emperor to orthodoxy. The whole winter through he made his preparations for the war which he could no longer honourably escape. Goths, Huns, and Alans readily enlisted; Pacatus tells us that from the Nile to the Caucasus, from the Taurus range to the Danube, men streamed to his standards. Promotus, who had recently annihilated a host of Greutungi under Odothaeus upon the Danube (386), commanded the cavalry and Timasius the infantry; among the officers were Richomer and Arbogast. In June Theodosius with Valentinian marched towards the West; he could look for no support from Italy, for Rome had fallen into the hands of Maximus during the preceding January, and the usurper's fleet was cruising in the Adriatic. Theodosius reached Stobi on June 14 and Scupi (Uskub) on June 21. It would seem that emissaries of Maximus had spread disaffection among the Germans in the eastern army, but a plot to murder Theodosius was disclosed in time and the traitors were cut down in the swamps to which they had fled for refuge. The Emperor advanced to Siscia on the Save; here, despite their inferiority in numbers, his troops swam the river and charged and routed the enemy. It is probable that in this engagement Andragathius, the foremost general on the side of Maximus, met his death. Theodosius won a second victory at Poetovio, where the western forces under the command of the usurper's brother Marcellinus fled in wild disorder. Many joined the victorious army, and Aemona (Laibach), which had stubbornly withstood a long siege, welcomed Theodosius within its walls. Maximus retreated into Italy and encamped around Aquileia. But he was allowed no opportunity to collect fresh forces wherewith to renew the struggle. Theodosius followed hard on the fugitive's track. Maximus with the courage of despair fell upon his pursuers, but was driven back into Aquileia and forced to surrender. Three miles from the city walls the captive was brought into the Emperor's presence. The soldiers anticipated the victor's pity and hurried Maximus off to his death (probably 28 July 388). Only a few of his partisans, among them his Moorish guards, shared their leader's fate. His fleet was defeated off Sicily, and Victor who had been left as Augustus in Gaul was slain by Arbogast. A general pardon quieted unrest in Italy, and Theodosius remained in Milan during the winter. Valentinian was restored to power, and with the death of his mother Justina his conversion to orthodoxy was completed.

Maximus had fallen, and for a court orator his character possessed no redeeming feature. But from less prejudiced authorities we seem to gain a picture of a man whose only fault was his enforced disloyalty to Theodosius, and of an Emperor who showed himself a vigorous and upright ruler, and who could plead as excuse for his avarice the pressure of long-threatened war with his co-Augustus. From these exactions which were perhaps unavoidable Gaul suffered severely, and on his departure from the West, while Nannienus and Quintinus were acting as joint *magistri militum*, the Franks burst across the Rhine under Genobaudes, Marcomir, and Sunno and threatened Cologne. After a Roman victory at the Silva Carvonaria (near Tournai?) Quintinus invaded barbarian territory from Novaesium, but the campaign was a disastrous failure. On the fall of Victor Arbogast remained, under the vague title of Comes or Count, the virtual ruler of Gaul, while Carietto and Syrus succeeded as *magistri militum* the nominees of Maximus. Arbogast on his arrival counselled a punitive expedition, but it would seem that Theodosius did not accept the advice. A peace was concluded, Marcomir and Sunno gave hostages, and Arbogast himself retired to winter quarters in Trier.

Valentinian remained with Theodosius in Milan during the winter of 388-9 and was with him on 13 June 389 when he made his solemn entry into Rome, accompanied by his five year old son Honorius. On this, apparently his only visit to the western capital he anxiously endeavoured to weaken the power and influence of Paganism, while he effected reforms both in the social and municipal life of the city. To the stern and haughty Diocletian the familiarity of the populace had been insufferable: Theodosius was liberal with his gifts, attended the public games, and won all hearts by his ready courtesy and genial humanity. In the autumn of 389 he returned to Milan, and there he remained during 390—that memorable year in which Church and State met as opposing powers and a righteous victory lay with the Church. In fact, he who would write of affairs of state during the last years of the fourth century must ever go borrowing from the church historians; he dare not at his peril omit the figure of the counsellor of Emperor after Emperor, the fearless, tyrannous, passionate, and loving bishop of Milan. Though the conduct of Ambrose may at times be arbitrary and repellent, the critic in his own despite admits perforce that he was a man worthy of a sovereign's trust and confidence. The facts of the massacre of Thessalonica are well known. Popular discontent had been aroused by the billeting upon the inhabitants of barbarian troops, and resentment sought its opportunity. Botherich, captain of the garrison, imprisoned a favourite charioteer for gross immorality and refused to free him at the demand of the citizens. The mob seized the occasion: disappointed of its pleasure, it murdered Botherich with savage brutality. The anger of Theodosius was ungovernable, and the repeated prayers of Ambrose for mercy were of no avail. The court circle had long been jealous of the bishop's influence and had endeavoured to exclude him from any interference with state policy. Ambrose knew well that he no longer enjoyed the full confidence of the Emperor. Theodosius listened to his ministers who urged an exemplary punishment, and the order was issued for a ruthless vengeance upon Thessalonica. The message cancelling the imperial command arrived too late to save the city. The Emperor had decreed retribution and his officers gave rein to their passions. Upon the people crowded in the circus the soldiers poured and an indiscriminate slaughter ensued; at least 7000 victims fell before the troops stayed their hand. Ambrose, pleading illness, withdrew from Milan and refused to meet Theodosius. With his own hand he wrote a private letter to the Emperor, acknowledging his zeal and love for God, but claiming that for such a crime of headlong passion there must be profound contrition: as David listened to Nathan, so let Theodosius hear God's minister; until repentance he dare not offer the sacrifice in the Emperor's presence. The letter is the appeal of undaunted courage to the essential nobility of the character of Theodosius. The gusts of fury passed and remorse issued in penitence. With his subjects around him in the Cathedral of Milan the Emperor, stripped of his royal purple, bowed himself in humility before the offended majesty of Heaven. Men have sought to heighten the victory of the Church and fables have clustered round the story, but the dignity of fact in its simplicity is far more splendid than the ornate fancies of any legend. Bishop and Emperor had proved each worthy of the other.

In 391 Theodosius returned to Constantinople by way of Thessalonica and Valentinian was left to rule the West. He did not reach Gaul till the autumn of 391; it was too late. Three years of undisputed power had left Arbogast without a rival in Gaul. It was not the troops alone who looked to their unconquered captain with blind admiration and unquestioning devotion: he was surrounded by a circle of Frankish fellow-countrymen who owed to him their promotion, while his honourable character, his generosity, and the sheer force of his personality had brought even the civil authorities to his side. There was one law in Gaul, and that was the will of Arbogast, there was only one superior whom Arbogast acknowledged, and he was the Emperor Theodosius who had given the West into his charge. From the first Valentinian's authority was flouted: his legislative power was allowed to rust unused, his orders were disobeyed and his palace became his prison: not even the imperial purple could

protect Harmonius, who was slain by Arbogast's orders at the Emperor's very feet. Valentinian implored support from Theodosius and contemplated seeking refuge in the East; he solemnly handed the haughty Count his dismissal, but Arbogast tore the paper in pieces with the retort that he would only receive his discharge from the Emperor who had appointed him. A letter was dispatched by Valentinian urging Ambrose to come to him with all speed to administer the sacrament of baptism; clearly he thought his life was threatened. He hailed the pretext of barbarian disturbances about the Alpine passes and himself prepared to leave for Italy, but mortification and pride kept him still in Vienne. The Pagan party considered that at length the influence of Arbogast might procure for them the restoration of the altar of Victory, but the disciple of Ambrose refused the ambassador's request. A few days later it was known that Valentinian had been strangled. Contemporaries could not determine whether he had met his death by violence or by his own hand (15 May 392). Ambrose seems to have accepted the latter alternative, and the guilt of Arbogast was never proven; with the longed-for rite of baptism so near at hand suicide certainly appears improbable, but perhaps the strain and stress of those days of waiting broke down the Emperor's endurance, and the mockery of his position became too bitter for a son of Valentinian I. His death, it must be admitted, did not find Arbogast unprepared. He could not declare himself Emperor, for Christian hatred, Roman pride, and Frankish jealousy barred the way; thus he became the first of a long line of barbarian king-makers: he overcame the reluctance of Eugenius and placed him on the throne.

The first sovereign to be at once the nominee and puppet of a barbarian general was a man of good family; formerly a teacher of rhetoric and later a high-placed secretary in the imperial service, the friend of Richomer and Symmachus and a peace-loving civilian—he would not endanger Arbogast's authority. Himself a Christian, although an associate of the Pagan aristocrats in Rome, he was unwilling to alienate the sympathies of either party, and adopted an attitude of impartial tolerance; he hoped to find safety in half measures. Rome saw a feverish revival of the old faith with strange processions of oriental deities, while Flavianus, a leading pagan, was made praetorian praefect. The altar of Victory was restored, but Eugenius sought to respect Christian prejudices, and the temples did not recover their confiscated revenues; these were granted as a personal gift to the petitioners. But in the fourth century none save minorities would hear of toleration, and men drew the inference that he who was no partisan was little better than a traitor. The orthodox Church in the person of Ambrose withdrew from Eugenius as from an apostate. The new Emperor naturally recognized Theodosius and Arcadius as co-Augusti, but in all the transactions between the western Court and Constantinople the person of Arbogast was discreetly veiled; his name was not suggested for the consulship, and it was no Frankish soldier who headed the embassy to Theodosius: the wisdom of Athens in the person of Rufinus and the purity of Christian bishops attested the king-maker's innocence, but the ambiguous reply of Theodosius hardly disguised his real intentions. The nomination of Eugenius was, it would seem, disregarded in the East, while in West and East alike diplomacy was but a means for gaining time before the inevitable arbitrament of war. To secure Gaul during his absence Arbogast determined to impress the barbarians with a wholesome dread of the power of Rome; in a winter campaign he devastated the territories of Bructeri and Chamavi, while Alemanni and Franks were forced to accept terms of peace whereby they agreed to furnish recruits for the Roman armies. Thus freed from anxiety in the West, Arbogast and Eugenius left with large reinforcements for Italy, where it seems that the new Emperor had been acknowledged from the time of his accession (spring 393?). In the following year Theodosius marched from Constantinople (end of May 394); Honorius, who had been created Augustus in January 393, was left behind with Arcadius in the capital. The Emperor appointed Timasius as general-in-chief with Stilicho for his subordinate; immense preparations had been made for the campaign—of the Goths alone some 20,000 under the leadership of Saul, Gaïnas, and Bacurius had been enlisted in the

army. Arbogast, either through the claim of kinship or as virtual ruler of the West, could bring into the field large forces of both Franks and Gauls, but he was outnumbered by the troops of Theodosius. Eugenius did not leave Milan till 1 August. Flavianus, as augur, declared that victory was assured; he had himself undertaken the defense of the passes of the Julian Alps, where he placed gilded statues of Jupiter to declare his devotion to Paganism. Theodosius overcame all resistance with ease and Flavianus, discouraged and ashamed, committed suicide. At about an equal distance between Aemona and Aquileia, on the stream of the Frigidus (Wipbach), the decisive battle took place. The Western army was encamped in the plain, awaiting the descent of Theodosius from the heights; Arbogast had posted Arbitio in ambush with orders to fall upon the unsuspecting troops as they left the higher ground. The Goths led the van and were the first to engage the enemy. Despite their heroic valor, the attack was unsuccessful; Bacurius was slain and 10,000 Goths lost their lives. Eugenius, as he rewarded his soldiers, considered the victory decisive, and the generals of Theodosius counselled retreat. Through the hours of the night the Emperor prayed alone and in the morning (6 September) with the battle-cry of "Where is the God of Theodosius?" he renewed the struggle. Arbitio played the traitor's part and leaving his hiding-place joined the Eastern army. But it was no human aid which decided the issue of the day. A tempestuous hurricane swept down upon the enemy: blinded by clouds of dust, their shields wrenched from their grasp, their missiles carried back upon themselves, the troops of Eugenius turned in panic flight. Theodosius had called on God, and Heaven had answered. The moral effect was overwhelming. Eugenius was surrendered by his own soldiers and slain; Arbogast fled into the mountains and two days later fell by his own hand.

Theodosius did not abuse his victory; he granted a general pardon—even the usurper's ministers lost only their rank and titles, which were restored to them in the following year. But the fatigues and hardships of the war had broken down the Emperor's health; Honorius was summoned from Constantinople and was present in Milan at his father's death (17 January 395).

From the invective of heathen critics and the flattery of court orators it is no easy task rightly to estimate the character and work of Theodosius. To the Christians he was naturally first and foremost the founder of an orthodox State and the scourge of heretics and pagans, while to the worshippers of the older faith it was precisely his religious views and the legislation inspired by them which inflamed their furious resentment. The judgment of both parties on the Emperor's policy as a whole was determined by their religious preconceptions. Rome at least was his debtor; in the darkest hour after the disaster at Hadrianople he had not despaired of the Empire, but had proved himself at once statesman and general. The Goths might have become to the provinces of the East what the Alemanni had long been to Gaul; the fact that it was otherwise was primarily due to the diplomacy of Theodosius. Retrenchment and economy, a breathing space in which to recover from her utter exhaustion, were a necessity for the Roman world; a brilliant and meteoric sovereign would have been but an added peril. To the men of his time the unwearying caution of Theodosius was a positive and precious virtue. His throne was supported by no hereditary dynastic sentiment, and he thus consciously and deliberately made a bid for public favour; he abandoned court tradition and appealed with the directness of a soldier to the sympathies of his subjects. In this he was justified: throughout his reign it was only in the West that usurpers arose, and even they would have been content to remain his colleagues, had he only consented. But this was not the only result of his refusal to play the demigod; Valentinian had often been perforce the tool of his ministers, but Theodosius determined to gather his own information and to see for himself the abuses from which the Empire suffered. His legislation is essentially detailed and practical:



the accused must not be haled off forthwith on information laid against him, but must be given thirty days to put his house in order;

provision is to be made for the children of the criminal, whether he be banished or executed, for they are not to suffer for their father's sins, and some share of the convict's property is to pass to his issue;

men are not to be ruined by any compulsion to undertake high-priestly offices, as that of the high-priesthood of the province of Syria which entailed the holding of costly public games;

provincials should not be driven to sell corn to the State below its market price, while corn from sea-coast lands is to be shipped to neighbouring sea-coast towns and not to distant inland districts, in order that the cost of transport may not ruin the farmer.

Fixed measures in metal and stone must be used by imperial tax collectors, that extortion may be made more difficult, while *defensores* are to be appointed to see to it that through the connivance of the authorities robbers and highwaymen shall not escape unpunished.

Theodosius himself had superintended the work of clearing Macedonia from troops of brigands, and he directed that men were to be permitted to take the law into their own hands if robbed on the high-roads or in the villages by night, and might slay the offender where he stood. Examples might be increased at will, but such laws as these suffice to illustrate the point. In a word, Theodosius knew where the shoe pinched, and he did what he could to ease the pain. Even when claims of Church and State conflicted, he refused to sacrifice justice to the demands of orthodox intolerance; in one case the tyrannous insistence of Ambrose conquered, and Christian monks who had at Callinicum destroyed a Jewish synagogue were at last freed from the duty of making reparation; but even here the stubborn resistance of the Emperor shows the general principles which governed his administration. Though naturally merciful, so that contemporaries wondered at his clemency towards the followers of defeated rivals, yet when seized by some sudden outburst of passion he could be terrible in his ferocity. He himself was conscious of his great failing, and when his anger had passed, men knew that he was the readier to pardon: *Praerogativa ignoscendi erat indignatum fuisse.*

But with every acknowledgment made of his weaknesses he served the Empire well; he brought the East from chaos into order; and even if it be on other grounds, posterity can hardly dispute the judgment of the Church or deny that the Emperor has been rightly styled: "Theodosius the Great

## CHAPTER IX

### THE TEUTONIC MIGRATIONS, AD 378-412

THE enormous force of the onrush made by the Huns upon the Ostrogoths had been decisive for the fate of the Visigoths also. A considerable part of Athanarich's army under their leaders Alavio and Fritigern had asked for and obtained from the Emperor Valens in the year 376 land for settlements on the right bank of the Danube. From that time these Goths were *foederati* of the Empire, and as such were obliged to render armed assistance and supply recruits. A demand for land made by bands of Ostrogoths under Alatheus and Saphrax was refused; nevertheless these bold Teutons effected the crossing of the river and followed their kinsmen. Quarrels between Romans and Goths led to Fritigern's victory of Marcianople, which opened the way to the Goths as far as Hadrianople. They were pushed back indeed into the Dobrudscha by Valens' army, and the troops under Richomer sent from the West by Gratian to assist the Eastern Empire were able to join the Eastern forces. After this however the success of arms remained changeable, especially when a section of Huns and Alani had joined the Goths. Thrace was left exposed to the enemy's raids, which extended as far as Macedonia. Now it was time for the Emperor to intervene in person, the more so as Gratian had promised to come quickly to his assistance. At first the campaign was successful. The Goths were defeated on the Maritza near Hadrianople, and Valens advanced towards Philippopolis to effect a junction with Gratian. But Fritigern hastened southward to cut Valens off from Constantinople. The Emperor was forced to turn back, and whilst at Hadrianople was asked by Gratian in a letter delivered by Richomer to postpone the final attack until his arrival. At a council of war however Valens complied with his general Sebastian's opinion to strike without delay, as he had been informed that the enemy numbered but ten thousand. In any case they would have had to wait a long time for Gratian, who was hurrying eastward from a remote field of war. After rejecting a very ambiguous message from Fritigern, Valens led the Romans against the Goths, and (9 Aug. 378) a battle took place to the north-east of Hadrianople, probably near Demeranlija. The Goths were fortunate in receiving timely assistance (from the Ostrogoths and Alani under Alatheus and Saphrax) after they had already defeated a body of Roman cavalry, which had attacked them prematurely. The Roman infantry also met with defeat at the hands of the Goths, and two-thirds of their army perished. The Emperor himself was killed by an arrow, and his generals Sebastian and Trajan also lost their lives. When he heard the news from Richomer, Gratian withdrew to Sirmium, and now the Eastern Empire lay open to the attacks of the barbarians.

On 10 August the Goths advanced to storm Hadrianople, as they had been informed that there, in a strongly fortified place, the Emperor's treasure and the war-chest were kept. But their efforts to seize the town were in vain. The municipal authorities of Hadrianople had not even admitted within its walls those Roman soldiers who during the night after their defeat had fled there and found shelter in the suburbs under the ramparts. At ten o'clock in the morning the long-protracted struggle for the town began. In the midst of the turmoil three hundred Roman infantry formed a wedge and went over to the enemy, by whom, strange to

say, all were killed. At last a terrible storm put an end to the fight by bringing the besieged the much needed supply of water, for want of which they had suffered the utmost distress. After this the Goths made several fruitless attempts to take the town by stratagem. When in the course of the struggle it became evident that many lives were being sacrificed to no purpose the Goths abandoned the siege from which the prudent Fritigern had from the beginning tried to dissuade them. Early on 12 August a council of war was held, in which it was decided to march against Perinthus on the Propontis, where, according to the report of many deserters, great treasures were to be found.

When the Goths had left Hadrianople the Roman soldiers gathered together and during the night one part of them, avoiding the high-roads, marched by lonely forest-paths to Philippopolis and thence to Sardica, probably to effect a junction with Gratian; whilst another part conveyed the well-preserved imperial treasures to Macedonia, where the Emperor, whose death was as yet unknown, was supposed to be. It will be observed that at this time the position of the Eastern Empire seemed hopeless. It could no longer defend itself against those robbing and plundering barbarians who, now that the battle was won, actually thought themselves strong enough to advance southward as far as the Propontis, and on their march could also rely on the assistance of the Huns and Alani. But here again the Goths had trusted too much to their good fortune. For, though on their arrival in the environs of Perinthus they encamped before the town, they did not feel strong enough for an attack, and carried on the war by terrible and systematic devastations only. In these circumstances it is surprising that they next marched upon Constantinople itself, the treasures of which greatly excited their covetousness. Apparently they hoped to surprise and take the capital at one blow. This time, however, through fear of hostile attacks they decided to approach the town in close array. They had almost reached Constantinople when they encountered a body of Saracens, who had come out in its defense. It is reported that by a monstrous deed one of these, a hairy, naked fellow, caused them to turn back. He threw himself with wild screams on one of the Goths, pierced his throat with a dagger, and greedily drank the blood which welled forth. For a time the struggles seem to have continued, but soon the Goths saw that they were powerless against the large and strongly fortified town and that they suffered greater loss than they inflicted. They therefore destroyed their siege engines on the Bosphorus, and bursting forth in single detachments, moved in a north-westerly direction through Thrace, Moesia, and Illyricum as far as the foot of the Julian Alps, plundering and devastating the country as they went. Every hand in the Eastern Empire was paralyzed with horror at the unrestrained ferocity of the barbarians. Only Julius, the *magister militum*, who held the command in the province of Asia, had courage enough for a terrible deed, which shows the boundless hatred felt by the Romans for the Goths, as well as the cruelty practiced in warfare at that time. He announced that on a certain day all Gothic soldiers in the towns and camps of Asia should receive their pay; instead of which all of them were at his command cut down by the Romans. In this manner he freed the provinces of the East from future danger. At the same time this incident shows clearly the straits to which the Eastern Empire was reduced. There was need of a clear-headed and determined ruler, if peace was ever to be restored to the Empire. With regard to this, however, everything depended upon the decision of Gratian, of whose doings we shall now have to give a short account.

We know that Gratian had made efforts long before the catastrophes to come to his uncle's aid against the Goths. From this he was prevented by a war with the Alemanni. An Aleman from the country of the Lentienses (afterwards the Linzgau on the Lake of Constance) who served in the Roman Guard had returned to his country with the news that Gratian was shortly going to render assistance to his uncle in the East. This news had induced his tribesmen to make a raid across the Rhine in February 378. They were at first repulsed by frontier troops; but when it became known that the greater part of the Roman army had

marched for Illyricum they prevailed upon their tribesmen to join in a big campaign. It was rumoured in Gaul that 40,000 or even as many as 70,000 Alemanni were on the war-path. Gratian at once called back those of his cohorts which were already on the way to Pannonia and put the *comes Britanniae* Nannienus in command of his troops, together with the brave Mallobaudes, king of the Franks. A battle was fought at Argentaria (near Colmar), in which the Romans, thanks to the skill of their generals, won a complete victory, and Priarius, the chieftain of the Lentienses, was killed. Gratian now attacked the Alemanni, crossed the Rhine, and sent the Lentienses flying to their mountains. There they were completely hemmed in and had to surrender, promising to supply recruits to the Romans. After this Gratian marched from Arbor Felix (near St Gallen) eastwards along the high-road, passing Lauriacum on the way. As we have already seen, he did not reach Thrace in time, and on hearing of the defeat at Hadrianople he withdrew to Sirmium. Here, at the beginning of 379, a great political event took place. It must be mentioned that Theodosius, who had formerly been the commander-in-chief in Upper Moesia, and had since been living in a kind of exile in Spain, had been recalled by Gratian and entrusted with a new command. Before the end of 378 Theodosius had already given a proof of his ability by the defeat of the Sarmatians, who appear to have invaded Pannonia. The success was welcome in a time so disastrous for the Romans. This is most probably one of the reasons why Gratian (19 Jan. 379) at Sirmium raised him to be Emperor of the East and enlarged his dominions by adding to them Dacia, Upper Moesia, Macedonia, Epirus and Achaia, i.e. Eastern Illyricum.

The Visigoths under Fritigern had without doubt been the moving spirit in the war, although the Ostrogoths had played a valiant part in it. After Ermanarich had committed suicide, Withimir had become king of the Ostrogoths. He lost his life fighting against the Alani, and seems to have been succeeded by his infant son, in whose name the princes Alatheus and Saphrax reigned supreme. These, as we saw, joined forces later on with the Visigoths and contributed largely to the victory at Hadrianople. It appears that for some time after this, both tribes of the Goths made common cause against the Romans. At first the two Emperors were successful in some minor campaigns against the Goths, and while Gratian went westward against the Franks and perhaps against the Vandals who had made an invasion across the Rhine, Theodosius succeeded in creating at Thessalonica, a place which he chose as a strong and sure base for his further operations, a new and efficient army, into which he admitted a considerable number of Goths. Before the end of 379 he and his forces gained important successes over the enemy, who found themselves almost entirely confined to Lower Moesia and, owing to a lack of supplies, were compelled to renew the war in 380. The Visigoths under Fritigern advanced in a south-westerly direction towards Macedonia, whilst the Ostrogoths, Alani, and Huns went to the northwest against Pannonia. Theodosius, who hurried to meet the Visigoths, suffered a severe defeat in an unexpected night-attack. The Goths, however, did not follow up their victory, but contented themselves with pillaging Macedonia and Thessaly, whilst the Emperor Theodosius lay a prey to a protracted illness at Thessalonica. During this period Macedonia suffered terribly from the barbarians. At last when Gratian, whose assistance Theodosius had implored, sent an army under Bauto and Arbogast, two Frankish generals, the Goths were compelled to retreat into Lower Moesia. Gratian himself was at the same time forced to take command of an army again; for his general Vitalianus had been unable to prevent the Ostrogoths, Alani, and Huns from invading Pannonia. As this barbarian invasion was a great danger to the Western Empire, it was highly important for Gratian to make peace with the enemy before suffering great losses. This he accomplished by assigning Pannonia and Upper Moesia to the Ostrogoths and their allies as *foederati*. This settlement of the barbarians at its eastern frontier guaranteed the peace of the Western Empire in the immediate future. For the Eastern Empire also peace seemed now ensured. When Theodosius, who as an orthodox ruler commanded greater sympathy from his



subjects than his predecessor, the Arian Valens, had recovered from his illness, he made a triumphal entry into Constantinople (24 Nov. 380), and here (11 Jan. 381) the Visigoth Athanarich arrived with his followers. He had been banished by the Goths whom he had led into Transylvania, and not desiring to ally himself with Fritigern on account of an old feud, asked to be admitted into the Empire. He was received with the greatest honours by Theodosius, but only survived his entrance by a fortnight. The high honour shown to Athanarich was evidently intended to create the impression among the inhabitants of the capital that war with the Goths was at an end; perhaps it was also hoped to promote more peaceful feelings among Fritigern's followers. We are also led to believe that Theodosius soon commenced negotiations with this dreaded prince, which were brought to a conclusion in 382 by the *magister militum* Saturninus. A treaty of peace was concluded at Constantinople (3 Oct. 382) by which permission was given to Fritigern and all his Goths to settle as allies in Lower Moesia. They were also to retain their domestic legislation and the right to elect their own princes. It was their duty in return to defend the frontier and to furnish troops, which, however, were to be led by their own chiefs. They obtained the districts assigned to them free of tribute, and moreover the Romans agreed to pay them annually a sum of money.

This treaty was, without doubt, at the time a triumph for Theodosius, and as such it was loudly praised by the Emperor's flatterers. But on closer examination we shall see that the Romans had only gained a momentary peace. From the outset it was impossible to accustom the Goths, proud conquerors of the Roman armies as they were, to the peaceful occupation of tilling the ground, and, as they had doubtless been allowed to settle in Moesia in a compact mass, retaining their domestic government, all efforts to Romanize them could but prove vain. Besides this the Danube, with the exception of the Dobrudscha, was stripped of Roman troops, and the ever-increasing number of Goths who entered the Roman army was naturally a considerable danger to it.

Moreover the majority of the Goths were Arians, and the rest still heathens. A year previously, however, Theodosius had not only attacked heathenism, but had issued a law against heretics, especially Arians. He had even sent his general Sapor into the East to expel the Arian bishops from their churches; only bishops professing the Nicene faith were to possess the churches. Thus the peace could not possibly be of long duration.

How greatly political questions excited the Goths, and how passionately their national feeling would sometimes break forth is shown by an event which occurred at Constantinople soon after 382. One day at the royal table two Gothic princes, who were specially honoured by Theodosius, gave free utterance to their opposed political convictions. Eriwulf was the leader of the national party among the Goths, which considered the destruction of the Roman Empire their ultimate object; he was an Arian by confession. Fravitta, on the other hand, was the head of that party which saw their future salvation in a close union with the Empire. He had married a Roman lady, and had remained a heathen. The quarrel between the two party-leaders ended by Fravitta drawing his sword and killing his opponent just outside the palace. The attempts of Eriwulf's followers to take immediate revenge were met with armed resistance on the part of the imperial palace-guards. This incident doubtless helped to strengthen Fravitta's position at the Emperor's Court, whilst he had made himself impossible to the Goths.

At this time a new danger to the Empire arose from those Goths who had remained at home and had been conquered by the Huns. As early as the winter of 384 or 385 they had taken possession of Halmyris (a town to the south of the estuary of the Danube) which however they left again, only to return in the autumn of 386 to ask for admission into the Empire together with other tribes. But the *magister militum* Promotus, commander of the troops in Thrace, forbade them to cross the river. He had the frontier carefully guarded, and met their attack with a ruse, cleverly conceived and successfully executed, by sending some

of his men to the Ostrogoths under the pretence of betraying the Roman army to them. In reality however those soldiers of his reported to Promotus the place and time of the proposed night-attack, and when the barbarians, led by Odothaeus, crossed the river, the Romans, who were posted on a large number of anchored boats, made short work of them. This time the better strategy of the Romans gained a complete victory over the Goths. To commemorate this victory the Emperor, who subsequently appeared in person on the battlefield, erected a huge column ornamented with reliefs in the quarter of the town which is called Taurus.

Meanwhile (25 Aug. 383) Gratian had been killed at Lyons at the instigation of the usurper Maximus, who had been proclaimed Emperor by the army in Britain and had found followers in Gaul. At first Theodosius pretended to accept Maximus for a colleague; but in 388 he led his army against him and defeated him at Liscia and Pettau. In the end the usurper was taken prisoner and killed at Aquileia. Theodosius now appointed Valentinian II, Gratian's youthful brother, Emperor of the West, only reserving for himself the co-regency of Italy. He then sent his experienced general Arbogast into Gaul, where the Teutons from the right bank of the Rhine had seized the occasion offered by the quarrel for the throne to extend their power beyond the frontier. Three chiefs of the Riparian Franks, Genobaudes, Marcomir, and Sunno, had indeed crossed the Rhine in the neighbourhood of Cologne and made a raid upon the Roman territory. When the Roman generals Nannienus and Quintinus went to meet the raiders at Cologne, one part of them left the borderland of the province, whilst the others continued their march into the country, till they were at last beaten back in the Carbonarian forest (to the east of Tournai). Quintinus now proceeded to attack the enemy and crossed the Rhine at Novaesium (Neuss). But after pushing forward for three days into the wild and pathless regions on the right bank of the Rhine, he was decoyed into an ambush, in which almost the whole of his army perished. Thus it appeared likely that the Roman rule in the Rhenish provinces would before long be completely overthrown; for the generals Carietto and Syrus, whom Maximus had left behind, found it impossible to put a stop to the barbarian raids. At this juncture Arbogast was sent by Theodosius to save the West. His first act was to capture Flavius Victor, the infant son of Maximus, and to have him put to death. Then he reinforced his army with those troops which Maximus had left stationed in Gaul, and which together with their generals Carietto and Syrus were easily won over to his side. Last of all he turned against his former tribesmen, the Franks, and demanded from them the restitution of the booty and surrender of the originators of the war. When these demands were refused, he hesitated to begin war by himself. He found it difficult to come to a decision, for the fate of Quintinus' troops was still fresh in his memory. In these straits he wrote to the Emperor Valentinian II, who seems to have urged a friendly settlement of the feuds; for in the autumn of 389 Arbogast had an interview with Marcomir and Sunno. The Franks, possibly fearing the mighty Theodosius, gave hostages, and a treaty of peace was concluded which cannot have been unfavourable to the barbarians.

In this way the Western Empire showed considerable indulgence in its treatment of the Teutons. The Eastern Empire on the contrary, and especially the Emperor, was soon directly and indirectly exposed to serious troubles from the Visigoths. We know that the Goths had extended their raids as far as Thessalonica. In this large town, the second in importance in the Balkan peninsula, there existed a certain amount of ill-feeling against the barbarians, which was greatly increased by the fact that the highest offices, both civil and military, were chiefly held by Teutons; moreover the town was garrisoned by Teuton soldiers.

The innate pride of Greeks and Romans alike was deeply wounded by this situation, and a very insignificant occurrence in the year 390 sufficed to make their hatred burst into flames. It happened in the following way. Botherich, the commandant of the town, had imprisoned a very popular charioteer and refused to set him free, when the people clamoured for his deliverance because of the approaching circus-games. This caused a rising against the

obnoxious barbarian in which he lost his life. At the time of this incident the Emperor Theodosius was at Milan where he had frequent intercourse with the influential bishop Ambrose; this was not without its effect upon him, though in his innermost heart the Emperor as a secular autocrat could not but be opposed to ecclesiastical pretensions. Although Theodosius inclined by nature to leniency, or at any rate made a show of that quality, in this case at least wrath overcame every human feeling in him, and he resolved to chastise the town in a way so cruel, that nothing can be put forward in defense of it. When the people of Thessalonica were assembled in the circus and absorbed in contemplation of the games soldiers suddenly broke in and cut down all whom their swords could reach. For three hours the slaughter went on, till the victims numbered 7000. The Emperor himself, urged perhaps to mercy by Ambrose, had at the last hour revoked his order, but it was too late. Probably Theodosius had been led to this unspeakable cruelty by persons of his intimate acquaintance, among whom Rufinus played a prominent part. It seems that Rufinus had been *magister officiorum* since 382; in 392 he rose to the position of *Praefectus Praetorio*. When the news of this massacre reached Milan, the Christian population of the town was paralyzed with terror. Ambrose left the town and addressed a letter of the utmost gravity to Theodosius. He explained to him that his deed called for penitence and warned him not to attend at church. The proud sovereign perceived that he would have to submit to the penitence imposed on him, and obeyed the bishop's will. He did not leave Milan till the following year; but before returning to the Eastern capital he had to sustain a dangerous attack from the Goths in Thrace.

In 390 the Visigoths broke the peace to which they had sworn, and invaded Thrace; Huns and other tribes from beyond the Danube had thrown in their lot with them. They were commanded by Alaric, a prince of the Visigoths, belonging to the family of the Balti. This is the first appearance of Alaric, who was then about twenty years of age, and whose great campaigns subsequently excited such terror throughout the Roman Empire. But even then the Thracians appear to have been in great distress: for (1 July 391) Theodosius issued an edict at Aquileia, by which the inhabitants of the endangered district received permission to carry arms and to kill anybody found marauding in the open country. After Theodosius had entered the province, he took great pains to destroy the bands of marauders, and himself assisted in their pursuit. On the Maritza, however, he fell into an ambush and was completely defeated. Even his life seems to have been in danger, but he was rescued by his general Promotus. The latter continued the war against the Goths till the end of 391, though he had apparently fallen into disfavour at Court. He lost his life in the war, and public opinion at the capital attributed his death to Rufinus. Stilicho the Vandal now became commander of the troops in Thrace. He was born about 360, and had at an early age been attached to an embassy to Persia. Afterwards Theodosius had given him his niece Serena in marriage and promoted him step by step. He was considered to be one of the ablest statesmen in the Eastern Empire, and the military command entrusted to him in 392 was destined to increase the importance of his position. For he succeeded at length in defeating the enemy, who for so long a time had been the terror of the Empire. The Goths were surrounded on the Maritza. But again the Emperor showed mercy and gave orders that the enemy should be permitted to go free. Theodosius' policy may probably be attributed to a certain fear of revenge, and it was doubtless influenced by Rufinus, who did not wish Stilicho to become too powerful. Thus a treaty with the vanquished Goths was concluded.

Meanwhile Arbogast had embarked upon a most ambitious course of politics. His aim was to get rid of the young and irresolute Valentinian II. Not indeed that he himself wished for the imperial crown, for he very likely felt its possession to be undesirable. His idea was to get Valentinian II out of the way, and then assist to the imperial throne some one of his ardent devotees, under whose name he himself hoped to wield the supreme power. For the attainment of this end, his first requisite was a trustworthy army. He therefore levied a large

number of Teuton troops, in whose loyalty he could place the utmost confidence. When Valentinian took up his abode in Gaul, the relations between him and the powerful Frank became more and more strained, till finally the Emperor from his throne handed to his rival a written order, demanding that he should resign his post. Arbogast tore the document in pieces before the eyes of the Emperor, whose days were thenceforth numbered. On 15 May 392 the youthful sovereign was assassinated at Vienne; but whether Arbogast was directly responsible for this deed remains uncertain. The way was now clear for the Frank's ambitious plans. A short time previously the Frank Richomer had recommended to his tribesman Arbogast the head of the imperial chancery, the *magister scriniorum* Eugenius. This Roman, formerly a rhetorician and grammarian, was the man whom Arbogast intended to raise to the imperial throne. Eugenius could not but yield to the mighty man's wish. He therefore sent an embassy to Theodosius in 392 to obtain his recognition. But Theodosius gave an evasive answer; and as there was every prospect of a war, Arbogast deemed it necessary to make provision for a safe retreat. We know that the neighbourhood of the Franks formed a very vulnerable point of the Roman government in Gaul. For this reason in the winter of 392 Arbogast undertook a campaign against these dangerous neighbors. He probably hoped at the same time to reinforce his army with Frankish troops, should he be successful in this war. He pushed on through Cologne and the country along the river Lippe into the territory of the Bructeri and Chamavi, after which he turned eastward against the Ampsivarii, who had joined forces with the Chatti under Marcomir. Apparently he met with but little resistance, for in the spring of 393 Eugenius succeeded in concluding treaties with the Franks and even the Alemanni, on condition that they supplied him with troops. The ensuing period was spent in preparations for war in both Empires, Eugenius having been, thanks to Arbogast's influence, recognized as Emperor in Italy also. Theodosius had reinforced his army more especially with Teutons; the Visigoths were again commanded by Alaric, whilst the leaders of the other *foederati* were Gainas, Saul, and the *comes domesticorum* Bacurius, an Armenian. The meeting of the two armies took place 5 Sept. 394 on the Frigidus, a tributary of the Isonza, probably the Hubel. As the Gothic troops formed the vanguard and opened the attack on the enemy, who were posted very favourably, they suffered severe losses on the first day of the battle, which greatly elated the Westerns. On the second day the battle would in all probability have been decided in favour of Arbogast, had not his general Arbitrio, who commanded the Frankish troops, gone over to Theodosius. It is related besides, that a violent storm from the northeast—the Bora, as it is called—wrought such havoc in the ranks of Eugenius' army, that it helped Theodosius to gain a complete victory. Eugenius was taken prisoner and put to death, and Arbogast escaped into the mountains, where he died by his own hand (8 Sept.). But whilst the relations and followers of Eugenius and Arbogast were pardoned, Alaric waited in vain for the post in the Roman army which Theodosius had promised him; and when (17 Jan. 395) Theodosius died at Milan, still in the prime of life, the Goths were sent home by Stilicho, who had been second in command during the war. To make matters worse, the yearly payments which had hitherto been made to the Goths were now injudiciously held back. These various causes combined to disturb the peace between the Romans and Goths, which had so far been tolerably well preserved, and the Goths once more commenced hostilities.

The time for a general rising seemed to be well chosen. Theodosius, whose strong hand had endeavoured to maintain the peace within the Empire, was now no more, and his sons were yet of tender age. The late Emperor had been the last to reign over the whole Empire. And even he, powerless to stay its decline, had been obliged to cede to the Goths an extensive district within its borders. How important the Teutonic element had grown can best be understood from the fact that the Teutons not only furnished the best part of the troops, but also commanded the armies and held the highest appointments, both civil and military.



Now that Theodosius was dead, the Empire was divided forever. At an age of hardly eighteen years his son Arcadius received the Empire of the East under the guidance of Rufinus, who had in 394, during the absence of Theodosius, been entrusted with the regency as well as with the supreme direction of Arcadius. On 27 April 395, to Rufinus' great vexation, the young Emperor married Eudoxia, who had been brought to him by Eutropius, the eunuch of the palace. She was the daughter of Bauto, the Frank who had played an important part under Gratian and Valentinian. In the course of the same year Rufinus was most cruelly slain by the soldiers whom Gainas had but recently led back to Constantinople. After his death Eutropius stood in high favor with the Emperor. He received the office of High Chamberlain (*praepositus sacri cubiculi*) and later on the title *patricius*. The younger son Honorius, who was in his eleventh year, received the Western Empire. Stilicho was appointed his guardian and also regent. He had been raised to the rank of *magister utriusque militiae* by Theodosius before his death, and, as we saw, had married a niece of the Emperor. This capable man was no doubt better fitted than any other to rule the Empire in the spirit of Theodosius, and when the Emperor died it was he who without delay hurried to the Rhine to receive homage for Honorius from the Teuton tribes, even as far as the Batavi. Apparently on this journey King Marcomir was delivered into his hands, and was sent into exile to Tuscany. After this Stilicho immediately returned to Italy.

Meanwhile the Visigoths had broken loose from Moesia. Those of their tribesmen who had formerly accompanied Alaric to Transylvania had joined them and chosen Alaric, whose power at that time, however, was still limited, as leader in the coming war. This war was fraught with danger for the Eastern Empire, for it appears that in the early spring of 395 the whole mass of the Visigoths marched south towards Constantinople. As before, there could of course be no question of capturing the city, but the surrounding country was mercilessly devastated. It is most probable that Rufinus, who paid repeated visits to the hostile camp, bribed the enemy to retire. Alaric now made his way along the coast to Macedonia and Thessaly. Near Larissa he encountered Stilicho, who had left Italy with strong forces. These were the victorious East-Roman soldiers, whom he was leading home to their own country, hoping at the same time to win back Illyria for the Western Empire. This province, though given to Theodosius by Gratian, was said to have been restored by the former a short time before his death. Apparently the Goths had first of all tried to gain the valley of the Peneus, the Vale of Tempe; but meeting with resistance, they had pushed on across the eastern slopes of Olympus into Thessaly, where they barricaded themselves behind their wagons. Stilicho was on the point of attacking them when he received a message from Arcadius, ordering him to dismiss the army of the Eastern Empire, and himself return to Italy. If at first sight this order seems strange, it is because we have long been accustomed to see in Stilicho a disinterested statesman and general, who dedicated his labour and personality to the family of Theodosius. This disposition of Eastern Illyria, which Theodosius was supposed to have made shortly before his death, is however very doubtful, and it is certain that Stilicho had entertained personal ambitions with regard to that province. Viewed in the light of these circumstances, the order from Arcadius appears in a very different light, especially if to this is added the fact that in the same year the Huns had broken through the gates of the Caucasus at Baku on the Caspian Sea and reached Syria by way of Armenia. There they laid siege to Antioch and proceeded thence to Asia Minor. Ravages of every kind marked their way. In this situation it was an absolute necessity for the welfare of the State that the army should return to its own country. Stilicho obeyed the order, because, as has justly been remarked, he was probably uncertain about the future conduct of the East-Roman troops, a section of whom remained in Greece under Gerontius' command to cover Thermopylae. Alaric, however, assisted perhaps by treachery, took possession of this famous pass without difficulty. After this the Goths marched through Boeotia into Attica. Here Alaric succeeded in seizing the

Piraeus, and forced Athens to capitulate by cutting off her supplies. It is probable that she escaped pillage by the payment of a sum of money; Alaric stayed for a short time peacefully within her walls. From Athens the march of the Goths was continued to Eleusis, where they ransacked the temple of Demeter, and further to Megara, which was quickly taken. Gerontius had left the entrance to the Peloponnesus undefended, and the Gothic hordes, meeting with no resistance, broke like a torrent upon Corinth and thence on Argos and Sparta. Many an ancient work of art must have perished in this rush, but no mention is made of any systematic and wilful destruction of the ancient monuments.

It is a curious fact, that after all this the East-Roman government seems neither to have made war against the Huns, who had invaded Asia, nor to have lent assistance to the Greeks, when Gerontius had so utterly failed to do his duty at Thermopylae and the Isthmus. Help came rather from another quarter, and primarily, it must be owned, with a different purpose in view. Though Stilicho had returned to Italy, he had been kept well informed about events in Greece. As he himself had designs on East-Illyria, to which Epirus and Achaia belonged, and as Alaric was to all appearances endeavouring to create an independent sovereignty in these provinces, it was imperative for the vicegerent of the West to interfere. In 397 he transported an army to Greece, and, landing on the south side of Corinth, expelled the Goths from Arcadia and surrounded them at Elis near the Alpheus on the plateau of Pholoe. But no decisive battle was fought, for Stilicho was not sufficiently master of his own troops, and just then the revolt of the Moorish prince Gildo threatened to become a serious danger to the Western Empire. Gildo had formerly been praefect of Mauretania and had subsequently been raised to the office of *magister utriusque militiae*. In the year 394 he began his revolt, whereby he intended to secure the North coast of Africa as a dominion of his own, and in 397 he offered Africa as a feudal province to the Eastern Empire, hoping thereby to kindle war between the two Empires. In this predicament Stilicho avoided a decisive encounter with the Goths. For the second time he allowed his adversary to escape. He even concluded a treaty with Alaric, which doubtless contained an alliance against the Eastern Empire; for in these precarious circumstances the chief of the brave Goths might possibly prove of great service to Stilicho in his ambitious private policy. The effect of these conditions on the mutual relations of the two Empires was soon apparent. At Constantinople Stilicho was declared an enemy of the State, whilst in the Western Empire the consulship of Eutropius, who had been nominated for 399 and had entirely won the favour of Arcadius, was not acknowledged. Before his death Theodosius had so arranged the division of the Empire that the cohesion of the whole might for the future be firmly and permanently secured. Thus the first deep cleft had been made in a union which was already difficult to maintain. Neither Empire had a permanent diplomatic representation; only special embassies were sent from time to time, so that unfounded suspicions were very likely to arise on either side.

At this time, while Stilicho was sailing back in haste from Greece to Italy to prepare for war against Gildo, the Goths made a raid into Epirus, which they devastated in a terrible manner. At last the government at Constantinople was roused sufficiently to make proposals of peace to Alaric. In return for a sum of money and the position of *magister militum* in Illyria, Alaric withdrew from the alliance with Stilicho, made peace with the Eastern Empire, and occupied Epirus, which had been assigned to him, with his Gothic troops. Another trouble for the Eastern Empire at this time arose from the large number of Goths who served in the army, and more especially through their leader Gainas. At his command they had killed Rufinus in 395. When Eutropius did not reward him for his services with the high military office he coveted, he joined a rebellion of his compatriot Tribigild in Phrygia, against whom he had been sent out with an army. For after the fall and execution of the powerful favourite Eutropius in the summer of 399, a national movement was set on foot at Constantinople, having for its object the abolition of foreign influence in the high government offices;

Aurelianus, Eutropius' successor, was at the head of this movement. But the Roman supremacy was not destined to be revived. The Gothic rebellion in Asia Minor grew more and more alarming, and Arcadius was soon obliged to negotiate with Gainas. During an interview with the Emperor, the Goth succeeded in obtaining his nomination to the post of *magister militum praesentalis* and the extradition of the three leaders of the national party, one of whom was Aurelianus. On his subsequent return to the capital, Gainas could consider himself master of the Empire, and as such demanded of the Emperor a place of worship for the Arian Goths. But the famous theologian and bishop, John Chrysostom, contrived to avert this danger to the orthodox Church. But the power of Gainas was not to be of long duration. When in July 400 he left the town with the majority of the Goths, owing to a feeling of insecurity, the inhabitants rose against those who had been left behind. At last no refuge remained to them except the church they had lately been given. In its ruins they were burned, as Gainas failed to come to their rescue in time to storm the city. Gainas was declared a public enemy, and the pursuit was entrusted to his tribesman Fravitta, who so far carried out his order that he followed Gainas to Thrace and the Hellespont, and prevented him from crossing to Asia. Eventually, at the end of the year 400, Gainas was killed on the further side of the Danube by a chief of the Huns, called Uldin, who sent his head to Constantinople.

Nothing is more characteristic of the impotence of the Eastern Empire, than the revolt of this Gothic general, whose downfall was only secured by a combination of favourable circumstances. The clever and valiant Goth succumbed only to strangers; the Empire itself had no means to overthrow him.

Such were the conditions at the dawn of the new century; the last twenty-five years of the old having brought nothing but war, poverty, and depopulation to the Eastern Empire. It is true that for the Western Empire the century had closed more favourably; the campaign against Gildo especially had been prepared by Stilicho with characteristic ability. This Moorish prince, after putting to death the sons of his brother Mascezel, who had gone to Italy, had proceeded to conquer the North of Africa. Only the large and fortified towns could resist his ever-increasing power. He created great anxiety in Rome by cutting off her African corn-supply; but the danger of a famine was averted by Stilicho, who succeeded in having corn brought by sea from Gaul and Spain. When his preparations for war were completed, Stilicho did not at this critical time put himself at the head of the army, but resigned the supreme command to Mascezel. The army was not large, but it seems that Stilicho relied upon the skill of its commander for entering into secret relations with the leaders of the enemy. Mascezel departed for Africa, where the campaign was decided between Tebeste and Ammedera on the Ardalio, a tributary of the Bagradas. Apparently no real battle was fought, but Gildo's troops went over to the enemy or fled into the mountains. Gildo himself first tried to escape by sea, but returned to land and soon after met his death at Tabraca. These wars against the two rebels Gainas and Gildo so excited the imagination of the contemporary world, that they formed the subject of many poetical productions. Of these "The Egyptians or On Providence", a novel by Synesius of Cyrene, and Claudian's "War against Gildo" are preserved.

With the year 401, however, there began for the Western Empire a period similar to that which the Eastern Empire had already so long endured. The Teutons began to press forward in dense masses against the provinces of the Western Empire, which they had so long spared, and finally effected the complete dissolution of that once so mighty realm. But this time the disturbance did not proceed from the Goths only; other tribes also were involved in the movement, which could no longer be restrained, and the danger to the Empire grew in proportion. In the first place Alaric had made use of the short time of his alliance with the Eastern Empire to increase his power, chiefly by re-arming his Goths from the Roman arsenals. His plan of founding an independent kingdom for himself in Greece had failed, and it probably seemed most tempting to him to transfer his attentions to Italy, whose resources

were not yet so completely drained by the Goths. No doubt Stilicho ruled there with a firm hand. He had in 398 created for himself an unassailable position by giving his daughter Maria, a mere child, in marriage to the Emperor Honorius, who was then fourteen years of age. But apparently Alaric did not fear the power of Stilicho, who had twice allowed him to escape from a most critical position; furthermore the Western Empire was just now engaged in a different direction. In the year 401, the Vandals, who had long ago settled in the regions between the Danube and the Theiss, began to grow restless. On account of their increasing population the majority of them had resolved to emigrate with their king Godigisel, retaining at the same time the right of possession over their old dominions. They were joined by Alani from Pannonia, and in the same year this new wave of migration reached Rhaetia by way of Noricum. Stilicho at first opposed them, but was eventually obliged to grant them territories in Noricum and Vindelicia under the suzerainty of Rome, in return for which they bound themselves to serve in the Roman army.

By this time Alaric had already left Epirus far behind and reached Aquileia by way of Aemona and the Birnbaum forest. This invasion of Italy by the barbarians caused great consternation; the fortifications of Rome were repaired and strengthened, and the young Emperor Honorius even contemplated an escape into Gaul. Venetia was already in the enemy's hands, and the road to Milan was occupied by the Goths. As Honorius was staying in this city, Alaric naturally desired above all to take possession of it. But Stilicho came to the rescue. He had reinforced his army with the Vandals and Alani with whom he had just made peace, and Alaric was forced to abandon the siege of Milan. He now tried to gain the coast in order to reach Rome. With Stilicho at his heels he turned to Ticinum and Rasta and thence to Pollentia. Here (6 April 402) a battle was fought in the early stages of which it seemed likely that the Romans would be defeated, as Saul, the Roman general of the Alani, had begun the battle prematurely. But the appearance of Stilicho with the main body of infantry changed the aspect of affairs. The fight was continued until nightfall, but though the Romans were left in possession of the field and took numerous prisoners, Stilicho can hardly be said to have gained a victory. For Alaric's forces retreated in perfect order and were able to continue their march on Rome. In this crisis Stilicho was obliged to come to terms with Alaric. The Gothic chief was raised to the rank of magister militum and promised to evacuate Italy. For the future the two generals arranged to conquer Eastern Illyria for the Western Empire. This treaty, which put a considerable check on the movements of the Goths, is explained not only by the state of affairs at that time, but also by the fact that Alaric's wife and children had been made prisoners during the battle. The Goths now left Italy, but remained close to the frontier, and made a fresh invasion in 403. This time Alaric tried to lay siege to Verona, but was defeated by Stilicho, and on trying to gain Rhaetia by way of the Brenner again found himself in a very dangerous plight, from which he could only extricate himself by concluding a new treaty with Stilicho against the Eastern Empire. Probably it was at this juncture that Sarus the Visigothic prince with his followers went over to Stilicho, a desertion which must be ascribed to Stilicho's diplomatic skill. The uncertainty of the situation may account for the very remarkable fact that Stilicho suffered the enemy to escape so often from his fatal embrace. Be that as it may, the Goths withdrew, and Stilicho could celebrate a brilliant triumph with Honorius. Alaric, however, does not appear to have returned to Epirus till much later, but remained for some time in the neighbourhood of Illyria.

In the following year (405) the Ostrogoths and Vandals, the Alani and the Quadi under the leadership of Radagaisus left their homes, crossed the Alps, and descended into Italy. Their number, though much exaggerated by contemporary historians, must have been considerable; for the hostile army marched through the North of the peninsula in several divisions. Stilicho seems to have collected his troops at Pavia; the invasion happened at a very inopportune moment, as he was about to carry out his designs on Eastern Illyria. This time,



however, he quickly succeeded in ridding himself of the enemy. He surrounded Radagaisus who had attacked Florence, in the narrow valleys of the Apennines near Faesulae, and destroyed a large part of his army. Radagaisus himself was captured with his sons whilst trying to escape, and was shortly afterwards executed. For this victory Stilicho's thanks were chiefly due to two foreign generals, Sarus the Goth and Uldin the Hun. In this manner Italy had indeed been speedily saved from great danger, but at the end of the next year (406) hostile hordes broke into Gaul with so much the greater violence. It is very probable that this invasion, which was undertaken by the Vandals, had some connection with that of Radagaisus. In conjunction with the Vandals were the Alani, who had recently formed an alliance with them, and the Suevi, by whom we must understand the Quadi, who had formerly dwelt north of the Vandals. This great tribal migration, following the road along the Roman frontier (limes), reached the river Main, where they met the Silingi, a Vandal tribe which had gone westward with the Burgundians in the third century. These now helped to swell the Vandal hordes, whilst a part of the Alani under the leadership of Goar enlisted in the Roman army on the Rhine. Near this river the Vandals were attacked by some Frankish tribes, who were keeping guard on the frontier, in accordance with their treaty with Stilicho. In the ensuing fight the Vandals suffered severe losses, their king Godigisel being among the slain. On receiving this news the Alani immediately turned about, and, led by their king Respendial, they completely routed the Franks. On the last day of 406 this mass of people crossed the Rhine at Mainz, which they invested and destroyed. The march was continued by Treves to Rheims, where the bishop Nicasius was slain in his own church; thence to Tournai, Terouenne, Arras, and Amiens. From this point the journey proceeded through Gallia Lugdunensis to Paris, Orleans, and Tours, and, passing through Aquitania into Novempopulana, by Bordeaux to Toulouse, which the bishop Exuperius saved from falling into the enemies' hands. But the fortified passes of the Pyrenees put a stop to their further advance. Thus Spain remained unconquered for the present, and the Vandals now made their way into the rich province of Narbonensis. The devastation of the extensive provinces and the conquered cities of Gaul was terrible; contemporary writers of prose and verse alike complain bitterly of the atrocities committed by the barbarians in this unhappy country. The oldest people could not remember so disastrous an invasion. The weakness of the Empire is revealed by the absence of a Roman army to oppose the Germans. Stilicho's policy was at that time directed towards Illyria, and for this reason he probably found it impossible to come to the assistance of Gaul.

This first great danger was soon followed by a second. The migration of the Vandals had very likely caused the Burgundians along the middle course of the Main to become restless; they now began to bear down upon the Alemanni on the lower Main. A part of the Burgundians had perhaps intended to join the great migration of 406, for shortly after we meet with them on the west side of the Rhine. The most important result, however, was, that the Alemanni now entered on a campaign against Roman Upper Germany, and conquered Worms, Speier, and Strasburg. Here again the Empire failed to send help, and the allied Franks remained quiet. Stilicho meanwhile collected an army in 406 and arranged a plan with Alaric, by which he could carry out his Illyrian projects from Epirus. Already a Praefectus Praetorio for Illyria had been nominated in the person of Jovius, when in the year 407 an event occurred which threw everything else into the background. A new emperor appeared on the scene. When a rumour had spread, that Alaric was dead, the legions in Britain after two unsuccessful attempts proclaimed Constantine emperor. According to Orosius, he was a common soldier, but his name excited hopes for better times. The new Emperor crossed over to Gaul without delay, where he was recognized by the Roman troops throughout the country. He immediately pushed forward into the districts along the Rhone, where, though he probably concluded treaties with the Alemanni, Burgundians, and Franks, he made but little impression

on the Teutons who had invaded the land. But Stilicho had already sent the experienced general Sarus with an army against him. In the neighbourhood of Valence, which Constantine had made his temporary abode, his general Justinian was defeated and killed in battle by Sarus. Another of the usurper's generals met his death soon afterwards during an interview with the crafty Goth. When, however, Constantine sent against him his newly appointed generals, the Frank Edobic and the Briton Gerontius, Sarus abandoned the siege of Valence and effected a passage into Italy by paying a sum of money to the fugitive peasants called Bagaudae, who at that time held the passes of the Western Alps. Stilicho joined Honorius at Rome to discuss the serious situation. Constantine, however, directed his attention towards Spain, evidently with a view to protect his rear before attacking Italy. At the passes across the Pyrenees he met with energetic resistance from Didymus, Verenianus, Theodosius, and Logadius, all relatives of the Emperor. But Constantine's son Constans soon overcame the enemy; he captured Verenianus and Didymus, whilst Theodosius and Logadius fled, the former to Italy, the latter to the East. After this, when Constans had returned to Gaul in triumph, he entrusted the passes to Gerontius, who was in command of the Honorians, a troop of barbarian *foederati*. These, it appears, fulfilled their duty but indifferently, for during the quarrels which ensued in the borderlands the Vandals, Alani and Suevi, who had pushed on as far as southern Gaul, saw an opportunity of executing their design on Spain.

With these disturbances in Spain is generally connected a great rising of the Celts in Britain and Gaul, which was directed against the advancing Teutonic tribes as well as against the Roman rule, and in which the Gaulish district of Armorica was especially concerned. Thus was prepared in these provinces the separation from the Roman government which had lasted for centuries, and at the same time Teutonic rule superseded that of the Romans in Spain.

Meanwhile Alaric had not failed to profit by the violent disturbances within the Western Empire. As Stilicho had neither undertaken the campaign against Illyria nor met the demands of the Gothic soldiers for their pay, Alaric believed himself entitled to deal a powerful blow at the Western Empire. Stilicho had recently strengthened his relations with the imperial house by a new link. The Empress Maria had died early, still a virgin as rumour went, and Stilicho succeeded in persuading the Emperor to marry his second daughter Thermantia. Now Alaric tried to force his way into Italy. He had left Epirus and reached Aemona. There he probably found the roads to the South barred; he therefore crossed the river Aquilis and made his way to Virunum in Noricum, whence he sent an embassy to Stilicho at Ravenna. The ambassadors demanded the enormous sum of four thousand pounds of gold as compensation for the long delay in Epirus and the present campaign of the Goths. Stilicho went to Rome to discuss the matter with the Emperor and the Senate. The majority of the Senate was opposed to the concession of this demand and would have preferred war with the Goths, but Stilicho's power in the assembly was still so great that his opinion prevailed and the huge sum was paid. At this juncture the rumour spread that the Emperor of the East was dead. Arcadius had indeed died (1 May 408). This greatly altered the situation, for Theodosius II, the heir to the Eastern throne, was but a child of seven. Honorius now decided to go to Ravenna, but was opposed by Stilicho, who wanted himself to inspect the troops there. But neither did Stilicho succeed in dissuading Honorius nor could a mutiny among the soldiers at Ravenna, which Sarus had promoted, induce the Emperor to desist from his plan. Nevertheless he eventually diverged from the route to Ravenna, and went to Bologna, where he ordered Stilicho to meet him for the purpose of discussing the situation in the East.

Stilicho's first concern at Bologna was to calm the agitation amongst the soldiers and recommend the ringleaders to the Emperor's mercy; then he took counsel with Honorius. It was the Emperor's wish to go in person to Constantinople and settle the affairs of the Eastern Empire, but Stilicho tried to turn him from this purpose, pointing out that the journey would cause too much expense, and that the Emperor could not well leave Italy whilst Constantine

was as yet powerful and residing at Arles. Honorius bent his will to the prudent counsel of his great statesman, and it was resolved that Stilicho should go to the East, whilst Alaric was sent with an army to Gaul against Constantine. Stilicho, however, neither departed for the East nor did he gather together the troops which remained assembled at Pavia, and were ill-disposed towards him. Meanwhile a cunning Greek, the chancellor Olympius, profited by the change in the Emperor's feelings towards his great minister. Under the mask of Christian piety he secretly intrigued against Stilicho in order to undermine his position. Thus Olympius accompanied the Emperor to Pavia and on this occasion spread the calumnious report, that Stilicho intended to kill the child Theodosius and put his own son Eucherius on the throne. The storm now gathered over Stilicho's head. The prelude to the catastrophe, however, took place at Pavia.

When the Emperor had arrived with Olympius at this town, the latter made an exhibition of his philanthropy by visiting the sick soldiers; probably his real object was to gather the threads of the conspiracy which he had already spun and to weave them further. On the fourth day Honorius himself appeared among the troops and tried to inspire them with enthusiasm for the fight against Constantine. At this moment Olympius gave a sign to the soldiers, and, in accordance with a previous arrangement, they threw themselves upon all the high military and civil officers present, who were supposed to be Stilicho's adherents. Some of them escaped to the town, but the soldiers rushed through the streets and killed all the unpopular dignitaries. The slaughter continued under the very eyes of the Emperor, who had withdrawn at first but reappeared without his royal robes and tried to check the mad fury of the soldiers. When the Emperor, fearing for his own life, had a second time retired, Longinianus, the Praefectus Praetorio for Italy, was also slain. News of this horrible mutiny reached Stilicho at Bologna. He at once summoned all the generals of Teutonic race in whose loyalty alone he could still trust. It was decided to attack the Roman army, should the Emperor himself have been killed. When, however, Stilicho learned that the mutiny had not been directed against Honorius, he resolved to abstain from punishing the culprits, for his enemies were numerous and he was no longer sure of the Emperor's support. But to this the Teuton generals would not agree, and Sarus even went so far as to have Stilicho's Hunnic bodyguard killed during the night. Stilicho now betook himself to Ravenna, and to this town Olympius dispatched a letter from the Emperor, addressed to the army, with the order to arrest Stilicho and keep him in honourable custody. During the night Stilicho took refuge in a church to secure the right of sanctuary; but in the morning the soldiers fetched him away, solemnly assuring him that his life was safe. Then a second letter from the Emperor was read, which condemned Stilicho to death for high-treason. The fallen man might still have saved his life by appealing to the Teuton soldiers, who were devoted to him, and would readily have fought for him. But he made no attempt to do so, probably to preserve the Empire from a civil war, which would have been fatal at this time. Without resistance he offered his neck to the sword. In him the Roman Empire (23 August 408) lost one of its most prominent statesmen, and examples provide us with a fairly full list of them, but, still more, to what extent all the forts were in occupation at the same time and to what extent one succeeded another.

The troops which garrisoned these military posts were Roman, in the sense that they not only obeyed the Roman Emperor but were in theory and to a great extent in practice, even in the later days of Roman Britain, recruited within the Empire. The legionaries came from Romanized districts in the Western Empire; the auxiliaries, naturally less civilized to begin with but drilled into Roman ways and speech, were largely drawn from the Rhine and its neighbourhood: some probably were Celts, like the native Britons, others (as their names on tombstones and altars prove) were Teutonic in race. To what extent Britons were enrolled to garrison Britain, is not very clear; certainly, the statement that British recruits were always

sent to the Continent (chiefly to Germany), by way of precaution, seems on our present evidence to be less sweepingly true than was formerly supposed.

From the standpoints alike of the ancient Roman statesman and of the modern Roman historian the military posts and their garrisons formed the dominant element in Britain. But they have left little permanent mark on the civilization and character of the island. The ruins of their forts and fortresses are on our hill-sides. But, Roman as they were, their garrisons did little to spread Roman culture here. Outside their walls, each of them had a small or large settlement of womenfolk, traders, perhaps also of time-expired soldiers wishful to end their days where they had served. But hardly any of these settlements grew up into towns. York may form an exception: it is a pure coincidence, due to causes far more recent than the Roman age, that Newcastle, Manchester and Cardiff stand on sites once occupied by Roman auxiliary forts. Nor do the garrisons appear to have greatly affected the racial character of the Romano-British population. Even in times of peace, the average annual discharge of time-expired men, with land-grants or bounties, cannot have greatly exceeded 1000, and, as we have seen, times of peace were rare in Britain. Of these discharged soldiers by no means all settled in Britain, and some of them may have been of Celtic or even of British birth. Whatever German or other foreign elements passed into the population through the army, cannot have been greater than that population could easily and naturally absorb without being seriously affected by them. The true contribution which the army made to Romano-British civilization was that its upland forts and fortresses formed a sheltering wall round the peaceful interior regions.

Behind these formidable garrisons, kept safe from barbarian inroads and in easy contact with the Roman Empire by short sea passages from Rutupiae (Richborough, near Sandwich in Kent) to Boulogne or from Colchester to the Rhine, stretched the lowlands of southern, midland policy; on the contrary the investment of the city was carried on with greater vigour than before. As the Goths also blockaded the Tiber, the city was cut off from all supplies, and soon famine broke out. No help came from Ravenna, and when the distress in the city was at its highest ambassadors were sent to the hostile camp to ask for moderate terms. At first Alaric demanded the surrender of all the gold and silver in the city, inclusive of all precious movable goods, and the emancipation of all Teuton slaves, but in the end he lowered his demand to an imposition, which, however, was still so heavy that it necessitated the confiscation of the sacred treasures stored in the temples. After this he withdrew his troops from Rome and went into the neighbouring province of Tuscany where he collected around his standard a great number of slaves, who had escaped from Rome. But even in this situation Honorius declined the negotiations for peace which were now urged by Alaric and the Senate alike.

This temporizing policy could not but bring ruin upon Italy, the more so, as at the beginning of 409 ambassadors came to treat with Honorius about the recognition of Constantine. The usurper had raised his son Constans, who had returned from Spain to Gaul, to the dignity of a co-emperor, and had had the two cousins of Honorius put to death. The Emperor, who entertained hopes that they were still alive and counted upon assistance from Constantine against Alaric, no longer withheld his recognition, and even sent him an imperial robe. During this time Olympius did not show himself in any way equal to the situation, but continued to persecute those whom he believed to be Stilicho's adherents. Honorius now ordered a body of picked troops from Dalmatia to come to the protection of Rome. These six thousand men, however, under their leader Valens were on their way surprised by Alaric, and all of them but one hundred were cut down. A second Roman embassy, in which the Roman bishop Innocent took part, and which was escorted by troops furnished by Alaric, was now sent to the Emperor. In the meantime Ataulf had at last made his way from Pannonia across the Alps, and although an army sent by the Emperor caused him some loss, probably near Ravenna, his junction with Alaric could not be prevented. Now at last a general outcry against



Olympius, who had shown himself so utterly incompetent, arose at the imperial Court. The Emperor was forced to give in and depose his favourite, and after this he at length inclined his ear to more peaceful proposals. When, however, the Gothic chief in an interview with the Praefectus Praetorio Jovius at Ariminum demanded not only an annual subsidy of money and corn, but also the cession of Venetia, Noricum, and Dalmatia, and when moreover the same Jovius in a letter to the Emperor proposed that Alaric should be raised to the rank of a *magister utrisque militiae*, because it was hoped that this would induce him to lower his terms, Honorius refused everything and was determined to go to war.

Apparently this bellicose mood continued, for shortly afterwards a fresh embassy from Constantine appeared at the Court, promising Honorius speedy support from British, Gaulish, and Spanish soldiers. Even Jovius had allowed himself to be persuaded by the Emperor and together with other high officials had taken an oath on pain of death never to make peace with Alaric.

At first all seemed to go well; Honorius levied 10,000 Huns for his army, and to his great satisfaction found that Alaric himself was inclined to peace and was sending some Italian bishops as ambassadors to him. Of his former conditions he only maintained the cession of Noricum and a subsidy of corn, the amount of which was to be left to the Emperor's decision. He requested Honorius not to allow the city of Rome, which had ruled the world for more than a thousand years, to be sacked and burnt by the Teutons. There can be no doubt that the Goths were forced by the pressure of circumstances to offer these conditions. But Honorius was prevented from complying with them by Jovius, who is said to have pleaded the sanctity of the oath which he and others had taken. Alaric now had recourse to a simple device in order to attain the object of his desires. As he could not out of consideration for the Goths aspire to the imperial crown himself, he caused an emperor to be proclaimed. In order to put this proclamation into effect he marched to Rome, seized the harbour of Portus, and told the Senate of his intention to divide among his troops all the corn which he found stored there, should the city refuse to obey his orders. The Senate gave in, and in compliance with Alaric's wish was Attalus raised to the throne. He was a Roman of noble descent, who had been given a high government post by Olympius and shortly afterwards made praefect of the city by Honorius. Attalus thereupon raised Alaric to the rank of *magister militum praesentalis*, and Ataulf to that of *comes domesticorum*; but he gave them each a Roman colleague in their office, and Valens was made *magister militum*, while Lampadius, an enemy of Alaric, became praefect of the city. On the next day Attalus delivered a high-flown oration in the Senate, boasting that it would be a small matter for him and the Romans to subjugate the whole world. Soon, however, his relations with Alaric became strained. Formerly he had been a heathen, but though he now accepted the Arian faith and was baptized by the Gothic bishop Sigesar, he not only openly slighted the Goths but also, disregarding Alaric's advice to send a Gothic army under Druma to Africa, dispatched the Roman Constans with troops ill-prepared for war to that country. Africa was at that time held by Heraclian, one of Honorius' generals, the murderer of Stilicho, and the province required the Emperor's whole attention, as the entire corn supply of Rome depended upon its possession.

Attalus himself now marched against Honorius at Ravenna. The latter, who had already contemplated an escape to the East, sent Attalus a message to the effect that he would consent to acknowledge him as co-emperor. Attalus replied, through Jovius, that he would order Honorius to be mutilated and banish him to some remote island, besides depriving him of his imperial dignity. At this critical moment, however, Honorius was saved by four thousand soldiers of the Eastern Empire, who disembarked at Ravenna and came to his assistance. When the news arrived that the expedition against Heraclian in Africa had proved a complete failure and that Rome was again exposed to a great famine, owing to this victory of Honorius' arms, Attalus and Alaric abandoned the siege of Ravenna. Alaric turned against Aemilia

where he took possession of all the cities except Bologna, and then advanced in a north-westerly direction towards Liguria. Attalus on the other hand hastened to Rome to take counsel with the Senate about the pressing African question. The majority of the assembly decided to send an army of Gothic and Roman troops to Africa under the command of the Goth Druma, but Attalus opposed the plan. This brought about his fall; for when Alaric heard of it he returned, stripped Attalus of the diadem and purple at Ariminum, and sent both to Honorius. He did not, however, leave the deposed Emperor to his fate, but kept him and his son Ampelius under his protection till peace had been concluded with Honorius. Placidia, Honorius' sister, was also in Alaric's keeping. If we may believe Zosimus, she was brought from Rome as a kind of hostage by Alaric, who, however, granted her imperial honours.

The deposition of Attalus in May or June 410 was the starting-point for renewed negotiations for peace between Alaric and the Emperor, in the course of which the former perhaps claimed a part of Italy for himself. But the peaceful propositions were nipped in the bud by the Goth Sarus. He was hostile to Alaric and Ataulf; at that time he lay encamped in Picenum. Under pretence of being menaced by Ataulf's strong body of troops, he went over to the Emperor and violated the truce by an attack on the Gothic camp. Alaric now marched for the third time against Rome, doubtless firmly resolved to punish the Emperor for his duplicity by thoroughly chastising the city, and to establish at last a kingdom of his own. The investment by the Goths caused another terrible famine in the city, and at last, during the night preceding 24 August 410, the Salarian gate was treacherously opened. Then followed a complete sack of the city, which did not, however, degenerate into mere wanton destruction, especially as it only lasted three days. The deeds of violence and cruelty which are mentioned more particularly in the writings of contemporary Christians were probably for the greater part committed by the slaves, who, as we know, had flocked to the Goths in great numbers. As early as 27 August the Goths left Rome laden with enormous spoil, and marched by Capua and Nola into southern Italy. For Alaric, who had probably borne the title of king already for a considerable time, had resolved to go to Africa by way of Sicily, and gain the dominion of Italy by the possession of that rich province. But when part of the army had embarked at Rhegium, his ships were scattered and destroyed by a storm. Alaric, therefore, turned back; but on the way north was seized by an illness which proved fatal before the end of the year 410. He was laid to rest in the river Basentus (Busento) near Cosentia. A large number of slaves were employed in first diverting the course of the river and then bringing it back into its former channel after the dead king and his treasures had been buried. In order that nobody might ever know the burial place, all the slaves who had been employed in the labour were killed. Ataulf was now elected king. He seems at first to have thought of carrying out the plans of his brother-in-law, Alaric; but on further consideration of the great power of Heraclian in Africa, he abandoned them and resolved rather to lead the Goths against Gaul. It is possible that on his march northward he again sacked Rome, and he certainly married Placidia before he withdrew from Italy. He invaded Gaul in 412, and in that year commenced the war which was waged so long by the Teutons against the Roman supremacy in that country.

A little earlier a similar struggle had begun in Spain, which resulted in the victory of the barbarians. In the autumn of 409 the Vandals, Alani, and Suevi had penetrated into Spain, tempted thither no doubt by the treasures of that rich country and by the greater security of a future settlement there. The course followed by those tribes was towards the west of the peninsula, first of all passing through Galicia and Lusitania. Constans, on leaving Spain, had certainly made an unfortunate choice in appointing Gerontius praefect; for not only did this official allow the Teutons to enter the country but he tried at the same time to put an end to Constantine's rule, by deserting him and causing one of his own followers, Maximus, to be proclaimed emperor. Circumstances even forced Gerontius into an alliance with the

barbarians. For when Constans returned to Spain, the usurper could only drive him out of the country by making common cause with the Teutons. Gerontius followed Constans to Gaul, invested him at Vienne, and put him to death at the beginning of 411. He then turned his attention to Constantine, who concentrated his forces at Arles. But Honorius had by now recovered sufficiently to make war against Constantine. For that purpose he sent the Roman Constantius and a Goth named Wulfila with an army to Gaul. When Gerontius advanced to meet them, his soldiers deserted him and joined the imperial troops. He himself met his death shortly afterwards in a burning house, whilst Maximus succeeded in escaping. This sealed the fate of Constantine; for Constantius and Wulfila defeated the army of the Frank Edobic, who came to render him assistance. Constantius then proceeded to besiege Arles, which for a considerable time withstood his efforts, but eventually surrendered on conditions to the general of Honorius. The reason for this was that Constantius had heard that Guntiarus, king of the Burgundians, and Goar, king of the Alani, had raised the Gaulish noble Jovinus to the imperial throne at Mainz, and in these circumstances he deemed it necessary to offer easy terms of capitulation to Constantine. The usurper submitted; but on the way to Ravenna he and his youngest son were killed by Honorius' command. His head was brought to Ravenna (18 Sept. 411). Meanwhile Jovinus with an army consisting of Burgundians, Franks, and Alemanni had marched southward, apparently in the belief that the critical situation of the Empire, which was at war with both Goths and Vandals, would facilitate a rapid extension of his power.

In these circumstances it was an easy matter for the Teutons who had invaded Spain to spread over a large part of the peninsula. For two years they scoured the west and south of the country, devastating and plundering as they went, until the alteration in the political situation, caused by the victories of Constantius, induced them to join the united Empire as *foederati*. In 411 they concluded a treaty with the Emperor, which imposed upon them the duty of defending Spain from foreign invasions. In return the Asdingi and Suevi received landed property for settlements in Galicia, the Silingi in Baetica, and the Alani in Lusitania and Carthaginensis. The larger Roman landowners probably ceded a third part of the land to them.

It was a time of the gravest convulsions for the Western Empire; for during these years were laid the foundations, on which the first important Teutonic States on Roman soil were built. Stilicho seems to have thought it possible for a kind of organic whole to develop out of the Roman and Teutonic nationalities; at least, that great statesman had always promoted peaceful relations between Romans and Teutons. But the change in politics after his death, as well as the immense size of the Empire, made a fusion of those two factors impossible. Now the time of the Teutonic conquests begins, though the name of *foederati* helped for a while to hide the real state of affairs. The very foundation of the Western Empire were shaken; but, above all, the future of Italy as the ruling power of the West was endangered by violent agitations in Africa, the country from which she drew her food-supplies. Just as here, in the heart of the Empire, so too on its borders, could serious danger be foreseen. Throughout the provinces the dissolution of the Empire was threatening. It had probably only been delayed so far by the lack of system in the Teutonic invasions and by the immense prestige of the Empire. But in respect of this the last generation had wrought a very perceptible change. During the long-continued warfare the Teutons had had time to become familiar with the manners of the Romans, their strategy, diplomacy, and political institutions, and it was owing to this that the great coalitions of tribes in 405 and 406 had already taken place. They are probably to be explained by the ever-increasing political discernment of the Teutons. Another result of those years of war was that under Alaric's rule the principle of monarchy was evolved out of military leadership; for the continuous warlike enterprises could not but develop an appreciation of a higher and more comprehensive supreme power. Thus Alaric was no longer the mere adviser of his tribe. His actions however do not show that he abused

his high rank in his behaviour towards his tribesmen, while at the same time he ever displayed towards the Romans a humane and generous spirit which was remarkable in those times. On the other hand the Teutonic tribes, and especially the Visigoths, had seen enough of the internal weakness of the great Empire and of the impotence of its rulers to encourage them to make more serious attacks on the Western half, although Alaric in 410 would willingly have saved from pillage the capital of the world—that capital which, according to his own words in a message brought to Honorius by an embassy of bishops, had ruled the world for more than a thousand years. The fact that he nevertheless led his army to the sack of the city proves that he did not shrink from extreme measures when it was important to display the superiority of the Gothic army over the Roman mercenaries.

Thus it is evident that the Teutonic tribes, and more especially the Visigoths, were at this time passing through a transition stage. They had not yet forgotten their native customs and manner of living, whilst at the same time the foreign influences to which they had been exposed had been sufficiently strong to modify to some extent their original disposition and mode of viewing things. But as far as may be gathered from contemporary sources, their policy had not been influenced by Christian principles, and Christianity altogether played an unimportant part in the history of these migrating Teutons. It is true that, owing to the scantiness of contemporary evidence, we have in many decisive cases to trust to conjecture, and it is a cause for much regret that the moving political forces and even more the real conditions of life among the migrating Teutons are wrapt in impenetrable darkness, which is only dispersed as they begin to live a more settled life, and in particular after the establishment of the Visigoths in Gaul and Spain, the Vandals in Africa, and the Ostrogoths in Italy.



## CHAPTER X

### THE TEUTONIC KINGDOMS

(A)

THE VISIGOTHS IN GAUL.

412-507

KING ATAULF had no intention of establishing a permanent dominion in Italy. As an occupation of Africa seemed hopeless he turned towards Gaul in the year 412, probably making use of the military road which crossed Mt Genève via Turin to the Rhone. Here he at first joined the anti-emperor Jovinus (set up in the summer of 411) who had a sure footing, especially in Auvergne, but was little pleased by the arrival of the Visigoths, which interfered with his plans of governing the whole of Gaul. Hence the two rulers soon came to open strife, especially as Jovinus had not named the Gothic king co-ruler, as he had hoped, but his own brother Sebastian. Ataulf went over to the side of the Emperor Honorius and promised, in return for the assurance of supplies of grain (and assignments of land), to deliver up the heads of both usurpers and to set free Placidia, the Emperor's sister, who was held as a prisoner by the Goths. He certainly succeeded without much trouble in getting rid of the usurpers. As, however, Honorius kept back the supply of grain and Ataulf, exasperated by this, did not give up Placidia, hostilities once more began between the Goths and the Romans. After an unsuccessful attempt to surprise Marseilles, Ataulf captured the towns of Narbonne, Toulouse, and Bordeaux by force of arms (413). But a complete alteration took place in the king's intentions, obviously through the influence of Placidia, whom he took as his (second) wife in January (414). As he himself repeatedly declared, he now finally gave up his original cherished plan of converting the Roman Empire into a Gothic one, and rather strove to identify his people wholly with the Roman State. His political programme was therefore just the same as that of the Ostrogoth king Theodoric, later on, when he accomplished the founding of the Italian kingdom. In spite of these assurances the Emperor refused him every concession; influenced by the general Constantius, who himself desired the hand of the beautiful princess, Honorius looked upon the marriage of his sister with the Barbarian as a grievous disgrace to his house. In consequence Ataulf was again compelled to turn his arms against the Empire. He first appointed an anti-emperor in the person of Attalus, without however achieving any success by this move, since Attains had not the slightest support in Gaul. When Constantius then blockaded the Gallic ports with his fleet and cut off supplies, the position of the Goths there became quite untenable, so that Ataulf decided to seek a place of retreat in Spain. He evacuated Gaul, after terrible devastation, and took possession of the Spanish province of Tarraconensis (in the beginning of 415), but without quite giving up the thought of a future understanding with the imperial power. In Barcelona, Placidia bore him a son, who received the name of Theodosius at his baptism, but he soon died. And not long afterwards death overtook the king from a wound which one of his followers inflicted out of revenge (in the summer of 415).

After Ataulf's death the anti-Romanizing tendencies among the Visigoths, never quite suppressed, became active again. Many Pretenders contended for the throne, but all, as it seems, were animated by the thought of governing independently of Rome and not in subjection to it. At length Sigerich, brother of the Visigoth prince Sarus, murdered by Ataulf, succeeded in getting possession of the throne. Sigerich at once had the children of Ataulf's first marriage slaughtered, and Placidia suffered the most shameful treatment from him. However, after reigning for one week only he was murdered certainly by the instigation of Wallia, who now became head of the Goths (autumn 415).

Wallia, although no less an enemy to Rome than his predecessor, at once granted the imperial princess a more humane treatment, and first tried to develop further the dominion already founded in Spain. But as the imperial fleet again cut off all supplies, and famine broke out, he determined to take possession of the Roman granary in Africa. But the undertaking miscarried because of the foundering in the Straits of Gibraltar of a detachment sent on in advance, which was looked upon as a bad omen (416). The king, obliged by necessity, concluded a treaty with Constantius in consequence of which the Goths pledged themselves, in return for a supply of 600,000 measures of grain from the Emperor, to deliver up Placidia, to free Spain from the Vandals, Alans, and Sueves, and to give hostages. After fierce protracted fighting the Gothic army overcame first the Silingian Vandals and then the Alans (416-418). But when Wallia also wanted to advance against the Asdingian Vandals and the Sueves in Galicia he was suddenly called back by Constantius, who did not wish the Goths to become too powerful, and land for his people to settle upon was assigned to him in the province of Aquitanica Secunda and in some adjoining districts by the terms of a treaty of alliance (end of 418). Shortly after Wallia died, and was succeeded on the Visigoth throne by Theodoric I, chosen by the people.

Historical tradition is silent over the first years of Theodoric's reign; they were taken up with the difficulties of devising and executing the partition of the land with the settled Roman population. The Goths kept their national constitution and were pledged to give military assistance to the Empire. Their king was under the supreme command of the Emperor; he only possessed a real power over his own people, while he had no legal authority over the Roman provincials. Such an indeterminate situation, after the endeavors so long directed towards the attainment of political independence, could not last long.

In 421 or 422 Theodoric fulfilled his agreement by sending a contingent to the Roman army which was marching against the Vandals; but in the decisive battle these troops fell upon the Romans from behind and so helped the Vandals to a brilliant victory. In spite of this base breach of faith the Goths came off unpunished, and even dared to advance southwards to the Mediterranean coast. In the year 425 a Gothic corps was before the important fortress of Arles, the coveted key of the Rhone valley; but it was forced to retreat by the rapid approach of an army under Aetius. After further fighting, about which unfortunately nothing detailed is known to us, peace was made and the Goths were granted full sovereignty over the provinces which had originally been assigned to them for occupation only—Aquitanica Secunda and the north-west corner of Narbonensis Prima—while they restored all their conquests (c. 426).

This peace continued for a considerable period and was only interrupted by the unsuccessful attempt of the Goths to surprise Arles (430). But when in 435 fresh disturbances broke out in Gaul, Theodoric took up once more his plans for the conquest of the whole of Narbonensian Gaul. In 436 he appeared with a strong force before the town of Narbonne, which however after a long siege was relieved by Roman troops (437). The Goths went on fighting, but without success, and were at last driven back as far as Toulouse. But in the decisive battle which was fought before the walls of this town (439) the Romans suffered a severe defeat, and only the heavy loss of life which the Goths themselves sustained could decide the king to agree to the provisional restoration of the *status quo*.

Theodoric was certainly not disposed to be satisfied with the narrow territory surrendered to him. Therefore (c. 442) we find him again on the side of Rome's enemies. First he entered into close relations with Gaiseric, the dreaded king of the Vandals; but this coalition, which would have been so dangerous for the Roman Empire, was broken up by the ingenious diplomacy of Aetius. He next tried to attach himself to the powerful and rising kingdom of the Sueves by giving King Rechiar one of his daughters in marriage, and by furnishing troops to assist his advance into Spain (449). It was only when danger threatened the whole of the civilized West by the rise of the power of the Huns under Attila, that the Goths again allied themselves with the Romans.

In the beginning of the year 451 Attila's mighty army, estimated at half a million, set out from Hungary, crossed the Rhine at Easter-time, and invaded Belgica. It was only now that Aetius, who had been deceived by the false representations of the king of the Huns, thought of offering resistance; but the standing army at his command was absolutely insufficient to hold the field against such a formidable opponent. He found himself, therefore, obliged to beg for help from the king of the Visigoths, who although he had at first intended to keep himself neutral and await the development of events in his territory, thought, after long hesitation, that it would be to his own interest to obey the call. Theodoric joined the Romans with a fine army which he himself led, accompanied by his sons Thorismund and Theodoric. Attila had in the meantime advanced as far as Orleans, which Sangiban, the king of the Alans who were settled there, promised to betray to him. The proposed treachery, however, was frustrated, for the allies were already on the spot before the arrival of the Huns, and had encamped in strength before the city. Attila thought he could not venture an attack on the strong fortifications with his troops, which principally consisted of cavalry, so he retreated to Troyes and took up a position five miles before that town on an extensive plain near the place called Mauriacus, there to await a decisive battle with the Gotho-Roman army which was following him. Attila occupied the centre of the Hun array with the picked troops of his people, while both the wings were composed of troops from the subjected German tribes. His opponents were so arranged that Theodoric with the bulk of the Visigoths occupied the right wing, Aetius with the Romans, and a part of the Goths under Thorismud formed the left wing of the army, while the untrustworthy Alans stood in the centre. Attila first tried to get possession of a height commanding the battlefield, but Aetius and Thorismud were beforehand and successfully repulsed all the attacks of the Huns on their position. The king of the Huns now hurled himself with great force on the Visigothic main body commanded by Theodoric. After a long struggle the Goths succeeded in driving the Huns back to their camp; great losses occurred on both sides; the aged king of the Goths was among the slain, as was also a kinsman of Attila's.

The battle however remained drawn, for both sides kept the field. The moral effect, which told for the Romans and their allies, was, however, very important, inasmuch as the belief that the powerful king of the Huns was invincible had suffered a severe shock. At first it was decided to shut up the Huns in their barricade of wagons and starve them out. But when the body of Theodoric, who had been supposed up till then to be among the survivors, had been found and buried, Thorismund, who was recognized as king by the army, called upon his people to revenge and to take the enemy's position by storm. But Aetius, who did not wish to let the Goths become too powerful, succeeded in persuading Thorismund to relinquish his scheme, advising his return to Toulouse, to prevent any attempt on his brother's part to get possession of the crown by means of the royal hoard there. Thus were the Goths deprived of the well-earned fruits of their famous exploit; the Huns returned home unmolested (451).

Thorismund proved himself anxious to develop the national policy adopted by his father, and in the same spirit. After he had succeeded, for the time being, in keeping possession of the throne, he subdued the Alans who had settled near Orleans and thereby

made preparations for extending the Gothic territory beyond the Loire. Then he tried to bring Arles under his power, but without having attained his object he returned once more to his country, where in the meanwhile his brothers, Theodoric (II) and Friedrich had stirred up a rebellion. After several armed encounters Thorismund was assassinated (453).

Theodoric II succeeded him on the throne. The characteristic mark of his rule is the close though occasionally interrupted connection with Rome. The treaty broken under Theodoric I—which implied the supremacy of the Empire over the kingdom of Toulouse—was renewed immediately after his accession to the throne. For the rest, this connection was never taken seriously by Theodoric but was principally used by him as a means towards the attainment of that end which his predecessors had vainly striven for by direct means — the spread of the Visigoth dominion in Gaul and more especially in Spain. Already, in the year 454, Theodoric found an opportunity for activity in the interest of the Roman Empire; a Gothic army under Friedrich marched into Spain and pacified the rebellious Bagaudae *ex auctoritate Romana*. After the murder of Valentinian III (March 455) Avitus went as magister militum to Gaul to win over the most influential powers of the country for the new Emperor, Petronius Maximus. In consequence of his personal influence—he had formerly initiated Theodoric into the knowledge of Roman literature—he succeeded in bringing the king of the Goths to recognize Maximus. When, however, soon after this, the news of the murder of the Emperor arrived (31 May), Theodoric requested him to take the *imperium* himself. On 9 July, Avitus, who had been proclaimed Emperor, accompanied by Gothic troops marched into Italy where he met with universal recognition. The close relations between the Empire and the Goths came again into operation against the Sueves. As the latter repeatedly made plundering expeditions into Roman territory, Theodoric, with a considerable force to which the Burgundians also added a contingent, marched over the Pyrenees in the summer of 456, decisively defeated them, and took possession of a large part of Spain, nominally for the Empire, but actually for himself.

But the state of affairs changed at one stroke when Avitus, in the autumn of the year 456, abdicated the purple. Theodoric had now no longer any interest in adhering to the Empire. He had in fact required the promotion of Avitus because he enjoyed a great reputation in Gaul and possessed there a strong support among the resident nobility. Friendship with him could only be of use to the king of the Goths in respect to the Roman provincials living in Toulouse. But the elevation of the new Emperor Majorian, on 1 April 457, had occurred in direct opposition to the wishes of the Gallo-Roman nobility to place one of themselves upon the imperial throne. Taking advantage of the consequent discord in Gaul, Theodoric appeared as the open foe of the imperial power of Rome. He himself marched with an army into the Gallic province of Narbonne and once more began with the siege of Arles; he also sent troops to Spain which, however, only fought with varying success. But in the winter of 458 the Emperor appeared in Gaul with considerable forces, quieted the rebellious Burgundians, and obliged the Visigoths to raise the blockade of Arles and again conclude peace (spring 459).

Although in the year 461 yet another change took place on the imperial throne, Theodoric thought it more advantageous for the time being to maintain, at least formally, the imperial alliance. On the other hand the chief general Aegidius, a faithful follower of Majorian, supported by a fine army, marched against the new imperial ruler. In the conflict which then ensued Theodoric found a favourable opportunity for resuming his policy of expansion in Gaul. At the call of Count Agrippinus, who was commanding in Narbonne and was hard pressed by Aegidius, he marched into the Roman territory and quartered upon that important town Gothic troops under the command of his brother Friedrich (462). Driven out of southern Gaul, Aegidius turned northwards whither a Gothic army led by Friedrich followed him. A great battle took place near Orleans in which the Goths suffered a severe



defeat, chiefly through the bravery of the Salian Franks, who were opposed to them and lost their leader in the battle (463). Taking advantage of the victory, Aegidius now began to press victoriously into the Visigoth territory, but sudden death prevented him from carrying out his purposes (464).

Theodoric, freed from his most dangerous enemy, did not delay making good the losses he had suffered; but he died in the year 466 at the hand of his brother Euric, who was a champion of the anti-Roman national party and now ascended the throne. Contemporaries agree in describing the new king as characterized by great energy and warlike ability. We may venture to add from historical facts that he was also a man of distinguished political talent. The leading idea in his policy—the entire rejection of even a formal suzerainty of the Roman Empire—came into operation on his accession to the throne. The embassy which he then sent off to the Emperor of Eastern Rome can only have had for its object a request for the recognition of the Visigoth sovereignty. As no agreement was arrived at he tried to bring about an alliance with the Vandals and the Sueves, but the negotiations came to nothing when a strong East-Roman fleet appeared in African waters (467). Euric at first pursued a neutral course, but as the Roman expedition, set on foot with such considerable effort against the Vandal kingdom, resulted so lamentably (468), he did not hesitate to come forward as assailant, while he simultaneously pushed forward his troops into Gaul and Spain (469). He opened hostilities in Gaul with a sudden attack on the Bretons whom the Emperor had sent to the town of Bourges; at Déols, not far from Chateauroux, a battle took place in which the Bretons were overthrown. Yet the Goths did not succeed in pushing forward over the Loire to the north. Count Paulus, supported by Frankish auxiliaries, successfully opposed them here. Euric therefore concentrated his whole strength partly on the conquest of the province of Aquitania Prima, partly on the annexation of the lower Rhone valley, especially the long-coveted Arles. The provinces of Novempopulana and (for the most part) Narbonensis Prima had been probably already occupied by the Goths under Theodoric II. An army which the West-Roman Emperor Anthemius sent to Gaul for the relief of Arles was defeated in the year 470 or 471, and for the time being a large part of Provence was seized by the Goths. In Aquitania Prima, also, town after town fell into the hands of Euric's general Victorious; only Clermont, the capital city of Auvergne, obstinately defied the repeated attacks of the barbarians for many years. The moving spirits in the resistance were the brave Ecdicius, a son of the former Emperor Avitus, and the poet Sidonius Apollinaris, who had been its bishop from about 470. The letters of the latter give us a clear picture of the struggle which was waged with the greatest animosity on both sides. Euric is said to have stated that he would rather give up the much more valuable Septimania than renounce the possession of that town. The wholly impotent Western Empire was unable to do anything for the besieged. In the year 475 peace was at last made between the Emperor Nepos and Euric by the intervention of Bishop Epiphanius of Ticinum (Pavia). Unfortunately the conditions are not more accurately known, but there can be no doubt that, besides the previously conquered territory in Spain, the district between the Loire, the Rhone, the Pyrenees, and the two seas was relinquished to Euric in sovereign possession. Thus Auvergne, so fiercely contended for, was surrendered to the Goths.

But in spite of this important success the king of the Goths had by no means reached the goal of his desires; it may be seen from the line of policy he followed later that the present moment seemed to him fit, for carrying out that subjection of the whole of the West which had long since been the aim of Alaric I.

For this reason peace only lasted for a year, which was spent in settling internal affairs. The most important event under Euric's government at this time is the publication of a Code of Law which was intended to settle the legal relations of the Goths, both amongst themselves and with the Romans who had come under the Gothic dominion. The deposition of the last

West-Roman Emperor, Romulus, by the leader of the mercenaries, Odovacar (Sept. 476), gave the king a welcome reason for renewing hostilities, as he looked upon the treaty made with the Empire as dissolved. A Gothic army crossed the Rhone and obtained final possession of the whole of southern Provence as far as the Maritime Alps, together with the cities of Arles and Marseilles, after a victorious battle against the Burgundians, who had ruled over this district under Roman suzerainty. But when Euric also marched a body of troops into Italy it suffered defeat from the officers of Odovacar. Consequently a treaty was concluded by the East-Roman Emperor Zeno and the king of the Burgundians whereby the newly conquered territory in Gaul (between the Rhone and the Alps south of the Durance) was surrendered by Odovacar to the Goths, while Euric evidently pledged himself to undertake no further hostilities against Italy (c. 477).

Euric was incessantly harassed by the difficulties of defending this mighty conquest from foes without and within. In particular, very frequent cause for interference was given by the conduct of the Catholic clergy, who openly showed their disloyalty, and in the Vandal kingdom did not shrink from the most treacherous actions. Yet they seem only in rare instances to have been answered by violence and cruelty. The Saxon pirates who, according to old custom, infested the coast of Gaul were vigorously punished by a fleet sent out against them. In the same way it seems that an invasion of the Salian Franks was warded off successfully. It is not strange that, owing to the prestige of the Visigoth power, Euric's help was repeatedly requested by other peoples, as by the Heruli, Warni, and Tulingi who, settled in the Netherlands, found themselves threatened by the overwhelming might of the Franks and owed to the intervention of the Gothic king the maintenance of their political existence. The poet Sidonius Apollinaris has left behind a vivid description of the way in which, at that time, the representatives of the most diverse nations pressed round Euric at the Visigoth Court, even the Persians are said to have formed an alliance with him against the Eastern Empire. It seems that envoys from the Roman population of Italy also appeared at Toulouse to ask the king to expel Odovacar, whose rule was only reluctantly endured by the Italians.

We do not know if Euric intended gratifying this last request, in any case he was prevented from executing any such designs through death, which overtook him in Arles in December 484. Under his son Alaric II the Visigoth power fell from its height. To be sure, the beginning of the decline originated at a time further back. Ataulf's political programme, as already observed, had originally contemplated the establishment of a national Gothic State in the place of the Roman Empire. Yet not one of the Visigoth rulers, in spite of honest purpose, could accomplish this task. It is to their credit that they succeeded at last, after severe fighting, in freeing themselves from the suzerainty of the Emperor and obtaining political autonomy, but the State which thus resulted resembled a Germanic National State no more than it did a Roman Imperium, and it could not contain the seeds of life because it was in a great measure dependent on foreign obsolescent institutions. The Goths had entered the world of Roman civilization too suddenly to be able either to resist or to absorb the foreign influences which pressed on them from all sides. It was fortunate for the progress of Romanization that the Goths, cut off from the rest of the German world, could not draw thence fresh strength to recuperate their nationality or to replace their losses, and moreover that through the immense extension of the kingdom under Euric the numerical proportion between the Roman and Gothic population had altered very much in favour of the former. So under the circumstances it was a certainty that the Gothic kingdom in Gaul must succumb to the rising and politically creative power of the Franks. Neither the personality of Alaric, who was little fitted for ruling, nor the antagonism between Catholicism and Arianism caused the downfall, they only hastened it.

Alaric ascended the throne on 28 December 484. The king was of an indolent weak nature, altogether the opposite of his father, and without energy or warlike capacity, as immediately became evident. For example, he submitted to give up Syagrius, whom he had received into his kingdom after the battle of Soissons (486), when the victorious king of the Franks threatened him with war. The inevitable settlement by arms of the rivalry between the two principal powers in Gaul was of course only put off a little longer by this compliance. About 494 the war began. It lasted for many years and was carried on with varying success on both sides. Hostilities were ended through the mediation of the Ostrogoth king Theodoric—who in the meanwhile had become Alaric's father-in-law—by the conclusion of a treaty of peace on the terms of *Uti possidetis* (c. 502), but this condition could not last long, for the antagonism was considerably aggravated by the conversion of Clovis to the Catholic Church in the year 496 (25 Dec.). Consequently the greatest part of Alaric's Roman subjects, with the clergy of course at their head, adhered to the Franks, and jealously endeavoured to bring about the subjection of the Visigoth kingdom to their rule. Alaric was obliged to adopt severe measures in some instances against such treasonable desires, but usually he tried by gentleness and the granting of favours to win over the Romans to his support, an attempt which, in view of the prevalent and insurmountable antagonism, was of course quite ineffectual and even defeated its own ends, being regarded only as weakness. Thus he permitted the bishoprics kept vacant under Euric to be again filled, he moreover permitted the Gallic bishops to hold a Council at Agde in September 506, and—of the ambiguous attitude of the clergy—it was opened with a prayer for the prosperity of the Visigoth kingdom. The publication of the so-called *Lex Romana Visigothorum*, also named *Breviarium Alaricianum*, represented the most important act of conciliation. This Code of Law, which had been composed by a commission of lawyers together with prominent laymen and even clergy, and was drawn from extracts and explanations of Roman law, was sanctioned by the king at Toulouse, 2 Feb. 506, after having received the approval of an assembly of bishops and distinguished provincials, and was ordered to be used by the Roman population in the Gothic kingdom.

Why the explosion was delayed until the year 507 is unknown. That the king of the Franks was the aggressor is certain. He easily found a pretext for beginning the war as champion and protector of Catholic Christianity against the absolutely just measures which Alaric took against his treacherous orthodox clergy. Clovis had sufficiently appreciated the by no means despicable power of the Visigoth kingdom, and had summoned a very considerable army, one contingent of which was furnished by the Riparian Franks. His allies, the Burgundians, approached from the east in order to take the Goths in the flank. Among his allies Clovis probably also counted on the Byzantines, who placed their fleet at his disposal. On his part Alaric had not looked upon coming events idly, but his preparations were hampered by the bad state of the finances of his kingdom. In order to obtain the necessary funds he was obliged to coin gold pieces of inferior value, which were soon discredited everywhere. Apparently the fighting strength of the Gothic army was inferior to the army of Clovis, but if the Ostrogoth troops, who had held out prospects of coming, should arrive at the right time Alaric could hope to oppose his foe successfully. The king of the Franks had to endeavour to bring about a decisive action before the arrival of these allies. In the spring of 507 he suddenly crossed the Loire and marched towards Poitiers, where he probably joined the Burgundians. On the Campus Vocladensis, ten miles from Poitiers, the Visigoths had taken up their position. Alaric put off beginning battle because he was waiting for the Ostrogoth troops, but as they were hindered by the appearance of a Byzantine fleet in Italian waters he determined to fight instead of beating a retreat, as it would have been wise to do. After a short engagement the Goths turned and fled. In the pursuit the king of the Goths was

killed, it was said by Clovis' own hand (507). With this overthrow the rule of the Visigoths in Gaul was ended forever.

The principal town of the Gothic kingdom was Toulouse, where the royal treasure was also kept; Euric from time to time also held court in Bordeaux, Alaric II in Narbonne. The Gothic rule originally stretched, as has been already mentioned, as far as the province of Aquitania Secunda and some bordering municipalities, among which was the district of Toulouse, but later on it extended not only over the whole territory of the Gallic provinces, but in addition to several parts of the provinces Viennensis, Narbonensis Secunda, Alpes Maritimae, and Lugdunensis Tertia. The Gothic possessions included also the greater part of the Iberian peninsula, *i.e.* the provinces of Baetica, Lusitania, Tarraconensis, and Carthaginensis. The provinces named were in Roman times, in so far as it was a question of civil administration, governed by *consulares* or *presides*, and they were again divided into city-districts (*civitates* or *municipia*). Under the sovereignty of the Goths this constitution was maintained in its chief features.

The inhabitants of the kingdom of Toulouse were composed of two races—the Goths and the Romans. The Goths were regarded by the Romans as foreigners so long as the federal connection remained in force, yet both peoples lived side by side, each under its own law and jurisdiction: intermarriage was forbidden. This rigid line of separation was adhered to even when the Goths had shaken off the imperial suzerainty and the Gothic king had become the sovereign of the native population of Gaul. Theoretically, the Romans had equal privileges in the State; thus they were not treated as a conquered people without rights, as the Vandals and Langobards (Lombards) dealt with the inhabitants of Africa and Italy. That the Goths were the real rulers was clearly enough made manifest to the Romans.

The domestic condition of the Visigoths before the settlement in Gaul was undoubtedly on the same level as in their original home; private property in land was unknown, agriculture was comparatively primitive, and cattle-rearing provided the principal means of subsistence. A national change began with the settlement in Aquitaine. This was done on the principle of the Roman quartering of troops, so that the Roman landowners were obliged to give up to the Goths in free possession a portion of their total property together with the *coloni*, slaves, and cattle appertaining to it. According to the oldest Gothic codes of law the Goth received two-thirds of the tilled land and, it seems, one-half of the woods. The wood and the meadow land which was not partitioned belonged to the Goths and the Romans for use in common. The parcels of land subjected to partition were called *sortes*, the Roman share, generally, *tertia*, their occupants *hospites* or *consortes*. The Gothic *sortes* were exempt from taxation. As the invaders were very numerous compared with the extent of the province to be apportioned, there is no doubt that not only the large estates, but also the middle-sized and smaller properties were partitioned. Nevertheless it is evident that not every Goth can have shared with a Roman possessor, because there would certainly not have been estates enough; we must rather assume that in the share given up larger properties were split up among several families, as a rule among kinsmen. As the apportionment of the single lots undoubtedly took place through the decisive influence of the king, it is natural that the nobility (*i.e.* nobility by military service) was favoured in the partition above the ordinary freemen. The landed property of the monarch's favourites must have gained considerably in extent, as elsewhere, through assignments from state property. The very considerable imperial possessions, both crown and private property, as a rule fell to the share of royalty.

Land partition in the districts conquered later followed the same plan as in Aquitaine; seizures of entire Roman estates certainly occurred, but they were exceptions and happened under special circumstances. As a rule the Romans were protected by law in the possession of their *tertiae*, even if it were only for fiscal reasons. The considerably extended range of the Gothic kingdom offered the people ample space for colonization, so it was not necessary to



encroach on the whole of the Roman territory as had been the case in Aquitaine. It is to be assumed that in the newly won territories only the superfluous element of the population had to be provided for; we are not to suppose a general desertion of the home-land.

The social economy proceeded, on the whole, on the same lines as before, i.e. through *coloni* and slaves, from whose toil the owners derived their principal support, at least in so far as it was a question of food. For the Goths, whose favourite occupations were warfare and the chase, had no inclination to devote themselves to arduous agricultural toil. They only wanted to control directly the rearing of cattle, as they did of old; animal food seems to have been provided principally by means of large herds of swine. The revolution which the partition of land brought about in the habits of the Goths was too powerful not to exert the deepest influence on all the conditions of life. The rich revenues led to the display of a wanton and indolent way of living; the close contact with the Romans, who were for the most part morally decadent, was bound to affect injuriously a people so famous in earlier times for its austere manners. The old national bonds of union, besides having been relaxed through the migration, now from the scattering of the mass in colonization lost more and more of their original importance, since kinsmen need no longer be companions on the farmstead in order to obtain a living. The adoption of the Roman conditions of land-holding obliged the Goths to accept numerous legal arrangements which were foreign to their national law and altered its principles considerably. Nevertheless the national consciousness was strong enough to prevent it from merging itself quickly and completely in the Roman system; in contrast to the Ostrogoths who did nothing but carefully conserve the Roman institutions which they found, the Visigoths are remarkable for an attitude in many respects independent towards the foreign organization.

The entire power of government lay in the hands of the king, but the several rulers did not succeed in making their power absolute. Outwardly the Visigoth king was only slightly distinguished from the other freemen; like them he wore the national skin garment, and long curly hair. The raised seat as well as the sword appear as tokens of royal power, the insignia such as the purple mantle and the crown do not come till later. The succession to the throne follows the system peculiar to the old German constitution of combined election and inheritance. After the death of Alaric I his brother-in-law Ataulf was chosen king; thus a kindred connection played an important part in this choice. Ataulf's friendliness to Rome had placed him in opposition to the great mass of the people; therefore his successor was not his brother, as he had wished, but first Sigerich and then Wallia, who both belonged to other houses. The elevation of Theodoric I is also an instance of free election; the royal dignity remained in his house for over a century. Thorismund was appointed king by the army; the succession of Theodoric II, Euric, and Alaric II, on the other hand, was only confirmed by popular recognition.

Just as the people regularly took a part in the choice of the successor to the throne, so their influence was often brought to bear on the sovereign's conduct of government. After the settlement in Gaul there could certainly no longer be any question of a national assembly in the old sense of the word, especially after the great expansion of territory under Euric. Meetings of all the freemen had become impossible on account of the expansion of the Gothic colonies. The circle of those who could obey the call to assemble became, therefore, smaller and smaller, while in carrying out the principal public functions, such as the coronation of the king, only those of the people who happened to be present at the place of election or who lived in the immediate neighbourhood, could as a rule take part. The importance which the commonalty hereby lost was gained by the nobility, an aristocracy founded on personal service to the king. It was only in the army that the greater part of the people found opportunity of expressing its will. It is certain that among the Visigoths, as among the Franks, regular military assemblies were held, which at first served the purpose of reviews and were

under the command of the king. In these assemblies important political questions were discussed but the decision of the people was not always for the welfare of the State.

The kingdom was subdivided very nearly on the lines of the previous Roman divisions into *provinciae*, and these again into *civitates (territoria)*. At the head of the province was the *dux* as magistrate for Goths and Romans. He was also, as his title implies, in the first place the commander of the militia in his district, and he provided also the final authority and appeal in matters of government, corresponding to the Praefectus Praetorio or *vicarius* of imperial times. The centre of gravity of the government lay in the municipalities whose rulers were *comites civitatum*. They took exactly the place of the Roman provincial governors, so that the city-districts also appear under the title of *provinciae*. Their authority extended even to the exercise of jurisdiction with the exception of such cases as were reserved to the civic magistrates, and included control of the police and the collection of taxes. The *dux* could at the same time become of a *civitas* in his district. At the head of the towns themselves were the *curiales* who, as hitherto, were bound by oath to fill their offices; and they were personally responsible for collecting the taxes. The most important official was the *defensor*, who was chosen from among the *curiales* by the citizens and only confirmed by the king. He exercised, in the first instance, jurisdiction in minor matters, but his activity extended over all the branches of municipal administration. Side by side with this Roman *magistrature* existed the national system which the Goths had brought with them. The Gothic people formed themselves into bodies of thousands, five hundreds, hundreds, and tens, which also remained as personal societies after the settlement. The *millenarius*, as of old, led the thousand in war and ruled over it jointly with the heads of the hundreds both in war and in peace. The *comes civitatis* and his *vicar* originally only possessed jurisdiction over the Romans of his own circuit, but in Euric's time that had so far changed that he now possessed authority to judge the Goths as well in civil suits in conjunction with the *millenarius*: thus the later condition was prepared in which the *millenarius* appears only as military official. On the other hand the *defensor* remained a judiciary solely for the Romans.

We know but little about the officers of the central government. The first minister of Euric and of Alaric II was Leo of Narbonne, a distinguished man of varied talents. His duty comprised a combination of the functions of the *quaestor sacri palatii* and of the *magister officiorum* at the imperial Court; he drew up the king's orders, conducted business with the ambassadors, and arranged the applications for an audience. A higher minister of the royal chancery was Anianus, who attested the authenticity of the official copies of the *Lex Romana Visigothorum* and distributed them; he seems to have answered to the Roman *primicerius notariorum* or *referendarius*.

The organization of the Catholic Church was not disturbed by the Visigoth rule: rather it was strengthened. The ecclesiastical subdivision of the land as it had developed in the last years of the Roman sway corresponded on the whole with the political: the bishoprics, which coincided in extent with the town districts, were grouped under metropolitan sees, which corresponded with the provinces of the secular administration. Since the middle of the fifth century the authority of the Roman bishop over the Church had been generally recognized. Next to the Pope the bishop of Arles exercised over the Gallic clergy a theoretically almost unlimited disciplinary power. A bishop was chosen by the laity and the clergy of his see, and was ordained by the metropolitan bishop of the province together with other bishops. Although the boundaries of the Visigoth kingdom now in no way coincided with the old provincial and metropolitan boundaries, the hitherto existing metropolitan connection was nevertheless not set aside, nor were the relations of the bishops with the Pope interfered with. The Gothic government as a rule showed great indulgence and consideration to the Catholic Church, which only changed to a more severe treatment when the clergy were guilty of

reasonable practices, as happened under Euric. No organized and general persecution of the Catholics from religious fanaticism ever took place. The Catholic Church enjoyed particularly favourable conditions under Alaric II, who in consideration of the threatening struggle with Clovis acknowledged the formal legal position of the Roman Church according to the hitherto existing rules.

Hardly anything is known of the ecclesiastical organization of the Arians in the kingdom of Toulouse. Probably in all the larger towns there were Arian bishops as well as orthodox ones, and no doubt in earlier times they had been appointed by the king. Under the several bishops were the different classes of subordinate clergy; presbyters and deacons are mentioned as in the orthodox Church. The endowment of the Arian Church was probably as a rule allowed for out of the revenue; now and then confiscated Catholic churches as well as their endowments were also made over to it. The church service was of course held in the vernacular as it was in other German churches; the greater number of the clergy were therefore of Gothic nationality. The opposition between the two creeds was also certainly a very sharp one. Both sides carried on an active propaganda, which on the Arian side not unfrequently seems to have been urged by force, but such ebullitions scarcely had the support and approval of the Gothic government.

Very scanty indeed is our knowledge of the civilization of the kingdom of Toulouse. That the Romance element was foremost in almost every department has already been observed. The Goths however held to their national dress until a later period; they wore the characteristic skin garment which covered the upper part of the body, and laced boots of horse-hide which reached up to the calf of the leg; the knee was left bare. There is no doubt that the Gothic tongue was spoken by the people in intercourse with each other; unhappily no vestiges remain of it except in proper names. It is certain however that a great part of the nobility, especially the higher officials, understood Latin well. Most of the Arian clergy undoubtedly were also masters of both languages. Latin was the language of diplomatic intercourse and of legislation. Theodoric II was trained in Roman literature by Avitus; Euric however understood so little of the foreign language that he was obliged to use an interpreter for diplomatic correspondence. Yet this king was in no way opposed to the knowledge and significance of classical culture. The Visigothic Court therefore formed a haven of frequent resort for the last representatives of Roman literature in Gaul. And the kings, from various motives, but especially from a fondness for Roman models, would employ the art of these men to celebrate their own deeds. Here may be named in the first place the poet Sidonius Apollinaris who for a long time lived, first in the Court of Theodoric II and then in that of Euric. Euric's minister Leo also is said to have distinguished himself as a poet, historian, and lawyer, but no more of his writings have been preserved than of the rhetorician Lampridius, who sang the fame of the Gothic royal house at the Court of Bordeaux. But the decay of literature and of culture in general, which had been for so long in progress in spite of the support of the still existent schools of rhetoricians, could assuredly not be stayed by the patronage of the Gothic kings.

(B)  
THE FRANKS BEFORE CLOVIS

Tacitus, in the *de Moribus Germanorum*, tells us that the Germans claimed to be descended from a common ancestor, Mannus, son of the earth-born god Tuisco. Mannus, according to the legend, had three sons, from whom sprang three groups of tribes: the Istaevones, who dwelt along the banks of the Rhine; the Ingaevones, whose seat was on the shores of the two seas, the *Oceanus Germanicus* (North Sea) and the *Mare Suevicum* (the

Baltic), and in the Cimbric peninsula between; and, lastly, more to the east and south, on the banks of the Elbe and the Danube, the Herminones. After indicating this general division, Tacitus, in the latter part of his work, enumerates about forty tribes, whose customs presented, no doubt, a strong general resemblance, but whose institutions and organization showed differences of a sufficiently marked character.

When we pass from the first century to the fifth, we find that the names of the Germanic peoples given by Tacitus have completely disappeared. Not only is there no mention of Istaevones, Ingaevones, and Herminones, but there is no trace of individual tribes such as the Chatti, Chauci, and Cherusci; their names are wholly unknown to the writers of the fourth and fifth centuries. In their place we find these writers using other designations: they speak of Franks, Saxons, Alemans. The writers of the Merovingian period not unnaturally supposed that these were the names of new peoples, who had invaded Germany and made good their footing there in the interval. This hypothesis found favour especially with regard to the Franks. As early as Gregory of Tours, we find mention of a tradition according to which the Franks had come from Pannonia, had first established themselves on the right bank of the Rhine, and had subsequently crossed the river. In the chronicler known under the name of Fredegar the Franks are represented as descended from the Trojans. "Their first king was Priam; afterwards they had a king named Friga; later, they divided into two parts, one of which migrated into Macedonia and received the name of Macedonians. Those who remained were driven out of Phrygia and wandered about, with their wives and children, for many years. They chose for themselves a king named Francion, and from him took the name of Franks. Francion made war upon many peoples, and after devastating Asia finally passed over into Europe, and established himself between the Rhine, the Danube and the sea". The writer of the *Liber Historiae* combines the statements of Gregory of Tours and of the pseudo-Fredegar, and, with a fine disregard of chronology, relates that, after the fall of Troy, one part of the Trojan people, under Priam and Antenor, came by way of the Black Sea to the mouth of the Danube, sailed up the river to Pannonia, and founded a city called Sicambria. The Trojans, so this anonymous writer continues, were defeated by the Emperor Valentinian, who laid them under tribute and named them Franks, that is wild men (*feros*), because of their boldness and hardness of heart. After a time the Franks slew the Roman officials whose duty it was to demand the tribute from them, and, on the death of Priam, they quitted Sicambria, and came to the neighborhood of the Rhine. There they chose themselves a king named Pharamond, son of Marcomir. This naïf legend, half-popular, half-learned, was accepted as fact throughout the Middle Ages. From it alone comes the name of Pharamond, which in most histories heads the list of the kings of France. In reality, there is nothing to prove that the Franks, any more than the Saxons or the Alemans, were races who came in from without, driven into Germany by an invasion of their own territory.

Some modern scholars have thought that the origin of the Franks, and of other races who make their appearance between the third century and the fifth, might be traced to a curious custom of the Germanic tribes. The nobles, whom Tacitus calls *principes*, attached to themselves a certain number of comrades, *comites*, whom they bound to fealty by a solemn oath. At the head of these followers they made pillaging expeditions, and levied war upon the neighbouring peoples, without however involving the community to which they belonged. The *comes* was ready to die for his chief; to desert him would have been an infamy. The chief, on his part, protected his follower, and gave him a war-horse, spear, etc. as the reward of his loyalty. Thus there were formed, outside the regular State, bands of warriors united together by the closest ties. These bands, so it is said, soon formed, in the interior of Germany, what were virtually new States, and the former *princeps* simply took the title of king. Such, according to the theory, was the origin of the Franks, the Alemans, and the Saxons. But this theory, however ingenious, cannot be accepted. The bands were formed exclusively of young



men of an age to bear arms; among the Franks we find from the first old men, women, and children. The bands were organized solely for war; whereas the most ancient laws of the Franks have much to say about the ownership of land, and about crimes against property; they represent the Franks as an organized nation with regular institutions.

The Franks, then, did not come into Germany from without; and it would be rash to seek their origin in the custom of forming bands. That being so, only one hypothesis remains open. From the second century to the fourth the Germans lived in a continual state of unrest. The different communities ceaselessly made war on one another and destroyed one another. Civil war also devastated many of them. The ancient communities were thus broken up, and from their remains were formed new communities which received new names. Thus is to be explained why it is that the nomenclature of the Germanic peoples in the fifth century differs so markedly from that which Tacitus has recorded. But neighbouring tribes presented, despite their constant antagonisms, considerable resemblances. They had a common dialect and similar habits and customs. They sometimes made temporary alliances, though holding themselves free to quarrel again before long and make war on one another with the utmost ferocity. In time, groups of these tribes came to be called by generic names, and this is doubtless the character of the names Franks, Alemans, and Saxons. These names were not applied, in the fourth and fifth centuries, to a single tribe, but to a group of neighbouring tribes who presented, along with real differences, certain common characteristics.

It appears that the peoples who lived along the right bank of the Rhine, to the north of the Main, received the name of Franks; those who had established themselves between the Ems and the Elbe, that of Saxons (Ptolemy mentions the Saxones as inhabitants of the Cimbric peninsula, and perhaps the name of this petty tribe had passed to the whole group); while those whose territory lay to the south of the Main and who at some time or other had overflowed into the *agri decumates* (the present Baden) were called Alemans. It is possible that, after all, we should see in these three peoples, as Waitz has suggested, the Istaevones, Ingaevones, and Herminones of Tacitus.

But it must be understood that between the numerous tribes known under each of the general names of Franks, Saxons, and Alemans there was no common bond. They did not constitute a single State but groups of States without federal connection or common organization. Sometimes two, three, even a considerable number of tribes, might join together to prosecute a war in common, but when the war was over the link snapped and the tribes fell asunder again.

Documentary evidence enables us to trace how the generic name *Franci* came to be given to certain tribes between the Main and the North Sea, for we find these tribes designated now by the ancient name which was known to Tacitus and again by the later name. In Peutinger's chart we find *Chamavi qui et Franci* and there is no doubt that we should read *qui et Franci*. The Chamavi inhabited the country between the Yssel and the Ems; later on, we find them a little further south, on the banks of the Rhine in Hamaland, and their laws were collected in the ninth century in the document known as the *Lex Francorum Chamavorum*. Along with the Chamavi we may reckon among the Franks the Attuarii or Chattuarii. We read in Ammianus Marcellinus (xx. 10) *Rheno transmisso, regionem pervasit* (Julian in AD 360) *Francorum quos Attuarios vocant*. Later, the *pagus Attuariorum* will correspond to the country of Emmerich, of Cleves, and of Xanten. We may note that in the Middle Ages there was to be found in Burgundy, in the neighbourhood of Dijon, a *pagus Attuariorum*, and it is very probable that a portion of this tribe settled at this spot in the course of the fifth century. The Bructeri, the Ampsivarii, and the Chatti were, like the Chamavi, reckoned as Franks. They are mentioned as such in a well-known passage of Sulpicius Alexander which is cited by Gregory of Tours (*Historia Francorum*, II. 9). Arbogast, a barbarian general in the service of Rome, desires to take vengeance on the Franks and their

chiefs—subreguli—Sunno and Marcomir. It is this Marcomir, chief of the Ampsivarii and Chatti, whom the author of the *Liber Historiae* makes the father of Pharamond, though he has nothing whatever to do with the Salian Franks.

Thus it is evident that the name Franks was given to a group of tribes, not to a single tribe. The earliest historical mention of the name may be that in Peutinger's chart, supposing, at least, that the words *et Pranci* are not a later interpolation. The earliest mention in a literary source is in the *Vita Aureliani* of Vopiscus, cap. 7. In the year 240, Aurelian, who was then only a military tribune, immediately after defeating the Franks in the neighbourhood of Mainz, was marching against the Persians, and his soldiers as they marched chanted this refrain:

Mille Sarmatas, mille Francos semel et semel occidimus;  
Mille Persas quaerimus.

It would be in any case impossible to follow the history of all these Frankish tribes for want of evidence, but even if their history was known it would be of quite secondary interest, for it would have only a remote connection with the history of France. Offshoots from these various tribes no doubt established themselves sporadically here and there in ancient Gaul, as in the case of the Attuarii. It was not however by the Franks as a whole, but by a single tribe, the Salian Franks, that Gaul was to be conquered; it was their king who was destined to be the ruler of this noble territory. It is therefore to the Salian Franks that we must devote our attention.

The Salian Franks are mentioned for the first time in *AD* 358. In that year Julian, as yet only a Caesar, marched against them. What is the origin of the name? It was long customary to derive it from the river Yssel (Isala), or from Saalland to the south of the Zuiderzee; but it seems much more probable that the name comes from *sal* (the salt sea). The Salian Franks at first lived by the shores of the North Sea, and were known by this name in contradistinction to the Ripuarian Franks, who lived on the banks of the Rhine. All their oldest legends speak of the sea, and the name of one of their earliest kings, Merovech, signifies sea-born.

From the shores of the North Sea the Salian Franks had advanced little by little towards the south, and at the period when Ammianus Marcellinus mentions them they occupied Toxandria, that is to say the region to the south of the Meuse, between that river and the Scheldt. Julian completely defeated the Salian Franks, but he left them in possession of their territory of Toxandria. Only, instead of occupying it as conquerors, they held it as *foederati*, agreeing to defend it against all other invaders. They furnished also to the armies of Rome soldiers whom we hear of as serving in far distant regions. In the *Notitia Dignitatum*, in which we find a sort of Army List of the Empire drawn up about the beginning of the fifth century, there is mention of *Salii seniores* and *Salii juniores*, and we also find *Salii* figuring in the *auxilia palatina*.

At the end of the fourth and beginning of the fifth century the Salian Franks established in Toxandria ceased to recognize the authority of Rome, and began to assert their independence. It was at this period that the Roman civilization disappeared from these regions. The Latin language ceased to be spoken and the Germanic tongue was alone employed. Even at the present day the inhabitants of these districts speak Flemish, a Germanic dialect. The place-names were altered and took on a Germanic form, with the terminations *hem*, *ghem*, *seele*, and *zele*, indicating a dwelling-place, *loo* wood, *dal* valley. The Christian religion retreated along with the Roman civilization, and those regions reverted to paganism. For a long time, it would seem, these Salian Franks were held in check by the great Roman road which led, by way of Arras, Cambrai, and Bavay, to Cologne, and which was protected by numerous forts.

The Salians were subdivided into a number of tribes each holding a *pagus*. Each of these divisions had a king who was chosen from the most noble family, and who was distinguished from his fellow-Franks by his long hair—*criniti reges*. The first of these kings to whom we have a distinct reference bore the name of Clogio or Clojo (Clodion). He had his seat at Dispargum, the exact position of which has not been determined—it may have been Diest in Brabant. Desiring to extend the borders of the Salian Franks he advanced southwards in the direction of the great Roman road. Before reaching it, however, he was surprised, near the town of Helena (Hélesmes-Nord), when engaged in celebrating the betrothal of one of his warriors to a fair-haired maiden, by Aetius, who exercised in the name of Rome the military command in Gaul. He sustained a crushing defeat; the victor carried off his chariots and took prisoner even the trembling bride. This was about the year 431. But Clodion was not long in recovering from this defeat. He sent spies into the neighbourhood of Cambrai, defeated the Romans, and captured the town. He had thus gained command of the great Roman road. Then, without encountering opposition, he advanced as far as the Somme, which marked the limit of Frankish territory. About this period Tournai on the Scheldt seems to have become the capital of the Salian Franks.

Clodion was succeeded in the kingship of the Franks by Merovech. All our histories of France assert that he was the son of Clodion; but Gregory of Tours simply says that he belonged to the family of that king, and he does not give even this statement as certain; it is maintained, he says, by certain persons. We should perhaps refer to Merovech certain statements of the Greek historian Priscus, who lived about the middle of the fifth century. On the death of a king of the Franks, he says, his two sons disputed the succession. The elder betook himself to Attila to seek his support; the younger preferred to claim the protection of the Emperor, and journeyed to Rome. “I saw him there”, he says; “he was still quite young. His fair hair, thick and very long, fell over his shoulders”. Aetius, who was at this time in Rome, received him graciously, loaded him with presents, and sent him back as a friend and ally. Certainly, in the sequel the Salian Franks responded to the appeal of Aetius and mustered to oppose the great invasion of Attila, fighting in the ranks of the Roman army at the battle of the Mauriac Plain (AD 451). The *Vita Lupi*, in which some confidence may be placed, names King Merovech among the combatants.

Various legends have gathered round the figure of Merovech. The pseudo-Fredegar narrates that as the mother of this prince was sitting by the sea-shore a monster sprang from the waves and overpowered her; and from this union was born Merovech. Evidently the legend owes its origin to an attempt to explain the etymology of the name Merovech, son of the sea. In consequence of this legend some historians have maintained that Merovech was a wholly mythical personage and they have sought out some remarkable etymologies to explain the name Merovingian, which is given to the kings of the first dynasty; but in our opinion the existence of this prince is sufficiently proved, and we interpret the term Merovingian as meaning descendants of Merovech.

Merovech had a son named Childeric. The relationship is attested in precise terms by Gregory of Tours who says *cujus filius fuit Childericus*. In addition to the legendary narratives about Childeric which Gregory gathered from oral tradition, we have also some very precise details which the celebrated historian borrowed from annals now no longer extant. The legendary tale is as follows. Childeric, who was extremely licentious, dishonoured the daughters of many of the Franks. His subjects therefore rose in their wrath, drove him from the throne, and even threatened to kill him. He fled to Thuringia—it is uncertain whether this was Thuringia beyond the Rhine, or whether there was a Thuringia on the left bank of the river—but he left behind him a faithful friend whom he charged to win back the allegiance of the Franks. Childeric and his friend broke a gold coin in two and each took a part. “When I send you my part”, said the friend, “and the pieces fit together to form one whole you may

safely return to your country". The Franks unanimously chose for their king Aegidius, who had succeeded Aetius in Gaul as *magister militum*. At the end of eight years the faithful friend, having succeeded in gaining over the Franks, sent to Childeric the token agreed upon, and the prince, on his return, was restored to the throne. The queen of the Thuringians, Basina by name, left her husband Basinus to follow Childeric. "I know thy worth", said she, "and thy great courage; therefore I have come to live with thee. If I had known, even beyond the sea, a man more worthy than thou art, I would have gone to him". Childeric, well pleased, married her forthwith, and from their union was born Clovis. This legend, on which it would be rash to base any historical conclusion, was amplified later, and the further developments of it have been preserved by the pseudo-Fredegair and the author of the *Liber Historiae*.

But alongside of this legendary story we have some definite information regarding Childeric. While the main centre of his kingdom continued to be in the neighbourhood of Tournai, he fought along with the Roman generals in the valley of the Loire against all the enemies who sought to wrest Gaul from the Empire. Unlike his predecessor Clodion and his son Clovis, he faithfully fulfilled his duties as a *foederatus*. In the year 463 the Visigoths made an effort to extend their dominions to the banks of the Loire. Aegidius marched against them, and defeated them at Orleans, Friedrich, brother of King Theodoric II, being slain in the battle.

Now we know for certain that Childeric was present at this battle. A short time afterwards the Saxons made a descent, by way of the North Sea, the Channel, and the Atlantic, under the leadership of a chief named Odovacar, established themselves in some islands at the mouth of the Loire, and threatened the town of Angers on the Mayenne. The situation was the more serious because Aegidius had lately died (October 464), leaving the command to his son Syagrius. Childeric threw himself into Angers and held it against the Saxons. He succeeded in beating off the besiegers, assumed the offensive, and recaptured from the Saxons the islands which they had seized. The defeated Odovacar placed himself, like Childeric, at the service of Rome, and the two adversaries, now reconciled, barred the path of a troop of Alemans who were returning from a pillaging expedition into Italy. Thus Childeric policed Gaul on behalf of Rome and endeavored to check the inroads and forays of the other barbarians.

The death of Childeric probably took place in the year 481, and he was buried at Tournai. His tomb was discovered in the year 1653. In it was a ring bearing his name, CHILDIRICI REGIS, with the image of the head and shoulders of a long-haired warrior. Numerous objects of value, arms, jewels, remains of a purple robe ornamented with golden bees, gold coins bearing the effigies of Leo I and Zeno, Emperors of Constantinople, were found in the tomb. Such of these treasures as could be preserved are now in the *Bibliothèque Nationale* at Paris. They serve as evidence that these Merovingian kings were fond of luxury and possessed quantities of valuable objects. In the ensuing volume it will be seen how Childeric's son Clovis broke with his father's policy, threw off his allegiance to the Empire, and conquered Gaul for his own hand. While Childeric was reigning at Tournai, another Salian chief, Ragnachar, reigned at Cambrai, the town which Clodion had taken; the residence of a third, named Chararic, is unknown to us.

The Salian Franks, as we have said above, were so called in contradistinction to the Ripuarians. The latter doubtless included a certain number of tribes, such as the Ampsivarii and the Bructeri. Julian, in the year 360, checked the advance of these barbarians and forced them to retire across the Rhine. In 389 Arbogast similarly checked their inroads and conquered all their territory in 392, as we have already said. But in the beginning of the fifth century, when Stilicho had withdrawn the Roman garrisons from the banks of the Rhine, they were able to advance without hindrance and establish themselves on the left bank of the river.



Their progress however was far from rapid. They only gained possession of Cologne at a time when Salvian, born about 400, was a man in middle life; and even then the town was retaken. It did not finally pass into their hands until the year 463. The town of Treves was taken and burned by the Franks four times before they made themselves masters of it. Towards 470 the Ripuarians had founded a fairly compact kingdom, of which the principal cities were Aix-la-Chapelle, Bonn, Juliers, and Zülpich. They had advanced southwards as far as Divodurum (Metz), the fortifications of which seem to have defied all their efforts. The Roman civilization, the Latin language, and even the Christian religion seem to have disappeared from the regions occupied by the compact masses of these invaders. The present frontier of the French and German languages, or a frontier drawn a little further to the south—for it appears that in course of time French has gained ground a little—indicates the limit of their dominions. In the course of their advance southwards, the Ripuarians came into collision with the Alemans, who had already made themselves masters of Alsace and were endeavoring to enlarge their borders in all directions. There were many battles between the Ripuarians and Alemans, of one of which, fought at Zülpich (Tolbiacum), a record has been preserved. Sigebert, king of the Ripuarians, was there wounded in the knee and walked lame for the rest of his life; whence he was known as *Sigebertus Claudus*. It appears that at this time the Alemans had penetrated far north into the kingdom of the Ripuarians. This kingdom was destined to have but a transient existence; we shall see in the following volume how it was destroyed by Clovis, and how all the Frankish tribes on the left bank of the Rhine were brought under his authority.

While the Salian and Ripuarian Franks were spreading along the left bank of the Rhine, and founding flourishing kingdoms there, other Frankish tribes remained on the right bank. They were firmly established, especially to the north of the Main, and among them the ancient tribe of the Chatti, from whom the Hessians are derived, took a leading place. Later this territory formed one of the duchies into which Germany was divided, and took from its Frankish inhabitants the name of Franconia.

If we desire to make ourselves acquainted with the manners and customs of the Franks, we must have recourse to the most ancient document which has come down from them—the Salic Law. The oldest redaction of this Law, as will be shown in the next volume, probably dates only from the last years of Clovis (507-511), but in it are codified much more ancient usages. On the basis of this code we can conjecture the condition of the Franks in the time of Clodion, of Merovech, and of Childeric. The family is still a very closely united whole; there is solidarity among relatives even to a remote degree. If a murderer could not pay the fine to which he had been sentenced, he must bring before the *mâl* (court) twelve *comprobators* who made affirmation that he could not pay it. That done, he returned to his dwelling, took up some earth from each of the four corners of his room, and cast it with the left hand over his shoulder towards his nearest relative; then, barefoot and clad only in his shirt, but bearing a spear in his hand, he leaped over the hedge which surrounded his dwelling. Once this ceremony had been performed, it devolved upon his relative, to whom he had thereby ceded his house, to pay the fine in his place. He might appeal in this way to a series of relatives one after another; and if, ultimately, none of them was able to pay, he was brought before four successive *mâls*, and if no one took pity on him and paid his debt, he was put to death. But if the family was thus a unit for the payment of fines, it had the compensating advantage of sharing the fine paid for the murder of one of its members. Since the solidarity of the family sometimes entailed dangerous consequences, it was permissible for an individual to break these family ties. The man who wished to do so presented himself at the *mâl* before the *centenarius* and broke into four pieces, above his head, three wands of alder. He then threw the pieces into the four corners, declaring that he separated himself from his relatives and renounced all rights of succession. The family included the slaves and *liti* or freedmen. Slaves

were the chattels of their master; if they were wounded, maimed, or killed, the master received the compensation; on the other hand, if the slave had committed any crime the master was obliged to pay, unless he preferred to give him up to bear the punishment. The Franks recognized private property, and severe penalties were denounced against those who invaded the rights of ownership; there are penalties for stealing from another's garden, meadow, corn-field, or flax-field, and for ploughing another's land. At a man's death all his property was divided among his sons; a daughter had no claim to any share of it. Later, she is simply excluded from Salic ground, that is from her father's house and the land that surrounds it.

We find also in the Salic Law some information about the organization of the State. The royal power appears strong. Any man who refuses to appear before the royal tribunal is outlawed. All his goods are confiscated and anyone who chooses may slay him with impunity; no one, not even his wife, may give him food, under penalty of a very heavy fine. All those who are employed about the king's person are protected by a special sanction. Their *wergeld* is three times as high as that of other Franks of the same social status. Over each of the territorial divisions called *pagi* the king placed a representative of his authority known as the *grafio*, or, to give him his later title, the *comes*. The *grafio* maintained order within his jurisdiction, levied such fines as were due to the king, executed the sentences of the courts, and seized the property of condemned persons who refused to pay their fines. The *pagus* was in turn subdivided into "hundreds" (*centenae*). Each "hundred" had its court of judgment known as the *mâl*; the place where it met was known as the *mâlberg*. This tribunal was presided over by the *centenarius* or *thunginus*—these terms appear to us to be synonymous. Historians have devoted much discussion to the question whether this official was appointed by the king or elected by the freemen of the "hundred". At the court of the "hundred" all the freemen had a right to be present, but only a few of them took part in the proceedings—some of them would be nominated for this duty on one occasion, some on another. In their capacity as assistants to the *centenarius* at the *mâl* the freemen were designated *rachineburgi*. In order to make a sentence valid it was required that seven *rachineburgi* should pronounce judgment. A plaintiff had the right to summon seven of them to give judgment upon his suit. If they refused, they had to pay a fine of three sols. If they persisted in their refusal, and did not undertake to pay the three sols before sunset, they incurred a fine of fifteen sols.

Every man's life was rated at a certain value; this was his price, the *wergeld*. The *wergeld* of a Salian Frank was 200 sols; that of a Roman 100 sols. If a Salian Frank had killed another Salian, or a Roman, without aggravating circumstances, the Court sentenced him to pay the price of the victim, the 200 or 100 sols. The *compositio* in this case is exactly equivalent to the *wergeld*; if, however, he had only wounded his victim he paid, according to the severity of the injury, a lower sum proportionate to the *wergeld*. If, however, the murder has taken place in particularly atrocious circumstances, if the murderer has endeavoured to conceal the corpse, if he has been accompanied by an armed band, or if the assassination has been unprovoked, the *compositio* may be three times, six times, nine times, the *wergeld*. Of this *compositio*, two thirds were paid to the relatives of the victim; this was the *faida* and bought off the right of private vengeance; the other third was paid to the State or to the king: it was called *fretus* or *fredum* from the German word *Friede* peace, and was a compensation for the breach of the public peace of which the king is the guardian. Thus a very lofty principle was embodied in this penalty.

The Salic Law is mainly a tariff of the fines which must be paid for various crimes and offences. The State thus endeavoured to substitute the judicial sentences of the courts for private vengeance, part of the compensation being paid to the victim or his family to induce them to renounce this right. But we may safely conjecture that the triumph of law over inveterate custom was not immediate. It was long before families were willing to leave to the

judgment of the courts serious crimes which had been committed against them, such as homicides and adulteries; they flew to arms and made war upon the guilty person and his family. The forming in this way of armed bands was very detrimental to public order.

The crimes mentioned most frequently in the Salic Law give us some grounds on which to form an idea of the manners and characteristics of the Franks. These Franks would seem to have been much given to bad language, for the Law mentions a great variety of terms of abuse. It is forbidden to call one's adversary a fox or a hare, or to reproach him with having flung away his shield; it is forbidden to call a woman *meretrix*, or to say that she had joined the witches at their revels. Warriors who are so easily enraged readily pass to violence and murder. Every form of homicide is mentioned in the Salic Law. The roads are not safe, and are often infested by armed bands. In addition to murder, theft is very often mentioned by the code — theft of fruits, of hay, of cattle-bells, of horse-clogs, of animals, of river-boats, of slaves, and even of freemen. All these thefts are punished with severity and are held by all to be base and shameful crimes. But there is a punishment of special severity for robbing a corpse which has been buried. The guilty person is outlawed, and is to be treated like a wild beast.

The civilization of these Franks is primitive; they are, above all else, warriors. As to their appearance, they brought their fair hair forward from the top of the head, leaving the back of the neck bare. On their faces they generally wore no hair but the moustache. They wore close-fitting garments, fastened with brooches, and bound in at the waist by a leather belt which was covered with bands of enamelled iron and clasped by an ornamental buckle. From this belt hung the long sword, the hanger or *scramasax*, and various articles of the toilet, such as scissors and combs made of bone. From it too was hung the single-bladed axe, the favourite weapon of the Franks, known as the *francisca*, which they used both at close quarters and by hurling it at their enemies from a distance. They were also armed with a long lance or spear formed of an iron blade at the end of a long wooden shaft. For defence they carried a large shield, made of wood or wattles covered with skins, the centre of which was formed by a convex plate of metal, the boss, fastened by iron rods to the body of the shield. They were fond of jewellery, wearing gold finger-rings and armlets, and collars formed of beads of amber or glass or paste inlaid with colour. They were buried with their arms and ornaments, and many Frankish cemeteries have been explored in which the dead were found fully armed, as if prepared for a great military review. The Franks were universally distinguished for courage. As Sidonius Apollinaris wrote of them: "from their youth up war is their passion. If they are crushed by weight of numbers, or through being taken at a disadvantage, death may overwhelm them, but not fear".

## CHAPTER XI

### THE SUEVES, ALANS, AND VANDALS IN SPAIN, 409-429

THANKS to its geographically strong position, the Iberian Peninsula had up till now escaped barbarian invasions; when however the Roman troops stationed to protect the passes of the Pyrenees gave way to negligence, the Asdingian and Silingian Vandals, the (non-German) Alans, and the Sueves availed themselves of the favourable opportunity to cross the mountains (autumn 409). For two whole years the four peoples wandered about devastating the flourishing country, especially the western and southern provinces, without settling anywhere; it was only when famine and disease broke out and menaced their own existence that they were persuaded to more peaceful relations. They concluded a treaty in the year 411 with the Emperor, according to which they received land to settle on as *foederati*, i.e. as subjects of the Empire with the duty of defending Spain against attacks from without. The assignment of the provinces in which the different peoples should settle was decided by lot; Galicia fell to the Asdingians and the Sueves, while the Silingians received Baetica (southern Spain), and the Alans, numerically the strongest people, Lusitania (Portugal) and Carthaginensis (capital Carthagen). Probably they divided the land with the Roman proprietors. The peace brought about in this way did not however last long; the Imperial Government had professed only to regard the arrangement as a temporary expedient. As early as the year 416 the Visigoth king, Wallia, appeared in Spain with a considerable army to free the land from the barbarians in the name of the Emperor. First of all the Silingians were attacked and, after repeated combats, completely destroyed (418), their king, Fredbal, being carried to Italy as prisoner. As a tribal name the name of Asdingians disappears: it only survived as the appellation of members of the royal family.

The Alans also, against whom Wallia next marched, were severely beaten and so much weakened that after the death of King Addac the people decided not to choose another head but to join the Asdingian Vandals, whose kings from that time bore the title *Reges Vandalorum et Alanorum* (418). Only the recall of Wallia (end of 418) saved the Asdingians and the Sueves from the extermination which menaced them. The former rallied wonderfully: they first of all turned against their Suevian neighbours, then under the rule of Hermeric, who had once more made overtures to the Emperor, and pressed them back into the Cantabrian Mountains from which they were only extricated by a Roman army which hurriedly came to their assistance (419). Obligated to retreat to Baetica, the Vandals encountered in 421 or 422 a strong Roman army under Castinus, but owing to the treachery of the Visigoth troops who were fighting on the Roman side they gained a brilliant victory. This success immensely stimulated the power of the Vandals and their desire for expansion. They then laid the foundation of their maritime power, afterwards so formidable; we understand that they infested the Balearic Isles and the coast of Mauretania in the year 425. At that time Carthagen and Seville, the last bulwarks of the Romans in southern Spain, also fell into their power.



Three years later died Gunderic who had ruled over the Vandals since 406. He was succeeded on the throne by his brother Gaiseric (born about 400), one of the most famous figures in the Wandering of the Nations (428). A year after his accession Gaiseric led his people over to Africa. This undertaking sprang from the same political considerations as had earlier moved the Visigoth kings, Alaric and Wallia: the rulers of that province, whose main function it was to supply Italy with corn, had the fate of the Roman Empire in their hands, but they were themselves in an almost unassailable position so long as a good navy was at their disposal. The immediate occasion was furnished by the confusion which then reigned in Africa—the revolt of the Moors, the revolutionary upheaval of the severely oppressed peasantry, the revolt of the ecclesiastical sects, particularly the Donatists (*Circumcelliones*), the manifest weakness of the Roman system of defense everywhere, and, finally, a quarrel between the military governor of Africa, Bonifacius, and the Imperial Government. The well-known story that Bonifacius himself had called the Vandals into the land to revenge the wrongs he had suffered is a fable, which first appeared in Roman authorities of a later time and was invented to veil the real reason. The crossing took place at Julia Traducta, now Tarifa, in May 429. Shortly before embarking the Vandal king turned back with a division of his army and totally defeated the Sueves in a bloody fight near Merida. The Sueves had taken advantage of the departure of their enemies to invade Lusitania. According to a trustworthy account, Gaiseric's people numbered at that time about 80,000 souls, i.e. about 15,000 armed men; their numbers were made up of Vandals, Alans, and Visigoth stragglers who had remained behind in Spain.

The Germans first met with the sternest resistance when they entered Numidia in the year 430. Bonifacius opposed them here with some hurriedly collected troops, but was defeated. The open country was then completely given over to the enemy; only a few forts—Hippo Regius (now Bona), Cirta (Constantine), and Carthage—were kept by the Romans, Hippo mainly through the influence of St Augustine who died during the siege 28 August 430. As it was impossible for the barbarians to take these strongholds owing to their inexperience in siege-work, and as the Romans in the meantime sent reinforcements under Aspar into Carthage by sea, Gaiseric, after heavy losses, resolved to enter into negotiations with the Emperor. On 11 Feb. 435, at Hippo Regius, a treaty was concluded with the imperial agent Trigetius, according to which the Vandals entered the service of the Empire as *foederati* and were settled in the proconsulate of Numidia (capital Hippo), probably in the same way as earlier in Spain, for here too no formal cession of territory took place.

Gaiseric, however, no doubt regarded the situation thus produced as only temporary. After he had again to some extent united his forces, he posed as a perfectly independent ruler in the district assigned to him. The arbitrary actions in which he indulged comprised the deposition of a number of orthodox clergy who had tried to hinder the performance of the Arian service. Vandal pirates scoured the Mediterranean and even plundered the coasts of Sicily in 437. But on 19 Oct. 439, Gaiseric unexpectedly attacked Carthage and captured the city without a stroke. The occupation was followed by a general pillage which naturally did not end without deeds of violence, even if we are not told of any deliberate destruction or damage to particular buildings. The Catholic clergy and the noble inhabitants of Carthage experienced the fate of banishment or slavery. All the churches inside the town as well as some outside were closed for orthodox services and given over to the Arian clergy together with the ecclesiastical property.

Gaiseric must have expected that after these proceedings the Imperial Government would use every possible means of chastising the bold raiders of its most valuable province. To prevent this and to reduce the Western Empire to a state of permanent helplessness by continuously harassing it, he fitted out a powerful fleet in the harbour of Carthage in the spring of 440 with the special aim of attacking Sardinia and Sicily, which were now primarily

relied upon to supply Italy with corn. Although extensive preparations for defence had been arranged the Vandals landed in Sicily without encountering any resistance and moved to and fro, burning and laying waste, but returned to Africa in the same year, 440, on hearing tidings of the approach of powerful Byzantine succours. The expected Greek fleet certainly appeared in Sicilian waters in 441, but the commanders wasted their time there in useless delay, and when the Persians and the Huns invaded the borderlands which had been denuded of troops, the whole fighting force was called back without having effected anything. Under these circumstances the Emperor of Western Rome found himself obliged to conclude a peace with Gaiseric, whose rule was officially recognized as independent, 442. It is stated by some authorities that Africa was divided between the two powers. The best parts of the country: Tingitian Mauretania (by which the Straits of Gibraltar were controlled), Zeugitana or Proconsularis, Byzacena and Numidia proconsularis fell to the Vandals, whilst Mauretania Caesariensis and Sitifensis, Cirtan Numidia and Tripolis remained to the Roman Empire.

This treaty forms an important epoch in the history of the Vandals and marks the end of their migration. A final settlement of the conditions for colonization now took place. The Vandals settled down definitely in the country districts of Zeugitana in the neighbourhood of Carthage. Military reasons, which made a settlement of the people desirable, especially in the neighbourhood of the capital city, as well as the circumstance that the most fertile arable land lay there, were of principal weight in this step. The former landowners—as many as had not been slain or exiled during the conquest—had to choose whether, after the loss of their property, they would make their home as freemen elsewhere or remain as servants, i.e. probably as *coloni*, on their former estates. The Catholic clergy, if they resided within the so-called Vandal allotment, met with the same fate as the landowners, a measure which was principally directed against their suspected political propaganda. In the other provinces and especially in the towns the Roman conditions of property remained as a rule undisturbed, although the Romans were considered as a subject people and the land the property of the State or the king. In order to deprive his enemies, internal or external, of every possible gathering-point, Gaiseric next had the fortifications of most of the towns demolished, with the exception of the Castle Septa in the Straits of Gibraltar, and the towns Hippo Regius and Carthage. The last was looked upon as the principal bulwark of the Vandal power. The sovereign position which Vandal power had now attained found expression in the legal dating of the regnal years from 19 Oct. 439, the date of the taking of Carthage, which was reckoned as New Year's Day. There is no trace here of any reckoning according to the consular years or indictions, as was the custom, for example, in the kingdom of the Burgundians, who continued to consider themselves formally as citizens of the Roman Empire.

How powerful the kingdom of Gaiseric was at this epoch is seen from the fact that the Visigoth king, Theodoric I, sought to form alliance with him by marrying his daughter to the king's son Huneric, the heir-presumptive to the throne. This state of affairs however did not last long, for Gaiseric, under the pretext that his daughter-in-law wanted to poison him, sent her back to her father after having cut off her nose and her ears. Probably the dissolution of this coalition, so menacing to Rome, was brought about by a diplomatic move on the part of the West-Roman minister Aetius, who held out prospects to the king of the Vandals of a marriage between his son and a daughter of the Emperor Valentinian III. Although the projected wedding did not take place, friendly relations were begun between the Vandals and the Romans which lasted until the year 455. Gaiseric was even induced to allow the see of Carthage, which had been vacant since 439, to be again filled.

But this friendly connection ceased at once when the Emperor Valentinian, the murderer of Aetius, was himself slain by that general's following (16 March 455). Gaiseric announced that he could not recognize the new Emperor Maximus, who had had a hand in the murders of Aetius and Valentinian and had forced the widowed Empress Eudoxia to marry him, as a fit

inheritor of the imperial throne. Under this pretext he immediately sailed to Italy with a large fleet, which seems to have been long since equipped in readiness for coming events. That he came in response to an appeal from Eudoxia cannot be for a moment supposed. Without meeting with any resistance the Vandals, amongst whom also were Moors, landed in the harbour of Portus, and marched along the Via Portuensis to the Eternal City. A great number of the inhabitants took to flight; when Maximus prepared to do likewise he was killed by one of the soldiers of his body-guard (31 May). On 2 June Gaiseric marched into Rome. At the Porta Portuensis he was received by Pope Leo I, who is said to have prevailed upon the king to refrain at least from fire and slaughter and content himself merely with plundering.

The Vandals stayed a fortnight (June 455) in Rome, long enough to take all the treasures which had been left by the Visigoths in the year 410 or restored since. First of all the imperial palace was fallen upon, all that was there was brought to the ships to adorn the royal residence in Carthage, among other things the insignia of imperial dignity. The same fate befell the Temple of Jupiter Capitolinus, of which even the half of the gilded roof was taken away. Among the plundered treasure the vessels of Solomon's Temple, formerly brought to Rome by Titus, took a conspicuous place. On the other hand, the Christian churches as a rule were spared. Murder and incendiarism also, as has been certainly proved, did not take place, neither was there any wanton destruction of buildings or works of art. It is therefore very unjust to brand Gaiseric's people with the word "Vandalism," which indeed came into use in France no earlier than the end of the eighteenth century. Besides the enormous spoil which the Vandals carried away were numerous prisoners, in particular the widowed Empress Eudoxia with her two daughters, Eudoxia and Placidia, as well as Gaudentius, the son of Aetius. The Vandals and the Moors divided the prisoners between them on their return; nevertheless Bishop Deogratias raised funds to ransom many of them by selling the vessels of the churches.

The capture of the Empress Eudoxia and her daughters gave the king valuable hostages against the hostile invasion of his kingdom which might now be expected. He was now fully master of the situation; his personality is from this time the centre of Western history. The Vandal fleet ruled the Mediterranean and cut off all supplies from Italy, so that a great famine broke out. In order to put an end to this intolerable state of affairs, Avitus the new Emperor of Western Rome (from 9 July 455) sent an embassy to Byzantium to induce the Emperor to take part in a joint attack against the Vandal Empire, for in an attack on Africa he could not dispense with the East-Roman fleet. But Marcian, probably influenced by the chief general Aspar, all-powerful in the East, still clung to inactivity and contented himself with asking Gaiseric to refrain from further hostilities towards Italy and to deliver up the prisoners of the imperial house, a proceeding which of course was quite ineffectual.

The result of this lethargy on the part of both empires was that the Vandals were in a position to seize the rest of the African provinces belonging to Rome; even the Moorish tribes seem to have acknowledged the Vandal sovereignty without positive resistance. Moreover Gaiseric made an alliance with the Spanish Sueves who had invaded and plundered the province of Tarraconensis (456) which belonged to the Roman Empire. At the same time a Vandal fleet laid waste Sicily and the bordering coast territory of South Italy. It is true that on land the Romans succeeded, under Ricimer, in defeating a hostile division at Agrigentum, as well as one at sea in Corsican waters, but these successes had no lasting effect, for the Vandals still commanded the Mediterranean as before. The populace, furious from the continued famine, compelled Avitus to fly to Gaul, where he died at the end of the year 456.

His successor on the imperial throne, Majorian (from 1 April 457), at once began in real earnest to consider schemes for the destruction of the Vandal Empire. It might be looked upon as auspicious that not long after his accession a body of Roman troops succeeded in defeating a band of Vandals and Moors, led by Gaiseric's brother-in-law, who were engaged in

desultory plunder in South Italy. The Emperor himself marched with a large army, which he had not got together without difficulty, from Italy to Gaul, in November 458, in order to exact recognition of his authority from the Visigoths and Burgundians who had seceded from Rome, and his success in this task at once rendered nugatory Gaiseric's conclusion of a Visigoth, Suevian, and Vandal alliance. In May 460 Majorian crossed the Pyrenees and moved upon Zaragoza to Carthage in order to cross from thence to Africa. The force that had been raised was so impressive that the king of the Vandals did not feel himself a match for it and sent messengers to sue for peace. When peace was refused he laid waste Mauretania and poisoned the wells in order to delay the advance of the enemy as much as possible. The Roman attack, however, could not be carried out, for the Vandals managed by means of treachery to seize a great number of the Roman ships which were lying outside the naval harbour near the modern Elche. Majorian had no alternative but to make peace with Gaiseric; his authority, however, was so shaken by this failure that he was divested of his dignity by Ricimer in August 461.

The result of the elevation of a new Emperor, Libius Severus, was that Gaiseric once more declared the agreement he had but just made to be at an end. He again began his naval attacks on Italy and Sicily. The embassies sent to him by the West-Roman as well as by the Byzantine Emperor Leo had no further result than the deliverance of Valentinian's widow and her daughter Placidia, for he had previously given the elder princess Eudoxia to his son Huneric in marriage. The king received as ransom a part of the treasure of Valentinian. It also seems that an agreement was come to with the East-Roman Empire. On the other hand the hostile relations with West-Rome continued, for Ricimer refused to comply with Gaiseric's principal demand, the bestowal of the imperial throne of the West upon Olybrius, Huneric's brother-in-law. Every year in the beginning of spring detachments of the Vandal fleet left the African harbours to infest the Mediterranean coasts. Unprotected places were plundered and destroyed, while the garrisoned places were carefully avoided.

The danger threatening the Western Empire reached its height when the commander Aegidius, who maintained an independent position in Gaul, made an alliance with Gaiseric and prepared to attack Italy in conjunction with him. This scheme was not carried out, for Aegidius died prematurely (464), but the situation still remained dangerous.

These miserable conditions lasted until the end of 467. The energetic Emperor Leo had by this time succeeded in overcoming the influence of Aspar, who had always been a hindrance to hostile measures against the Vandals. He dispatched a fleet under the command of Marcellinus to convey the newly-created Western Emperor Anthemius to Italy and afterwards proceed to Africa. But first he sent an embassy to Gaiseric to inform him of the accession of Anthemius and to threaten him with war unless he would relinquish his marauding expeditions. The king instantly refused the demand and declared the agreements made with Byzantium at an end. His ships no longer sought Italy, but the coasts of the Eastern Empire: Illyria, the Peloponnesus, and all the rest of Greece felt his powerful arm, and even Alexandria felt itself menaced. But when the attempt of Marcellinus to advance against Africa miscarried on account of contrary winds, Leo determined to make great warlike preparations and to destroy his terrible opponent at one blow. Eleven hundred ships were got together and an army of 100,000 men raised. The plan of campaign was to attack the Vandal Empire on three sides. The main army was to march under Basiliscus direct to Carthage, another body under Heraclius and Marsus was to advance overland from Egypt to the West, while Marcellinus with his fleet was to strike at the Vandal centre in the Mediterranean. But once more fortune favoured the Vandals. They succeeded under cover of night in surprising Basiliscus' fleet, which was already anchored at the Promontorium Mercurii (now Cape Bon), and destroyed a part of it by fire. The rest took to flight and scarcely one-half of the fine armada managed to escape to Sicily (468). The not unimportant successes which the other



Byzantine generals had in the meantime achieved could not balance this catastrophe, and as a crowning misfortune the able Marcellinus when on the point of sailing for Carthage was murdered (August 468). Leo was therefore obliged to relinquish further undertakings and make peace once more with Gaiseric.

The peace, however, only lasted a few years. After Leo's death (Jan. 474) the Vandals again devastated the coast of Greece in frequent expeditions. The Emperor Zeno, who was not prepared to punish the marauders, was obliged to sue for peace, and sent the Senator Severus to Carthage to superintend negotiations. It was agreed that the two empires from that time should not be hostile to each other. The king promised to guarantee freedom of worship to the Catholics in Carthage and to permit the return of the clergy who had been banished for political intrigues, although he could not be prevailed upon to allow a new appointment to the Carthaginian bishopric, vacant since Deogratias' death (457). Besides this he restored without ransom the Roman prisoners who had been allotted to him and his family, and gave Severus permission to buy back the slaves allotted as booty among the Vandals with the goodwill of their owners. In return the Byzantine Emperor, as the overlord of both halves of the Empire, no doubt formally recognized the Vandal kingdom in its then extent—it comprised the entire Roman province of Africa, the Balearic Isles, Pithyusae, Corsica, Sardinia, and Sicily (autumn 476). Gaiseric soon afterwards made over Sicily to Odovacar in return for the payment of a yearly tribute, only reserving for himself the town of Lilybaeum, which had a strategical importance as a starting-point for Africa.

On 25 January 477, Gaiseric died at a very great age after he had raised the Vandal Empire to the height of its power. What he accomplished, as general and politician, in his active life is beyond praise and is unreservedly acknowledged by contemporaries. On the other hand, a less favourable verdict must be pronounced on his statesmanship. The Empire he established was a hybrid State and therefore bore from the beginning the seeds of decay in itself. The nations under his rule were kept strictly separate from each other, and the possibility of an amalgamation, which might have been the foundation of a new political organization, was thus prevented. Herein is seen the truth found by experience, that the existence of all kingdoms erected by conquest is bound up with the life of their creator unless the latter can succeed in creating a united organism on a national, constitutional, or economic basis.

The decline was already noticeable under Gaiseric's eldest son and successor, Huneric, the husband of the imperial princess Eudoxia. The Moorish tribes living in the Aures mountains, after fighting for some time with varying fortune, succeeded at last in shaking off the Vandal rule. In a quarrel with the Eastern Empire over the surrender of Eudoxia's fortune, Huneric early gave in; he was even willing to permit the episcopal see at Carthage to be filled again (481) and grant the Catholics in his Empire still greater freedom of movement. Only when he learned that he had not to fear hostilities from Byzantium did he show himself in his true colours, a tyrant of the worst, most bloodthirsty type. Then he raged against the members of his own house and against his father's friends. Some of them he banished, others he murdered in a horrible manner in order to secure the succession to his son Hilderic. When nothing more remained for him to do in this direction he proceeded to oppress his Catholic subjects. Among some of the measures taken by him the most important is the notorious Edict of 24 January 484, in which the king ordered that the edicts made by the Roman Emperors against heresy should be applied to all his Catholic subjects unless they adopted Arianism by 1 June in that year. Next, orthodox priests were forbidden to hold religious services, to possess churches or build new ones, to baptize, consecrate, and so forth, and they were especially forbidden to reside in any towns or villages. The property of all Catholic churches and the churches themselves were bestowed on the Arian clergy. Laymen were disabled from

making or receiving gifts or legacies; court officials of the Catholic creed were deprived of their dignity and declared infamous. For the several classes of the people graduated money-fines were established according to rank; but in case of persistence all were condemned to transportation and confiscation of property. Huneric gave the execution of these provisions into the hands of the Arian clergy, who carried out the punishments threatened with the most revolting cruelty, and even went beyond them. Repeated intervention on the part of the Emperor and the Pope remained quite ineffectual, for they confined themselves to representations. Perhaps Catholicism might have been quite rooted out in Africa if the king had not died prematurely on 23 December 484.

Under his successor Gunthamund, better times began for the oppressed orthodox Church. As early as the year 487 most of the Catholic churches were opened again and the banished priests recalled. The reason for these changed circumstances lay partly in the personal character of the king, partly in the Emperor's separation from the Roman Church which appeared to debar Gunthamund's Catholic subjects from conspiring with Byzantium, and partly in the now ever-increasing dimensions of Moorish rebellion. Gunthamund was very fortunate in driving back these last to their haunts, but he did not succeed in completely defeating them. He absolutely failed when he attempted to regain possession of Sicily during the struggle between Odovacar and Theodoric the Great. The expedition sent thither was expelled by the Ostrogoths, and the king was compelled even to relinquish the tribute which had hitherto been paid to him (491).

Gunthamund died 3 September 496; Thrasamund his brother, distinguished for his beauty, amiability, wisdom, and general culture, succeeded him on the throne. He pursued yet a different course from that of his predecessors with regard to the Catholics. He tried, like Huneric, to spread Arianism in his kingdom, yet as a rule he avoided the violent measures to which that king had recourse. Thus several bishops, among whom was the bishop of Carthage, were once more banished, but they were well treated in their exile. His action was mainly due to religious fanaticism, for there was no ground for political suspicion, at least during the greater part of his reign; the king was on friendly terms with the schismatical Emperor Anastasius. After the accession of the orthodox Emperor Justin (518) Thrasamund's aversion to the Catholics is easier to understand, especially when the Emperor took steps to improve the position of the orthodox episcopate in Africa. The Vandal kingdom found a real support in the alliance with the Ostrogoths in Italy. Theodoric the Great, swayed by the desire to bring about an alliance of all German princes of the Arian faith, wedded his widowed sister Amalafriada to Thrasamund, whose first wife had died childless; she came to Carthage with a retinue of 1000 distinguished Goths as her body-guard as well as 5000 slaves capable of bearing arms, and brought her royal husband a dowry of the part of the island of Sicily round Lilybaeum (500). A temporary interruption occurred in the alliance between the two States in 510-511, because Thrasamund gave pecuniary support to Gesalech the pretender to the Visigothic throne, who was not recognized by Theodoric; but on the representation of his brother-in-law he repented and apologized. Serious difficulties occurred in the Vandal kingdom once more through the Moors. The tribes of Tripolis really succeeded in making themselves independent. At the end of his reign the king himself took the field against them, but suffered defeat.

Thrasamund died on 6 May 523; he was succeeded by the already aged, utterly effeminate son of Huneric and Eudoxia, Hilderic, who was averse from warfare. Thrasamund, having a presentiment of future events, had exacted an oath from him not to restore to the banished Catholics either their churches or their privileges, but Hilderic evaded his pledge, for even before his formal accession, he recalled the exiled clergy and ordered fresh elections in the place of those who had died. In foreign politics also the new king turned entirely from the system hitherto followed, of alliance with the Ostrogoth kingdom, and entered into a close

connection with the Byzantine Empire where Justinian, the nephew of the ageing Emperor Justin, already practically wielded the sceptre. Inasmuch as he had coins struck bearing the effigy of Justin I, Hilderic formally gave the impression of recognizing a kind of suzerainty of the Byzantine Empire. To the opposition of Amalafriada and her following he replied by slaughtering the Goths and flinging the sister of Theodoric into prison. To avenge this insult the Gothic king fitted out a strong fleet, but his death (526) prevented the dispatch of the expedition, which would probably have been fatal to the Vandal kingdom. Theodoric's grandson and successor Athalarich, or rather his mother Amalasantha, was content with making remonstrances, which of course received no attention.

Though there was nothing to fear from the Ostrogoths, the danger from the Moors waxed ever greater. After the year 525 it appears that they had acquired control over Mauretania Caesariensis with the exception of its capital city, of the Sitifensis Province, and of southern Numidia as well—Mauretania Tingitana had already been given up. But especially momentous in its widespread results was the rise of Antalas who at the head of some tribes in the southern part of Byzacene infested this province more and more, and at last severely defeated the relieving Vandal troops commanded by Oamer, a cousin of Hilderic. The dislike of the Vandals to their king, which had been existent long before this event, showed itself fully at this failure. Hilderic was deposed by the defeated army on its return home and was imprisoned together with his followers, and in his stead the next heir to the throne Gelimer, a great-grandson of Gaiseric, was called upon to rule (19 May 530). Doubtless this usurpation was mainly the result of Gelimer's ambition and love of power, but on the whole it was sustained by the will of the people. They were discontented with the policy hitherto pursued towards the Catholics and Byzantium as well as with the unwarlike, inconsistent character of Hilderic, who was to Teutonic ideas utterly unworthy of royalty.

This course of events was most welcome to the Byzantine Emperor, who in any case had for some time past harboured some idea of the plan which later he definitely announced for joining all the lands belonging to the old Roman Empire under his own sceptre. Just as he afterwards posed as the avenger of Amalasantha, so he now became the official protector of the rights of the deposed king of the Vandals. He asked Gelimer in the most courteous manner not openly to violate the law regarding the succession to the throne, which had been decreed by Gaiseric and had been always hitherto respected, but to be satisfied with the actual exercise of power and to let the old king, whose death might shortly be expected, remain as nominal ruler. Gelimer did not deign at first to answer the Emperor; when, however, the latter took a sharper tone and demanded the surrender of the prisoners he haughtily rejected the interference, emphatically claimed validity for his own succession and declared that he was ready to oppose with the utmost vigour any attack which might occur. Justinian was now firmly resolved to bring matters to an armed decision, but first took steps to end the war which had been begun against the Persians. In the year 532 peace was concluded with them.

The scheme directed against the Vandal kingdom found no approval from the body of crown councillors before whom Justinian laid it for an opinion. They objected to the chronic want of money in the state treasury and that the same fate might easily be prepared for the Byzantines as had befallen Basiliscus under Gaiseric. The troops, too, which had just sustained the fatigues of the Persian campaign, were little fit to be again sent to an uncertain conflict against a powerful and famous kingdom on the other side of the sea. Justinian was almost persuaded to give up the undertaking when a fresh impulse, that of religion, made itself felt. An oriental bishop appeared at Court and declared that God himself had, in a dream, commanded him to reproach the Emperor on account of his indecision and to tell him that he might count on the support of Heaven if he would march forth to liberate the Christian (that is, the orthodox) people of Africa from the dominion of the heretics.

Through this kind of influence on the part of the Catholic clergy, and through the endeavours of the Roman nobility who had been reinstated by Hilderic but driven forth again by Gelimer, Justinian was entirely brought round. Belisarius, previously commander-in-chief in the Persian war, was placed at the head of the expedition with unlimited authority. It was very fortunate for the Emperor that, in the first place, the Ostrogoth queen Amalasantha declared for him and held out prospects of supplying provisions and horses in Sicily, and, further, that the Vandal governor of Sardinia, Godas, rose against Gelimer and asked for troops to enable him to hold his own, and finally that the population of Tripolis, led by a distinguished Roman, Prudentius, declared itself in favour of union with Byzantium.

In June 533 the preparations for war were completed. The army mustered reckoned 10,000 infantry under Johannes of Epidamnus and about 5000 cavalry, also the 5000 men of Belisarius' powerfully mounted guard, 400 Heruls, and 600 Huns. The fleet was composed of 500 transport vessels and 92 battleships under the command of Kalonymus. Among Belisarius' attendants was the historian Procopius of Caesarea, to whom we owe the vivid and trustworthy description of the campaign. The departure of the ships took place at the end of July, and the last hour of the kingdom which was once so powerful had struck.

It is only in Africa that we are well acquainted with the internal circumstances of the Vandal kingdom; for of the parallel conditions in the Spanish communities of the Sueves, Alans, and the Silingian and Asdingian Vandals we only know, at the present time, that they were under monarchical rule. The centre of Vandal rule in Africa was Carthage; here all the threads of the government converged, here the king also held court. The Roman division of the land into provinces (Mauretania: Tingitana, Caesariensis, Sitifensis; Numidia; Proconsularis or Zeugitana; Byzacene; Tripolitana) remained the same. The districts assigned to the Vandals, the so-called '*Sortes Vandalorum*', were separated as especial commands. The governing people were the Vandals of the Asdingian branch which now alone survived, with whom were joined the Alans and contingents from different peoples, among whom in particular were Goths. The Alans, who probably were already Germanized at the time of the transference to Africa, seem to have maintained a kind of independence for a while, but in Procopius' time these foreign elements had become completely merged in the Vandals. The Romans were by far more numerous. These were by no means looked upon as having equal privileges, but were treated as conquered subjects according to the usages of war. Marriages between them and the Vandals were forbidden, as they were in all the German States founded on Roman soil except among the Franks. If, however, the hitherto existing arrangements outside the Vandal settlements remained the same in the main—and indeed even the high offices were left in the hands of the Romans—this only happened because the Vandal kings proved themselves incapable of providing a fresh political organization. On the other hand, the numerous Moorish tribes were to a great extent held in only slight subjection. They retained their autonomy, as they did in the time of the Romans, but their princes received from the hands of the Vandal kings the insignia of their dignity. Under Gaiseric's stern government they conducted themselves quietly and completely left off their raids into civilized districts, which had occurred so frequently in the last years of the Roman rule, but even under Huneric they began with ever-increasing success to struggle for their independence. The destruction which befell the works of ancient civilization in Africa must be placed to the account of the Moors, not of the Vandals.

The first settlement of the Vandals in Africa was on the basis of a treaty with the Roman Empire, when the people were settled among the Roman landowners and as an equivalent became liable to land tax and military service. The land settlement which took place after the recognition of the Vandal sovereignty was carried out as by right of conquest; the largest and most valuable estates of the country landowners in the province of Zeugitana were taken



possession of and given to individual Vandal households. Further particulars of the details are wanting, yet it is certain that the Roman organization arranged on the basis of landed property grants was not disturbed. The property only changed hands, otherwise the conditions were the same as they had been under Roman government. Of the villa, the manor-house on the Roman estate, a Vandal with his family now took possession, and the *coloni* had to pay the necessary dues to the landed proprietor or his representative and render the usual compulsory service. The profits of the single estates were in any case on an average not insignificant, for they made the development of a luxurious mode of life possible even after an increase in the number of the population. The management of the estate was, as formerly, directed only in a minority of cases by the new masters themselves, for they lacked the necessary knowledge, and service in the Court and in the army compelled them to be absent frequently from their property. More often the management was entrusted to stewards or farmers (*conductores*) who were survivals from the earlier state of things. Nevertheless the position of the dependents of the manor, wherever they were directly under the Vandal rule, must have been materially improved in comparison with what it had been formerly, for we know from various authorities that the country people were in no way content with the reintroduction of the old system of oppression by the Byzantines after the fall of the Vandal kingdom.

The Vandals like the other German races were divided into three classes—slaves, freemen, and nobles. The nobleman as he now appears is a noble by service who derives his privileged position from serving the king, not as earlier from birth. The freemen comprised the bulk of the people, nevertheless they had, in comparison with earlier times, lost considerably in political importance while the rights of the popular assembly had devolved in the strengthened monarchy. The slaves were entirely without rights, they were reckoned not as persons but as alienable chattels. The position of the *coloni* who were taken over from the Roman settlement was wholly foreign to the Vandals; they remained tied to the soil but were personally free peasants who kept their former constitutional status

At the head of the State was the King, whose power had gradually become unlimited and differed but little from that of the Byzantine Roman Emperor. His full official title was *Rex Vandalorum et Alanorum*. His mark of distinction and that of his kindred was, as with the Merwings, long hair falling to the shoulders. While the earlier rulers dressed in the customary Vandal costume, Gelimer wore the purple mantle, like the Emperor.

The succession to the throne was legally settled by Gaiseric's so-called testament. Gaiseric, who himself had obtained the throne through the choice of the people, ignoring probably the sons of his predecessor Gunderic, who were still minors, considered himself after he had fully grasped monarchical power as the new founder of the Vandal kingship, as the originator of a dynasty. The sovereignty was looked upon as an inheritance for his family over which no right of disposal belonged to the people. As however the existence of several heirs threatened the by no means solidly established kingdom with the risk of subdivision into several portions, Gaiseric established the principle of individual succession; moreover he provided that the crown should pass to the eldest of his male issue at the time being. By this last provision the government of a minor, unable to bear arms, was made, humanly speaking, impossible. The Vandal kingdom was the first and for a long time the only State in which the idea of a permanent rule of succession came to be realized—and rightly is Gaiseric's family statute reckoned in history among the most remarkable facts relating to public law. It remained valid until the end of the kingdom. Gaiseric himself was succeeded by his eldest son Huneric who was succeeded in turns by two of his nephews Gunthamund and Thrasamund, and only after the death of the latter came Huneric's son Hilderic. Gelimer obtained the throne, on the other hand, in a direct and irregular way, and his endeavours to represent himself to Justinian as a legitimate ruler did not succeed.

The scope of the royal power comprised the national army, the convening of the assembly, justice, legislation and executive, the appointments to the praefecture, the supreme control of finance, of police, and of the Church. Of any co-operation in the government by the people—by the Vandals (not of course by the Romans) such as obtained in olden times, there is no sign whatever.

The development of absolute government seems to have been completed in the year 442; according to the brief but significant statements of our authorities several nobles, who had twice risen against the king because he had overstepped the limits of his authority, were put to death with a good many of the people. The origin of the royal power is traceable to God; the dominant centre of the State is the king and his court.

In war the king is in chief command over the troops and issues the summons to the weapon-bearing freemen. The arrangement of the army was, like that of the nation, by thousands and hundreds. Larger divisions of troops were placed under commanders appointed especially by the monarch and generally selected from the royal family. The Vandals had been even in their settlements in Hungary a nation of horsemen, and they remained so in Africa. They were chiefly armed with long spears and swords, and were little suited to long campaigns. Their principal strength lay in their fleet. The ships they commanded were usually small, lightly built, fast sailing cruisers which did not hold more than about 40 persons. In the great mobility of the army as well as of the navy lay the secret of the surprising successes which the Vandals achieved. But immediately after Gaiseric's death, a general military decline began. Enervated by the hot climate and the luxury into which they had been allured by the produce of a rich country, they lost their warlike capacity more and more, and thus sank before the attack of the Byzantines in a manner almost unique in history.

The king is the director of the whole external polity. He sends forth and receives envoys, concludes alliances, decides war and peace. On single and peculiarly important questions he may take counsel beforehand with the chiefs of his following, but the royal will alone is absolute.

The Vandals were judged according to their national principles of jurisprudence in the separate hundred districts by the leaders of the thousands. Sentences for political offences were reserved for the king as executor of justice in the national assembly. Legal procedure for the Romans remained the same as before. Judgment was passed on trivial matters by the town magistrates, on greater by provincial governors according to Roman law but in the name of the king. Quarrels between Vandals and Romans were of course settled only in the Vandal court of justice according to the law of the victor. That the king often interfered arbitrarily in the regular legal proceedings of the Romans is not surprising, considering the state of affairs, but a similar arbitrary interference among the Vandals is a circumstance of political importance: treason, treachery against the person of the king and his house, apostasy from the Arian Church come into prominence, so that the life and freedom of individuals were almost at the mercy of the monarch's will.

The laws which the Vandal kings enacted were, as far as we know, for the most part directed against the Romans and the Catholics. In addition to the numerous edicts concerning religion the regulations issued against the immorality so widespread in Africa are especially worthy of remark, but like all regulations of the kind only possessed a temporary efficiency. On the other hand, the law of royal succession which we have already alluded to possessed universal validity.

The officials in the service of the Court and State as also those in the Church are all subject to the royal power; they are nominated by the monarch or at least confirmed by him, and can be deprived of their functions by peremptory royal decree. The members belonging to the household of the king represent different elements, spiritual and lay, German and Roman, free and unfree together. The highest official in the Vandal Court was the *praepositus regni*,

whose importance lay entirely in the sphere of the government of the kingdom; his position corresponded to that of a prime minister. As holders of this office appear, so far as is known, only persons of Teutonic nationality. An important post was also that of head of the Chancery of the Cabinet, who had to draw up the king's written edicts and was besides frequently entrusted with different missions of especial political importance. The existence of a special Arian court clergy is to be inferred from the fact that at the princely courts house chaplains are mentioned. Besides these there lived permanently at the Vandal Court a supernumerary class of men who without holding any definite office enjoyed the favour of the king and were employed by him in different ways. A number of them seem to have borne the title comes as among the Franks, Ostrogoths, and others; from among them were taken, for example, the envoys sent to foreign nations. Together with the provincial officials, who might be temporarily present at the Court, and the Arian bishops, the persons of principal position in the king's circle frequently co-operated in the decision of important questions of state affairs. As a general designation for these persons when they belonged to the laity the expression *domestici* appears. Admittance into the royal household required an oath of fealty.

From among the king's circle were drawn the greater part of the higher officials in the provincial government, especially over the Vandals. The most important officers of the Vandals were the heads of the thousands (the *chiliarchs, millenarii*), on whom devolved the management of the districts, i.e. the settlements of a thousand heads of families, in judicial, military, administrative, and fiscal respects. Outside the Vandal allotments the organization of the Roman system in Africa still remained, with the exception of the military, and the duties of the separate offices were discharged by the Romans themselves. The only exceptions were the islands in the Mediterranean; Sardinia, Corsica, and the Balearic Isles were united into one province and placed under a governor of German nationality who resided in Sardinia and exercised both military and civil functions.

The ruler has by virtue of his position absolute right over the revenue of the State; state property and royal private property are identical. A principal source of revenue is provided by the produce of royal domains, which in Roman Africa occupy a particularly important place. To this was added the taxes paid by the provincials, from which the Vandals themselves were entirely exempt. The burdens, however, cannot as a rule have been so oppressive as they were under the Roman rule, for later on, under the government of the Byzantines, the former more lenient conditions were regretted. Besides the taxes were to be taken into account the proceeds from the tolls, the right of coinage, fines, dues from mines and manufactures, and other unusual receipts.

The Arian as well as the Catholic Church is subject to the royal power; the appointment of bishops is dependent on the consent of the sovereign, the synods are convoked by the king and can only meet with his permission. The Asdingian Vandals in their seats in Hungary had clearly been already converted to Arianism, while the Silingians, Alans, and Sueves in the first phase of their Spanish career were still adherents of paganism. After the occupation of Africa the Catholic clergy were entirely expelled from the country districts in the province of Zeugitana as well as from Carthage, and the vacant places were given over to the Arian clergy with the whole of the church property. In the other parts of the kingdom few or no Arian priests were to be found; only under Huneric who presented the whole of the Catholic churches to the Arians (a measure which certainly was never wholly carried out) were they installed in greater numbers. The bishop residing in Carthage bore the title of Patriarch and exercised as metropolitan a supreme power over the whole of the Arian clergy. Since the Arian church-service was held in the vernacular as among the other Germans, the clergy were mostly of German nationality.

The position of the Catholic Church was, as has been already remarked, very varied under the different rulers and very largely dependent on the state of foreign politics. In Africa,

after the tumult of the conquest had passed over and the endowment of the Arian Established Church was put into effect, Gaiseric only proceeded against those adherents of orthodoxy from whom danger to the State was to be feared. The clergy beyond the Vandal allotment were closely supervised, but they were not molested if they did not oppose the royal will but confined themselves to the execution of their pastoral duties. The real persecutions began first under Huneric and were continued, after an interval of peace, by Gunthamund and Thrasamund, though in a milder form. Hilderic gave the Catholic Church its complete freedom again; his successor Gelimer, an ardent Arian, was too much occupied with political complications to be able to be active in that sphere. Ecclesiastical conditions suffered therefore only temporary not permanent disturbance and sustained no material hurt; rather, the persecutions contributed largely to temper the inner strength of the African Church.

When the Vandals occupied Africa they were undoubtedly still in the same primitive stage of civilization in which they had lived in their homes in Hungary. Their political position as conquerors, the settlement in an enclosed district, the sharp religious opposition must certainly have hindered a rapid acceptance of the Roman influence. But under Gelimer they quite adopted the luxurious mode of life of the Romans, i.e. of the rich nobility; they lived in magnificent palaces, wore fine clothes, visited theatres, gave themselves up to the pleasures of an excellent table and did homage with great passion to Aphrodite. Roman literary culture had just made its appearance in the royal Court and among the nobility. Gaiseric was himself certainly, at least at first, not skilled in Latin, but one of his grandsons was famous for having distinguished himself in the acquisition of manifold knowledge. The same is said of Thrasamund, and we may assume it of Hilderic.

Latin was the language of diplomatic intercourse and legislation, as it was in the other German kingdoms; the Vandal language was quite supplanted, and only remained in use in popular intercourse and in the church-service. So in the last years of the Vandal dominion Roman literature in Africa produced a tiny harvest. The poet Dracontius is to be remembered in this connection, and the poets preserved in the anthology of the Codex Salmasianus, and Bishop Fulgentius of Ruspe. The art of architecture found in Thrasamund an eager patron; mention is made of splendid buildings which were raised under this king. There is certainly no authentic trace extant of any artistic capacity among the Vandals themselves.



## CHAPTER XII

### THE HUNS

#### (A)

#### THE ASIATIC BACKGROUND

THE Asiatic background has its basis in the immense zone of steppes and deserts which stretches from the Caspian Sea to the Khin-gan Mountains, and is divided into two regions by the Pamir and the Thian Shan ranges. The western region, like the whole lowland district of West Asia, even to the extreme north, is a deserted sea-bed; the eastern (Tarim basin and Gobi) seems formerly to have been covered with great fresh-water lakes. The water-basins began to evaporate and to shrink to inland seas, while the intervening country became a desert. The largest remains of former enormous water-basins are the salt Caspian Sea and the sweet-water Aral Sea. In both regions all the moisture that falls evaporates, so that no rivers reach the open sea; most of them ooze away in the sand, and only the greatest, such as the Syr, Amu, Hi, Chu, Tarim, flow into large inland seas. The fact that the evaporation is greater than the fall of moisture, and that the latter takes place chiefly in the cold season, has important consequences, which account for the desert nature of the land. All the salt which is released by the weathering and decomposition of the soil remains in the ground, and only in the higher regions with greater falls of moisture, and by the banks of rivers is the soil sufficiently lixiviated to be fit for cultivation. Everywhere else is steppe and desert absolutely uncultivable. The surface of the land can be divided into six categories: sand-deserts, grave deserts, salt-steppes, loam-steppes, loess-land, and rocky mountains.

Of these the sand-deserts form by far the greatest part. They consist of fine drift-sand, which the driving storm wind forms into sickleshaped shifting dunes (*barkhans*). The loose drift-sand is waterless, and for the most part without vegetation; the *barkhans*, however, here and there display a few poor saxaul and other shrubs; human life is impossible. The gravel-deserts, also very extensive, which form the transition between the sand deserts and the steppes, have a sparse vegetation and serve the nomads as grazing-grounds in their wanderings to and from winter quarters and summer pastures. The adjoining salt-steppes, consisting of loam and sand, are so impregnated with salt that the latter settles down on the surface like rime. In spring they bear a scanty vegetation, which, on account of its saline nature, affords excellent pasture for numerous flocks of sheep. During the rain of autumn and spring the loam-steppes, consisting of loess-soil mixed with much sand, are covered with luxuriant verdure and myriads of wild flowers, especially tulips, and, on the drier ground, with camel-thorn (*Alhagi camelorum*), without which the camel could not exist for any length of time. These steppes form the real pastures of the nomads. In the loess-land agriculture and gardening are only possible where the soil has been sufficiently softened by rainfall and artificial canals, and is constantly irrigated. It forms the sub-soil of all cultivable oases. Without irrigation the soil becomes in summer as hard as concrete, and its vegetation dies completely. The oases comprise only two per cent, of the total area of Turkestan. As a rule the rocky mountains are quite bare; they consist of black gleaming stone cracked by frost and heat, and are waterless.

Roughly speaking these differences of vegetation follow one another from south to north, viz. the salt-, the sand-, and the grass-steppes. A little below 50 N. latitude the landscape of West Asia changes in consequence of a greater fall of moisture. The undrained lakes become less frequent, the rivers reach the sea (Ishim, Tobol, etc.) and trees appear. Here begins, as a transition to the compact forest-land, the tree-steppe on the very fertile "black earth." On the Yenisei are park-like districts with splendid grass plains, and luxuriant trees. Northward come endless pine-forests, and beyond them, towards the Arctic Sea, is the moss-steppe or tundra.

The climate is typically continental, with icy cold winters, hot summers, cold nights, and hot days with enormous fluctuations of temperature. The warmth increases quickly from winter to spring and decreases just as quickly from summer to autumn. In West Turkestan, the summer is almost cloudless and rainless, and at this time the steppes become deserts. On account of the dryness little snow falls; as a rule it remains loose and is whirled aloft by the north-east storm wind (*buran*). These storm *burans* are just as terrible as the summer storms of salt-dust in Trans-Caspia at a temperature of 104 to 113 Fahr. Considering that in summer the temperature sometimes reaches 118 in the shade, exceeding body-heat by 20, and that in winter it sinks below 31, and further that the heat, especially in the sand-deserts, reaches a degree at which the white of egg coagulates, the climate, even if not deadly, should be very injurious to man; Hindustan, which is far less hot, enervates the European on account of the greater moisture, and has changed the Aryan, once so energetic, to the weak and cowardly Hindu. Nevertheless the contrary is the case. The climate of Turkestan is wholesome, and its people are long-lived and healthy, and that especially in the hot summer, on account of the unparalleled dryness of the air. Once acclimatised, one bears the heat very well, and likewise the extreme cold of winter. The climate of Central Asia furthers a rapid bodily and mental development and premature ageing, as well as corpulence, especially among the Altaians. Obesity is even regarded as a distinction, and it became so native to the mounted nomads that it accompanied them to Europe; it is characteristic of all the nomads who have invaded Europe; and Hippocrates mentions it expressly as a characteristic of the Scythians. The climate of Turkestan also influences the character, leading to an apathy which creates indifference to the heaviest blows of fate, and even accompanies the condemned to the scaffold.

The entire West Asiatic region from the salt-steppes to the compact forest-land forms one economic whole. The well-watered northern part, which remains green throughout the summer, feeds countless herds in the warm season, but affords no pasturage in winter owing to the deep snow. On the other hand, the southern part, which is poor in water the grass-, sand-, and salt-steppes is uninhabitable in summer. Thus the northern part provides summer pastures, the southern the Aral-Caspian basin winter pastures to one and the same nomad people.

The nomad then is the son and product of the peculiar and variable constitution which nevertheless is an indivisible economic whole of the Asiatic background. Any agriculture, worthy of the name, is impossible, in the steppes and deserts the few oases excepted on account of the dryness of the summer, when animals also find no food. Life on the steppes and deserts is only possible in connection either with the Siberian grass-region or with the mountains. This life is necessarily extremely hard and restless for man and beast and it creates a condition of nomadism, which must at the same time be a mounted nomadism, seeing that a wagon would be an impossibility in the long trackless wanderings over mountain and valley, river and swamp, and that goods and chattels, together with the disjoinable dwellings, can only be carried on the backs of beasts of burden.

Setting aside the Glacial Period and the small Bruckner cycle of 35 years or so, the climatic changes of Central Asia, according to Huntington, fall into cycles of several hundred

years' duration within which the aridity rises and sinks considerably. All Central Asia has undergone a series of climatic pulsations during historic times. There seems to be strong evidence that at the time of Christ or earlier the climate was much moister and more propitious than it now is. Then during the first few centuries of the Christian era there appears to have been an epoch of increasing aridity. It culminated about *AD* 500, at which time the climate appears to have been drier than at present. Next came an epoch of more propitious climate which reached its acme about *AD* 900. There is a little evidence of a second epoch of aridity which was especially marked in the twelfth century. Finally, in the later Middle Ages, a rise in the level of the Caspian Sea and the condition of certain ruins render it probable that climatic conditions once again became somewhat favourable, only to give place ere long to the present aridity.

But Central Asia has not been, since the beginning of historic records, in a state of desiccation. The process of geological desiccation was already ended in prehistoric times, and even the oldest historic accounts testify to the same climatic conditions as those of today. The earliest Babylonian kings maintained irrigation works, and Hammurabi had canals made through the land, one of which bore his name. Thus, as at present, without artificial irrigation agriculture was not possible there 4200 years ago. Palestine's climate too has not changed in the least since Biblical times: its present waste condition is the result of Turkish mismanagement, and Biot has proved from the cultivated plants grown in the earliest times that the temperature of China has remained the same for 3300 years. Curtius Rufus and Arrian give similar accounts of Bactria.

Amid the enormous wastes there are countless sand-buried ruins of populous cities, monasteries, and villages and choked-up canals standing on ground won from the waste by systematic canalisation; where the system of irrigation was destroyed, the earlier natural state, the desert, returned. The causes of such destruction are manifold.

1. Earthquake.
2. Violent rain-spouts after which the river does not find its former bed, and the canals receive no more water from it.
3. On the highest edge of the steppe, at the foot of the glacier, lie enormous flat heaps of débris, and here the canalisation begins. If one side of this heap rises higher than the other, the direction of the current is shifted, and the oases nurtured by the now forsaken stream become derelict. But the habitable ground simply migrates with the river. If, for example, a river altered its course four times in historic times, three series of ruins remain behind; but it is erroneous simply to add these ruins together, and to conclude from them that the whole once formed a flourishing land which has become waste, when in reality the three series of settlements did not flourish side by side but consecutively. This fallacy vitiates all accounts which assume a progressive or periodic desiccation as the chief cause of the abandonment of oases.
4. Continuous drought in consequence of which the rivers become so waterless that they cannot feed the canals of the lower river-basin, and thus the oases affected must become parched, and are not always re-settled in more favourable years.
5. Neglect of the extreme care demanded in the administration of the canal system. If irrigation is extended in the district next the mountain from which the water comes, just so much water is taken from the lower oases. But in this case too nothing is lost which cannot be replaced in another direction: vice versa if an oasis on the upper course of the river disappears through losing its canal system, the lower river course thus becomes well watered and makes possible the formation of a new oasis.
6. The most terrible mischief is the work of enemies. In order to make the whole oasis liable to tribute they need only seize the main canal; and the nomads often blindly plundered and destroyed everything. A single raid was enough to transform hundreds of oases into ashes

and desert. The nomads moreover not only ruined countless cities and villages of Central Asia, but they also denuded the steppe itself, and promoted drift-sand by senseless uprooting of trees and bushes for the sake of firewood. But for them, according to Berg, there would be little drifts and in Central Asia, for, in his opinion, all sand-formations must in time become firm. All the sand-deserts which he observed on the Aral Sea and in Semiryechensk were originally firm, and even now most of them are still kept firm by the vegetation.

With the varied dangers of irrigation systems it is impossible to decide in the case of each group of ruins what causes have produced them; it is therefore doubtful whether we can place in the foreground the secular changes of climate. It is not even true that the cultivation of the oases thrive better in the damper and cooler periods than in the arid and hot ones. Thus the oases of Turfan in Chinese Turkestan, which is so extremely arid and so unendurably hot in summer, are exceptionally fertile. We may therefore conclude that the cultivation of the oases was considerably more extended in the damper and cooler periods, but considerably less productive than in the arid and hot ones of today.

Changes in the volume of water of single rivers and lakes are clearly apparent within short periods, and these lead to frequent local migrations of the peasant population and to new constructions as well as to the abandonment of irrigation canals. Thus there is here a continual local fluctuation in the settlements, but history knows nothing of regular migrations of agriculturists. Still less is an unfavourable climatic change the cause of the nomad invasions of Europe. The nomad does not remain at all during the summer in the parched steppe and desert; and in the periods of increasing aridity and summer heat South Siberia was warmer and the mountain glaciers retreated, and hence the pastures in both these directions were extended. The only consequence of this was that the distance between summer and winter pastures increased and the nomad had to wander further and quicker. The computation is correct in itself, that the number of animals that can be reared to the square mile depends on and varies with the annual rainfall; but the nomad is not hampered by square miles; the poorer or richer the growth of grass the shorter or longer time he remains, and he is accustomed from year to year to fluctuations in the abundance of his flocks. Moreover a shifting of the winter pastures is not impossible, for their autumn and spring vegetation is not destroyed by a progressive aridity, and if the water current changes its bed, the nomad simply follows it. Further, the effect of a secular progressive aridity is spread over so many generations that it is not catastrophic for any one of them.

The nomad invasions of China and Europe must therefore have had other causes; and we know something about the invasions of several nomad hordes of the Avars, Turks (Osman), and Cumans, for example.

Since the second half of the fifth century *AD* that is, the time to which Huntington assigns the greatest aridity there had existed in the Oxus basin the powerful empire of the Ephthalite horde, on the ruins of which the empire of the West Turks was founded in the middle of the sixth century. Had Central Asia been at that time so arid and therefore poor in pasture, the then victorious horde would have driven out the other hordes in order to secure for themselves more pasture land. Yet exactly the opposite took place; the Turks enslaved the other hordes, and when the Avars fled to Europe, the Turkish Khagan claimed them back at the Byzantine Court. In like manner the Turks (Osman) fled from the sword of the Mongols in 1225 from Khorasan to Armenia, and in 1235 the Cumans fled to Hungary. The violence of the Mongols is strikingly described by Gibbon: "from the Caspian to the Indus they ruined a tract of many hundred miles which was adorned with the habitations and labours of mankind, and five centuries have not been sufficient to repair the ravages of four years". Therefore the main cause of the nomad invasions of Europe is not increasing aridity but political changes.



There remains the question: How did the nomads originate? On the theory of a progressive desiccation it is assumed that the Aryan peasantry of Turkestan were compelled to take to a nomad life through the degeneration of their fields to steppes and wastes. But the peasant bound to the soil is incapable of a mode of life so unsettled, and requiring of him much new experience. Robbed of his corn-fields and reduced to beggary, could he be at the same time so rich as to procure himself the herds of cattle necessary to his existence, and so gifted with divination as suddenly to wander with them in search of pasture over immeasurable distances? A decrease of cultivable soil would bring about only a continual decrease in the number of inhabitants. The peasant as such disappeared, emigrated, or perished, and his home became a desert, and was occupied by another people who knew from experience how to make use of it in its changed state, *i.e.* as winter grazing-ground. This new people must have been already nomadic, and have made their way from the pastures of the North and therefore they must have belonged to the Altaian race.

The delta oases have been the home of man from early prehistoric time, throughout Turkestan and northern Persia. The two oldest culture strata of Anau prove that the settlers of the first Culture cultivated wheat and barley, had rectangular houses of air-dried bricks, but only wild animals at first, out of which were locally domesticated the long horned ox, the pig, and horse, and successively two breeds of sheep. The second Culture had the domestic ox, both long- and short-horned, the pig, and the horse. The domestic goat, camel, and dog appear, and a new hornless breed of sheep. The cultivation of cereals was discovered in Asia long before *BC* 8000. The domestication of cattle, pigs, and sheep, and probably of the horse, was accomplished at Anau between *BC* 8000 and 6800. Consequently, the agricultural stage preceded the nomadic shepherd stage in Asia. It follows, therefore, that before domestication of animals was accomplished, mankind in Central Asia was divided sharply into two classes settled agriculturists on the one hand, and hunters who wandered within a limited range on the other hand. When the nomadic hunters became shepherds, they necessarily wandered between ever-widening limits as the seasons and pasturage required for increasing herds. The establishment of the first domestic breeds of pigs, long-horned cattle, large sheep and horses, was followed by a deteriorating climate which may have as Pumpelly, though questionably, assumes changed these to smaller breeds. Dr Duerst identifies the second breed of sheep with the turbary sheep (*Torfschaf*), and the pig with the turbary pig (*Torfschwein*), which appear as already domesticated in the neolithic stations of Europe. They must therefore have been descendants of those domesticated on the oases of the Anau district.

They make their appearance in European neolithic stations apparently contemporaneously with an immigration of a people of a round-headed Asiatic type which seems to have infiltrated gradually among the prevailing long-headed Europeans. The presumption is, therefore, that these animals were brought from Asia by this round-headed people, and that we have in this immigration perhaps the earliest post-glacial factor in the problem of Asiatic influence in European racial as well as cultural origins, for they brought with them both the art of cattle-breeding and some knowledge of agriculture.

The skulls of the first and second cultures in Anau are all dolichocephalic or mesocephalic, without a trace of the round-headed element. We are therefore justified in assuming that the domestication and the forming of the several breeds of domestic animals were effected by a long-headed people. And since the people of the two successive cultures were settled oasis-agriculturists and breeders, we may assume as probable that agriculture and settled life in towns on the oases originated among people of a dolichocephalic type. Since Dr Duerst identifies the second breed of sheep established during the first culture of Anau, with the turbary sheep in Europe, contemporaneously with skulls of the round-headed Galcha type, it should follow that the domestic animals of the European neolithic stations were brought thither, together with wheat and barley, by round-headed immigrants (of an Asiatic type)

Since the original agriculturists and breeders were long-headed, it seems probable that the immigrants were broad-headed nomads who, having acquired from the oasis people domestic animals and rudimentary agriculture of the kind still practised by the shepherd nomads of Central Asia, infiltrated among the neolithic settlements of Eastern and Central Europe, and adopted the stone-implement culture of the hunting and fishing peoples among whom they came. In this connection it is not without significance that throughout the whole historical period, the combination of settled town life and agriculture has been the fundamental characteristic of the Aryan-speaking Galchas, and of the Iranians inhabiting Western Central Asia and the Persian plateau, while the peoples of pure Asiatic mongoloid type have been essentially shepherd nomads, who, as already shewn, could have become shepherds only after the settled agriculturists of the oases had established domesticated breeds of cattle.

The origin of the taming of wild into domestic animals is one of the most difficult problems of economic history. What was its aim? The use that we make of domestic animals? Certainly not, for adaptability thereto could only gradually be imparted to the animals and could not be foreseen; it could not be anticipated that the cow and the goat would ever give more milk than their young needed, and that beyond the time of lactation; nor could it be anticipated that sheep not woolly by nature would develop a fleece. Even for us it would be too uneconomical to breed such a powerful animal and such a large consumer of fodder as the ox merely for a supply of meat; and besides beef is not readily eaten in Central Asia. Moreover the wild ox is entirely unsuitable for draught, for it is one of the shyest as well as strongest and most dangerous of animals. And it should be specially emphasised that a long step lies between taming individual animals and domesticating them, for as a rule wild animals, however well tamed, do not breed in captivity. Consequently the domestication was not produced simply by taming or for economic ends. It is the great service of Eduard Hahn to have laid down the theory that the domestication involuntary and unforeseen was the result of forcing for religious purposes certain favourite animals of certain divinities into reservations where they remained reproductive, and at the same time gradually lost their original wildness through peaceful contact with man. The beasts of sacrifice were taken from these enclosures. Thus originated the castrated ox which quietly let itself be yoked before the sacred car; and by systematic milking for sacrificial purposes the milk-secretion of the cow and the goat was gradually increased. Lastly, when man perceived what he had gained from the animals, he turned to his own use the peculiarities thus produced by enclosure and gradual domestication.

In general, cattle-rearing is unknown to the severest kind of nomadism. The ox soon dies of thirst, and it has not sufficient endurance or speed for the enormous wanderings; its flesh has little value in the steppe. The animals actually employed for rearing and food are consequently the sheep (to a less extent the goat as leader of the sheep flocks), the horse, and here and there the ass; also, in a smaller number, the two-humped camel (in Turan the one-humped dromedary as well) as a beast of burden. Where the district admits of it, and long wanderings are not necessary (e.g. in Mongolia, in the Pamir, in the Amu-delta, in South Russia, etc.), the Altaian has engaged in cattle-breeding from the remotest times.

A wealthy Mongolian possesses as many as 20,000 horses and still more sheep. Rich Kirghiz sometimes have hundreds of camels, thousands of horses, tens of thousands of sheep. The minimum for a Kirghiz family of five is 5 oxen, 28 sheep, and 15 horses. Some have fewer sheep, but the number of horses cannot sink below 15, for a stud of mares, with their foals, is indispensable for the production of kumiz.

The Turkoman is poorest in horses. However, the Turkoman horse is the noblest in the whole of Central Asia, and surpasses all other breeds in speed, endurance, intelligence, faithfulness, and a marvellous sense of locality; it serves for riding and milk-giving only, and

is not a beast of burden, as are the camel, the dromedary, or the ox. The Turkoman horse is tall, with long narrow body, long thin legs and neck, and a small head; it is nothing but skin, bones, muscles, and sinews, and even with the best attention it does not fatten. The mane is represented by short bristly hairs. On their predatory expeditions the Turkomans often cover 650 miles in the waterless desert in five days, and that with their heavy booty of goods and men. Their horses attain their greatest speed when they have galloped from 7 to 14 miles, and races over such a distance as that from London to Bristol are not too much for them. Of course they owe their powers to the training of thousands of years in the endless steppes and deserts, and to the continual plundering raids, which demanded the utmost endurance and privation of which horse and rider were capable. The least attractive to look at in Turkestan is the Kirghiz horse, which is small, powerful, and strong-maned. During snow-storm or frost it often does without food for a long time. It is never sheltered under a roof, and bears 40 Fahr. in the open air, and the extremest summer heat, during which it can do without water for from three to four days. It can easily cover 80 miles a day, and never tastes barley or oats in its life.

The Altaian rides with a very short stirrup, and thus trotting would be too exhausting both for man and horse, so as a rule he goes at a walk or a gallop. Instead of the trot there is another more comfortable movement in which the horse's centre of gravity moves steadily forward in a horizontal line, and shaking and jolting is avoided. The horse advances the two left feet one after the other, and then the two right feet (keeping the time of four threshers); in this way it can cover ten miles per hour. The most prized horses are the "amblers," which always move the two feet on one side simultaneously, and are sometimes so swift that other horses can scarcely keep up with them at a gallop. Spurs are unknown to the Altaian, and in the steppe horseshoes are not needed. The nomad spends the greater part of his life in the saddle; when he is not lying inactive in the tent he is invariably on horseback. At the markets everybody is mounted. In the saddle all bargains are struck, meetings are held, kumiz is drunk, and even sleep is taken. The seller too has his wares felt, furs, carpets, sheep, goats, calves before, behind, and beneath him on his horse. The riding-horse must answer promptly to the bridle, and must not betray his master by neighing during a raid. Therefore the young stallion for mares are not ridden is taken from the herd with a lasso, and castrated.

The nomads of the Asiatic background all belong to the Altaian branch of the Ural-Altai race. The Altaian primitive type displays the following characteristics : body compact, strong-boned, small to medium-sized; trunk long; hands and feet often exceptionally small; feet thin and short, and, in consequence of the peculiar method of riding (with short stirrup), bent outwards, whence the gait is very waddling; calves very little developed; head large and brachycephalic; face broad; cheek-bones prominent; mouth large and broad; jaw mesognathic; teeth strong and snow-white; chin broad; nose broad and flat; forehead low and little arched; ears large; eyes considerably wide apart, deep-sunken, and dark-brown to piercing black; eye-opening narrow, and slit obliquely, with an almost perpendicular fold of skin over the inner corner (Mongol-fold), and with elevated outer corner; skin wheat-colour, light-buff (Mongols) to bronze-colour (Turks); hair coarse, stiff as a horse's mane, coal-black; beard scanty and bristly, often entirely wanting, generally only a moustache; bodily strength considerable; sensitiveness to climatic influences and wounds slight; sight and hearing incredibly keen; memory extraordinary.

The Ural-Altai languages branch off as follows :

Uralish : Samo-yeddish, Finno-Ungrian

Altaic: Turkish, Mongolish, Manchu-Tungusish

Finno-Ugrian: Finnish, Permish, Ugrian

Finnish: Lappish Finnish and Lappish Esthonian, Tcheremiss. Mordvinish

Permish: Zyryanish, Votyakish

Ugrian: Magyarish, Vogulish, Ostyakish  
Turkish: Yakutish, Bashkirish, Kirghizigh, Uigurish, Tartarish, Osmanish (Turkish in the narrower sense)  
Mongolish: Buryatish, Kalmuckish, Mongolish (in the narrower sense)

(B)  
SOCIAL ORGANIZATION

Six to ten blood-related tents (Mongol, *yúrta*)—on the average, families of five to six heads— form a camp (Turk, *aul*, Mongol, *khoton*, *khotum*, Roumanian *catun*) which wanders together; even the best grazing-ground would not admit of a greater number together. The leader of the camp is the eldest member of that family which possesses most animals. Several camps make a clan (Turk, *tire*, Mongol, *aïmak*). Hence there are the general interests of the Clan and also the individual interests of the camps, which latter frequently conflict. For the settlement of disputes an authority is necessary, a personality who through wealth, mental capacity, uprightness, bravery, and wide relationships is able to protect the clan. As an election of A chief is unknown to nomads, and they could not agree if it were known, the chieftainship is usually gained by a violent usurpation, and is seldom recognised generally. Thus the judgment of the chieftain is mostly a decision to which the parties submit themselves more or less voluntarily.

Several clans form a tribe (*uruk*), several tribes a folk (Turks *il*, Mongol, *uluss*). Conflicts within the tribes and the folks are settled by a union of the separate clan chieftains in an arbitration procedure in which each chieftain defends the claims of his clan, but very often the collective decision is obeyed by none of the parties. In times of unrest great hordes have formed themselves out of the folks, and at the head of these stood a Khagan or a Khan. The hordes, like the folks and tribes, form a separate whole only in so far as they are opposed to other hordes, folks, and tribes. The horde protects its parts from the remaining hordes, just as does the folk and the tribe. Thus all three are in a real sense insurance societies for the protection of common interests.

The organization based on genealogy is much dislocated by political occurrences, for in the steppe the peoples, like the drift-sand, are in constant motion. One people displaces or breaks through another, and so we find the same tribal name among peoples widely separated from one another. Moreover from the names of great war-heroes arose tribal names for those often quite motely conglomerations of peoples who were united for a considerable time under the conqueror's lead and then remained together, for example the Seljuks, Uzbegs, Chagatais, Osmands, and many others. This easy new formation, exchange, and loss of the tribal name has operated from the earliest times, and the numerous swarms of nomads who forced their way into Europe under the most various names are really only different offshoots of the same few nations.

The organization of the nomads rests on a double principle. The greater unions caused by political circumstances, having no direct connection with the life and needs of the people in the desert, often cease soon after the death of their creator; on the other hand the camps, the clans, and in part the tribes also, retain an organic life, and take deep root in the life of the people. Not merely the consciousness of their blood-relationship but the knowledge of the degree of relationship is thoroughly alive, and every Kirghiz boy knows his *jeti-atalar*, that is, the names of his seven forefathers. What is outside this is regarded as the remoter relationship. Hence a homogeneous political organization of large masses is unfrequent and transitory, and today among the Turks it is only the Kara-Kirghiz people of Bast Turkestan—



who are rich in herds—that live under a central government—that of an hereditary *Aga-Manap*, beneath whom the Manaps, also hereditary, of the separate tribes, with a council of the “gray-beards” (*aksakals*) of the separate clans, rule and govern the people rather despotically. What among the Turks is the exception, was from the earliest times known to history the rule among the Mongols, who were despotically governed by their princes. The Khan wielded unlimited authority over all. No one dared to settle in any place to which he had not been assigned. The Khan directed the princes, they the “thousand-men”, the “thousand-men”, the “hundred-men”, and they the “ten-men”. Whatever was ordered them was promptly carried out; even certain death was faced without a murmur. But towards foreigners they were just as barbarous as the Turks. The origin of despotism among the Altaians is to be traced to a subjugation by another nomad horde, which among the Turkish Kazak-Kirghiz and the Mongol Kalmucks of the Volga developed into a nobility (“white bones”, the female sex “white flesh”) in contrast with the common people (“black bones”, “black flesh”).

The transitoriness of the wider unions on the one hand, and the indestructibility of the clans and camps on the other, explain why extensive separations, especially among the Turko-Tartars, were of constant occurrence. The desert rears to independence and freedom from restraint small patriarchally-directed family alliances with “gray-beards” (*aksakals*) from families of aristocratic strain at their head. These families boast of their direct descent from some Sultan, Beg, or famous *Batyr* (“hero”, *recte* robber, cattle-thief). But the “gray-beards” mostly exercise the mere shadow of dominion. The Turkomans say: “We are a people without a head, and we won’t have one either; among us each is Padishah”; as an appendage to this, “Sahara is full of Sheikhs”.

The wanderings of the nomads are incorrectly designated when they are called roaming wanderings, for not even the hunter “roams”. He has his definite hunting-grounds, and always returns to his accustomed places. Still more regular are the wanderings of the nomads, however far they extend. The longest are those of the Kirghiz who winter by the Aral Sea and have their summer pastures ten degrees of latitude further north in the steppes of Troitsk and Omsk. The distance, allowing for the zig-zag course, comes to more than 1000 miles, so that each year the nomad must cover 2000 miles with all his herds and other goods.

During the winter the nomad in the desert is, so to speak, a prisoner in his tent, practical, neat, and comfortable as this is. It is a rotunda 15 feet high, and often over 30 feet broad. Its framework consists of a wooden lattice in six to ten separable divisions, which can be widened out, or pushed together for packing. Above this comes the roof-frame of light rafters which come together in a ring above. This is the opening for air, light, and smoke, and is only covered at night and during severe cold. Inside a matting of steppe-grass runs round the framework, and outside is a felt covering bound round with ropes of camel’s hair. Tent-pegs and ropes protect the tent from being over- turned by the violent north-east *orkan*, during which the hearth-fire must be put out. As the felt absorbs and emits very little heat, the tent is warm in winter, and cool in summer. Inside the tent the sacks of victuals hang on the points of the wall-lattice; on the rafters above are the weapons, harness, saddles, and, among the heathen tribes, the idols. Behind the hearth, the seat of honour for guests and old men is spread with the best felt and carpets; in front of the hearth is the place for drinking-vessels and sometimes for fuel, the latter consisting of camel- and cattle-dung, since firewood is found only in a few places in the steppes and deserts. The nomad-life admits of only the most necessary and least breakable utensils : for preparing food for all in the tent there is a large cast-iron caldron, acquired in Chinese or Russian traffic, with tripod and tongs; a trunk-like *kumiz*-vat of four smoked horse-hides thickened with fat; *kumiz*-bottles, and water-bottles of leather; wooden chests, tubs and cans hollowed out of pieces of wood, or gourds; wooden dishes, drinking-bowls, and spoons; among the slave-hunting Turkomans short and long chains, manacles, fetters, and iron collars also hung in the tent to the right of the entrance.

The accommodation provided by the tent, and the economising of space is astonishing; from long past times everything has had its assigned place; there is room for forty men by day, and twenty by night, notwithstanding the many objects hanging and lying about. The master of the household, with the men, occupies the place of honour; left and right of the hearth are the sleeping-places (felt, which is rolled up in the daytime); left of the entrance the wife and the women and children, to the right the male slaves, do their work. For anyone to leave his wonted place unnecessarily, or without the order of the master, would be an unheard-of proceeding. In three-quarters of an hour a large tent can be put up and furnished, and it can be taken to pieces and packed just as quickly; even with movables and stores it is so light that two camels suffice to carry it. The Nogai-Tartars carry their basket-like felt tents, which are only 8 to 10 feet in diameter, on two-wheeled carts drawn at a trot by small-sized oxen. In the thirteenth century, under Chinghiz and his followers, the Mongols also made use of such cart-tents, drawn by one camel, as store-holders, but only in the Volga-district and not in their own country in Mongolia. They also put their great tents—as much as thirty feet in diameter—on carts drawn by twenty-four oxen twelve in a line. The nature of the ground admitted of this procedure and consequently the tent had not to be taken to pieces at each stopping-place (as must be done in the steppes and deserts), but only where a considerable halt was made. In South Russia such wagon-tents date from the oldest times, and were already in use among the Scythians.

Among a continually wandering pastoral people the interests of neighbours often collide, as we know from the Bible-story of Abraham and Lot. Thus a definite partition of the land comes about. A folk, or a section of a folk—a tribe—regards a certain stretch of land as its special property, and tolerates no trespass from any neighbour whatsoever. The tribe, again, consists of clans and the latter of camps, which, in their turn, regard parts of the whole tribal district as their own. This produces a very confused medley of districts, over which the individual camps wander. In spring and autumn the nomad can find abundant fodder almost everywhere, in consequence of the greater moisture and luxuriant grass crop. The winter and summer abodes demand definite conditions for the prosperity of the herds. The winter settlement must not have too severe a climate, the summer grazing-ground must be as exempt as possible from the terrific plague of insects. Since many more conditions must be satisfied for the winter than for the summer pastures, it is the winter quarters which determine the density of the nomad population. Thus the wealth of a people accords with the abundance of their winter quarters, and all internal encounters and campaigns of former centuries are to be regarded as a constant struggle for the best winter settlements.

In winter, whenever possible, the same places as have been used for long times past are occupied; in the deep-lying valley of a once-existing river, not over-exposed to the wind, with good water, and grazing-places where the snow settles as little as possible, and the last year's dung makes the ground warmer and, at the same time, provides fuel. Here at the end of October the tent, made warmer by another covering, is pitched, protecting the nomad from the raging winter *buran* and the numbing cold. The herds, however, remain in the open air without a sheltering roof, and must scrape for themselves the withered shrubs, stalks, and roots from the snow. They get terribly thin; indeed sheep, camels, and oxen perish when the snow falls deep, and the horses in scraping for fodder trample down the plants and make them uneatable, or when ice forms and shuts out sustenance entirely. But in early spring the situation improves, especially for the sheep, which, from mere skeletons, revive and get fat on the salt-steppes where a cursory inspection reveals no vegetation on the glittering crust of salt. The salt-pastures are incomparably more nourishing than the richest Alpine meadows, and without salt there would be no sheep-rearing nomads in Central Asia. To freshen the spring-pasturage the steppe is burnt off as soon as the snow has melted, as the dry last year's steppe-

grass gets matted under the snow, and would retard the sprouting of the new grass; the ground manured by the ashes then gets luxuriantly green after a few days.

In the middle or at the end of April, during the lambing of the sheep, and the foaling of the mares, preparations for striking the winter tent are made. At this time the animals yield most milk, and a stock of hard cheese (*kurut*) is made. At the beginning of May the steppe begins to dry up, and the intolerable insects appear. Now the goods which are superfluous for the summer are secretly buried, the tent is struck, and loaded with all necessary goods and chattels on the decorated camels. It is the day of greatest rejoicing for the nomad, who leaves his inhospitable winter quarters in festal attire.

The winter quarters are regarded as the fixed property of the individual tent owners, but the summer pastures are the common property of the clan. Here each member of the clan, rich or poor, has in theory the right to settle where he likes. But the wealthy and illustrious always know how to secure the best places. To effect this each camp keeps the time of departure to the summer pastures and the direction to be taken as secret as possible; at the same time it makes an arrangement with the nearest-related camps, in conformity with which they suddenly depart in order to reach their goal as quickly as possible. If the place chosen is already occupied, the next which is still free is taken. At the beginning of spring, when the grass is still scanty, the camps can remain only a very short time—often one day or even only half a day—in one place; later on in their more distant wandering—from well to well—they can stay for weeks in the same place. At midsummer movement is more rapid, and in autumn, with an increasing abundance of water, it is again slower. In the sand-desert the nomad finds the wells covered by drift-sand, and he must dig down to them afresh, if necessary daily. The regulation of these wanderings is undertaken by the *aksakals*, not always according to justice.

The cattle can easily be taken off by a hostile neighbour, for the steppe is free and open. Therefore the nomads of the steppes, unlike the nomads of the mountains, do not split themselves into single families. They constantly need a small war-band to recover the stolen booty from the enemy. On the other hand, the instinct of self-preservation often drives a whole people to violate their neighbours' rights of property. When there is dearth of fodder the cattle are ruined, and the enterprise and energy of the owner cannot avert calamity. The impoverished nomad infallibly goes to the wall as a solitary individual, and only seldom is he, as a former wanderer (*tshorva*) capable of becoming a despised settler (*tshomru*). For he feels it to be the greatest misfortune and humiliation when he must take to the plough, somewhere by a watercourse on the edge of the desert; and so long as the loss of all his herds has not hopelessly crushed him, he does not resign himself to that terrible fate which Mahomet has proscribed with the words: "wherever this implement has penetrated, it has always brought with it servitude and shame".

In spring, when severe frost suddenly sets in after the first thaw, and the thin layer of snow is covered in a single night with a crust of ice an inch thick, the cattle cannot scrape food out of the snow, and the owner cannot possibly supply a substitute. When the frost continues hundreds of thousands of beasts perish, and whole districts previously rich in herds become suddenly poor. So as soon as ice appears the people affected leave their winter quarters, and penetrate far into their neighbours' territory until they find food for their herds. If they are successful a part at least of their cattle is saved, and when the weather changes they return home. But if all their cattle perish entirely, they must starve if they are unwilling to rob their wealthy neighbour of a part of his herds. Bloody feuds occur too in autumn on the return from the summer pastures, when the horses have become fat and powerful and the longer nights favour and cover long rides. The nomad now carries out the raids of robbery and revenge resolved upon and skilfully planned in the summer, and then he goes to his winter quarters.

But how can these barbarous robbers live together without exterminating each other? They are bridled by an old and tyrannical king, invisible to themselves, the *deb* (custom, wont). This prohibits robbery and murder, immorality and injustice towards associates in times of peace; but the strange neighbour is outlawed; to rob, enslave, or kill him is an heroic deed. The nomads' ideas of justice are remarkably similar to those of our ancestors. Every offence is regarded as an injury to the interests of a fellow-man, and is expiated by indemnification of the loser. Among the Kazak-Kirghiz anyone who has killed a man of the plebs (a "black bone"), whether wilfully or accidentally makes no difference, must compensate the relations with a *kun* (i.e. 1000 sheep or 100 horses or 50 camels). The slaughter of a "white bone" costs a sevenfold *kun*. Murder of their own wives, children, and slaves goes unpunished, since they themselves are the losers. If a Kirghiz steals an animal, he must restore it together with two of the same value. If a wrong-doer is unable to pay the fine, his nearest relations, and failing them the whole camp, must provide it.

The principal food consists of milk-products—not of the fresh milk itself, which is only taken by children and the sick. A special Turko-Tartar food is *yogurt*, prepared with leaven from curdled milk. The Mongols also eat butter—the more rancid the more palatable—dripping with dirt, and carried without wrapping in their hairy greasy coat-pockets. From mare's milk, which yields no cream, *kumiz* (Kirghiz), *tshegan* (Mongolish) is fermented, an extremely nutritious drink which is good for consumption, and from which by itself life can be sustained. However, it keeps only a few hours, after which it becomes too sour and effervescent, and so the whole supply must be drunk at once. In summer, with an abundance of mares, there is such a superfluity of *kumiz* that hospitality is unlimited, and half Altai is always drunk. The Turkomans and Kara-Kalpaks, who possess few horses and no studs, drink *kumiz* seldom. The much-drunk *airan* from fermented unskimmed camel, cow, and sheep milk quenches thirst for hours, just as does the *kefir* of the Tartars from cow's milk. The *airan*, after being condensed by boiling, and dried hard as stone into little balls in the sun, is made into *kurt*, *kurut*, which can be kept for months and is the only means of making bitter salt-water drinkable. According to Marco Polo it formed the provision of the Mongol armies, and if the horsemen could not quench his thirst in any other way, he opened one of his horse's veins and drank the blood. From *kumiz* and also from millet a strong spirit (Kirghiz *boza*) is distilled, which produces dead-drunkenness followed by a pleasant Nirvana-sensation.

A comparison of Rubruquis' account with that of Radloff shows that the dairying among the Altaians has remained the same from the earliest times. A late acquisition from China, and only available for the wealthier, is the "brick-tea", which is also a currency, and a substitute for money.

Little meat is eaten, notwithstanding the abundance of the herds; it is only customary on festive occasions or as a consequence of a visit of special honour. In order not to lessen the stock of cattle, the people content themselves with the cattle that are sick beyond recovery, or dead and even decaying. The meat is eaten boiled, and the broth drunk afterwards. Only the Volga-Kalmucks and the Kara-Kirghiz, who are very rich in flocks, live principally on sheep and horse meat. That the Huns and Tartars ate raw meat softened by being carried under the saddle, is a mistake of the chroniclers. At the present time the mounted nomads are accustomed to put thin strips of salted raw meat on their horses' sores, before saddling them, to bring about a speedy healing. But this meat, impregnated with the sweat of the horse and reeking intolerably, is absolutely uneatable.

From the earliest times, on account of the enormous abundance of game, hunting has been eagerly practised for the sake of food and skins, or as sport, either with trap and snare, or on horseback with falcon and eagle. From Persia came the long-haired greyhound in addition. Fishing cannot be pursued by long-wandering nomads, and they make no use even of the best-



stocked rivers. But by the lakes and the rivers which do not dry up, fishing is an important source of food among short-wandering nomads.

For grain the seeds of wild-growing cereals are gathered; here and there millet is grown without difficulty, even on poor soil. A bag of millet-meal suffices the horseman for days; a handful of it with a drink of water appeases him well enough. Thus bread is a luxury for the nomad herdsman, and the necessary grain can only be procured in barter for the products of cattle-rearing and house-industry. But the Kirghiz of Ferghana in their short but high wanderings on the Pamir and Alai high above the last agricultural settlements, which only extend to 4600 feet, carry on an extensive agriculture (summer-wheat, millet, barley) by means of slaves and laborers at a height of 8500 feet, while they themselves climb with their herds to a height of 15,800 feet, and partly winter in the valleys which are free from snow in winter. The nomads eat vegetables seldom, as only carrots and onions grow in the steppes. The half-settled agricultural half-nomads of today can be left out of consideration. According to Plano Carpini the Mongols had neither bread nor vegetables nor leguminous food, nor anything else except meat, of which they ate so little that other peoples could scarcely have lived on it. However, in summer they consumed an enormous quantity of milk, and that failing in winter, one or two bowls of thin millet boiled in water in the morning, and nothing more except a little meat in the evening.

We see that from the earliest times the Altaian nomad has lived by animal-rearing, and in a subsidiary degree by hunting, and fishing, and here and there by a very scanty agriculture. As among some hordes, especially the old Magyars, fishing and hunting are made much of, many believe that they were originally a hunting and fishing folk, and took to cattle-rearing later. This is an impossibility. The Magyars, just as were the others, were pure nomads even during winter, otherwise their herds would have perished. Hunting and fishing they pursued only as stop-gaps when milk failed. A fishing and hunting people cannot so easily become mounted nomads, and least of all organised in such a terribly warlike way as were the Magyars.

The innate voracity of the Turko-Tartars is the consequence of the climate. The Bedouin in the latitude of 20° to 32°, at a mean temperature of 86° F, can easily be more abstinent and moderate with his single meal a day (meat, dates, truffles) than the Altaian in the freezing cold, between the latitudes of 38° and 58°, with his three copious meals. The variable climate and its consequences—hunger in winter, superfluity in summer—have so hardened the Altaian that he can without difficulty hold out for days without water, and for weeks (in a known case forty-two days) in a snowstorm without any food; but he can also consume a six-months' old whether at one sitting, and is ready to repeat the dose straight off!

Originally the Altaian clothed himself in skins, leather, and felt, and not till later in vegetable-stuffs acquired by barter, tribute, or plunder. Today the outer-coat of the Kazak-Kirghiz is still made of the shining skin of a foal with the tail left on for ornament. The Tsaidan-Mongols wear next their bare skin a felt gown, with the addition of a skin in winter only, and leather breeches. All Central Asiatics wear the high spherical sheep-skin cap (also used as a pillow), the *tshapan* (similar to a dressing-gown and consisting of fur or felt in winter), leather boots, or felt stockings bound round with rags. Among many tribes the hair of the men is worn long or shaved off entirely (Herodotus tells of a snub-nosed, shaven-headed people in the lower Ural), and the Magyars, Cumans, and others were shorn bare, but for two pigtales.

The wife occupies a very dependent position. On her shoulders falls the entire work of the household, the very manifold needs of which are to be satisfied almost entirely by home industry. She must take down the tent, pack it up, load it on camels, and pitch it; she must prepare leather, felt, leather-bottles, cords, waterproof material, and colours from various

plants; she must spin and weave wool and hair; she must make clothes, collect camel- and cattle-dung, knead it with dust into tough paste, and form and dry it into cakes; she must saddle and bridle horses and camels, milk the sheep, prepare *kumiz*, *kurut*, and *airan*, and graze the herds of sheep in the night—for the husband does this only by day, and in addition only milks the mares; his remaining occupation is almost entirely war and plundering. To share the domestic work would be for an Altaian *pater-familias* an unheard-of humiliation.

Originally the choice of a wife was as unrestricted among all the Altaians as among the Mongols, who, according to Plano Carpini and Marco Polo, might marry any relative and non-relative except their own mothers and daughters, and sisters by their own mothers. But today several nomad peoples are strictly exogamic. The bride was chosen by the father, when still in her childhood; her price (*kalym*) was twenty-seven to a hundred mares, and her dowry had roughly the same value. Polygamy was consequently only possible among tribes rich in herds, but it was a necessity, as one wife alone could not accomplish the many duties. Virgin purity and conjugal fidelity are among the Turko-Tartars, and especially among the Kirghiz, somewhat rare virtues; on the other hand, Marco Polo agrees with Radloff in praising the absolute fidelity of the Mongol women.

The upbringing of the children entails the extreme of hardening. During its first six weeks the new-born child is bathed daily, summer and winter alike, in the open air; thenceforward the nomad never washes, his whole life long. The Kalmuck in particular is absolutely shy of water. Almost to puberty the children go naked summer and winter; only on the march do they wear a light *khalat* and fur-cap. They are suckled at the breast to their fifth year. At three or four they already sit free with their mother on horseback, and a six-year-old girl rides like a sportsman. The education of the boys is limited to riding; at the most falconry in addition. On the other hand, the girls are put to most exhausting work from their tenderest years, and the value of a bride is decided by the work she can discharge. Among nearly all Altaian peoples the son thinks little of his mother, but towards his father he is submissive.

Hereditary right is purely agnatic. As soon as the married son is able to look after himself, he is no longer under the authority of his father, and if he likes he can demand as inheritance a part of the herds adequate to establishing a separate household. Then however he is entirely settled with, and he cannot inherit further on the death of his father when there are younger sons—his brothers—still unportioned. If impoverished the father has the right to take back from his apportioned sons every fifth animal from the herds (Kalmucks). The daughters are never entitled to inherit, and on marrying receive merely a suitable dowry from their brothers, who then receive the *kalym*. If only daughters survive, the inheritance goes to the father's brothers or cousins, who in that case receive the *kalym* as well.

Speedy as the Altaian is on horseback, on foot he is helpless and unwieldy; and so the dance is unknown to him. All games full of dash and excitement are played on horseback. His hospitality is marvellous; for weeks at a time he treats the new arrival to the best he has, even when it is the despised and hated Shtitish Persian. He possesses many sagas and songs—mostly in the minor key, and monotonous as the steppes—which are accompanied on a two-stringed guitar. Tenor and mezzo-soprano predominate, and the gait of the horse and the stride of the camel mark the rhythm.

The surplus of the female house-industry and of the herds is, as a rule, exchanged in barter for weapons and armours, metal and wooden articles, clothing material, brick-tea, and grain. Instead of our gold and silver coinage they have a sheep coinage, in which all valuations are made. Of course they were acquainted with foreign coins from the earliest times, and obtained countless millions of pounds from tribute, plunder, and ransom of prisoners, and they used coins, now and then, in external trading, but among themselves they still barter, and conclude all their business in sheep, cattle, horses, and camels. Rubruquis says of the Mongols in 1353: "We found nothing purchasable for gold and silver, only for fabrics,

of which we had none. When our servant showed them a Hyperpyron (Byzantine gold coin), they rubbed it with their fingers and smelt it to see if it were copper." They have no hand-workers except a few smiths.

The Altaian, and especially the Turko-Tartar barbarian, considered only the advantage of the moment; the unlimited plundering was hostile to any transit-trade. But when and so long as a strong hand controlled the universal plundering spirit, a caravan trade between north and south, and especially between east and west was possible, and, with high duties, formed a considerable source of income for the Central-Asiatic despots.

(C)

Religion. Shamanism

The religious conceptions of a group of primitive people inhabiting such an enormous district were of course never uniform. Today the greatest part of the Altaians is Buddhist, or Islamic, and only a few Siberian Turkish tribes remain true to the old-Altaian Shamanism.

The characteristic feature of Shamanism is the belief in the close union of the living with their long dead ancestors; thus it is an uninterrupted ancestor worship. This faculty however is possessed only by a few families, those of the Shamans, who pass on their power from father to son, or sometimes daughter—with the visible symbol of the Shaman drum by means of which he can call up the spirits through the power of his ancestors, and compel them to active assistance, and can separate his own soul from his body and send it into the kingdoms of light and of darkness. He prepares the sacrifice, conjures up the spirits, leads prayers of petition and thanksgiving, and in short is doctor, soothsayer, and weather prophet. In consequence he is held in high regard, but is less loved than feared, as his ceremonies are uncanny, and he himself dangerous if evil inclined. The chosen of his ancestors attains to his Shaman power not by instruction but by sudden inspiration; he falls into a frenzy, utters inarticulate cries, rolls his eyes, turns himself round in a circle as if possessed, until, covered with perspiration, he wallows on the ground in epileptic convulsions; his body becomes insensible to impressions; according to accounts he swallows automatically, and without subsequent injury, red-hot iron, knives, and needles, and brings them up again dry. These passions get stronger and stronger, till the individual seizes the Shaman drum and begins "shamaneering". Not before this does his nature compose itself, the power of his ancestors has passed into him, and he must thenceforth "shamaneer". He is moreover dressed in a fantastic garb hung with rattling iron trinkets. The Shaman drum is a wooden hoop with a skin, painted with gay figures, stretched over both sides, and all kinds of clattering bells and little sticks of iron upon it. In "shamaneering" the drum is vigorously struck with one drum-stick, and the ancestors thus invoked interrogated about the cause of the evil which is to be banished, and the sacrifice which is to be made to the divinity in order to avert it. The beast of sacrifice is then slaughtered and eaten, the skin together with all the bones is set aside as the sacrificial offering. Then follows the conjuration-in-chief, with the most frantic hocus-pocus, by means of which the Shaman strives to penetrate with his soul into the highest possible region of heaven in order to undertake an interrogation of the god of heaven himself.

From the great confusion of local creeds some such Shaman system as the following can be constructed; though the people themselves have only very vague conceptions of it.

The universe consists of a number of layers separated one from another by a certain something. The seventeen upper layers form the kingdom of light, seven or nine the underworld of darkness. In between lies the surface of man's earth, constantly influenced by both powers. The good divinities and spirits of heaven protect men, but the bad endeavour to

destroy them. Originally there was only water and neither earth nor heaven nor sun nor moon. Then *Tengere Kaira Khan* (the kind heaven) created first a being like himself, *Kishi*, man. Both soared in bliss over the water, but *Kishi* wished to exalt himself above the creator, and losing through his transgression the power to fly, fell headlong into the bottomless water. In his mercy *Kaira Khan* caused a star to rise out of the flood, upon which the drowning *Kishi* could sit; but as he could no longer fly *Kaira Khan* caused him to dive deep down and bring up earth, which he strewed upon the surface of the water. But *Kishi* kept a piece of it in his mouth in order to create a special country out of it for himself. This swelled in his mouth and would have suffocated him had he not spat it out so that morasses formed on *Kaira Khan's* hitherto smooth earth. In consequence *Kaira Khan* named *Kishi Erlik*, banished him from the kingdom of light, and caused a nine-branched tree to grow out of the earth, and under each branch created a man as first father of each of the nine peoples of the present time.

In vain *Erlik* besought *Kaira Khan* to entrust to him the nine fair and good men; but he found out how to pervert them to evil. Angered thereat *Kaira Khan* left foolish man to himself, and condemned *Erlik* to the third layer of darkness. But for himself he created the seventeen layers of heaven and set up his dwelling in the highest. As the protector and teacher of the now deserted race of man he left behind *Mai-Tärä* (the Sublime). *Erlik* too with the permission of the *Kaira Khan* built himself a heaven and peopled it with his own subjects, the bad spirits, men corrupted by him. And behold, they lived more comfortably than the sons of the earth created by *Kaira Khan*. And so *Kaira Khan* caused *Erlik's* heaven to be shattered into small pieces, which falling on the earth formed huge mountains and gorges.

But *Erlik* was doomed until the end of the world to everlasting darkness. And now from the seven-teenth layer of heaven *Kaira Khan* controls the destiny of the universe. By emanation from him the three highest divinities came into being : *Bai Ulgon* (the Great) in the sixteenth, *Kysagan Tengere* (the Mighty) in the ninth, and *Mergen Tengere* (the All-wise) in the seventh layer of heaven, where "Mother Sun" dwells also. In the sixth is enthroned "Father Moon," in the fifth *Kudai Yayutshi* (the highest Creator). *Ulgon's* two sons *Yayik* and *Mai-Tara*, the protecting patrons of mankind, dwell in the third on the milk-white sea *Sut-akkol*, the source of all life; near it is the mountain *Suro*, the dwelling of the seven *Kudau* with their subjects the *Yayutshi*, the guardian angels of mankind. Here is also the paradise of the blessed and righteous ancestors of living men, who mediate between the divinities of heaven and their own descendants, and can help them in their need. The earth is personified in a community of spirits (*Yer-su*) beneficent to man, the seventeen high Khans (princes) of the seventeen spring districts, whose abodes lie on the seventeen snow peaks of the highest mountains, by the sources of the seventeen streams which water the land.

In the seven layers of the dark underworld prevails the dismal light of the underworld sun peculiar to them. This is the dwelling of all the evil spirits who waylay men at every turn: misshapen goblins, witches, *Kormos*, and others ruled by *Erlik-Khan* the dreadful prince on the black throne. Still deeper lies the horrible hell, *Kasyrgan*, where the sinners and criminals of mankind suffer just punishment.

All evil comes from *Erlik*, cattle-disease, poverty, illness, and death. Thus there is no more important duty for man than to hold him steadfastly in honour, to call him "father *Erlik*", and to appease him with rich sacrifices. If a man is to be born, *Ulgon*, at the request of the former's ancestors, orders his son *Yayik* to give a *Yayutshi* charge of the birth, with the life-force from the milk-white sea. This *Yayutshi* then watches over the newly-born during the whole of his life on earth. But at the same time *Erlik* sends forth a *Kormos* to prevent the birth or at least to hamper it, and to injure and misguide the newly-born his whole life long. And if *Erlik* is successful in annihilating the life-forces of a man, *Kormos* drags the soul before *Erlik's* judgment-seat. If the man was more good than bad, *Erlik* has no power over him, *Kormos* stands aside, and the *Yayutshi* brings the soul up to paradise. But the soul of the



wicked is abandoned by its Yayutshi, dragged by its Kormos to hell in the deepest layer of the underworld, and flung into a gigantic caldron of scalding tar. The worst sinners remain for ever beneath the surface of the tar, the rest rise gradually above the bubbling tar until at last the crown of the head with the pigtail comes to view. So even the sinner's good works are not in vain. The blessed in heaven reflect on the kindnesses once done by him, and they and his ancestors send his former Yayutshi to hell, who grasps him by the pigtail, pulls him out of the tar, and bears the soul up to heaven. For this reason the Kalmucks let their pigtails grow, as did many of the nomad peoples of history.

However, there is no absolute justice. The gods of light, like the spirits of darkness, allow themselves to be won over by sacrificial viands, and, if rich offerings are forthcoming, they willingly wink at transgression; they are envious of man's wealth and demand gifts from all, and so it is advisable to stand well with both powers, and that can only be done through the medium of the Shamans. So long as Erlik is banished in the darkness, a uniform ordering of the universe exists till the last day when everything created comes to an end, and the world ceases to be.

With Shamanism fire-worship was closely associated. Fire purifies everything, wards off evil, and makes every enchantment ineffective. Hence the sick man, and the strange arrival, and everything which he brings with him must pass between two fires. Probably fire-worship was originally common to all the Altaians, and the Magyars also of the ninth century were described by the Arabian geographer as fire-worshippers.

In consequence of the healthy climate, the milk diet, and the Spartan hardening, the Altaian enjoys excellent health, hence the saying "Healthy as a Kirghiz". There are not a few old men of eighty, and some of a hundred years. Infectious diseases are almost unknown, chiefly because the constant smoke in the tent acts as a disinfectant, though combined with the ghastly filthiness it promotes the very frequent eye-complaints, itch, and eruptions of the skin. In consequence of the constant wandering on camel-back, and through the Shaman hocus-pocus, illness and death at home are vexatious, and sudden death on the field of battle is preferred. In order not to be forgotten, the Turko-Tartar—in contrast to the Mongol—likes to be buried in a conspicuous place, and, as such places do not exist on the steppes, after a year there is heaped over the buried corpse an artificial mound which, according to the wealth of the dead man, rises to a hill-like tumulus. At the same time an ostentatious funeral festival lasting seven days is held, with races, prize combats, and other games on horseback. Hundreds of horses, camels, and sheep are then consumed.

(D)

*Weapons. Predatory Life*

The nomad loves his horses and weapons as himself. The principal weapon is the lance, and in European warfare the Uhlans and Cossacks survive from the armies of the steppes. The nomad-peoples who invaded Europe were all wonderfully sure bowmen. The value of the bow lies in the treacherous noiselessness of the arrow, which is the best weapon for hunting and ambush, and is therefore still in use today together with the rifle. In addition there have always been long-handled iron hatchets and pick-shaped battle-axes for striking and hurling, and the bent sabre.

The warrior's body was often protected by a shirt of Armour made of small polished steel plates, or by a harness of ox-leather plates, the head by a helmet; all mostly Persian or Caucasian work.

The hard-restless life of the mounted nomad is easily disturbed by pressure from his like, by the death of his cattle from hunger and disease, and by the prospect of plunder, which makes him a professional robber. Of this the Turkoman was long a type. The leading features

in the life of a Turkoman are the *alaman* (predatory expedition) or the *tchapao* (the surprise). The invitation to any enterprise likely to be attended with profit finds him ever ready to arm himself and to spring to his saddle. The design itself is always kept a profound secret even from the nearest relative; and as soon as the *serdar* (chief elect) has had bestowed upon him by some *mollah* or other the *fatiha* (benediction), every man betakes himself, at the commencement of the evening, by different ways, to a certain place indicated before as the rendezvous. The attack is always made either at midnight, when an inhabited settlement, or at sunrise, when a caravan or any hostile troop is its object. This attack of the Turkomans, like that of the Huns and Tartars, is rather to be styled a surprise. They separate themselves into several divisions, and make two, hardly ever three, assaults upon their unsuspecting prey; for, according to a Turkoman proverb, "Try twice, turn back the third time". The party assailed must possess great resolution and firmness to be able to withstand a surprise of this nature; the Persians seldom do so. Very often a Turkoman will not hesitate to attack five or even more Persians, and will succeed in his enterprise. Often the Persians, struck with a panic, throw away their arms, demand the cords, and bind each other mutually; the Turkomans have no occasion to dismount except for the purpose of fastening the last of them. He who resists is cut down; the coward who surrenders has his hands bound, and the horseman either takes him up on his saddle (in which case his feet are bound under the horse's belly), or drives him before him : whenever from any cause this is not possible, the wretched man is attached to the tail of the animal and has for hours and hours even for days and days to follow the robber to his desert home. Each captive is then ill-treated until his captor learns from him how high a ransom can be extracted from his kinsmen. But ransoming was a long way from meaning salvation itself, for on the journey home the ransomed were not seldom captured again and once more enslaved. Poor captives were sold at the usual price in the slave-markets at Bokhara, Khiva, *etc.*; for example, a woman of fifty for ten ducats. Those that could not be disposed of and were retained as herdsmen, had the sinews of their heels cut, to hinder them from flight. Until their overthrow by Skobelev in 1881 more than 15,000 Tekke-Turkomans contrived such raids day and night; about a million people in Persia alone were carried off in the last century, and made on the average certainly not less than 10 per head.

In the ninth century the Magyars and their nomadic predecessors in South Russia, according to Ibn Rusta's Arabian source, behaved exactly as the Turkomans in Persia; they provided for the slave-markets on the Pontus so many Slav captives that the name slave finally became the designation in the West of the worst servitude.

With man-stealing was associated cattle-stealing (*baranta*), which finally made any attempt at cattle-rearing impossible for the systematically plundered victim, and drove him to vegetarianism without milk nourishment. And what a vegetarianism, when agriculture had to suffer from the ever-recurring raids, and from bad harvests! And where the predatory herdsmen settled for the winter in the midst of an agricultural population and in his own interests allowed them a bare existence as his serfs, there came about a remarkable connection of two strata of people different in race and, for a time, in speech also.

A typical land in this respect is Ferghana, the former Khanate of Khokand, on the southern border of the Great Kirghiz horde. The indigenous inhabitants of this country, the entirely vegetarian Tadjiks and Sarts, from immemorial times passed from the hands of one nomad people to another in the most frightful servitude. In the sweat of their brows they dug canals for irrigation, cultivated fields, and put into practice a hundred arts, only to pay the lion's share to their oppressors who, in the full consciousness of their boundless power, indulged the most bestial appetites. But the majority of the dominant horde could not turn from their innate and uncontrollable impulse to wander; in the spring they were drawn

irresistibly to the free air of the high-lying steppes, and only a part of them returned to winter among the enslaved peasantry.

This hopeless state of affairs continued to the Russian conquest in 1876, for the directly adjoining deserts always poured forth wild hordes afresh, who nipped in the bud any humaner intercourse of herdsmen and peasants. For rapine and slavery were inevitable wherever the nomads of the vast steppes and deserts made their abode in the immediate neighbourhood of more civilized lands. What their own niggardly soil denied them, they took by force from the fruitful lands of their neighbours. And because the plundered husbandman could not pursue the fleet mounted nomad into the trackless desert, he remained unprotected.

The fertile districts on the edge of the Sahara and the Arabian desert were also in this frightful position, and Iran felt this calamity all the harder, because the adjoining deserts of Turan are the most extensive and terrible, and their inhabitants the wildest of all the nomads of the world. No better fared the peoples inhabiting East Europe, on the western boundaries of the steppe-zone.

As early as the fourth century B. C. Ephorus stated that the customs, according to the individual peoples, of the Scythians and the Sarmatians (both names covered the most medley conglomerations of nomads and peasants) were very dissimilar. Some even ate human beings (as the Massagetae ate their sick or aged parents), others abstained from all animals. A thousand years later Pseudo-Caesar of Nazianzus tells of a double people, that of the Sklavenes (Slavs) and Phisonites on the lower Danube, of whom the Sklavenes abstained from meat eating. And Constantine Porphyrogenitus in the year 952 stated that the Russians (North Germanic Varangians, who coming from Scandinavia held sway over the Slavs of Russia) bought horses, cattle, and sheep from their terrible nomadic neighbours the Patzinaks, because they had none of these animals themselves (i.e. in the Slav lands which they dominated). In certain districts of East Europe therefore vegetarianism was permanent among the peasant folk, who for more than two thousand years had been visited by the Altaians with rapine and murder; this can be proved from original sources to have been the case from the fourth century BC to the tenth century AD. that is, for 1400 years! It is exactly the same state of things as in Ferghana in modern times.

As long as a nomad horde finds sufficient room in the steppe it does not think of emigration, and always returns home from its raids richly laden with the plunder. But if the steppe-zone is thrown into a ferment by struggles for the winter pastures or by other causes, the relatively weakest horde gets pushed out of the steppe, and must conquer a new home outside the zone. For it is only weak against the remaining nomad hordes, but against any other State upon which it falls it is irresistible. All the nomads of history who broke into Europe, the Scythians, Sarmatians, Huns, Bulgarians, Avars, Magyars, Cumans, were the weakest in the steppes and had to take to flight, whence they became assailants of the world, before whom the strongest States tottered. With an energetic Khan at their head, who organised them on military lines, such a horde transformed itself into an incomparable army, compelled by the instinct of self-preservation to hold fast together in the midst of the hostile population which they subjugated; for however superfluous a central government may be in the steppe, it is of vital importance to a conquering nomad horde outside it. Consequently, while that part of the people which remained in the steppe was split up into loose clan associations, the other part, which emigrated, possessed itself of immense territories, exterminated the greater part of entire nations and enslaved the rest, scattered them as far as they pleased, and founded a despotically governed State with a ridiculously small band of horsemen.

The high figures in the chronicles are fictions exaggerated by terror and imagination, seeing that large troops of horsemen, who recklessly destroyed everything around them, would not have found in a narrow space even the necessary pasture for their many horses.

Each Mongol under Chinghiz Khan, for example, was obliged to take with him 18 horses and mares, so as always to have a fresh steed and sufficient mare's milk and horse's blood for food and drink. Two corps under the command of Sabutai and Chebe sufficed this great conqueror for the overthrow of West Asia. In four years they devastated and in great part depopulated Khorasan, North Persia, Azerbaidjan, Georgia, Armenia, Caucasia, the Crimea, and the Volga territories, took hundreds of towns, and utterly defeated in bloody engagements the large armies of the Georgians, Lesghians, Circassians, and Cumans, and the united forces of the Russian princes. But they spared themselves as much as possible, by driving those of the subjugated people who were capable of bearing arms into the fight before them (as the Huns and Avars did previously), and cutting them down at once when they hesitated.

But what the Altaian armies lacked in numbers was made up for by their skill in surprises, their fury, their cunning, mobility, and elusiveness, and the panic which preceded them and froze the blood of all peoples. On their marvellously fleet horses they could traverse immense distances, and their scouts provided them with accurate local information as to the remotest lands and their weakness. Add to this the enormous advantage that among them even the most insignificant news spread like wildfire from aul to aul by means of voluntary couriers surpassing any intelligence department, however well organised. The tactics of the Mongols are described by Marco Polo in agreement with Piano Carpini and all the other writers as follows: "They never let themselves come to close quarters, but keep perpetually riding round and shooting into the enemy. And as they do not count it any shame to run away in battle, they will sometimes pretend to do so, and in running away they turn in the saddle and shoot hard and strong at the foe, and in this way make great havoc. Their horses are trained so perfectly that they will double hither and thither, just like a dog, in a way that is quite astonishing. Thus they fight to as good purpose in running away as if they stood and faced the enemy, because of the vast volleys of arrows that they shoot in this way, turning round upon their pursuers, who are fancying that they have won the battle. But when the Tartars see that they have killed and wounded a good many horses and men, they wheel round bodily and return to the charge in perfect order and with loud cries; and in a very short time the enemy are routed. In truth they are stout and valiant soldiers and inured to war. And you perceive that it is just when the enemy sees them run, and imagines that he has gained the battle, that he has in reality lost it; for the Tartars wheel round in a moment when they judge the right time has come. And after this fashion they have won many a fight". The chronicler, Peter of Zittau, in the year 1315, described the tactics of the Magyars in exactly the same way.

When a vigorous conqueror like Attila or Chinghiz arose among the mounted nomads and combined several hordes for a cyclonic advance, they swept all before them on the march, like a veritable avalanche of peoples. The news of the onward rolling flood scared the bravest people, and compelled them to fly from their homes; thus their neighbours, too, were set in tumultuous motion, and so it went on until some more powerful State took defensive measures and stemmed the tide of peoples. Now the fugitives had to face the assailant. A battle of nations was fought, the flower of famous peoples strewed the field, and powerful nations were wiped out. The deserted or devastated territories were occupied by peoples hitherto often quite unknown, or settled by nations forcibly brought there by the conqueror; States, generally without duration and kept together only by the one powerful hand, were founded. The giant State, having no cohesion from within, fell to pieces at the death of the conqueror or shortly after; but the sediment of peoples, together with a stratum of their nomad oppressors which remained from the flood, could not be pushed back again, and immense areas of a continent received once again an entirely new ethnography the work of one single furious conqueror.



Often and longer than in Europe successive Altaian empires held together in Asia, where the original population had long become worn out by eternal servitude and the central zone of the steppes supplied a near and secure base for plundering hordes. That some of these Asiatic empires attained to a high degree of prosperity is not due to the conquerors, who indeed quickly demongolised themselves by marriage with aliens, but was the consequence of the geographical position, the productivity of the soil, and the resigned tractableness and adaptability of the subjugated who, in spite of all the splendour of their masters, were forced to languish in helpless servitude. Out of Central Asia from time immemorial one nomad horde after another broke into the steppes of South Russia and of Hungary, and after exterminating or pushing out their predecessors and occupying their territories, used this new base to harry and enslave the surrounding peoples far and wide, forcibly transforming their whole being, as in Ferghana.

But the bestial fury of the nomads not only laid bare the country, recklessly depopulated enormous tracts, dragged off entire peoples and forcibly transplanted and enslaved them, but where their sway was of any duration they brought their subjects down to the level of brutes, and extirpated every trace of nobler feeling from their souls. Central Asia of today, as Vambery states from personal observation, is a sink of all vices. And Franz von Schwarz draws the following cheerless picture of the Turkestan Sarts, among whom he lived for fifteen years: With respect to character they are sunk as low as man possibly can be. But this is not at all to be wondered at, as for thousands of years they were oppressed and enslaved by all possible peoples, against whom they could only maintain themselves by servility, cunning, and deceit. The Sart is cowardly, fawning, cringing, reticent, suspicious, deceitful, revengeful, cruel, and boastful. At the same time he shows in his appearance and manner a dignity and bearing that would compel the uninitiated to regard him as the ideal of a man of honour. In the former native States, as in Bokhara and Khiva today, the entire system of government and administration was based exclusively on lying, deceit, and bribery, and it was quite impossible for a poor man to get justice.

The opposite of the Sart is his oppressor the Kirghiz, who is shy, morose, and violent, but also honourable, upright, good-hearted, and brave. The terrible slave-hunting Turkoman is distinguished from all other Central Asiatics by his bold and piercing glance and proud bearing. In wild bravery no other race on earth can match itself with him, and as a horseman he is unsurpassed. He has an unruly disposition and recognises no authority, but his word can be absolutely relied upon.

What a tragic fate for an enslaved people. Although its lowest degradation is already behind it, how long yet will it be the object of universal and not unnatural contempt, while its former oppressor, void of all humane feeling, a professional murderer and cattle-thief, remains as a hero and ideal super-man?

So long as the dominant nomad horde remains true to its wandering life, it lives in the midst of the subjugated only in winter, and proceeds in spring to the summer pastures. But it is wise enough to leave behind overseers and guards, to prevent revolts. The individual nomad has no need to keep many slaves; besides, he would have no occupation and no food for them, and so an entire horde enslaves entire peoples, who must provide food for themselves. In so far as he does not winter directly among them, the nomad only comes to plunder them regularly, leaving them nothing but what is absolutely indispensable.

The peasantry had to supply the nomads and their herds who wintered among them with all that was demanded. For this purpose they stored up grain and fodder during the summer, for in Central and East Europe the snow falls too deep for the herds to be left to scrape out fodder alone. During the winter the wives and daughters of the enslaved became a prey to the lusts of the yellow-skins, by whom they were incessantly violated, and thus every conjugal and family tie and as a further consequence the entire social organization was seriously

loosened. The ancient Indo-European patriarchal principle, which has exclusively prevailed among the Altaians also from the earliest times, languished among the enslaved just because of the violation and loosening of the conjugal bond, which often continued for hundreds of years.

The matriarchal principle came into prominence, for the Altaian adulterer repudiated bastards, and still more did the husband where there was one, so the children followed the mother. Where therefore matriarchal phenomena occur among Indo-Europeans, usually among the lower strata of population, they are not survivals of pre-patriarchal times, but probably arose later from the corruption of married life by systematic adultery. Thus the subjugated Indo-Europeans became here more, there less mongolised by the mixture of races, and in places the two superimposed races became fused into a uniform mixed people.

Indo-European usage and law died out, and the savage wilfulness of the Altaians had exclusive sway. Revolutions among the people driven to despair followed, but they were quelled in blood, and the oppression exercised still more heavily. Even if here and there the yoke was successfully shaken off, the emancipated, long paralysed and robbed of all capability of self-organization, were unable to remain independent. Commonly they fell into anarchy and then voluntarily gave themselves up to another milder-seeming servitude, or became once more the prey of an if possible rougher conqueror.

In consequence of the everlasting man-hunting and especially the carrying off of women in foreign civilised districts there ensued a strong mixing of blood, and the Altaian race-characteristics grew fainter, especially to the south and west. The Greeks by the time of Alexander the Great were no longer struck by the Mongol type already much obliterated of the nomads pasturing in the district between the Oxus and the Jaxartes. This led to the supposition that these nomads had belonged to the Indo-European race and had originally been settled peasants, and that they had been compelled to limit themselves to animal rearing and to become nomads only after the conversion of their fields to deserts through the evaporation of the water-basins. This supposition is false, as we have seen before

The steppes and deserts of Central Asia are an impassable barrier for the South Asiatics, the Aryans, but not for the North Asiatic, the Altaian; for him they are an open country providing him with the indispensable winter pastures. On the other hand, for the South Asiatic Aryan these deserts are an object of terror, and besides he is not impelled towards them, as he has winter pastures near at hand. It is this difference in the distance of summer and winter pastures that makes the North Asiatic Altaian an ever-wandering herdsman, and the grazing part of the Indo-European race cattle-rearers settled in limited districts. Thus, while the native Iranian must halt before the trackless region of steppes and deserts and cannot follow the well-mounted robber nomad thither, Iran itself is the object of greatest longing to the nomadic Altaian. Here he can plunder and enslave to his heart's delight, and if he succeeds in maintaining himself for a considerable time among the Aryans, he learns the language of the subjugated people, and by mingling with them loses his Mongol characteristics more and more. If the Iranian is now fortunate enough to shake off the yoke, the dispossessed iranised Altaian intruder inflicts himself upon other lands. So it was with the Scythians.

Leaving their families behind in the South Russian steppes, the Scythians invaded Media c. BC 630 and advanced into Mesopotamia and Syria as far as Egypt. In Media they took Median wives and learned the Median language. After being driven out by Cyaxares, on their return some twenty-eight years later, they met with a new generation, the offspring of the wives and daughters whom they had left behind, and slaves of an alien race. A thorough mixture of race within a single generation is hardly conceivable. A hundred and fifty years later Hippocrates found them still so foreign, so Mongolian, that he could say that they were "very different from the rest of mankind, and only like themselves, as are also the Egyptians". He remarked their yellowish-red complexion, corpulence, smooth skins, and their consequent

eunuch-like appearance all typically Mongol characteristics. Hippocrates was the most celebrated physician and natural philosopher of the ancient world. His evidence is unshakable, and cannot be invalidated by the Aryan speech of the Scythians. Their Mongol type was innate in them, whereas their Iranian speech was acquired and is no refutation of Hippocrates' testimony. On the later Greek vases from South Russian excavations they already appear strongly demongolised and the Altaian is only suggested by their hair, which is as stiff as a horse's mane the characteristic that survives longest among all Ural-Altaian hybrid peoples.

If a nomad army is obliged to take foreign non-nomadic wives, there occurs at once a dualism, corresponding to the two sexes, in the language and way of living of each individual household. The new wives cannot live in the saddle, they do not know how to take down the tent, load it on the beasts of burden, and set it up again, and yet they must share the restless life of the herdsman. Consequently, where the ground admits of it, as in South Russia, the tent is put on wheels and drawn by animals.

Thus the Scythian women were hamaxobiotic (wagon inhabiting), the men however remained true to their horse-riding life and taught their boys too, as soon as they could keep themselves in the saddle. But the dualism in language could not maintain itself; the children held to the language of the mother, the more easily because even the fathers understood Medish, and so the Altaian Scythian people, with their language finally iranised, became Iranian. But their mode of life remained unchanged : the consumption of horse-flesh, soured horse's milk (kumiz) and cheese of the same, the hemp vapour bath for men (the women bathed differently), singeing of the fleshy parts of the body as a cure for rheumatism, poisoning of the arrow-tips, wholesale human offerings, and slaughter of favourite wives at the burials of princes, the placing on horseback of the stuffed bodies of murdered warriors round the grave, etc., all such customs as are found so well defined among the Mongols of the Middle Ages

The modern Tartars of the Crimea, whose classical beauty sometimes rivals that of the Greeks and Romans, underwent, in the same land, the same change to the Aryan type.

The same is the case with the Magyars whose mounted nomadic mode of life and fury, and consequently their origin, was Turkish, but their language was a mixture of Ugrian and Turkish on an Ugrian basis. Evidently a Magyar army, Turkish in blood, formerly advanced far to the north where it subdued an Ugrian people and took Ugrian wives; the children then blended the Ugrian speech of their mothers with the Turkish speech of their fathers. But they must also once have dominated Indo-European peoples and mixed themselves very strongly with them, for Gardezi's original source from the middle of the ninth century describes them as "handsome, stately men". At that time they were leading the nomad existence in the Pontic Steppe the old Scythia whence they engaged in terrible slave-hunting among the neighbouring Slavs; and as they were notorious women-hunters, they must have assimilated much Slav, Alan, and Circassian blood, and thus became "handsome, stately men". However the change did not end there. At the end of the ninth century their army, on its return from a predatory expedition, found their kindred at home totally exterminated by their deadly enemies, the Patzinaks, a related stock. Consequently the whole body had again to take foreign wives, and they occupied the steppes of Hungary. Before this catastrophe the Magyars are said to have mustered 20,000 horsemen, an oriental exaggeration, for this would assume a nomad people of 200,000 souls. Consequently only a few thousand horsemen could have fled to Hungary. There they mixed themselves further with the medley race-conglomeration settled there, which had formed itself centuries before, and assimilated stragglers from the related Patzinak stock. By this absorption the Altaian type asserted itself so predominantly that the Frankish writers were never tired of depicting their ugliness and loathsomeness in the most horrifying colours. Their fury was so irresistible that in sixty-three years they were able with impunity to

make thirty-two great predatory expeditions as far as the North Sea, and to France, Spain, Italy, and Byzantium. Thus the modern Magyars are one of the most varied race-mixtures on the face of the earth, and one of the two chief Magyar types of today traced to the Arpad era by tomb-findings is dolichocephalic with a narrow visage. There we have before us Altaian origin, Ugrian speech, and Indo-European type combined.

Such metamorphoses are typical for all nomads who, leaving their families at home, attack foreign peoples and at the same time make war on one another. In the furious tumult in which the Central Asiatic mounted hordes constantly swarmed, and fought one another for the spoils, it is to be presumed that nearly all such people, like the Scythians and Magyars, at least once sustained the loss of their wives and children. The mounted nomads could, therefore, remain a pure race only where they constantly opposed their own kin, whereas to the south and west they were merged so imperceptibly in the Semitic and Indo-European stock, that no race-boundary is perceivable.

The most diversified was the destiny of those mounted nomads who became romanised in the Balkan peninsula (Roumanians or Vlaxhs), but, surprising as it may be outside the steppe region, remain true to this day to their life as horse and sheep nomads wherever this is still at all possible. During the summer they grazed on most of the mountains of the Balkan peninsula, and took up their winter quarters on the sea-coasts among a peasant population speaking a different language. Thence they gradually spread, unnoticed by the chroniclers, along all the mountain ranges, over all the Carpathians of Transylvania, North Hungary, and South Galicia to Moravia; towards the north-west from Montenegro onwards over Herzegovina, Bosnia, Istria, as far as South Styria; towards the south over Albania far into Greece. In the entire Balkan peninsula there is scarcely a span of earth which they have not grazed. And like the peasantry among which they wintered (and winter) long enough, they became (and become) after a transitory bilingualism, Greeks, Albanians, Servians, Bulgarians, Ruthenians, Poles, Slovaks, Chekhs, Slovenes, Croatians, seeing that they appeared there not as a compact body, but as a mobile nomad stratum among a strange-tongued and more numerous peasant element, and not till later did they gradually take to agriculture and themselves become settled. In Istria they are still bilingual. On the other hand they maintain themselves in Roumania, East Hungary, Bukovina, Bessarabia for the following reasons: the central portion of this region, the Transylvanian mountain belt, sustained with its rich summer pastures such a number of grazing-camps, that the nomads in the favourable winter quarters of the Roumanian plain were finally able to absorb the Slav peasantry, already almost wiped out by the everlasting passage through them of other wild nomad peoples. In Macedonia, too, a remainder of them still exists. Were they not denationalised, the Roumanians today would be by far the most numerous but also the most scattered people of South Europe, not less than twenty million souls.

The Roumanians were not descendants of Roman colonists of Dacia left behind in East Hungary and Transylvania. Their nomadic life is a confutation of this, for the Emperor Trajan (after *AD* 107) transplanted settled colonists from the entire Roman Empire. And after the removal and withdrawal of the Roman colonists (c. *AD* 271) Dacia, for untold centuries, was the arena of the wildest international struggles known to history, and these could not have been outlived by any nomad people remaining there. To be sure, some express the opinion that the Roumanian nomad herdsmen fled into the Transylvanian mountains at each new invasion (by the Huns, Bulgarians, Avars, Magyars, Patzinaks, Cumans successively) and subsequently always returned. But the nomad can support himself in the mountains only during the summer, and he must descend to pass the winter. On the other hand, each of these new invading nomad hordes needed these mountains for summer grazing for their own herds. Thus the Roumanians could not have escaped, and their alleged game of hide-and-seek would have been in vain. But south of the Danube also the origin of the Roumanians must not be



sought in Roman times, but much later, because nomads are never quickly denationalised. For in the summer they are quite alone on the otherwise uninhabited mountains, having intercourse with one another in their own language, and only in their winter quarters among the foreign-speaking peasantry are they compelled in their dealings with them to resort to the foreign tongue. Thus they remain for centuries bilingual before they are quite denationalised, and this can be proved from original sources precisely in the case of the Roumanians (Vlachs) in the old kingdom of Servia. Accordingly the romanising of the Roumanians presupposes a Romance peasant population already existing there for a long time and of different race, through the influence of which they first became bilingual and then very gradually, after some centuries, forgot their own language. In what district could this have taken place? For nomads outside the salt-steppe the seacoast offers precisely on account of the salt, and the mild winter the most suitable winter quarters, and, as a matter of fact, from the earliest times certain shores of the Adriatic, the Ionian, Aegean, and Marmora, were crowded with Vlachian *catuns*, and are partly so at the present time. Among all these sea-districts, however, only Dalmatia had remained so long Romanic as to be able entirely to romanise a nomad people. From this district the expansion of the Roumanians had its beginning, so that the name Daco-Roumanians is nothing but a fiction.

The Spanish and Italian nomad shepherds too can have had no other origin. Alans took part in Radagaisus' invasion of Italy in 405, and, having advanced to Gaul, founded in 411 a kingdom in Lusitania which was destroyed by the Visigoths. The remainder advanced into Africa with the Vandals in 429. Traces of the Alans remained for a long time in Gaul. Sarmatian and Bulgarian hordes accompanied Alboin to Italy in 568, and twelve places in northern Italy are still called Bolgaro, Bolgheri, etc. A horde of Altaian Bulgars fled to Italy later, and received from the Lombard Grimoald (662-672) extensive and hitherto barren settlements in the mountains of Abruzzi and their neighbourhood. In the time of Paulus Diaconus (797) they also spoke Latin, but their mother tongue was still intact, for only on their winter pastures in Apulia and Campania, in contact with Latin peasants in whose fields they encamped, were they compelled to speak Latin. The old Roman sheep-rearing pursued by slaves has no connection with nomadism.

Therefore neither the non-Mongol appearance, nor the Semitic, Indo-European, or Finno-Ugrian language of any historical mounted nomad people can be held as a serious argument for their Semitic, Indo-European, or Finno-Ugrian origin. Everything speaks for one single place of origin for the mounted nomads, and that is in the Turanian-Mongol steppes and deserts. These alone, by their enormous extent, their unparalleled severity of climate, their uselessness in summer, their salt vegetation nourishing countless herds, and above all by their indivisible economic connection with the distant grass-abounding north these alone give rise to a people with the ineradicable habits of mounted nomads. The Indo-European vocabulary reveals no trace of a former mounted nomadism; there is no ground for speaking of Indo-European, Semitic, Finno-Ugrian nomads, but only of nomads who have remained Altaic or of indo-europeanised, semiticised, ugrianised nomads. The Scythians became Iranian, the Magyars Ugrian, the Avars and Bulgarians Slavic, and so on.

The identical origin of all the mounted nomads of historic and modern times is also demonstrated by the identity of their entire mode of life, even in its details and most trivial particulars, their customs, and their habits. One nomad people is the counterfeit of the other, and after more than two thousand years no change, no differentiation, no progress is to be observed among them. Accordingly we can always supplement our not always precise information about individual historical hordes, and the consequences of their appearance, by comparisons with the better known hordes. We are best informed about the Mongols of the thirteenth century, and that by Rogerius Canon of Varad, Thomas Archdeacon of Spalato,

Plano Carpini, Rubruquis, Marco Polo and others, whose accounts are therefore indispensable for a correct estimation of all earlier nomadic invaders of Europe.

This is the role of nomadism in the history of the world: countries too distant from its basis it could only ravage transitorily, with robbery, murder, fire, and slavery, but the stamp which it left upon the peoples which it directly dominated or adjoined remains uneffaceable. The Orient, the cradle and chief nursery of civilization, it delivered over to barbarism; it completely paralysed the greater part of Europe, and it transformed and radically corrupted the race, spirit, and character of countless millions for incalculable ages to come. That which is called the inferiority of the East European is its work, and had Germany or France possessed steppes like Hungary, where the nomads could also have maintained themselves and thence completed their work of destruction, in all probability the light of West European civilization would long ago have been extinguished, the entire Old World would have been barbarized, and at the head of civilization today would be stagnant China.

(E)

### ATTILA

If the extraordinary individual, who styled himself not unjustly the scourge of God and terror of the world, had never existed, the history of the Huns would have been very little more interesting to us at the present epoch, than that of the Gepidae, or Alans, or any of the chief nations that were assembled under his banner; but the immensity of the exploits, and the still greater pretensions of that memorable warrior, render it a matter of interest to know the origins of his power, and the very beginnings from which his countrymen had arisen, to threaten the subjugation of the civilized world, and the extirpation of the Christian religion. There has probably existed, before or since the time of Attila, but one other potentate, who, in his brief career, passed like a meteor over Europe, building up an empire, that was maintained by his personal qualities, and crumbled to atoms the moment he was withdrawn from it, leaving, however, consequences of which it is difficult to calculate the extent or termination.

One of the greatest losses that the history of Europe has sustained, is that of the eight books of the life of Attila, written in Greek by Priscus, who was his cotemporary and personally acquainted with him, and who, by the fragments that have been preserved to us, appears to have been most particular, candid, and entertaining, in his details. The loss is the more to be regretted, as it is certain that they did exist entire in the library of the Vatican after the restoration of literature, though it appears to have been ascertained by anxious research, that they are no longer to be found there; and there seems reason to suspect, that they may have been purposely destroyed through the jealousy of the Church of Rome, lest their publication should bring to light any facts or circumstances, that might militate against its policy or doctrines; when we consider the conspicuous part which was acted by the bishop of Rome, at the close of the Italian campaign of Attila, a period not long antecedent to the claim advanced by his successors to religious and political supremacy.

As we are thus deprived of the great fountain of information, our materials relating to the events of some of the most important portions of his life, and especially the particulars of its termination, are lamentably deficient. Under these circumstances it will be necessary to compare the brief and conflicting notices which have descended to us, with the copious and varied details of the most rude and ancient romances of Europe, which, however involved in confusion, and discredited by fiction and anachronism, can scarcely be supposed to have been built upon no foundation. The little we know concerning the origin and early habits of the Huns, is chiefly derived from Chinese writers who were consulted by Des Guignes, which may be compared with the statements of ancient chroniclers, and, as far as relates to the

general manners of the Huns and other tribes that emerged from Asia, is most strikingly confirmed by Latin authority.

Two different accounts have been given by the old chroniclers of the origin of the Huns. The one, that they were descended from Magog the son of Japhet, brought forth by his wife Enech in Havilah, fifty-eight years after the deluge; the other, that the two branches of the Huns and Magyars were derived from Hunor and Magor, elder sons of Nimrod, who settled in the land of Havilah (meaning thereby Persia), and, having followed a deer to the banks of the Maeotis, obtained permission from Nimrod to settle there. By the agreement of all writers, the Huns were Scythians, and if the Scythian tribes were descended and named from Cush, son of Ham, the Huns could not have been of the blood of Japhet. A singular fabulous origin has been attributed to them.

Filimer king of the Goths, and son of Gundaric the great, having issued from Scandinavia and occupied the Scythian territory, found certain witches amongst his people, who were called in their language Aliorumnae or Alirunes, and he drove them far from his army into the desert, where they led a wandering life, and, uniting themselves with the unclean spirits of the wilderness, produced a most ferocious offspring, which lurked at first amongst the marshes, a swarthy and slender race, of small stature, and scarcely endowed with the articulate voice of a human being. It rarely, if ever, happens that a very old tradition is entirely without meaning or foundation, and it may perhaps be drawn from this absurd fable, that the Huns were of mixed descent between the Goths and Tartars.

Great and formidable to all Europe as the Huns were in the reign of Attila, it is a matter of doubt what language they spoke. Eccard is quoted by Pray as arguing that they were Slavs, and used the Slavonic tongue, because Priscus only mentions two barbarian languages, as having been spoken in the camp of Attila, which were the Gothic and Hunnish; and he observes, that if the Slavonic and Hunnish had not been identical he would have mentioned the former also.

Pray, anxious, as are all the Hungarian writers, to identify the ancient Huns with the Avars of a later period, with the Magyars, and their own countrymen, argues against this, asserting that the Slavs did not enter Dalmatia and Illyria, till the time when the Avars were in Hungary, about a century after the days of Attila, and that the Tartars, to whom he refers the Hunnish origin, are not Slavonians.

There were, however, certainly Sarmatian nations under Attila, of which the Quadi may be particularly mentioned, and the words of Ovid distinguish the Sarmatian from the Gothic, as much as those of Priscus do the Hunnish language. But in truth Priscus does not say that only two languages were spoken, though he names the Gothic and Hunnish as prevalent, and perhaps as being only dialects of one tongue, for he nowhere asserts them to be radically distinct; and a brief examination of ancient evidence will perhaps lead us rather to consider it as a Teutonic dialect, than allied to the modern Hungarian. Priscus invariably uses the word Scythian, to include the Gothic nations with the Huns, and, if they were radically different in language as well as appearance, it is very difficult to understand how they should have been so classed under one denomination. He speaks also of their singing Scythian songs, which would convey no distinct meaning if the Scythians had two languages as widely different as the Gothic and Hungarian. In three other passages he mentions the language of the Huns. He says that on the embassy, with which he was himself associated, Maximin took with him Rusticius, "who was skilled in the tongue of the barbarians, and accompanied us into Scythia". Whenever he speaks of the Huns specially, he calls them Huns. He says of Zercon the buffoon, that, "mixing the tongue of the Huns and that of the Goths with that of the Italians, he kept the whole court, except Attila, in incessant laughter"; concerning which it may be observed, that, if the Hunnish and Gothic were not merely dialects of one language, the jests of Zercon could have been intelligible to very few of Attila's soldiers, and could

scarcely have kept the whole court in a roar of laughter. In the other passage he says, "The Scythians, being a mixed people, adhere to their own barbarous tongue, either that of the Huns, or that of the Goths, or even those who have intercourse with the Romans, that of the Italians, but they do not readily speak Greek, except the captives from Thrace and the maritime part of Illyria". This is the sum of the information transmitted to us concerning their language, which seems to point rather to kindred tongues, like those of the Danes and Swedes which are easily understood by either nation, than to two languages radically different.

In the account given by Priscus of his progress through the north of Hungary with the embassy, he states that they were furnished instead of wine, with what was called by the natives *meed*, writing the word in Greek *medos*; and as those natives were the very Huns of Attila, near his principal residence, it affords a strong reason for attributing to them a Teutonic dialect, though the word *kamos* which he mentions for a sort of beer is not so easily traced. The name of *Alirunes* or *Alrunae* given to the mothers of the Huns, and stated by Jordanes in the first century after the death of Attila to have been the name used by the people amongst whom they originated, is decidedly a Teutonic word, which may be found in the Scandinavian Edda, written *aulrunar*. Jordanes tells us that the Huns called their fortified seat in Pannonia Hunniwar, which is indubitably Teutonic, the last syllable being the word which, according to the dialect, is called ware, ward, or guard, from which last form of the word our court is derived. The king, who led the Huns into Europe, is named by Jordanes, Balamber or Balamer, which is actually the same name as that of Walamir king of the Goths under Attila, whom Malchus calls Balamir. We know from the history of Menander that the river Volga was called Attila, or as the Greeks write it *Atteelas*, in German Ethel, in which form the name is connected with the Teutonic *edel*, noble; and the name of king Attila in the oldest German is *Etzel*, in which form it is possibly connected with the Teutonic *steel*, alluding to the sword-god, which with a similar deduction from the Greek *chalybos*, has been called *chalybdicos*, *chalib*, and *excalibur*. The documents, which could clear up the point, are probably lost beyond all chance of recovery, but it seems questionable whether the nationality of modern Hungarians has not induced them to claim a connection of blood with the Huns of Attila, to which they are perhaps not entitled.

Desericius in his voluminous work has exerted himself to demonstrate that the Huns had no affinity with the Alans, Goths, Gepids, Vandals, and Lombards, and they were certainly a race differing in stature and color from the Alans, which proves them to have been long distinct, though they may have branched out at a period later than the dispersion of mankind in the time of Peleg; but they dwelt near to each other, and their habits and worship were precisely the same. The question above proposed is whether their language was a dialect of the general Teutonic tongue spoken by those nations, (perhaps even an admixture of that with some other language) or radically and entirely distinct like the modern Hungarian. The oldest account we have of the Scythians is given in detail by Herodotus, about 450 years before the birth of Christ; 380 years after Christ Ammianus Marcellinus described the Alans who were of the Gothic family, with manners exactly similar to those of the Huns, and the same sword-worship which had been described as used amongst the Scythians by the father of profane history; and in the following century we find Attila the Hun, obtaining great reverence by means of a like sanctified sword, and making the very Scythian sacrifices described by Herodotus, and the Huns and Goths still called promiscuously Scythians by the Greek writers. The Teutonic nations and the Huns had therefore during at least 900 years before the death of Attila been known under one common denomination, and entertained the same habits and a similar religion; and it will not easily be proved that their languages had no affinity, by those who wish to establish the identity of the Huns and Hungarians.

The Hunnish nation, says Ammianus Marcellinus in the fourth century, little known by ancient records, and dwelling nigh the frozen ocean beyond the Meotian marshes, exceeds



every known degree of savageness. From their very infancy their cheeks are gashed so deeply with steel, that the growth of the beard is impeded by scars; they grow up, like eunuchs, without beards or manly beauty. The whole race have compact and firm limbs, and thick necks, a prodigiously square stature, like two-legged beasts or stumps coarsely shaped into human figures.

They are so hardy, that they require neither fire, nor seasoned victuals, but live on the roots of wild plants, and the half-raw flesh of any sort of cattle, which they quickly warm by placing it under them on the backs of their horses.

They never frequent any sort of buildings, which they look upon as set apart for the sepulchers of the dead, and, except in case of urgent necessity, they will not go under the shelter of a roof, and they think themselves insecure there, not having even a thatched cottage amongst them; but, wandering in the woods from their very cradle, they are accustomed to endure frost, hunger, and thirst.

They are clothed with coverings made of linen and the skins of wood mice stitched together, nor have they any change of garment, or ever put off that which they wear till it is reduced to rags and drops off.

They cover their heads with curved fur caps; their hairy legs are defended by goat skins, and their shoes are so ill fitted as to prevent their stepping freely, on which account they are not well qualified for infantry; but, almost growing to the backs of their horses which are hardy and ill-shaped, and often sitting upon them after the fashion of a woman, they perform any thing they have to do on horseback. There they sit night and day, buy and sell, eat and drink, and leaning on the neck of the animal take their slumber, and even their deepest repose.

They hold their councils on horseback. Without submitting to any strict royal authority, they follow the tumultuous guidance of their principal individuals, and act usually by a sudden impulse. When attacked they will sometimes stand to fight, but enter into battle drawn up in the figure of wedges, with a variety of frightful vociferations. Extremely light and sudden in their movements, they disperse purposely to take breath, and careering without any formed line they make vast slaughter of their enemies; but, owing to the rapidity of their maneuvers, they seldom stop to attack a rampart, or hostile camp.

At a distance they fight with missile weapons, most skillfully pointed with sharp bones. Near at hand they engage with the sword, without any regard for their own persons, and while the enemy is employed in parrying the attack, they entangle his limbs with a noose in such a manner as to deprive him of the power of riding or resisting. None of them plough, or touch any agricultural instrument.

They all ramble about like fugitives without any fixed place of abode with the wagons in which they live, in which their wives weave their dark clothing, cohabit with them, bring forth their children, and in which they rear the boys to the age of puberty. Faithless in truces, inconstant, animated by every new suggestion of hope, they give way to every furious incitement.

They are as ignorant, as irrational animals, of the distinction between honesty and dishonesty, versatile and obscure in speech, influenced by no religious or superstitious fear, insatiably covetous of gold, so fluctuating and irritable that they often fall off from their companions without any sufficient cause, and reconcile themselves again, without any steps having been taken to pacify them. Such were the Huns when they burst into Europe about the year 374 after Christ, and such they had been from the earliest period of history.

After the confusion of tongues in Sennaar (2247 BC) the Huns are said to have migrated into the mountains of Armenia and Georgia. Thence, emerging into the plain between the Tanais and Volga, they divided, part to the east, and part to the west. What became of those who travelled west does not appear, if the Huns are to be considered as distinct both from the

Teutonic and Slavonian races. We read in some writers of dark and white Huns; the former being undoubtedly the Huns proper, and the latter some of the yellow haired tribes like the Alans, who dwelt in their vicinity with habits very similar. The Huns who travelled eastward led a pastoral life, enclosed amongst the mountains, and had no intercourse with other nations, but perpetual warfare with the Chinese, from whom the only information concerning them is derived.

The Chinese make mention of the Huns 2207 *BC* dwelling to the NE, of China, feeding on the flesh of their flocks and dressed in skins. In their dealings with other people their affirmation held the place of an oath. They punished murder and theft, that is amongst themselves, with certain death. They accustomed their children to hunt and use arms. In their earliest years they shot birds and mice with arrows; growing bigger they pursued hares and foxes. No one amongst them could be deemed a man, till he had slain an enemy, or was bold and skillful enough to do so. It was their custom to attack their enemies unexpectedly, and to fly as rapidly when it was expedient. The great speed of their horses facilitated this mode of warfare, and the Chinese, who were accustomed to standing fight, could not pursue and vanquish them: and the Huns, if defeated, retired unto desert places, where the enemy would find it very grievous to follow them.

They were quite illiterate; their weapons were bows and arrows, and swords. They had more or fewer wives according to their means, and it was not unusual for a son to marry his stepmother, or a brother the widow of his brother. The Hun who could rescue the body of a slain comrade from the enemy became heir to all his property. They were anxious to make captives, whom they employed in tending their flocks. Thieves amongst other nations, they were faithful to each other.

They lived in tents placed upon wagons. The ancient Huns adorned their coffins with precious things, gold, silver, and jewels, according to the rank of the deceased, but they erected no tombs. Many servants and concubines followed the body at the funeral, and served it as if living; troops of righting men accompanied it, and at the full moon they began combats which lasted till the change. Then they cut off the heads of many prisoners, and each of the fighting men was rewarded with a measure of wine made from sour milk.

Teuman, who reigned after the death of Chi-Hoam-tio, 210 years before Christ, over the Huns between the Irtysh on the west, and the Amur, which rises in the mountains to the east of lake Baikal, and flows into the sea opposite Kamtchatka, pressed the Chinese on his southern confines, which appears to be the earliest specific action of the Huns upon record. He was killed by his son Meté, who took the title of Tanjoo or Tanju, meaning son of heaven. Whatever be the etymology of the name Tanju, coming to us through the Chinese historians, we cannot rely upon it as being a Hunnish title expressed in the Hunnish language. Some of the names they give of the ancient Hunnish potentates are so decidedly and radically different from the names borne by Hunnish princes in Europe, that they must be looked upon as Chinese or Tartar versions of the names, rather than as the very appellations by which those persons were distinguished amongst their countrymen, unless their language underwent a complete change in the course of a few centuries after this period.

It is certainly possible that the Huns, if they had originally some affinity to the Tartars, as their personal appearance seems to indicate, having after centuries of connection with other Tartar races, been expelled by them from their seats, and having in their turn subdued their Gothic neighbors, may have gradually renounced much of the language of their invaders and adopted in great part the speech of the more humanized people who by conquest had become associated with them. The abode of the Tanjoos was in the mountains of Tartary.

On the first moon of the year the grandees of the empire or principal officers, each of whom commanded ten thousand men, assembled to hold a general council at the court of the Tanjoo, which ended with a solemn sacrifice.

At the fifth moon they met in another place, and sacrificed to Heaven, and Earth, and the Manes of their ancestors. In the autumn they assembled at a third place to number the people and cattle. The Tanjoo every day proceeded into the open plain to worship the sun, and every evening in like manner adored the moon. The title used by the Tanjoo, when he wrote to the emperor of China, was, the great Tanjoo of the Huns, engendered by Heaven and Earth, established by the sun and moon. The tent of the Tanjoo was on the left hand, as the most honorable place amongst the Huns, and it faced to the west. We know from Priscus that, when he visited the court of Attila, the seats on his right hand were considered the most honorable, and those on his left of secondary consideration; by which it appears that even in their highest ceremonies the Huns of his time had departed from their ancient custom, and adopted that which prevailed amongst the Goths. Mete was a successful prince, and extended the limits of his kingdom.

In the year 162 *BC* the Huns vanquished the people called Yue-chi, settled along the Gihon, who were afterwards called Jeta or Yetan, and were identical with the Getae. These adored Buddha, and carried the worship of Woden, who is the same Deity, into Europe; and, being of the Gothic race, they perhaps in some measure engrafted their habits and language on those of their ferocious conquerors. The empire of the Tanjoos having gradually increased, and having been maintained by frequent contests with various success against the Chinese, began to decline about the time of the birth of Christ, and in *AD* 93 it was entirely overthrown, the Tanjoo being defeated in battle, taken, and beheaded.

The Sien-pi Tartars occupied their territory, and many of the Huns mingling with them took the name of Sien-pi. The rest migrated westward into the country of the Baschkirs. This empire of the Huns, who are not mentioned by the Chinese as being a Tartar race, is said to have subsisted, from 1230 years before, till 93 years after the birth of our Savior, but the succession of Tanjoos is only known since 210 *BC*.

In 109 the Huns occupied Bucharria, and the country between the Gihon or Oxus, and the Irtish. In 120 they defeated the Iguri to the south, and killed the Chinese general who led them. In 134 they were themselves defeated by the Iguri, and in 151 they were driven further west by the Sien-pis.

In 310 we are told that, Lieou-toung king of the Huns having fallen in love with the widow of his father, she answered his passion, but was so bitterly reproached by her own son, that she died of vexation. This circumstance, transmitted to us amongst the scanty records of Hunnish transactions, militates directly against the accusation made against them by some modern writers of utter indifference concerning all incestuous connections.

It seems that the queen, mother of the heir to the throne, being dead, the king had taken to his throne another wife who had thereupon the rights of queen, and was not inheritable like the numerous wives of secondary condition who replenished the harem. Her submitting to the passion of her stepson was therefore probably regarded not only as an improper connection, but as a degradation from the rank and station she occupied as widow of the king. It is not improbable that the first wife enjoyed the rights of queen, on whose death the lady next espoused might succeed to her privileges; but we have no certainty that the wife, who was to have especial rights, and whose issue were to inherit, may not have been selected by the choice of her husband from the multitude of his wives.

In 316 Lieou-yao king of the Huns took prisoner a general of the Tsin Tartars, and invited him to a feast. On receiving the royal invitation, the captive warrior answered that he was so grieved by the disasters of his country, that he would rather die than survive them. Thereupon he was immediately accommodated with a sword and destroyed himself. Having failed in his first gracious intentions towards his prisoner, the monarch next turned his attention to the widow of the Tartar, who had also fallen into his hands, and was very beautiful, and he proposed to marry her: but the lady rejected his kindness with the same

Spartan repugnance as her husband, whom she declared herself unwilling to outlive. The Hunnish monarch was equally scrupulous of thwarting her inclinations, and he was reduced to the gratification of burying them both in the most pompous manner.

In 318 the Topa Tartars gained possession of the country east of the Irtish. At this period the Tanjoo had his principal abode in the land of the Baschkirs, but his territory extended east to the Hi, and stretched westward to the Caspian. The Sien-pis confined them on the east, and the Topas driving the Sien-pis on the Huns, forced the latter further westward. On the south and south-west they were stopped by the Persians. From about the birth of Christ to the time of Valentinian the first (*AD* 364) the Alans had inhabited the lands between the Volga and the Tanais.

Ammianus Marcellinus, who died soon after the Huns entered Europe, states that the Alans occupied in his time the immeasurable and uncultivated wastes of the Scythians beyond the Tanais, taking their name from that of a mountain. The Neuri inhabited the midland parts near some abrupt hills, which were exposed to the north wind and severe frost. Next to them dwelt, the Budini, and the Geloni, a warlike people who flayed their slain enemies and made coverings of the human skins for themselves and their horses.

The Agathyrsi bordered on them, who dyed both their bodies and their hair with blue spots; the lower classes with few and small marks, the nobles with thicker spots more deeply stained.

The Melanchaenae and Anthropophagi were said to wander on the skirts of these nations, devouring their captives, and a large tract reaching to the northeast towards the Chinese was understood to be left unoccupied by the withdrawal of various tribes from the vicinity of those ferocious marauders.

The Alans had spread themselves very widely towards the east, where they had many populous tribes, who reached even to the banks of the Ganges. Like the Huns they had neither plough, nor cottage; they lived on flesh and milk, in wagons with curved coverings of bark. When they arrived at a grassy district, they arranged their wagons in a circle, and as soon as the grass was consumed, they shifted their quarters. The plains which they frequented were very productive of grass, and interspersed with tracts that bore apples or other fruit, which they consumed when occasion required. Their tender years were passed in the wagons, but they were early habituated to ride, and esteemed it disgraceful to walk, and were all by instruction skillful and expert warriors.

They were universally tall and well made, with yellowish hair, and remarkable by their eyes, in which ferocity was tempered with a more pleasing expression; swift in their movements, lightly armed, and much like the Huns in everything, but more polished in their dress and mode of living, making inroads both to hunt and plunder, as far as the Cimmerian Bosphorus, and into Armenia and Media. Perils and warfare were their delight; the slaughter of a man their highest boast; and they reviled with bitterness those who lived to old age or died by accidents, esteeming it blessed to fall in battle. They fastened the hairy scalps of their enemies to their horses for trappings and ornament. They erected no temples, but planted a naked sword with barbarous rites in the ground and worshipped it as the protector of the district round which they had arranged their wagons. They had a singular mode of divining by collecting together a number of straight twigs, and after a time separating them again with some sort of incantation. Slavery was unknown amongst them; and the whole nation was considered to be of noble blood. Their judges were chosen on account of the prowess they had shown in warfare.

Upon these nations the Huns were driven by the inroads of the Tartars, who continued to force them towards the west. In the interval between the years 318 and 374, advancing northward of the Caspian, they subdued the Alans, associating numbers of them with themselves, and forcing the rest to take refuge in Europe.



In 374 they crossed the Maeotian swamp, or at least the river Tanais, into Europe. They had long considered the marshes to be an impenetrable girdle, till one of their nation, named Baudetes, having adventured more than usual in pursuit of a stag, succeeded in penetrating through them, and on his return communicated the important intelligence to his countrymen. Bishop Jordanes says that the stag led on the hunters by occasionally stopping to entice them, till it had conducted them into European Scythia, which he verily believes the foul spirits from whom they were descended devised out of enmity to its inhabitants.

The Huns profited immediately by the discovery of this passage, which opened to them a new world, and, whether they really crossed the Maeotis stagnant and choked with reeds or the Tanais higher up, they soon pushed their victorious arms to the banks of the Danube. They immediately attacked and reduced the Alipzuri and several other tribes, not omitting to sacrifice a due proportion of the first captives they made, according to the Scythian custom, to the Sword-God whom they worshipped. The hideous appearance of their swarthy and cicatrized faces, their short, stout, and erect figures, the swiftness of their steeds, and the skill of their archers, spread dismay on all sides, and they came like a hurricane upon the several nations who were peaceably depasturing the European banks of the Tanais.

The Alcidzuri, Itamari, Tuncassi, and Boisci, were subdued on the first inroad; and the following season was fatal to the liberty of the European Alans, excepting such as preferred to migrate westward, and seek the protection or extort the toleration of the Romans. Every conflict was a source of increased power to the Huns, who compelled the nations they subdued to join with them in further invasions, and with the sword of the Alans, united to their own, they now attacked the Goths.

Ermanric was at that time sovereign of the Goths, a man of very advanced years, who was then lingering under the effects of a wound received from Sarus and Animius, brothers of Sanielh or Sanilda, whom he had caused to be torn asunder by wild horses, to avenge himself on her husband, a chieftain of the Roxolani, who had revolted from him. The conjuncture was favorable to the invaders, and their king Balamer attacked the broad and fertile lands of Ermanric, who after vainly attempting to defend them, put an end to his own life. The Ostrogoths were subdued, having been previously weakened by the secession of the Visigoths, who had applied to the Roman emperor Valens to give them a part of Thrace or Moesia, south of the Danube, preferring a nominal dependance on the Romans, to the heavier yoke of the Hunnish invaders. The request was granted, and they were baptized into the creed of Valens, who was an Arian. Ermanric having perished, the Ostrogoths remained subject to the Huns, under the administration of Winithar or Withimir of the family of the Amali, who retained the insignia of royalty.

The Gepidae were reduced under subjection to the Huns at the same period, and so rapid was their progress, that, within two years after crossing the Moeotis, they wrested the Pannonias from the Romans, either by force of arms, or by negotiation. In 378 Fritigern, king of those Goths, who had inundated Thrace, being irritated by Lupicinus and Maximus, and pressed by famine, made war upon the Romans. He was assisted by the Huns and Alans whom he subsidized, and many actions took place with various success. Valens, alarmed at their progress, made a hasty peace with the Persians, and returned suddenly from Antioch to Constantinople. Gratian advanced with a considerable force to form a junction with the army of Valens, but the latter, confident of victory, and fearful of losing, or of sharing with Gratian, the luster of that success which he anticipated, rashly attacked the Goths and their allies at the twelfth milestone from Adrianople near Perinthus.

The Armenian cavalry were routed by the first charge of the Goths, and left the infantry completely exposed to the enemy. The attack of the horse was supported by a shower of arrows, in the use of which the Huns were particularly skillful, and the Roman infantry was completely routed and cut to pieces by the swords and billhooks of the barbarians.

Valens took refuge in a house, where he was burnt alive by his pursuers, a practice not uncommon amongst the Scandinavian nations.

Gratian, receiving intelligence of this disaster, immediately recalled from Spain Theodosius, who in the following year repaired the falling fortunes of Rome, and, both by successful conflicts and by conciliatory offers and presents, put an end to the war. The pacification was however of short duration, and in 380 Gratian, being molested by the Huns, obtained the assistance of the Goths whom he took into his service.

It was probably at this time, that Balamer king of the Huns violated the treaties he had made with the Romans, and laid waste many towns and much of their territory with his armies, stating that his subjects were in want of the necessaries of life. The Romans sent an embassy to him, and promised to pay him nineteen pounds weight of gold annually, on condition of his abstaining from a renewal of such incursions. Whether the Ostrogoths had taken part with the Romans or not in 380, Winithar soon after attempted to throw off the Hunnish yoke, and his efforts were eminently successful. In the first encounter he captured a Hunnish king called Box, together with his sons, and seventy men of distinction, all of whom he crucified, to terrify the rest of their countrymen. Nothing else is known concerning this Hunnish prince, but it seems that from the time of the invasion of Europe in 374 till the murder of Bleda by his brother Attila, the Huns were never governed by a sole king.

For a short time Winithar the Goth reigned independent; Balamer, with the assistance of Sigismund the son of Hunnimund the Ostrogoth, who continued faithful to the Huns, attacked him, but was discomfited in two successive engagements. In the third battle on the banks of the river Erac, Balamer killed him, having wounded him surreptitiously in the head with an arrow, as they were approaching to each other. The defeat of his partisans was complete. Balamer married his granddaughter Waladamarea, and possessed the whole empire, a Gothic prince however ruling over the Ostrogoths under the authority of the Huns.

Hunnimund the son of Ermanric succeeded to Winithar, and fought successfully against the Suevi. His son Thorismond reigned after him, and in the second year after his accession gained a great victory over the Gepidae, but was killed by the fall of his horse. The Goths greatly lamented him, and remained forty years after his death without a king, Berismund his son having followed the Visigoths into the west to avoid the Hunnish ascendancy. Balamer died in 386, soon after his marriage, probably leaving no children, and it is not known who immediately succeeded him.

The first king mentioned by the Roman writers after this period is Huldin, but nothing is detailed concerning him before the year 400.

It seems probable that the three kings Bela, Cheve, and Cadica, named by the Hungarians as having reigned simultaneously, belong to the reign of Balamer, and perhaps Bela was the real name of the king who was styled by the Romans Balamerus. Under them was said to have been fought a great battle at a place called Potentialia, which from its circumstances seems referable to the period when the Huns first occupied Pannonia, seven or eight years before the death of Balamer.

Bela, Cheve, and Cadica, pitched their camp upon the Teiss. Maternus, being at that time praefect of Pannonia, administered the affairs of Dalmatia, Mysia, Achaea, Thrace, and Macedonia. He solicited the aid of Detricus (Dietric or Theodoric), who then ruled over a part of Germany, and having collected a great miscellaneous force to resist the common enemy, they encamped at Zaazhalon in Pannonia, not far from the southern bank of the Danube, and remained posted near Potentialia and Thethis.

The Huns crossed the Danube below the site of Buda, surprised the allied army in the night, and routed them with great slaughter, and encamped in the vale of Tharnok. There the Huns were attacked in their turn, when the allies had rallied their scattered forces, and after a severe contest the Huns were compelled in the evening to recross the Danube and return to

their former position, but the victorious army was too much weakened to pursue them, and, fearful of a fresh attack, retired to Tulna, a town of Austria in the neighborhood of Vienna.

It seems extremely improbable that a narrative so circumstantial and apparently impartial, though discredited by some modern writers, should be entirely fabulous, and the persons mentioned in it fictitious. It is evident, that it must be referred to the period when the Goths and Romans were acting together, that is the year 380, when, according to the Latin writers, the Goths asked the assistance of Gratian against the Huns, and when, according to Priscus, Balamer violated the treaties and laid waste much of the Roman territory; Balamer (perhaps identical with Bela) being the chief sovereign, Box, Cheve, and Cadica, inferior kings over portions of the Huns.

To Balamer probably succeeded immediately Mundiuc, the father of Attila, but nothing is known of the particular actions of his life, and he is never named as concerned either with or against the Romans, in any military operations. In 388 the Huns were employed by Gratian against the Juthungi in Bavaria, and destined to act against Maximus in Gaul. In 394 they sent auxiliaries to Theodosius mixed with Alans and Goths under Gaines, Sanies, and Bacurius. In 397 it seems that Theotimus, bishop of Tomi or Tomiswar in Bulgaria, converted some Huns to Christianity, and it is not improbable that these converts were the persons whom Rhuas and Attila demanded and crucified. From about the year 400 till 411 Huldin commanded the Huns in immediate contact with the empire, but we have no reason for supposing him to have been sole monarch of the Hunnish nation.

In 400 he killed Gaines, and sent his head to Arcadius. In conjunction with Sarus who was king over a portion of the Goths, Huldin and his Huns afforded assistance to Rome in 406, when Radagais had invaded Italy. Radagais is said to have been the most savage of all the barbarian monarchs. So strangely were the various nations blended, who were set in motion by the irruption of the Huns, and the pressure of the Asiatic Alans and other tribes upon the pastoral nations of Europe, that it is not known of what people this mighty commander was originally the ruler. Probably he was king of the Obotritae, or some other nation in the neighbourhood of Mecklenberg, where he was worshipped as a God after his death.

He has been styled by most writers king of the Goths, because a great part of his force was Gothic, but there is no reason to suppose he was a Visigoth, and he certainly was not an Ostrogoth. Orosius calls him a pagan and Scythian, which conveys no distinct information, and it is even not unlikely that he may have been a Slavonian. Whatever was his own nation, he had been a most successful adventurer, swelling his army with the fighting men of the tribes which he successively overthrew, and drawing others to his camp by the renown of his name, till he had collected an immense confederated army of Vandals, Sueves, Burgundians, Alans, and Goths. With this force he entered Italy, and laying waste the whole country north of the Po, he prepared to besiege Florence at the head of 200,000 soldiers; threatening that he would raze the fortifications of Rome, and burn her palaces; that he would sacrifice the most distinguished patricians to his Gods, and compel the rest to adopt the *mastruca*, or garment of skin dressed with the hair on, that was worn by some of the barbarous nations.

The approach of this formidable enemy filled the Roman capital with dismay: the pagans thought that under the protection and with the assistance of the Gods, whom he was said to conciliate by daily immolations of human victims, it was impossible for him to be overcome, because the Romans neither offered to the Gods any such sacrifices, nor permitted them to be offered by any one. There was a concourse of heathens in the town, all believing that they were visited with this scourge, because the sacred rites of the great Gods had been neglected. Loud complaints were made, and it was proposed to resume immediately the celebration of the ancient worship, and throughout the whole city the name of Christ was loaded with blasphemies; but the degenerate Romans were more disposed to curse and offer

up sacrifice, than to fight in defence of the empire. A very small force was collected under Stilicho, and the defence of Italy was entrusted to Huldin with a Hunnish, Sarus with a Gothic, and Goar with an Alan, force of hired auxiliaries.

The prudent measures of Stilicho ensured their success. The invading army was camped on the arid ridge above Faesulae, ill furnished with water and provisions. Stilicho conducted his approaches with such skill, that he blocked up all the avenues, and rendered it impossible for the enemy to draw out his army in line against him. Without the uncertainty of a hazardous conflict, without any loss to be compensated by victory, the army defending Rome ate, drank, and were merry, while the invaders hungered, and thirsted, and pined away without hope of extricating themselves from their calamitous situation. Radagais despairing abandoned his army, fled, and was intercepted.

The conqueror has been accused of sullyng the glory of this achievement, by the deliberate murder or execution of his prisoner. A third part of the army surrendered, and the captives were so numerous, that herds of them were sold for single pieces of gold, and such was their misery, that the greater part of them perished after having been purchased. The entire credit of the discomfiture of the invaders, is given by the writers of that age to the troops of Huldin and Sarus, and the Roman forces are not mentioned.

There were twelve thousand noble Goths whom the Latins called *optimati* in the army of Radagais, and with these, after the disaster of their leader, Stilicho entered into confederacy. It appears by the chronicle of Prosper, that the army of Radagais was separated in three divisions under distinct chiefs; one division only perished at Faesulae; the other two were untouched, and his remaining Goths were afterwards diverted by Stilicho into Gaul. It seems that there must have been treachery in the invading army, which was not unlikely to occur, seeing that it consisted principally of Goths, and that he was besieged by Goths under Sarus.

Supposing the two other divisions of the army of Radagais to have been faithful to him, it could scarcely be doubted that, when he quitted the troops who were surrounded at Faesulae, he was attempting to rejoin them, for the purpose of leading them on to raise the blockade, and was intercepted in that undertaking: but a due consideration of the subject will lead us to suspect that the account given by Aventinus is correct, that Huldin and Sarus had entered Italy in concert with Radagais, but were seduced from his authority by Stilicho. Their force must have been part of the two divisions which remained uncaptured, and the Goths of Sarus a portion of the very troops which Stilicho afterwards persuaded to remove their quarters into Gaul; for it is impossible otherwise to explain how a sufficient power of Huns and Goths could be at hand to oppose an army of 200,000 men, which had already overrun and laid waste all the north of Italy, and had placed itself between Stilicho and the dominions of the Huns. The probability is therefore strong, that Stilicho discomfited Radagais by means of his own auxiliaries, having by negotiation drawn off from him two-thirds of his army, and surrounded the remainder, which might have consisted of sixty or seventy thousand men nominally, but probably was already reduced by the rude invasion of a hostile country.

From this period during some years the Huns do not appear to have manifested any decided hostility to the Romans. In 409 a small force of Hunnish auxiliaries assisted them to defeat Ataulfus, and in 410 Honorius appears to have hired a body of Huns to oppose the progress of Alaric, which is not surprising, as the Huns were certainly not united under any sole monarch, and both they and the Goths seem at that time to have been ready to assist the highest bidder. The peaceable demeanor of the Huns towards the empire is probably the reason that so little has reached us concerning their kings at this period.

No mention of Huldin occurs after the campaign against Radagais, and, although we are told that the Hunnish satellites or auxiliaries of Stilicho were destroyed when he himself was killed, we hear of no Hunnish king, till the brief mention which is made by Photius, in



detailing the contents of the work of Olympiodorus, of Charato, chief of the Hunnish petty kings. The circumstances mentioned by him are certainly referable to the period between the usurpation of Jovinus in 411 and his death in 413.

Olympiodorus was sent on an embassy from Constantinople to Donatus and the Hunnish princes, whose marvellous skill in archery struck him with astonishment. Who Donatus was is not known, but he must have been either a Hunnish king, or a chieftain of some nation closely connected with them. Donatus was ensnared by an oath, probably of safe conduct, and unlawfully and treacherously put to death by the Romans. Charato the chief of the Hunnish kings was greatly exasperated, but the Romans contrived to appease his resentment by presents. Nothing further is known of Charato; he may have been the chief ruler of the Huns, or which is more probable, only the first of the petty kings under Mundiuc.

From the year 413 no true historical competitor appears to contest the occupation of the Hunnish throne with Mundiuc, though a false king has been conjured up by Pray in his Hungarian annals, in the person of Rugas or Rhoilus. At this period the celebrated Roman Aetius was a hostage in the Hunnish court, having been previously three years a hostage to Alaric the Goth. It is most probable that he was given as surety to the Huns for the safe return of the auxiliary force which they sent in 410 against Alaric. He was the son of Gaudentius, by birth a Scythian or Goth, who had risen from the condition of a menial to the highest rank in the cavalry.

His mother was a noble and wealthy Italian, and at the time of his birth his father was a man of praetorian dignity. Aetius, having passed his youth as a hostage at the courts of Alaric and the Hunnish king, married the daughter of Carpileo, was made a count, and had the superintendence of the domestics and palace of Joannes. He was a man of middle size, of manly habits, well made, neither slight nor heavy, active in mind and limbs, a good horseman, a good archer and poleman, of consummate military skill, and equally adroit in the conduct of civil affairs; neither avaricious, nor covetous, endowed with great mental accomplishments, and never swerving from his purpose at the instigation of bad advisers; very patient of injuries, desirous at all times of laborious occupation, regardless of danger, bearing without inconvenience hunger, thirst, and watchfulness; to whom it is known to have been foretold in his early youth that he was destined to rise to great authority.

Such is the character given of him by a contemporary writer; to all which might have been added, that he was a consummate villain, a treacherous subject, a fake Christian, and a double dealer in every action of his life. In 423 his patron Joannes, known by the name of John the tyrant, (which title only implies that he possessed himself of unlawful authority) seized the opportunity of the death of Honorius to assume the sovereign power, and sent ambassadors to Theodosius, who threw them into prison. In order to strengthen himself against the attack which he had reason to expect, he dispatched Aetius, who was then superintendant of his palace, with a great weight of gold to the Huns, with many of whom he had become united by close ties of personal friendship, while he was a hostage at their court.

In 425 the Huns entered Italy under the guidance of Aetius. Their number has been estimated at 60,000. It is not known by whom they were commanded, though it has been asserted that Attila was then twenty-five years old and headed the expedition. At this critical moment Joannes was killed, and the subtle Aetius immediately made his peace with Valentinian, who was glad to receive the traitor into favor, on condition of his removing the formidable army of invaders from Italy. Having advanced in compliance with the request of Aetius, and already received the gold of Joannes, they were easily prevailed upon to withdraw by him who had conducted them, and they appear to have returned home without committing any outrages, which marks the great influence that Aetius had acquired over their leaders.

It seems however most probable that they were commanded by Rhuas, who in the succeeding year threatened that he would destroy Constantinople, and probably made an

incursion into the territory of the Eastern emperor, though the marvelous account which is given of the expedition by contemporary writers is a gross and palpable falsehood, which must be detailed only to be confuted.

Theodoret, who lived at the time when this event is said to have taken place, after speaking of the destruction of pagan temples and the general superintendence of Providence, says, “for indeed when Rhoilus the leader of the Nomad Scythians both crossed the Danube with an army of the greatest magnitude, and laid waste and plundered Thrace, and threatened that he would besiege the imperial city, and take it by main force, and utterly destroy it, God having struck him with lightning and bolts of fire from above, both destroyed him by fire, and extinguished the whole of his army”.

Socrates, also cotemporaneous, writes to the following effect: “After the slaughter of John the tyrant, the barbarians, whom he had called to his assistance against the Romans, were prepared to overrun the Roman possessions. The emperor Theodosius, having heard this, according to his custom, left the care of these things to the Almighty; and, applying himself to prayer, not long after obtained the things which he desired; for what straightway befell the barbarians, it is good to hear. Their leader, whose name was Rugas, dies, having been struck by lightning, and a pestilence supervening consumed the greater part of the men who were with him; and this struck the barbarians with the greatest terror, not so much because they had dared to take up arms against the noble nation of the Romans, as because they found it assisted by the power of God”.

Well indeed might the Huns have trembled, and all Europe have quaked even to the present day at the recollection of such a manifest and terrible interposition of the Almighty, if the Hunnish king with an immense army had been so annihilated, and, as Socrates proceeds to say, in pursuance of an express prophecy: but it is easy to demonstrate the falsehood of the narrative.

Theodoret immediately subjoins to the passage cited from him, that the Lord did something of the same kind in the Persian war, when the Persians, having broken the existing treaty and attacked the Roman provinces, were overpowered by rain and hail; that in a former war, Gororanus having attacked a certain town, the archbishop alone broke his lofty towers and engines to pieces and saved the city; that on another occasion a city being beleaguered by a barbarian force, the bishop of the place put with his own hands an enormous stone on a balista or engine called the apostle Thomas, and firing it off in the name of the Lord knocked off the head of the king of the barbarians, and thereby raised the siege. The fellowship of such tales takes away all faith from that which concerns the Huns. But according to Socrates, the event was prophesied by Ezekiel, and the prophecy applied previously by the bishop of Constantinople; and here we arrive at the clue to explain how such a marvelous relation came to be credited.

“Archbishop Proclus (continues Socrates) preached on the prophecy of Ezekiel, and the prophecy was in these words—And thou, son of man, prophesy against Gog the ruler, *Rosh* Misoch, and Thobel; for I will judge him with death and blood, and overflowing rain and hailstones; for I will rain fire and brimstone upon him and all those with him, and on the many nations with him; and I will be magnified and glorified, and I will be known in the presence of many nations and they shall know that I am the Lord”. This prophecy is put together from the second verse of the 38th ch. of Ezekiel. “Son of man, set thy face against Gog, the land of Magog, the chief prince of Meshech and Tubal, and prophesy against him”, and the 22d and 23d verses, “I will plead against him...” The word *Rhos* upon which the application of this prophecy to the Hunnish Rhuas rested, occurs in the Septuagint, though it is not in the Vulgate, the word having been rendered by St. Jerome *head*, and applied to the following word, signifying the head or chief prince of Meshech. The archbishop was wonderfully praised for this adaptation of the prophecy, and, according to Socrates, it was the

universal topic of conversation in Constantinople; and doubtless this adaptation gave birth to the marvelous history.

Rhuas had threatened to destroy Constantinople; while the people were expecting his attack, the archbishop assures them that God had expressly denounced by his prophet that he would destroy Rhuas and his people with fire and brimstone from heaven. Rhuas never came near Constantinople; the archbishop's prediction was confirmed in the important part that concerned the safety of its inhabitants, and the story became current that it had been entirely fulfilled, and that Rhuas and his army had perished accordingly. The story is confined to the Greek divines; not one of the Latin chronicles of that age mentions any expedition of the Huns under Rhuas against the Eastern empire. Bishops Idatius, Prosper, and Jordanes are silent; Cassiodorus and Marcellinus are silent; but if such a manifestation of the Almighty had occurred, or anything that could give color to such a belief had really taken place, Europe would have rung with the rumor of it to its very furthest extremities.

Procopius relates the death of John the tyrant, but nothing concerning Rhuas. To complete the refutation of the tale we learn from Priscus, who was sent on an embassy to the Huns from Constantinople, only twenty-two years after the date of the supposed catastrophe, that Rhuas was alive after the consulship of Dionysius which took place in 429, that is three years after the time when the divine vengeance is said to have overtaken him; and the chronicle of Prosper Tyro says that Rhuas died in 434. The Hungarian annalist, Pray, carrying absurdity to the highest pitch, and aware that Rhuas was alive in 429, asserts that there must have been two kings, one Rugas killed by fire from heaven, and another by name Rhuas his successor; and he accuses all foregoing writers of having confounded them, though there is not the slightest reason for imagining that there were two such kings, except the inconvenient circumstance of his being found alive long after the time when he should have been exterminated, to fulfill the prediction of the Byzantine prelate.

It is known from Jornandes (Jordanes) that Rhuas and Octar were brothers of Mundiuc and kings of the Huns before the reign of Attila, but that they had not the sovereign authority over all the Huns. The date of their accession is no more known than that of Mundiuc.

Pray, who is always expert in distorting the truth to support his own theory, assumes inaccurately from Jornandes that, on the death of Mundiuc, Attila his son was a minor, and that Octar and Rhuas his uncles had been appointed by his father to be his guardians. There is no authority for the supposition, excepting that Calanus says Mundiuc commended his sons with their portion of the kingdom to his brother Subthar.

Octar, otherwise called Subthar, and Rhuas were probably kings in conjunction with their brother. We do not know that Attila was not also a king during their life-time, which the expression of Calanus seems to imply, and even during his father's reign, for his own son had regal authority during his life-time. Octar and Rhuas did not reign over all the Huns, yet after their death and the murder of his brother Bleda, Attila was sole monarch, which seems to imply that Attila and Bleda were the kings who had reigned over those not subject to their uncles. The very circumstance of the joint reign of Attila and Bleda, till the latter was removed by murder, shows that brothers had a concurrent right of sovereignty amongst the Huns, and would lead us to conclude that Octar and Rhuas were associated with Mundiuc, and Calanus expressly says that Subthar (otherwise called Octar) did reign in conjunction with Mundiuc. Pray argues that if they held the throne in their own right, and not as guardians, Obarses, who is mentioned by Priscus as another son of Mundiuc, should have been a king also, which he does not appear to have been; but this is quite erroneous, for Obarses is not said to have been by the same mother; and it is clear, that although the Hunnish kings were allowed to indulge in polygamy, there was one queen with superior rights, whose children alone were entitled to succeed. Attila had a legion of wives and a host of children,

but Priscus only mentions by name three sons, who were children of Creca whom he calls especially his wife and not one of his wives, and they alone succeeded to his dignities, though the other sons wished the kingdom to be equally divided amongst them.

In the obscure period of Mundiuc's reign, the first collision of the Huns with the Burgundians must have taken place, which led to events celebrated in the romantic legends of almost the whole of Europe north of the Danube, of which it is however very difficult to unravel the real history. The Burgundiones (supposed to be the Frugundiones of Ptolemy) had their earliest recorded kingdom near the Vistula, on the borders of Germany and Sarmatia. At that time *Born-holm* or *Burgundar-holm* in the Baltic seems to have been their sacred place of deposit for the dead, an island perhaps consecrated like Mona or Iona.

From the Vistula they appear to have advanced to the Oder, and having approached the Rhine in 359, as early as 413 they established themselves, 80,000 in number, on the Gallic side of that river. Athanaric is the earliest of their chiefs who is recorded to have reigned near the Rhine, marrying Blysinda daughter of Marcomir, who was the sire of Pharamond. His eldest son Gondegesil succeeded him, and dying, left the crown to his brother Gundioc or Gondaker, who had three sons, Gondegesil, Gondemar, otherwise called Gunnar or Gunther, and Gondebod.

The royal family of the Burgundians were called Nibelungian or Nifflungian, and were supposed to have brought with them a great treasure of gold which was probably removed from Born-holm. During the reign of Mundiuc the Huns made successful incursions into the territory of the Burgundians, plundered their towns, and reduced them to a state of dependence: The Arian priests took advantage of their miserable and depressed state to inculcate their doctrines amongst them, representing idolatry to be the cause of their reverses; whereupon the Burgundians embraced a qualified sort of Christianity, and were baptized into the Arian faith. Octar, after the death of his brother, proceeded in the year 430 with a large army of Huns into Burgundy to chastise their apostate and rebellious vassals; but he was defeated with great slaughter, and perished in the expedition, though probably not in battle. Elated by this success, the Burgundian king seems to have thought himself strong enough to fight single-handed against all opponents, and, instead of courting the alliance of any one of the great powers, disposed himself to make head against them all.

When the unexpected death of John the tyrant had rendered abortive the invasion of Italy by the Huns under the guidance of Aetius, that skillful negotiator made his terms with Valentinian and Placidia, and the chief command of the army in Gaul was the reward which he immediately received for the dismissal of the Huns. In the very next year he delivered Arles from the Visigoths, and in 428 he recovered from Clodion, king of the Franks, the parts of Gaul near the Rhine which had been occupied by him, and in the following year he overpowered the Juthungi in Bavaria.

Having brought to an end the Vindelician or Bavarian war, in the autumn or the following spring he defeated the Burgundians who were pressing sorely on the Belgians, and on that occasion the Huns, Herulians, Franks, Sauromatians, Saliens, and Gelons fought against him. This conflict must have taken place immediately before the disaster of Oetar's army, when the Huns and their auxiliaries were probably invading some part of the Belgic territory, and the check they received on that occasion may have encouraged the Burgundians to revolt and overpower them.

In the year 432 Bonifacius his rival, who had been urged to acts of treason, and betrayed by the perfidy of Aetius, returned from Africa to Rome, and obtained the dignity of Master of the forces. A personal conflict took place between them, in which Aetius was worsted, but his antagonist died a few days after from the effects of a wound which he had then received. Aetius retired to his villa, but an attempt having been there made upon his life by the partisans of Bonifacius, he fled into Dalmatia, and from thence he proceeded to the court of Rhuas king



of the Huns in Pannonia. The great influence, which he had obtained amongst them, had suffered no diminution, and at the head of a Hunnish army he once more threatened the throne of Valentinian. The Romans called the Visigoths to their assistance, but no engagement took place on this occasion; Placidia and her son submitted to the demands of Aetius, and he returned again with accumulated honors to command the army in Gaul. His antagonists were now the Burgundians, who must have provoked the Romans by making inroads or attempting to establish themselves on the territory of the empire; and in 435 he completely routed them with exceeding great slaughter, and forced their king to throw himself upon his mercy.

In the meantime immediately after the restoration of Aetius to favor, his protector Rhuas had died, and Attila had succeeded to the throne in Pannonia. His brother Bleda reigned over a portion of the Huns, apparently nearer to the confines of Asia. It is not known with certainty which was the eldest, the fact not being stated by any author of decisive authority; but as Priscus, whenever he mentions them in conjunction, places the name of Attila first, and Jordanes states that he succeeded to the throne with his brother Bleda, the presumption is very strong that Attila was the eldest.

The Hungarian writers who have attributed to Attila the extraordinary age of 124, state also that he was born and died on the same days of the year as Julius Caesar, and that he was seventy-two years old when he was made king, considering that he acceded to the throne in 402, and that he was an efficient commander of the troops, when the Huns entered Europe in 374. This monstrous absurdity is only surpassed by the assertion, that, after his death, a son, said to have been borne to him by the Roman princess Honoria, fled to the father of Attila, who was still living in extreme old age and debility.

The words of Priscus, who was personally acquainted with Attila, afford a decisive refutation to those who attribute to him extraordinary longevity and a protracted reign. He states on the authority of Romulus the father-in-law of Orestes, the favorite of Attila, with whom he conversed in the presence of Constantius who had been secretary to Attila, and of Constantiolus a native of Paeonia which was subject to him, that no king, either of the Scythians or of any other country, had done such great things in so short a time. The date of Attila's accession to the supreme power, at least over that portion of the Huns, which was in contact with the Romans, is fixed with great precision by comparing the words of two contemporary writers.

Priscus says that Rhuas, being king over the Huns, had determined to wage war against the Amilsuri, Itamari, Tonosures, Boisci, and other nations bordering on the Danube, who had entered into confederation with the Romans. Thereupon he sent Eslas, who had been accustomed to negotiate between him and the Romans, to threaten that he would put an end to the subsisting peace, unless the Roman would deliver up to him all those who had fled from the Huns to their protection. The Romans, desirous of sending an embassy to Rhuas, fixed upon Plinthas of Scythian, and Dionysius of Thracian, extraction, both generals and men of consular dignity. It was however not thought expedient to dispatch the ambassadors before the return of Eslas to the court of his sovereign, and Plinthas sent with him Sengilachus, one of his dependants to persuade Rhuas to treat with no other Roman than himself. "But (continues Priscus) Rhuas having come to his end, and the kingdom of the Huns passed unto Attila, it seemed fitting to the Roman Senate, that Plinthas should proceed upon the embassy to them". Dionysius was not consul till 429, and the chronicle of Prosper Tyro fixes the death of Rhuas in 434. In that year therefore it appears that Attila succeeded to the throne of his uncle in conjunction with his brother Bleda, who ruled over a considerable distinct force of Huns, but may perhaps have resided near Attila in Pannonia.

The manner of the death of Rhuas is not recorded, the relation of his destruction by fire from heaven before Constantinople being disproved; but the language of Jordanes throws a strong suspicion upon Attila of having removed him by murder, for after mentioning his

succession to his uncles, and relating that he slew his brother, to obtain an augmentation of power, he adds that he had proceeded by the slaughter of all his relatives. We have no reason to believe that any other relative stood between him and the supreme authority, and it is not credible that Jordanes should represent a single act of fratricide as the murder of all his family. It is barely possible, that, although Rhuas did not die by lightning before Constantinople, as alleged by the Greek ecclesiastics, it may have been given out by his murderers in 434, that he was struck by lightning, and that he may even have been destroyed by some explosion of chemical fire, as was probably the case with the emperor Carus, who is universally said by old historical writers to have been struck by lightning while lying sick in his tent; though it cannot be reasonably doubted, on reading the letter of his secretary, that he was murdered by his chamberlains.

The age of Attila at the time of his accession cannot be ascertained. Rejecting as absurd the accounts of his great age, we cannot assent to such an abridgement of his life as Pray has made, in order to accommodate his notion of an undivided and hereditary monarchy. Assuming that he must have been a minor when his father died, and forgetting that, if his uncles had occupied the sovereign authority merely as guardians, they would have been bound to resign it when Attila arrived at manhood, and that he was not of a character to live until twenty-six years of age, if unjustly excluded, without making any attempt to possess himself of his hereditary rights, he assigns twenty years to him, as the maximum of his age in 428, when his father died, and twenty-six when he succeeded Rhuas in 434. But he has entirely overlooked a circumstance which shows the inconsistency of this calculation; which is, that, if Attila by the Hunnish laws could not have reigned under the age of twenty-one, his son could not have done so; yet in 448 Priscus, having been at the court of Attila, relates the elevation of the eldest son of Attila and Creca by his father's directions to the throne of the Acatzires and other nations near the Euxine. If barely twenty-one in 448 he must have been born in 427, and Attila must have been married to Creca at least as early as 426, two years before the death of Mundiuc, at which period according to Pray's calculation he could have been but eighteen years old; and it would not be easy to show that the Hunnish monarch was likely to establish his son by marriage to that woman who amongst his numerous wives was to give heirs to the throne, while it was still deemed necessary to hold him in tutelage.

That Attila must have been married to Creca before the year 427 is all that we can ascertain; if barely twenty-one at that time, he must have been born as early as 406, and would have been twenty-eight when he succeeded Rhuas, but it is most likely that he was older. Creca was perhaps his first wife, and her children on that account heirs to the throne, and it is most likely that he was raised to the rank of a petty king during the life of his father. The old Scandinavian legends, concerning which more will be said hereafter, speak much of his residence at the court of Gundioc or Giuka king of Burgundy, (calling Attila by the name of Sigurd) and of his intimacy with Gundaker or Gunnar the Burgundian prince. In all these accounts he is described as the greatest warrior of his age. It is very probable that Attila was employed in the first subjugation of the Burgundians, and, while they remained in vassalage under the Huns, the young prince of Burgundy must, in the natural course of things, have served under Attila in his campaigns against the petty chieftains of the neighbouring countries.

In consequence of the death of Rhuas, by a decree of the senate which was approved by the emperor Theodosius, Plinthus was dispatched to the court of Attila without Dionysius, and at his special request it was decreed, that Epigenes, who had served the office of quaestor, a man much considered on account of his learning, should accompany him. They proceeded to Margus a town of Moesian Illyria near the Danube, opposite the fortress Constantia which was on the northern bank, whither the two Hunnish kings had resorted. Attila and Bleda

advanced without the walls on horseback, not choosing to receive the Roman embassy on foot.

The Roman ambassadors, consulting their dignity, mounted their horses also, that they might be on equal terms with the Huns; but, notwithstanding their momentary exaltation, they proceeded immediately to sign a most disgraceful treaty, which was ratified by the oaths of either party, according to the customary ceremonials of their respective countries.

The Romans bound themselves to send back to the Huns all those who, at however distant a period, had fled from their dominion and taken refuge under Roman protection, and also all Roman prisoners who had escaped from captivity without paying ransom, and in default of the restoration of any such prisoner, eight pieces of gold were to be given for each head to their former captors. They further promised to give no assistance to any barbarian nation, that should wage war against the Huns. It was agreed that trade should be carried on between the two powers on equal terms, and that peace should continue between them so long as the Romans failed not to pay seven hundred pounds weight of gold annually to the Huns, the tribute exacted until that time having been no more than three hundred and fifty pounds. Thereupon the fugitives were actually given up, amongst whom were two youths of the blood royal, Mama and Atakam, who were immediately crucified in Carsus a fortress of Thrace, as a punishment for their flight.

In this year the Roman princess Honoria, having disgraced herself by an illicit connection with her chamberlain Eugenius, and her pregnancy having been detected, was expelled from the palace at Ravenna, and sent by her mother Placidia to Theodosius at Constantinople, where she was placed under the superintendence of his sister Pulcheria, who lived under a religious vow of celibacy, to which she adhered even when, after the death of her brother, she espoused Marcian as a support to the throne, but excluded him from conjugal rights. The princess, not less ambitious than devoted to pleasure, secretly excited Attila against the Western empire by the tender of her hand. He does not appear to have accepted the proposal at the time, and the offer was perhaps repeated at a later period, when it suited his plans to demand her in marriage. Having concluded peace on such advantageous terms with the Romans, Attila with his brother Bleda marched against some tribes of Scythians, who had either not yet submitted to the authority or had presumed to shake off the yoke of the Huns, and they immediately attacked the Sorosgi in the east of Europe. This expedition was undoubtedly attended with the success that usually crowned the arms of Attila, but the particulars of it have perished with the lost work of Priscus. Having reduced his Scythian adversaries, he turned his thoughts to avenge the overthrow of his uncle by the Burgundians, and in 436 he vanquished them with great slaughter and the loss of their sovereign.

In the year 437 the Romans, undoubtedly through the influence of Aetius, obtained the assistance of a body of Hunnish auxiliaries, who were conducted by the Roman general Litorius against the Visigoths then laying siege to Narbonne. The two armies were drawn up in line against each other, and showed the most determined countenance, and it seemed as if the fortunes of Theodoric must depend upon the issue of that day, but the collision of these formidable armies was suspended by negotiation, the Goths and the Huns shook hands upon the field of battle, and Attila was appeased by the concessions of the Visigoths. What advantages he obtained by this bloodless victory and the dereliction of the Roman interests, we are not informed by Jornandes who relates the circumstance, but he styles Attila at this period the sole ruler of almost the whole Scythian nation throughout the world, and of marvellous celebrity amongst all nations, a statement which very ill accords with the suggestions of Pray, who makes him a novice just emerged from the tutelage of his uncles.

Two years after however Litorius appeared again in the field against Theodoric at the head of an army of Huns, who seem to have been subsidized by the Romans. The Huns fought with their usual valour, and the victory was for a while doubtful, but the unparalleled rashness

and imprudence of Litorius rendered the exertions of his troops unavailing. He was taken by the Goths, and led ignominiously through the streets of Narbonne; the Hunnish auxiliaries were completely routed, and we do not hear of their ever again having acted in concert with the Romans. From this time we have no account of any proceedings of the Huns in Gaul, till the year of the great battle of Châlons, and the attention of Attila appears to have been principally directed against the Eastern empire.

It is exceedingly difficult to adjust the dates and particulars of the several events that are mentioned by different writers. The capture of Margus and Viminacium, which seems to have been the first act of hostility against Theodosius, has been referred by Belius to the year 434, immediately after the reduction of the Sorosgi, but it is not credible that Margus should have been captured by the Huns, immediately after the peace concluded there. On the contrary, the account of Priscus makes it evident that those events directly preceded a more important attack on the dominions of Theodosius, and they are clearly referable to the year 439, following immediately the disaster of Litorius in Gaul. During the security of a great annual fair in the neighbourhood of the Danube, the Hunnish army fell unexpectedly on the Roman, seized on the fortress which protected them, and slew a great number of their people. Remonstrances were made concerning this flagrant breach of faith, but the Huns replied, that they were by no means the aggressors, because the bishop of Margus had entered their territory, and pillaged the royal domain; and that, unless he was immediately delivered into their hands, together with all the fugitives whom the Romans were bound by treaty to give up, they would prosecute the war with greater severity. The Romans denied the truth of their complaint, but the Huns, confident in their assertion, declined entering into proofs of their accusation, and, having crossed the Danube, carried war and devastation into the forts and cities of their enemies, and, amongst others of less importance, they captured Viminacium, a Mysian city in Illyria. So fallen was the spirit and vigour of the Roman empire, that, notwithstanding the alleged innocence of the bishop of Margus, it began to be pretty loudly suggested that he ought rather to be delivered up to the vengeance of the barbarians, than the whole territory of the empire exposed to their atrocities. The bishop, aware of his perilous situation, secretly passed over to the enemy, and offered to deliver up the town, if the Scythian princes would enter into terms with him. They promised him every possible advantage, if he would make good his proposal, pledging their hands and confirming the agreement by oaths; whereupon the bishop returned into the Roman territory with a great force of Huns, and having placed them opposite the bank of the river in ambush, in the night time he arose at the appointed signal, and delivered up the town to its enemies. Margus having been thus taken and sacked by the Huns, they became daily more formidable, and waxed in strength and insolence.

In the following year (441) Attila collected an army consisting specially of his own Huns, and wrote to the emperor Theodosius concerning the fugitives in the Roman territory and the tribute which had been withheld from him on occasion of the war, demanding that they should be instantly delivered up, and ambassadors sent to arrange with him concerning the payments to be made in future; and he added that if they made any delay or warlike preparations, he should not be able to restrain the impetuosity of his people. Theodosius showed no disposition to submit; he peremptorily refused to yield up the refugees, and answered that he would abide the event of warfare, but that he would nevertheless send ambassadors to reconcile their differences, if possible. Thereupon Senator, a man of consular dignity, was sent by the emperor to treat with Attila; he did not however venture to traverse the territory of the Huns even under the protection of the character of an ambassador, but sailed across the Euxine to Odessus, the modern Odessa, situated near Oczakow on its northern extremity, where the general Theodulus, who had been dispatched on a like mission, was at that time abiding, without having succeeded in obtaining an audience. In what quarter



Attila was then stationed, is not recorded, but he had probably advanced with his army, before the negotiator reached his destination; for on the receipt of the answer of Theodosius, being greatly incensed, he made an immediate and sanguinary irruption into the Roman dependencies, and, having taken several fortresses, he overwhelmed Ratiaria, a city of great magnitude and very populous, which stood near the site of Artzar, a little below Vidin on the Danube. He was accompanied by his brother on this inroad, and they laid waste a great part of Illyria, demolishing Naissus, (Nissa) Singidunum, (Belgrade) and other flourishing towns. Seven years after, the sophist Priscus on his embassy to the court of Attila, passed by the desolated site of Naissus, and saw the ruins of that exterminated town, and the country strewn with the bones of its inhabitants.

The succeeding campaign was ushered in by the appearance of a comet of great magnitude, which added to the terror of the Hunnish arms, and a fatal pestilence raged throughout Europe. The brothers renewed the ravage of Illyria, and stretched their victorious course to the extreme shores of Thrace. In this expedition only we hear of Persians serving under Attila together with Saracens and Isaurians, but it is certain that no part of Persia was reduced under his dominion, though the Bactrian king of the Caucasian Paropamisus is said to have been amongst his military vassals.

Arnegisclus was entrusted by Theodosius with a great army to stop the progress of the invader, but he was completely routed on the shore of the Chersonese; the enemy approached within twenty miles of Constantinople, and almost all the cities of Thrace, except Adrianople and Heraclea, submitted to the conqueror. The army, which was quartered in Sicily for the protection of the eastern provinces, was hastily recalled for the defence of Constantinople, and Aspar and Anatolius, masters of the forces, were sent to negotiate with the invaders, whose progress they had small hope of arresting in the field of battle. A treaty or rather a truce for a year was concluded with the Huns by Anatolius, according to which the Romans consented to give up the fugitives, to pay 6000 pounds weight of gold for the arrears of tribute, and the future tribute was assessed at 2100 pounds of gold; twelve pieces of gold were to be the ransom of every Roman prisoner who had escaped from his chains, and on default of payment he was to be sent back to captivity. The Romans were also compelled to pledge themselves to admit no refugees from the dominions of the Huns within the limits of the empire.

The ambassadors of Theodosius, too haughty to acknowledge the grievous necessity to which they were reduced, of accepting whatever terms the conqueror might think fit to impose, pretended to make all these concessions willingly; but, through excessive dread of their adversaries, peace upon any conditions was their paramount object, and it was needful to submit to the imposition of such a heavy tribute, though the wealth not only of individuals, but of the public treasury, had been dissipated in unseasonable shows, in reprehensible canvassing for dignities, in luxurious and immoderate expenditure, which would not only have been misbecoming a prudent government in the most prosperous affluence, but was especially unfitting for those degenerate Romans, who, having neglected the discipline of war, had been tributary not only to the Huns, but to every barbarian that pressed upon the several frontiers of the empire.

The emperor levied with the greatest rigor the taxes and assessments which were necessary to furnish the stipulated tribute to the Huns, and those even whose lands, on account of the destructive inroads of the barbarians, had been for a while discharged from the payment of taxes, either by a judicial decision, or by imperial indulgence, were compelled to contribute. The senators paid into the treasury the gold which was required from them beyond their means, and their eminent situation was the cause of ruin to many of them; for those, who were appointed by the emperor to levy the rate, exacted it with insolence, so that many persons, who had been in affluent circumstances, were forced to sell their furniture and the

trinkets and apparel of the women. So grievous was the calamity of this peace to the Romans, that many hanged themselves in despair, or perished by voluntary starvation. The treasury being immediately emptied, the gold and the fugitives were sent to the Huns, Scottas having arrived at Constantinople from the court of Attila to receive them. Many however of the fugitives, who would not surrender to be delivered up to their inexorable countrymen, from whose hands they would have suffered a cruel and lingering death, were slain by the Romans to propitiate the enemy; and amongst those were some of the blood royal of Scythia, who, refusing to serve under Attila, had fled to the Romans.

Attila was not however contented with these severe exactions, but proceeded to summon the Azimunthians to surrender the captives they had taken from the Huns and their allies, and the Roman refugees whom they harboured, as well as those whom they had retaken from them. Azimus was a fortress of great strength, not far from the Illyrian frontier, but appertaining to Thrace. The inhabitants of this formidable post had not only resisted the attacks of the Huns within their walls, so that no hopes were entertained of reducing them, but had successfully sallied out against the invaders, and discomfited in many reenounters the numerous forces and most expert commanders of the barbarians. Their scouts traversed the country in every direction, and brought them sure intelligence of every movement of the enemy; and, whenever the Azimunthians received information that they were returning from an inroad laden with the plunder of the Romans, they concerted measures for intercepting their passage, and falling unexpectedly upon them, though few in number, by the most resolute and enterprising valour, aided by a perfect knowledge of the intricacies of the country, they were usually successful, and not only slaughtered many of the Huns, but rescued the Roman prisoners and gave shelter to the deserters from the pagans.

Attila therefore declared that he would not withdraw his army, nor consider the conditions of the treaty fulfilled, until the Azimunthians should have dismissed all their captives, and delivered up to him the Romans who were in the fort, or paid the stipulated ransom.

Neither Anatolius by negotiation, nor Theodulus by the array of the army which was entrusted to him for the protection of Thrace, could divert Attila from this determination, for he was enhardened by success, and ready in a moment to recommence his operations, while they were dejected and discouraged by the recent disaster.

Letters were therefore sent to Azimus, requiring them to liberate their captives, and to send back the Romans who had been rescued, or twelve pieces of gold in lieu of each of them. The Azimunthians replied that they had suffered the Romans, who had fled to their protection, to depart at their pleasure, but that all the Scythian captives had been slain; excepting two whom they retained, because the Huns, after having for a while besieged their fortress, had placed themselves in ambush, and carried off some children who were tending the flocks at a short distance from the walls, and that, unless those were restored, they would not give up the captives they had made in war.

Enquiries were instituted concerning these children, but they were not forthcoming, and, the Hunnish kings having made oath that they had them not, the Azimunthians set free their captives, and swore likewise that the Romans had departed from amongst them; but they swore falsely, the Romans being still in the fortress, while they held themselves absolved from the guilt of perjury by the countervailing merit of having saved their countrymen. It appears from this account, which is detailed by Priscus, that the Azimunthians were a hardy race in possession of an impregnable mountain hold, where they rendered a very qualified allegiance to the emperor, and probably closed their gates against his tax-gatherers.

About this period, probably in the campaign of 442, Attila asserted that he had possessed himself of the ancient iron sword, which from the earliest recorded time had been the God of the Scythians. A herdsman, tracking the blood of a heifer which had been

wounded in the leg, was said to have discovered the mysterious blade standing erect in the sod, as if he had been flung forth from heaven, and carried it to Attila, who received it as a fresh revelation of the sword of *Ares* or *Areimanius* which had been worshipped by the ancient Scythian kings, but had long disappeared from earth. He accepted it as a sacred badge and evidence that the power of the spirit of war was committed to him, and a certain presage of the approaching universality of his dominion.

The prevailing expectation of the advent of the Messiah, mankind being greatly ignorant of the true character of Him who was to come, had encouraged Octavius Caesar to assume the title of Augustus, and pretend to divine honors; and it was perhaps not merely the flattery of his courtiers, but the real opinion of those who expected a divine revelation at that period, that represented him as a present God.

The era of Attila was marked by a very general expectation of the revelation of Antichrist. It has been already mentioned that it was prophesied to Aetius in his youth that he was to be some great one; by which expression is meant a divine incarnation.

Symmachus in his panegyric of Gratian amongst his orations discovered and edited by Maius, stated about sixty-five years before that he heard the prophets of the Gentiles were whispering, that the man was already born, to whom it was necessary that the whole world should submit; that he believed the presage, and acknowledged the oracles of the enemy.

There seems to have been a strong opinion entertained in Italy that the fortunes of Rome could only be upheld by making her the head of the barbarous nations and of all paganism, and in this spirit Symmachus had pleaded before Valentinian in 384 against Christianity, and, as his oration is styled, on behalf of his sacred country. The great object of this party in Rome was to give a Roman ruler to the Gentiles, instead of receiving an emperor from them. With this view the traitor Stilicho, a nominal Christian, educated his son in paganism and the most bitter animosity against the Christians.

When Radagais invaded Italy, the people looked to Stilicho for salvation, and it was carried by acclamation in Rome, that the neglected rites of their ancient Deities must be immediately renewed. After Honorius had cut short the traitor, dispersed his barbarian satellites, and driven into banishment his panegyrist the poet Claudian, who was a decided pagan, and probably died at the court of some heathen king, Aetius became the head of this party, with like views and deeper villainy. To him it had been prophesied that he was the great one whom the nations were expecting. His son Carpileo was sent to be educated amongst the heathens; he had, by long residence both at the Gothic court of Alaric and amongst the Huns of Attila, familiarized himself with all the leading characters of Europe.

The pious and eloquent Prudentius was too remote from these odious machinations to have suspected the sincerity of Stilicho, and saw in him only the saviour of the empire and defender of Christianity; and it is probable that with like hypocrisy Aetius, whose wife was certainly a Christian, imposed on the credulity of Leo, who appears to have highly regarded him; which is the least creditable circumstance known concerning that pontiff. Exerting his great military talents no further than suited his hidden views, and balancing all the powers of Europe with the nicest artifice, that no one might obtain the universal dominion which he expected ultimately to snatch from them all, he proceeded steadily in his object, till Valentinian cut him short at the moment when the death of Attila had probably determined him to declare himself.

The minds of all men both in the Roman empire, and amongst the heathen nations of Europe, being thus strongly tinctured with the expectation of the revelation of a predestined and distinguished person, who was to establish a new and prevailing theocracy, the importance of assuming that character to himself could not escape the penetration of Attila; and it is not impossible, that, educated as he was in the cradle of superstition, he may have believed that the great destinies to which he pretended were really awaiting him. We learn

from Jordanes, who quotes the authority of Priscus, that he acquired very great influence by the acquisition and production of the venerated sword. The title which he assumed is said to have been, Attila, grandson or rather descendant of the great Nembroth or Nimrod, nurtured in Engaddi, by the grace of God king of Huns, Goths, Danes, and Medes, the dread of the world. He is represented on an old medallion with *teraphim* or a head on his breast

We know from the Hamartagenia of Prudentius that Nimrod with a snaky-haired head was the object of adoration of the heretical followers of Marcion, and the same head was the palladium set up by Antiochus Epiphanes over the gates of Antioch, though it has been called the visage of Charon. The memory of Nimrod was certainly regarded with mystic veneration by many, and by asserting himself to be the heir of that mighty hunter before the Lord, he vindicated to himself at least the whole Babylonian kingdom.

The singular assertion in his style that he was nurtured in Engaddi, where he certainly never had been, will be more easily understood on reference to the twelfth chapter of Revelation concerning the woman clothed with the sun, who was to bring forth in the wilderness, "where she hath a place prepared of God", a man-child, who was to contend with the dragon having seven heads and ten horns, and rule all nations with a rod of iron.

This prophecy was at that time understood universally by the sincere Christians to refer to the birth of Constantine who was to overthrow the paganism of the city on the seven hills, and it is still so explained: but it is evident that the heathens must have looked upon it in a different light, and have regarded it as a foretelling of the birth of that great one, who should master the temporal power of Rome. The assertion therefore that he was nurtured in Engaddi, is a claim to be looked upon as that man-child who was to be brought forth in a place prepared of God in the wilderness. Engaddi means a place of palms and vines in the desert; it was hard by Zoar, the city of refuge, which was saved in the vale of Siddim or demons, when the rest were destroyed by fire and brimstone from the Lord in heaven, and might therefore be especially called a place prepared of God in the wilderness, like the garden of Amalthea, in which Bacchus was fabled to have been brought up. That such a title was either actually assumed by Attila, or given to him by those who favoured his pretensions, may be established by the total ignorance of the historians who have recorded it of its meaning, and the extraordinary fact being stated by them without any comment Engaddi was also the seat of the Essenian cenobites, that remnant of the inhabitants of Sodom, who before the advent of our Savior had set the example of the most profligate abominations under the mask of holiness and austerity; and a fitter cradle could hardly have been devised for an Anti-Christian adventurer.

He was certainly not king over the Medes, but the title was probably assumed when he had been on the point of undertaking an expedition to reduce them, which Priscus ascertained to have been his intention, and would probably have been carried into execution, if his life had been prolonged. Notwithstanding the vague accounts of early Danish history, which have been put together from Scandinavian legends, the name of Danes appears to have been scarcely known before this period.

Servius, whose commentary on Virgil had perhaps been then written a little more than twenty years, probably makes the first mention of the name, saying that the Dahae, a people of Scythia adjoining to Persia on the north, were called also Dani. Picrius writes concerning the same passage, that the Dahae and Dacians were the same people. Jornandes a century after the time of Attila, first names the Danes in Denmark, stating them to be a distinguished race of superior stature amongst the Codani, with whose name that of the south of the Baltic, called Sinus Codanus, is identical.

Procopius gives an account of the migration of the Herulians from the vicinity of the Danube through the tribes of the Danes into Thule, the modern Thylemark. Nicolas Olaus says that he found it stated in an old Hungarian chronicle that the Danes formerly inhabited



the region of Hungarian Dacia, and betook themselves to the maritime parts of the north of Europe through fear of the Huns. If the Dacians who had migrated northwards bore at that time the name of Danes on the coast of the Baltic, they were not of sufficient importance in themselves to have merited such a particular mention in the title of the great monarch, unless because he actually occupied Dacia.

It is however exceedingly probable that the particular mention of Danes, had reference to the prevailing opinion that Antichrist was to be of the tribe of Dan, founded upon the prophecy of Jacob in the 49th chapter of Genesis, "Dan shall be a serpent by the way, an adder in the path, that bites the horse's heels, so that his rider shall fall backward. I have waited for thy salvation, O Lord", which last words seem to imply that the posterity of Dan would not await it, as Jacob had done, and from the circumstance of the tribe of Dan not being sealed in Revelation.

We are informed by several writers that in the reign of Attila, a certain mysterious person, who is called a second Moses in Crete, that is coming in the spirit of Moses, deceived the Jews in that island, pledging himself to lead them back through the sea with dry feet to the land of promise. Those who linked themselves together by the hair, and sprang off a cliff into the sea at his suggestion, all perished; a few were converted to Christianity and escaped. The Rabbis and rabbinites assure us that there cannot be a second Moses, coming in the power of Dan, unless his soul be an emanation of Cain the fratricide. Postel states that the Moses in Crete was such an one as Antichrist. Werner Rolewink in his *fasciculus temporum* makes the second Moses synchronize with Patric's voyage to Ireland.

Father Colgan, in his *Trias thaumaturge*, says that the magic wand, which was transmitted by Adam and Nimrod to Moses, passed into the hands of Jesus Christ, and from him was transmitted to Patric; who spent forty days and forty nights in a mountain, fasting and conversing with God, saw God in a burning bush, and died at the same age as Moses, (viz. 120) and his eye was not dim, nor his natural strength abated; and from these and other coincidences, he is called the second Moses.

St. Patric is also said to have summoned all the serpents and venomous creatures to the top of a mountain over the sea and bade them jump down, and they were all drowned. It cannot be overlooked on reading the several passages relating to the second Moses, that the story appears to have a more intimate connection with the affairs of Attila, than is stated on the face of any one of the extracts; for the writers proceed immediately from the narration of Attila's acts to this strange account, and again from it to Attila's invasion of Gaul. Whether such a man as Patric actually existed, and was sent on a secret mission by Attila to prepare the way for himself as Antichrist, as we read in the Scandinavian sagas that Attila sent Herbut on a mission to king Arthur in Great Britain, or whether Patric was merely a fictitious name used by those in Ireland, who looked to the coming of Attila as Antichrist, to represent his power and his kingdom, it may be difficult to determine; but the Cretan tale seems to be connected with the legend of St. Patric, and that legend to have reference to the expectation that Attila would establish an universal antichristian dominion. When we are told that a person deceived the Jews with the expectation of leading them back to the land of promise, coming as a second Moses, and such an one as Antichrist, that no second Moses could come in the power of Dan, except an emanation from the soul of Cain the fratricide; that Attila affected particularly the title of king of the Danes, and that he did murder his brother like Cain, and attempt to establish an antichristian universal empire, we have some reason to conclude that Attila did pretend to come in the power of Dan, and in the spirit of Moses as a lawgiver.

Having thus arrayed himself with superhuman pretensions, as predestined to overthrow that empire, which, in compliance with the predictions of the Sibyl, Romulus was said to have consecrated with the blood of Remus, Attila proceeded soon after to murder his brother Bleda.

The exact mode of his death is not known; he is said to have been slain and cast into the Danube; according to one account a dispute arose concerning the name to be given to the new town of Sicambria, which either brother wished to call after his own, and the modern Buda is said to be a version of the name Bleda. The tradition of the twelve birds seen by Romulus and the six seen by Remus, bears a strong appearance of having been founded on some true prophecy concerning the duration of the ever memorable Roman empire, and it is very remarkable that Attila murdered his brother Bleda, and may be supposed to have consecrated by his blood the new city of Sicambria, which he intended to make the seat of a new empire to supersede that of Rome, exactly twelve centuries after the alleged revelation of the twelve birds to Romulus; 755 being the years of Rome before Christ, and 445 after Christ, the date of the murder of Bleda, making exactly twelve centuries from his death to that of Remus. If we add six single years for the six birds of Remus, it brings us to the year 452 on which Attila, master of nearly all Italy, was expected to enter Rome; if instead of six single years we add six lustra or periods of five years by which the Romans were wont to number the lapse of time, it brings us precisely to the year 476 in which the Roman empire was finally extinguished by Odoacer.

It is not easy to believe that such wonderful coincidences are accidental, especially when we recollect that this is not a subsequent interpretation of the augury, built upon the events that actually took place, but it had been thus explained in the oldest times; and, as the period drew near, the most learned men, both heathen and Christian, were looking for its accomplishment, and it is not unlikely that Attila used for his ensign a vulture bearing a golden crown with reference to the birds of Romulus. Varro, as cited by Censorinus, had written that he had heard Vettius a distinguished augur and a man of great genius and learning say, that if the facts related by historians concerning the foundation of the city by Romulus and the twelve vultures were true, the Roman state would endure twelve hundred years, since it had already survived the 120th year.

The pagan poet Claudian who was contemporary with and involved in the ruin of Stilicho, had stated that the people dreading the invasion of the Goths counted the years numbered by the twelve vultures, and from the expiration of the twelfth century anticipated the overthrow of Rome. Sidonius Apollinaris bishop of Clermont, who wrote a few years after the death of Attila alluded in two passages to the fate prognosticated to Rome by the twelve vultures. It is therefore quite certain that Attila must have been aware of this prediction, and of the interpretation which was given to it by Christians and pagans at this period, and had been handed down from remote antiquity; and it is as certain that such a circumstance must have had great weight with a man attempting to establish an empire which was to supersede that of Rome, and to be built in like manner upon the worship of the sword-god Mars; and it can scarcely be doubted that this prediction and a consideration of the received history of Romulus had its share in exciting him to murder his brother Bleda.

Aiming at the establishment of universal dominion by the influence of superstition and religious awe, as well as by the force of arms, he could no more have overlooked the fact, that the twelve centuries of Romulus were actually expiring in the year when he followed his fratricidal example, than it had escaped the flatterers of Augustus that in his time the seventy weeks of Daniel were expiring amidst the intense expectation of the nations.

The same year that witnessed the elevation of Attila to the sole power amongst the Huns by the removal of his brother, brought a fresh attack upon the Eastern empire, though neither the causes which led to the renewal of hostilities, nor the events of the campaign have been handed down to posterity. After a pause of one year, probably obtained by fresh concessions from Theodosius, the war was renewed on a greater scale than ever in 447.

The forces of the Western empire afforded no assistance to their Eastern brethren, and not less than seventy cities were taken and ravaged by the Huns. It was a fierce contest, and

greater than the former wars of the Huns; the castles and towns of a large tract of Europe were levelled to the ground. Arnegisclus made a memorable stand against Attila and fought valiantly, but fell in the battle, and the total discomfiture of his army left the whole of Thrace at the mercy of the conqueror. In this campaign the celebrated Arderic king of the Gepidae distinguished himself under Attila, who was supported by the Ostrogoths and a portion of the Alans, and various other nations serving under their respective kings.

The whole extent south of the Danube, from Illyria to the Black Sea, was ravaged by the Huns, whose army swept a breadth of five days journey as they advanced. Jordanes says that Arnegisclus fell at Marcianopolis, close to Varna near the shores of the Black sea. Marcellinus says the conflict took place on the banks of the Utus, which flows into the Danube a little to the east of Sophia, a place very far in the rear of Attila's advanced position, which Marcellinus himself states to have been at Thermopolis, supposed to mean Thermopylae. The probability is therefore, that the battle was fought near Marcianopolis. If it was fought near the Utus, Attila must have pursued his uninterrupted course afterwards through Macedonia and Thessaly. Theodosius in this dilemma attempted to tamper with the kings under Attila, and excited against him the princes of the Acatzires on the northern side of the Euxine. Attila is said to have been alarmed at this intelligence, and to have been fearful that the territory which he had ravaged to the south of the river, would be unable to support his immense army, and was induced by prudential motives to listen to the negotiators of Theodosius.

The immediate danger to the empire was averted by the conclusion of a truce, and Attila now turned his arms against the Acatzires, a Hunnish race dwelling on the borders of the Black sea, who were governed by a number of petty kings. Theodosius had offered them bribes, to induce them to withdraw from confederation with Attila. The messenger however, who was charged with the imperial presents, did not distribute them according to the estimated rank of the several princes, so that Curidach who was the senior king, received only the second present. Incensed at this, and considering himself to have been slighted and deprived of his due, he called in the aid of Attila against the other princes of the Acatzires. Attila without loss of time, sent a considerable force against them, slew some, and reduced the rest to subjection. He then invited Curidach to partake in the fruits of the victory, but he, suspecting some design against his person, and adroitly adapting his flattery to the pretensions which Attila had lately advanced, on the production of the divine sword, made answer, that it was a formidable thing for a man to come into the presence of a God; for if no one could steadfastly behold the face of the sun, how should he without injury look upon the greatest of divinities. By these means, Curidach retained his sovereignty, while the power of the rest was yielded up to the Hun.

Attila now sent ambassadors to Constantinople, to redemand the fugitives from his territory. He seems to have been at all times particularly irritable concerning those who withdrew themselves from subjection to his authority by flight to the Christians, and the certainty of their execution, if recaptured, rendered their protectors very unwilling to surrender them.

On this occasion his legates were received with great courtesy, and loaded with presents, but they were dismissed with assurances that there were no refugees at Constantinople. Four successive embassies were dispatched to Theodosius, and enriched by the liberality of the Romans; for Attila, aware of the gifts by which his ambassadors were conciliated through fear of an abrupt infringement of the truce, whenever he wished to confer a benefit upon any of his favourites or dependants, found some excuse for sending them on a mission to enrich themselves.

The Romans obeyed him as their lord and master, and submitted to all his demands, not only dreading the renewal of hostilities by the Huns, but harassed by the warlike preparations

of the Parthians, the maritime attacks of the Vandals in the Mediterranean, the inroads of the Isauri, and the repeated incursions of the Saracens who laid waste the eastern parts of the empire. They humbled themselves therefore towards Attila, and temporized with him, while they were preparing to make head against their other enemies, and levied troops, and made choice of generals to oppose them.

In the following year (*AD* 448) Edécon, who is called a Scythian, a man highly distinguished by his military exploits, was sent to Constantinople by Attila, together with Orestes, who was of Roman extraction, dwelling in Paeonia near the Savus, which had been ceded to Attila by a treaty concluded with Aetius the commander of the forces of the Western empire.

Edécon proceeded to the imperial palace, and delivered the letters of Attila, in which he reiterated his complaints touching the fugitives, and threatened that he would have recourse to arms again, unless they were delivered up to him and the Romans desisted from ploughing the lands which he had lately wrested from them, or at least overrun. The territory which he claimed extended on the southern bank of the Danube, from Paeonia to the Thracian Novae, with a breadth of five days journey for an active man; and he forbade the Illyrian fair being held as heretofore on the banks of the Danube, but in Naissus which he had utterly destroyed, and now appointed to be the boundary between his states and the Romans. He demanded that the most distinguished men of consular dignity should be sent to his court to arrange all matters in dispute, and threatened, that if they should delay, he would advance to Sardica.

The letter having been read, Edécon delivered the message of his sovereign through the interpretation of Bigilas, and withdrew with him through another quarter of the royal palace, to visit Chrysaphius the shield-bearer of the emperor, who had then much influence. Edécon expressed great admiration at the splendor of the imperial residence, and, when they reached the apartment of Chrysaphius, Bigilas interpreted to him the words in which the Scythian had stated that he admired the magnificence and envied the wealth of the Romans. The eunuch seized this opportunity to tamper with the fidelity of the barbarian, and told him that he should enjoy like opulence and dwell under ceilings of gold, if he would exchange the party of the Scythians for that of the Romans. Edécon replied that it was not lawful for the servant of another master to do this without the permission of his lord; whereupon the insidious eunuch asked him if he had free access to Attila, and influence in the Hunnish court. Edécon replied that he was a confidential attendant, and took his turn with other chosen and distinguished individuals to watch in arms over his safety upon the days allotted to him. Thereupon Chrysaphius said, that if he would pledge himself to the Romans, he would promise him great advantages; but that leisure was necessary to make arrangements, for which purpose he proposed to him to return to supper without Orestes and the rest of the embassy.

Edécon having undertaken to do so, and having returned according to agreement, Bigilas acting as interpreter between them, they pledged their right hands and swore, the one that he would speak of things the most advantageous to Edécon, the other that he would not reveal their discourse, whether he might assent to the proposals or not. The eunuch, satisfied with this promise, proceeded to assure the Scythian that if on his return he would murder Attila and make his escape to the Romans he should enjoy great wealth and luxury. Edécon assented, but stated that money would be necessary to distribute amongst the soldiers under him, that they might assist him without reluctance, for which purpose he required fifty pounds weight of gold.

Chrysaphius would have disbursed the money immediately, but Edécon represented the necessity of his returning first to render an account of his embassy, and of his being accompanied by Bigilas who might bring Attila's answer concerning the refugees, and at the same time a communication from himself to state when and how the gold might be remitted to



him; for that Attila would question him closely according to his custom, what gifts and how much money he had obtained from the Romans; nor should he be able to conceal the truth easily, on account of the numbers who were with him. Chrysaphius assented to this, and when his guest had withdrawn, he proceeded to disclose the treacherous scheme to the emperor, who immediately sent for Martialis, the master or warden of the palace, to whom by virtue of his office all the counsels of the emperor were necessarily confided, as he had the superintendence of the letter-carriers, the interpreters, and the soldiers who kept guard in the palace.

It seemed good to the emperor and these his advisers to send Maximin with Bigilas under the existing circumstances, to the court of Attila: that Bigilas in the character of interpreter should obey the instructions he might receive from Edécon, but that Maximin should have charge to deliver the letter of the emperor, remaining entirely ignorant of the infamous conspiracy which was to be carried on under the cover of his mission. Theodosius wrote in the credentials of the ambassadors that Bigilas was the interpreter, but that Maximin was a man of much greater distinction and very much in his confidence. He exhorted Attila not to infringe the treaty, inasmuch as he then sent to him seventeen refugees in addition to those who had been already delivered up, and assured him that there were no more in his dominions. Maximin was instructed to use his endeavours to persuade Attila not to require an ambassador of higher rank, as it had been customary for his ancestors and the other kings of Scythia, to receive any military or civil envoy; and suggest the expediency of his sending Onegesius to arrange the matters which were under discussion; and represent the impracticability of Attila's conferring with a man of consular dignity at Sardica which had been demolished by the Huns.

Maximin persuaded the sophist and historian Priscus to accompany him on this expedition; and if the eight books which he afterwards wrote had not unfortunately perished, those extracts only being preserved which relate to the embassies, we should not have to lament the insufficiency of our materials for some parts of the history of Attila.

They set forth therefore in company with the barbarians, and proceeded to Sardica, thirteen days journey from Constantinople. Here they tarried, and thought it advisable to invite Edécon and his companions to take their meal with them. The natives furnished them with sheep and oxen, which they slaughtered and prepared for their repast. During the banquet the barbarians exalted the name of Attila, and the Greeks that of the emperor, whereupon Bigilas said that it was not just to compare a God with a man, intimating thereby that Theodosius was the divinity and Attila a human potentate. The guests took great offence at the insinuation, and grew very warm on the subject, but the ambassadors exerted themselves to change the subject and pacify them, and after the supper Maximin presented Edécon and Orestes with silken apparel and oriental jewels. Orestes outstand Edécon, and observed after his departure to Maximin, that he acted well and wisely in not imitating the conduct of those about the emperor; for some had invited to supper Edécon alone, and had loaded him with gifts; but the ambassadors, not being aware of the circumstance to which he alluded, asked him in what respect he had been neglected and Edécon honoured, to which he made no reply, but withdrew.

The subject being discussed in conversation the next day, Bigilas observed that Orestes ought not to have expected to receive the same honors as Edécon, inasmuch as Orestes was the follower and scribe of Attila, but Edécon was very distinguished in warfare, and being of Hunnish blood was in higher estimation; after which he addressed Edécon in his own language, and subsequently informed the ambassadors, that he had told him what had been said by Orestes, and with difficulty had allayed his anger on the subject, but the historian does not rely implicitly on the veracity of the interpretation.

Arriving at Naissus five days journey from the Danube, they found it demolished by the Huns, but some sick persons were abiding in the ruins of the temples. The party sought for a clear place to unyoke their beasts of burden, for the whole bank of the river was strewn with the bones of those who had fallen in the war; an incident which furnishes a horrible picture of the desolating atrocity of Hunnish warfare, by which the whole population of a distinguished town had been exterminated, and as yet after the lapse of several years, there had been none to bury their remains.

On the following day they visited Agintheus who commanded the forces in Illyria, and had his quarters not far from Naissus, that they might deliver to him the injunctions of the emperor, and receive from his hands five refugees who were to make up the complement of seventeen, concerning whom he had written to Attila, and who were to be delivered up to his relentless indignation. Agintheus, as he was ordered, surrendered the ill-fated fugitives, softening the harshness of the act towards them by the expression of his unavailing regret.

On the succeeding day they continued their journey from the mountains of Naissus towards the Danube, passing through some woody and circuitous defiles, so that those who were unacquainted with the country and imagined they were travelling westward, were astonished in the morning at seeing the sunrise opposite to them, and fancied it was a prodigy portending the subversion of all established order, till it was explained to them that on account of natural impediments, that part of the road was necessarily turned towards the east.

From the mountainous passes they issued into a level and woody district, where barbarian ferrymen received the whole party into canoes which they had themselves scooped out of solid stems, and conveyed them across the Danube. It seems that they had travelled night and day, excepting when they halted at Sardica, at Naissus, and after the interview with Agintheus. The boats had not been prepared for the ambassadors, but to ferry over the river a multitude of Attila's people, whom they met on the way, for Attila had made a pretence of desiring to hunt in the territories wrested from the Romans, though in fact it was a preparation for war, which he meditated under the pretext that all the refugees had not been delivered up to him.

Having crossed the Danube, and proceeded about 70 stadia or a little more than eight English miles, they were made to halt on a plain, while the attendants of Edécon carried the news of their arrival to Attila. In the evening, while they were at supper, two Scythians arrived at their quarters, and ordered them to proceed to Attila, but having been requested to alight from their horses, they partook of the meal, and on the following morning served as their conductors. About the ninth hour of the day they reached the numerous tents of Attila, and being about to pitch their own on a knoll, the barbarians forbid it, because those of Attila were on the level ground.

The Romans having therefore established themselves where they were directed, Edécon, Orestes, Scottas, and others of the principal men, intruded themselves, and began to make enquiries into the objects of the embassy. At first the Romans looked at each other with surprise and gave no answer to the unbecoming questions, but the barbarians were troublesome and urgent in the enquiries, whereupon they were told that the message of the emperor was unto Attila, and no other person. Scottas answered angrily that they were sent by their leader to make this enquiry, and had not come to gratify their own curiosity. The Romans represented that it was nowhere customary for ambassadors without entering into the presence of the person to whom they had been sent to be called upon to declare the objects of their mission through the intervention of other persons; that the Scythians who had been on missions to the emperor well knew this, and that, unless admitted into the presence, as the ambassadors of Attila had always been, they would not communicate their instructions.

The messengers of Attila returned to him, and soon after coming back without Edécon, declared to the Romans all the particulars concerning which they were sent to treat by the

emperor, and ordered them, if they had nothing further to communicate, to take their departure as speedily as possible.

The Romans were amazed, and, being unable to conjecture through what channel the secrets of the emperor had been divulged, thought it prudent to decline giving any answer, unless admitted to the royal presence; whereupon they were ordered to depart instantly. While they were preparing for the journey, Bigilas blamed them for the answer they had given, saying that it would be better to be detected in a falsehood, than to return without accomplishing their purpose; and asserted that if he could have come to the sight of Attila, he should easily have persuaded him to recede from his dispute with the Romans, having become well acquainted with him, when he had accompanied the mission of Anatolius; whence Edécon was also well disposed towards him; so that, under pretext of the embassy, by speaking truth or falsehood, as occasion might require, they might complete the arrangements touching the conspiracy against Attila, and the transmission of the gold which Edécon had stated to be necessary, that it might be divided amongst the satellites: but he little suspected, that he had been betrayed, for Edécon, whether his promises, as is most probable, had been deceitful from the first, or he had taken alarm, lest Orestes, indignant at what had passed at Sardica, should report to Attila that he had had separate and private conferences with the emperor and Chrysaphius, had divulged the whole conspiracy to the Hun, both the quota of gold that had been required, and the points concerning which the Romans had been instructed to negotiate.

The orders of Attila had been peremptory, and although it was night, the ambassadors, hungry and cold, were under the necessity of making ready for their departure, when a second message from the great king enjoined them to tarry till a more seasonable hour; and at the same time he sent them an ox and some river fish, on which they supped and retired to rest, hoping that he might be more favourably disposed on the morrow; but in the morning the same messengers returned, ordering them to depart, if they had nothing else to communicate.

They prepared therefore once more for the journey, notwithstanding the earnest suggestion of Bigilas, that they should answer that they had other things to set forth. The historian Priscus, through friendship to Maximin, who appeared very much dejected at the disgraceful issue of his mission, taking with him Rusticius, who understood the Hunnish language, for an interpreter, went to Scottas, and promised him ample presents from Maximin, if he would obtain for him an interview with Attila; assuring him that the subject matter of the embassy was not only important to the two nations, but personally to his brother Onegesius who was then absent from the court; and he adroitly added, that he understood he had great weight with Attila, but that he should better know how to estimate his importance, if he could prevail in this point. Scottas replied, that he had quite as much influence as Onegesius, and would prove it; and he mounted his horse immediately, and rode to the tent of the monarch. Priscus returning to Maximin found him and Bigilas lying on the grass, and, having declared what he had done, and recommended to Maximin to look out the gifts for Scottas and consider what he should say to Attila, was much applauded, and those amongst the retinue, who were actually starting, were called back, and their departure was suspended till the result of the application of Scottas should be known. While they were thus employed, they were summoned by Scottas to the presence of Attila.

Entering they beheld the monarch seated on a wooden throne, and guarded by a numerous circle of barbarians. Maximin alone approaching saluted him, while the rest of the Romans stood aloof; and, having delivered the letter of Theodosius, he said that the emperor prayed for the health and prosperity of him and his people. Attila answered, "May it be to the Romans, as they wish to me", and immediately turning his discourse to Bigilas, he called him a shameless beast, and asked how he presumed to come before him, knowing what terms of peace had been concluded between himself and Anatolius, and that no ambassadors should

have been sent to him before all the refugees had been delivered up. Bigilas having replied, that there was no refugee of Scythian blood remaining in the empire, for that all had been given up, he waxed more angry, and exclaimed with loudness and violence, that he would crucify him, and give him for food to the birds, if he were not scrupulous of infringing the laws concerning ambassadors by awarding to him the just punishment of his impudence, and the rashness of his speech; for that many refugees were still amongst the Romans, whose names he ordered the secretaries to read from a tablet. After that had been performed, he commanded him to depart immediately, and Eslas to accompany him and bear a message to the Romans, that every fugitive, since the time when Carpileo the son of Aetius had been sent to Attila as a hostage from the Western empire, must be forthwith delivered up; inasmuch as he would not suffer his own servants to bear arms against him, however little they could avail for the protection of the Romans: “for”, he added, using nearly the language of Sennacherib, “which of all the cities or fortresses that I have thought fit to capture, has been successfully defended against me?” He further directed them after having delivered his message concerning the fugitives, to return and inform him whether the Romans chose to surrender them, or to await the war which he should wage against them; but he commanded Maximin to stay for his answer to the letter of Theodosius, and enquired for the presents of the emperor, which were given to him. The ambassadors retired to their tents, where Bigilas expressed his surprise at the violent demeanour of Attila towards him, who had been formerly received with so much gentleness. The Romans imagined that the conversation at Sardica, in which Bigilas had called him a mortal and Theodosius a divinity, must have been related to him by some of the guests, who were present at that banquet; but Bigilas, who had intimate acquaintance with the Hunnish court, would not credit the suggestion, saying that no one excepting Edécon would dare to enter into discourse with him on such matters, and that he would undoubtedly be silent, not merely on account of his oath, but through fear that he might be condemned to death for having been present at, and lent himself to, secret counsels against the life of his sovereign.

While these matters were under discussion, Edécon returned, and, drawing Bigilas aside, renewed the subject of the gold which he required for distribution, and, after giving directions concerning its payment, he withdrew. Priscus, the friend of Maximin, who was kept in ignorance of the atrocious conspiracy, having enquired into the subject of that conversation, Bigilas who was himself deceived by Edécon, eluded the enquiry by saying that Edécon had complained that he was brought into trouble on account of the detention of the fugitives, and that all of them should have been delivered up, or ambassadors of the highest dignity sent for the purpose of pacifying Attila.

A further command was presently issued by the monarch, that neither Bigilas nor any of the Romans should buy any Roman captive or barbarian slave, or any horse or other article except necessary provender, until the differences should be adjusted; and this he did with subtlety, that Bigilas might have no excuse for bringing the gold which was promised to Edécon; and, under pretence of writing an answer to Theodosius, he required the Romans to await the return home of Onegesius, that they might deliver to him the presents sent by the emperor.

Onegesius was at that time absent, having been sent to establish the eldest son of Attila and Creca on the throne of the Acatares, whose reduction has been already mentioned. Bigilas was therefore dispatched alone with Eslas to bring back the answer concerning the refugees, but in truth to afford him an opportunity of fetching the gold, and the rest were detained in their tents, but after one day's interval they were made to proceed together with Attila towards the north of Hungary.

The ambassadors had not travelled far in the suite of the Hunnish monarch, when their conductors directed them to follow a different road, for Attila thought fit to tarry in a certain



hamlet, where he had determined to add his daughter Eskam to the number of his wives. We are informed by Priscus that this marriage was conformable to the law of the Scythians. His expression is somewhat remarkable, and literally rendered is, “where he purposed to marry his daughter Eskam, having indeed many wives, but espousing this one also according to Scythian law”. Some writers have taken occasion from this passage to assert that there was no prohibition amongst the Huns to any marriage, however repugnant to propriety on account of relationship, and St. Jerome has made a similar declaration, probably with no better foundation, concerning the Persians, amongst whom incest was no more generally permitted, than polygamy was amongst the Jews. The instances of two wives recorded in the case of Lamech, and of Jacob, and Elkanah, are evidently particular cases departing from the established practice, and the permission given to the kings of the Jews to possess many wives and concubines, was the consequence of the Lord’s having conceded to the Jews, as a punishment for their perverse entreaties, “a king over them, that they might be like all the nations”; a king therefore having all the privileges enjoyed by the adjoining potentates, namely that they could do no wrong and might take any number of wives, however nearly related to them in blood, notwithstanding the prohibition that had been given prospectively concerning them, that they should not multiply their wives, a prohibition which was certainly respected by the generality of the Jews.

The words of Priscus do not imply that either polygamy or incest were lawful to all the Huns, but that it was lawful to Attila, as it had been to Cambyses, on account of his prerogative. The Hungarian writers, indignant at the reproaches cast on the morals of their supposed ancestors on this occasion, have attempted to make it appear that the lady espoused by Attila was not his child, but the daughter of a man named Eskam, considering the undeclined name Eskam to be a genitive case, and rendering the preceding word *the daughter of* instead of his daughter. On a careful consideration of the construction of sentences in the Greek written by Priscus and others of that period, it will be apparent that the words cannot mean to marry the daughter of Eskam.

While Attila was revelling with his new bride, the ambassadors were conducted onward across a level country, and traversed several rivers in canoes or boats used by the people who lived on their banks, similar to those in which they had crossed the Danube. The next in size to that river were stated to have been the Drecon, the Ugas, and Tiphesas, which last is the Teiss, but it has not been found practicable to identify the two others. The lesser streams were passed in boats that were carried on wagons by the barbarians through the country which was liable to be flooded.

Millet was brought to the Romans for food from the villages instead of wheat, and mead instead of wine, together with a sort of beer made from barley which was called by the natives *cam*. After a long and weary journey, they pitched their tents at evening near a lake of clear water which the inhabitants of a neighbouring hamlet were in the habit of fetching for drink.

A violent storm of wind and rain with exceedingly vivid lightning came on immediately after they had encamped, and not only overset their tents and laid all flat, but washed away their provisions and furniture into the lake. The Romans were so terrified, that they fled in various directions, floundering through the tempest in the dark night, to avoid the same fate as their chattels, till they fortunately met again in the village hard by, where they were very clamorous to be supplied with everything they wanted. The Scythian cottagers ran out of their hovels and inquired into the cause of their vociferations, and being informed by the barbarians who were in company that they had been put to confusion by the storm, they invited them in, and kindled speedily a cheerful blaze with dry reeds.

The mistress of the hamlet was a lady, who had been one of the wives of Bleda, and hearing of the misadventure of the Romans, she sent to them a present of victuals, and also paid them the singular compliment, which however was a usual practice of honourable

hospitality amongst the Huns, of sending them some beautiful Scythian women, who were enjoined to comply with all their wishes; but the ambassadors were either too decorous or too disheartened to be desirous of availing themselves of the offer, and declined the favours which were destined for them. The ladies were regaled with a portion of the supper and dismissed, and the ambassadors, having taken their repose in the cottages of the natives, proceeded at daybreak in search of their equipments, part of which they found on the spot where they had encamped, part on the banks of the lake, and part in the water; but the whole of their goods was recovered, and they tarried all day in the hamlet to dry them in the sun, which shone out brilliantly after that stormy night. When due attention had been paid to the beasts of burden, they proceeded to visit the queen, and, having saluted her, they returned thanks for her hospitality, and presented her with three silver vessels, some crimson fleeces, Indian pepper, dates, and other articles for desert, which not being found amongst the barbarians were valuable to them.

Having thus returned her compliment, they took their leave and proceeded on their journey for seven days, till the Scythian conductors made them halt in a village on their way, because Attila was coming in that direction, and it was not allowable for them to travel before him. At this place they fell in with ambassadors from the Western empire, Count Romulus, *Primutus praefect* of Noricum, and Romanus general of a division. Constantius was with them, whom Aetius had sent as a secretary to Attila, and Tatullus the father of Orestes who was with Edécon, not being members of the legation, but having undertaken the journey through private motives, the former on account of his previous intimacy with them in Italy, the latter from relationship, his son Orestes having married the daughter of Romulus from the city Patavion in Noricum. Their object was to pacify Attila, who required that Silvanus, a Roman silversmith, should be delivered up to him, because he had received some golden vessels from another Constantius, a native of Western Gaul, who had also been sent as a secretary by Aetius to Attila and Bleda. When the Huns were laying siege to Sirmium in Paeonia, those vessels had been delivered to Constantius by the bishop of the place for his own ransom in case he should survive the capture of the city, and to redeem others amongst the captives if he should have fallen; but Constantius after the taking of Sirmium was faithless to his trust, and pawned the vessels for money to Silvanus, to be redeemed within a given time, or the sale of them to stand good.

Attila and Bleda, having suspected this Constantius of treason, crucified him, and Attila, hearing what had been done concerning the golden vessels, demanded Silvanus to be given up, as a robber of his property. The object of the embassy was therefore to persuade Attila that Silvanus was no thief, but that having taken the goods in pawn from Constantius, he had sold them as unredeemed pledges to the first priests who wished for them, because it was not lawful to sell them for the use of laymen, as they had been consecrated. The ambassadors were directed to try to prevail upon Attila to give up his claim to the vessels for this reason, and, if he persevered, to offer him gold in their stead, but on no account to give up the innocent silversmith to be crucified. The two parties of Eastern and Western Romans followed the route of Attila, and, after crossing some more rivers, they arrived at a large village, where Attila had a fixed residence.

It is not possible to gather, from the statement of the journey of the ambassadors, the exact situation of this place, but the number of days they had travelled makes it evident that it must have been in the north of Hungary. They had not however arrived at the Carpathian mountains. Tokay has been mentioned by Buat as the most probable site. It has been also conjectured that the tents of Attila, which were first visited by the legation, were pitched opposite Viddin, and that Jasberin was the site of the royal village; but other writers have been of opinion that it was in that part of Moldavia which produces neither stone nor wood, for Priscus states that there was none in the neighbourhood, and that the stone, with which the

baths of Onegesius were built, was brought out of the land of the Paeonians. That they did not cross the Danube near Viddin is however evident, because it lies north-east of Nissa, and Priscus says their general course was westward of that place; and it seems that they must have crossed a little below Belgrade, and passed the Themes, the Bega, and the Theiss in the first instance, and afterwards the large tributary rivers which fall into the Theiss from the westward, and shaped their course towards Tokay. Jornandes calls the three rivers named by Priscus, the Tysia, Tibiscia, and Dricca. Tibiscus is the known name of the Theiss, and Tysia is probably a river falling into the Theiss which may have given to it the modern name. Nothing is known concerning the Dricca. To have reached Moldavia they must have traversed the rivers of Wallachia, shaping their course eastward after visiting the tents of Attila; but the only certain fact is that they did cross the Theiss, which lay in the contrary direction, and having done so they could only have reached Moldavia by recrossing that river, and threading one of the three passes through the mountains that separate it from Transylvania, neither of which suppositions is consistent with the narrative of Priscus. In another passage that writer states that the land of the Paeonians was by the river Saus, and it is certain from two passages in Menander, that Saus was the Saave, which falls into the Danube from the opposite side a little below the Theiss, and the land in question was evidently the modern Sirmia near Belgrade, whence the stone might easily be carried up the river Theiss to Tokay in boats, but could not with any degree of probability have been conveyed to Moldavia. The facility of water-carriage probably induced Onegesius to procure the stone from Sirmia, for although there might be stone nearer in the mountains to the north, the conveyance of it would have been more difficult, and the Huns were probably from their habits impatient of labour in the quarries.

In the same situation, or not far distant, on the right of the Theiss, was the strong hold and palace of the king of the Avar Huns, which was called the Hring and was destroyed by the armies of Charlemagne in 796, and is said by the writers of that period to have subsisted many centuries. These stupendous works are mentioned by Jordanes, who says they were called Hunniwar by the Huns, but he does not describe them; and it is observable that the name of Ring by which they were known in the eighth century is also a Teutonic word, which probably had descended from the Huns of Attila, to the Avars who then occupied them. Priscus uses an expression equivalent to ring, when he speaks of the enclosure, which surrounded the dwelling of Attila, by the Greek word *peribolos*. In the reign of Charlemagne, we find the marvellous fortifications of the Huns occupied by the Avars, who acquired the ascendancy at a period subsequent to the death of Attila, by whom they had been subdued, and afterwards were called Huns by the neighbouring nations.

These works are particularly described by Notgerus Balbus, commonly called the Monk of St. Gall in a passage of most difficult construction. He states, that the land of the Huns was surrounded by nine circles; and that when, imagining the circles to be common hedges, he asked Aldabert, who had served under Charlemagne, what was the wonder, he learned from him that one circle was as wide, or comprehended in itself as much, as the distance from Constance to a place called Castrum Turonicum, of which the site in all probability cannot now be ascertained.

The abbot of Saint Gall was under the jurisdiction of the bishop of Constance, and Castrum Turonicum must have been some place in that neighbourhood not having a see. It does not mean Tours, which was Caesarodunum Turonum. He goes on to state, that each circle was so constructed with stems of oak, beech, and fir, that it was twenty feet wide and twenty high; that the whole cavity was filled with hard stones, or tenacious chalk, perhaps meaning mortar. The surface was covered with sods. Between, bushes were planted, which (according to the probable meaning of the expression) were cut after the manner of clipped hedges. Between these circles, hamlets and villages were so placed, that the human voice

could be heard from one to another. Opposite these buildings, narrow doors were fabricated in the strong walls. “Also (he adds) from the second circle, which was constructed in like manner as the first, there was an extent of twenty Teutonic, which are forty Italian, miles unto the third. In like manner even unto the ninth; although the circles themselves were much more contracted one than another; and from circle to circle tenements and habitations were so arranged in every direction, that by the sound of trumpets the signification of everything could be comprehended at the distance between each of them”.

From the very obscure passage of which the above is a close translation, we learn first that the distance between the two outer circles was equal to that of Constance from an unknown town; that the distance between the second and third was forty Italian miles of five thousand feet, equal to near thirty-eight English miles. The word also might seem to imply that the distance between the first and second circle, or between Constance and Castrum Turonicum, was also about thirty-eight English miles, but that would give too great a diameter. It is much more difficult to explain what follows; it may imply that the spaces between the circles were invariably equal, adding the mere truism, that the circumference of the inner concentric circles was necessarily smaller than that of the outer; or it may imply that the walls were built in the same manner throughout, but that the inner spaces were narrower. If the former interpretation be adopted, which certainly appears more conformable to the words, and the spaces between the several rings, and between the inner ring and the centre be considered to have been similar, that is, thirty-eight English miles, the diameter of the outer circle would be six hundred and eighty-four miles, and would enclose a great deal more than the whole of Hungary, and is inconsistent with what we have reason to believe, that the rings were situated between the Danube and the Theiss.

A circle of about one hundred and fifty miles diameter will enclose the greater part of Upper Hungary between those two rivers, the Mora, and the Krapac mountains, and such was probably the site and extent of those great works, supposing the space between the two exterior belts to have been less than between the second and third, perhaps sixteen miles, and the remaining twenty-one miles of the radius, or forty-two of the diameter, to have been divided amongst the seven interior. The inner portion would thus have consisted of seven concentric circles, like the town of Ecbatana, as described by Herodotus, to which two wider belts were superadded. The celebrated labyrinth of Crete was perhaps a structure of the same kind.

Eginhart, notary of Charlemagne, in his *Annales*, says that in 791 the emperor defeated the Huns upon the Danube, drove them from their fortifications, and penetrated to the mouth of the river Arrabon or Raab. That in 796 Eric duke of Friuli plundered the Ringus, and that later in the same year, Pepin having driven the Huns across the Theiss, and utterly demolished their palace, “which is Ringus, but is called by the Lombards Campus”, sent their treasures to Charlemagne. In his *Vita Caroli Magni*, the notary says the wars with the Huns lasted eight years, and were so bloody that all the dwellings in Pannonia were destroyed, and not a vestige of a human habitation remained in the place where the palace of the *chagawn* had been situated.

The anonymous annals of Charlemagne say that in 791 he took the defenses of the Avars, advanced to the Raab, and retired; and in 796 he received a message in Saxony, which informed him that Pepin was lodged with his army in the Ring. The unknown author of another *Vita Caroli Magni*, says that in 791 the Huns abandoned their works near the Danube, and he marched to the river Raab. In 796 Henry duke of Friuli (for Henry and Eric are different forms of the same name) having sent a force into Pannonia, plundered the Ring of the Avars, who were divided by civil war, the *chagawn* having been murdered by his own people; and he sent their treasures, which had been accumulated there during a long course of centuries, to Charlemagne. That in the same year Thudun came over to him with a great part



of the Avars, and was baptized; and before the end of that year (796) a message was received by Charlemagne, that Pepin had come to blows with the new *chagawn* and his nobles, and again a second message that Pepin was lodged in the Ring.

Another author who wrote about the year 858, says that in 796 Pepin arrived at the celebrated place which is called Rinch, where the Huns surrendered to him. An ancient Saxon poet, who wrote in the reign of Arnolf, AD 888, gives a similar account, and says that Pepin beat the Huns beyond the Theiss, and leveled to the ground their royal residence called Hring. It is quite clear that the palace or royal residence in which the plunder of Europe had been then stored up for three or four centuries was the central ring or circle of the nine circumvallations which have been described; and, as they had existed for centuries, there is no reason to doubt that they were the identical fortifications which Jordanes states to have existed in the time of Attila under the name of Hunniwar. The central ring was perhaps in the neighbourhood of Gomor in Upper Hungary. It is observable that Eusebius, speaking of the six concentric walls to the Babylon of Nebuchadnezzar, calls them by the same word (*periboloi*) which is used by Priscus in describing the residence of Attila.

A passage concerning the abode of the Hunnish monarch in Saemund's Edda, which has been entirely misunderstood by the Latin translator, and which the annotator calls one of the passages in the poem which cannot be solved, alludes to the concentric circumvallations as having existed in the time of Attila, and it was only difficult, because he knew not the nature of the defences to which it refers. It may be translated literally thus. "They saw the land of Attila and deep towers; the fierce men stand in that high bourg, the hall around the people of the South, surrounded with set-beams, with circles bound together, with white shields, the obstacle of spearmen. There Attila was drinking wine in his divine hall. The warders sat without." The translator renders the word *sess-meithom*, seat-beams, and explains it thus, that the hall had wooden seats round it, and that either a bundle of shields was hung over head above the seats, or single shields tied together suspended against the wall. On reference to the detailed account of the Hunnish fortifications, it is evident that the set-beams are the stems (*stipites*) with which the circumvallations were constructed; that the circles bound together are the concentric belts or rings; that the white shields are a figurative illustration of the same, white, because as the Monk of St. Gall says, they were made with chalk, and shields, as explained in the next line, because they were obstacles opposed to the attack of an enemy.

The editors could not have found this easy solution of the passage in Scandinavian literature, and they looked no further. The conformity of these various and very ancient authorities gives strong reason for assuming that Attila had (to use the remarkable expression of Ammianus Marcellinus when speaking of the circular positions of the Alans) *circumcircated* the district of Upper Hungary, and that hither Priscus was conducted; not to the inmost ring, but the village situated perhaps on the outside of its eastern entrance near Tokay, as Sicambria the favourite abode of Attila near Buda was perhaps at its southern entrance; but it is possible that the exterior belts may not have been constructed till a later period. The dwelling of Attila, and that of Onegesius, are both described by Priscus, as being surrounded with a circular construction of wood, which he calls *peribolos*, not for security, but for ornament, which shows the affection the Huns had for the Ring in their architecture. The palace of Attila exceeded all the other structures in size and conspicuous appearance. It was built with massive timber, and beautifully polished planks, and adorned with towers. The dwelling of Onegesius was the next in importance, but not ornamented with towers, though in like manner environed by a wooden ring, formed of upright timber close set in the ground. At a short distance were the baths which Onegesius, who had great wealth and influence amongst the Huns, had caused to be constructed of stone from the Sirmian quarries, by a captive architect who was a native of Sirmium, and had vainly hoped that his manumission would be the reward of his labours; but Onegesius, after the building was completed, made the

unfortunate architect superintendant of the bath, and caused him to wait upon himself and his friends during their ablutions.

As Attila made his entry into this village, a number of damsels advanced to meet him, arranged in ranks under, white veils of exceeding fineness, which were of great length, and so extended and held aloft by the hands of the women, that under every one of them walked seven or more damsels, singing Scythian airs, and the rows of young women thus placed under the veils were very numerous.

The way to the royal residence lay by the dwelling of Onegesius, and, as Attila was passing it, the wife of Onegesius came out with a multitude of servants bearing dressed fish and wine, which is the highest compliment amongst the Huns, and she saluted Attila praying him to partake of her liberality. He, wishing to appear gracious to the wife of his confidential friend, ate as he sat upon his horse, a table of massive silver being lifted up to him by the attendants; and, having tasted of the cup offered to him, he retired into his own palace, which was placed in a more elevated situation than the other buildings, and overlooked them.

The ambassadors were invited into the house of Onegesius, who had returned together with the son of Attila, and they dined there, being received by the wife of Onegesius and the most distinguished of his relatives; for he had not leisure to partake with them, having been summoned to make a report of the transactions of his mission to Attila, who had not before seen him since his return, and to detail the particulars of the misadventure of Attila's son, who had broken his right arm by a fall. When they withdrew from the hospitable board of Onegesius, the Romans pitched their tents in the neighbourhood of the palace of Attila, that Maximin might be at hand to confer with him or his counsellors. Early the next morning Priscus was sent by Maximin to Onegesius to present to him the gifts which he brought on his own part and that of the emperor, and to learn whether the favourite would grant him an interview, and at what time.

The Huns had not risen so early as the Romans, and, the doors being all closed, the historian remained with the menials who bore the presents, waiting without the ring of timber that surrounded the buildings, until some person should happen to come out. While he was walking up and down to beguile the time, he was surprised on being addressed by a man habited as a Hun who bade him hail in the Greek language, which was rarely spoken by any amongst them, except captives from Thrace or the coast of Illyria, and those might be at once recognized by the miserable and squalid condition of their garments and hair; but this man appeared to be a Scythian in excellent plight, with his hair neatly cropped all round.

Having returned his salutation, Priscus was informed that he was a Greek who had gone to attend the fair at the Mysian city Viminacium on the Danube, where he had married a rich wife and established himself; but, on the capture of that town by the Huns, he and all his wealth had fallen to the lot of Onegesius, in the division of the spoil amongst the principal followers of Attila. Sometime after, having fought valiantly in company with the Huns against the Romans and Acatzires, according to the Scythian law he had regained his liberty by surrendering to his master all the plunder he had made in the war; and, having a place at the table of Onegesius, he was well satisfied with his present condition: for that the Huns, when the labours of warfare were at an end, lived without any cares, enjoying their possessions without any molestation, and in perfect security. On the other hand he drew a melancholy picture of the state of the empire, of which the subjects were easily taken or slain in war, because the jealousy of their masters prevented their being entrusted with arms for their own defence, and that even those, who carried arms on behalf of the Romans, suffered grievously from the incapacity and inertness of their officers; but that in peace the case was even worse than in war, through the weight of taxes and the extortion of evil men in power, the laws not being equally administered to all, but transgressed with impunity by the rich and powerful, while strictly carried into operation against the indigent, if indeed they survived the period of

a protracted and ruinous lawsuit; and so deeply rooted was the corruption of justice, that no man amongst them could hope for the protection of the laws, without conciliating by money the favor of the judge and his dependants.

The historian according to his own account attempted to reply to the censures of the apostate Greek by a feeble panegyric on the system of Roman jurisprudence, without contradicting the facts that were alleged. This brought forth a brief observation, which appears to have been unanswerable and uncontroverted, that the constitution of Rome might be good, and her laws excellent, but that both were perverted by the corruption of those who administered them.

The door having been at length opened accidentally, Priscus eagerly enquired for Onegesius, stating that he came from Maximin the ambassador of the Romans; but this application did not procure admission for him, and he was requested to wait till the Hun should come forth. Onegesius having appeared soon after, accepted the gold and presents, which he ordered his attendants to carry into the house; and he replied to the request which Maximin made for an interview, that he would visit the Roman in his tent. This he did soon after, and, having thanked him for the presents, enquired upon what account he had requested an interview.

Maximin expressed an earnest desire that Onegesius should personally proceed into the Roman territory, and enquire into and adjust the points in dispute favourably to the emperor. Onegesius rejected with indignation all tampering with his allegiance, asking if they imagined that he did not esteem servitude under Attila to be more honourable than independent wealth amongst the Romans; but added that he could be more useful to them by remaining where he was and softening the frequent irritation of his monarch, than by going amongst them and exposing himself to blame, if he should act in any respect against the opinion of Attila.

Before he departed, Onegesius consented to receive the future communications of the ambassador through the intervention of Priscus, because the high dignity of Maximin would have rendered frequent and protracted interviews with him unbecoming and probably liable to suspicion. On the following day the historian penetrated the ring which enclosed the mansions of Attila, being the bearer of presents to Kreka (or Creca) his principal queen, who had borne him three sons, of whom the eldest had been raised to the rank of king over the Acatzires and other tribes bordering upon the Euxine. The various buildings within the enclosure were of wood; some constructed with planks expertly fitted together and beautified with pannels or carvings of in sculpture; others of straight massive timber perfectly squared and planed, and ornamented in relief with highly wrought beams or mouldings.

The visitors having been admitted by the Huns, who were standing at the door, found the queen reclining upon a soft counterpane, the floor of the room being delicately carpeted, and opposite to her were sitting upon the carpet damsels employed in embroidering veils or scarfs, which were worn by the Huns over their clothing for ornament. Having saluted her and presented the gifts, Priscus withdrew, and, waiting for Onegesius who was known to have entered the residence of Attila, he proceeded towards some of the other buildings, in which he then resided, without any interruption from the guards to whom he was known. Standing amidst the crowd of people, he observed the multitude in motion, and a press and noise, as if the monarch was coming forth; and presently he saw him, accompanied by Onegesius, issue from his dwelling, bearing himself haughtily and casting his eyes round on all sides.

Many, who had controversies, came before him, and received in the open air his sentence on the points in dispute; and, after the close of his judicial labors, he re-entered the house and gave audience to the ambassadors of various barbarian nations. Priscus continued to await the leisure of Onegesius in the palace court, where he was accosted by the ambassadors from the Western empire, who inquired whether Maximin had received his dismissal, or was under the necessity of remaining.

Priscus replied that he was waiting for Onegesius to ascertain that very point, and enquired into the success of their mission, but was informed by them that Attila was quite inexorable and denounced immediate war against Valentinian, unless either Silvanus or the golden vessels were delivered up to him. Priscus, having expressed his surprise at the arrogance of Attila, received some interesting information from Romulus, whose sources of knowledge were undeniable, his daughter being married to Orestes the follower of Edéon and scribe of Attila, whose father Tatullus was even then in the company.

This information is very important, for we may rely upon it as the true statement of the power of Attila at that time, and the extent of his empire. He asserted that no king, either of Scythia or any other land had done such great things in so short a time; inasmuch as his rule extended over the islands in the ocean, and in addition to all Scythia, he had reduced the Romans to be tributary to him; and that, not content with his European conquests, he was meditating even then the subjugation of Persia.

The Danish historians, who are determined to shut their eyes against the fact, that Attila was master of the Danish islands and the south of Scandinavia which the Romans considered to be an island called by them Thule, and that in truth they have no authentic history previous to the time of Attila, who is mixed up under diverse names in their ancient legends, have asserted that Russia was looked upon as insular by the Romans, and was meant by the islands of the ocean upon this occasion.

But the statement of Priscus is an unequivocal admission by an enemy to Attila, who had the means of knowing and could not be mistaken, that he did rule over the islands of the ocean generally, and whether part of Russia was supposed to be an island and included under the denomination or not, that single portion could not by any interpretation have been intended to the exclusion of the rest. On the other hand the words may be interpreted to include Great Britain and Ireland, and it may be a matter of doubt whether even that was not intended, and whether, although Attila never set foot in Great Britain, the legends of St Patric and Arthur, which are contemporaneous with and have evident reference to him, do not represent the influence and authority which he had acquired in the British isles through his emissaries and the weight of his Antichristian pretensions; but with respect to his dominion over the Danish and Scandinavian territory, which was more particularly called the islands of the ocean, the assertion of Romulus made in the presence of the father of Orestes would have been irrefragable, even if it had not been confirmed, as it is, by the concurring evidence of the Scandinavian sagas and Teutonic legends.

The Eastern Romans, having enquired through what quarter he would be able to attack the Persians, were further informed by him that the dominions of Attila extended to the neighbourhood of the Medes, and that Bazic and Cursic, two Huns of the blood royal, who ruled over many followers and afterwards went to Rome to negotiate an alliance, had actually penetrated into Media, the Romans being prevented by other wars at that time from interfering to prevent the inroad. The account given by those princes was that they had crossed a desert tract and afterwards a lake, which Romulus supposed to be the Maeotis, and after fifteen days journey surmounted a ridge of hills and descended into Media, which they began to ravage, but an immense host of Persian archers having come upon them, they were forced to fall back carrying with them only a small portion of the booty. Romulus therefore represented, that if Attila should determine to attack the Medes and Persians and Parthians, and render them tributary, he would find ready access to their territory, and had ample means to reduce them, against which no nation could make head successfully.

The party of Priscus having said that it was a consummation greatly to be desired, that Attila should be pleased to attack the Persians, and leave the empire at peace, were judiciously answered by Constantiolus that after the reduction of the Medes, Persians, and Parthians, Attila would be found still more formidable, and would no longer bear that the



Roman empire should continue distinct from his own, but would treat them openly as his slaves; whereas at present he was contented with the payment of gold in consideration of the dignity conferred upon him; for, as Priscus witnesses, the degenerate Romans had bestowed upon their most dreaded antagonist the title of commander in chief over the Roman forces; but the Hun, not contented with the title by which, at the expense of national honour, they had hoped to sooth his vanity, demanded an ample stipend in the character of commander in chief; and even at that time in his angry moments he was wont to say, that his servants were the commanders of armies, and equal in honour with the emperors of Rome. “And yet (he adds) his power will erelong be greater, as the sword of Mars revealed by the God testifies, which being reputed sacred and worshipped by the Scythian kings as dedicated to the dispenser of battles, had disappeared in former times, but had been again found through the means of a heifer”, which had been wounded by it, and left a track of blood that led to its discovery.

Onegesius, having at length come forth, delayed answering the enquiries of Priscus, till he had conversed with some barbarians, after which he desired him to enquire from Maximin what man of consular dignity the Romans intended to send to treat with Attila, a question which must have been insolently intended, inasmuch as Maximin was of high rank and appointed for that special purpose.

Priscus having made this report and consulted with his principal, returned to answer the insult by a compliment to Onegesius, saying that the Romans would prefer that he should proceed to their court to adjust the points in controversy; but, if that could not be obtained, they would send whatever person would be most acceptable to Attila. Thereupon Onegesius desired Priscus to request the immediate presence of Maximin, whom he conducted straightway to the monarch.

Attila demanded that either Nomus or Anatolius or Senator should be sent to him, refusing to receive any other person in the character of ambassador. Maximin having represented to him, that by naming the persons with whom he chose to confer he could not fail to alarm the suspicions of Theodosius, he replied that unless they thought fit to do as he required, he would settle the controversy by the sword.

On the return of the ambassador and historian to the Roman tents, they were visited by the father of Orestes, who brought them an invitation from Attila to a banquet at the ninth hour of the day. At the appointed time the legates from the Eastern and Western empire, having proceeded together according to the invitation, stood at the threshold of the banqueting hall of Attila. After the fashion of the Hunnish court, the cupbearers, who were stationed near the door, placed a goblet in their hands, that they might drink a health to Attila before they took their places, to which they advanced after having tasted the cup. The seats were all placed against the wall on either side, but Attila sat on an elevated couch in the centre, another couch being placed behind him, from whence there was an ascent by means of steps to that on which he was seated.

The historian states that the seats on the right hand of Attila were considered the most honourable, and those on the left were secondary situations, which however were allotted to the Roman ambassadors, Bench, a noble Scythian, being placed above them. Onegesius sat upon a seat on the right beside the couch of Attila, and opposite to him on another seat were two of the monarch’s sons. The eldest of the three, who were all children of Kreka, sat on the very couch of Attila, not beside him, but on the furthest edge, looking on the ground out of respect to his father. When the whole company were arranged in the several places destined for them, a cupbearer approaching Attila handed a goblet to him. Each guest had a particular cupbearer, whose duty it was to place himself in rank with the others, when the king’s cupbearer advanced.

Attila, having taken the goblet, saluted the person who occupied the first place, and he who was thus honoured arose, nor was it lawful for him to sit down till having either emptied,

or at least tasted, his own goblet, he had returned it to his cupbearer. In this manner Attila drank successively to the health of each of his convives, and, when he reseated himself, they returned the salutation, tasting the liquor after having addressed him. When this ceremony was ended, the cupbearers retired from the hall. Tables for three, four, or more guests, were placed behind that of Attila, where each person might help himself from the dish before him, but must not move from the place allotted to him. Then stepped forth the first attendant of Attila, bearing a dish filled with meat, and after him those who distributed bread and fish to the different tables. For the Romans and all the other guests a most sumptuous repast was furnished upon round silver plates, but the king himself ate nothing but flesh and that upon a wooden trencher, and showed like moderation in everything else, for the goblets of all his guests were of gold or of silver, but his own cup was also of wood. His dress was equally simple, being remarkable only for its perfect cleanness; and neither the formidable sword that hung beside him, nor the ligaments of his sandals, nor the bit of his horse was ornamented with gold and precious stones, like those of his followers. His personal appearance is recorded by Jordanes, extracting the description undoubtedly from Priscus, whom he cites immediately afterwards, but the original account is lost.

His stature was short, with a wide chest, a head of unusual magnitude, and small eyes which he had a habit of casting to the right and left with a haughty aspect; his beard was thin with an intermixture of grey hairs, his nose flat, and his complexion very dark, indicating his origin, as we are told by Jordanes, but whether he means simply that he had the peculiarities of the Hunnish race, or alludes to the diabolical extraction which he attributes to them, does not perfectly appear.

Having ate of the fish which was served on the first dishes, the whole company stood up, and no one might sit down again before he had quaffed to the bottom a cup full of wine, wishing health and prosperity to Attila. Having rendered him this honour, each person reseated himself, and proceeded to attack the second dish, which contained some other dainty; but after each dish had been finished, the same ceremony of standing up, and emptying a cup of wine to the monarch's health was repeated.

When the daylight began to fail, torches were lighted, and two barbarians, standing opposite to him, recited verses which they had composed, celebrating his victories, and the virtues which adorn a warrior. The guests appeared to listen to them with earnest attention, some delighted with the poetry, some excited by the recollections of the battles that were described, and others melting even into tears, their warlike spirit having been reduced by age to languish within a body no longer apt for military exertions.

When the songs were ended, a Scythian fool, uttering every sort of absurdity, made the whole court laugh. After him Zercon the Moor entered. He had come to the court, hoping by the good offices of Edécon to recover his wife, who, when he was a favourite with Bleda, had been given to him amongst the barbarians, but had been left by him in Scythia, when he was sent by Attila as a present to Aetius. He was ill-grown, short, hump-backed, with crooked legs, so excessively flat nosed, that there was scarcely any projection over his nostrils, and he lisped ridiculously. He had been formerly given to Aspar the son of Ardaburius, with whom he tarried some time in Lybia; but he was afterwards taken prisoner, when the Huns made an irruption into Thrace, and brought to the Hunnish kings. Attila hated to look on him, but Bleda took great delight in him, on account of the absurd things which he said, and his whimsical manner of walking and moving his body; and he kept him in his presence both at banquets and in warfare, and in his military expeditions he made him wear armour as a laughing-stock.

The ugly dwarf however contrived to make his escape with some other captives, but Bleda neglecting to pursue the others, ordered the most active search to be made after Zercon, and, when he was retaken and brought before him, he enquired why he preferred servitude

under the Romans to his household; whereupon the Moor confessed his error, but attributed his flight entirely to the want of a wife. Bleda laughed exceedingly, and said that he should have one; and in fact so absolute were the Hunnish kings, that he gave him in marriage a woman of noble birth, who had been an attendant on the queen, but on account of some unseasonable act was no longer permitted to approach her. He continued thus with Bleda until his death, when he was sent by Attila as a present to Aetius, who gave him back to Aspar. Having now returned to the court of Attila, he was disappointed in the hope of recovering his wife, because Attila was incensed at his having run away, when he had sent him as a present; but at this moment of festivity, by his look, his dress, and voice, and by the confusion of the words he used, blending in a ludicrous manner the language of the Goths and Huns with that of the Latins, he excited all the party, except Attila, to the most inextinguishable laughter; but Attila sat motionless, without the least change of countenance, and neither by word or sign showed any semblance of hilarity; excepting that he pinched the cheek of his youngest son by Kreka, named Ernas or Irnach, as he stood by him, and looked upon him with kindness. Priscus, having expressed his surprise, at his apparent preference for this child and neglect of the others, to a Scythian who sat by him and understood Latin, was told by him under promise of secrecy that it had been prophesied to Attila, that his race, which must otherwise be extinguished, would be upheld by this boy.

The carouse was prolonged far into the night, but the Romans, finding the potations inconveniently liberal, thought it advisable to withdraw; and on the following morning they visited Onegesius for the purpose of asking to be dismissed, and not kept wasting their time to no avail. They were informed by him that Attila desired their departure, and having left them for a short time he consulted with the select council concerning the wishes of Attila, and digested the letters which were to be sent to Theodosius with the assistance of certain scribes, and of Rusticius, who has been already mentioned, a native of Mysia who had been taken prisoner, and on account of his fluency in composition was retained in the epistolary department at the court of the Hun. The council being ended, the ambassadors applied to Onegesius for the liberation of the wife and children of Sylla, who had been captured in Ratiaria. He was not averse to set them free, but required an enormous ransom; whereupon they strove to move his compassion, by representing their former rank and condition, and their present misery. After having seen Attila again, he liberated the lady for 500 pieces of gold, and sent the children as a present to the emperor.

In the meantime the ambassadors had received an invitation from Rekan the wife of Attila, to sup at the house of Adam the superintendant of her household and affairs; and having proceeded together with some of the principal Scythians, they were received with much courtesy, and fared sumptuously. Each of the guests paid them the singular compliment after the Hunnish fashion of standing up from the table and giving them a cup of wine, and, after they had drunk, embracing them and kissing them before he received back the cup. The supper was prolonged till it was time to retire to rest, and on the following day they were again invited to feast with Attila. The same forms were observed as on the former day, but instead of his elder son, Obarsius or Obars his uncle on the father's side sat on his couch.

During the repast the monarch spoke kindly to them, desiring them to request the emperor to send a wife, as he had promised, for Constantius the secretary who had been given to him by Aetius. This Constantius, having previously accompanied the ambassadors whom Attila had sent to Theodosius, had promised that he would exert himself to make the peace durable, if the emperor would bestow a rich wife upon him, which was granted, and the daughter of Saturninus a rich and distinguished Greek, was promised to him. But Saturninus was afterwards assassinated by the empress Eudocia, and the emperor was prevented by Zeno, a man of consular dignity, from fulfilling his promise. This man had led a great force of Isaurians to the protection of Constantinople during the war, and, having then the command of

all the forces in the East, he had withdrawn the damsel from the custody in which she had been placed, and had betrothed her to Rufus, one of his own dependants.

Constantius complained to the emperor of the insult and injustice done to him, and asked to have either the lady who had been thus abducted, or another bride of equal rank and opulence; on which account Attila enjoined to Maximin the care of the interests of his secretary, who undertook to give him a portion of the dowry, if he should succeed in obtaining one of the most wealthy Greek heiresses in marriage.

Three days after, the ambassadors of Theodosius were dismissed with gifts, and with them Attila sent, on a mission to the emperor, Berich, who has been mentioned as having sat above them at the banquet. He was a member of the select council, and lord over many Scythian villages, and had been on some former occasion received by the Romans on an embassy.

During the journey, while they were tarrying in a certain village, a Scythian was taken, who had been sent as a spy by the Romans into the territory of Attila, who forthwith ordered him to be crucified. On the next day, as they were passing through another village, they saw two men who had formerly been taken prisoners in war, and were conducted with their hands tied behind them, having been guilty of murdering the masters to whom they had been allotted; and these were also crucified, their heads having been fixed to two beams furnished with hooks.

At the passage of the Danube, Berich, who had until then been exceedingly familiar and friendly, became very hostile and exasperated in consequence of some futile differences between the servants. He showed the first mark of resentment by redemanding a horse which he had given to Maximin; for Attila had ordered all the members of the select council to offer gifts to Maximin, and a horse had been sent by every one of them; Maximin however, wishing to get credit for moderation, had accepted only a few and sent back the remainder. Not content with requiring back his gift, Berich would no longer keep company with them on the road or eat with them; but having passed through Philippopolis and reached Adrianople, they came to an explanation with him, and a seeming reconciliation having taken place, they invited him to supper. On their arrival however at Constantinople it appeared that he still nourished the same resentment, alleging as a cause some offensive depreciation of Areobindus and Aspar by Maximin, detracting from their achievements in war, on account of the insignificance of the barbarians to whom they had been opposed, which he looked upon as an insult to himself and his countrymen.

On the way they had met Bigilas returning from Constantinople, and had informed him of the result of their mission. When Bigilas reached the quarter where Attila was then sojourning, he was seized by persons who had received previous directions to that effect, and the money which he was bringing for Edécon was taken from him. Being brought before Attila, he was asked, for what purpose he had brought so much gold; to which he replied, that he had brought it to supply himself and his companions with horses and other necessaries on the road, and with a view to ransom several captives, by whose relations he had been strenuously entreated; but Attila addressing him said, "Nevertheless, O malignant wild beast, you shall not by your sophistry escape judgment, nor will any pretext be sufficient to screen you from the infliction of punishment, for the money which thou hast in store is infinitely greater than necessary for thy expenses, or the purchase of horses and beasts of burden, or even for the ransom of captives, all which moreover I forbid you when thou earnest with Maximin". Having thus said, he ordered the son of Bigilas, who had been then for the first time brought to the Hunnish court, to be hewn down with the sword, unless he should forthwith declare unto whom and for what purpose he was bringing so much gold. But, when Bigilas beheld his son about to suffer death, he began to weep and lament, and cry out that justice demanded that he should be smitten with the sword, and not his son who was



innocent of all offence; and without further delay he confessed all the things that had been devised between himself and Edécon, the eunuch Chrysaphius and the emperor, again imploring that he might be executed and not his son. Attila knowing from the previous report of Edécon that Bigilas had spoken the truth, directed him to be kept in chains, and threatened that he would not set him free, until his son should have been sent to Constantinople, and should have brought back other five hundred pieces of gold for their ransom. He therefore remained in custody, and his son was sent together with Orestes and Eslas to Constantinople.

The purse, in which the gold had been brought by Bigilas, was delivered to Edécon, and he was ordered by Attila to suspend it to his neck, and thus to enter the presence of the emperor, and having shown it to ask Chrysaphius whether he recognized it. Eslas was ordered to state that Theodosius was indeed the son of a noble father, and that Attila was also of noble birth, and had well sustained the nobility inherited from his father Mundiuc, but that Theodosius had fallen from his dignified station by submitting to pay tribute to him, and was become his slave; and that he therefore acted ill in devising secret snares like a wicked domestic against his superior, whom fortune had given him for his master. That Attila would not forgive the offence committed by him, unless the eunuch Chrysaphius were delivered up to undergo condign punishment. The storm, which was soon to burst on Chrysaphius, threatened him from more than one quarter; on the one side Attila demanded his life, on the other Zeno, incensed against the minister on account of the act of his master, who had confiscated to the public treasury the property of the daughter of Saturninus, whom Zeno had married to his dependant Theodosius had ordered the confiscation, being stung by the report of Maximin, who had stated that Attila had said that the emperor ought to fulfil his promise and give the lady to Constantius, for that no one amongst his subjects could have power to betroth her in contravention of his authority and engagements; that if the man who had dared to do so had not already suffered punishment for his temerity, the emperor was a slave to his own servants, and that he would willingly afford him assistance to emancipate him from their dominion.

The party of Chrysaphius, however, being prevalent at the court of Theodosius, it was determined to dispatch to Attila Anatolius master of the royal guard, who had proposed the terms of peace which had been concluded with the Huns, and Nomus having the title of master of the forces; both numbered amongst the patricians who had precedence over regular military rank. Nomus was sent with Anatolius, because he was very friendly to Chrysaphius, and Attila well-disposed to receive him, and because he was also a man of great wealth, and was never sparing of money, when he had any object to accomplish. They were directed to use every endeavour to mollify Attila, and persuade him to adhere to the treaty which had been concluded; and to promise Constantius a wife in every respect as desirable as the lady of whom he had been disappointed; assuring him that the daughter of Saturninus had been averse to the alliance proposed, and was lawfully wedded to another; and that the Roman law did not authorize the betrothment of a woman to any man without her own consent.

Chrysaphius sent a present of gold to pacify the offended monarch. The mission of Theodosius having crossed the Danube proceeded through the territory of the Huns as far as the Drencon or Drecon; for Attila, through respect for Anatolius and Nomus whom he esteemed, advanced towards them and met them on the banks of that river, to save them a further journey. At first he spoke to them in the most overbearing tone, but at length their gifts and conciliatory language prevailed over his irritated temper, and he consented to keep the peace, and gave up to the Romans all the land he claimed to the south of the Danube, and waived his demands for the restoration of fugitives, on condition that the Romans should pledge themselves to receive none in future. He also set free Bigilas, having received the 500 pounds of gold which his son had brought with the embassy; and he further, to show his kindness towards Nomus and Anatolius, liberated several captives without any ransom; and

he dismissed the ambassadors with presents of horses and skins of wild beasts, such as were usually worn for ornament by the Scythian kings.

Constantius was directed to proceed with them on their return to Constantinople, that he might obtain without further delay, the rich heiress promised to him by the emperor; nor was the secretary unsuccessful in this expedition, but consummated his nuptials with the widow of Armatus, the son of Plinthus, who had been a Roman general and consul. The lady was both rich and noble, and espoused Constantius at the request of the emperor. It is impossible to contemplate these transactions, of which Priscus, who was engaged in them, has left such minute particulars, without blushing at the perfidious villainy of the Christian court, and admiring the noble magnanimity and moderation of the pagan on this occasion; but it was perhaps the policy of Attila to represent his own life to be so protected by the great destinies for which he pretended to have been foredoomed, that such attempts against it were very unimportant and certain of ending in discomfiture; and it might be more for his interest to treat them with scorn, than to attract attention to them by a public execution.

In the whole career of his life he was disposed to clemency when it did not militate against the success of his undertakings, but inexorable and remorseless where it was his interest to disarm opposition by the terror of his exterminating vengeance. The indiscriminate slaughter of the inhabitants of a town captured after an obstinate defence, might deter another from resisting, but he must have been aware that those, who had entered into a direct conspiracy against his life, must have done so with the certain expectation of crucifixion if they should foil; and that the punishment, if inflicted, would add nothing to the motives which necessarily existed to deter men from engaging in so desperate an undertaking; and that treating it lightly, as a vain and impracticable scheme which it was not worth his while to punish, might be the best mode of deterring the superstitious from attempting it. It is most remarkable that his personal respect and deference for *Nomus* and *Anatolius* should have won from him in the plenitude of his strength and at the very moment when he must have been most irritated by the treacherous and disgusting designs of *Theodosius*, concessions which would in vain have been sought for by an appeal to arms.

The empire, however, though relieved from the immediate fear of *Attila*, was threatened with internal dissensions, and *Zeno* became a formidable rival to his master. The sword of *Attila*, though sheathed, was ever ready for fresh contests, and he appears to have been in the following year (*AD* 450) excited to new threats of invasion, in consequence of the non-payment of the stipulated tribute by the emperor.

*Apollonius*, brother to *Rufus* then defunct, to whom *Zeno* had given the daughter of *Saturninus*, friendly to *Zeno* upon that account, and bearing the rank of general, was dispatched to pacify *Attila*; but, having crossed the *Danube*, he was denied access to him: for *Attila* was enraged at the retention of the tribute, which he said had been arranged and agreed upon by men better and more worthy to reign than *Theodosius*, and he therefore rejected the ambassador, to show his contempt for the emperor; but, although he refused to admit his messenger, or to enter into any negotiation, he nevertheless ordered the gifts of *Theodosius* to be sent to him, and threatened *Apollonius* with death if he should deny them. The ambassador however showed a spirit worthy of the ancient fortunes of *Rome*, and replied, that it did not become the *Scythians* to ask for what they must take either as gifts, or by plunder; signifying that he was ready to give them if his embassy was received, but that the *Huns* must take them as booty if they thought fit to assassinate him. *Attila*, however, though he frequently indulged in such threats, appears in fact to have always respected the immunity conferred on ambassadors by the common consent of nations; and the high-minded Roman was dismissed without having been admitted into his presence.

*Theodosius* did not live to feel the effects of the anger of *Attila*, from whom it is probable that he withheld the promised tribute in consequence of the exhausted state of his

finances, rather than a determination to brave his animosity. A fall from his horse terminated the life of this inglorious and degraded emperor. His sister Pulcheria, was proclaimed empress without opposition, although there had been no previous instance of a female succeeding to the throne; and the first act of her reign was the execution of Chrysaphius without a legal trial, before the gates of Constantinople. Fearful however of swaying the sceptre of the East without the support of a stronger arm at so critical a period, she immediately espoused the senator Marcian, a Thracian about sixty years of age, who had served with credit under Aspar and Ardaburius; but, though she invested him by this political union with the imperial purple, she compelled him in wedlock to respect the religious vow which she had made of perpetual virginity.

As soon as Attila heard of the accession of Marcian to the throne, he sent to demand the stipulated tribute, but Marcian adopted a higher tone than his predecessor, and replied that he did not hold himself bound by the humiliating concessions of Theodosius; that he would send presents to him, if he kept the peace, but, if he threatened war, he would oppose to him arms and men by no means inferior to his own forces.

At this period the intrigue of Honoria with Attila had been discovered, and had brought down upon her the indignation and vengeance of either empire. The extract, which is extant from the history of Priscus, relating to this subject, refers to a previous relation of the circumstances which had taken place, but, that being lost, their particulars can only be imperfectly collected or surmised from subsequent allusions. At the voluptuous court of Ravenna, that princess celebrated for her beauty and her incontinence, while she continued still under the guardianship of Placidia her mother and her brother Valentinian, in the very spring of her youth, sixteen years before this period, had been found pregnant by her chamberlain Eugenius, and had been disgracefully sent from thence to Constantinople, to be immured in the secluded chambers of Pulcheria the sister of Theodosius, who had made a vow of singleness, and dwelt in a sworn society of holy virgins. Weary of the monotonous and hopeless mode of life in which her youth was thus passing away, under the tutelage of her harsh and sanctified relation, she had probably at a much earlier period, made a tender to Attila of her hand and pretensions to the throne of Rome, and that offer, to which on his first accession to the throne, he had paid little attention, had been renewed a little before this period, when his matured designs against the empire rendered such an alliance important, as a ground whereon to rest his claims.

The message was carried to Attila by an eunuch dispatched by the princess secretly from Constantinople with a letter and a ring, which he was instructed to deliver, but the exact date of the occurrence is not recorded. At the moment of the accession of Marcian to the throne, the correspondence of Honoria with the Hun was by some accident brought to light. The unfortunate and guilty princess was regarded with abhorrence by the Christians, and previously to her being sent back to Italy and placed in strict confinement at Ravenna, she was compelled to give her hand in marriage to some person who was selected for that purpose, in order to render her union with Attila unlawful and impracticable. The records are lost which would have informed us who and what the bridegroom was, but it is pretty evident that the ceremony only was performed, and that the marriage was not consummated; and as it was certainly not intended that she should ever avail herself of the privileges of a married woman, the husband selected for her was probably an obscure and perhaps a blind old man, for the extinction of the eyes was the usual mode of disqualifying a man to wear the imperial purple of Constantinople.

In the passage of Priscus which is preserved, and which evidently refers to a detailed account of the transactions, he says that when the things which had been done concerning her were reported to Attila, he immediately sent ambassadors to Valentinian emperor of the West, to assert that Honoria had been guilty of no unbecoming conduct, inasmuch as he had entered

into an engagement to marry her, and that he would take up arms in her cause, unless she were admitted to hold the sceptre of the empire. The Romans answered that it was not possible for him to espouse Honoria, who had been given to another man, and that she had no right to the throne, for the Roman dynasty consisted of a succession of males, and not of females: an answer which singularly contrasts with the contemporaneous and undisputed elevation of Pulcheria to the sister throne of Byzantium, occasioned perhaps by some intrigues for the downfall of Chrysaphius.

The rejection of the demands of Attila by Marcian had been softened by presents, and probably the refusal of Honoria's hand was accompanied by like appeasement. According to the Alexandrine or Paschal chronicle, and to John of Antioch, surnamed Malellas, Attila sent to either emperor a Gothic messenger, saying, "My lord and yours commands you through me to make ready your palace for his reception". Malellas mentions Theodosius, who was dead at this time; but the account is probably referable to the simultaneous summons which he sent to Constantinople and Rome immediately after the death of that emperor.

The views of Attila extended to the subjugation of the Medes and Persians, the Eastern and Western empires, and the Gothic and Franc kingdoms in France and Spain, which would have left him without a rival between the boundaries of China, or at least of the Tartars, and the Atlantic ocean : but he was awhile doubtful against which of those powers he should first turn his arms. Genseric the formidable king of the Vandals, who had wrested from Rome her African possessions, excited him to attack Theodoric king of the Visigoths, whose capital was Tolosa, the modern Toulouse. The daughter of Theodoric had been married to Hunneric the son of the Vandal monarch, who was so savage in his disposition, and inhuman even towards his own offspring, that on a bare suspicion that she had mixed poison for him, he cut off her nostrils and sent her back mutilated to her father. Fearing therefore the vengeance of Theodoric, he exerted himself by negotiation and ample presents to draw upon his antagonist the overwhelming armies of the Hun. The subsidy offered by Genseric probably determined Attila to commence his operations by the subjugation of Gaul, where he would have to attack the Franks of Meroveus, the Alans under Sangiban, the Gallic empire of Theodoric extending from his capital Tolosa into Spain, and the Roman province which was defended by the flower of the Roman army under the celebrated Aetius. The pretext for this invasion was the restitution of Alberon, the son and rightful heir of Clodion lately deceased, to the throne of his father in the north of France, from whence he had been expelled by the arts of the bastard Meroveus. Previous to his undertaking this memorable expedition, Attila held a plenary court or comitia in Thuringia at Erfurt, (for Eisenach, which has been named as the place where they were held, is perhaps a town of later origin) probably for the especial purpose of hearing the plaint of Basina the widow of Clodion, who had fled with her sons to the court of her brother Basinus in Thuringia.

Eudoxius, a physician, had been drawn into a faction of rebels in Gaul, who, being pushed to extremities by the extortions of the nobles and clergy, had first revolted in the reign of Diocletian under the denomination of Bagauds, and had since made head under the guidance of Tibato against the Roman authority. They were everywhere defeated and severely handled, and Eudoxius was the only man of importance amongst the movers of that sedition who escaped, and he took refuge at the Hunnish court. He is described as a bad, but able, man; and from him it is supposed that Attila received much information concerning the actual state of Gaul, and encouragement to attempt its invasion. It is observable, that the organization of the faction called Bagauds seems to have been the only popular attempt to vindicate civil rights under the domination of the Western emperors.

Meroveus, against whom the arms of Attila were now directed, was the illegitimate son of Clodion, and his master of the horse. The dynasty of the Marcomirians ended with Clodion



the son of Pharamond and grandson of Marcomir; and Meroveus, a traitor, an usurper, and alien to the blood royal, being illegitimate, founded a new dynasty. Fredegarius, writing in 641, says that the mother of Meroveus was bathing on the coast and was attacked by a sea-monster, who became the father of Meroveus. This fable has evident relation to his illegitimacy. The writer who there cites Fredegarius from Gregory of Tours considers the Marobudos or Maroboduus who lived in the time of Augustus and Tiberius to have been an earlier Meroveus, the former name being the Augustan, the latter the recent Gallo-Latin version of the Teutonic name Maerwu or Merwu. He also shows that the Merovingian kings called themselves by that title, (which makes it appear that they affected to be a new dynasty, and not inheritors from Clodion) by authorities dating AD 641 as above, AD 645 and 720, the last being thirty years before the restoration of the rightful heirs by the elevation of Pepin.

Mezeray states that Clodion left three sons (the eldest having died) Alberon, Regnault, and Rangcaire, who were too young to reign, and therefore the states elected Meroveus his bastard son. He boasts of his exploits in the Catalaunian victory, of which he attributes the principal honour to him, but entirely suppresses the cause of that war, which was to re-establish the rightful king whom he had expelled: and he adds incorrectly that, when firmly fixed in Gaul, he went to succour the sons of Clodion and establish them in Hainault, Brabant, and Namur; saying that on his return from that expedition he died in the tenth year of his reign in 458.

The historian Priscus, who was at the court of Attila on an embassy in 448, when Clodion was alive or on the point of death, never saw Alberon the rightful heir, who had not at that time had recourse to the Huns. At some antecedent period not ascertained, he had however seen Meroveus on an embassy at Rome, a beardless youth with long yellow hair falling over his shoulders, and he says that Aetius, having adopted him as his son and loaded him with gifts, despatched him to the emperor to acquire his friendship and enjoy his society in martial exercises. There is some obscurity however in the passage, for the word *presbenúmenos*, acting the part of a legate, must apply to a mission from the Franks, and could not refer to his visit at the court of Valentinian under the recommendation of the Roman general Aetius.

It seems that Priscus meant that Meroveus was at Rome as an ambassador when he saw him, and was at some subsequent period sent by Aetius to carouse with Valentinian, probably at Ravenna.

Looking to the subtle character and constant double dealing of Aetius, it can scarcely be doubted, that when he adopted Meroveus and sent him to Valentinian, he had intended to sow future dissensions in the family of Clodion, and to make use of Meroveus for the furtherance of his own schemes, whether against the inheritance of the Franc king or against the throne of Valentinian, or, as is most probable, against both: and, in directing him to be presented to the emperor as the son of Clodion, with a view to the acquisition of his society and friendship, it is not likely that either Aetius or Meroveus should have put forward his illegitimacy; nor was it probable that Priscus, a Greek sophist of Constantinople, accidentally seeing this beardless young Franc at Rome, should have been informed at the time of his spurious birth. When Meroveus seized the throne and expelled Alberon who fled to the Huns, it was a matter of notoriety to all Europe that Alberon was the rightful heir and eldest son of Clodion, and if Priscus was not aware of the illegitimacy of Meroveus, he must have concluded that he was younger than him to whom the inheritance appertained. His silence as to the name of the banished king is proof that he had not very ample information concerning the transaction, and perhaps only knew the little which he states; and, living at Constantinople far from the scene of action, he may have fallen very naturally into an error on the point of seniority. If Meroveus had succeeded to the throne of his lawful father, though to the prejudice of an elder brother, his accession would not have been that of a new dynasty, and, instead of being called

Merovingian kings, he and his descendants would from the first have been named after Pharamond the sire or Marcomir the grandsire of Clodion.

The brief expression therefore of Priscus, that the elder son of Clodion sought the assistance of the Huns, the younger that of Aetius, is insufficient to outweigh the far greater probability of the fact as related by other writers, that Meroveus was in fact the oldest, though not the legitimate, son of Clodion. The lineal genealogy runs thus:— 1. Marcomir.—2. Pharamond.—3. Clodion who died 448.—4. Alberon, d.491.—5. Wambert, d. 529—6. Ambert, d. 570. (collateral Wambert 2.)—7. Arnold, d. 601.—8. St. Arnulf, d. 641.—9. Ansegisus, d. 685.— 10. Pepin, d. 714.—11. Charles Martell, d. 741.—12. Pepin, d. 768.— 13. Charlemagne, and so on, till the occupation of the throne by Hugh Capet in 987, when the Marcomirian line became extinct.

John Bertels abbot of Epternach collected all the traditions and chronicles he could find in the convents of Luxemburg and Ardennes. He states that Clodion Capillatus married Basina daughter of Widolph duke of the Thuringians, probably sister to Basinus who was duke when Attila was in Thuringia. She bore him four sons, Phrison, Alberon or Auberon, Reginald, and Rauchas. Phrison died very young of an arrow-shot, and the grief of that loss hastened the death of his father. Clodion by his will appointed his bastard son Meroveus, who was his master of the horse, to be regent and guardian of his sons.

For some years he acted with fidelity, but when the Roman arms were pressing on the Franks, he tendered his resignation, declining the responsibility of administering the affairs of another person in such a crisis, and knowing that his authority and skill were necessary at the moment. The result was conformable to his expectations. The Franks proclaimed him king, and he took the crown, whereupon queen Basina sent her three sons for safety to Thuringia. Some years afterwards Alberon took counsel how he should recover his rights and destroy Meroveus and his progeny; Meroveus at the same time meditating the like against him and his kindred.

With these views Alberon married Argotta daughter of Theodemir king of the Goths, formed a strict alliance with the Goths, Vandals, Bohems, and Ostrogoths, and by their aid recovered possession of Arduenna, Lower Alsatia, Brabantia, Cameracum, and Turnacum, and obtained the title of Rex Cameracensis. His chief residence however was in the Nemus Carbonarium, a part of the forest of Ardennes, where he sacrificed to idols and fortified Mons Hannoniae (Mons in Hainault), as an asylum against the malice of Meroveus. Argotta bore him Wambert, who married a daughter of the emperor Zeno.

A lieutenant under Clovis conquered Brabant and Flanders about the year 492, and took king Alberon and his two brothers prisoners, whom the French king barbarously slew with his own hand, as soon as they were brought into his presence. He afterwards affected remorse, and endeavoured to allure Wambert into his power, in order to cut off the last remnant of Clodion's legitimate heirs. Wambert was however too wary, and placed his sons Wambert and Anselbert (or Ambert), under the safeguard of Theodoric king of Italy and the emperor Zeno who made them senators of the Eastern empire.

About AD 520 Wambert recovered Ardennes and Hainault, to which possessions the senator Wambert the second succeeded on his death in 528, by favour of Childebert king of Paris, who also gave Anselbert the marquisate of Moselle and Scheld, of which the seat of government was on the latter river. The senator Wambert, who espoused St. Clotilda daughter of Almeric king of Italy, was succeeded by a third Wambert his son.

Such is the statement of Bertels. The only inaccuracy, which appears on the face of it, is that the events, which took place between the death of Clodion in 448, and the flight of Alberon to the Huns previous to Attila's invasion of Gaul in 451, a space of only three years, appear to be extended over a longer, though indefinite, period. With this limitation, that Meroveus could not have continued faithful above two years, and that Alberon immediately

sought assistance to recover his rights, there is no reason to doubt that the account of Bertels is substantially correct. He was unacquainted with the writings of Priscus, and appears to have known nothing about Attila and his Huns; yet, except what relates to the inferior age of Meroveus, he affords collateral evidence from quite different sources, which is confirmed by the account of the Greek sophist; for it is evident that the Goths, with whom Bertels states Alberon to have made alliance, were the great confederacy of nations headed by Attila and brought by him on the occasion of the disputed succession of Clodion into the celebrated field of Chalons.

The Thuringian writers of the middle ages make mention of the movements of Attila, and state that he was in Thuringia and at Eisenach. The Danish writer, professor Suhm, referring to the Thuringian authors, states his disbelief of the existence of Eisenach in the days of Attila, and thinks that Erfurt, anciently called Bicurgium, was the place intended. Sidonius Apollinaris mentions Toringus (the Thuringian) amongst the people who invaded Belgium under the command of Attila. German histories unknown to Bertelius and only seen in MS. by Lazius, affirm that Attila held a diet of his kings and dukes in Thuringia before he set out to invade Gaul. Putting these concurrent accounts together, it seems that Attila held a diet in Thuringia, where he heard the plaint of queen Basina and her sons, and proceeded to act thereupon. Henning in his Universal Genealogy gives the following statement: Clodio crinitus had, by ..., Meroveus, who married Verica daughter of Guntraum king of Sweden, and died AD 458, and by Basina daughter of Widolph king of Thuringia Albero or Alberic from whom the Carolingians are descended, Rauches or Roches lord of Cambray, and Reginald king of the Eburi who married Wamberga daughter of Alaric the first king of the Visigoths in Spain. Albero warred under Attila, hoping to recover the sceptre of his father, of which his brother Meroveus had taken forcible possession. Being defeated he retreated to his own people, (meaning his Belgic or Cameracan subjects) being careful not to fall into the hands of Meroveus, and died about 491.

Brother James of Guise relates that Clodion king of the Francs had by his wife, daughter of the king of Austrien (Austracia) and Toringien, four sons. He made a certain Meroveus his master of the horse. Soon after, besieging Soissons, he lost his eldest son, and, being much afflicted, died also. Previously he assembled his nobles, and assigned to his wife and each of his three remaining sons their portions, and gave them into the keeping of Meroveus. Meroveus enlarged the kingdom by conquest; afterwards, some enemies invading it, he said to the people, "I am not your king, and I will no longer be the guardian, for I have already incurred more cost than I can pay; therefore provide for the country as you will". Consequently the Francs raised him to the throne. He straightway summoned all the soldiers that were on furlough, and drove out the enemy. The widow of Clodion, with two of her sons, fled to Thuringia and Austracia. When big enough, they redemanded the kingdom, and had some combats with Meroveus. By the assistance of the Huns, Goths, Ostrogoths, Armoricans, Saxons, and many others, they won back from Meroveus the lands their father had assigned them, beginning from Austracia to the Alsatic mountains, and from the south of Burgundy to the Rhine, and westward to Rheims, Laon, Cambray, and Tournay, and on the north to the ocean, which kingdom was molested by Meroveus and many others. From Clodion's three sons, Aubron, Regnault, and Rauchaure, the rulers of Hainault, Loraine, Brabant, and Namur, took their origin. Clodion was buried at Cambray in 448 according to the rites of the "Sarrazins". He adds that many opinions existed touching Meroveus.

According to Sigebert he was the son of Clodion; Andreas Marcianensis styled him his kinsman (*son afin*, meaning affinis); *l'histoire des Francois* states that he was not his son, but nevertheless descended from the Trojans, and that he was a useful king, from whom were derived the Francs called Merovingians, who held the kingdom against the heirs of Clodion. Almericus states that after Bleda's death, the widow of Clodion made alliance with the Huns

and Ostrogoths, gave them a part of her land, and waged war against Meroveus. Brother James continues to say that in 453 (he should have said 451) Attila, accompanied by Walamir king of the Ostrogoths, and Arderic king of the Gepidae, and many of their dependants from the quarter of the wind aquilon, left Pannonia and invaded Gaul. Alberic or Aubron, second son of Clodion, was a man of such subtlety, knowledge, activity, and prowess, that he often worsted the Merovingians, who usurped and held his country.

He commonly sojourned in the woods, and sacrificed to Gods and Goddesses, and re-established the pagan worship in his territories, for he thought the Gods in whom he trusted would give him back his kingdom; because Mars and Jove had once appeared to him, and declared that to himself, or to his lineage, all the dominions of his father should be restored. Thereupon he began assiduously to rebuild the decayed cities and castles, Strasburg which was dismantled of walls, Thulle, Espinal, Mereasse, and the leaden baths at Espinal; in the forest of Dogieuse a castle and temples; near the Alsatic mountains and forests the same; in the centre of his kingdom in Ardenne, the altar, temple, and castle of Namur; the temple of Mercury, now chateau Sanson, and other impregnable forts; in the forêt Carboniere many, such as Chateaulieu, where on the mount he built a square tower, and called it from himself Aubron.

On the same mount, near the town, he dug a well which is still there. He built a temple of Minerva on a hill, now mount St. Audebert, but then mount Auberon, but which the Christians now call La Houppé Auberon; in the forest of Dicongue a temple of the idol, and called it by his own name. By the aid of the Saxons he beat the Merovingians in the forêt Carboniere near Chateaulieu, now called Monts en Haynau, and he named the spot Merowinge, and the inhabitants now call it Meuwin. He beat them again at a place called Mirewault, and the Merovingians said the Gods of the forest gave him victory, and thereupon remained a long time at peace with him. They stiled him *enchanteur of feu*. He had several children; the eldest Waubert, who was king of the Austracians, and inherited all his father's lands and defended them valiantly. Aubron died old, and was buried with Sarrazin rites in the mount called La Houppé Auberon, upon which great trees are now planted.

Clovis invaded the lands of the king of Cambray called Rauchaire, brother of Auberon, and at last he and his brothers Richier and Regnault, were betrayed into his power, and slain by his own hand; and he persecuted their connections. Here is an evident blunder, in the calling Rauchaire instead of Auberon, king of Cambray, and then to make up the number, repeating the name Rauchaire with a difference of orthography, as Richier, and thus making five sons of Basina, instead of four, the eldest having been killed at the siege of Soissons in the life-time of Clodion.

The history thus given contains ample confirmation to the relation of Bertels, with a similar protraction of the period between the death of Clodion, and the attempt of Alberon to recover his throne, which is in some degree accounted for by placing in 453 the Hunnish invasion, which actually took place in 451. That Meroveus did not pretend to be the legitimate son of Clodion, is evident from the expression of Gregory Tours, who flourished in the next century, and might even have conversed with persons who had seen Meroveus, and merely says that he was "as some assert, of the stock of Clodion".

No reliance can be placed on the relation of any French writer of later times, for, without citing any satisfactory authorities, they all avoid the true point, and falsify the history, so strangely does nationality and a desire to make out the dynasty of their kings to have been legitimate appear to have warped and prejudiced their understandings; in the same manner that we find the Danish historians when they meet with the name of Attila king of the Huns, in their most ancient legends of events, which they themselves refer to the exact period of his Gallic invasion, shutting their eyes against the true history, and saying that this Attila was a petty king over some Huns in Groningen, because they will not acknowledge that which



Priscus, who was personally acquainted with Attila, asserts, that his dominion extended to the Baltic or islands of the ocean, and consequently that he was, as appears also from the title he assumed, king of the Danes.

That Meroveus was received at Rome as the son of Clodion, is clear by the testimony of Priscus; that he was illegitimate and older than the rightful heir, is established by the local chronicles and the greater probability of the fact. Whether Alberon was put to death as well as his brothers by Clovis, or fell in the previous battle, and was buried in the Houppe d' Aubron, appears to be a matter of some doubt, which perhaps might be solved at this day, by opening the supposed place of his interment; but it is not improbable that his name affixed to that mount, as a monumental cenotaph, may have given birth to the notion that he was buried there, and occasioned the omission of his name in some of the accounts of the atrocious act of Clovis, especially as there is no other tradition of the manner of his death, though so many particulars of his life are recorded.

When Attila had determined to march his army into Gaul, he exerted himself to sow disunion between the Visigoths and Romans. He sent ambassadors to Valentinian to assure him in a letter full of blandishment that he had no hostile intentions against the Roman power in that country, but was marching against Theodoric, and requested that the Romans would not take part against him. To Theodoric he wrote at the same time, exhorting him to detach himself from his alliance with the Romans, and to remember the wars which they had lately stirred up against him. Thereupon the emperor wrote to Theodoric urging him to act in union with him against the common enemy, "who wished to reduce the whole world to slavery; who sought no pretext for invasion, but held whatever his arm could execute to be just and right; who grasped at everything within his compass, and satiated his licentiousness with excess of pride". He represented to the Visigoth that he ruled over a limb of the Roman empire, and exhorted him for his own security to unite with the Romans in defending their common interests.

Theodoric replied, "Ye have your wish; ye have made Attila and me enemies. We will encounter him, whithersoever he shall call us, and, although he may be inflated by diverse victories over proud nations, haughty as he is, the Goths will know how to contend with him. I call no warfare grievous, except that which its cause renders weak, for he, on whom majesty has smiled, has no reverse to fear".

The chiefs of the Gothic court applauded this spirited answer, of which however the last words do not convey any very definite meaning. The people shouted and followed him, and the Visigoths were animated by an ardent desire to measure their strength with the conqueror of so many nations.

In the spring of 451 Attila put his immense army in motion to effect the invasion of Gaul. Many of the nations that marched under him are enumerated by Sidonius; the Neuri, who are stated by Ammianus Marcellinus to have dwelt amongst the Alans in their former situations; the Hoedi, whom Valesius asserts to have been a tribe of Huns; the Gepides, Ostrogoths, Alans, Bastarnae, Turcilingi, Scirri, Heruli, Rugi, Bellonoti, Sarmatae, Geloni, Scevi, Burgundiones, Quadi, Marcomanni, Savienses or Suavi, Toringi, (Thuringians) the Franks who bordered on the river Vierus, and the Bructeri, who were considered to be allied to the Francs in blood. Aventhius mentions also the Boii, Suevi, and Alemanni under king Gibuld. In Henning's Genealogies it is said that a hundred nations marched under Attila. This immense army pursued its course south of the Danube, and passed through Noricum and the northern part of Rhaetia, that is to say the southern parts of Bavaria and Swabia. His northern vassals the Rugians, Quadi, Marcomanni, Thuringians, and other tribes followed, it seems, a more northerly course, having directions to form a junction with him on the Rhine.

Near the lake of Constance he was probably opposed by and routed a portion of the Burgundians, who were in the interest of Aetius, and attempted to prevent him from passing

the Rhine. Aventinus says that he slew on that occasion their kings Gundaric and Sigismund, which does not appear to be correct, at least with respect to Gundaric.

The forests of Germany, almost indiscriminately called Hercynian, furnished him with timber to construct vessels or rafts, on which the immense multitude, which constituted his army, was transported across the Rhine. Strasburg probably first felt the effects of his fury, and was levelled to the ground. At a later period, a figure of Attila is said to have been placed over the gate of that town. Some writers have asserted, that Metz (Divodurum Mediomatricorum) was the first place that he destroyed; thither he certainly proceeded and burnt the town, butchering its inhabitants, and the very priests at the altars. His march was directed towards the Belgian territory, and, having sacked Treves on his route, he overwhelmed the north of France, destroying whatever resisted him. Whether Tongres and Maastricht were destroyed before or after the battle of Chalons, is not certain. No effectual resistance could be offered to him by the Franks under Meroveus, and Alberon was speedily reinstated in the greater part of the kingdom of Clodion.

At this time Aetius, having expected that Theodoric would have made head against Attila, and probably wishing that they might weaken each other by the collision, his own forces remaining untouched, while Attila was overrunning all Belgium, had scarcely crossed the Alps, leading with him a small and very inefficient force. But intelligence was brought to him of the unexampled successes of Attila, and that the Visigoths, appearing to despise the Huns, whom they had formerly beaten when subsidized by Litorius, were awaiting in their own territory the attack of the invader, if he should think fit to bear down upon them.

The active mind of Aetius was equal to the arduous position in which he stood. He immediately dispatched Avitus to urge Theodoric to draw out his force without delay and form a junction with him. His exertions were great and rapid to collect a force sufficient to make head against the conqueror, who was already preparing to fall upon the south of France. Theodoric, accompanied by his two eldest sons Torismond and Theodoric, took the field, having ordered his four younger sons to remain at Tolosa, to which he himself was not destined to return. The wonderful genius and activity of Aetius, when it suited his views to bestir himself, was never more conspicuous than on this occasion, when he speedily brought together a force equal to that of the Hun. In the allied army the Visigoths of Theodoric, the Alans of king Sangiban, the Franks of Meroveus, Sarmatians, Armoricans, Burgundians, Saxons, Litarii, Riparioli, and several other German and Celtic nations were united with the Romans. Although the affairs of Attila are conspicuous in the Northern legends, it is observable that, in the vast concourse of tribes pouring into France from every quarter of Europe, no mention is made by any writer of Danes, for this simple reason that there was in truth no such nation at that period, other than the Dacians from the Danube, notwithstanding the assertions of Danish historians.

The attack of Paris did not fall within the line of Attila's operations, and the Christians subsequently attributed the salvation of that city to the merits of St. Genevieve; but Paris was not then a great metropolis. The late king Clodion had had his principal seat at Dispargum, supposed by some to have been Louvain, but probably Duysberg on the right bank of the Rhine. It was apparently one of the effects of Attila's invasion, by detaching Cambray, Hainault, and the rest of the Belgic provinces from the kingdom of Meroveus, to make Paris become the seat of his government. Tolosa, the flourishing capital of Theodoric the Visigoth, was an object of superior importance to Attila. He had already, in pursuance of his intentions, reduced again under the authority of Alberon the greater part of the Belgic portion of the kingdom of the Franks; and his promises to make a powerful diversion in favor of Genseric king of the Vandals in Africa, and his own ambitious views, pointed to the south of France. His main force was therefore directed against Orleans; from whence, if he had been

successful, he would have undoubtedly continued his victorious course towards the Gothic metropolis, or Arelas the principal city of the Roman province.

We know not to whom the military defence of Orleans was entrusted. Sangiban, king of the Alans, who occupied the neighbourhood of the Loire, was at that time in Orleans, but he does not appear to have had the command of the garrison. In the history of these times, whether relating to the Gallic war, or the invasion of Italy, we hear more of the bishop of the place, who seems generally to have taken upon himself the chief conduct of affairs, than of any military prefect; partly, perhaps, because the details which have reached us have been chiefly transmitted through ecclesiastics. To the bishop, therefore, has been generally attributed both the vigour that defended, and the treason that surrendered to the pagan, the fortresses of the Roman empire; the traitors and the martyrs seem to have found a place equally in the calendar of saints. Anianus, since called St. Aignan, held the see of Orleans, when the immense force of Attila proceeded to invest it. He made every disposition for a stout defence, encouraged the people and the garrison to put their confidence in God, without relaxing their efforts, and despatched a trusty messenger to Aetius, urging him to advance immediately to his relief.

The operations of the Hun were perhaps impeded for a few days by unseasonable weather, but his engines battered the town with irresistible force, and it seemed as if nothing but the direct interposition of Providence could save the town and its inhabitants from the terrible chastisement, which Attila never failed to inflict upon those who presumed to defend themselves. Bishop Anian prayed, and prayed, and prayed; but the walls were shaken by the force of the battering rams, the garrison were driven from the battlements by the Hunnish archery, and the battlements themselves crumbled under the repeated shocks of the blocks of stone that were hurled by the machines of the besiegers. He sent his attendant to look out and report whether he saw anything in the distance. The answer was, no. Again he sent him, and nothing was distinguishable.

A third time, and he reported, like the messenger of Elijah, that a little cloud was rising on the plain. The bishop shouted to the people, that it was the aid of God, and throughout the whole town there was a cry of the aid of God, mingled with the shrieks of women; for at that very instant the Huns were scaling the breach and actually in the town, and in a few moments the city would have been a blazing and bloody example of barbarian vengeance. But Attila had seen the little cloud that was advancing in the distance, and recognized the dust that was raised by the rapid advance of the Gothic cavalry, which formed the van of the army of Aetius. Instantly he saw the danger of exposing his troops to the attack of a powerful enemy under that consummate general, amidst the disorganization which must accompany the sack of a populous city, which was on the point of being delivered up to plunder; and at the very instant when Orleans was taken, and the work of violation and massacre was on the point of commencing, the successful assailants were astonished by the signal for a retreat.

The deliverance was attributed by the Christians to the direct interposition of Providence, obtained by the faith and supplications of their priest.

Attila did not think it expedient to await the attack of Aetius before the walls of a hostile town, and, having learned the strength of the allied army, he retreated to the great plains of Champagne which took their name from *Catalaunum*, the modern Châlons upon Marne, and by that movement he probably fell back upon his own resources and concentrated his forces, for it is not likely that the whole of his enormous army should have been in the lines before Orleans. He knew that he had to contend with a general of great skill, a king of approved valour, and an army equal to his own in numbers and warlike habits.

Upon the plain of Châlons was then to be decided the fate of Europe; the combatants there assembled had been drawn together from the immense tract of country which reaches from the straits of Gibraltar to the Caspian sea. It is impossible in our days to approach the

consideration of this contest without bringing to mind that nearly fourteen centuries after this great event, the armies of the same immeasurable line of territory were to be again assembled on the same plain, and under circumstances very similar, for the overthrow of the only individual who has arisen since that day, resembling Attila in his character, in his success, in his mode of acting and his views of universal dominion; that both were defeated, and both came forth again to be the terror of Europe in one more final campaign.

On his retrograde march towards Châlons, a circumstance is said to have occurred, which, if it was not, as may be suspected, a politic contrivance of his own, was at least adroitly put forward by Attila, for the purpose of increasing the terror of his name, an object of peculiar importance at the moment of a retreat.

A Christian hermit was brought to him, who had been urgent for admittance to his presence, and addressed him at length, assuring him that God, on account of the iniquities of his people, which he fully detailed, placed the sword in his hand, which, when they should have returned to a sound state, he would resume and give to another. He said to him "You are the scourge of God, for the chastisement of the Christians", and added that he would be unsuccessful in the battle he was about to fight, but that the kingdom would not pass out of his hands.

From this moment Attila appears to have assumed the title of Scourge of God, which accorded with his views of oversetting the Christian religion, and establishing his own right to universal dominion upon the grounds of a heavenly delegation. He had long pretended to be the holder of that sword, which was regarded either as the God itself, or the symbol of the principal God which the Scythian nations worshipped.

The title which he now assumed, appears to have furnished a pretext to insincere Christians, under the specious garb of humility and resignation to the chastisement of the Almighty, to betray into his hands the places which they should have defended; and, in an age so prone to superstition, it is not unlikely that it may have influenced many devout Christians to yield to him without offering any resistance. Attila, having heard the prediction of the hermit, consulted his own soothsayers, of whom there was always a multitude with his army.

According to their custom, they inspected the entrails of cattle, and certain veins which were distinguished upon the bones after they had been scraped, and after due deliberation they announced to him an unfavourable issue of the battle, but consoled him by the assurance that the principal leader of his enemies would perish in the engagement.

Attila is said to have understood that the prediction pointed to Aetius, whose loss would have been irreparable to the Romans. He therefore determined to give battle to the allies at a late hour of the day, that he might reap the advantage awarded to him by the prophecy with as little loss as possible, and that the approach of night might screen his army from the reverse which he had reason to expect. He is said to have proposed a truce which was refused by Aetius. It is not improbable that the predictions of his soothsayers may have caused him to hesitate, and he was perhaps desirous of a few more days to collect the forces which he might have left in Belgium.

In the night preceding the great battle, an important collision took place between 90,000 of the Franks on the side of the Romans, and of the Gepidae who formed an important part of the Hunnish army, and many on both sides had fallen. Whatever hesitation Attila might have felt in the first instance, he acted with his usual decision when the hour arrived, which was to decide the fate of Western Europe. The hostile armies lay close to each other on an extensive plain, which stretched 150,000 paces in length, and above 100,000 in breadth.

The forces of Attila were on the left, the Romans on the right of a sloping hill, which either army was desirous of occupying on account of the advantage of the position. Aetius commanded the left wing of the allies, with the troops that were in the service of the emperor. Theodoric with his Goths formed the right, and Sangiban with his Alans was placed



in the centre, so surrounded as to prevent his withdrawing himself, since he was regarded with suspicion, and known to be fearful of incurring the vengeance of Attila, and he was probably supported by the Franks.

Attila with his Huns, surrounded by a bodyguard of chosen troops, commanded in the centre of his army. His wings were composed of various subject nations, led by their several kings, amongst whom the Ostrogothic brothers Walamir, Theodemir, and Widimir, were conspicuous, distinguished not only by their valour, but by the nobility of their descent, being joint-heirs of the illustrious race of the Amali.

But the most renowned amongst them was Arderic, who led into the field an innumerable force of Gepidae, and commanded the right wing. Attila placed the greatest confidence in his fidelity, and relied much upon his advice. He shared the favour of the Hun with Walamir, who was the eldest and principal king of the Ostrogoths, and highly valued for his sagacity. Walamir commanded the left wing which was opposed to Theodoric. But Attila was the soul of his army; the numberless kings, who served under his orders, attended like satellites to his nod, observed the least motion of his eye, and were ever prompt to execute his commands.

The battle commenced with a struggle for the possession of the higher ground, which was as yet unoccupied. Attila directed his troops to advance to its summit, but Aetius had anticipated his movement, and, having gained possession of it, by the advantage of the ground easily routed the Huns who were advancing, and drove them down the hill. Attila quickly rallied the Huns, and encouraged them by a harangue, in which he said that he should think it a vain thing to inspirit them by words, as if they were ignorant of their duty, and novices in war, after having vanquished so many nations, and actually subdued the world, if they did not suffer what they had won to be wrested from them. A new leader might resort to, and an inexperienced army might require, such exhortations; but it neither became them to hear, nor him to address to them, words of trite and common encouragement; for to what had they been habituated, if not to warfare? what could be sweeter to brave men than vengeance, the greatest of the gifts of nature?

“Let us therefore”, he said, “attack the enemy briskly. The assailants are always the stoutest-hearted. Despise the junction of separate nations; to seek alliances betrays weakness. See even now, before the attack, the enemy are panic-stricken; they seek the elevated places, they take possession of the mounds, and, repenting of their hardihood, they are already desirous of finding fortifications in the open plain. The lightness of the Roman arms is known to you; I will not say that they are overpowered by the first wounds, but by the very dust. While they are assembling in line and locking their shields, do you fight after your own manner with excellent spirit, and despising their array, attack the Alans, overwhelm the Visigoths. We must win the repose of victory by destroying the sinews of war; the limbs drop, when the nerves are cut through, and a body cannot stand when the bones are taken from it. Huns, let your spirits rise; put forth all your skill and all your prowess. Let him, who is wounded, demand of his comrade the death of his antagonist; let him, who is untouched, satiate himself with the slaughter of enemies. No weapons will harm those who are doomed to conquer; those who are to die would be overtaken even in repose by their destiny. Why should fortune have made the Huns victorious over so many nations, unless the glory of this contest had been reserved for them? Who opened the passage of the Maeotian swamp to our ancestors, so many centuries shut up and secret? Who enabled them, when as yet unarmed, to defeat their armed adversaries? An allied assemblage will not be able to resist the countenance of the Huns. I am not deceived; this is the field which so many successes have promised to us. I myself will throw the first darts at the enemy, and if any one of you can endure repose while Attila is fighting, he wants the energy of life”.

By such exhortations the wonted spirit of his soldiers was renewed, and well may it be seen, by the tenor of his language, how absolute was his control over the various kings, of whose subjects his army was composed, when he could thus publicly contrast the unity of his own force, with the weakness of an allied confederacy. They rushed impetuously onward, and, though the posture of affairs under the disadvantage of ground was formidable, the presence of Attila prevented any hesitation; they engaged hand to hand with the enemy. The contest was fierce, complicated, immense, and obstinate, to which, according to the assertion of Jordanes, the records of antiquity presented nothing similar. That historian, who wrote about a century after, says that he heard from old men, that a rivulet which traversed the plain was swollen by blood into the appearance of a torrent, and that those, who were tormented by thirst and the fever of their wounds, drank blood from its channel for their refreshment. In the heat of the battle Theodoric riding along the ranks and animating his Visigoths, was knocked off his horse, as it was reported, by the dart of Andages an Ostrogoth in the army of Attila. In the confusion his own cavalry charged over him, and he was trampled to death. It appears that the Ostrogoths, who formed the left wing of the Huns, were overpowered by this charge and gave way, and that the Visigoths advancing beyond the Alans, who were opposed to Attila in the centre, had turned the position of the Huns, and threatened their flank and rear; but, seeing the danger with which he was menaced, Attila immediately fell back upon his camp, which was fenced round by his baggage wagons, behind which the Hunnish archers presented an insurmountable obstacle to the impetuosity of the Gothic cavalry. But the whole army did not retire behind the defenses, and the Huns stood firm until it was dark; for Torismond, the eldest son of Theodoric, who was not by his father's side in the battle, but had been stationed by the wary Aetius near his own person, probably as a surety for the fidelity of Theodoric, and had at the first driven the Huns down the hill in concert with the Romans, being separated from them afterwards, and mistaking in the darkness the Hunnish troops for the main body of the Visigoths, came unawares near the wagons, and fighting valiantly was wounded on the head and knocked off his horse, and being rescued by his soldiers discontinued the attack.

The superstition of the combatants increased the horrors of a nocturnal conflict, and a supernatural voice was supposed to have been heard by either army, which terminated the conflict. While this advantage had been gained at night-fall by the right wing of the allies, which had broken the left and forced the centre of Attila's army to fall back, the left wing under Aetius had been roughly handled by Arderic, and separated from the main body of his forces.

Aetius, ignorant of the success of his right and cut off from all communication with the rest of his army, was in the greatest peril, and fearful that the Visigoths had been overpowered. With difficulty he retreated to his camp, and passed the night under arms, expecting his entrenchments to be attacked by a victorious enemy. A most qualified victory it was, but certainly a victory, for the Visigoths did carry the battle to the very camp of Attila, whose right wing, though successful, did not pursue Aetius to his; but the singular result of this engagement was, that each of the chief commanders passed the night under momentary expectation of an assault from his antagonist. Attila, with the desperate resolution of a pagan, made a vast pyre within the limits of his encampment, which was piled up with harness, and such of the accoutrements of his cavalry, as were not in immediate use, on which he had determined to burn himself with his women and riches, in case his defenses should be stormed, that he might not fall alive into the hands of his enemies, nor any one of them boast of having slain him; but he presented a determined front to the allies, and placed a strong force of armed men and archers in front of the cars, keeping up at the same time an incessant din of warlike instruments to animate his own troops, and alarm those of Aetius by the expectation of an attack.

The dawn discovered to both armies a plain absolutely loaded with the bodies of the slain, and Aetius, perceiving that Attila stood on the defensive, and showed no intention of advancing, became sensible of the successes of the former evening; and, after he had communicated with the Visigoths, it was determined to attempt to reduce Attila by a blockade, as the army of Stilicho had reduced the great host of Radagais near Florence; for the fire of the Hunnish archers was so hot, that they dared not attack him in his position.

But the victorious Theodoric was missing, and no one amongst his troops could account for his disappearance. Torismond and his brother instituted a search for his body, and it was discovered amongst the thickest heaps of the slain. It was borne in sight of the Huns with funereal songs to the camp of the Visigoths, where his obsequies were celebrated with pompous ceremony and loud vociferations, which seemed discordant to the ears of the polished Romans; and Torismond was raised to the estate of a king upon the shield of his forefathers. Having offered to his departed father all the honours, which the customs of his countrymen required, he was ardently desirous of revenging himself on Attila, and would gladly have bearded the lion in his den, but he was not so rash as to attempt an attack with his Visigoths alone; and it was necessary to consult with Aetius. That crafty politician, who appears at every moment of his life to have played a double game, did not consider it for his own advantage to renew the attack. The Huns had sustained such a severe loss of men, that it was not probable that Attila would then renew his attempt either to penetrate into the Roman province, or to conquer the kingdom of the Visigoths. On the other hand, if he should succeed in utterly overpowering the Hun, he dreaded to find a second Alaric in his grandson, who might prove not less formidable to the empire.

His own views were fixed upon the imperial purple, and the report, that he entered into secret negotiations with Attila, after the battle of Châlons, with a view to his own advancement, is probably correct. Being consulted by his young ally, he advised him to forbear from renewing the attack, and to retire with his forces to his own dominions, lest his younger brothers should take advantage of his absence to possess themselves of his throne. With like craftiness, he persuaded Meroveus rather to content himself with what remained to him of the kingdom of Clodion, than to risk the consequence of another engagement, in the hope of recovering the Belgian territory.

The loss of human life in the battle is estimated at about 160,000 souls, and whether we look to the numbers and prowess of the combatants, the immensity of the carnage, or its consequences to the whole of Europe, it was undoubtedly one of the most important battles that were ever fought.

When the retreat of the Visigoths was first announced to Attila, he imagined that it was a crafty device of the enemy to lure him into some rash undertaking, and he remained for some time close in his camp; but when the utter and continued silence of their late position convinced him that they had really withdrawn, his mind was greatly elevated, and all his hopes of obtaining universal dominion were instantly renewed. He was very boastful in his language, and is said to have cried out, as soon as the departure of Torismond was confirmed, "A star is falling before me and the earth trembling. Lo, I am the hammer of the world".

In that singular expression will be recognized an allusion to the hammer of the God Thor, of which the form is known to have been a cross, and in fact nearly identical with that of the mysterious sword which Attila wore, reversing it so that the hilt becomes the mallet and the blade the handle. He met with no further opposition from any part of the allied army, from which it may be pretty surely concluded that Aetius did enter into a secret arrangement with him, which, though suspected, never became public, as Aetius did not communicate it to the Romans. If we may judge from the result, the terms must have been that Attila should not attack the Roman province or kingdom of Tolosa, but should retain his Belgian conquests which were raised into the kingdom of Cameracura for Alberon, and should not be molested

by the allies; to which we may suppose that Aetius added private terms to promote his own elevation. It is probable that when, after the decease of Attila, Valentinian caused Aetius to be put to death, he was apprised of his treasonable plans, which were perhaps on the eve of being carried into execution.

In order to remove the impression of a defeat, Attila, having surveyed the field of battle, of which he was ultimately left the master by the retreat of those who had defeated him in a qualified manner, ordered a great sacrifice to be made according to the practice of his nation, to the God Mars, that is to the sword which he wore, and which was the visible personification of the war-god. The fashion of that sacrifice was after this manner. They raised a lofty square structure of faggots, measuring 375 paces on each of its sides, three of which were perpendicular, but the fourth graduated, so that it was easily ascended. In their regular stations such structures were renovated every year by an accumulation of 150 wagon loads of brush-wood. On the summit the ancient iron sword, which was symbolical of the war-god, was planted. To that idol sheep and horses were sacrificed.

The sacrificator first made fast a rope round the feet of the animal, and, standing behind it, by pulling the rope threw it down, and thereupon invoking the God, he cast a halter round its neck, and strangled it by twisting the rope with a stick; and without either burning, or cutting, or sprinkling it, he immediately proceeded to skin and cook it. In ancient times, when their state was very rude, and they dwelt in extensive plains where fuel was very rare, they used the bones of the animals for fuel, as the South Americans do at this day, and even the paunch of the animal for a kettle. As soon as the beast was cooked, the sacrificator taking the first share of the flesh and entrails, threw the rest before him. Of their captives they sacrificed one chosen out of each hundred, not in the same manner as the beasts, but having first poured wine on his head, they cut his throat, and received the blood in a vessel, which they afterwards carried up to the summit of the pile, and they emptied the blood upon the sword. They cut off the right shoulder of each man that was thus slaughtered, together with the arm and hand, and cast it into the air; and after the completion of their ceremonies they departed, leaving the limb to lie wherever it happened to have fallen, and the body apart from it. Such was the mode in which the ancient Scythians had sacrificed nine hundred years before; such were the rites by which the Huns had celebrated their first successes in Europe, and by which Attila now returned thanksgiving on the plain of Châlons for the retreat of the Christians.

Such was the man, before whom the Christians trembled, and with whom the Arians and some other sectarians are said to have been plotting for the destruction of the Catholics. Ammianus Marcellinus had already testified, that in his time no wild beasts were so blood-thirsty as the various denominations of Christians against each other. Probably more with a view to wipe out the impression of his retreat, and of the check which he had received, than of prosecuting the invasion, he now moved forward again with his whole force, not in the direct line to Orleans, but in a direction which appeared to threaten Orleans, and he advanced against Troyes on the 29th of July. Lupus the bishop of that place, and soon after sanctified, delivered up the town to Attila, and prevailed upon him to spare the place and its inhabitants. He is said to have gone out bareheaded, attended by his clergy and many of the citizens to meet Attila, and to have asked him, who he was that subdued kings, overturned nations, destroyed towns, and reduced everything under his subjection.

Attila replied, "I am the king of the Huns and the scourge of God". To which Lupus answered saying, "Who shall resist the scourge of God, which may rage against whomsoever he will! Come therefore, scourge of my God, proceed whithersoever you will; all things shall obey you, as the minister of the Almighty, without impediment from me".

Attila marched through the town without injuring it, and the Christian legends say that the Huns were smitten with blindness, so that they passed on without seeing anything, a miracle attributed to the sanctity of Lupus. That hypocritical villain received, as the minister



of his God, the barbarian whose sword was reeking with the recent immolation of his Christian captives, and he proceeded with Attila to the Rhine, and did not return to his diocese. His panegyrists assert that Attila for the good of his own soul compelled Lupus to accompany him. It is not unlikely that Attila may have thought that such a mock Christian in high dignity might be useful to him, by inducing others to submit, and the bishop probably thought that, after the part he had acted, he was safest under Attila's protection; not having anticipated, when he received the Hun with such honours, that he would immediately afterwards retire from France.

He is eulogized by Sidonius Apollinaris, soon after bishop of Clermont, whose praise is perhaps not very valuable, and whose writings, very different from those of Prudentius, as well as his name, bear the stamp rather of paganism than of genuine Christianity. Attila thence changed the direction of his march and returned to Pannonia. He certainly, however, left an organized force behind to defend the Belgian kingdom of Cameracum against Meroveus, for Alberon and his two brothers continued in possession of it, till they were defeated by the army of Clovis (Louis), and subsequently massacred by him.

Having passed through Troyes, Attila, seeing the people flying to the woods, had compassion on them, and ordered them to return home without fear. A woman with one little girl tied round her neck, two others on a pack-horse, and seven elder daughters accompanying her on foot, cast herself at his feet and supplicated his protection. It was the policy of Attila to treat with general clemency those who threw themselves on his mercy, while he exterminated those who defied him, and he was naturally good-natured, when his ambitious views were not thwarted. He raised up the suppliant lady benignly, and dismissed her with assurances of his favor, and ample gifts to enable her to educate and give marriage portions to her daughters.

The Huns who were left to defend and complete the reduction of Belgium are said to have been commanded by Giulas, who commenced his career by the sack of Rheims, of which the inhabitants had given great offence by harassing the Hunnish army before the battle of Châlons. The citizens in extreme distress crowded round their bishop Nicasius, imploring his advice in the fatal alternative of hopeless resistance, or surrender to the certain vengeance of the barbarians. Nicasius admonished them that the success of Attila was permitted on account of their sins; but that they were destined to brief torments in the hands of the tyrant to obtain salvation and heavenly life. He exhorted them to follow and imitate his example.

His sister Eutropia, a pious virgin of exceeding beauty, seconded his exhortations; and many of the citizens animated by their enthusiastic piety accompanied them to the church of the Virgin Mary, singing hymns and psalms, in the midst of which Nicasius was butchered by the Huns. The beauty of Eutropia excited the desires of the conqueror who had slain her brother, but she is said to have torn out both his eyes, and was slain with all the Christians who had taken refuge in the church. Rheims was demolished, but Attila was not present. Diogenes, bishop of Arras, was also killed by the Huns and the town destroyed. Tongres underwent the same fate, notwithstanding the sanctity and prayers of St. Servatius. Maastricht suffered either before or after the battle of Châlons.

After the destruction of Tongres, the Huns are said to have undertaken the siege of Cologne, which has been rendered famous by the alleged martyrdom of St. Ursula and 11,010 virgins, an absurd fable, which it will be however proper to notice, as the lady has obtained a place in the calendar. If the eyes of the Hunnish general had been extinguished, he could scarcely have commanded in the subsequent operations; supposing them to have been lacerated by Eutropia, it is not improbable that he may have acted very ferociously and butchered many young women at Cologne, but the story of Ursula is utterly absurd, and the name Giulas seems like a corruption of Julius borrowed from an older tale, and was probably not the real name of a Hunnish commander.

Sigebertus, who flourished at the end of the eleventh century, is probably the first writer extant who detailed the story as relating to Ursula. The tale is given with some variation by different authors.

The account of Nicolas Olaus is as follows: Ursula was the only daughter of the king of Britannia; she was courted by Ethereus son of the king of the Angli, who requested her father to betroth her to him, on condition that she should be permitted to travel for three years according to her vow, requiring from Ethereus ten virgins of undoubted chastity for her companions, to each of whom as well as to herself a thousand maidens should be attached. The 11,011 virgins entered the mouth of the Rhine on board eleven large ships, and proceeded to Cologne and Basle, whence they journeyed on foot to Rome, and, having visited all the shrines in that quarter, according to her vow, they returned with Cyriac pope of Rome to Basle and Cologne, where the whole party were intercepted and massacred by the Huns under Giulas.

Gobelin Persona (born *AD* 1358), in *Cosmodrom*, fully exposes the absurdity of the story, and shows that there never was such a pope or bishop of Rome, and that such visitations to Rome were unknown at that period. He says the tale was derived from a recluse of Shonaugia about the year 1156; and Pray, trusting to G. Persona, says that Elizabetha Shonaugiensis, in her revelations in the 12th century, first added its present form to the story of the virgins, which is untrue, for she did not even place the event in the age of Attila. It is certain that Ursula's name was in the calendar of saints before the time of Elizabeth, and that she did not invent the tale, because she mentions having seen what she relates in a vision on the day of the feast of the 11,000 holy virgins.

Cardinal Desericus found at Rome an old and imperfect MS. which refers the event to the year 237, saying that Alexander Severus sent Maximin the Thracian from Illyria to repress the Germans near the Rhine. The former being killed, Maximin proclaimed himself emperor. He employed Julius prefect of the Rhine to besiege Cologne, and, through hatred to the Romans, caused the virgins returning from Rome to be massacred by Julius. It states another account to be that when Maximin moved to the siege of Aquileia, where he perished, Julius collected a band of Suni (a people of Germany mentioned by Pliny, Tacitus, and Cluverius), and slew the virgins, and that Suni was afterwards confounded with Hunni, who were called according to the Latin orthography Chuni. The MS. quotes Lampridius and Julius Capitolinus falsely. Another account in Baronius (*Ann. eccles.*) refers the tale to the year 381. He says that Gratian having conciliated the Huns, wished that part of them should attack Great Britain with a fleet, and part enter Gaul in concert with the Alans; that Conan, a petty king in Great Britain, accompanied Maximus from thence to Gaul, and persuaded him to locate the British troops in the territory evacuated by the Armoricans, and to send over to Dinoc king of Cornwall for Ursula who was betrothed to Conan, and 11,000 virgins for wives to the soldiers who were to form the new colony; that Gaunus a Hunnish, and Melga a Pictish, pirate intercepted them, and, as they preferred death to the loss of virginity, slew them all. Baronius probably derived the account from Geoffrey of Monmouth, and it originated in the *Brut* or *Chronicle of the kings of Britain*, which says that Maximus and Cynan having killed Hymblat king of the Gauls, Maximus gave Armorica to Cynan, who sent to the earl of Cornwall for 11,000 daughters of noble Britons, 60 daughters of foreigners, and servant maids. Their ships were dispersed and some sank. Two were seized by Gwnass and Melwas, the former commander of the Huns, the latter of the Picts, who were at sea with crews in support of Gratian. Another manuscript of the *Brut* says that Cynan was enamoured of the daughter of Dunawd king of Cornwall, and sent for her with a large number of British women.

There appears no reason to doubt the veracity of this narrative, which accounts for the subsequent connection between Britany and Cornwall; and it appears by a letter of St Ambrose to Maximus that the Huns were employed at that time by the Roman emperor; and

from another it is evident that the Huns had been desired to enter Gaul, but were diverted by Valentinian. Sigebertus in his chronicle says that in 389 Gnamus and Melga were leaders of the Huns and Britons employed by Gratian against Maximus, and laid waste Great Britain, but were driven into Ireland by a detachment sent by Maximus.

The Huns as a nation had certainly no navy or maritime habits, but it is not improbable that, when they overran the North, some of them may have adventured as sea-rovers after the example of the Northmen. Vegnier, Vertot, Dubos, Turner, &c deny the migration of Britons into Armorica in the time of Maximin, and maintain that the first Briton who settled there was one Rhivallon who fled from the encroachments of the Saxons in 513. The Loire is the southern boundary of Britany, and the words of Sidonius Apollinaris who wrote in the 5th century, and says that Euric king of Thoulouse was advised to invade and conquer the Britons situated above the Loire, is decisive as to the error of their assertion. Their king appears to have been Riothamus, to whom a letter addressed by Sidonius is extant, and he is mentioned by Jordanes as Riothimus king of the Britons amongst the Bituriges in France. The upshot of the whole appears to be that when Maximus founded a British colony in Britany in the 4th century, some of the wives or intended brides of the colonists were intercepted by a Hunnish and Pictish pirate in the service of Gratian; that in the following century the general of Attila, having had his eyes lacerated by Eutropia, perhaps butchered some women at Cologne, called Colonia Ubiorum; that Ursula the bride of the prince of the British colony, having been killed by the pirates, had been sanctified as a martyr; and that in the 11th or 12th centuries the stories were confounded, the women who were slain having in both instances belonged to a colony, (Colonia) and suffered for resisting the incontinency of the Huns.

That such is the real history of this fable appears further from this, that Floras, Ado, and Wandelbert, writers of the 8th and 9th centuries on martyrology, state the murder of the virgins at Cologne, but nothing about Great Britain, Ursula, Ethereus, or any names of virgins or anything concerning a pilgrimage to Rome. That Cologne (Agrippina Colonia Ubiorum) was destroyed by the Huns is affirmed by Sigonius, Herm. Fleinius in vit. SS. ad 21 Oct and Harseus ap. Vales. and others besides the Hungarian writers.

From Troyes Attila probably returned directly to Pannonia, through either Strasbourg or Basle, continuing his course along the Danube. He passed the ensuing winter at his capital Sicambria, which was perhaps the ancient Buda. It is fabulously stated to have been founded by Antenor the Trojan.

When Attila either built or enlarged Sicambria, he is said to have wished to bestow his own name upon it, and the fatal quarrel between him and his brother is stated to have arisen from a dispute whether it should be called Attila or Budawar. Bleda is by some writers named Buda, and in Scandinavian sagas Buddla is given as the name of the father of Attila, and perhaps it may be considered as having some reference to the name Buddha, the oriental title of Woden or Odin, who seems to have been on some occasions identified with Attila himself in ancient Scandinavian legends. The winter was employed in recruiting his forces, and at the opening of the spring of 453, Attila had under his command a more powerful army, than that with which he had entered Gaul. Early in the season he set this mighty host in motion for the overthrow of Rome. As he mounted on his horse to take the command of this momentous expedition, a crow is said to have perched on his right shoulder, and immediately afterwards to have risen so high into the air, that it could no longer be discerned.

The augury was accepted with joy, and the soldiers anticipated nothing less than the subjugation and plunder of Italy. It will be remembered that the God Odin is fabled to have had two crows or ravens which flew every day round the world to do his missions, and returned at evening to his heavenly mansion; nor were these messengers unknown to the Greek and Roman mythology. Plutarch relates that two crows were sent out by Jupiter, one to the east, the other to the west, and, having flown round the world, met at Delphi. Livy writes

that when Valerius, hence called Corvinus, was engaged in contest with a powerful Gaul, a crow lighted on his helmet, and gave him the victory by assailing the eyes of his antagonist; and we know from Prudentius that this was one of the Delphic crows, sacred to Apollo.

It is stated by Strabo that when Alexander the Great was in danger of perishing amidst the sands of the desert, on his way from Parsetonium to the temple of Jupiter Ammon, he was delivered by the guidance of two crows; nor will it be forgotten that ravens brought food to Elijah. With these recollections it seems not improbable that Attila may have practised some imposture in the sight of his army, or at least that such a tale was purposely circulated amongst his followers, to promote the superstitious belief of a communication having been made to him by the Deity. There is much discrepancy in the various accounts of the route by which he entered Italy, but from the enormous bulk of his army it is probable that they may all be founded in truth, and that his army advanced in several columns which were to reunite after having passed the Alps.

The Byzantine emperor Marcian, who had the administration of the provinces on the north-west of the Adriatic, had left their numerous towns ungarrisoned. Attila crossed the Drave and the Save, and the whole of Styria, Carinthia, Illyria, and Dalmatia, was overrun by his forces without any serious opposition. Aetius, who commanded the armies of Rome, whether from treasonable views, or because Valentinian kept the main forces of the empire for the immediate defence of Rome, whither he had withdrawn from Ravenna upon the alarm of an approaching invasion, certainly made no attempt to oppose the progress of the great antagonist whom he had so lately discomfited on the plain of Châlons; but the whole tenor of his life seems to mark that he must have been consulting his own personal aggrandizement, and utterly disregarding the interests of his country.

We may figure to ourselves the reminiscences of that great and dissembling commander, while, stretching his hopes to the acquisition of power exceeding that of the mightiest emperors, he lay in purposed inactivity before Rome, awaiting the effects of intemperance and disorganization on the force of Attila, and distraction and imbecility on the imperial counsels. We may fancy him bringing to mind the early instructions of his Scythian father, and of his mother who was descended from one of the most illustrious families of Latium; the youthful energy which had led him to excel in every exercise of the field or forest; his first and early military achievements; his sojourn as a hostage in the court of Alaric, and afterwards of Rhuas the Hunnish monarch; the hypocrisy with which he had pretended to embrace Christianity, while his heart was imbued with the leaven of paganism; his initiation of his son Carpileo into all the orgies of idolatry in the capital of Attila; his abode in the palace of John the usurper; his advance at the head of a Hunnish army towards Ravenna, the consternation with which he heard of the sudden destruction of John, and the art with which he made his peace with Valentinian; the military titles which were the reward of his treason, extorted from his imbecile rulers; his command in Gaul, where in three campaigns he rescued Aries from the Visigoths, the Rhine from Clodion, and overwhelmed the Juthungians of Bavaria; the treachery by which he had compromised Boniface, and the ruin he brought thereby on the Roman authority in Africa; his personal conflict with Boniface, and mortification at the only defeat he suffered in his life, and the malignant joy with which he heard of the subsequent death of his rival; his flight from the arm of justice to Ms pagan ally, and the authority which he again obtained through the influence of the enemies of his country; his further successes in Gaul and Burgundy; the art with which he reconciled Theodoric to the Roman arms; the energy with which he inspired his allies; the mighty conflict of Châlons; the skill with which he diverted Torismond from avenging his father, and persuaded Meroveus to remain content with the Parisian kingdom; his secret negotiations with Attila, and all the vast and daring projects which had been since fermenting in his mind. If we place this picture



before us, we shall probably have filled up the outline of historical truth with no unreal imaginations.

The heart sickens, when we bring to mind the praises lavished by Gibbon upon this evil man, the outbreaking of whose treachery was probably anticipated by the jealousy of his roaster, and his sudden destruction. The existence of a coin bearing the superscription Flavius Aetius imperator, gives reason to suspect that he had even committed an overt act of treason before he was cut short by Valentinian.

The defence of the Julian Alps, through which the Huns were preparing to enter Italy, was entrusted to a small number of Visigothic auxiliaries under Alaric and Antal or Athal. Emona a flourishing town at the foot of the Alps was evacuated by its inhabitants on the approach of the invaders, by whom it was so completely destroyed, that no author recognizes its existence after that period. The Roman auxiliaries delayed the advance of Attila a little through the Goritian forest; but, after many conflicts, they were forced to abandon the mountain passes, and multitudes of barbarians poured through them with overwhelming impetuosity on the delightful district of Forum Julii. On the first alarm of an intended invasion, Valentinian had taken measures to put the important city of Aquileia in a state to resist the advance of the enemy. About the year 190 before the birth of Christ, the Gauls, having entered Carnia from Germany, had founded a city near the site of Aquileia, which was soon destroyed by the Romans. The Istri invaded the province four years after, whereupon the senate determined to build a town for the defence of the neighbouring territory, and in the year 181 before Christ Aquileia was founded by a colony from Rome. Augustus Caesar adorned Aquileia with temples and theatres, fortified the harbour, and paved the roads. He increased its circuit to twelve miles, or, as some say, to fifteen.

The remains of a double wall were to be seen in tolerable preservation in the 17th century, running directly east, eleven miles in length, like two parallel lines, composed of stones piled up, but not cemented by any kind of mortar. Aquileia stood on the banks and at the mouth of the river Natissa, which washed a large part of its wall. Sabellicus supposes that the name of the Sontius was lost after its junction with the Natissa, (whereas on the contrary the modern name of the Natisone is lost in the Isonzo) or else that the Natissa did not in ancient times fall into the Sontius, or that a stream flowed by a subterraneous channel out of the Natissa into the sea, because both Pliny and Strabo mention the mouth of the Natissa.

He adds that in his time only a church of the Virgin Mary, and the huts of a few peasants and fishermen remained on the site of Aquileia; but that many monuments, public ways, magnificent and sumptuous paved roads, aqueducts, sepulchres, and pavements, were still extant, by which the great size and distinguished appearance of the ancient town might be easily ascertained. The territory of Aquileia was called Forum Julii and also Carnia. The Carnians were a people inhabiting the mountains, where they led a pastoral life, their country being too rugged for tillage. In the year of our Lord 167 the physician Galen followed M. Aurelius and L. Commodus to Aquileia, and wrote his commentaries there.

In 361 in the reign of Julian his general Immon besieged Aquileia, and finding that the citizens derived great advantage from the river as a defence and means of obtaining provisions, he discontinued the siege, and employed his army by an immense exertion to excavate a new bed for the river, and conduct it to the sea at a considerable distance from the town. The inhabitants were however supplied by plenty of cisterns and wells, and did not suffer from the loss of water. Aquileia underwent another siege subsequently, when Maximin was discomfited before its walls and put to death by his own troops.

Herodian, who gives an account of this siege, states that Aquileia was a city of the first magnitude, with an abundant population, being situated on the seashore in front of all the Illyrian nations, as the emporium of Italy, delivering to navigators the produce of the continent brought down by land or by the rivers, and furnishing seaborne necessaries,

especially wine, to the upper countries, which were less fertile than the southern provinces from severity of climate.

Immediately after crossing the Alps, Attila routed and utterly annihilated the Roman force which was opposed to him in the neighbourhood of Tergeste, the modern Trieste, especially the cavalry under Forestus the distinguished ruler of Atestia, the modern Este, and other Italian troops which had been placed there by Menapus the governor of Aquileia to oppose his progress. The Huns then crossed the Sontius, and directed their whole might against Aquileia, which was at that time one of the fairest and most flourishing cities in the world, but was destined to be trampled under the relentless foot of Attila, and to become a desolation and a thing obliterated from the earth. Belenus, Felenus, or Belis had been the tutelary God of Aquileia, and, although the population was now at least nominally Christian, he was still held in great veneration as a guardian saint, if not an actual Deity. Herodian states that, when Maximin was engaged in the fruitless siege of Aquileia, before which he lost his life by the hands of his own soldiers, the besieged were encouraged by the oracles of their peculiar or provincial God Belin, or, if the word be inflected, Belis, whom they worshipped most religiously, and considered to be Apollo. The soldiers of Maximin affirmed that they beheld the likeness of the God in the air, fighting for the town, either superstitiously fancying that they saw something unusual, or making use of the fable to cover their own unwillingness.

Julius Capitolinus says that the discomfiture of Maximin was foretold by the augurs of the God Belenus, who is mentioned also by Ausonius. G. F. Palladio says that, when Maxentius was patriarch, about the year 841, a church and monastery of Benedictine monks was built out of the ruins of the temple of the false God of the province named Bellenus, not far from Aquileia, and was named L'Abbatia della Belligna, but was afterwards abandoned on account of malaria. The name given to the monastery and derived from that of the pagan God, out of the ruins of whose temple it was constructed, is very deserving of notice.

In the same manner the temple of Flora at Brescia became the chapel of St Florianus. These are amongst the numerous instances of the manner in which the Christians compounded with the pagans, not really converting them, but permitting the worship of their favourite idol under the licensed character of a saint. This baneful practice became a main source of the corruption of the church of Rome.

The Christianity of the Aquileians must have continued in a very unsettled state, for Stephen the patriarch in 517 was an Arian, and the epitaph of Elias the patriarch, who removed the see of Aquileia to Grado, states him to have been a Manichaeon. Palladius gives eight inscriptions in which Belenus is named. The last is Apollini Beleno C. Aquileien. felix .... He adds that the church of St Felix the martyr stands where the temple of Belenus was; that the natives do not call it Felix, but Felus (non Felicem sed Felum) with an evident allusion, as he observes, to the ancient name of the God. He adds that there is another more certain reminiscence of Belenus, because there still exists a noble abbey of which the tutelary saint is called St. Martin, (and be it recollected that in Latin these saints were actually called Divi) but is universally called Belenus for no other reason than the recollection of the idol, which after so many centuries could not be extinguished by any rites of true religion. In fact it was the corrupt impropriety of those rites, which, by attributing divinity to the saint, nourished and appeared to justify the reminiscence of the idol. Palladius adds that in the first age of Christianity the Aquileians did not desist from worshipping Belenus with magnificent sacrifices, and were so prone to that superstition, that those who were initiated in it were a great obstacle to the spread of Christianity.

Sir John Reresby, who travelled in the time of Cromwell, speaking of Venice says: "The palace of the patriarchs is one of the first, where we saw some ancient statues of the Roman Gods, as of Bacchus, Mercury, Pallas, Venus, and others; as also some little couches or beds on which the Romans used to lie when they made feasts in honour of their Gods. Upon these

are engraved certain characters, signifying vows made to the God Bellinus, formerly in great repute amongst the Aquileians, from whom these were taken with many other antiquities, at the razing of one of their chief cities and a Roman colony by Attila king of the Huns”.

This is a curious confirmation of the account given by Sabellicus and H. Palladium that Menapus governor of Aquileia removed the valuables and furniture of the town to the Venetian isle of Gradus before he evacuated it, written by a person who does not appear to have known that Aquileia itself had been sacked by Attila. Joannes Candidas, a lawyer of Venice, whose work was published in 1521, seven years after that of Sabellicus, discredits the accounts of Menapus and Oricus, but without any reason assigned, probably from indiscriminate disgust at the Atestine forgeries. H. Palladius gives a remarkable inscription found at Aquileia, and dated a few years before its destruction. Januarius who thus forewarned the inhabitants of the city of its approaching destruction by the scourge of God was patriarch before Nicetas, and died in 452 before the accomplishment of the visitation he foresaw.

On the approach of the enemy Menapus ordered a simultaneous sally from two gates of the town, and slew many of the Huns who had advanced incautiously, and put their van to flight. The conflict was continued for many hours, when he was at last forced to give way before the increasing numbers of the enemy, and retreated safely into the town.

Attila fortified his encampment, and on the following day accompanied by a few followers is said to have reconnoitred the town. He had almost reached the river, when Menapus suddenly attacked him from the rear. Attila with difficulty escaped, wounded, and baring lost the ornament of his helmet, and the greater part, if not the whole, of his attendants. After this hazardous encounter he became more cautious, acted more through the agency of his generals, and exposed himself less to personal danger.

According to another account, he had been in the habit of going his rounds alone and disguised, to observe the most assailable points of the city, and having been induced by the apparent silence and loneliness of the wall to approach nearer than usual, he was surprised by a body of armed men, who, having observed him, had sallied through a sewer under the walls, not knowing him to be the great king, but desirous of extorting from a hostile spy the plans of the enemy, and learning what hopes they entertained of capturing the town.

They surrounded him, therefore, wishing to take him alive. He placed his back against a steep bank, so that he could only be assailed in front, and defended himself; but finding the Aquileians, who were not desirous of killing him, remiss in the attack, he suddenly sprang forward with a loud shout and slew two of them, and immediately vaulting over the wall of some buildings near the town, he escaped to his own troops. Those, who had surrounded him, reported that, while he was looking round and collecting his strength for the assault, the appearance of his eyes was in a manner celestial, and sparks of fire glanced from them, like the energy attributed by heathen writers to the eyes of their Gods. The same anecdote is related by another historian, who states that he was on horseback, and that the circumstance took place near the end of the siege, the day before he observed the departure of the stork. He also speaks of the sparks emitted from his eyes, and says that when two of the assailants had been slain by him, the rest were daunted and suffered him to depart.

Menapus was a man of great activity and valour; he did not permit the Huns to enjoy a moment of rest by day or night, sometimes attacking them by surprise, sometimes openly, intercepting their foragers, capturing their stragglers, and carrying slaughter and tumult into their quarters by night. Attila at the commencement of the siege had no instruments for taking towns with him except ladders, either because his people were not skilful in the construction of engines, or because he preferred, through excess of pride, to rely on their personal exertions. A desperate attack was however made by the Huns with ladders, which was repelled by the garrison, who threw stones, fire, and boiling water, on the assailants; Menapus

everywhere exerting himself, exhorting and exciting his troops, rewarding valour and punishing remissness. After a great loss of men, Attila was forced to discontinue the assault, but it was renewed day after day with no better success, till at last the Huns found it necessary to make regular and scientific approaches, throwing up a bank and constructing *vineo*, which at that time were the usual protection of besiegers. At this period of the siege it is probable that Attila undertook the great work at Udine, which was at first called Hunnium, and afterwards Utinum, as a place of safety for his sick and wounded, and a strong depot, whenever he might advance into Italy. The conical hill which he raised and fortified, remains to this day an imperishable monument of the immensity of his resources.

All writers concerning it agree that it was fortified by Attila during the siege, having been perhaps originally strengthened by Julius Caesar. H. Palladium gives an ample account of it to the following effect Attila raised it up and fortified it as a safe post during the siege, and a point of support for his future operations. During the beleaguering of Aquileia, the concourse to Hunnium had been so great, that many had built themselves houses of wood and stone along the way to Aquileia. Attila feared that a sally from thence might overpower these defenseless houses, and he abstained from pressing the siege for a few days, while he marked out the site of a town, and surrounded it with a strong rampart and gates protected by towers. After the capture of Aquileia he built a wall on the new rampart, and raised the mound of the Julian fortress, not only the slaves and captives, but all the soldiers, bringing earth in the cavity of their shields, till it was sufficiently increased. H. Palladius had an opportunity of verifying this account, the earth having been excavated to make a tank, when the artificial nature of one side of the mound was evident, from the admixture of worked stones and fragments of tiles with the earth, and also by the discovery of an old helmet; whereas the other side of the mound consisted of dry rock.

Having thus raised a secure defence for his own troops against the destructive sallies of the garrison, Attila pressed the siege with vigour. At the northern angle of the tower stood a tower of great antiquity, which, being occupied by a strong force, very much molested Attila. Menapus had strengthened its fortifications, and made a wall and ditch in front of it. It was a great object to Attila to gain possession of this outwork, because it commanded the whole town. He therefore approached his works to it, and filled the ditch with earth and stones, and tried by his archery to drive the Aquileians from the walls, while he sent light troops across the ditch to break down the wall with hatchets. Having succeeded in clearing the walls by incessant volleys of arrows, they overleaped the fosse, singing barbarian omens of victory. Menapus came immediately to the relief of the tower, and hot iron, molten lead, and blazing pitch, were thrown upon the Huns. Attila goaded on fresh troops to the attack, compelling them not only by words of command, but by the sword, to advance to certain death. But at length they gained a footing on the inner side of the fosse, and began to destroy the wall, where the mortar of the new works was not perfectly hardened, and a narrow breach was made.

Menapus singly resisted in the breach, and sallied through it, followed by a great power of Aquileians, and they forced their way even to Attila himself through the flying enemy, throwing torches and firebrands amongst them. Oricus brother of the governor sallied at the same time through the nearest gate with the Roman cavalry, and made great havoc amongst the enemy, killing all stragglers, and increasing the disorder of the discomfited Huns. Attila immediately ordered his own cavalry to advance, and charged at their head. After a severe conflict near the villa of Mencetius, Oricus was either killed or mortally wounded, and his followers nearly all cut off.

Menapus, wounded, returned through the breach in the outer wall, and some of the Huns forced their way in, but their comrades were beat off by the engines of the garrison, and he got safe into the town. Night succeeded, and the Huns continued to sap the foundations of the



tower, but, being only protected by their shields, they were at last forced to fall back with great loss of men. The Aquileians however had sacrificed their whole cavalry and its leader, a loss which outweighed all the previous slaughter of the enemy, and the town was become ruinous and almost untenable. Forestus and many other valiant men had fallen in its defence.

Menapus, therefore, despairing of successful resistance, as the army of Aetius remained inactive behind the Po, and no hopes of relief were held out to him, sent by night the children and women, and the wounded men to the nearest island, Gradus, with the patriarch Nicetas and the church utensils, being confident that the barbarians, who were unskilled in navigation, would not pursue their enemies by sea. He then attempted to repair the fortifications of the town and the wall in front of it.

The third month was now far spent, since Attila had commenced operations against Aquileia, and yet there was no certain prospect of taking the town. His troops murmured, and began to talk of raising the siege, when he observed a stork remove its young from the long contested tower. Thereupon he turned to his soldiers, and, auguring its speedy fall from that circumstance, he exhorted them to make a most vigorous attack upon it. Having been undermined and shaken before, it was at last beat out of the perpendicular by the immense stones thrown by the engines which he had caused to be constructed. It fell in the night time with a tremendous crash, which made the whole population start out of their beds; and, if Attila had immediately attacked the city, he might have taken it in the first moment of confusion.

The obscurity of the night and the ignorance of the Huns as to the actual state of the defenses gave the besieged a short respite, and Menapus quickly constructed an inner fortification with mud and stones, but he was aware that such a defence could not hold out long. At day break, Attila, having seen the state of things, made a bloody attack, and gained possession of the ruins of the tower; and, having driven the Aquileians behind the old wall, he began to strengthen the post, intending to use it for offensive operations against the town. Menapus now despaired of making good the defence of Aquileia; provisions were beginning to fail, and Valentinian had abandoned the outfit of a fleet which he had ordered to be equipped at Ravenna at the commencement of the siege. The governor therefore removed the greater part of his people to Gradus during the night, and placed statues or figures on the walls to look like sentinels, and prevent the enemy from noticing the evacuation of the city by the garrison.

When the day broke, the Huns at first wondered at the unusual silence, but at length observing birds alight on some of the figures, they perceived that the fortifications were abandoned. They immediately forced their way through the new wall, and killed all the men, children, and aged women, who were still remaining in the town; the younger women found in it were reserved for the embraces of the conquerors. Two matrons of high rank, and distinguished for beauty and chastity, having lost their husbands during the siege, had continued day and night mourning over their tombs, and refused to leave them, when the town was evacuated. Their names were Digna and Honoria. When the defences were stormed, to escape the incontinency of the Huns, Digna ascended an adjoining tower, which stood beside the river, and, having veiled her head, she threw herself into it and perished. Honoria, having thrown her arms round the stone sepulchre in which the remains of her husband were interred, clung to it with such perseverance, that she could not be dragged from it, till slain by the swords of the enemy. Thus fell Aquileia, 633 years after its foundation, perhaps the greatest town in the West after Rome.

Almost all the writers, who mention its overthrow, say that it was completely burnt and demolished, so that the barbarians seemed desirous of obliterating every vestige of its existence, but many circumstances contradict that assertion, which has been hastily adopted by modern historians. Aquileia is frequently mentioned as existing after the departure of

Attila, and it is certain that the patriarchs continued to dwell there till the time of the invasion of the Lombards, from whom the last calamity of the town proceeded. Justinian, long after the time of Attila, calls Aquileia the greatest of all the cities of the West, as if it were still existing. Many particulars indeed are known concerning Aquileia, down to the period of the removal of the see. Nicetas, the patriarch, returned from Gradus, after the retreat of Attila, and exerted himself to restore the church and the town.

The fugitives began to reassemble from different quarters, and many of them, having been supposed to have died in the war, found their wives provided with other husbands. This led to a correspondence between Nicetas and Pope Leo, the patriarch complaining that many of the women had remarried, knowing that their husbands were in captivity, and not expecting them to return. Leo exculpated the women who really believed their husbands to be dead, and condemned the others as guilty of adultery, but he ordered all to return to their first husbands under pain of excommunication. He directed those who had been baptized by heretics, not having been before baptized, to be confirmed by imposition of hands as having taken the form of baptism without the sanctification, but he forbade rebaptism. The heretics alluded to were the Sabellians and Arians, of whom there were many in the army of Attila, and who appear to have made common cause with the pagans. The whole letter of Leo is extant, and proves that Nicetas did not fall, as has been asserted, in the siege. He died about the year 463, and his statue and epitaph were placed in the patriarchal hall at Udine.

During the siege detachments from the army of Attila carried devastation far and wide in the adjoining territory, and treason was at work to betray into his hands several of the cities of Italy. Treviso, then Tarvisium, is said to have been yielded to the Huns through the means of its bishop Helinundus, who was probably inclined to the Arians, and of Araicus Tempesta, and Verona to have been given up by Diatheric or Theodoric, who has been celebrated in various Scandinavian and German romances under the name of Thidrek of Bern, meaning Verona, and has been much confounded with Theodoric the great, afterwards king of Italy, who was not then born. After the demolition of Aquileia, Attila marched immediately against Concordia, a flourishing town, of which the ruler Janus (who has become the hero of an Italian, perhaps originally a Provencal, romance) had probably molested him during the siege. Janus, with his wife Ariadne, fled to the nearest islands, and the conqueror entered and annihilated the deserted city. One church, that of St Stephen, and a few cottages were the only remains of Concordia at the end of the 15th century.

Attila next exterminated Altinum. Patavium (Padua), Cremona, Vincentia (Vicenza), Mediolanum (Milan), Brixia (Brescia), and Bergomum (Bergamo), were successively captured. The fugitives from Aquileia had established themselves in the isle of Gradua, the Concordians fled to Crapulse, afterwards Caorli, the Altinates to Torcellum, Maiorbium, and Amorianum, and the Paduans to Rivus altus, which is now nearly the centre of Venice, and is recognized in the modern name of the Rialto.

The foundations of the bright city of the waters was then laid, upon the sedgy islands that fringed the Adriatic, by the refugees from the various towns of Italy that were dismantled by the barbarian. Valentinian had fled from his palace at Ravenna to the protection of the eternal city, and Attila, while besieging Padua, or at a later period of his progress, is said to have received John the Arian bishop of Ravenna, who came with his clergy in white robes to solicit his mercy for their town and its population, and perhaps to offer him the assistance of the Arians to subjugate all Italy without a conflict, if he would adopt their faith. He is said to have answered that he would spare the town, but would throw down their gates and trample them under the feet of his cavalry, that the inhabitants might not in their vanity imagine their own strength to have been the cause of their preservation.

On his march to Concordia, Attila is said to have met some mountebanks, who, in the hope of obtaining money, jumped with singular skill and agility amongst some swords which

were artfully arranged. Thinking the employment despicable for men who had evidently sufficient bodily power and activity to use the sword efficiently in warfare, he ordered them to be covered with armour and to imitate him in vaulting on horseback with the weight of metal on them, which they proved unable to perform; neither could they bend the bow properly, nor fix the arrow in the string. He therefore ordered their well-fed bodies to be reduced by spare diet and exercise, and enrolled them amongst his recruits.

After the capture of Padua, a distinguished poet named Marullus the Calabrian, and who was probably the same person whose poem detailing the latter part of the siege of Troy which had been “left untold by the blind bard of Greece”, has descended to us under the name of Quintus Calaber, recited a poem in his praise, which gave him such offence, because it referred his origin to the gods of Greece and Rome, that he ordered it to be burnt and the poet put to death, but he remitted the latter part of the sentence. This anecdote, which was probably extracted from the MS. of Priscus, has been misunderstood by those who imagined from it that he repudiated divine honours, whereas the offence was the connecting him with a worship he detested, and with Bacchus or some other deity of the Pelasgians. Herodotus relates that Scylas, king of the Scythians, was beheaded by his own subjects in Borysthenes, and his palace, which was adorned with marble sphinxes and gryphons, fulminated and burnt by the god of the Scythians, because he adopted the Bacchic rites, which were held in abhorrence amongst them. That furnishes an explanation to the indignation of Attila.

During the attack of Florence, a statue of the god Mars, which notwithstanding the edict of Caesar still occupied an elevated station in the town, having been, however, removed from the temple which was dedicated to St. John, fell into the Arno, probably knocked down by the engines of the besiegers. At Vincentia Attila met with a stout resistance, and, finding his men hesitate, he leaped into the fosse, and wading through the water, which was breast-deep, led them to the assault, and was the first who scaled the rampart. But at Brixia he met with more dangerous opposition, and received a wound in the hand, which induced him to consign that city to more complete destruction than the rest of the conquered places. Yet Brixia was a town in which paganism appears to have lingered particularly. The temple of Flora had been converted into a church dedicated to St Floranus, to accommodate the heathens who adhered to their tutelary divinity, furnishing, like the dedication of the temple of Belis, or Felus, to St. Felix at Aquileia, one of the many instances in which the Church of Rome compromised with the pagans, whom it admitted within its pale without really converting them from idolatry, thus laying the foundation of its own corruption; but, in the Triumpline valley hard by, the iron statue of the god Tyllinus had escaped amidst the general destruction of idols, and remained after the days of Attila. Milan submitted to the conqueror, and a curious anecdote is related in a fragment of Priscus, for the preservation of which we are indebted to his having used an uncommon word for a bag, which caused it to be quoted by the lexicographer Suidas. Attila having observed in Milan a picture of the Roman emperors seated upon a throne of gold, and Scythians prostrate before them, ordered himself to be painted on a throne, and the Roman emperors bearing sacks on their shoulders and pouring out gold from them at his feet. After inflicting this lesson upon the pride of the Caesars he continued his victorious career, plundering Ticinum (Pavia), Mantua, Placentia, Parma, and Ferrara, and, as Jornandes asserts, demolished almost all Italy, which gives some color to the improbable assertion of the Hungarian writers, that he despatched his general Zowar to ravage Apulia, Calabria, and the whole coast of the Adriatic, destroying a town named Catona, as having been founded by Cato. Geminianus, bishop of Mutina (Modena), afterwards sanctified, is said to have played the same game as Lupus and John of Ravenna, and by submission to have conciliated the favor of the invader and saved the town. Attila is particularly stated to have laid waste Emilia (which must mean the country traversed by the via Emilia, between Aquileia and Rimini, Pisa and Tortona) and Marchia, which has been explained to signify the territory of Bergamo, but

was in truth used to designate the March of Ancona. Ferrara is said to have been destroyed, though, perhaps, at an earlier period of the campaign.

Thus far had Attila proceeded without meeting any material obstacle after the reduction of Aquileia, but Aetius had probably a considerable force under his command for the protection of Rome, and, since the Huns had crossed the Po, he had not ceased to hang upon their flanks, and to take every opportunity of cutting off their stragglers. A course of desultory victories and continual plunder had probably contributed to relax the discipline and diminish the numbers of the army of Attila. He deliberated whether or not to proceed against Rome, and such deliberations generally end by the adoption of the weaker counsel.

Evil forebodings had become prevalent amongst his vassal kings, who represented to him that Alaric had not long survived the invasion and plunder of the Romulean capital, and the mind of Attila appears at that time to have been influenced by a vague superstitious apprehension. He halted, as the later authorities assert near the confluence of the Mincio and the Po, but it has been presumed from the relation of Jordanes who names the place *Acroventus Mambuleius*, where the Mincio is forded by travelers, that it must have been where the great Roman road crossed the river at *Ardelica*, the modern *Peschiera*, near the point where it issues from the *Benacus* or *Lago di Garda*, close to the farm of *Virgil*, and the *Sirmian peninsula* of *Catullus*. It is however by no means improbable that the river might have been forded at some place to the south of *Mantua*, though the opinion of *Maffei* has led to the supposition that the place designated was close to *Peschiera*. *Governolo*, near the confluence of the Mincio and the Po, is a much more probable situation for the halt of Attila, after having ravaged the southern banks of the Po; for if he had actually fallen back as far as the *Benacus* before he received the embassy, he must have previously abandoned the prosecution of his enterprise, which is not even surmised by any writer on the subject.

While he was hesitating, whether to advance and attempt the complete subjugation of Rome, or to give way to the forebodings of his advisers, *Zowar* is said to have returned with great plunder from the coast of the *Adriatic*, and at the same moment an embassy from *Valentinian*, who had despatched *Leo* the pope or bishop of Rome, *Avienus* a man of consular dignity, and the praetorian prefect *Trigetius*, arrived at the camp of Attila. *Leo* is stated by his biographer and some other writers to have thrown himself at the feet of Attila, and to have delivered a speech of the most abject and unconditional submission. He is made to say, after the manner of *Lupus*, that evil men had felt his scourge, and to pray that the suppliants who addressed him might feel his clemency.

That the senate and Roman people, once conquerors of the world, but now defeated, humbly asked pardon and safety from Attila the king of kings; that nothing amid the exuberant glory of his great actions, could have befallen him more conducive to the present lustre of his name or to its future celebrity, than that the people, before whose feet all nations and kings had lain prostrate, should now be suppliant before his. That he had subdued the whole world, since it had been granted to him to overthrow the Romans, who had conquered all other nations. That they prayed him who had subdued all things to subdue himself; that, as he had surpassed the summit of human glory, nothing could render him more like to Almighty God, than to will that security should be extended through his protection to the many whom he had subdued.

The letters however of *Leo*, which are extant, upon various subjects chiefly connected with church discipline, seem to testify a right-judging and upright mind, and render it very improbable that he should have debased himself and the government which he then represented by such mean and contemptible adulation. Whether he addressed the mighty Hun in the language of abject submission, or strove to conciliate him by a more rational and dignified appeal, he was completely successful in obtaining the object of his mission.



The king is said to have stood silent and astonished, moved by veneration at the appearance, and affected by the tears, of the pontiff; and, when he was afterwards questioned by his vassals, why he had conceded so much to the entreaties of Leo, to have answered that he did not reverence him, but had seen another man in sacerdotal raiment, more august in form and venerable from his grey hairs, who held a drawn sword, and threatened him with instant death, unless he granted everything that Leo demanded. The vision was reputed to be that of St Peter, and according to Nicolas Olaus he saw two figures, who were reported to have been St. Paul and St Peter.

This celebrated anecdote, the memory of which is said to have been made illustrious by the works of Raphael and Algarve, is to be looked upon as an ecclesiastical fiction, but Attila seems to have been alarmed by a superstitious dread of the fate which overtook Alaric speedily after the subjugation of Rome. A joke is related as having been prevalent against Attila amongst his followers, founded on the names of the two bishops Lupus and Leo, that as in Gaul he had yielded to the wolf, he now gave way before the lion. He had probably more weighty reasons for his retreat, than the venerable aspect of the lion, the visions of the apostles, or the fate of the Gothic conqueror. His army was enervated by the sack of the Italian towns, and a grievous pestilence had thinned its ranks; the devastation of the country had rendered it difficult to obtain subsistence, and his troops were suffering from famine, as well as disease; the recollection of Radagais, who had not long before in the plenitude of his power been starved into unconditional surrender on the heights of Faesulae, may have furnished him with rational grounds of apprehension, while the army of Aetius, fresh and unbroken, was hanging upon his skirts, intercepting his foragers, cutting off his stragglers, and watching opportunity to inflict some more important injury.

An ample donation of gold, according to the base practice of that period, was probably added to the causes which induced Attila to forego for that season at least the attack of Rome; and he consented to withdraw his forces, threatening however that he would return in the ensuing spring to inflict the most determined vengeance on the Romans, unless Honoria and her portion of the imperial inheritance were conceded to him. Cassiodorius and Carpileo probably transacted the details of the treaty after the first audience of the ambassadors.

Theodoric king of Italy, in a rescript to the Roman senate, announcing the elevation of M. A. Cassiodorius to the patriciate, asserts that the conclusion of the peace was mainly attributable to the skill and intrepidity of the elder Cassiodorius his father. He speaks in high praise of him, saying that his mental qualities were equal to those of Aetius, and that on account of his wisdom and glorious exertions on behalf of the state he was associated with that distinguished commander, and was therefore deputed with Carpileo son of Aetius to "Attila the armipotent". "Fearless (continues Theodoric) he beheld the man who was dreaded by the empire; confiding in the truth he disregarded his terrible and threatening countenance. He found the king haughty, but left him appeased; and so completely overthrew his calumnious allegations by the force of truth, that he disposed him to seek conciliation, whose interest was not to be at peace with a state so wealthy. By his firmness he raised up the timid party, nor could those be looked upon as faint-hearted, who were defended by such fearless negotiators. He returned with a treaty, which the nation had despaired of obtaining". Theodoric bears no mean testimony to the magnanimity of Attila, when he asserts, that the truth spoken by a foe could disarm him in the full career of his hostility. Cassiodorius, to whom we are indebted for the preservation of Theodoric's account of his father's distinguished ability in conducting the negotiation, says in his chronicle that pope Leo made the peace under the direction of Valentinian.

Whether or not Honoria was afterwards delivered up to Attila is a point that admits of doubt, though no mention of her having been given to him is made by the Roman writers; but the Hungarians speak of a son Chaba borne to him by Honoria after his death. Nothing is

recorded concerning her after this period, and she most probably died in prison, unless, having been sent to him, she finished her life amongst the heathens.

She was not amongst the ladies of the imperial family whom Genseric afterwards carried off from the sack of Rome to Africa. The steps which had been taken on the discovery of the correspondence of Honoria with Attila are buried in oblivion with the lost work of Priscus, but the expression of Jordanes that Attila asserted that Honoria had done (or, strictly, admitted) nothing which should disqualify her from marrying him, induces me to believe that she was immediately compelled to undergo a mock ceremony of marriage, probably never consummated, for the purpose of preventing her union with him.

A medal has been preserved, and engraved by Angeloni, in which she bears the title of Augusta, which was perhaps struck at this time to appease and gratify Attila, for at no other time was Valentinian likely to have permitted it. After the pacification had been concluded between Attila and the Roman legates, he fell back with his whole force towards Pannonia. At the passage of the Lycus or Lech, a fanatical woman, perhaps one of the prophetesses who are described as always accompanying the Hunnish armies, is said to have suddenly crossed his path, and, seizing hold of the bridle of his horse, to have three times cried out, "Back, Attila!", but notwithstanding that warning he continued his course to his Hungarian capital, from whence he was never again to take the field against the Romans.

Having returned home, Attila sent an embassy to Marcian to demand tribute, whereupon Apollonius was dispatched across the Danube from Constantinople to appease his anger. It does not appear whether he pacified him by gifts at that time, but money was probably paid.

Jordanes states that Attila proceeded afterwards by a different route from that which he had before followed to re-enter Gaul, and again attempt the reduction of the Alans on the Loire; but that Torismond king of the Visigoths was prepared to assist them, and defeated him once more on the same Catalaunian plain, forcing him to return home ingloriously. Notwithstanding the assertion of that writer, who lived in the century next after the events he related, the concurrent testimony of the Roman Chronicles, and the date of Attila's death make it certain that the story was as false, as it is improbable. It must have originated in the circumstance of king Torismond having succeeded to the throne during the victory of Chalons, which might therefore have been truly said to have been gained first by Theodoric, and after his fall by Torismond; and an interval of time being erroneously placed between the exploits of the father and the son, the same events were supposed to have occurred again at a later period. Gregory of Tours however relates that the Alans themselves were defeated by Torismond not long before his death, which took place in this same year, but he makes no mention of any Huns in Gaul at that period.

If the life of the Hunnish conqueror had been prolonged many years beyond this time, it appears as certain, as any event that human foresight can anticipate by the consideration of existing things and past experience, that the Roman empires of the West and East must ere long have been reduced to unconditional surrender of their authority, and that, without the intervention of some great and unexpected deliverance, Christianity, which had so lately become the law of the empire, must have been nearly stifled in Europe; but it pleased the Divine wisdom to cut short the life of Attila at the very moment, when the predictions concerning the termination of the Roman power, at the expiration of its 1200th year, seemed about to be accomplished by his elevation to the thrones of both Caesars, and the revelation of Antichrist was expected in his person; and with his life the mighty fabric which he had consolidated was immediately dissolved.

The innumerable offspring of his multifarious concubinage claimed participation in the inheritance of his power. They did not however succeed in wresting it from the children of Creca, who were his lawful successors, but the great warriors amongst his vassal kings were too valiant and preponderant to be long constrained by influence less authoritative, than that

of Attila. The Gothic kings threw off the yoke; and Gepidian Arderic, who had been the faithful counsellor and companion of Attila, and the bulwark of his authority, struck the fatal blow to that of the young princes, whom he defeated in a great battle near the river Netad, which is not identified, and took possession of all Dacia.

From that moment the ascendancy of the Huns was utterly extinguished. Ellac, the eldest of the princes fell in the battle, and Dengisich and Irnach fled to the shores of the Euxine. In the following year (455) Dengisich having the chief power amongst the Huns, in concert with Irnach, attacked the Goths as refractory vassals, but they were utterly defeated by Walamir, and a small remnant escaped to the strong defenses called Hunniwar in Pannonia. Irnach fled into Asia to a part of the Hunnish dominions called lesser Scythia, and his subsequent career was too insignificant to have been recorded.

Odoacer, who was destined to put an end to the Roman empire in the West a few years after, was a person of no great distinction in the Hunnish court at the time of the death of Attila; and Theodoric, soon afterwards king of Italy, was born from a concubine of one of the Gothic kings two years after his death nearly on the day of the victory gained over the Huns by Walamir. The account of a contemporary writer preserved by Photius, states that he was the son of Walamir, who had prognosticated the future greatness of his son, by the emission of sparks from his body, a phenomenon by which the horse of Tiberius and the ass of Severus, (probably Libius Severus) are said by him to have presignated the elevation of their riders. Malchus and some other writers call him the son of Theodemir. Gibbon has followed the latter, and does not appear to have known the doubt which exists on the subject. A coin of Theodoric having the head of Zeno on the reverse, appears to testify, that, like Odoacer, he held the crown of Italy in nominal subordination at least to the Eastern emperor.

The particulars of the death of Attila are involved in considerable obscurity. The chronicler Marcellinus, who wrote in the next century, asserts that he was murdered by a concubine, suborned by the patrician Aetius, and indeed it is difficult to believe that any great act of political villainy should have been committed at that time without the privity of that unprincipled statesman. Jordanes cites from the lost history of Priscus, that Attila, according to the custom of his nation, (probably meaning only the privilege of its kings) having added to the innumerable multitude of his wives a very beautiful girl called Hildico, which is merely another form of the name Hilda, after indulging in great hilarity at the wedding, lay upon his back oppressed with wine and sleep; that a redundancy of blood, which gushed from his nose, having found a passage into his throat, put an end to his life by suffocation; and that inebriety thus terminated all his glories. This story was doubtless promulgated by his murderers, but is highly improbable, when we consider the great abstemiousness of Attila, recorded by Priscus; and, as marriage was to him a circumstance of very frequent occurrence, it is not likely that he should have departed from his usual habits of sobriety on this occasion.

Sigonius and Callimachiis state the name of the lady to have been Hildico, but Olaus, Thurocz, and Bonfinius, call her Mycolth, daughter of the king of Bactria, and Ritius varies that name to Muzoth, while Diaconus, the Alexandrine Chronicle, and Johannes Malalas simply call her a Hunnish prostitute, by which opprobrious term the Christian writers would probably have styled any of his subsidiary wives. Johannes Malalas also says that the girl was suspected of having murdered him, but that others assert he was murdered by his sword-bearer at the instigation of Aetius. He is said to have struck his foot painfully, as he entered the bridal chamber, on which, addressing himself, as it was supposed, to the angel of death, he exclaimed, "If it be time, I come"; and on the night of his marriage his favourite horse died suddenly.

The most ancient legends of Germany and Scandinavia are filled with the adventures of Attila, and of the ever memorable Hilda (the Hildico of Jordanes) in a variety of forms, and with much confusion of circumstances and appellations. The celebrated old German lay of the

Nibelungians treats of this matter. A great part of the poetical Edda of the Scandinavians is occupied with the detail of these transactions, and the old sagas called *Volsunga*, *Wilkma*, and *Nifflunga Saga*, are records of the same. A careful consideration of the old Scandinavian documents, together with the undeniable evidence of Priscus, that Attila ruled over the Northern islands, makes it pretty clear, that the Danes have no real history previous to the occupation of their territory by Attila, and that most of their ancient traditions are reminiscences of that mighty conqueror, (who was in some respects the Odin of the North, as he was also the Arthur of Great Britain) or at least blended with them.

In the *Heltenbuch* we read of the emperor Otnit, certainly meaning Attila, and attributing to him a name almost identical with Odin. Odin or Woden having been worshipped by the Scythian tribes in Asia, and probably being one with the sword-God, of whose type Attila had possessed himself, the name would be naturally bestowed upon Attila by those who acknowledged his divine title. An ancient medallion represents Attila with teraphim or a head upon his breast, and Odin was said to have preserved the head of Mimer cut off which gave oracular responses.

Attila is named Sigurd in several Scandinavian legends; Sigge is a name for Odin, and Sigtun his place of abode, all being connected with the word Sigr, victory. Sigi the son of Odin acquired dominion in France according to the prose Edda, and *Volsunga saga* says he was king of the Huns. The Edda states also that Sigi's brother Balldr, who fell by an act of fratricide, (meaning Bleda) ruled in Westphalia. Those statements actually designate Attila, who was looked upon as the son or incarnation of the sword-god, being the only Hun who ever had power in France. It must be borne in mind that, while the oldest Northern legends connect Odin with the Huns, the existence of that nation was unknown in Europe till 78 years before the death of Attila.

The Edda of Snorro states that Hlidskialf was the throne of Odin, and in *Atla quida st. 14.* the same name is given to the tower or dwelling-place of Attila. That Valhall was the residence of Odin is universally known; the abode of Attila bears that name in the Edda, *Atla mal in Gr. st. 14.* In the same Edda, in *Sigurd. quid. Fafh. 3. st 34,* Hilda says that Attila compelled her to marry against her will; and in *Brynh. quid,* she says that Odin condemned her to involuntary wedlock. In *Brynh. quid. 1. st. 14.* and in *Volospa* it is said that Odin conversed with, and obtained responses from the head of Mimer cut off, but, in *Wilkina saga c. 147,* Sigurd, who is unquestionably Attila, kills Mimer. That Odin and his followers were Asiatics, or Asians, as they are styled in the Edda, perfectly accords with the origin of the Huns who had so lately entered Europe; nor does there appear to be the slightest ground for the suggestion of the Danish historian Suhm, that Odin was a person driven out of Asia into the North of Europe by the conquests of Mithridates, except the antiquity which, without proof, he was desirous of giving to the events detailed in the Scandinavian records; whereas it is most probable that no such individual bearing the name of Odin ever existed in the North of Europe, though that opinion may not be palatable to the Danish antiquarians. Attila is called in the Edda the son of Buddla, a name which seems closely connected with Buddha, the Asiatic title of the God Woden or Odin. Buddla is stated in *Fundinn Noregur* to have conquered Saxony and established himself there, but not to have been himself a Saxon. The exclamation attributed to Attila, "Lo, I am the hammer of the world", has evident reference to the Scandinavian hammer of the God Thor; and, as he is identified with the war-god, his sister and wife Hilda is the war-goddess, of the Northern nations.

According to Olaus Magnus, Hother (the same who according to the oldest mythology of the North killed Balder son of Odin, from jealousy, on account of a woman), was set on the throne of Sweden by his brother Attila; and Attila succeeded Hothinus, that is Odin. This Hother, according to *Vegtam's quida* (known as the Descent of Odin), in the verse Edda, was brother to Balder, as he is above stated to have been brother to Attila. Hother himself



according to Vegtam's quida was killed by Ali, (sometimes called Vali) who in the old Swedish version is Atle, that is Attila, and in the Latin Atlas, another form of his name, son of Odin and Rinda; therefore all the three were brothers.

I entertain no doubt that this famous tale of fratricide refers to the known murder of Bleda by his brother Attila, with a duplication of the act of fratricide, like that which occurs in all the tales of the murder of Attila himself; the cause assigned for the first act of fratricide being jealousy, for the second, revenge. Olaus Magnus states in his appendix, that Attila hated the Danes so, that he set a dog to reign over them, (which has some reference to the account in the Provençal romance that Attila was himself begotten by a dog, and had canine features) and that he was betrayed by his wife, who robbed him, and fled from him, and conspired with his son against him. In p. 827, we find another Attila king of Sweden, who also conquers the Danes, and dies by murder. Olaus compiled his work from vernacular legends, and in these fables we cannot fail to recognize the reminiscences of the mighty Hun, and his close connection with Odin, and the earliest mythology and story of the north; and they are confirmatory of the fact asserted by Priscus, that he did rule over the maritime countries of the Baltic. But the Scandinavian mythology not only begins with Attila, either, doing the same things that are averred concerning Odin, or called his son, but it also ends with him; for the prose Edda concludes with stating that this Ali, Atle, or Attila (who is stated in c 15. to be the son of Odin, powerful in military valour, and in archery, which was the special weapon of the Huns), is to survive with Vidar the God of silence, after the destruction of all the other Gods, and *reign as before upon Ida*; that is, that Attila was expected to come again in power, as appears by so many accounts of him both under his own name and the romantic name of Arthur. He is the son of Odin, taken as the sword-god or spirit of war and victory; he is Odin himself, looking to his achievements upon earth. The strange tale of the deception of the Jews in Crete in the reign of Attila, by a person pretending to come in the power of Moses as he did, throws some light on the assertion that Ali or Attila was ultimately to reign on Ida, the Cretan mountain, which was a type of that in Asia.

In the Scandinavian legends the catastrophe of Attila's life is told and repeated under different names with some variation. In the first place he appears as the son of Sigmund, possessing a celebrated sword called Gram, and a wonderful grey horse Grana, under the name Sigurd, a Hunnish king, superior to all his contemporaries in martial prowess, the vanquisher of many kings in France, sojourning for some time with the Burgundian monarch, betrothed to and lying with Hilda, surnamed Bryn-hilda, the sister of king Attila, fraudulently giving her up to Gunnar or Gunther, prince of Burgundy, and espousing the daughter of Hilda surnamed Grim or Chrim-Hilda, and murdered at the instigation of the revengeful woman he had forsaken by one of the Burgundian (otherwise called Nibelungian) princes, but not before he had slain one of his assailants, and after his death she burns herself, together with much wealth and many of her slaves.

He next appears in the same legends as Attila (Atli), son of Buddla, a king victorious over the Saxons near the Rhine, espousing Hilda, surnamed Grim or Chrim-Hilda, the widow of Sigurd, and having not only the same wife, but the same sword Gram and horse Grana, and his wife excites another Burgundian prince to murder him, having previously served up to him at supper her own children by him, after which she attempts to destroy herself. Then she is conveyed to the court of another king who had married her daughter Hilda, called Svan-Hilda, where another catastrophe takes place, a child of the same name as before, Erpur, is killed, and she likewise orders a pile for the purpose of burning herself. The first half of the old German Nibelungenlied relates the adventures of the person called Sigurd by the Scandinavians, under the name Sigfried, his marriage with Chrim-Hilda, and his murder by the revenge of Bryn-Hilda.

The second part relates the marriage of the widow to Attila king of the Huns, her attempts to avenge the death of Sigfried on the Burgundian princes, and her destruction by Theodoric. It is strange that the Danish historian Suhm, although in his chronology he has made these events coincide exactly with the era of Attila, appears never to have suspected, or did not choose to perceive, that the Attila mentioned in the Sagas and Edda was the renowned king of the Huns; nor did it ever occur to him that Sigurd king of the Huns could be no other person. On the contrary, he supposes the Attila there mentioned to have been a petty king over some Huns settled in Groningen. That Attila, brother of Brynhilda and son of Buddla, was Attila king of the Huns is certified by the Nibelungenlied and the copious detail of his adventures in Wilkinga saga; and the Danish editors of the late edition of the tragic Edda are satisfied of that simple fact, though they see no further into the unravelling of their confused traditions concerning him.

That Sigurd the Hunnish king of the Edda and Sagas, the Sigfried of the old German poem, was Attila, appears indisputably from the following considerations:—He had the same wife, the same sword, and the same horse; he was king of the Huns, and the greatest warrior of his age; he was engaged with the Burgundians, partly in alliance and partly in warfare; he vanquished many princes on the French side of the Rhine: all which applies to Attila. He was exactly contemporary with Attila, according to the chronology of those who did not suspect their identity. He was not only married to, but murdered by Hilda, as well as Attila.

It is utterly impossible that such another king should have existed at the same period, and been engaged on the same theatre of action with similar success, and under like circumstances, without coming into collision with him, and that no vestige of such a character should appear in the authentic histories of the times, still less could there have been such another Hunnish king at the same time. His identity with Attila is proved by his renown and achievements, as well as by the catastrophe of his life; and in a still more striking manner by the assertion of Brynhilda in the Edda, that, if Sigurd had lived a little longer, *he would have obtained universal dominion*.

In Sinfiotla lok is found another form of the story of Attila. Sinfiotl is the son of Sigmund the Volsungian; he and Gunnar woo the same person, on which account he slays Gunnar, and in his turn is murdered by Borg-Hilda, said there to be sister to Gunnar.

In Oddrunar Gratr there is another version of the tale. Gunnar is surprised in an intrigue with Oddruna, sister of Attila, whereupon Attila puts him to death in a cellar filled with vipers, and has the heart of his brother Hagen cut out. In Oddruna, sister of Attila, intriguing with Gunnar, may be recognized, under another name, Brynhilda, sister of Attila, fraudulently married to him. In Atla mal and Ada quida, Attila is said to have decoyed the Burgundian princes to his court to avenge the death of their sister Brynhilda, who had burnt herself after they had killed Sigurd, to have cut out the heart of Hagen, and thrown Gunnar amongst the vipers, in consequence of which his wife, the sister of Gunnar, killed his children and himself, and tried to commit suicide. In the Nibelungenlied, instead of being decoyed by Attila, they go treacherously, at the instigation of Hilda, to murder Attila, and are put to death as above stated.

Volsunga saga treats fully of the history of Sigurd, and subsequently of Attila; and at the end thereof as well as in Regner Lodbrok's saga, the name of Kraka is given to Aslauga, the daughter of Sigurd, which tallies with that of Kreka, the principal wife of Attila, recorded by Prisons. In Wilkina or Niflunga saga, Attila appears under the name of Sigurd Swein, and the Burgundian father of Gunnar is called Alldrian instead of Giuka. After the death of Sigurd Swein his widow is married to Attila, who being disgusted with her atrocities, permits Theodoric to kill her with the sword in his presence, to prevent her, as he states, from murdering Attila; whereby Sigurd Swein is distinctly identified with Sigurd Sigmundson, and with Sigfried of the Nibelungenlied, whose widow is killed in the same manner by Theodoric.

Afterwards a younger Burgundian prince, Alldrian, son of Hagen, entices Attila into a cavern in a lonely mountain, where he discovers to him the amassed wealth of the Nibelungians and of Sigurd, and succeeds in blocking him up in the cavern, and tells him to satiate himself with the riches he had desired. Alldrian then returns to Bryn-Hilda the widow of Gunnar, who had caused the death of Sigurd and receives him with high favor on account of his having slain Attila. This account tallies with that of the enclosure of king Arthur in Mount Etna, where he was supposed to be still living, and from whence he was expected to return and rule once more upon earth. In the same saga the affairs of king Arthur are mixed up with those of Attila, and in an earlier chapter Attila sends a messenger to woo Herka (perhaps the same name as the I Kreka of Priscus, wife of Attila, and called Cerca (by his Latin translators) *under the feigned name of Sigurd*.

In Saemund's Edda, Sigurd is called the Southron, agreeing with the appellation of halls of the south given in another passage thereof to the residence of Attila. The legend of Hedin is a confused inversion of the Attilane tragedy. The same enchantress Hilda is the occasion of bloodshed; Hedin, a name nearly identical with Odin, representing Attila, and Hagen, his antagonist, bearing the same name as one of the Burgundian conspirators. The tale is an inversion of the conflict between Attila and the Burgundian princes. That it belongs to Hunnish history, and not merely to the Scandinavian population, is clear, because Saxo Grammaticus says that Hedin fought a battle which lasted three days with the king of the Huns.

The ancient chronology of the Danes respecting the inhabitants of Scandinavia is in a great measure founded upon Fundinn Noregur or Norwegian origins, a genealogical work in the old Scandinavian tongue, evidently written in the reign of Harald Harfager, who first united all Norway under the dominion of an individual (in 888 according to Suhm), for the purpose of showing that through his female ancestors he was descended from all the great families of the North; from Odin, through one line, from Buddla, the father of Attila and Brynhilda through another, from Sigurd through another, from Norr, Gorr, &c. The Danish historians have shown much want of discernment in believing this fabrication. The falsehood of these genealogies, which were forgeries of great political importance to Harald, may be at once demonstrated by the descent from Sigurd, whose death, if he be considered as Attila, took place in 453, and, taken as he is by the Danish historians, is placed a very few years earlier, that is just long enough before to give time for the last events of his life to be acted over again under the name of Attila. Yet the pedigree gives, 1. Sigurd; 2. Aslauga, his daughter by Bryn-Hilda, married to Regner Lodbrok; 3. Sigurd the snake-eyed; 4. Aslauga, his daughter; 5. Sigurd the hart; 6. Ragn-Hilda, mother of Harald Harfager; allowing only five generations for the space of 435 years between the death of Sigurd, taken at the latest period, and the monarchy of Harald, which makes each person in the pedigree 87 years old at the time of the birth of the child that succeeds. Such an absurdity throws complete discredit upon the whole tissue of genealogies, evidently a clumsy fabrication to reconcile the North to the usurpations of Harald, and it strikes at the root of the whole frame of ancient Danish story.

In a note to a short poem at the end of Helga, I apologized for a supposed confusion in my Icelandic translations between Aslauga, the daughter of Sigurd Sigmundson, surnamed Fafnisbana, who lived in the fifth century, and Aslauga, wife of Regner Lodbrok, daughter of Sigurd Swein, asserted to have lived in the eighth. I now retract that apology, into which I was misled by the disingenuous chronology of Suhm. The Fundinn Noregur distinctly says that the wife of Regner was Aslauga, the child of Brynhilda daughter of Buddla, and of Sigurd Fafnisbana, who lived, by the assent of all writers, in the fifth century, and who was no other than Attila; and Nifflunga Saga, relating his death and the vengeance of Bryn-Hilda, calls the same person by the name of Sigurd Swein. The Danish historian, finding himself thwarted by the gross anachronism in the false pedigree of Harald, attempted to bolster it up by splitting

the same individuals into separate persons in different centuries, ringing the changes on the names Sigurd and Aslauga; to such a degree could nationality and a desire to uphold the truth and authenticity of Scandinavian legends warp the understanding, and even apparently the candour, of an antiquarian, whose disquisitions were too minute to allow a probability of his not having suspected the imposture. The story of Regner Lodbrok is a blending of the adventures of the grandfather of king Harald Harfager (a northern sea-rover, killed in the eighth or ninth century by Ella in Northumberland), with some of the celebrated Attilane reminiscences concerning Hilda, Sigurd, and Aslauga, who may have been the younger Hilda; and consequently we read that the sons of Regner, with a great army, proceeded in his lifetime to Luneberg in Saxony, *with the intention of marching against Rome, but abandoned the expedition on further consideration*, a passage from the life of Attila, ridiculously misapplied to the offspring of a Northern pirate. The name Regner appears to have been Hunnish, for Agathias mentions that Regnar, general of the Goths, who attempted to assassinate Narses, was not a Goth, but of the tribe of Bittores, a Hunnish race. Regner Lodbrok himself is stated to be the son of another Sigurd (Sigurd Ring) and another Hilda (Alf-Hilda), so incessantly are the changes rung upon these feigned names of the sera of Attila. It appears that the poetical Edda had been written long enough before the reign of Harald Harfager for the particulars related in it to have obtained credence, and before the names Dane and Denmark were established in the north of Europe, probably at the close of the sixth century.

It will be observed that, in all the various versions of the catastrophe which cut short the life of this mighty potentate, a revengeful woman of the name of Hilda bears a conspicuous part; that some false play, by which she was dishonoured, seems invariably to be the cause of her virulence, and that the Burgundian family are always mixed up in the transaction, with great confusion between an elder and a younger Hilda. Both Cassiodorus and Prosper Aquitanicus testify in their chronicles the fact that Gundicar or Gunnar, the Burgundian, was slain by the Huns not long after his treaty with Aetius, showing thereby that the later legends have some foundation in reality. The result of these various relations, taking into consideration that Priscus states Attila to have married his daughter Eskam, seems to be, that he, as told of him under the name of Sigurd, had a daughter by his sister Hilda, who is sometimes called Bryn-hilda, sometimes *Hilda i bryniu*, or the mailed Hilda, described as a warlike woman and enchantress; that he had betrothed himself to her, but not married her, and that he afterwards compelled her against her will to marry the prince of Burgundy; that he subsequently in 448 espoused the younger Hilda, (sometimes called Chrim or Grim Hilda, sometimes Gudruna or divine enchantress, as the other Hilda is also called Oddruna or enchantress of the arrow head) his daughter by his sister, (Brynhilda, sometimes also called Grimhilda) in consequence of which she, the elder Hilda, excited the Burgundian princes to attempt to slay him; but that he put them to death, and was afterwards murdered by a younger prince of that nation at her instigation; that the catastrophe did not take place on the night of his marriage with Hilda, but at a later period and on the occasion of another wedding, though the previous union with Hilda was the cause of his murder. Coupling these particulars with the account of Priscus, that in 448 he wedded his own daughter Eskam, of other historians that he died on the night of his wedding with Mycolth, and of others that Hilda was suspected of having murdered him, it seems not improbable that Eskam was the younger Hilda, his daughter by his sister whom he had compelled to marry the Burgundian, and through whose revenge his murder was effected, with the aid of one of the Burgundian princes, on the night of his marriage with Mycolth in 453; Gunnar, otherwise called Gunther or Gundicar, having been previously excited against him, and slain after an unsuccessful attempt upon his life. It is very probable, that Aetius was privy to the conspiracy, as Marcellinus has positively asserted.

The Wilkina saga contains the detail of a variety of exploits by Attila, his victory over Osantrix king of Denmark, with his gigantic champions Aspilian and his brothers, his



conquest of Russia from Waldemar, and the defeat of Hermanric by his arms, some of which events may perhaps be founded in truth, but they are discredited by the anachronism of introducing as his coadjutor, Theodoric of Verona, meaning Theodoric afterwards king of Italy, who was not born till two years after the death of Attila; but, in this and in various other relations he has been confounded with an earlier Theodoric, or the actions of Theodemir the vassal of Attila have been attributed to Theodoric, who was either his son or his nephew. Hermanric the Ostrogoth had been probably dead before the birth of Attila, and the supposed victories over him, and the alleged cooperation of Theodoric, were perhaps connected with the fabulous account of Attila's great longevity; but the age of 120 years attributed to him by the Hungarian writers, being that of Moses, seems to have arisen out of the notion that he came in the spirit of Moses, and was in fact alter Moses.

According to the statement of Priscus, as related by Jordanes, the attendants of Attila abstained from entering the bridal chamber for a considerable time, thinking that he was pleased to lie late; but at length, after calling loudly in vain, having forced the door they found him dead, and the girl, whom he had espoused, dejected and weeping under the covering of her veil. Thereupon, according to the customary manner of mourning the dead amongst his countrymen, they cicatrized their faces, in order, as the historian says, that he might be bewailed by the blood of men, and not by the tears of women. A silken tent was pitched in the open plain, and there his body was borne and lay for some time in state; while the most distinguished of the Hunnish cavalry careered around him, in the manner customary at the games or tournaments of the Roman circus, in which the horsemen used to be divided into four parties clothed with uniforms of different colours, and they chanted during their evolutions his praise in funereal accents, saying, "Attila, the chief king of the Huns, son of Mundiuc, lord of the bravest nations, endowed with an extent of power unheard of before his time, having alone possessed all the kingdoms of Scythia and Germany, and terrified both empires of the Roman city, having captured or trampled on their towns and having consented to receive an annual tribute, being appeased by entreaties to spare those which were not yet sacked, when he had brought all those things to a prosperous conclusion, ended his life, not by hostile violence or by the treachery of his own people, but in the full enjoyment of the security of his nation, amidst festivities, and without any sense of pain. Who would not esteem such a termination of his life desirable!

After the equestrian exercises had been performed, and the dirge, of which the above substance has been preserved to us, had been chanted, they buried him secretly. He had three several coffins or rather biers, the first decorated with gold, the second with silver, the third with iron, signifying by those symbols that the three metals appertained to so powerful a king; with evident reference to the prophetic monarchies of Daniel, the gold representing the Babylonian, the silver that of the Medes, to both of which he pretended in the title he had assumed, and the iron both the Roman empire, and the deified sword by virtue of which he ruled. He was interred at night, after which a vast heap of spoils was made over his tomb, or rather over his body; and they buried with him arms of his enemies which had been taken in battle, trappings studded with gems, and the banners of various nations.

After this ceremony, the Huns celebrated his funeral rites with profane feasting and wassail, and the supper is said to have been served up in four courses, the first on plate of gold, the second of silver, the third of brass, the fourth of iron, including the third or brazen Macedonian kingdom with the three others which had been before signified; and it is observable that the historians, who have recorded these remarkable facts, do not seem to have had any notion of their apparent mystical intention, and their ignorance of the secret meaning affords strong reason for believing their report.

The slaves by whose labour the grave of the Hunnish monarch was excavated, were put to death as a sacrifice to his manes, and, as Jordanes states, to deter curiosity from prying into

and pilfering the wealth which was interred with him; but it is difficult to understand how the place of his interment could be rendered secret, even by murdering the workmen, if the tomb was covered with the spoils of nations, and it is most probable that the spoils were all buried and laid over the site of the body, and not over the tomb externally. With like view to secrecy and security, the body of Alaric had been deposited under the bed of the river Busentinus. The Hungarian writers say that Attila was buried near Kaiazo or Cheveshusa (a Hunnish word of Teutonic origin, meaning Cheve's house) where the Hunnish kings Cheve, Cadica, and Balamber, were entombed.

The identity of Attila with the Arthur of romance has been pointed out by the author of Nimrod. It is by no means improbable, that, when the arms of Attila extended themselves successfully over the North of Europe, the Saxon sea-kings, whom he, being unprovided with a maritime force, could not reduce under his dominion, may have removed to England in some measure to avoid his ascendancy; and, although we have no reason to believe that Attila ever sent any military expedition into Great Britain, the Scandinavian legends say that his companion Theodoric sent Herbert his nephew thither to king Arthur, who can be demonstrated to be no other than Attila, to ask for the hand of his daughter Hilda in marriage, but there is a story of fraud wherever the nuptials of Hilda are mentioned, and Herbert in this account draws a frightful picture of Theodoric to disgust her, and marries her himself. It may be surmised, that, as it was natural for the Britons, who were sorely pressed by the Saxons, to apply to the great conqueror of Europe, he may have sent them assurances of his good-will and intention of succouring them hereafter, and have initiated them in his Antichristian pretensions and claim to universal monarchy.

From such secret communications the Druidical freemasonry may have originated; and Olaus Magnus, who styles Arthur king over Britain, Ireland, Scandinavia, Denmark, and the rest of Europe to the Palus Maeotis, which could not have been predicated of any man except Attila, mentions that he instituted certain families or societies of *illustrious men*, which seems actually to designate *lodges of illuminati*.

The following extract from a MS. by the author of Nimrod, which he has kindly communicated, will preclude the necessity of my entering further into this part of the subject. It seems to me clear that the Arthurian fable is a Druidical location of Attila, as head of the Antichristian power, in Great Britain. "This topic may be handled to better satisfaction by showing to what real man and actions the unreal Arthur of Britain had reference, and why mortals so widely removed from the era of the lower Western empire, as those who seem to revive in his person, have been raised up, like phantoms, to cross our path in history.

The Arthur of romance was king in AD 452, and the *siege perilleux* in the centre of the round table, bore an inscription that in that year the seat ought to be filled, and the quest of the Saint Grail achieved; yet Arthur failed of doing either. Bearing that date of romance in mind, we must observe that Arthur was armed with a sword brought to him from heaven, in right of which he was (like a second Orion) called Llainawg, the sword-bearer. The celestial sword was so interwoven with his life, that, until it was flung into the water, he could not depart from this world for his appointed sojourn in Damalis or Avallon.

It seems to have contained the divine part of his nature. In Tyran le Blanc we read of Arthur imprisoned in a silken cage, having life, but void of knowledge and discernment, save that he could answer all questions by gazing fixedly upon the naked blade of his sword Excalibur. When that was taken from him, he no longer knew, perceived, or remembered anything.

That sword was his mind and his memory. Ireland, the Hebrides, Iceland, Scandinavia, Denmark, Germany and France, were conquered by Arthur, according to the accounts given in the Bruts and in Romance; he prevailed over the Roman empire of the West, and (as Leslie bishop of Ross says) over that of the East also. Attila king of the Huns claimed sovereignty

over the Scythian and Sarmatic nations in right of the sword of Mars, not a weapon used by that God, but an idol of him, immemorially revered in Scythia, though seldom seen upon earth, of which he boasted himself to be the possessor. Most of the Northern nations seem to have been obedient to his power, and both sections of Constantine's empire were humbled by his arms into the payment of tribute. Arthur is stated to have passed into Gaul, and gained a great victory in Champagne over the roman general Lucius Tiberius, and was marching on to attack the Roman emperor himself in Italy, (whom Geofrey ap Arthur calls Leo) when the intrigues of Medrawd the Pict, and Guenever recalled him home, and shortly after destroyed him. The Hun fought a great battle in Champagne against the general Flavius Aetius, and soon after marched against Italy, where he was encountered by pope Leo, and by agreement with him, (but for what private reasons I leave for historians to enquire) returned to his own country. This was in *AD* 452, the very same year in which the Romantic Arthur should have filled the *siege perilleux*, but did not. A few months completed the life of Attila, by means (as it has been supposed) of an unfaithful wife and foreign or domestic treason. It may be asked, is it possible, that two celestial sword-bearers should have been thought, or even feigned, to spring up, conquer Europe, successfully assail the Roman empire, return home, and perish under circumstances so minutely similar, and a perfect correspondence of date? True it is that the Brutic Arthur bears date considerably later than the Romantic, but it also true that the later date is only a cryptographic expression or cypher to denote the earlier one. Arthur, say the Brute, withdrew to Avallon in *AD* 542, which three figures are merely an anagram of 452".—“Of Arthur the sword-bearer it is said that he disappeared mysteriously from the earth, to which he was one day to return; *Nibelungenlied* speaks of the disappearance of the Hun, as doubting whether he was swallowed up by the earth, concealed in the mountains, or carried off by the Devil; and a Norse saga describes him as being enclosed alive in a hollow mountain, amidst accumulated treasures”.—“Alain Bouchard (*Grand Chronique de Bretagne*, fol. 53) pretends that one Daniel Dremruz or the Red-visaged, reigned in Little Britain from 689 to 730, carried his arms into Germany, was elected king of the Germans, and proceeded to Pavia, where he married the daughter of the emperor Leo, He returned to Armorica where he was the most powerful monarch of all the West. His title is equivalent to Florid-faced (Gwrid ap Gwrid Glau) an Arthurian title. He is said to have descended from the Earls of Cornwall, Arthur's native province. Like Arthur he had no real existence; like Attila he ended his career of conquest by an Italian expedition, but did not penetrate beyond the north of Italy, during the reign of an emperor Leo who did not exist at the time mentioned. The circumstances identify him with both Arthur and Attila”.—“In a great lake near Nantes is an island called *isle d'Un*, meaning Hun, in which is a great stone with a hole in it, under which a giant is said to sleep, who contended against Christianity, represented in the person of St. Martin of Tours; and it is traditional that a virgin is hereafter to put her arm through the hole and raise the stone, and resuscitate the giant and convert him. Martin died before the reign of Attila, but was uncle to St. Patric, his contemporary. The sleeping Hun is evidently Attila, and the legend furnishes another proof of his anti-Christian character, and of his identity with Arthur, abiding in, and expected to return from, the island of Avallon”.

It is much to be regretted that the particulars of the life of this conspicuous man have not been more perfectly preserved, but if we assume from what has been premised, that which I firmly believe, that the mythology and the early history of the North originates in Attila, that the Arthurian legends have like reference to him, and that the Antichristian expectations, which had centered in him, continued to be cherished in the mysticism of romances, giving a tinge to whatever literature did not spring from monastic sources, we cannot fail to perceive how great was the depth and durability of his spiritual influence and machinations, as well as his political power; and we may estimate what would have been the grievous consequences, if

his career had not been cut short before he had had time to complete the subjugation of Europe and consolidate his Antichristian empire.

His character may be easily traced from his conduct and achievements. Simple and abstemious in his habits, he gave no cause to the humblest of his followers to look with an evil eye on his exaltation. He was hardy, strong, active, and distinguished in martial exercises; silent and thoughtful in his hours of festivity; his determinations were peremptory, their execution rapid and effectual.

Superstition and terror extended his influence, but the happiness of his subjects, his kindness, justice, and success, gave strength to his authority. He afforded safety to all who were overshadowed by his power, while he threatened certain destruction to all who resisted his dominion, and unrelenting persecution to all who fled from it.

The lamentable state of Europe, at the time of his accession, gives reason to conceive the delight, with which the industrious portion of the nations under his government must have hailed its protection; while the rapidity of his conquests, and the belief that he acted under a divine delegation, ensured to him the enthusiastic confidence of his soldiers. Partial and corrupt administration of the laws, tyrannical and ruinous exactions, inroads of barbarous marauders, wavering and imbecile policy, had annihilated the security of every individual within the limits of the Roman empire; and incessant strife, between the various nations who were pressing upon each other and upon the Romans for subsistence, had spread havoc and starvation without its confines over a large portion of Europe; but, wherever the ascendancy of Attila was established, the scene of bloodshed was immediately removed beyond its boundaries; the wealth, which he snatched by force of arms, or extorted by negotiation, from his opponents, continued to flow into his territory, and its interior presented an unexampled scene of contentment and security.

Attila was perhaps the mightiest of those, who have distinguished themselves for a few brief years on the theatre of earthly glory; and, if he had not been cut short in the plenitude of his strength by an overruling Providence, we have every reason to believe that he must ere long have obtained the undisputed possession of Europe, and neither the Persians of Asia, nor the Vandals of Africa, could have offered any serious opposition to the indefinite extension of his empire. But his personal influence was the magic girdle which held together the immense league that had been cemented under his authority, and the moment his commanding talents were removed by a sudden and unexpected death, the power, which had been a single-handed and resistless weapon in his grasp, appeared too mighty to be wielded by any person of inferior qualifications.

The establishment of his government over the habitable world was inconsistent with the spread of Christianity, and the Almighty will, which had sent him as a scourge on the population of the Roman empire, permitted him not to complete the overthrow of true religion; but annihilated by his decease the great fabric he had constructed, which was immediately dissolved by internal conflict in the absence of his absolute and decisive authority. The mighty one was gathered to his fathers; the power of the Huns, which had shed a baleful and meteorous gleam over the age in which he lived, was speedily obscured; their generation was lost, and their name extinguished; and the historian, after searching amongst the records of time for the imperfect relation of his achievements, is left to conjecture the city of his abode, the manner of his death, the place of his interment, and even the language that he spoke, and in which his decrees had been promulgated from the confines of China to the waters of the German ocean.



## CHAPTER XIII

### (A)

#### ROMAN BRITAIN

THE character and history of Roman Britain, as of many other Roman provinces, were predominantly determined by the facts of its geography. To that cause, or set of causes, more than to any other, we must attribute alike the Roman desire to conquer the province and the actual stages of the conquest, the distribution of the troops employed as permanent garrison, the quality and extent of the Romanized civilization, and, lastly, a great part of the long series of incidents by which the island was lost to Rome and Roman culture.

Geologically, Britain forms the north-west side of a huge valley which had its south-east side in northern and central France. Down the centre of this valley ran two rivers, the one flowing south-west along a bed now covered by the English Channel, the other flowing north-east through a region now beneath the German Ocean. From these rivers, the land sloped upwards, south-east to Vosges, Alps, and Cevennes, north-west to Cornwall, Wales and northern Britain. The two rivers have long vanished. But the configuration of their valleys has lasted. Though unquiet seas now divide England from north-western Europe, the two areas, that were once the two sides of the valleys, still look to each other. Their lowlands lie opposite; their main rivers flow out into the intervening sea; their easiest entrances face; each area lies open by nature to the trade or the brute force of the other; each has its most fertile, most habitable, and least defensible districts next to those of the other.

Hence comes the peculiar configuration of our island. In south-east Britain there is little continuous hill-country that rises above the 600 foot contour line. Instead, wide undulating lowlands, marked by no striking physical feature and containing little to arrest or even divert the march of ancient armies or of traders, stretch over all the south and east and midlands. For hills, we must go north of Trent and Humber or west of Severn and Exe. There we shall find almost the converse of the south-east. Throughout a large, scattered region, extending from Cornwall to the Highlands, the land lies mostly above, and much of it high above, the 600 foot line; its soil and climate are ill-suited to agriculture; its deep valleys and gorges and wild moors and high peaks oppose alike the soldier and the citizen. Behind this upland lies the Atlantic, and an Atlantic which meant of old the reverse of what it does today. To the ancients, this hill-country was the end of the world; for us—since Columbus—it is the beginning

These physical features are reproduced plainly in the early history of Britain. It was natural that about *BC* 50-A.D. 50 southern Britain should be occupied by Celtic tribes and even families which had close kindred in Gaul, and that a lively intercourse should exist between the two. It was no less natural that, even before Rome had fully conquered Gaul, Caesar's troops should be seen in Kent and Middlesex (*BC* 55-54) and Roman suzerainty extended over these regions; and when the annexation of Gaul was finally complete, that of Britain seemed the obvious sequel. The sequel was, indeed, delayed awhile by political causes. Augustus (*BC* 43-*AD* 14) had too much else to do: Tiberius (14-37) saw no need for it, just as he saw no need for any wars of conquest. But after 37 it became urgent. Changes in southern Britain had favoured an anti-Roman reaction there and had even perhaps produced

disquiet in northern Gaul; Caligula (37-41) had made some fiasco in connection with it; when Claudius succeeded, there was need of vigorous action and, as it chanced, the leading statesmen of the moment favoured a forward policy in many lands. The result was a well-planned and deservedly successful invasion (*AD* 43).

The details of the ensuing war of conquest do not here concern us. It is enough to say that the lowlands offered little resistance. In one part of them, near the south-east coast, Roman ways had become familiar since Caesar's raids. In another part—the midlands—the population was then, as now, thin. Nowhere (despite the theories of Guest and Green) were there physical obstacles likely to delay the Roman arms. By 47 the invaders had subdued almost all the lowlands, as far west as Exeter and Shrewsbury and as far north as the Humber. Then came a pause. The difficulties of the hill-country, the bravery of the hill-tribes, political circumstances at Rome, combined not indeed to arrest but seriously to impede advance. But the decade 70-80 saw the final conquest of Wales and the first subjugation of northern England, and in the years 80-84 Agricola was able to cross the Tyne and the Cheviots and gradually advance into Perthshire. Much of the land which he overran was but imperfectly subdued and the northern part of it—everything, probably, north of the Tweed—was abandoned when he was recalled (85). Thirty years later (115-120) an insurrection shook the whole Roman power in northern Britain, and when Hadrian had restored order, he established the frontier along a line from Tyne to Solway, which he fortified by forts and a continuous wall (about 122-124). Fifteen or twenty years later, about *AD* 140, his successor Pius, for reasons not properly recorded, made a fresh advance; he annexed Scotland up to the narrow isthmus between Forth and Clyde and fortified that with a continuous wall, a series of forts along it variously estimated at 12 or (more probably) at 18 or 20, and some outposts along the natural route through the Gap of Stirling to the north-east. This wall was not meant as a substitute for Hadrian's Wall, but as a defence to the country north of it.

Rome had now reached her furthest permanent north. But the advance was not long accepted quietly by the natives. Twenty years after Pius had built his wall, a storm broke loose through all northern Britain from Derbyshire to Cheviot or beyond (about 158-160). A second storm followed 20 years later (about 183); the Wall of Pius was then or soon after definitely lost, and disorder apparently continued till the Emperor Septimius Severus came out in person (208-211) and rebuilt the Wall of Hadrian to form, with a few outlying forts, the Roman frontier. With this step ends the series of alternating organization and revolt which make up the external history of the earlier Roman Britain. Henceforward the Wall was the boundary until the coming of the barbarians who ended Roman rule in the island.

The force which garrisoned this fluctuating frontier and kept the province quiet consisted of three (till *AD* 85, of four) legions and an uncertain number of troops of the second grade, the so-called *auxilia*, in all perhaps some 35-40,000 men, mostly heavy infantry. The three legions were disposed in three fortresses, *Isca Silurum* (Caerleon on Usk, *legio II Augusta*), *Deva* (Chester, *legio XX Valeria Victrix*) and *Eburacum* (York, *legio VI Victrix*): from these centers detachments (*vexillationes*) were sent out to form expeditionary forces, to construct fortifications and other military works, and generally to meet important but occasional needs. Outside these three main fortresses, the province was kept quiet and safe by a network of small forts (*castella*), varying in size from two or three to six or seven acres and garrisoned by auxiliary *cohortes* (infantry) or *alae* (cavalry), some 500 and some 1000 strong. These forts were planted along important roads and at strategic points, 10 or 15 or 20 miles apart. Their distribution is noteworthy. In the lowlands there were none. During the early years of the conquest we can, indeed, trace garrisons at one or two places, such as Cirencester. But, as the conquest advanced, it was seen that the lowlands needed no force to ensure their peace, and the troops were pushed on into the hills, beyond Severn and Trent. Eighteen or twenty forts were dotted about Wales, though many of these seem to have been

abandoned in the course of the second century, as having become superfluous through the growing pacification of the land. A much larger number can be detected in Derbyshire, Lancashire, the hill-country of Yorkshire, and northwards as far as Cheviot: Hadrian's Wall, in particular, was principally defended by a series of such forts. We cannot, however, give precise statistics of these forts until exploration has advanced further: it is doubtful not only how far the known examples provide us with a fairly full list of them, but, still more, to what extent all the forts were in occupation at the same time and to what extent one succeeded another.

The troops which garrisoned these military posts were Roman, in the sense that they not only obeyed the Roman Emperor but were in theory and to a great extent in practice, even in the later days of Roman Britain, recruited within the Empire. The legionaries came from Romanized districts in the Western Empire; the auxiliaries, naturally less civilized to begin with but drilled into Roman ways and speech, were largely drawn from the Rhine and its neighbourhood: some probably were Celts, like the native Britons, others (as their names on tombstones and altars prove) were Teutonic in race. To what extent Britons were enrolled to garrison Britain, is not very clear; certainly, the statement that British recruits were always sent to the Continent (chiefly to Germany), by way of precaution, seems on our present evidence to be less sweepingly true than was formerly supposed.

From the standpoints alike of the ancient Roman statesman and of the modern Roman historian the military posts and their garrisons formed the dominant element in Britain. But they have left little permanent mark on the civilization and character of the island. The ruins of their forts and fortresses are on our hill-sides. But, Roman as they were, their garrisons did little to spread Roman culture here. Outside their walls, each of them had a small or large settlement of womenfolk, traders, perhaps also of time-expired soldiers wishful to end their days where they had served. But hardly any of these settlements grew up into towns. York may form an exception: it is a pure coincidence, due to causes far more recent than the Roman age, that Newcastle, Manchester, and Cardiff stand on sites once occupied by Roman 'auxiliary' forts. Nor do the garrisons appear to have greatly affected the racial character of the Romano-British population. Even in times of peace, the average annual discharge of time-expired men, with land-grants or bounties, cannot have greatly exceeded 1000, and, as we have seen, times of peace were rare in Britain. Of these discharged soldiers by no means all settled in Britain, and some of them may have been of Celtic or even of British birth. Whatever German or other foreign elements passed into the population through the army, cannot have been greater than that population could easily and naturally absorb without being seriously affected by them. The true contribution which the army made to Romano-British civilization was that its upland forts and fortresses formed a sheltering wall round the peaceful interior regions.

Behind these formidable garrisons, kept safe from barbarian inroads and in easy contact with the Roman Empire by short sea passages from Rutupiae (Richborough, near Sandwich in Kent) to Boulogne or from Colchester to the Rhine, stretched the lowlands of southern, midland, and eastern Britain. Here Roman culture spread and something approximating to real Romanization took place. The process began probably before the Claudian invasion of 43. The native British coinage of the south-eastern tribes and other indications suggest that, in the 100 years between Julius Caesar and Claudius, Roman ways and perhaps even Roman speech had found admission to the shores of Britain, and this infiltration (as I have said) may have made easier the ultimate conquest. After the conquest, the process continued in two ways. In part it was definitely aided by the government which established here, as in other provinces, municipalities peopled by Roman citizens, for the most part discharged legionaries, and known as *coloniae*: these, however, were comparatively few in Britain. Far greater was the automatic movement. Italians flocked to the newly opened regions—traders, as it seems,

rather than the laborers who form the emigrants from Italy today: how numerous they were, we can hardly tell, but such commercial emigrations are always more important commercially than for their mere numbers. Certainly a far more notable movement was the automatic acceptance of Roman civilization by the British natives.

We can to some extent trace this movement. Quite early in the period *AD* 43-80, the British town Verulamium, just outside St Albans in Hertfordshire, was judged to have become sufficiently Romanized to merit the municipal status and title of *municipium* (practically equivalent to that of the *colonia* manned by veteran soldiers). The great revolt of Boudicca (less correctly called Boadicea) in *AD* 60 was directed not only against the supremacy of Rome but also against the spread of Roman civilization, and one incident in it was the massacre of many thousands of "loyal" natives along with actual Romans. Romanization, it is plain, had been spreading apace. Nor did this massacre check it for long. The Flavian period (*AD* 70-96) saw in Britain, as indeed in other provinces, a serious development of Roman culture and in particular of Roman town life, the peculiar gift of Rome to her western provinces. In the decade *AD* 70-80, the Britons began, as Tacitus tells us, to speak Latin and to use Latin dress and the material fabric of Latin civilized life. Now towns sprang up, such as Silchester (Calleva Atrebatum) and Caerwent (Venta Silurum), laid out on the model approved by Roman town-planners, furnished with public buildings (*forum*, *basilica*, etc.) of Roman style, and filled with houses which were Roman in their internal fittings (baths, hypocausts, wall-paintings) if not in ground-plan. Now the baths of Bath (Aquae Sulis) were equipped with civilized buildings suited to their new visitors: the earliest datable monument there belongs to about 77. Two *coloniae* also were planted. Hitherto there had only been one, established by Claudius at Colchester (Camulodunum): now one was added at Lincoln (Lindum) and in 96 a third at Gloucester (Glevum). A new Civil Judge (*legatus iuridicus*) begins to make his appearance beside the regular *legatus Augusti pro praetore* who was at once commander of the troops and judge of the chief court and governor of the province, and the appointment is doubtless due to increasing civil business in the law courts. When Tacitus praises Agricola because he encouraged the provincials to adopt Roman culture, he praises him for following the tendency of his age, not for striking out any novel line of his own. It is probable that by the end of the first century, Roman civilization was laying firm hold on all the British lowlands.

Subsequent progress was slower, or at least less showy. Little advance was made beyond the lowlands. Towns and 'villas' were rare west of the Severn, and save in the vale of York they were equally rare north of the Trent. The uplands remained comparatively unaffected. Their population, as recent excavations in Cumberland and in Anglesey have shown, used Roman objects and came to some extent within range of Roman culture. But it seems impossible to speak of them as fully civilized, even if, in the later years of the Roman occupation, they did not remain wholly barbarian. In the lowlands we may ascribe to the second and third centuries the development of the rural system and the building of farmhouses and country residences constructed in Roman fashion. It is very difficult to date these houses. But the evidence of coins seems to show that the end of the third and the first half of the fourth century were the periods when they were most numerous and most fully occupied, and when, as we may fairly argue, the countryside of Roman Britain was most fully permeated with Roman culture. For such a conclusion we shall have the support of a neighbouring parallel in Gaul.

The administration of the civilized part of Britain, while of course subject to the governor of the whole province, was in effect entrusted to the local authorities. Each Roman *municipium* and *colonia* ruled itself, including a territory which might be as long and broad as a small English county. Some districts probably belonged to the Imperial Domains and were ruled by local agents of the Emperor; such, probably, were the lead-mining districts, as on



Mendip or in Derbyshire or Flintshire. The remainder of the country, by far its largest part, was divided up, as before the Roman conquest, among the native cantons or tribes, now organized in more or less Roman fashion: each tribe had its council (*ordo*) and tribal magistrates and its capital where the tribal council met. Thus, the tribe or canton of the Silures, the *civitas Silurum*, as it learnt to call itself, had its capital at Venta Silurum, Caerwent (between Chepstow and Newport); there its council met and *decreto ordinis*, by decree of the council, measures were taken for the government of the tribal area which probably covered much of Monmouthshire and some of Glamorgan. This, we know by epigraphic evidence, occurred at Caerwent and we shall not be rash in assuming, on slighter evidence, that the same system obtained in other tribal areas in Britain. It is just the system which Rome applied also to the local government of Gaul north of the Cevennes: it illustrates well the Roman method of entrusting local government to a restricted form of Home Rule.

In the social fabric of Romano-British life, the two chief elements were the town and the country house or 'villa'. Both are mainly Roman importations. The Celts do not appear to have reached any definite urban life, either in Gaul or in Britain, before the coming of the Romans, though they no doubt had, even in Britain, agglomerations of houses which came near to being towns. But with the Roman conquest a real town life arose. In part, this was directly created by the government under the Roman forms of *municipium* and *colonia*, noticed above. Colchester (Camulodunum), Lincoln (Lindum), Gloucester (Glevum), York (Eburdum), were *coloniae*; the first three were founded in the first century by drafts of time-expired soldiers and the fourth, York, probably grew out of the 'civil settlement' on the west bank of the Ouse which confronted the legionary fortress under the present Cathedral and its precincts. One town Verulamium (St Albans) was a *municipium*, ranking with the four *coloniae* in privilege and standing but different (as explained above) in origin. All these five towns attained considerable prosperity, and in particular Camulodunum, Eburacum, and Verulamium, but none can vie with the more splendid municipalities of other provinces.

Besides them, Roman Britain could show a larger number—some ten or fifteen, according to the standard adopted—of country-towns which varied much in size but possessed in their own way the essential features of urban life. The chief of these seem to be the following: (1) Isurium Brigantum, capital or *chef-lieu* of the Brigantes, now Aldborough, some twelve miles N.W. of York and the most northerly Romano-British town properly so called, (2) Ratae, capital of the Coritani, now Leicester, (3) Viroconium—so best spelt, not Uriconium—capital of the Cornovii, now Wroxeter, on the Severn, five miles below Shrewsbury, (4) Corinium, capital of the Dobuni, now Cirencester, (5) Venta Silurum, already mentioned, (6) Isca Dumnoniorum, capital of the Dumnonii, now Exeter, (7) Durnovaria, capital of the Durotriges, now Dorchester in Dorsetshire, (8) Venta Belgarum, capital of the Belgae, now Winchester, (9) Calleva Atrebatum, capital of the Atrebates, close to Silchester, (10) Durovernum Cantiacorum, capital of the Cantii, now Canterbury, (11) Venta Icenorum, capital of the Iceni, now Caister by Norwich, and perhaps—for the limits of the list are not easily drawn with rigidity—Chesterford (Roman name unknown) in Essex, Kenchester (Magna) in Herefordshire, Chesterton (Durobrivae?) on the Nen, Rochester (also Durobrivae) in Kent, and even one or two which have perhaps less right to inclusion. Many of these towns are indicated by the Ravenna Geographer as holding some special rank and nearly all are declared by their remains to be the sites of really Romanized town-life. What exactly their status or government was, has yet to be defined. But it is fairly probable—especially from the Caerwent monument erected by the *ordo civitatis Silurum*—that the authorities of town and tribe were one.

The general fashion of these towns has been revealed to us by excavations at Silchester and Caerwent. At Silchester, the whole 100 acres within the walls have been systematically uncovered during the last twenty years and the buildings studied with especial care. At

Caerwent, a smaller area (39 acres) has been excavated so far as the buildings of the present village permit. Both show much the same features, with certain differences in detail which are both natural and instructive: (I) Both have been *planned* according to the Roman method, which obtained in many parts of the Empire: that is, the streets run at right angles, so as to form a chessboard pattern with square plots for the houses. At Silchester, where space was obviously abundant, the sanctity of the street frontages seems to have been in general observed: at Caerwent, which is of smaller size and more thickly crowded with buildings, the street plan has suffered some encroachments, but not so much as to obliterate its character. (II) Both towns had near their centre the Town Buildings known as *Forum* and *Basilica*. At Silchester the Forum was a rectangular plot of two acres, with streets running along all its four sides. It contained a central open court, nearly 140 feet square, surrounded on three sides by corridors or cloisters with rooms—presumably shops and lounges—opening into them; on the fourth side was a pillared hall, 270 by 58 feet in floor space, decorated with Corinthian columns, marble lined walls, statues, and the like, and behind this hall a row of rooms which probably served as offices for the town authorities and the like. The Caerwent Municipal Buildings were very similar: so (as far as we can tell from imperfect finds) were those at Cirencester and Wroxeter. They are indeed examples of a type which was represented in most large towns of the western Empire and in Italy itself. (III) Both towns had in addition small temples in different quarters within the walls and at Silchester a small building close to the Forum is so similar in every detail to the early Christian church of the western *basilican* type, that we can hardly hesitate to call it a church. (IV) Both towns, again, seem to have had Public Baths: those at Silchester covered an area of 80 by 160 feet in their earliest form and in later times were much extended. Both again had more direct provision for amusements. At Silchester an earthen amphitheatre stood outside the walls: at Caerwent there are traces of the stone walls of one inside the ramparts. (V) Of dwelling-houses and shops and the like both towns had naturally no lack. The private houses are built like most of the private houses in the Celtic part of the Empire, in fashions very dissimilar from anything at Pompeii or Rome, but are fitted in Roman style with mosaics, hypocausts, painted wall-plaster, and the like. They are especially noteworthy as being properly ‘country houses’, brought together to form a town perforce, and not ‘town houses’ such as could be used to compose regular rows or terraces or streets. Even the architecture thus declares that the town life of these cantonal *chef-lieux*, though real, was incomplete.

The civilization of the towns appears to have been of the Roman type. Not only do the buildings declare this: inscriptions, and, in particular, casual scratchings on tiles or pots which can often be assigned to the lower classes, prove that Latin was both read and written and spoken easily in Silchester and Caerwent. Whether Celtic was also known, is uncertain: here evidence is totally lacking. But it may be observed that if Celtic was understood, one would expect to meet it, quite as much as Latin, on casual *sgraffiti*, while the total disappearance of a native tongue can be paralleled from southern Gaul and southern Spain and is not incredible in towns. Nor do the smaller objects found at Silchester and Caerwent show much survival of the Late Celtic art which prevailed in Britain in the pre-Roman age and which certainly survived here and there in the island. But while Romanized, these towns are not large or rich. It has been calculated that Silchester did not contain more than eighty houses of decent size, and the industries traceable there—in particular, some dyers’ furnaces—do not indicate wealth or capital. The Romano-British towns, it seems, were assimilated to Rome. But they were not powerful enough to carry their Roman culture through a barbarian conquest or impose it on their conquerors.

From the town we pass to the country. This seems to have been divided up among estates commonly (though perhaps unscientifically) styled ‘villas’. Of the residences, etc. which formed the buildings of these estates many examples survive. Some are as large and

luxurious as any Gaulish nobleman's residence on the other side of the Channel. Others are small houses or even mere farms or cottages. It is difficult, on our present evidence, to deduce from these houses the agrarian system to which they belonged, save that it was plainly no mere slave system. But it is clear from the character of the residences and the remains in them that they represent the same Romanized civilization as the towns, while a few chance *sgraffiti* suggest that Latin was used in some, at least, of them. A priori, it is not improbable that, while the towns were Romanized, the countryside remained to some extent Celtic or bilingual. But all that is certain as yet is that scanty evidence proves some knowledge of Latin. These country houses were very irregularly distributed over the island. In some districts they abounded and included splendid mansions: such districts are north Kent, west Sussex, parts of Hants, of Somerset, of Gloucestershire, of Lincolnshire. Other districts, notably the midlands of Warwickshire or Buckinghamshire, contained very few 'villas' and indeed, as it seems, very few inhabitants at all. The Romans probably found these latter districts thinly peopled and they left them in the same condition.

Besides country houses and farms, the countryside also contained occasional villages or hamlets inhabited solely by peasants; such have been excavated in Dorsetshire by the late General Pitt-Rivers. These villages testify, in their degree, to the spread of Roman material civilization. However little their inhabitants understood of the higher aspects of Roman culture, the objects found in them—pottery, brooches, etc.—are much the same as those of the Romanized towns and villas and are widely different from those of the Celtic villages, such as those lately excavated near Glastonbury, which belong to the latest pre-Roman age.

The province was, on the whole, well provided with roads, some of them constructed for military purposes, some obviously connected with the various towns: whether any of them follow lines laid out by the Britons before *AD* 43 is more than doubtful. In describing them, we must put aside all notion of the famous 'Four Great Roads' of Saxon times. That category of four roads was a medieval invention, probably dating from the eleventh or twelfth century antiquaries, and the names of the roads composing it are Anglo-Saxon names, some of which the inventors of the 'Four Road' plainly did not understand. If we examine the Roman roads actually known to us, we discern in the English lowlands four main groups of roads radiating from the natural geographical centre, London, and a fifth group crossing England from north-east to south-west. The first ran from the Kentish ports and Canterbury through the populous north Kent to London. The second took the traveller west by Staines (Pontes) to Silchester and thence by various branching roads to Winchester, Dorchester, Exeter, to Bath, to Gloucester and south Wales. A third, known to the English as Watling street, crossed the Midlands by Verulam to Wall near Lichfield (Letocetum), Wroxeter, Chester (Deva) and mid and north Wales: it also, by a branch from High Cross (Venonae) gave access to Leicester and Lincoln. A fourth, running north-east from London, led to Colchester and Caister by Norwich and (as it seems) by a branch through Cambridge to Lincoln. The fifth group, unconnected with London, comprises two roads of importance. One, named 'Fosse' by the English, ran from Lincoln and Leicester by High Cross to Cirencester, Bath and Exeter. Another, probably called Ryknield street by the English, ran from the north through Sheffield and Derby and Birmingham (of which Derby alone is a Roman site) to Cirencester and in a fashion duplicated the Fosse. There were also other roads—such as Akeman street, which crossed the southern Midlands from near St Albans by way of Alchester (near Bicester) to Cirencester and Bath — which must be considered as independent of the main scheme. But, judged by the places they served and by the posts along them, the five groups above indicated seem the really important roads of southern or non-military Roman Britain.

The road systems of Wales and of the north were military and can best be understood from a map. In Wales, roads ran along the south and north coasts to Carmarthen and Carnarvon, while a road (Sarn Helen) along the west coast connected the two, and interior

roads—especially one up the Severn from Wroxeter and one down the Usk—connected the forts which guarded the valleys: these roads, however, need further exploration before they can be fully set out. In the north, three main routes are visible. One, starting from the legionary fortress at York, ran north, with various branches, to places on the lower Tyne, Corbridge, Newcastle (Pons Aelius), Shields. Another, diverging at Catterick Bridge from the first, ran over Stainmoor to the Eden valley and the Roman Wall near Carlisle. A third, starting from the legionary fortress at Chester (Deva) passed north to the Lake country and by various ramifications served all that is now Cumberland, Westmorland and west Northumberland. Several of these roads appear, as it were, in duplicate leading from the same general starting-point to the same general destination, and no doubt, if we knew enough, we should find that one of the two routes in question belonged to an older or a later age than the other.

Communications with the Continent seem to have been conducted chiefly between the Kentish ports and those of the opposite Gaulish littoral, and in particular between Rutupiae (Richborough, just north of Sandwich) and Gessoriacum, otherwise called Bononia, now Boulogne. There was also not infrequent intercourse between Colchester and the Rhine estuary, to which we may ascribe various German products found in Roman Colchester, though not elsewhere in Roman Britain. On occasion men also reached or left the island by long sea passages. Troops, it appears, were sometimes shipped direct from Fectio (Vechten, near Utrecht), the port of the Rhine, to the mouth of the Tyne in Northumberland, while traders now and then sailed direct from Gaul to Ireland and to British ports on the Irish Channel. The police of the seas was entrusted to a *classis Britannica*, which intermittent references in our authorities show to have existed from the middle of the first century (that is from the original conquest or soon after) till at least the end of the third century. Despite its title, the principal station of this fleet was not in Britain but at Boulogne, and its work was the preservation of order on either coast of the Straits of Dover. This fleet appears to have been a police flotilla rather than a naval force, but for once it emerged into the political importance which fleets often assume. About 286 a Menapian (i.e. probably, Belgian) by name Carausius became commandant, possibly with extended powers to cope with the increasing piracy; he set himself up as colleague to the two reigning emperors, Maximian and Diocletian, enlarged his fleet, allied himself with the sea-robbers, and in 289 actually extorted some kind of recognition at Rome. But in 293 he was murdered and his successor Allectus was crushed by the Emperor Constantius Chlorus in 296. Carausius was apparently an able man. But in his aims he differed little from many other pretenders to the throne whom the later third century produced: his object was not an independent Britain but a share in the government of the Empire. His special significance is that he showed, for the first time in history, how a fleet might detach Britain from its geographical connection with the north-western Continent. Twelve centuries passed before this possibility was again realized.

The preceding paragraphs have described the main features of Roman Britain, civil and military, during the main part of its existence. In the fourth century, change was plainly imminent. Barbarian sailors, Saxons and others, began, as we have seen, rather earlier than 300 to issue from the other shores of the German Ocean and to vex the coasts of Gaul and probably also those of Britain. Carausius in 286 or 287 was sent to repress them. After his and his successor's deaths, some change, the nature of which is not yet quite clear, was made in the *classis Britannica*, and we now hear hardly anything more of it. A system of coast defence was established from the Wash to the Isle of Wight. It consisted of some nine forts, each planted on a harbour and garrisoned by a regiment of horse or foot. The 'British Fleet', so far as Britain was concerned, may have been divided up amongst these forts or may have been entirely suspended. But it is difficult to make out (owing to the general obscurity) whether the change was made in the interests of coast defence or as a preventive against another



Carausius. The new system was known—from the name of the chief assailant—as the Saxon Shore (*Litus Saxonicum*).

Whatever the step and whatever the motive, Britain appears for a while to have escaped the Saxon pillages. During the first years of the fourth century, it enjoyed indeed considerable prosperity. But no Golden Age lasts long. Before 350, probably in 343, the Emperor Constans had to cross the Channel and drive out the raiders—not Saxons only, but Picts from the north and Scots (Irish) from the north-west. This event opens the first act in the Fall of Roman Britain (343-383). In 360 further interference was needed and Lupicinus, *magister armorum*, was sent over from Gaul. Probably he effected little: certainly we read that in 368 all Britain was in evil plight and Theodosius (father of Theodosius I), Rome's best general at that time, was dispatched with large forces. He won a complete success. In 368 he cleared the invading bands out of the south: in 369 he moved north, restoring towns and forts and *limites*, including presumably Hadrian's Wall. So decisive was his victory that one district—now unfortunately unidentifiable—which he rescued from the barbarians, was named Valentia in honour of the then Emperor of the West, Valentinian I. For some years after this Britain disappears from recorded history, and may be thought to have enjoyed comparative peace.

Such is the account given us by ancient writers of the period circa 343-383. It sounds as though things were already “about as bad as they could be”. But a similar tale is told of many other provinces, and yet the Empire survived. When Ausonius wrote his *Mosella* in 371, he described the Moselle valley as a rich and fertile and happy countryside. Britain had no Ausonius. But she can adduce archaeological evidence, which is often more valuable than literature. The coins which have been found in Romano-British ‘villas’, ill-recorded as they too often are, give us a clue. They suggest that some country houses and farms were destroyed or abandoned as early as 350 or 360, but that more of them remained occupied till about 385 or even later. It is not surprising to read in Ammianus that about 360 Britain was able to export corn regularly to northern Germany and Gaul. The first act in the Fall of Roman Britain contained trouble and disturbance, no doubt, but few disasters.

The second act (383 to about 410) brought greater evils and of a new kind. In 383 an officer of the British army, by birth a Spaniard, by name Magnus Maximus, proclaimed himself Emperor, crossed with many troops to Gaul and conquered western Europe: in 387 he seized Italy: in 388 he was overthrown by the legitimate Emperors. Later British tradition of the sixth century asserted that his British troops never returned home and that the island was thus left defenseless. We cannot verify this tradition. But we have proof, both that Britain was sore pressed and that the central government tried to help it. Claudian alludes to measures taken by Stilicho, prime minister to the then Emperor Honorius, about 395-8. Archaeological evidence shows that the coast-fort of Pevensey (Anderida) was repaired under Honorius, and that a fort was built high on the summit of Peak, overhanging the Yorkshire coast halfway between Whitby and Scarborough, by an officer of the same period who is known to have been in Britain a little after 400. These efforts were in vain. Troops—not necessarily legionaries though Claudian calls them *legio*—had to be withdrawn for the defense of Italy in 402. Finally, the Great Raid of barbarians who crossed the Rhine on the winter's night which divided 406 from 407 and the subsequent barbarian attack on Rome itself cut Britain off from the Mediterranean. The so-called ‘departure of the Romans’ speedily followed. This departure did not mean any great departure of persons, Roman or other, from the island. It meant that the central government in Italy now ceased to send out the usual governors and other high officials and to organize the supply of troops. No one went: some persons failed to come.

How far the British themselves were responsible for, or even agreeable to, this sundering of an ancient tie is, even after the latest inquiries, not very certain. The old idea that Britons and Romans were still two distinct and hostile racial elements has, of course, been long abandoned by all competent inquirers—for reasons which the preceding pages will have

made evident. But we have the names of three usurpers who tried to seize the imperial crown in Britain (406-11), Marcus, Gratian, and Constantine, and it seems that, as Constantine went off to seek a throne on the Continent, the Britons left to themselves set up a local autonomy for self-protection. Unfortunately, our ancient authorities are less clear than could be wished, especially on the chronology of these events. One thing which seems certain is that Britain did not conceive herself as breaking loose from the Empire and that in the years to come the Britons considered themselves 'Romans'. If we may believe Gildas, they even appealed for help to Aetius, the Roman minister, in 446.

The attacks of the 'Saxons' had begun before 300 and though at first their brunt fell more heavily on the Gaulish than on the British coasts, they were felt seriously in Britain from about 350 onwards. At first, they were the attacks of mere pillagers: later, like the later attacks of the barbarians elsewhere, they became invasions of settlers. When exactly the change took place, is unknown, nor is it clear what incident gave the stimulus. It seems probable, however, that the Britons of the early fourth century, harassed by attacks of all kinds, adopted the common device—even more familiar in that age than in any other—and set a thief to catch a thief. The man who set is named in the legends Vortigern of Kent; the thieves who were set, are called Hengest and Horsa. We need not attach much weight to these names, nor can we hope to fix a precise date. But the incident is sufficiently well attested and sufficiently probable to find acceptance, and it obviously occurred early in the fifth century. It had the natural result. The English, called in to protect, remained to rule: they formed settlements on the east coast and began the English invasion. But they began it under conditions altogether different from those which attended the barbarian conquests on the Continent. The English were more savage and hostile to civilization than most of the continental invaders; on the other hand, they were far less overwhelmingly numerous. The Romano-British culture was less strong and coherent than the civilization of Roman Gaul, but the Britons themselves—at least those in the hills—were no less ready to fight than the bravest of the continental provincials. The sequel was naturally different in the two regions.

The course of the invasion is a matter for English historians. But part of it depends on Romano-British archaeology. This seems to contradict violently the chronology which the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle sets out in suspiciously precise detail. We know that Wroxeter was burnt and we have evidence that the burning occurred soon after (if indeed it was not before) *AD* 400. We must treat this evidence cautiously, since not a fiftieth part of the site has yet been explored. But at Silchester, which has been all uncovered, the spade has told us that the town was abandoned (not burnt), and as a limit for the date, we find no coins which need be later than about *AD* 420. The same absence of fifth century coins may be noted on other sites which have been sufficiently explored to yield trustworthy testimony. It would seem as if the invaders, entering Britain on its eastern and least defensible side, were able, like the Romans four centuries earlier, rapidly to sweep over the lowlands, but were not able to maintain their hold. Thus for several generations this region became a debatable land, where neither Romano-British city life could safely endure nor the English take firm hold and settle. In the long confusion, the Romano-British civilization of the lowlands perished. The towns, burnt or abandoned, lay waste and empty. Even Durovernum (Canterbury), presumably the capital of Vortigern, whom the legend mates with a Saxon wife, ceased to exist, and at the healing springs of Aquae Sulis (Bath) the wild birds built their nests in the marsh which hid the ruins. The country houses and farms perished even more easily: not one is known in which we can trace English inhabitants succeeding to British. The old native tribal areas and the Roman administrative boundaries were alike lost: today we have no certain knowledge of any of them. The Roman speech vanished; the Romano-British material civilization, and the house-plans and house-furniture, hypocausts and mosaics, even the fashions of brooches and pottery,

vanished with it. Only the solid *aggeres* of the roads remained still in use, and in these, too, there were gaps and intervals. All else was but the scattered débris of a ruined world.

Meanwhile the Romanized Britons, in losing the lowlands, lost their towns and all the apparatus of town life. They retired into the hills, to Wales and to the north—the later Strathclyde—and there, in a region where Roman civilization had never established itself in its higher forms, they underwent an intelligible change. The Celtic element, never quite extinct in those hills and reinforced perhaps by immigrations from Ireland, reasserted itself afresh. Gradually, the remnants of Roman civilization were worn down: the Celtic speech reappeared and, as sequel, the Late Celtic art was strong enough to pass on an artistic legacy to the Middle Ages.

(B)

TEUTONIC CONQUEST OF BRITAIN.  
AD 450-477

According to Bede, who wrote his Ecclesiastical History about AD 731, the Teutonic invasions of Britain began during the joint reign of Marcian and Valentinian III, that is, between the years AD 450 and 455. Bede states that the invaders came from three powerful nations, the Saxons, Angles, and Jutes. From the Jutes came those who occupied Kent and the Isle of Wight with the adjacent coast of Hampshire, from the Saxons came the people of Essex, Sussex, and Wessex, and from the Angles the East Anglians, Middle Anglians, and Northumbrians. He adds that the Saxons were sprung from the Old Saxons and that the Angles came from a district called Angulus, which lay between the territories of the Jutes and those of the Saxons, and was said to be still unoccupied in his day. The leaders of this invasion, according to Bede, were two brothers named Hengest and Horsa, from the former of whom the Kentish royal family claimed to be descended. They were summoned in the first place by the British king Wyrhtgeorn (Vortigern) to defend him against the assaults of his northern foes, and received a reward in territory in return for their assistance, but a quarrel soon broke out on account of the alleged failure of the king to redeem his promises. The Saxon Chronicle amplifies Bede's account by mentioning certain battles, the result of which was to transfer Kent to the possession of the invaders. Of these events, however, a far more detailed account is furnished by the *Historia Brittonum* known by the name of Nennius, which narrates that the British nobles were treacherously massacred by Hengest at a conference, and that the king himself was captured and only released on the cession of certain provinces. After this a heroic resistance was offered to the invaders by the king's son Vortemir.

The Saxon Chronicle is our only authority for two stories dealing with the early history of the kingdoms of Sussex and Wessex. The foundation of the former kingdom is attributed to a certain Aelle, who is said to have landed in 477. This person is mentioned by Bede as the first king who gained a hegemony (*imperium*) over the neighbouring English kings, though he gives no account of his exploits and assigns no date for his reign. The foundation of the kingdom of Wessex is attributed in the Chronicle to a certain Cerdic and his son Cynric, who are said to have arrived about forty years after Hengest and to have eventually established their position after a number of conflicts with the Britons. This story is connected, according to the same authority, with the occupation of the Isle of Wight, which is said to have been given by Cerdic to his nephews Stuf and Wihtgar (530).

It is difficult to determine how much historical fact underlies these stories. Little value can be attached to the dates given in the Saxon Chronicle. It is clear too that we have to deal with an etiological element, especially in the West Saxon story. Indeed this story is the most suspicious of the three. In making Cynric the son of Cerdic the account is at variance even with the genealogy contained in the Chronicle itself, while it is also very curious that Cerdic, the founder of the kingdom, bears what appears to be a Welsh name.

The only reference to the invasion which can be regarded as in any way contemporary occurs in an anonymous Gaulish Chronicle which comes to an end in the year 452. It is there stated that in 441-2 after many disasters the provinces of Britain were subdued by the Saxons. This date would appear to be irreconcilable with that given by Bede for the arrival of Hengest, and the discrepancy has given rise to a good deal of discussion. Yet another date 428-9 is given by an entry in the *Historia Brittonum*, the source of which cannot be traced.

The difference in all these cases is of comparatively little moment. Some scholars however hold that the invasions began at a much earlier time, during the latter half of the fourth century. The authority of the passage in the *Historia Brittonum* which states that the Saxons came in 375 can hardly be upheld. More importance is perhaps to be attached to the fact that part of the coast of Britain is called *Litus Saxonicum* in the *Notitia Dignitatum*, which was drawn up in the early years of the fifth century; as this may indicate that Saxon settlements had already taken place in this island. Yet if this be so these Saxons must have been subject to the Roman authorities. Whether they had any connection with Hengest's invasion we have no means of determining.

The first reference to the Saxons occurs in a work dating from the middle of the second century A.D., namely the Geography of Ptolemy, in which they are said to occupy the neck of the Cimbric Peninsula (presumably the region which now forms the province of Schleswig), together with three islands off its west coast. The Angles are mentioned half a century earlier by Tacitus in his *Germania* (cap. 40). No precise indication is given of their position, but they are clearly represented as a maritime people and the connection in which their name occurs would suggest the Baltic coast, though Tacitus appears to have little knowledge of that region. Such indications as are given are perfectly compatible with the traditions of later times, which place the original home of the Angles on the east coast of Schleswig. To the Jutes we have no reference earlier than the sixth century.

The Saxons no doubt belonged to the same stock as the Old Saxons of the Continent. In the fourth century we find this people settled in the district between the lower Elbe and the Zuiderzee. According to their own traditions they had come thither by sea, and certainly we have no evidence of their presence in that region during the first century, when it was well known to the Romans and frequently traversed by their armies. Whether the Saxons who invaded Britain came from the peninsula or from the region west of the Elbe cannot be decided with certainty, but since they appear to have been practically indistinguishable from the Angles the former alternative seems more probable. In any case they were a maritime people and their piratical ravages are frequently mentioned from the close of the third century onwards.

The Angles, on the other hand, are never mentioned by Roman writers from the time of Tacitus until the sixth century, when they were settled in Britain. In their case however we have certain heroic traditions which appear to have been preserved independently both in England and Denmark. These traditions centre round an old king named Wermund and his son Offa, of whom the latter is said to have won great glory in a single combat, the scene of which was fixed by Danish tradition at Rendsburg on the Eider. From him the Mercian royal family traced their descent, while the royal family of Wessex claimed to derive their origin from a certain Wig the son of Freawine, both of whom according to Danish tradition were



governors of Schleswig under the kings above mentioned. The date indicated by the genealogies for the reigns of these kings is the latter half of the fourth century.

It is a much debated question whether the Jutes who settled in Britain came from Jutland. In the course of the sixth century we hear twice of a people of this name which came into conflict with the Franks, probably in western Germany, but it is by no means impossible that this also was a case of invasion from Jutland. The same name probably occurs also in connection with the heroic story of Finn and Hengest, with regard to which our information is unfortunately very defective.

We have no satisfactory evidence of any linguistic differences between the Angles, Saxons, and Jutes. The divergences of dialect which appear in our earliest records are at first only slight and such as may very well have grown up after the invasion of Britain. The language as a whole must be pronounced homogeneous, its nearest affinities being with the Frisian dialects. Nor with regard to customs or institutions have we any evidence of a distinction between the Angles and Saxons. On the other hand the Kentish laws exhibit a marked divergence from those of the other kingdoms, in respect of the constitution of society, a divergence which can scarcely have come into existence subsequent to the invasion. We have no information with regard to the characteristics of the Hampshire Jutes.

It may be doubted whether all those who took part in the invasion of Britain belonged to the three nationalities which we have been discussing. The attempts made from time to time to trace the presence of settlers belonging to other peoples cannot be pronounced successful, and when Procopius speaks of Frisians inhabiting our island together with Angles and Britons it is possible that he may mean either the Jutes or the Saxons. Yet considering the numbers which must have been required for such an undertaking, it is highly probable that the invading forces were augmented by adventurers from all the regions bordering on the North Sea, perhaps even from districts more remote.

With regard to the state of civilization attained by the maritime Teutonic peoples at the period when these settlements took place, a good deal of information is afforded by their earliest cemeteries in this country as well as by others on the opposite side of the North Sea. Amongst the latter perhaps the most important is that of Borgstedterfeld near Rendsburg, where the remains found show much affinity to those discovered in this country. Much is also to be learnt from the great bog-deposits at Thorsbjaerg and Nydam in the east of Schleswig, the latter of which appears to be only slightly earlier than the cemetery of Borgstedterfeld. In a district slightly more remote, at Vi in Fyen, a still larger deposit has been found dating from about the same period. Among the most interesting objects found at Nydam were two clinker-built boats about seventy feet long which are preserved practically complete. A very large number of weapons were also found in this and the other deposits. At Nydam were found 550 spears and 106 swords, a large number of which bear the marks of Roman provincial workshops. At Vi was discovered a complete coat of mail containing twenty thousand rings. Fragments of such articles together with silver and bronze helmets were found at Thorsbjaerg. This deposit also yielded some articles of clothing in a fair state of preservation, among them cloaks, coats, long trousers, and shoes. Taken together the evidence of the various deposits shows conclusively not only that the warriors of the period were armed in a manner not substantially improved upon for many centuries afterwards, but also that certain arts, such as that of weaving, had been carried to a high degree of perfection.

The form of writing employed by the invaders of Britain was the Runic alphabet. The origin of this is uncertain, but it was widely used by the inhabitants of Scandinavian countries from perhaps the fourth century *AD* until late in the Middle Ages. A few early inscriptions have been found in Germany. In England itself we have scarcely any inscriptions dating from the first two centuries after the invasion, but in the seventh century the Mercian kings engraved their coins with it, and about the same time and perhaps down to the end of the

eighth century it was used on sepulchral monuments in Northumbria as well as on various small articles found in different parts of the country.

It may be noted that inscriptions in the same alphabet were found in the deposits at Thorsbjærg and Nydam and also on one of the two magnificent horns found at Gallehus in Jutland, which perhaps represent the highest point reached by the art of the period.

Apart from this archaeological evidence a considerable amount of information may be derived from the remains of ancient heroic poetry. For although these poems, as we have them, date only from the seventh century, there is no reason for supposing that the civilization which they portray differs substantially from that of a century or two earlier. The weapons and other articles which they describe appear to be identical in type with those found in the deposits already mentioned, while the dead are disposed of by cremation, a practice which apparently went out of use during the sixth century. The poems are, essentially court works, and scanty as they unfortunately are, they give us a vivid picture of the court life of the period with which they deal. This period is substantially that of the Conquest of Britain, namely, from the fourth to the sixth century, but it is a remarkable fact that these works never mention Britain itself and very seldom persons of English nationality. The scene of *Beowulf* is laid in Denmark and Sweden and the characters belong to the same regions, while *Waldhere* is concerned with the Burgundians and their neighbours. Many of these characters can be traced in German and Norse literature, and the evidence seems to point to the existence of a widespread court poetry which we may perhaps almost describe as international.

Concerning the religion of the invading peoples little can be stated with certainty. Almost all that we know of Teutonic mythology comes from Icelandic sources, and it is difficult to determine how much of this was peculiar to Iceland and how much was common to Scandinavian countries and to the Teutonic nations in general. The English evidence unfortunately is particularly scanty. However there is little doubt that the chief divinity among the military class was Woden, from whom most of the royal families claimed to be descended. Thunor, presumably the Thunder-God, may be traced in many place-names and Ti (Tiw) is found in glosses as a translation of Mars. All these deities together with Frig have left a record of themselves in the names of the days of the week. The East Saxon royal family claimed descent from a certain Seaxneat who appears to have been a divinity. There is evidence also of belief in elves, valkyries, and other supernatural beings.

On their forms of worship we have scarcely any more information. In Northumbria at any rate there seems to have been a special class of priests who were not allowed to bear arms or to ride except on mares. Sanctuaries are occasionally mentioned, but we do not know whether these were temples or merely sacred groves. A number of religious festivals are also recorded by Bede, especially during the winter months. It may be remarked in passing that the calendar appears to have been of the 'modified lunar' type with an intercalary month added from time to time. The year is said to have begun approximately, we must presume—at the winter solstice. There are some indications however which suggest that at an earlier period it may have begun after the harvest.

There is no doubt that the invading peoples possessed a highly developed system of agriculture long before they landed in this country. Many agricultural implements have been found among the bog-deposits in Schleswig. Representations of ploughing operations occur in rock-carvings in Bohuslan (Sweden) which date from the Bronze Age, at least a thousand years earlier than the invasion. All the ordinary cereals were well known and cultivated, though on the other hand the system of cultivation followed in this country was probably a continuation of that which had previously been employed here. There is no evidence that the heavy plough with eight oxen was used before the invasion by the conquerors. The water-mill doubtless first became known to them in Britain, and for ages afterwards it failed to oust the quern. In horticulture the advance made was very great: the names of practically all

vegetables and fruits are derived from Latin, and though the knowledge of a few of their names may have filtered through from the Rhine provinces, there can be little doubt that the great bulk were first acquired in this country.

These considerations bring us to the much disputed question as to what became of the native population. The insignificance of the British element in the English language is scarcely explicable unless the invaders came over in very large numbers. On the other hand, many scholars have probably gone too far in supposing that the native population was entirely blotted out. British records say that they were massacred or enslaved. In later times, i.e. in the eleventh century, the number of slaves in England was not great, but it is not safe to infer that such was the case four or five centuries earlier. Indeed the little evidence that we have on this question suggests that in some districts at least they were a very numerous class. There can be little doubt at all events that the first invasions were essentially of a military character. Attempts have been made to trace in various quarters settlements of kindreds especially from the occurrence of place-names with the suffixes *-ingas*, *-ingatun*, etc., but the evidence is at best exceedingly ambiguous. Among the Scandinavians who took part in the great invasion of 866 we can trace various grades of officials (*eorlas*, *holdas*, etc.) between whom the land appears to have been partitioned, and although we have no contemporary evidence of what took place in the Saxon invasion, there is a *prima facie* probability that a similar course was followed. To the present writer it seems incredible that so great an undertaking as the invasion of Britain should have been accomplished without the employment of large and organized forces. The earliest records we possess furnish abundant evidence for the existence of a very numerous military class of different grades, while the provincial government appears to have been vested in the hands of royal officials and not in popular bodies.

From archaeological evidence and from the character of local nomenclature we can to a certain extent determine the area occupied by the invaders at various periods, although very much remains to be done in these fields of investigation. Thus the practice of cremation is found in early cemeteries in the valley of the Trent and in various parts of the Thames valley as far west as Brighthampton in Oxfordshire, but there is scarcely any evidence for its employment further to the west. In local nomenclature again changes may be observed thus the proportion of place-names ending in the suffix *-ham* to those ending in the suffix *-ton* decreases as we proceed from east to west. So far as the evidence is at present collected it would seem to indicate that the eastern and south-eastern counties, together with the banks of the large rivers for some distance inland, show an earlier type of Saxon nomenclature than the rest of the country. But it is highly probable that as in the case of the invasion of 866 a much larger area was ravaged by the invaders than was actually settled by them at first.

The account of the invasion given by Gildas, vague as it unfortunately is, points distinctly to the same conclusion. He speaks in the first place of a time when the country was harried far and wide, when the cities were spoiled, and the inhabitants slain or enslaved. Then came a time when the natives under Ambrosius Aurelianus began to offer a more effective resistance, from which time forward war continued with varying success until the siege of Mons Badonicus. From the time of that siege until the date when Gildas wrote, the Britons had had no serious trouble from the invaders, though faction was rife among themselves. Unfortunately he supplies us with no means of dating the course of events with certainty except that apparently the period of comparative peace had lasted forty-four years. The Cambrian Annals date the siege of Mons Badonicus in 518, but they also date in 549 the death of Maelgwn king of Gwynedd who is mentioned by Gildas as alive. The majority of scholars accept the latter of these dates and reject the former, placing the date of the siege towards the end of the fifth century. The evidence of Gildas then on the whole leads us to conclude that the Conquest of Britain may be divided into two distinct periods. The first occupied some

fifty years from the beginning of the invasion, while the second can hardly have begun much before the middle of the sixth century.

Among the invaders themselves a number of separate kingdoms arose. It is commonly held that these kingdoms were the outcome of separate invasions, but no evidence is forthcoming in favour of such a view, and it seems at least as likely that several of them arose out of subsequent divisions, as was the case after the Scandinavian invasion in the ninth century. The kingdoms which we find actually existing in our earliest historical records are ten in number: (1) Kent, (2) Sussex, (3) Essex, (4) Wessex, (5) East Anglia, (6) Mercia, (7) Hwicce, (8) Deira, (9) Bernicia, (10) Isle of Wight.

There are traces also of a kingdom in the district between Mercia, Middle Anglia, East Anglia, and Essex—perhaps Northamptonshire and Bedfordshire—while from Lindsey we have what appears to be the genealogy of a royal family. There is no clear evidence that Middlesex and Surrey were separate kingdoms at any time, though (if certain disputed charters are genuine) the latter was under a ruler who styled himself *subregulus* in the latter part of the seventh century. The balance of probability is in favour of the view that both these provinces originally formed part of Essex.

We have already mentioned that little value is to be attached to the dates given for the foundation and early progress of the kingdom of Wessex. They are apparently quite incompatible with the testimony of Gildas. Moreover that part of the story which relates to the Isle of Wight is difficult to reconcile with Bede's account, since it altogether ignores the existence of Jutish settlements in this quarter. According to Bede the Isle of Wight retained a dynasty of its own until the time of Ceadwalla (685-688), by whom it was mercilessly ravaged. The Chronicle states, as we have seen, that the island was given by Cerdic to his nephews Stuf and Wihtgar and barely mentions the devastations of Ceadwalla. Further, according to Bede, the greater part of the coast of Hampshire was occupied by Jutes. These likewise are ignored by the Chronicle, which seems to imply that the West Saxon invasion started from this quarter. In view of these difficulties some scholars have been inclined to suspect that the annals dealing with the early part of the West Saxon invasion are entirely of a fictitious character, and that the West Saxon invaders really spread from a different quarter, perhaps the valley of the Thames, and at a later date than that assigned by the Chronicle. It is to be hoped that in the future archaeological research may throw light on this difficult question.

The difficulties presented by Gildas cease when we reach the middle of the sixth century. From this time onwards, although we have no means of checking them, the entries in the Chronicle may be records of real events which took place approximately at the times assigned to them. The first entry of this series is the account of a fight between Cynric and the Britons at Salisbury in 552: the second records a similar conflict in 556 at Beranburg, which has been identified with Barbury Camp near Swindon. In 560 Cynric is said to have been succeeded by Ceawlin, who in 568 had a successful encounter with Aethelberht king of Kent. In 571 another prince apparently West Saxon, by name Cuthwulf, fought with the Britons at a place called Bedcanford, commonly supposed to be Bedford, and gained possession of Bensington, Aylesbury, Eynsham, and perhaps Lenborough. If we are to trust this entry it would seem to mean that Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire were conquered by the West Saxons at this time. In 577 Ceawlin and another West Saxon prince named Cuthwine are said to have fought against the Britons at Deorham (identified with Dyrham in Gloucestershire) and gained possession of Bath, Cirencester, and Gloucester.

Ceawlin is the first West Saxon king mentioned by Bede. The same historian states that he was the first English king after Aelle, whose overlordship (*imperium*) was recognised by the other kings. We need not doubt that the records of his victories have some solid foundation. About a century later we find in the basins of the Severn and Avon, in



Gloucestershire, Worcestershire, and part of Warwickshire, the kingdom of the Hwicce with a dynasty of its own which lasted down to the time of Offa. This kingdom can hardly have come into existence before Ceawlin's successful westward movements, but we have no information as to its origin, as to the date when it was separated from Wessex, or whether its dynasty was a branch of the West Saxon royal family.

In the basin of the Trent both north and south of that river lay the Mercian kingdom, the name of which seems to imply that it grew out of frontier settlements. Its royal family traced its descent from the ancient kings of Angel, but we do not know whether the kingdom itself was due to an independent movement, or whether like that of the Hwicce it was an offshoot from one or more eastern kingdoms. The first king of whom we have any definite record is a certain Cearl who flourished early in the seventh century and married his daughter to the Northumbrian king Edwin. Eventually the kingdom of Mercia absorbed all its immediate neighbours, Lindsey, Middle Anglia, and Hwicce, together with parts of Essex and Wessex. In the sixth century however it was probably of comparatively limited extent. Chester appears to have remained in possession of the Britons until about the year 615, and it is scarcely probable that the western districts of the Wreocensaete and Magasaete, corresponding to the present counties of Shropshire and Herefordshire, were occupied until still later.

To the north of the Humber we find the two kingdoms of Deira and Bernicia. Concerning the former, which appears to have coincided with the eastern half of Yorkshire, we have very little information. The first king of whom we have record is a certain Aelle who was reigning at the time when Gregory met with English slave-boys in Rome (585-8). The date given for his reign by the Chronicle (560-588) cannot be trusted. Eventually this kingdom came into the hands of the Bernician king Aethelfrith, who married Aelle's daughter. If we are to believe the account given in the *Historia Brittonum* that Aethelfrith reigned twelve years in Deira, the date of this event would be about 605. The western part of Yorkshire appears to have been known as Elmet and to have remained in British hands until the reign of Edwin

The northernmost kingdom founded by the invaders in Britain was that of Bernicia. Ida, from whom subsequent kings claimed descent, is said to have begun to reign in 547. After his death, which took place twelve years later, he was followed by several of his sons in swift succession. Of these the most important was Theodric, who according to ancient chronological computation reigned from about 572 to about 579. The *Historia Brittonum* relates that he fought against several British kings, amongst them Urien who appears in ancient Welsh poetry, and Rhydderch Hen, who as we know from Adamnan's Life of St Columba reigned at Dumbarton. On one occasion the Britons are said to have besieged Theodric in Lindisfarne. The chief centre of the Bernician kingdom appears to have been Bamborough, but we have no occasion to suppose that it attained to any great dimensions or significance until the reign of Aethelfrith. He seems to have become king in 592-3, and is said by Bede to have harried the Britons more than any other English prince. The chief exploits for which his name has been handed down are firstly his encounter with the Dalriadic king Aedan who came against him probably in support of the Britons in 603, and secondly the massacre of the Britons at Chester about twelve years later. The former of these events is said to have occurred at a place called Degsastan. If this place is rightly identified with Dawston in Liddesdale, it would seem that the Bernician kingdom had already extended some distance into what is now Scotland; but its northern and western boundaries must be regarded as very uncertain at the time of which we are speaking.

Aethelfrith's successes had the effect of placing the later Northumbrian kings in a position of superiority to their southern rivals. At the close of the sixth century however the chief English ruler was Aethelberht of Kent, whose authority was recognised by all the more southern kings. The precise nature of the *imperium* which he exercised has been much

disputed, but we can hardly doubt that it implied some such recognition of personal overlordship as we find in later times, for example, in the relations of the northern princes with Edward the Elder. His power too was sufficient to guarantee a safe conduct to foreign missionaries as far as the western border of Wessex. He married the Christian Berhta (Bertha), daughter of the Frankish prince Chariberht, and shortly before the close of the century was confronted by Augustine who had been sent to Britain by Gregory the Great. This event had far-reaching consequences in the history of the Anglo-Saxon kingdoms, which will be described in a later chapter of this work.

## CHAPTER XIV

### ITALY AND THE WEST, AD 410-476

The process of history in the Western Empire, during the period which lies between the death of Alaric (410) and the fall of Romulus Augustulus (476), is towards the establishment of Teutonic kingdoms, partly displacing and partly embracing the old local administration within their boundaries, but as a rule remaining in some sort of nominal connection with the imperial system itself. In the course of this process, therefore, the imperial scheme, in which the invading barbarians take a regular place under the name of *foederati*, still survives, along with much of the old provincial machinery, which they find too useful to be disturbed; but while much that is old survives, much is also added which is new. Germanic tribes, with their kings and their dooms, their moots and their *fyrds*, settle bodily on the soil, as new forces in the domain of politics and economics, of religion and of law. The Latinized provincial pays a new allegiance to the tribal king: the Roman *possessor* has to admit the tribesmen as his 'guests' on part of his lands; the Catholic priest is forced to reconcile himself to the Arianism, which these tribes had inherited from the days of Ulfila; and the Roman jurist, if he can still occupy himself by reducing the Codex Theodosianus into a Breviarium Alaricianum, must also admit the entrance of strange Leges Barbarorum into the field of jurisprudence.

This process of history may be said to have entered on its effective stage in the West with Alaric's invasion of Italy. But it had been present, as a potentiality and a menace, for many years before Alaric heard the voice that drew him steadily towards Rome. The frontier war along the *limes* was as old as the second century. The pressure of the population of the German forests upon the Roman world was so ancient and inveterate, and so much of that population had in one way or another entered the Empire for so long a period, that when the barrier finally broke, the flood came as no cataclysm, but as something which was almost in the natural order of things. There may have been movements in Central Asia which explain the final breach of the Roman barriers; but even without invoking the Huns to our aid, we can see that at the beginning of the fifth century the Germans would finally have passed the *limes*, and the Romans at last have failed to stem their advance, owing to the simple operation of causes which had long been at work on either side. Among the Germans population had grown by leaps and bounds, while subsistence had increased in less than an arithmetical ratio; and the necessity of finding a *quieta patria*, an unthreatened territory of sufficient size and productivity, with an ancient tradition of more intensive culture than they had themselves attained, had become for them a matter of life and death. Among the Romans population had decayed for century after century, and the land had gone steadily out of cultivation, until nature herself seemed to have created the vacuum into which, in time, she inevitably attracted the Germans. The rush begins with the passage of the Danube by the Goths in 376, and is continued in the passage of the Rhine by the Vandals, Alans, and Sueves in 406. A hundred years after the passage of the Danube the final result of the movement begins to appear in the West. The praefecture of Gaul now sees in each of its three former dioceses Teutonic kingdoms established—Saxons and Jutes in the Britains; Visigoths (under their great king Euric) in the Seven Provinces of Gaul proper; Sueves (along with Visigoths) in the Spains. In the praefecture of Italy two of the three dioceses are under powerful barbarian rulers:

Odoacar has just made himself king of Italy, and Gaiseric has long been king of Africa; while the diocese of Illyricum is still in the melting-pot.

If we regard the movement of events from 410 to 476 internally, and from a Roman point of view, we shall find in the domestic politics of the period much that is the natural correlative of the *Volkerwanderung* without. Already, in the very beginning of this period, and indeed long before, the barbarian has settled in every part of the Empire, and among every class of society. Masses of barbarians have been attached to the soil as cultivators (*inquilini*), to fill the gaps in the population and reclaim the derelict soil: masses, again, have entered the army, until it has become almost predominantly German. Barbarian cultivators and soldiers thus formed the basis of the pyramid; but barbarians might also climb to the apex. Under Theodosius I, who had made it his policy to cultivate the friendship of the barbarians, the Frank Arbogast already appears as *magister militiae*, and attempts, like Ricimer afterwards, to use his office for the purpose of erecting a puppet as emperor. He fell before Theodosius in the battle of the Frigidus (394); but the Vandal Stilicho (to whom he is said to have commended the care of his children and the defence of the Empire) was the heir of his position, and Stilicho had for successor Aetius the ‘last of the Romans’, but also the friend of the Huns—as Aetius was succeeded in turn by Ricimer the Sueve. It is these barbaric or semi-barbaric figures, vested with the office of commander-in-chief of the troops of the West, which form the landmarks in the history of the fifth century; and we should be most true to reality if we distinguished the divisions of this period not by the *regna* of an Honorius or a Valentinian, but by the *magisteria* of Constantius, Aetius, and Ricimer. These “empire-destroying saviours of the Western Empire” were in reality the prime ministers of their generation, prime ministers resting not on a parliament (though they might, like Stilicho, affect to rely on the Senate), but on their control of a barbarian soldiery. Their power depended, partly on their influence with this wild force, which the Empire at once needed and dreaded, partly on the fact that the nominal representatives of imperial rule were weaklings or boys, whose court was under the influence of women and eunuchs; but the *de facto* position which they held was also sanctioned, since the time of Theodosius, by something of a legal guarantee. Treating the West, after the battle of the Frigidus, as a conquered territory, whose main problem was certain to be that of military defence, Theodosius had left it under the nominal rule of his son, but under the real government of Stilicho; and in his hands he had combined the two commands of infantry and cavalry, which in the East continued to remain distinct. In this position of *magister utriusque militiae* (already anticipated for a time by Arbogast), Stilicho, and his successors who inherited the title, controlled at once the imperial infantry and cavalry, along with the fleets on seas and on rivers: they supervised the barbaric settlements within the Empire; and they nominated the heads of the staffs of subordinate officers. As imperial generalissimo, in an age of military exigencies, the barbarian *magister militiae* was the ultimate sovereign; and the title of *patricius*, sometimes united with the name of *parens*, which in the fifth century came to be applied peculiarly to the ‘master of the troops’, proclaimed his sovereignty to the world.

Dependent upon barbarian troops, and himself often of barbarian origin, the policy of the ‘master of the troops’ towards the barbarians outside the pale, who sought to enter the Empire, was bound to be dubious. Orosius practically accuses Stilicho of complicity with Alaric, and certainly charges him with the invitation of the Vandals, Alans, and Sueves into Gaul in 406: Aetius was for years the friend of the Huns: Ricimer was apparently not averse to inciting the Visigoths to war against a Roman commander in Gaul. Inevitably, therefore, a Roman party formed itself in opposition to the master of the troops, a party curiously uniting within its ranks the senate, the eunuchs of the court, and some jealous soldier with his followers. The result would be a *coup d'état*, such as those of 408 or 454; but inevitably a new *magister* succeeds to the assassinated Stilicho or Aetius, and if the struggle still continues to



be waged (as for instance between Anthemius and Ricimer), its predestined end—the foundation of a kingdom of Italy by some real or virtual generalissimo—draws constantly nearer. In the course of this struggle religious motives apparently intertwine themselves with the underlying motive of racial feeling. Stilicho would seem to have stood for toleration: and a Catholic reaction, headed by the Court, followed upon his fall, and gave to the episcopate an increase of jurisdiction, while it banished all enemies of the faith from the imperial service. Yet Litorius, the lieutenant of Aetius, put his trust in the responses of seers and the monitions of demons" as late as 439: Ricimer, though no pagan, was an Arian. The extreme orthodoxy of the Court of Ravenna, contrasted with the dubious faith of the soldiery and its leaders, must thus have helped to whet the intensity of party strife.

In the period which we are to consider, it would thus appear that the great feature, from an external point of view, is the occupation of successive portions of the Western Empire by barbaric kings, of whom the greatest is Gaiseric, the hero of the last scene of the Wandering of the Nations, who links by his subtle policy the various enemies of the Empire into one system of attack; while internally the dominant factor is the transmutation of the Diocletian autocracy into a quasi-constitutional monarchy, in which the last members of the Theodosian house sink into *empereurs fainéants*, and the commander-in-chief becomes, as it were, a mayor of the palace. Yet another feature in external policy is the relation of the Western Emperors to those of the East, and other features deserving of notice in internal development are the growth of the Papacy, and the new importance from time to time assumed by the Senate.

Upon the Eastern Empire the West is again and again forced to rely. The Eastern Emperors give the West its rulers—Valentinian III, Anthemius, Nepos; or in any case they give a legitimate title to the rulers whom the West, in one way or another, has found for itself. Not only so, but upon occasion they give to the West the succour, which again and again it is forced to beg in the course of its struggle with the Vandals. Theoretically, as always, the unity of the Empire persists: there is still one Empire, with two joint rulers. But in practice, after 395, there are two separate States with separate policies and separate lines of development; and both Priscus in the East, and Sidonius Apollinaris in the West, acknowledge the fact of the separation. In these separate States there is, indeed, much that is parallel. The East has to face the Huns and the Goths equally with the West; like the West, it has its barbarian *magistri militiae* (with the great difference, however, that there are generally two concurrent *magistri* to weaken each other by their rivalry) and the Eastern Emperor has to deal with Aspar in 471, as Valentinian III had dealt with Aetius in 454. In both Empires, again, the house of Theodosius became extinct at much the same time. But here the parallel ends. In the West the death of Valentinian III was followed by the rule of the emperor-makers (Ricimer, Gundobad, and Orestes), and by a succession of nine emperors in twenty-one years: in the East new and powerful emperors arose, who found the office of 'master of the troops' far weaker than in the West, and were able, by the alliance they formed with the Isaurians, to discover in their own realms a substitute and an antidote for barbaric auxiliaries, and thus to prolong the existence of their Empire for a thousand years. Meanwhile ecclesiastical development confirmed the separation and widened the differences between the two Empires. While Eastern theologians pursued their metaphysical inquiries into the unity of the Godhead, a new school of churchmanship, of a legal rather than a metaphysical complexion, arose in the West under the influence of St Augustine; and the growth of the Papacy, especially under the rule of Leo I (440-461), gave to this new school a dogmatic arbiter and an administrative ruler of its own.

The development of the Papacy, like the new vigour which the Senate occasionally displays, is largely the result of the decadence of the Western Emperors and of their seclusion in the marshes of Ravenna. The pietism of the Court, under the influence of Placidia, helped to confirm a power, which its withdrawal to Ravenna had already begun to establish; while

the victories of Pope Leo over heresies in Italy, his successful interference against Monophysitism in the East, and the prestige of his mission to Attila in 451 and his mediation with Gaiseric in 455, contributed to the increase both of his ecclesiastical power and of his political influence. Meanwhile the bishops, everywhere in the West, tended to become the leading figures in their dioceses. The constitutions of 408 gave them civil jurisdiction in their dioceses and the power of enforcing the laws against heresy. In the chief town of his diocese each bishop gradually came to discharge the duties, even if he did not assume the office, of the *defensor civitatis*; and wherever a barbarian kingdom was established, the bishop was a natural mediator between the conquerors and their subjects.

The new importance assumed by the Senate in the course of the fifth century is evident both at Constantinople and at Rome. During the minority of Theodosius II it is chiefly the Senate of Constantinople which aids the regent Pulcheria and her minister Anthemius, the praetorian praefect, in the conduct of affairs; and though the Roman Senate hardly exerts any continuous influence, again and again in times of crisis it helps to determine the course of events. The autocracy consolidated by Diocletian begins to revert to the original dyarchy of *princeps* and *senatus* which Augustus had founded. In the early years of the fifth century, partly in the later years of Stilicho, who made it his policy to favor the Senate, and partly during the interregnum in the effective exercise of the office of *magister militiae*, which lasted from the fall of Stilicho till the appearance of Constantius (411), it had shown considerable activity; but the period of its greatest influence covers the last twenty-five years of the Western Empire. It was with two of the chief senators that Pope Leo went to meet Attila in 451: it was before the Senate that Valentinian defended himself for the assassination of Aetius in 454. The assassination of Valentinian himself was followed by the accession of Maximus, a member of the great senatorial family of the Anicii; and it has even been suggested that the accession of Maximus perhaps indicates an attempt of the Anicii to establish a new government in the West, independent of Constantinople and resting on the support of the Senate. Maximus fell; but his successor, Avitus, who came to the throne by the support of a Gallo-Roman party, was resisted by the Senate, and fell in his turn. The accession of the next emperor, Majorian, is at any rate in form a triumph for the Senate; in his first constitution Majorian thanks the Senate for letting its choice fall upon him, and promises to govern by its advice. But the reign of Anthemius (467-472) seems to mark the zenith of senatorial power. It was the appeal of the Senate to Constantinople which led to his accession; during his reign the Senate is powerful enough to try and condemn Arvandus, the praetorian praefect of Gaul, on a charge of treason; and in the civil war which precedes his fall, the Senate takes his side against his adversary Ricimer. Thus, in the paralysis of the imperial authority, the Senate stands side by side, and sometimes face to face, with the military power, as the representative of public authority and civil order. Its effective power is indeed little; the sword is too strong and too keen for that; but at any rate, in the agonies of the Empire, it behaves not unworthily of its secular tradition. And indeed in still other ways one cannot but feel that the end of Rome was not unworthy of herself. Her last work in her age-long task of ruling the peoples was to give into the hands of the Teutonic tribes her structure of law and her system of administration: to the one, as late as 438, the Codex Theodosianus had just been added, while the other was being reformed and purified as late as the days of the last real Emperor of the West, Majorian. So Rome handed on the torch, as it were, newly trimmed; and though we must admit that in fact the imperial government of the fifth century suffered from the impotence of over-centralization, we must also allow that she was in intention, as Professor Dill has well said, "probably never so anxious to check abuses of administration, or so compassionate for the desolate and the suffering, as in the years when her forces were being paralyzed".

The figures in the drama of the last years of the Western Empire, which have perhaps had the greatest appeal for the imagination of the historian, are those of Galla Placidia and of Attila. Both figures have, indeed, a significance, which deserves some little consideration. Ravenna still testifies today to the fame of Placidia; and her name suggests the names of many others, her kinswomen and contemporaries, Pulcheria, Eudocia, Eudoxia, and Honoria, whose influence appears, in the pages of the Byzantine historians, to have largely determined the destinies of their age. "It is indeed", writes Gregorovius, "a remarkable historic phenomenon, that in periods of decadence some female figure generally rises into prominence"; and Professor Bury has also remarked that the influence of women was a natural result of the new mode of palatial life—a result which is obviously apparent in the attribution of the title of Augusta to Eudoxia in the East and to Placidia in the West. Yet one cannot but feel that the Byzantine historians have been led by a certain feminism, if it may be so called, which is characteristic of their historiography, to attribute to women, at any rate as regards the West, an excessive influence on the politics of the period. The fifth century was the age of the erotic novel—of *Daphnis and Chloe*, of *Leucippe and Cleitophon*; and it would almost appear as if Byzantine historians had infused into their history the eroticism of contemporary novels. It is therefore permissible to doubt whether Honoria was really responsible for the attack of Attila upon the West, or Eudoxia for the sack of Rome by Gaiseric: whether Olympiodorus' account of the relations of Honorius and Placidia after the death of Constantius is not a play of fancy, and the story given by Joannes Antiochenus and Procopius of the seduction of the wife of Maximus by Valentinian III, which led Maximus to compass his death, is not equally fanciful.

The figure of Attila owes much of its fascination to the vivid descriptions which Priscus gives of his court and Jordanes of the great battle of the Mauriac plain; and the Nibelungenlied has added the attraction of legend to the appeal of history. Attila has, indeed, his significance in the history of the world. It matters little that he was vanquished in one of the so-called "decisive battles of the world": if he had been the victor on the Mauriac plain, and had lived for twenty years afterwards, instead of two, he would none the less have fallen at last, if only the allies who stood together in that battle had continued their alliance. The real significance of Attila lies in the fact, that the pressure of his Huns forced the Romans and the Teutons to recognize that the common interest of civilization was at stake, and thus drove them to make the great alliance, on which the future progress of the world depended. The fusion of Romans and Teutons, of which the marriage of Ataulf and Placidia, as it is described in the pages of Olympiodorus, may seem to be a harbinger, is cemented in the bloodshed of the Mauriac plain.

Between the death of Alaric and the fall of Romulus Augustulus, the progress of events may be arranged in three definite stages. A period, which is marked by the patriciate of Constantius, begins in 410 and ends with the death of Honorius in 423; during this period there takes place the Visigothic settlement in the South of France. A second period, marked by the patriciate of Aetius, covers the reign of Valentinian III, and ends in 455: it is the period of the Vandal settlement in Africa, and of Hunnish inroads into Gaul and Italy. A final period, in which the patriciate is held by Ricimer, follows upon the extinction of the Theodosian house in the West: it ends, in the phrase of Count Marcellinus, who alone seems to have realized the importance of the event, with the "extinction of the Western Empire of the Roman race", and the settlement of Odovacar in Italy.

At the end of 410 Rufinus, as he wrote the preface to his translation of the homilies of Origen in a Sicilian villa which looked across to Reggio, saw the city in flames, and witnessed the gathering of the ships with which Alaric was preparing to invade Africa. A little later, and he may have seen the ships destroyed by a tempest; a little later still, and he may have heard of Alaric's death and of his burial in the bed of the Busento. The Gothic king was succeeded by his brother-in-law Ataulf; and upon the doings of Ataulf, for the next two years, there rests

a cloud of darkness. We know, indeed, that he stayed in Italy till the spring of 412; we learn from the Theodosian Code that he was in Tuscany in 411; and we are told by Jordanes that at this time he was spoiling Italy of public and private wealth alike, and that his Goths stripped Rome once more, like a flock of locusts, while Honorius sat powerless behind the walls of Ravenna—the one rock left to the Emperor in the deluge which at this time covered Italy, Gaul, and Spain. But the story of Jordanes is probably apocryphal. Orosius and Olympiodorus, who are excellent contemporary authorities, both remark on the prosperity of Rome in the years that followed on the sack of 410: “recent as is the sack, we would think, as we look at the multitude of the Roman people, that nothing at all had happened, were it not for some traces of fire”. In the face of this evidence, a second plundering of Rome by Ataulf is improbable; and it appears equally improbable, when we consider the character of the new Gothic king and the natural line of his policy. A Narbonese citizen, who had perhaps witnessed the marriage of Ataulf to Galla Placidia in 414 at Narbonne and heard the shouts of acclamation, from Romans and Goths alike, which hailed the marriage festivities, reported to St Jerome at Bethlehem, in the hearing of Orosius, the words which he had often heard fall from the lips of Ataulf. “I have found by experience, that my Goths are too savage to pay any obedience to laws, but I have also found, that without laws a State is never a State; and so I have chosen the glory of seeking to restore and to increase by Gothic strength the name of Rome. Wherefore I avoid war and strive for peace”. In 411 Ataulf had indeed already strong motives for seeking peace. He had abandoned the African expedition of Alaric, but he needed the supplies which that expedition had been meant to procure, and which he could now only gain from the Emperor; and he had in his train the captive Placidia, the sister of Honorius, whose hand would carry the succession to her brother's throne. To negotiate with Honorius for supplies and for formal consent to his marriage with Placidia was thus the natural policy of Ataulf; and in such negotiations the year 411 may have passed. But if there were negotiations, there was no treaty. Honorius had been strengthened by the arrival of a Byzantine fleet with an army on board; and he showed himself obdurate. When Ataulf was driven from Italy into Gaul, apparently by lack of supplies, in the spring of 412, he did not come as the friend and ally of Honorius.

In 412 Gaul was beginning to emerge from a state of whirling chaos. The usurper within, and the barbarian from without, had divided the country since 406. There had been two swarms of invaders, and two different ‘tyrants’. In 406 the Vandals, Alans, and Sueves had poured into Gaul, surged to the feet of the Pyrenees, and falling back for a while had then, with the aid of treachery, poured over the mountains and vanished into Spain, which henceforth became the prey of “four plagues—the sword, and famine, and pestilence, and the noisome beast” (409). In the wake of this tide had followed an influx of Franks, Alemanni, and Burgundians; and in 411 these three peoples were still encamped in Gaul, along the western bank of the Rhine, preparing for a permanent settlement. The usurpation of Constantine in 406 had synchronized with the invasion of Gaul by the Vandals, Alans, and Sueves; and indeed, the invasion was probably the result of the usurpation, for Stilicho would seem to have invited these people into Gaul, in the hope of barring the usurper's way into Italy. In 409 a second tyrant had arisen in Spain: Gerontius, one of Constantine's own officers, had created a rival emperor, called Maximus; and it was this usurpation which had caused the invasion of Spain by the Vandals and their allies, Gerontius having invited them into Spain, as Stilicho had before invited them into Gaul, in order to gain their alliance in his struggle with Constantine. In 411 Gerontius had advanced into Gaul, and was besieging Constantine in Arles, while Constantine was hoping for the arrival of an army of relief from the barbarians on the Rhine. At this moment Constantius, the new ‘master of the troops’, arrived in Gaul to defend the cause of the legitimate emperor, Honorius. He met with instant success. Gerontius was overwhelmed and perished: Constantine's barbarian reinforcements were attacked and



defeated; Constantine himself was captured, and sent to Italy for execution. By the end of 411 Gaul was clear of both usurpers; and the Roman general stood face to face with the Franks, Alemanni, and Burgundians, who had meanwhile, during the operations round Arles, created a new emperor, Jovinus, to give a colour of legality to their position in Gaul. Without attacking Jovinus, however, Constantius seems to have left Gaul at the end of the year, perhaps because the northward march of Ataulf was already causing unrest at Ravenna.

When Ataulf's march finally conducted him over Mont Genève into Gaul, somewhere near Valence, in the spring of 412, it seemed probable that he would throw himself on the side of Jovinus, now encamped in Auvergne, and acquire from the usurper a settlement in southern Gaul. It was his natural policy: it was the course which was advised by the ex-Emperor Attalus, who still followed in the train of the Goths. But Jovinus and Ataulf failed to agree. Ataulf seems to have occupied Bordeaux in the course of 412, and Jovinus regarded him as an intruder, whose presence in Gaul threatened himself and his barbarian allies; while on his side Ataulf attacked and killed one of Jovinus' supporters, with whom he had an ancient feud. Dardanus, the loyal praefect of the Gauls, was able to win Ataulf over to the side of his master, and some sort of treaty was made (413), by which Ataulf engaged to send to Honorius the heads of Jovinus and his brother Sebastian, in return for regular supplies of provisions, and the recognition of his position in Bordeaux and (possibly) the whole of Aquitania Secunda. Ataulf fulfilled his promise with regard to Jovinus and Sebastian; but by the autumn of 413 he had already quarrelled with Honorius, and the Goths and the Romans were once more at war. Two causes were responsible for the struggle. In the first place the government of Honorius had failed to provide the Goths with the promised supplies. The failure is evidently connected with the revolt of Heraclian, the Count of Africa, in the course of the year 413. Heraclian, influenced by the example of the many usurpations in Gaul, and finding a basis in the anti-imperial sentiment of the persecuted Donatists of Africa, had prepared for revolt in 412; and in 413 he prohibited the export of corn from his province, the great granary of Rome, and had sailed for Italy with an armada which contained, according to Orosius, the almost incredible number of 3700 ships. He was beaten at Otricoli in Umbria with great slaughter, and flying back to Africa perished at Carthage; but his revolt, however unsuccessful in its issue, exercised during its course a considerable effect on the policy of Honorius. On the one hand, it must have been largely responsible for the treaty with Ataulf in 413: the imperial Government needed Constantius in Italy to meet Heraclian, and, destitute of troops of its own in Gaul, it had to induce the Goths to crush the usurper Jovinus on its behalf. At the same time, however, the revolt had also exercised an opposite effect; it had prevented the imperial Government from furnishing the Goths with supplies, and had made it inevitable that Ataulf should seek by war what he could not get by peace.

There was however a second and perhaps more crucial cause of hostilities between the Goths and the Romans. Placidia still remained with the Goths; and the question of the succession, which her marriage involved, had still to be settled. Again and again, in the course of history, the problem of a dubious succession has been the very hinge of events; and the question of the succession to Honorius, as it had influenced the policy and the fate of Stilicho, still continued to determine the policy of Ataulf and the history of the Western Empire. In this question Constantius, the 'master of the troops', was now resolved to interfere. Sprung from Naissus (the modern Nisch), he was a man of pure Roman blood, and stood at the head of the Roman or anti-barbarian party. "In him", says Orosius, "the State felt the utility of having its forces at last commanded by a Roman general, and realized the danger it had before incurred from its barbarian generals". As he rode, bending over his horse's mane, and darting quick looks to right and left, men said of him (Olympiodorus writes) that he was meant for empire; and he had resolved to secure the succession to the throne by the hand of Placidia—the more,

perhaps, as such a marriage would mean the victory of his party, and the defeat of the 'barbarian' Ataulf.

In the autumn of 413 hostilities began. Ataulf passed from Aquitanica Secunda into Narbonensis: he seized Toulouse, and "at the time of the gathering of the grapes" he occupied Narbonne. Marseilles (which, as a great port, would have been an excellent source of supplies) he failed to take, owing to the stout resistance of Boniface, the future Count of Africa; but at Narbonne, in the beginning of 414, he took the decisive step of wedding Placidia. By a curious irony, the bridegroom offered to the bride, as his wedding gift, part of the treasures which Alaric had taken from Rome; and the ex-Emperor Attalus joined in singing the epithalamia. Yet Romans and Goths rejoiced together; and the marriage, like that of Alexander the Great to Roxana, is the symbol of the fusion of two peoples and two civilizations. "Thus was fulfilled the prophecy of Daniel", Hydatius writes, "that a daughter of the King of the South should marry the King of the North". Meanwhile in Italy Constantius had been created consul for the year 414, and was using the confiscated goods of the rebel Heraclian to celebrate his entry upon office with the usual public entertainments, in the very month of the marriage festivities at Narbonne. In the spring he advanced into Gaul. Here he found that Ataulf, anxious for some colour of legitimacy, and seeking to maintain some connection with the 'Roman name', had caused Attalus once more to play the part of emperor, excusing thereby his occupation of Narbonensis, as the Franks and their allies had sought to excuse their position on the west of the Rhine by the elevation of Jovinus in 412. An imperial Court arose in Bordeaux in the spring of 414; and Paulinus of Pella was made procurator of the imaginary imperial domain of the actor-emperor Attalus, who once more, in the phrase of Orosius, "played at empire" for the pleasure of the Goths. But on the approach of Constantius, Ataulf set the city on fire, and leaving it smoking behind him, advanced to defend Narbonensis. Constantius, however, used his fleet to prevent the Goths from receiving supplies by sea; and the pressure of famine drove Ataulf from Narbonne. He retreated by way of Bazas, which he failed to take, as the procurator Paulinus induced the Alans to desert from his army; and, having no longer a base in Bordeaux, he was forced to cross the Pyrenees into Spain, where along with the Emperor Attalus, he occupied Barcelona (probably in the winter of 414-415). In devastated Spain famine still dogged the steps of the Goths: the Vandals nicknamed them *Truli*, because they paid a piece of gold for each *trula* of corn they bought. This of itself would naturally drive Ataulf to negotiate with Honorius, but the birth of a son and heir, significantly named Theodosius, made both Ataulf and Placidia tenfold more anxious for peace, and for the recognition of their child's right of succession to the throne of his childless uncle. The Emperor, Attalus, was thrown aside as useless; Ataulf was ready to recognize Honorius, if Honorius would recognize Theodosius. But his hopes shipwrecked on the resistance of Constantius, who had now been rewarded by the title of *patricius* for his success in expelling the Goths from Gaul. Soon afterwards the child Theodosius died, and was buried in a silver coffin with great lamentations at Barcelona. In the same city, in the autumn of 415, Ataulf himself was assassinated in his stables by one of his followers. With him died his dream of "restoring by Gothic strength the Roman name"; yet with his last breath he commanded his brother to restore Placidia and make peace with Rome.

The Goths, however, were not minded for peace. On the death of Ataulf (after the week's reign of Sigerich, memorable only for the humiliation he inflicted on Placidia, by forcing her to walk twelve miles on foot before his horse), there succeeded a new king, Wallia, "elected by his people", Orosius says, "to make war with Rome, but ordained by God to make peace". Harassed by want of supplies, Wallia resolved to imitate the policy of Alaric, and to strike at Africa, the great granary of the West. The fate of Alaric attended his expedition: his fleet was shattered by a storm during its passage, twelve miles from the Straits of Gibraltar, at the beginning of 416. Wallia now found that it was peace with Rome, which

alone would give food to his starving army; and Rome was equally ready for peace, if it only meant the restoration of Placidia. In the course of 416 the treaty was made. The Romans purchased Placidia by 600,000 measures of corn; Wallia became the ally of the Empire, and promised to recover Spain from the Vandals, Alans, and Sueves. In January 417 Constantius was once more created consul: in the same month he became the husband of the unwilling Placidia. She bore him two children, Honoria and Valentinian; and thus the problem of the succession was finally settled by the victory of the Roman Constantius, and the name of Rome was renewed by Roman strength. It was no undeserved triumph which Constantius celebrated in 417. The turmoil which had raged since Alaric's entry into Greece in 396 seemed to have ceased: the loss of the whole of the Gauls, which had seemed inevitable since the usurpation and the barbarian influx of 406, was, at any rate in large measure, averted. Constantius had recovered much of the Seven Provinces: Wallia was recovering Spain.

Constantius too was finally destined to settle the problem of the Goths, and to give them at last the *quieta patria*, in search of which they had wandered for so many years. For a time Wallia fought valiantly in Spain (416-418): he destroyed the Silingian Vandals, and so thoroughly defeated the Alans, that the broken remnants of the tribe merged themselves into the Asdingian Vandals. In the beginning of 416 the Romans had only held the east coast and some of the cities of Spain: by 418 the Asdingian Vandals and the Sueves had been pushed back into the north-west of the peninsula, and Lusitania and Baetica had been recovered. In 419 Wallia had his reward; Constantius summoned the Goths into Gaul, and gave them for a habitation the Second Aquitaine. Along with it went Toulouse, which became their capital, and other towns in the Narbonese province; and thus the Visigoths acquired a territory of their own, with an Atlantic seaboard, but, as yet, without any outlet to the Mediterranean. We can only conjecture the reasons which dictated this policy. It may be, as Professor Bury suggests, that Honorius did not wish to surrender Spain, because it was the home of the Theodosian house and the seat of the gold mines: it may be that the imperial Government wished to invigorate with the leaven of Gothic energy the declining population of south-western Gaul. In any case the policy is of great importance. For the first time the imperial Government had, of its own motion, given a settlement within the Empire to a Teutonic people living under its own king. But the policy becomes doubly important, when it is considered in connection with the constitution of 418, which gave local government to Gaul, and enacted that representatives of all its towns should meet annually at Arles. Honorius was endeavouring to throw upon Gaul the burden of its own government, and in the new municipal federation which he had thus instituted he sought to find a place for the Goths. On the one hand, the council at Arles would contain representatives from the towns in Gothic territory, and would thus connect the Goths with the Roman name: on the other, the Goths, as *foederati* of the council, defending its territory, and supplying its troops, would give weight to its deliberations. The policy of decentralization thus enunciated in 418, and the combination of that policy with the settlement of the Visigoths in 419, indicate that the Empire was ceasing to be centralized and Roman, and was becoming instead Teutonic and local.

The years that elapse between the settlement of the Goths and the death of Honorius in 423 are occupied by the affairs of Italy and the court history of Ravenna. In 421 Constantius, who had been virtual ruler of the West since 411, was elevated by Honorius, somewhat reluctantly, to the dignity of Augustus and the position of colleague. Placidia, to whose instance the elevation of her husband was probably due, had her own ambition satisfied by the title of Augusta, and began actively to exercise the influence on events, which she had already exercised more passively during the struggle between Ataulf and Constantius. The elevation of Constantius and of Placidia to the imperial dignity led to friction with the Eastern Empire, which refused to ratify the action of Honorius, and in 421 a war seemed imminent between East and West. But Constantius, whose rough soldier tastes made him chafe at the restrictions

of imperial etiquette, fell ill and died in the autumn of 421, and with his death the menace of war disappeared. The influence of Placidia remained unshaken after her husband's death: the weak Honorius shared his affection between his beloved poultry and his sister; and scandalmongers even whispered tales about his excessive affection for Placidia. But by 422 the affection had yielded to hatred; and a struggle raged at Ravenna between the party of Honorius, and a party gathered round Placidia, which found its support in the retinue of barbarians she had inherited from her marriages with Ataulf and Constantius. The struggle would appear to be the old struggle of the Roman and the barbarian parties; and it is perhaps permissible to conjecture that the question at issue was the succession to the office of *magister militum*, which Constantius had held. If this conjecture be admitted, Castinus may be regarded as the candidate of Honorius, and Boniface as the candidate of Placidia; and the quarrel of Castinus and Boniface, on the eve of a projected expedition against the Vandals of Spain, which is narrated by the annalists, may thus be connected with the struggle between Honorius and Placidia. The issue of the struggle was the victory of Honorius and Castinus (422). Castinus became the *magister militum* and took command of the Spanish expedition, in which he allowed himself to be signally defeated by the Asdingian Vandals, now settled in Baetica: Boniface fled from the Court to Africa, and established himself, at the head of a body of *foederati*, as a semi-independent governor of the African diocese, where he had before been serving as the tribune of barbarian *auxilia*. The flight of Boniface was followed by the banishment of Placidia and her children to Constantinople (423); but in her exile she was supported by Boniface, who sent her money from Africa. This was the position of affairs when Honorius died (423). One of the weakest of emperors, he had had a most troubled reign; yet the last years of his rule had been marked by peace and success, thanks to the valour and policy of Constantius, who had defeated the various usurpers and recovered much of the Transalpine lands. The one virtue of Honorius was a taste for government on paper, such as his nephew Theodosius II also showed; he issued a number of well-meant *constitutiones*, alleviating the burden of taxation on Italy after the Gothic ravages, and seeking to attract new cultivators to waste lands by the offer of advantageous terms.

The death of Honorius marks the beginning of a new phase in the history of the Western Empire. For the next thirty years a new personality dominates the course of events within the Empire: Aetius, fills the scene with his actions; while without the barbaric background is peopled by the squat figures of the Huns. Aetius was a Roman from Silistria, born about the year 390, the son of a certain Gaudentius, a *magister equitum*, by a rich Italian wife. In his youth he had served in the office of the praetorian praefect; and twice he had been a hostage, once with Alaric and his Goths, and once with the Huns. During the years in which he lived with the Huns, sometime between 411 and 423, he formed a connection with them, which was to exercise a great influence on the whole of his own career and on the history of the Empire itself. The Huns themselves, until they were united by Attila under a single government after the year 445, were a loose federation of Asiatic tribes, living to the north of the Danube, and serving as a fertile source of recruits for the Roman army. They had already served Stilicho as mercenaries in his struggle with Radagaisus, and some time afterwards Honorius had taken 10,000 of them into his service. After 423 they definitely formed the bulk of the armies of the Empire, which was now unable to draw so freely on the German tribes, occupied as these were in winning or maintaining their own settlements in Gaul, in Spain, and in Africa. Valentinian III may thus almost be called Emperor "by the grace of the Huns"; and to them Aetius owed both his political position and his military success.

On the death of Honorius the natural heir to the vacant throne was the young Valentinian, the son of Constantius and Placidia. But Valentinian was only a boy of four, and he was living at Constantinople. When the news of Honorius' death came to the ears of Theodosius II, he concealed the intelligence, until he had sent an army into Dalmatia; and he



seems to have contemplated, at any rate for the moment, the possibility of uniting in his own hands the whole of the Empire. But meanwhile a step was taken at Ravenna—either in order to anticipate and prevent such a policy on the part of the Eastern Emperor, or independently and without any reference to his action—which altered the whole position of affairs. A party, with which Castinus, the new *magister militum*, seems to have been connected, determined to assert the independence of the West, and elevated John, the chief of the notaries in the imperial service, to the vacant throne. Aetius took office under the usurper as *Curu Palatii* (or Constable), and was sent to the Huns to recruit an army; while all the available forces were dispatched to Africa to attack Boniface, the foe of Castinus and the friend of Placidia and Valentinian. Theodosius found himself compelled to abandon any hopes he may have cherished of annexing the Western Empire, and to content himself with securing it for the Theodosian house, while recognizing its independence. He accordingly sent Valentinian to the West in 424, with an army to enforce his claims; and as John was weakened by the dispatch of his forces to Africa, and Aetius had not yet appeared with his Huns, the triumph of Valentinian was easy. His succession was a vindication of the title of the Theodosian house; and, when we consider the anticlerical policy pursued by John, who had attacked the privileges of the clergy, it may also be regarded as a victory of clericalism, a cause to which the Theodosian house was always devoted. A closer connection between East and West may also be said to be one of the results of the accession of Valentinian, even it finally prevented the union of the two which had for a moment seem possible; and the hostile attitude which had characterized the relation of Byzantium and Rome during the reign of Honorius, both in the days of Stilicho and in those of Constantius, now disappears.

Three days after the execution of the defeated usurper, Aetius appeared in Italy with 60,000 Huns. Too late to save his master, he nevertheless renewed the fight; and he was only induced to desist, and to send his Huns back to the Danube, by the promise of the title of *comes* along with a command in Gaul. Here Theodoric, the king of the Visigoths, had taken advantage of the confusion which had followed on the death of Honorius to deliver an attack upon Arles. Aetius relieved the town, and eventually made a treaty with Theodoric, by which, in return for the cession of the conquests they had recently made, the Visigoths ceased to stand to the Western Empire in the dependent relation of *foederati*, and became autonomous. Meanwhile in Italy Castinus, who appears to have been the chief supporter of John, had been punished by exile; and a certain Felix had taken his place at the head of affairs, with the titles of *magister militum* and *patricius*. Inheriting the position of Castinus, Felix seems to have inherited, or at any rate to have renewed, his feud with Boniface, the governor of Africa. Possibly Boniface, the old friend and supporter of Placidia, may have hoped for the position of regent which Felix now held, and he may have been discontented with the reward which he actually received after Placidia's victory—the title of *comes* and the confirmation of his position in Africa; possibly the situation in Africa itself may have forced Boniface, as it had before forced Heraclian, into disloyalty to the Empire. Africa was full of Donatists, and the Donatists hated the central government, which, under the influence of clericalism, used all its resources to support the orthodox cause. Religious schism became the mother of a movement of nationalism; in contrast with loyal and imperialist Gaul, Africa, in the early years of the fifth century, was rapidly tending to political independence. At the same time a certain degeneration of character seems to have affected Count Boniface himself. The noble hero celebrated by Olympiodorus, the pious friend and correspondent of St Augustine, who had once had serious thoughts of deserting the world for a monastery, would appear—if it be not a calumny of orthodox Catholics—to have lost all moral fibre after his second marriage to an Arian wife. He showed himself slack at once in his private life and in his government of Africa; and the result was a summons from Felix, recalling him to Italy, in 427. Boniface showed himself contumacious, and a civil war began. In the course of the war Boniface

defeated one army sent against him by Felix; but when a second army came, largely composed of mercenaries hired from the Visigoths, and under the command of a German, Sigisvult, he found himself hard pressed.

At this moment, if we follow the accounts of Procopius and Jordanes, Boniface made his fatal appeal to the Vandals of Spain, and thereby irretrievably ruined his own reputation and his province. But Procopius and Jordanes belong to the sixth century; and the one contemporary authority who writes of this crisis with any detail—Prosper Tiro—definitely says that the Vandals were summoned to the rescue by *both contending parties (a concertantibus)*, and thus implies, what is in itself most probable, that the imperial army under Sigisvult and the rebel force of Boniface both sought external aid. It may well have been the case that the Vandals were already pressing southward from Spain towards Africa, and that, perhaps impelled by famine, or attracted by the fertility of Africa, the El Dorado of the Western Germans of this century, they were following the line of policy already indicated by Alaric, and unsuccessfully attempted from Spain itself by Wallia. Spain and Northern Africa have again and again in history been drawn together by an inevitable attraction, alike in the days of Hamilcar and Hannibal, in the times of the Caliphate of Cordova, and during the reigns of the Spanish monarchs of the sixteenth century. So the Vandals, who in 419 had moved down from their quarters in the north-west of Spain, and again occupied its southernmost province (Baetica), already appear as early as 425 in Mauretania (probably the western province of Mauretania Tingitana, which lay just across the Straits of Gibraltar and counted, for administrative purposes, as part of Spain). Their pressure would naturally increase, when the civil war in Africa opened the doors of opportunity; and we may well imagine that the incoming bands, whose numbers and real intentions were imperfectly apprehended in the African diocese, would naturally be invited to their aid by both sides alike. In any case Gaiseric came with the whole of the Vandal people in the spring of 429, and evacuating Spain he rapidly occupied the provinces of Mauretania. The Romans at once awoke to their danger: the civil war abruptly ceased; and the home government quickly negotiated first a truce, and then a definite treaty, with the rebel Boniface. Uniting all the forces he could muster, including the Visigothic mercenaries, Boniface, as the recognised governor of Africa, attacked the Vandals, after a vain attempt to induce them to depart by means of negotiations. He was defeated; the Vandals advanced from Mauretania into Numidia; and he was besieged in Hippo (430). A new army came to his aid from Constantinople, under the command of Aspar; but the combined troops of Aspar and Boniface suffered another defeat (431). After the defeat Aspar returned to Constantinople, and Boniface was summoned to Italy by Placidia; Hippo fell, and Gaiseric pressed onwards from Numidia into Africa Proconsularis.

It was Aetius who was the cause of the recall of Boniface to Italy in 432; for the summons of Placidia was dictated by the desire to find a counterpoise to the influence which Aetius had by this time acquired. After his struggle with the Goths, and the treaty which ended the struggle (? 426), Aetius had still been occupied in Gaul by hostilities with the Franks. While Africa was being lost, Gaul was being recovered; Tours was relieved; the Franks were repelled from Arras, and, in 428, driven back across the Rhine. Aetius even carried his arms towards the Danube, and won success in a campaign in Rhaetia and Noricum in the year 430, in the course of which he inflicted heavy losses on the Juthungi, a tribe which had crossed the Danube from the north. Like Julius Caesar five centuries before, he now acquired, as the result of his Transalpine campaigns, a commanding position at Rome. In 429 he became *magister equitum per Gallias*, but Felix, with the title of *patricius*, still stood at the head of affairs. In 430, however, Felix was murdered on the steps of one of the churches at Ravenna, in a military tumult which was apparently the work of Aetius. Felix had been plotting against his dangerous rival, and Aetius, forewarned of his plots, and forearmed by the

support of his own Hunnish followers, saved himself from impending ruin by the ruin of his enemy. He now became *magister utriusque militiae*, at once generalissimo and prime minister of the Empire of the West; and in 432 (after a new campaign in Noricum, and a second defeat of the Franks) he was created consul for the year.

It was at this juncture that Placidia (who, according to one authority, had instigated the plots of Felix in 430) summoned Boniface to the rescue, and sought to recover her independence, by creating him 'master of the troops' in Aetius' place. The dismissed general took to arms; and a great struggle ensued. Once more, as in the days of Caesar and Pompey, two generals fought for control of the Roman Empire; and as the earlier struggle had shown the utter decay of the Republic, so this later struggle attests, as Mommsen remarks, the complete dissolution of the political and military system of the Empire. The fight was engaged near Rimini; and though one authority speaks of Aetius as victor, the bulk of evidence and the probabilities of the case both point to the victory of Boniface. Boniface died soon after the victory, but his son-in-law, Sebastian, succeeded to his position; and the defeated Aetius, after seeking in vain to find security in retirement on his own estates, fled to his old friends the Huns. Here he was received by King Rua, and found welcome support. Returning in 433 with an army of Huns, he was completely victorious. It was in vain that Placidia attempted to get the support of the Visigoths; she had to dismiss and then to banish Sebastian, and to admit Aetius not only to his old office of master of the troops, but also to the new dignity of *patricius*. Once more, as in 425 and in 430, Aetius had forced Placidia to use his services; and henceforward till his death in 454 he is the ruler of the West, receiving in royal state the embassies of the provinces, and enjoying the honour, unparalleled hitherto under the Empire for an ordinary citizen, of a triple consulate.

The policy of Aetius seems steadily directed towards Gaul, and to the retention of a basis for the Empire along the valleys of the Rhine, the Loire, and the Seine. Loyal Gaul seemed to him well worth defence; nationalist Africa he apparently neglected. One of the first acts of the government, after his accession to power, was the conclusion of a treaty with the Vandals and their king, whereby the provinces of Mauretania and much of Numidia were ceded to Gaiseric, in return for an annual tribute and hostages. In this treaty Aetius imitated the policy of Constantius towards the Visigoths, and gave the Vandals a similar settlement in Africa, as tributary *foederati*. Peace once made in Africa, he turned his attention to Gaul. Here there were several problems to engage his attention. The Burgundians were attacking Belgica Prima, the district round Metz and Treves; a Jacquerie of revolted peasantry and slaves (the Bagaudae, who steadily waged a social war during the fourth and fifth centuries) was raging everywhere; and, perhaps most dangerous of all, the Visigoths, taking advantage of these opportunities to pursue their policy of extension from Bordeaux towards the Mediterranean, were seeking to capture Narbonne. Aetius, with the aid of his Hunnish mercenaries, proved equal to the danger. He defeated the Burgundians, who were shortly afterwards almost annihilated by an attack of the Huns (the remnant of the nation gaining a new settlement in Savoy); his lieutenant Litorius raised the siege of Narbonne, and he himself, according to his panegyrist Merobaudes, defeated a Gothic army, during the absence of Theodoric, *ad montem Colubrarium* (436); while the Jacquerie came to an end with the capture of its leader in 437. Encouraged by their successes, the Romans seem to have carried their arms into the territory of the Visigoths, and in 439 Litorius led his Hunnish troops to an attack upon Toulouse itself. Eager to gain success on his own hand, and rashly trusting the advice of his pagan soothsayers, he rushed into battle, and suffered a considerable defeat. Aetius now consented to peace with the Goths, on the same terms as before in 426; and he sought to ensure the continuance of the peace by planting a body of Alans near Orleans, to guard the valley of the Loire. Then, leaving Gaul at peace—a peace which continued undisturbed till the coming of Attila in 451—he returned once more to Italy.

During the absence of Aetius in Gaul, Valentinian III had gone to the East, and married Eudoxia, the daughter of Theodosius II, thus drawing closer that new connection of East and West, which had begun on the death of Honorius, and had been testified by the dispatch of Eastern troops to the aid of the Western Empire against the Vandals in 431. One result of Valentinian's journey to the East was the reception at Rome by the senate in 438 (the reception is described in an excerpt from the acts of the Senate which precedes the Code) of the Codex Theodosianus, a collection of imperial constitutions since the days of Constantine, which had just been compiled in Byzantium at the instance of Theodosius. Another result was the final cession by the Western Empire of part of Dalmatia, one of the provinces of the diocese of Illyricum, the debatable land which Stilicho had so long disputed with the East. The cession was perhaps the price paid by the West in order to gain the aid of the East against the Vandals of Africa, and, more especially, to secure the services of the fleet which was still maintained in Eastern waters. In spite of the treaty of 435, the croachments of the Vandals in Africa had still continued, and they had even begun to make piratical descents on the coasts of the Western Mediterranean. In the first years of his conquest of Africa, Gaiseric must have put himself in possession of a small fleet of swift cruisers (*liburnae*), which was maintained in the diocese of Africa for the defence of its coasts from piracy. To these he would naturally add the numerous transports belonging to the *navicularii*, the corporation charged with the duty of transporting African corn to Rome. In 439 he was able, by the capture of Carthage, to provide himself with the necessary naval base; and henceforth he enjoyed the maritime supremacy of the Western Mediterranean. Like many another sovereign of Algeria since his time, Gaiseric made his capital into a buccaneering stronghold. Even before 435, he had been attacking Sicily and Calabria: in 440 he resumed the attack, and not only ravaged Sicily, but also besieged Panormus, from which, however, he was forced to retire by the approach of a fleet from the East. In the face of this peril Italy, apparently destitute of a fleet, could do no more for itself than repair the walls of its towns, and station troops along the coasts—measures which are enjoyed by the novels of Valentinian III for the years 440 and 441; but Theodosius II determined to use the Eastern fleet to attack Gaiseric in his own quarters. The expedition of 441 proved, however, an utter failure, as indeed all expeditions against the Vandals were destined to prove themselves till the days of Belisarius. Gaiseric, a master of diplomacy, was able to use his wealth to induce both the Huns of the Danube and the enemies of the Eastern Empire along the Euphrates to bestir themselves; and Theodosius, finding himself hard pressed at home, was forced to withdraw his fleet, which Gaiseric had managed to keep idle in Sicily by pretence of negotiation. The one result of the expedition was a new treaty, made by Theodosius and confirmed by Valentinian in 442, by which Gaiseric gained the two rich provinces of Africa Proconsularis and Byzacena, and retained possession of part of Numidia (possibly as full sovereign and no longer as *foederatus*), while he abandoned to the Empire the less productive provinces of Mauretania on the west. But the treaty could not be permanent; and the two dangers which had shown themselves between 439 and 442 were fated to recur. On the one hand the piratical inroads of Gaiseric were destined to sap the resources and hasten the fall of the Western Empire; on the other, Gaiseric was to continue with fatal results the policy, which he had first attempted in 441, of uniting the enemies of the Roman name by his intrigues and his bribes in a great league against the Empire. It is of these two themes that the history of the Western Empire is chiefly composed in the few remaining years of its life.

The loss of Africa thus counterbalanced, and indeed far more than counterbalanced, Aetius' arduous recovery of Gaul. Elsewhere than in Gaul and Italy, the Western Empire only maintained a precarious hold on Spain. Britain was finally lost: a Gaulish chronicler notes under the years 441-442 that "the Britains, hitherto suffering from various disasters and vicissitudes, succumb to the sway of the Saxons". The diocese of Illyricum was partly ceded



to the Eastern Empire, partly occupied by the Huns. Gaul itself was thickly sown with barbarian settlements: there were Franks in the north, and Goths in the south-west; there were Burgundians in Savoy, Alemanni on the upper Rhine, and Mans at Valence and Orleans; while the Bretons were beginning to occupy the north-west. In Spain the disappearance of the Vandals in 429 left the Sueves as the only barbarian settlers; and they had for a time remained entrenched in the north-west of the peninsula, leaving the rest to the Roman provincials. But the accession of Rechiar in 438 marked the beginning of a new and aggressive policy. In 439 he entered Merida, on the southern boundary of Lusitania; in 441 he occupied Seville, and conquered the provinces of Baetica and Carthagera. The Roman commanders, who in Spain, as in Gaul, had to face a Jacquerie of revolted peasants as well as the barbarian enemy, were impotent to stay his progress; by his death in 448 he had occupied the greater part of Spain, and the Romans were confined to its north-east corner.

Such was the state of the Western Empire, when the threatening cloud of Huns on the horizon began to grow thicker and darker, until in 451 it finally burst. Till 440 the Huns, settled along the Danube, had not molested the Empire, but had, on the contrary, served steadily as mercenaries in the army of the West; and it had been by their aid that Aetius had been able to pursue his policy of the reconquest of Gaul. But after 440 a change begins to take place. The subtle Gaiseric, anxious to divert attention from his own position in the south, begins to induce the Huns to attack the Empire on the north; while at the same time a movement of consolidation takes place among the various tribes, which turns them into a unitary State under a single ambitious ruler. After the death of King Rua, to whom Aetius had fled for refuge in 433, two brothers, Attila and Bleda, had reigned as joint sovereigns of the Huns; but in 444 Attila killed his brother, and rapidly erecting a military monarchy began to dream of a universal empire, which should stretch from the Euphrates to the Atlantic. It was against the Eastern Empire that the Huns, like the Goths before them, first turned their arms. Impelled by Gaiseric, they ravaged Illyria and Thrace to the very gates of Constantinople, in the years 441 and 442; and the 'Anatolian Peace' of 443 had only stayed their ravages at the price of an annual *Hungeld* of over 2000 pounds of gold. But it was an uneasy peace which the Eastern Empire had thus purchased; and in 447 Attila swept down into its territories as far as Thermopylae, plundering 70 cities on his way. After this great raid embassies passed and repassed between the Court of Attila and Byzantium, among others the famous embassy (448) of which the historian Priscus was a member, and whose fortunes in the land of the Huns are narrated so vividly in his pages. Still the *Hungeld* continued to be paid, and still Theodosius seemed the mere vassal of Attila; but on the death of Theodosius in 450 his successor Martian, who was made of sterner stuff, stoutly refused the tribute. At this crisis, when the wrath of Attila seemed destined to wreak itself in the final destruction of the Eastern Empire, the Huns suddenly poured westward into Gaul, and vanished for ever from the pages of Byzantine history.

It has already been seen that under the influence of Aetius the relations of the Western Empire to the Huns had been steadily amicable, and indeed that Hunnish mercenaries had been the stay and support not only of the private ambitions of the *patricius* but also of his public policy. The new policy of hostility to the Empire, on which Attila had embarked in 441, seems for the next ten years to have affected the East alone. During these ten years, the history of the Western Empire is curiously obscure: we hear nothing of Aetius, save that he was consul for the third time in 446, and we know little, if anything, of the relations of Valentinian III to the Huns. We may guess that tribute was paid to the Huns by the West as well as by the East; we hear of the son of Aetius as a hostage at the Court of Attila. We know that, during the campaign of 441-442, the church plate of Sirmium escaped the clutches of Attila, and was deposited at Rome, apparently with a government official; and we know that in 448 Priscus met in Hungary envoys of the Western Empire, who had come to attempt to

parry Attila's demand for this plate. To this motive, which it must be confessed appears but slight, romance has added another, in order to explain the diversion of Attila's attention to the West in 451.

In 434 the princess Honoria, the sister of Valentinian III, had been seduced by one of her chamberlains, and banished to Constantinople, where she was condemned to share in the semi-monastic life of the ladies of the palace. Years afterwards, embittered by a life of compulsory asceticism, and snatching at any hope of release, she is said (but our information only comes from Byzantine historians, whose tendency to a 'feminine' interpretation of history has already been noticed) to have appealed to Attila, and to have sent him a ring. Attila accepted the appeal and the ring; and claiming Honoria as his betrothed wife, he demanded from her brother the half of the Western Empire as her dowry. The story may be banished, at any rate in part, as an instance of the erotic romanticism which occasionally appears in the Byzantine historiography of this century. We may dismiss the episode of the ring and the whole story of Honoria's appeal, though we are bound to believe (on the testimony of Priscus himself, confirmed by a Gaulish chronicler) that when Attila was already determined on war with the West, he demanded the hand of Honoria and a large dowry, and made the refusal of his demands into a *casus belli*. But there are other causes which will serve to explain why Attila would in any case have attacked the West in 451. The Balkan lands had been wasted by the raids of the previous ten years; and Gaul and Italy offered a more fertile field, to which events conspired to draw Attila's attention about 450. A doctor in Gaul, who had been one of the secret leaders of the Bagaudae, had fled to his Court in 448, and brought word of the discontent among the lower classes which was rife in his native country. At the same time a civil war was raging among the Franks; two brothers were contending for the throne, and while one of the two appealed to Aetius, the other invoked the aid of Attila. Finally, Gaiseric was instigating the Huns to an expedition against the Visigoths, whose hostility he had had good reason to fear, ever since he had caused his son Huneric to repudiate his wife, the daughter of Theodoric I, and send her back mutilated to her father, some years before (445). The reason here given for hostility between the Vandals and the Visigoths, which only comes from Jordanes, is perhaps dubious; the fact of such hostility, resting as it does on the authority of Priscus, must be accepted

When the Huns poured into Gaul in 451, the position of the Western Empire seemed desperate. It was perhaps a little thing that a terrible famine (*obsценissima fames*) had devastated Italy in 450. Far more serious was the absence of any army with which Aetius might confront the enemy. For the last twenty-five years he had relied on Hunnish mercenaries to fight his battles; and now, when he had to fight the Huns themselves, he was practically powerless. Everything depended on the line which the Visigoths would take. If they would combine with Rome in the face of a common danger, Rome was saved: if they stood aloof, and waited until they were themselves attacked, Rome could only fall. Attila was cunning enough to attempt to sow dissension between the Visigoths and the Romans, writing to assure either, that the other alone was the object of his attack; but his actions were more eloquent than his words. After crossing the Rhine, somewhere to the north of Mainz, he sacked the Gallo-Roman city of Metz. The Romans now awoke to the crisis: Aetius hastened to Gaul, and collected on the spot a motley army of mercenaries and *foederati*. Meanwhile, as the Romans looked anxiously to the Visigoths, Attila moved on Orleans, in the hope of acquiring possession of the city from the Alans who were settled there, and so gaining a base of operations against the Goths. The move showed Theodoric I his danger; he rapidly joined his forces with those of Aetius, who now at last could draw breath; and the two together hastened to the defence of Orleans. Finding Orleans too strongly guarded, Attila checked his advance, and retired eastwards; the allies followed, and near Troyes, on the Mauriac plain, was engaged *bellum atrox multiplex immane pertinax*. The great battle was drawn; but its

ultimate result was the retreat of the Huns, after they had stood their ground in their camp for several days. We are assured by more than one of our authorities, that the camp might have been stormed, and the Huns annihilated, but for the astute policy of Aetius. Perhaps he desired to keep his hands free to renew once more his old connection with the Huns; perhaps he feared the predominance of the Visigoths, which would have followed on the annihilation of the Huns. At any rate he is said to have induced the new Gothic king Thorismund—Theodoric I had been killed in the battle—to withdraw at once to his territories, by representing forcibly to him the need of securing his succession against possible rivals at home. A bridge was thus built for Attila's retreat; and Aetius was able to secure for himself the booty, which the retreating Huns were forced to relinquish in the course of their long march.

The significance of the repulse of Attila from Gaul by the joint forces of the Romans and the Goths has already been discussed at the beginning of this chapter. The repulse was no decisive crisis in the history of the world: the Empire of Attila was of too ephemeral a nature to be crucially dangerous; and his attack on the West was like the passing of a transitory meteor, which affected its destinies far less than the steady and deliberate menace of the policy of Gaiseric. But the meteor was not yet exhausted; and Italy had to feel in 452, what Gaul had experienced in 451. Attila now marched from Pannonia over the Julian Alps: Aquileia fell, and the whole of the province of Venetia was ravaged. Passing from Venetia into Liguria, the Huns sacked Milan and Pavia; and the way seemed clear across the Apennines to Rome itself. Aetius, with no troops at his command, was powerless; a contemporary writer, Prosper Tiro, failing to understand that the successes of the previous years had only been won by the aid of Goths, blames the Roman general "for making no provision according to the manner of his deeds in the previous year; failing even to bar the Alpine passes, and planning to desert Italy together with the Emperor". In truth the position was desperate; and it remains one of the problems of history why the Huns refrained from attacking Rome, and retired instead to the Danube. Tradition has ascribed the merit of diverting Attila from Rome to Pope Leo I; the *Liber Pontificalis* tells how Leo "for the sake of the Roman name undertook an embassy, and went his way to the king of the Huns, and delivered Italy from the peril of the enemy". It is indeed true that the Emperor, now resident in Rome, joined with the senate in sending to Attila an embassy of three persons, one of whom was Pope Leo, and that soon after the coming of this embassy Attila gave the signal for retreat. It may be that the embassy promised Attila a tribute, and even the hand of Honoria with a dowry; and it may be that Attila was induced to listen to these promises, by the unfavourable position in which he began to find himself placed. His army was pressing for return, eager perhaps to secure the spoils it had already won, and alleging the fate of Alaric as a warning against laying hands on Rome. His troops, after all their ravages, were suffering from famine, and an Italian summer was infecting them with fever; while the Eastern Emperor, who had been occupied by the Council of Chalcedon and the problem of Eutychianism in the year 451, was now dispatching troops to the aid of Aetius. Swayed, perhaps, by these considerations, Attila listened to the offers of the embassy, and returned home; and there he died, in the year after his Italian campaign.

The death of Attila was followed, in the next year, by the assassination of Aetius (454); and the assassination of Aetius was followed, a year afterwards, by the assassination of his master, Valentinian III. The death of Attila, and the subsequent collapse of the Hunnish Empire, which had rested entirely on his personality, deprived Aetius of any prospect of support from the Huns, if his position were once again challenged. Nor was there, after the end of the war with Attila, any pressing danger which made the services of the great soldier indispensable. He had never enjoyed the confidence of the Theodosian house: he had simply forced himself on Placidia and her son Valentinian, both in 425 and in 433. Placidia, a woman of ambitious temper, must have chafed under his domination; and she must equally, as a

zealous Catholic and the friend of the Roman party in the Empire, have resented the supremacy of a man who rested on barbarian support and condoned, if he did not share, the paganism of supporters like Litorius and Marcellinus. She had died in 450; but the eunuch Heraclius had succeeded to her policy and influence, and in conjunction with the senator Maximus he instigated his master to the ruin of Aetius. The ambition of Aetius made Valentinian the more ready to consent to his ruin. No son had been born to Valentinian from his marriage with Eudoxia; and Aetius apparently aspired to secure the succession for his own family, by gaining the hand of one of the two imperial princesses for his son Gaudentius. One of the few things, however, which stirred the pusillanimity of the Theodosian house to action was a dynastic question; and as Theodosius II had been ready to go to war rather than admit the elevation of Constantius to the dignity of Augustus in 419, so Valentinian III nerved himself to assassinate Aetius with his own hand, rather than permit the marriage of one of his daughters to the son of a subject. At the end of September 454, as the minister and his master sat together over the accounts of the Empire, Valentinian suddenly sprang up from the table, and after hot words drew his sword on Aetius. Heraclius hurried to his aid, and the two together cut him down. Thus he fell, *atque cum ipso Hesperium cecidit regnum*. Of his character and real magnitude we know little. Gregory of Tours preserves a colourless eulogy from the pages of a contemporary prose-writer; and the panegyrics of Merobaudes are equally colourless. That he was the one prop and stay of the Western Empire during his life is the unanimous verdict of his contemporaries; but whether or no he was really great as a general or a statesman we cannot tell. He was beaten by Boniface; and it was not he, but the Goths and their king, who really triumphed on the Mauriac plain; yet he recovered Gaul in a series of campaigns, and he kept the Visigoths in check. As a statesman he may be blamed for neglect of Africa, and a too ready acquiescence in its occupation by Gaiseric; yet it may be doubted whether the Roman hold on the allegiance of Africa was not too weak to be maintained, and in any case he kept Italy comparatively free from the ravages of the Vandals so long as he lived. If he was less Roman than his predecessor Constantius, he was far more Roman than his successor Ricimer; and if he had occasionally used the arms of the Huns for his own ends, he had also used them to maintain the Empire. One merit he had which must count for much—the merit of recognizing and encouraging men of ability. Majorian and Marcellinus, two of the finest figures in the history of the falling Empire, were men of his training.

A wit at Court, when asked by Valentinian III what he thought of the death of Aetius, replied —“Sir, you have used your left hand to cut off your right”. In truth, Valentinian signed his own death warrant, when he joined in the murder of his minister. He had hastened, immediately after the murder, to send explanations to the barbarian *foederati*, with whom Aetius had been allied; but vengeance was to come upon him within his own Court. Maximus, the senator who had joined with Heraclius in compassing the ruin of Aetius, had hoped to succeed to the position and office of his victim. Disappointed in his hopes, he resolved to procure the assassination of Valentinian, and to seize for himself the vacant throne. Two of Aetius’ followers, whose names, Optila and Thraustila, suggest a Hunnish origin, were induced to revenge their master; and in March 455 Valentinian was assassinated on the Campus Martii, in the sight of his army, while he stood watching the games. Heraclius fell with him; but not a hand was raised to punish the assassins. With Valentinian III the Theodosian house was extinguished in the West, as it had already come to an end in the East on the death of Theodosius II in 450. Though he had ruled for thirty years, Valentinian had influenced the destinies of his Empire even less than his uncle Honorius. Procopius, if his evidence is worth consideration, tells us that Valentinian had received an effeminate education from his mother Placidia, and that, when he became a man, he consorted with quacks and astrologers, and practiced immorality. He only once flashed into action, when, piqued by the presumption of Aetius in aspiring to connect himself with the imperial family,



he struck him down. He thought he had slain his master; he found that he had slain his protector; and he fell a helpless victim to the first conspiracy which was hatched against his throne.

The twenty-one years which precede the utter extinction of the Roman Empire in the West are distinguished in several respects from the preceding thirty years in which Aetius had ruled and Valentinian III had reigned. The 'master of the troops' is still the virtual ruler of the Empire; and after a short interval Ricimer proves himself the destined successor of Aetius. But the new master of the troops, in the absence of any legitimate representative of the Theodosian house, chews his power more openly: he becomes a king-maker instead of a prime minister, and ushers on and off the stage a rapid succession a puppet emperors. And while Aetius had rested on the support of the Huns, Ricimer uses instead the support of new German tribes. The death of Attila in 453 had been followed by a great struggle between the Huns and the various Germanic tribes whom they had subdued—the Ostrogoths and the Gepidae, the Rugii, the Heruli, and the Sciri. At the battle of Nedão the Huns had been vanquished, and the German tribes had settled down in the Danubian provinces either as independent powers, or as *foederati* of the Western Empire. It was from these tribes, and particularly from the Rugii, Heruli, and Sciri that the army of the Western Empire was drawn for the last twenty years of its existence. The Rugii were settled to the north of the Danube, in what is now Lower Austria: they appear in the history of the time now as sending troops to Italy (for instance in 458), and now as vexing with their inroads the parts of Noricum which lay immediately south of the river. The Life of St Severinus, one of the most trustworthy and valuable authorities which we possess, describes their depredations, and the activity of the Saint in protecting the harassed provincials. The Sciri had settled after 453 in the north-west corner of modern Hungary; but shattered in a struggle with the Ostrogoths in 469, they had either merged themselves with the Heruli, or passed into Italy to serve under the Roman standards. The Heruli had also settled in Hungary, close to the Sciri: they were a numerous people, and they supplied the bulk of the German mercenaries who served in the legions. Herulian troops were the leaders in the revolt of 476, which overthrew the last emperor; and Odovacar is styled *rex Herulorum*. It was the steady influx of these tribes which led to their demand for a regular settlement in Italy in 476; and when that settlement took place, it involved the disappearance of the Empire from Italy, and the erection in its place of a barbarian kingdom, similar to the kingdoms established by the Vandals and Visigoths, except that it was a kingdom resting not on one people, but on a number of different if cognate tribes.

Apart from these new factors, the play of forces remains in many ways much the same. The Gallo-Romans still form the loyalist core of the Empire; but the advance of the Visigoths threatens, and finally breaks, their connection with Rome. There is still an intermittent connection with the East; and the policy of Gaiseric still contributes to determine the course of events. It was Gaiseric who, after the catastrophe of 455, first struck at the derelict Empire. The assassination of Valentinian had been followed by the accession of Maximus. The head of the great family of the Anicii, Maximus was the leader of the senatorial and Roman party; and his accession would seem to indicate an attempt by that party to institute a new government, independent at once of the *magister militiae* at home and of the Eastern Emperor at Constantinople. But it was an age of force; and in such an age such a government had no root. Gaiseric saw his opportunity, and with no Aetius to check his progress, he launched his fleet at Rome. Byzantine tradition ascribes the attack once more to the influence of a woman; Eudoxia, the wife of the murdered Valentinian, whom Maximus had married to support his title, is said to have invited Gaiseric to Rome, as Honoria is said to have invited Attila, in order to gain her revenge. In reality Gaiseric simply came because the riches of Rome were to be had for the coming. As his ships put into the Tiber, the defenceless Maximus fled from the city, and was killed by the mob in his flight, after a brief reign of 70 days. The Vandals

entered Rome unopposed, in the month of June. Once more, as in the days of Attila, the Church showed itself the only power which, in the absence of an army, could protect the falling Empire, and at the instance of Pope Leo Gaiseric confined himself to a peaceful sack of the city. For a fortnight the Vandals plundered at their leisure, *secura et libera scrutatione*: they stripped the roof of the Temple of Jupiter of its gilded bronze, and laid their hands on the sacred vessels of the Temple, which Titus had brought to Rome nearly four hundred years before. Then they sailed for Africa with their spoils, and with valuable hostages, destined for the future to be pawns in the policy of Gaiseric—Gaudentius the son of Aetius, and Eudoxia the widow of Valentinian, with her two daughters, Eudoxia and Placidia.

The next Emperor, Avitus, came from Gaul. Here Thorismund, the new king of the Visigoths, who had succeeded to his crown on the Mauriac plain, had been killed by his brothers in 453, for pursuing a policy “contrary to Roman peace”. Theodoric II, his successor, owing his succession to a Roman party, was naturally friendly to Rome. He had learned Latin from Avitus, a Gallo-Roman noble, and he showed his Latin sympathies by renewing the old *foedus* of the Visigoths with Rome, and by sending an army to Spain to repress the Bagaudae in the interest and under the authority of the Empire. Avitus, who had been dispatched to Gaul during the brief reign of Maximus as master of the troops of the diocese, came to Toulouse in the course of his mission, during the summer of 455; and here, on the death of Maximus, he was induced to assume the imperial title. The new Emperor represented an alliance of the Gallo-Roman nobility with the Visigothic kingdom; and the fruits of his accession rapidly appeared, when Theodoric, in the course of 456, acting under an imperial commission, invaded and conquered the Suevic kingdom in Spain, which had shown itself of late inimical to the Empire, and had taken advantage of the troubles of 455 to pursue a policy of expansion into the Roman territory in the north-east of the peninsula.

But Avitus, strong as was his position in Gaul and Spain, failed to conciliate the support of Rome. He was indeed recognised by the Senate, when first he came to Rome, at the end of 455; and he was adopted by the Eastern Emperor, Marcian, as his colleague in the government of the Empire. But difficulties soon arose. One of his first acts had been the dispatch of an embassy to Gaiseric, who seems to have annexed the province of Tripolitana and reoccupied the Mauretania during the course of 455. Avitus demanded the observance of the treaty of 435, and sent into Sicily an army under Ricimer the Sueve to support his demand, Gaiseric at once replied by launching his fleet against Italy; but Ricimer, in 456, was able to win a considerable victory over the Vandal fleet near Corsica. The victory might seem to consolidate the position of Avitus; but Ricimer determined to use his newly won influence against his master, and he found a body of discontent in Rome to support his plans. Avitus had come to Rome with a body of Gothic troops; but famine had compelled him to dismiss his allies, and in order to provide them with pay before they departed he had been forced to strip the bronze from the roofs of public buildings. In this way he succeeded at once in finally alienating the Romans, who had always disliked an emperor imposed upon them by Gaul, and in leaving himself defenseless; and when Ricimer revolted, and the Senate, in conjunction with Ricimer, passed upon him the sentence of deposition, he was forced to fly to Gaul. Returning with an insufficient army, in the autumn of 456, he was defeated by Ricimer near Piacenza; and his short reign was ended by his compulsory consecration to the office of bishop, and shortly afterwards by his death. It is curious to notice that the two things which seemed most in his favour had proved his undoing. The Gothic invasion of Spain, successful as it was, had left him without the aid of the Gothic king at the critical moment; while Ricimer’s victory over the Vandals had only impelled the victor to attempt the destruction of his master.

Ricimer, now virtual ruler of the West, was a man of pure German blood—the son of a Suevic noble by a Visigothic mother, the sister of Wallia. *Magister militum*, he is the

successor of Stilicho and Aetius; but unlike his predecessors, he has nothing Roman in his composition and little that is Roman in his policy. Stilicho and Aetius had wished to be first in the State, but they had also wished to serve the Theodosian house; Ricimer was a jealous barbarian, erecting puppet after puppet, but unable to tolerate even the rule of his puppets. His power rested nakedly on the sword and the barbarian mercenaries of his race; and one only wonders why he tolerated the survival of an emperor in Italy throughout his life, and did not anticipate Odovacar in making a kingdom of his own instead. It may be that his early training among the Visigoths, and his subsequent service under Aetius, had given him the Roman tincture which Odovacar lacked; in any case his policy towards the Vandals and the Visigoths shows something of a Roman motive.

For some months after the disappearance of Avitus there was an interregnum. Ricimer apparently took no steps to fill the vacancy; and Marcian, the Eastern Emperor, was on his death-bed. At last Leo, who had eventually succeeded to Marcian by the grace of Aspar, the 'master of the troops' in the East, elevated Ricimer to the dignity of *patricius* (457), and named Majorian, who had fought by Ricimer's side in the struggle of 456, as *magister militum* in his stead. A few months afterwards the election of the Senate and the consent of the army united to make Majorian emperor. Majorian belonged to an old Roman family with administrative traditions. His grandfather had been *magister peditum et equitum* on the Danube under Theodosius the Great; his father had been a fiscal officer under Aetius; and under Aetius he had himself served with distinction. If we can trust the evidence of his constitutions and the testimony of Procopius, Majorian has every title to be considered one of the greatest of the later Roman Emperors. Not only is the rescript in which he notifies his accession to the senate full of pledges of good government; he sought in the course of his reign to redeem his pledges, and by strengthening, for instance, the office of *defensor civitatis* to repeople and reinvigorate the declining *municipia* of the Empire. The constitution by which he sought to protect the ancient monuments of Rome is in marked contrast with the vandalism to which Avitus had been forced, and bears witness to the conservative and Roman policy which he sought to pursue. In his foreign policy he addressed himself manfully to the problems which faced him in Africa, in Gaul, and in Spain.

His first problem lay naturally in Gaul. The party which had stood for Avitus, and the Visigoths who had been its allies, were both inevitably opposed to the man who had joined in Avitus' deposition; and the reconciliation of Gaul to the new *regime* was thus of primary importance. After issuing a number of constitutions for the reform of the Empire in the course of 458, Majorian crossed the Alps at the end of the year, with a motley army of Rugians, Sueves, and Ostrogoths. The Gallo-Roman party received him without a struggle, and the *littérateur* of the party, Sidonius Apollinaris, pronounced a eulogy on the Emperor at Lyons. With the Visigoths, who had been attacking Arles, there was a short but apparently decisive struggle: Theodoric II was beaten, and renewed his alliance with Rome. It remained for Majorian to regulate the affairs of Spain, and, using it as a base, to equip a fleet in its ports for a final attack on Gaiseric. In 460 he moved into the province. His victory over the Visigoths, themselves in occupation of much of Spain since 457, had made his path easy; and a fleet of 300 vessels, which had long been under preparation, was assembled at the port of Alicante for the expedition against the Vandals. But Gaiseric, aided by treachery, surprised the fleet and captured a number of ships; the projected expedition collapsed, like every expedition against Gaiseric, and Majorian had to acknowledge defeat. He seems to have made a treaty with Gaiseric, recognizing the new acquisitions which Gaiseric had made since 455; but the failure of the expedition proved nevertheless his ruin. Ricimer was jealous of an emperor who showed himself too vigorous; and though Majorian had sought to conciliate him, as the language of his constitutions shows, he had failed to appease his jealousy. When he moved into Italy, in the summer of 461, perhaps to forestall an attack by Ricimer, he only came to

meet with defeat and death in a battle near Tortona. With him indeed died the 'Roman name', and in his fall the barbarian party triumphed. His reign had been filled by a manly attempt at the *renovatio imperii*, both by administrative reforms within, and a vigorous policy without; but his reforms had aroused the opposition of a corrupt bureaucracy; his foreign policy had been defeated by the cunning of Gaiseric; and he fell before the jealousy of the barbarian whom he overshadowed.

The death of Majorian advanced the dissolution of the Western Empire a step further. The Visigoths and the Vandals both regarded themselves as absolved from the treaties which they had made with Majorian; and Gaiseric, hating Ricimer as the nephew of Wallia, the destroyer of part of his people, directed his piratical attacks once more against Sicily and Italy. Not only so, but when Ricimer raised to the imperial throne Severus (a puppet-emperor, on the reverse of whose coins he significantly placed his own monogram), two of the provincial governors of the Empire refused him allegiance, and ruled as independent sovereigns within their spheres—Aegidius in central Gaul, and Marcellinus in Dalmatia. Ricimer was almost powerless: he could only attempt an alliance with the Visigoths against Aegidius, and send his petitions to the Eastern Emperor Leo to keep Marcellinus and the Vandals in check. The policy had some success: Aegidius and Theodoric checked each other, until the death of the former in 464; and Marcellinus was induced by the Eastern Emperor to keep the peace. But Gaiseric, though he consented to restore Eudoxia and one of her daughters to Leo, refused to cease from his raids upon Italy, until he had received the inheritances of Aetius and Valentinian III, which he claimed in the name of his captives—Gaudentius, the son of Aetius, and Eudoxia, the elder daughter of Valentinian, now married to his son Huneric. To these claims he soon added another. Placidia, the younger daughter of Valentinian, was married at Constantinople to a Roman senator, Olybrius; and Gaiseric demanded that Olybrius, now the brother-in-law of his own son, and therefore likely to be a friend of the Vandals, should be acknowledged as Emperor of the West. As Attila had demanded the church plate of Sirmium and the hand of Honoria, so Gaiseric now demanded the two inheritances and the succession of Olybrius; and it was to give weight to these demands that he continued to direct his annual raids against Italy.

It is perhaps the positions held by Aegidius and Marcellinus in Gaul and Dalmatia which show most clearly the ruin of the Empire. The flagging brain ceases to control the limbs and members of the State; the Roman scheme of an organized world-community falls into fragments. Marcellinus, one of the young men trained by Aetius, had been promoted to the office of *magister militiae* in Dalmatia. On the murder of Aetius, he had refused obedience to Valentinian III; but on the succession of Majorian, who was also one of Aetius' men, he resumed his allegiance to the Empire, and was given the task of defending Sicily. The fall of Majorian drove him once more into rebellion, and though he was forced to leave Sicily, owing to the intrigues of Ricimer among his troops, he maintained himself as the independent ruler of Dalmatia. In the great expedition of 468 he joined with the Eastern and Western Emperors as a practically independent sovereign, and though he was assassinated in the course of the expedition, possibly at the instigation of Ricimer, he seems to have left his nephew, Nepos, the future Emperor, to succeed to his position. A pagan, and a friend of philosophers, with whom he held high converse in his Dalmatian palace, Marcellinus stands, alike in his character and in his political position, as one of the most interesting figures of his age. His contemporary, Aegidius, is a man of more ordinary type. A lieutenant of Majorian, he had been created *magister militum per Gallias*; and on the death of his master, he had assumed an independent position in central Gaul, with the aid of the Salian Franks, who, in revolt against their own king, had, if Gregory of Tours may be trusted, accepted him for their chief. In 463 he had defeated the Visigoths in a battle near Orleans, and put himself into touch with Gaiseric for a combined attack on Italy; but in 464 he died. His power descended to his



son Syagrius, who maintained his independence as “Roman King of Soissons” until he was overthrown by Clovis in 486. Parallel in some ways to the position of Marcellinus and Aegidius is the beneficent theocracy which St Severinus established about the same time in Noricum, a masterless province unprotected by Rome, and harassed by the raids of the Rugii from the north of the river. The Saint mediated for his people with the Rugian kings Flaccitheus and his successor Feletheus; he used his influence among the provincials of Noricum to secure the regular payment of tithes for the use of the poor; in famine and flood he helped his flock, and kept the lamp of Christianity alight in a dark land.

The death of the nominal Emperor, Severus, in 465, made little difference in the history of the West. For two years after his death the West had no emperor of its own, and the whole Empire was nominally united under Leo I. Ricimer was content to prolong an interregnum, which left him sole ruler; Gaiseric was still pressing for the succession of Olybrius; and Leo was at once unwilling to create an emperor who was likely to be a vassal of Gaiseric, and anxious to maintain the peace which existed between the Vandals and the Eastern Empire. Accordingly he delayed the creation of a successor to Severus until Gaiseric, in 467, impatient of the delay, delivered an attack on the Peloponnesus. Leo now felt himself free to act: he listened to the prayers of the Roman Senate, and appointed as Emperor Anthemius, a son-in-law of the Emperor Marcian, and a man of large experience, who had held the highest offices of the Eastern Empire. The gift of Anthemius' daughter in marriage was intended to conciliate the support of Ricimer; and East and West, thus united together on a firm basis, were to deliver a final and crushing attack on the Vandals, and to punish Gaiseric for the reign of terror he had exercised in the West ever since 461

In April 467, Anthemius came to Italy, escorted by Count Marcellinus and an army. By 468 a great armada had been collected, to be launched against Carthage. The expenses were enormous: one office supplied 47,000 pounds of gold, another 17,000 pounds of gold and 700,000 pounds of silver; and this vast sum, which seems incredibly large, was furnished partly from the proceeds of confiscations, and partly by the Emperor Anthemius. A triple attack was projected. On the side of the East Basiliscus was to command the armada, and to deliver an attack on Carthage, while Heraclius marched by land through Tripoli to deliver a simultaneous attack on the flank of the Vandals. On the side of the West Marcellinus (conciliated by the Eastern Emperor, who was not unwilling to see Dalmatia in the hands of a ruler practically independent of the West) commanded a force which was destined to operate in Sardinia and Sicily. Once more, however, Gaiseric defeated his foes, as in 442 and 461, and once more treachery, perhaps instigated by the subtle Vandal, proved the ruin of an expedition against Carthage. The Alan Aspar, *magister militum per Orientem*, frowned on an expedition which might render his master independent of his support; and already dubious of his ascendancy, he seems to have procured the nomination of Basiliscus, an incapable *procrastinator*, in order to ruin the success of the expedition. Ricimer, generalissimo of the West, was in a very similar position: he feared the success of the expedition, because it might consolidate the power of Anthemius, and he hated with a personal hatred the Count Marcellinus, who commanded the Western forces. The inevitable result followed. Basiliscus was amused by Gaiseric with negotiations, and not unwillingly delayed, until Gaiseric sent fire-ships among his armada, and destroyed the bulk of his ships; while Marcellinus, after recovering Sardinia, was killed in Sicily by an assassin, in whom it is impossible not to suspect an agent of Ricimer. The success gained by Heraclius, who had won Tripoli and was marching on Carthage, was neutralized; the destruction of Basiliscus' fleet and the assassination of Marcellinus involved the complete failure of the expedition. When one remembers that Aspar, Ricimer, and Gaiseric were all Arians, one almost wonders if the whole story does not indicate an Arian conspiracy against the Catholic Empire; but political exigencies are sufficient to explain the issue, and the real fact would appear to be, that the two

generalissimos of East and West were content to purchase their own security at the cost of the Empire they served.

Aspar indeed failed in the event to buy security, even at the price he had been willing to pay. In 471 Leo attempted a *coup d'etat*: Aspar fell, and the victorious Emperor, who had already been recruiting Isaurians within his own Empire, in order to counteract and eventually supersede the dangerous influence of the German mercenaries, was able to continue his policy, and thus to preserve the independent existence of the Eastern Empire. With the West it was different. Here there was no substitute for Ricimer and his Germans: here there was no elasticity which would enable the Empire to recover, as it did in the East, from the loss of prestige and of resources involved by the disastrous failure of 468. For a time, indeed, Anthemius, with the support of the Senate which had called him to the throne, and of the Roman party which hated barbarian domination, struggled to make head against Ricimer. The struggle partly turned on the course of events in Gaul. Here Euric, in 466, had assassinated his brother Theodoric II, as Theodoric had before assassinated his brother Thorismund. A vigorous and enterprising king, the most successful of all the Visigothic rulers of Toulouse, Euric immediately began, after the failure of the expedition of 468, to take advantage of the condition of the Western Empire in order to make himself ruler of the whole of Gaul. He may have hoped to gain the aid of the Gallo-Roman nobility, who were by no means friendly to the ascendancy of Ricimer; and there were certainly Roman officials in Gaul, like Arvandus, the *Praefectus Praetorio*, who lent themselves to his plans. But Anthemius and the Senate saw the danger by which they were threatened. Arvandus was brought to Rome in 469, tried by the Senate, and sentenced to death—a striking instance of the activity which the Senate could still display; and Anthemius attempted to gain the support of the nobility of Gaul, by giving the title of *patricius* to Ecdicius, the son of Avitus, and the office of praefect of Rome to Sidonius Apollinaris. In spite of these measures, however, he failed to save Gaul from the Visigoths. In 470 Euric took the field, and, defeating a Roman army, gained possession of Arles and other towns as the prize of his victory. Much of Auvergne also fell into his hands, but he failed to take its chief city, Clermont, where the valour of Ecdicius and the exhortations of Sidonius, newly consecrated bishop of the city, inspired a stout resistance. Yet Gaul was none the less really lost; and failure in Gaul meant for Anthemius ruin in Italy. Already in 471 civil war was imminent. Ricimer, seeing his chance, had gathered his forces at Milan, while Anthemius was stationed at Rome. Round the one was collected the army of Teutonic mercenaries; round the other, though he was not popular in Catholic Italy, being reputed to be "Hellenic" and a lover of philosophy, there rallied the officials, the Senate, and the people of Rome. Once more the old struggle of the Roman and barbarian parties was destined to be rehearsed. For a moment the mediation of Epiphanius, the saintly bishop of Pavia, procured (if we may trust the account of his biographer Ennodius) a temporary peace; but in 472 war came. Early in the year Ricimer marched on Rome, and besieged the city with an army, in which the Scirian Odovacar was one of the commanders. For five months the city suffered from siege and from famine. At last an army which had marched from Gaul to the relief of Anthemius, under the command of Ricimer, the master of troops of that province, was defeated by Ricimer, and treachery completed the fall of the beleaguered city. In July Ricimer marched into Rome, now under the heel of a conqueror for the third time in the course of the century; and Anthemius, seeking in vain to save his life by mingling in disguise with the beggars round the door of one of the Roman churches, was detected and beheaded by Ricimer's nephew, Gundobad. Once more the Empire seemed destroyed: civil war, said Pope Gelasius, had overturned the city and the feeble remnants of the Roman Empire.

The death of Anthemius had already been preceded by the accession of Olybrius, the husband of Valentinian's daughter, and the relative by marriage of Gaiseric. The circumstances of the accession of Olybrius are obscure. A curious story in a late Byzantine

writer makes him appear in Italy during the struggle between Anthemius and Ricimer, with public instructions from Leo to mediate in the struggle, but with a sealed letter to Anthemius, in which it was suggested that the bearer should be instantly executed. The letter is said to have fallen into the hands of Ricimer, who replied by elevating Olybrius to the imperial throne. We can only say that Olybrius came to Italy in the spring of 472, whether sent by Leo, or (as is perhaps more likely) invited by Ricimer, and that he was proclaimed emperor by Ricimer before the fall of Rome and the death of Anthemius. The reign of Olybrius, connected as he was with the old Theodosian house and with the Vandal rulers of Africa, seemed to promise well for the future of the West; but it only lasted for a few months. Short as it was, it saw the death of Ricimer, at the end of August 472, and the elevation in his place of his nephew Gundobad, a Burgundian. But though a nominal successor took his place, the death of Ricimer left a gap that could not be filled. If he was a barbarian, he had yet in his way venerated the Roman name and preserved the tradition of the Roman Empire; he had sought to be emperor-maker rather than King of Italy, and for sixteen years he had kept the Empire alive in the West. Within four years of his death the last shadow of an emperor had disappeared; and a barbarian kingdom had been established in Italy.

Olybrius died at the end of October 472. The throne remained vacant through the winter; and it was not until March of 473 that Gundobad proclaimed Glycerius emperor at Ravenna. But Gundobad soon left Italy, having affairs in Gaul; and Glycerius, deprived of his support, was unable to maintain his position. He succeeded, indeed, in averting one danger, when he induced a body of Ostrogoths, who had entered Italy from the north-east under their king Widimir, to join their kinsmen, the Visigoths of Gaul. His position, however, had never been confirmed by the Eastern Emperor; and at the end of 473 Leo appointed Julius Nepos, the nephew of Marcellinus of Dalmatia, to be emperor in his place. In the spring of 474 Nepos arrived in Italy with an army: Glycerius could offer no resistance; and in the middle of June he was captured at Portus, near the mouth of the Tiber, and forcibly consecrated bishop of Salona in Dalmatia. The accession of Nepos seemed a triumph for the Roman cause, and a defeat for the barbarian party. Once more, as in the days of Anthemius, an emperor ruled at Rome who was the real colleague and ally of the Emperor of Constantinople; and Nepos, unlike Anthemius, had the advantage of having no master of troops at his side. With the aid of the Eastern Empire, and in the absence of any successor to Ricimer, Nepos might possibly hope to secure the permanent triumph of the Roman cause in the West.

But the aid of the Eastern Empire was destined to prove a broken reed, and Ricimer was fated to find his successor. In 475 a revolt, headed by Basiliscus, drove Zeno, who had succeeded to Leo in 474, from Constantinople, and disturbed the East until 477. The West was thus left to its own resources during the crisis of its fate; and taking their opportunity the barbarian mercenaries found themselves new leaders, and under their guidance settled its fate at their will. For the first few months of his reign Nepos was left undisturbed; but even so he was compelled to make a heavy sacrifice, and to buy peace with Euric at the price of the formal surrender of Auvergne, to the great grief of its bishop Sidonius.<sup>2</sup> In 475, however, there appeared a new leader of the barbarian mercenaries. This was Orestes, a Roman of Pannonia, who had served Attila as secretary, and had been entrusted by his master with the conduct of negotiations with the Roman Empire. On the death of Attila, he had come to Italy, and having married a daughter of Romulus, an Italian of the rank of *comes*, who had served under Aetius as ambassador to the Huns, he had had a successful career in the imperial service. He had risen high enough by 475 to be created *magister militiae* by Nepos; and in virtue both of his official position and of a natural sympathy which his previous career must have inspired he became the leader of the barbarian party. Once at the head of the army he instantly marched upon Rome. Nepos, powerless before his adversary, fled to Ravenna, and unable to maintain himself there, escaped at the end of August 475 to his native Dalmatia,

where he survived as an emperor in exile until he was assassinated by his followers in 480. At the end of October Orestes proclaimed as emperor his son, a boy named Romulus after his maternal grandfather, and surnamed (perhaps only in derision, and after his fall) Augustulus. Thus was restored the old *régime* of the nominal emperor controlled by the military dictator, and for nearly a year this *régime* continued.

But the barbarian mercenaries—the Rugii, Sciri, and Heruli—were by no means contented with the old condition of things. Since the fall of Attila, they had emigrated so steadily into Italy from the north-east, that they had become a numerous people; and they desired to find for themselves, in the country of their adoption, what other Germanic tribes had found in Gaul and Spain and Africa—a regular settlement on the soil in the position of *hospites*. They would no longer be cantoned in barracks in the Roman fashion: they desired to be free farmers settled on the soil after the German manner, ready to attend the levy in time of need for the defense of Italy, but not bound to serve continually in foreign expeditions as a professional army. They accordingly asked of Orestes a third of the soil of Italy: they demanded that every Roman possessor should cede a third of his estate to some German *hospes*. It appears a modest demand, when one reflects that the Visigoths settled by Constantius in south-western Gaul in 418 had been allowed two-thirds of the soil and its appurtenant cattle and cultivators. But the cession of 418 had been a matter of free grant: the demand of 476 was the demand of a mutinous soldiery. The grant of south-western Gaul had been the grant of one corner of the Empire, made with the design of protecting the rest: the surrender of Italy would mean the surrender of the home and hearth of the Empire. Orestes accordingly rejected the demand of the troops. They replied by creating Odovacar their king, and under his banner they took for themselves what Orestes refused to give.

Odovacar, perhaps a Scirian by birth, and possibly the son of a certain Edeco who had once served with Orestes as one of the envoys of Attila, had passed through Noricum, where St Severinus had predicted his future greatness, and come to Italy somewhere about 470. He had served under Ricimer in 472 against Anthemius; and by 476 he had evidently distinguished himself sufficiently to be readily chosen as their king by the congeries of Germanic tribes which were cantoned in Italy. His action was prompt and decisive. He became king on 23 August: by the 28th Orestes had been captured and beheaded at Piacenza, and on 4 September Paulus, the brother of Orestes, was killed in attempting to defend Ravenna. The Emperor Romulus Augustulus became the captive of the new king, who, however, spared the life of the handsome boy, and sent him to live on a pension in a Campanian villa. While Odovacar was annexing Italy, Euric was spreading his conquests in Gaul; and when he occupied Marseilles, Gaul, like Italy, was lost.

The success of Odovacar did not, however, mean the erection of an absolutely independent Teutonic kingdom in Italy, or the total extinction of the Roman Empire in the West; and it does not therefore indicate the beginning of a new era, in anything like the same sense as the coronation of Charlemagne in 800. It is indeed a new and important fact, that after 476 there was no Western Emperor until the year 800, and it must be admitted that the absence of any separate Emperor of the West vitally affected both the history of the Teutonic tribes and the development of the Papacy, during those three centuries. But the absence of a separate emperor did not mean the abeyance of the Empire itself in the West. The Empire had always been, and always continued in theory to be, one and indivisible. There might be two representatives at the head of the imperial scheme; but the disappearance of one of the two did not mean the disappearance of half of the scheme; it only meant that for the future one representative would stand at the head of the whole scheme, and that this scheme would be represented somewhat less effectively in that part of the Empire which had now lost its separate head. The scheme itself continued in the West, and its continued existence was acknowledged by Odovacar himself. Zeno now became the one ruler of the Empire; and to



him Odovacar sent the imperial insignia of Romulus Augustulus, while he demanded in return the traditional title of *patricius*, to legalize his position in the imperial order. The old Roman administration persisted in Italy: there was still a *Praefectus Praetorio Italiae*; and the Roman Senate still nominated a consul for the West. Odovacar is thus not so much an independent German king, as a second Ricimer—a *patricius*, holding the reins of power in his own hands, but acknowledging a nominal emperor, with the one difference that the emperor is now the ruler of the East, and not a puppet living at Rome or Ravenna. Yet after all Odovacar bore the title of *rex*: he had been lifted to power on the shields of German warriors. *De facto*, he ruled in Italy as its king; and while his legal position looks backwards to Ricimer, we cannot but admit that his actual position looks forward to Alboin and the later Lombard kings. He is a Janus-like figure; and while we remember that he looks towards the past, we must not forget that he also faces the future. We may insist that the Empire remained in the West after 476; we must also insist that every vestige of a Western Emperor had passed away. We may speak of Odovacar as *patricius*; we must also allow that he spoke of himself as *rex*. He is of the fellowship of Euric and Gaiseric; and when we remember that these three were ruling in Gaul and Africa and Italy in 476, we shall not quarrel greatly with the words of Count Marcellinus: *Hesperium Romanae gentis imperium . . cum hoc Augustulo periit .. Gothorum dehinc regibus Romam tenentibus.*

## CHAPTER XV

### THE KINGDOM OF ITALY UNDER ODOVACAR AND THEODORIC

THE time between the years 476 and 526 is a period of transition from the system of twin Empires which existed from the time of Arcadius and Honorius to the separation of Italy from the rest of the Empire. It is for this reason an interesting period. It marks the surrender by Constantinople of a certain measure of autonomy to that portion of the Empire which, finding that government under the faction set up after the death of Theodosius was impossible, had ended by submission to rulers nominated from Byzantium; it marks too, the progress achieved by the barbarians, who far from wishing to destroy a state of things which had formerly been hostile, adapted themselves to it readily when they had once risen to power, and showed themselves as careful of its traditions as their predecessors; it marks further, the preponderant part played in the affairs of the time by a growing power—the Church—and the adaptability shown by her in dealing with kings who were heretics and avowed followers of Arius.

The attempt to found an Italian kingdom was destined to speedy failure. There were too many obstacles in the way of its permanent establishment; Justinian it is true was to show himself capable of giving effectual support to the claims of Byzantium and of making an end of the Ostrogothic kingdom, but even his authority was powerless to bring about the union of the two portions of the Roman Empire. Another barbarian race, the Lombards, shared with the Papacy—the one authority which emerged victorious from these struggles—the possession of a country which, owing to the irreconcilable nature of the lay and religious elements, was destined to recover only in modern times unity, peace and that consciousness of a national existence which is the sole guarantee of permanence.

Cassiodorus writes in his chronicle: “In the Consulate of Basiliscus and Armatus, Orestes and his brother Paulus were slain by Odovacar; the latter took the title of king, albeit he wore not the purple, nor assumed the insignia of royalty”. We have here in the concise language of an annalist intent on telling much in a few words, the history of a revolution which appears to us, at this distance of time, to have been pregnant with consequences. The Emperor—that Romulus Augustulus whose associated names have so often served to point a moral—is not mentioned. It was left to Jordanes alone, a century later, to make any reference to him. The seizure of the supreme power by leaders of barbarian origin had become since the time of Ricimer a recognised process; it is moreover Orestes who is attacked by Odovacar, and Orestes was a simple patrician and in no sense clothed with the imperial dignity. The Empire itself suffered no change, it was merely that one more barbarian had come to the front. It was only when Odovacar was to set up pretensions to independent and sovereign authority that annalists and chroniclers were to accord him special mention on the ground that his claim was without precedent. Up to that point his intervention was only one among many similar events which occurred at this period.

Orestes was of Pannonian origin; he had acted as secretary to Attila, and with Edeco had taken a chief part in frustrating the conspiracy organized by Theodosius II against the life of the king of the Huns. After the death of the barbarian king, he entered the service of Anthemius, who appointed him commander of the household troops. He took part—under what circumstances we are ignorant—in the struggles which brought about the fall and the murder of Anthemius, an emperor imposed from Constantinople, the elevation and death of Olybrius, the short-lived rule of the Burgundian Gundobad and the elevation of Glycerius. For

the second time the East imposed an Augustus on the West, and Leo appointed Julius Nepos to bear rule at Rome. Under his reign Orestes, who had been promoted to the rank of commander-in-chief, was charged with the task of transferring Auvergne to the Visigoth king Euric, to whom it had been ceded by the Roman government.

How it came about that Orestes, instead of leading his army to Gaul, led it against Ravenna and who induced him to attack Nepos, we have no documentary evidence to show. Nepos fled and retired to Salona, where he found his predecessor Glycerius, whom he had appointed to be bishop of that place. Having achieved this success Orestes proclaimed as the new Emperor Romulus Augustulus, his son by the daughter of Count Romulus, a Roman noble (475). Even as Orestes had driven out Nepos, another barbarian— Odovacar—was before long to drive out Orestes and his son, and once more the contemporary documents afford no plausible explanation of this fresh revolution.

Odovacar was a Rugian, the son of that Edeco, Attila's general and minister. Odovacar had followed his father's colleague into Italy where he occupied the humble position of spearman in the household troop, from which he gradually rose to higher rank. Whether the ambition which fired him was provoked by the spectacle of the internal conflicts in which he took part, or whether by the prediction of St Severinus the Apostle of Noricum, it is impossible to say. It is, however, certain at in the Lives of the Saints there is a record to the effect that Severinus in his hermitage of Favianum was visited one day by certain barbarians who asked for his benediction before going to seek their fortunes in Italy, and one of them, scantily clad in the skins of beasts, was of so lofty a stature that he was compelled to stoop in order to pass through the low doorway of the cell. The monk observed the movement and exclaimed: "Go, go forward into Italy. Today you are clothed in sorry skins but ere long you shall distribute great rewards to many people". The man whom Severinus thus designated for supreme rule was Odovacar the son of Edeco. He appears to have enjoyed great popularity among the mercenary troops, and profiting by their discontent at the failure of Orestes to reward their devotion, he induced them to take active measures, and gained to his side the barbarians of Liguria and the Trentino. Orestes declined the combat offered by Odovacar in the plains of Lodi, retreated behind the Lambro with the object of covering Pavia and shortly afterwards shut himself up in that city. Odovacar laid siege to him there, and Pavia, which, as Ennodius tells us, had been pillaged by the soldiers of Orestes, was sacked by the troops of Odovacar; Orestes was delivered up to Odovacar, who had him put to death 8 August, 476. Odovacar next marched on Ravenna which was defended by Paulus the brother of Orestes and where Romulus had taken refuge. In a chance encounter which took place in a pine forest close to the city Paulus was killed and Odovacar, occupied Ravenna, which had taken the place of Rome as the favorite residence of the Caesars of the West.

Romulus who had hidden himself and cast off the fatal purple was brought before him. Odovacar taking pity on his youth and moved by his beauty consented to spare his life. He moreover granted him a revenue of 6000 gold solidi and assigned him as his residence the Lucullanum, a villa in Campania near Cape Misenum which had been built by Marius and decorated by Lucullus.

In succession to three Emperors of the West who still survived, Glycerius and Nepos in Dalmatia and Romulus in Campania, Odovacar, styled by Jordanes King of the Rugians, by the Anonymus Valesii King of the Turcilingi, and by other authorities Prince of the Sciri, now wielded supreme power.

At this point certain questions arise as to the nature of the authority which he exercised and to his relations with Byzantium and the established powers in Italy. The documents which supply an answer are scanty. The passages devoted to Odovacar give no details except such as relate to the beginning and end of his reign; it is plain too, that the Latin writers of the time were more intent on pleasing Theodoric than on recording the facts of history.

Cassiodorus has been careful to point out that Odovacar refused altogether to assume the imperial insignia and the purple robe and was content with the 'title of king'. These events took place when Basiliscus having driven Zeno from power was reigning as Emperor of the East, that is, at a moment of dynastic trouble in the other half of the Empire. The possession of Ravenna, the exile of Romulus, and the death of Orestes did not suffice to secure to Odovacar the lordship of Italy; it was only after his formal entry into Rome and his tacit recognition by the Senate, that he could look upon his authority as finally established.

He was not however satisfied with this, but desired a formal appointment by the Emperor and the recognition of his authority by Constantinople. A palace conspiracy which broke out in 477 having replaced Zeno on the throne of Byzantium, the ex-sovereign Romulus Augustulus, in spite of the fact that never having been formally recognized by the Emperor, he had no legal claim to take such a step, sent certain Senators as an embassy to Zeno. The representatives of the Senate were instructed to inform the Emperor that Italy had no need of a separate ruler and that the autocrat of the two divisions of the Empire sufficed as Emperor for both, that Odovacar moreover, in virtue of his political capacity and military strength, was fully competent to protect the interests of the Italian diocese, and under these circumstances they prayed that Zeno would recognize the high qualities of Odovacar by conferring on him the title of Patrician and by entrusting him with the government of Italy.

The Emperor's reply was truly diplomatic. After severely censuring the Senate for the culpable indifference they had shown with respect to the murder of Anthemius and the expulsion of Nepos, two sovereigns who had been sent by the East to rule in Italy, he declared to the ambassadors that it was their business to decide on the course to be pursued. Certain members of the legation represented more especially the interests of Odovacar, and to them the Emperor declared that he fully approved of the conduct of the barbarian in adopting Roman manners, and that he would forthwith bestow on him the well-merited title of Patrician if Nepos had not already done so, and he gave them a letter for Odovacar in which he granted him the dignity in question. Zeno in short had to recognize the *fait accompli*, the more so as the ambassadors from Rome to Byzantium had there found themselves in the presence of another mission sent from Dalmatia by Nepos to beg for the deposed sovereign the assistance of the newly restored Emperor. He however could only condole with him on his lot and point out its similarity to that from which he himself had just escaped.

There is yet another proof of the tacit recognition of Odovacar's authority. In 480 Nepos was assassinated by the Counts Victor and Ovida (or Odiva) and in 481, as if he had been the legitimate heir of a predecessor whose death it was his duty to avenge, Odovacar led an expedition against the murderers, defeated and slew Ovida and restored Dalmatia to the Italian diocese. More than this, Odovacar looked upon himself as the formally appointed representative of Zeno, for at the time of the revolt of Illus, he refused to aid the latter, who had applied to him as well as to the kings of Persia and Armenia for assistance against the Emperor. He had already exercised sovereign power in the cession of Narbonne to the Visigoths of Euric and in the conclusion of a treaty with Gaiseric in 477, by the terms of which the king of the Vandals restored Sicily to the Italians, subject to the payment of a tribute and retaining possession of a castle which he had built in the island.

This is all we know, till Theodoric appears upon the scene, of the achievements of Odovacar; with respect to his relations with the inhabitants of Italy we are better informed. In and after 482 the regular record of consuls, interrupted since 477, was resumed. The Roman administration continued to work as in the past; there was a praetorian praefect Pelagius who, like so many of his predecessors, contrived to exact contributions on his own behalf as well as on behalf of the State. The relations between Odovacar and the Senate were so intimate that together and in their joint names they set up statues to Zeno in the city of Rome. Between the Church and Odovacar, albeit he was an Arian, no difficulties arose, the Pope Simplicius (468-



483) recognized the authority of Odovacar, and the king preserved excellent relations with Epiphanius, bishop of Pavia, and with St Severinus, whose requests he was accustomed to treat with marked deference and respect. On the death of Simplicius in March 483, a meeting of the Senate and clergy took place and on the proposition of the praetorian prefect and patrician Basilius, it was resolved that the election of a new pope should not take place without previous consultation with the representative of King Odovacar, as he is styled without addition in the report of the proceedings. Further, future popes were bidden in the name of the king and under threat of anathema to refrain from alienating the possessions of the Church.

The picture of Italy under the government of Odovacar is difficult to trace. We have no Cassiodorus to preserve for us the terms of the decrees which he signed. Our only source of information, the works of Ennodius, is by no means free from suspicion. If we are to believe the bishop of Pavia, it was the evil one in person who inspired Odovacar with the ambition to reign, that he was a destroyer—populator intestinus—that his fall was a veritable relief and that Theodoric was a deliverer; in short that Odovacar was a tyrant in the full sense of the word.

It must be remembered that it is the panegyrist of Theodoric who speaks in these terms. The word tyrant which he employs must be understood, as the Byzantine historians understood it, in its Greek sense, that is, in the sense of an authority set up out of the ordinary course. The specific charges of tyranny which are made against Odovacar are unconvincing, especially the accusation that he distributed amongst his soldiers a third of the land of Italy. We will deal later with the part played by Theodoric.

It is not among these events that we must look for the cause of the fall of Odovacar; the only possible explanation lies in the fact that the Italians obeyed with alacrity, so soon as they were made clear, the orders of Constantinople on domestic affairs—holding themselves free to disobey them later on—and it was by the formal and specific authority of the Emperor that Theodoric was sent into Italy.

Theodoric, an Amal by birth, was the son of Theodemir king of the Goths and his wife Erelieva. His father had discharged the duties of a paid warden of the marches on the northern frontiers of the Empire of the East. Theodoric having been sent to Constantinople as a hostage spent his childhood and youth in that city; he stood high in the favour of the Emperor Leo and became deeply imbued with Greek civilization; his education cannot however have advanced very far, as when he reigned in Italy he was unable to sign his name and was compelled therefore to trace with his pen the first four letters cut out for the purpose in a sheet of gold.

On the death of his father, having in his turn become king, Theodoric established his headquarters in Moesia and found himself involved in a chronic struggle with a Gothic chief Theodoric ‘the Squinter’ (Theodoric Strabo), who aspired to the kingly dignity. To accomplish this purpose Theodoric Strabo relied on the good will of the Eastern Emperors. Having thrown in his lot with Basiliscus, he helped him to drive Zeno from the throne and received rewards in the shape of money and military rank; but when Zeno returned to power it was Theodoric the Amal who in virtue of his fidelity stood highest in the imperial favour. Adopted by the Emperor, loaded with wealth and raised to patrician dignity, he enjoyed from 475 to 479 great influence at the Byzantine Court. He was given the command of an expedition sent to chastise Strabo who had risen in revolt, and found his rival encamped in the Haemus; the men of each army were of kindred race and Theodoric the Amal was compelled by his soldiers to form a coalition with the enemy. Till the death of Strabo, which occurred in 481, the two Theodorics intrigued together against the Emperor and with the Emperor against each other and there followed a series of reconciliations and mutual betrayals. From that time forward Theodoric the Amal became a formidable power, he held Dacia and Moesia and it was necessary to treat him with respect. Zeno nominated him for Consul in 483 and in 484 he

filled that office; it was in this capacity that he subdued the rebels Illus and Leontius, and on this ground he was granted in 486 the honor of a triumph and an equestrian statue in one of the squares of Byzantium.

This accumulation of dignities conferred by Zeno concealed the distrust which he felt, and which before long he made manifest by sending Theodoric into Italy.

Jordanes maintains that it was Theodoric himself who conceived the plan of the conquest of Italy and that in a long speech addressed to the Emperor, he depicted the sufferings of his own nation which was then quartered in Illyria and the advantages which would accrue to Zeno in having as his vicegerent a son instead of a usurper, and a ruler who would hold his kingdom by the imperial bounty. Certain authors such as the Anonymus Valesii and Paulus Diaconus have transformed this permission granted by the Emperor into a formal treaty giving to Theodoric the assurance, says the former, that he should 'reign' in the place of Odovacar, and recommending him, says the latter—after formally investing him with the purple—to the good graces of the Senate. The explanation given by Procopius and adopted by Jordanes in another passage is, however, more plausible. Zeno, better pleased that Theodoric should go into Italy than that he should remain close at hand and in the neighbourhood of Byzantium, sent him to attack Odovacar; a similar method had been pursued with Widimir and Ataulf in order to remove them to a distance from Rome. In any case it was in the name of the Emperor that Theodoric acted, and he held his power by grant from him.

The title which he bore when he started from Constantinople, that of Patrician, sufficed in his own opinion and that of Zeno to legalize his power and to clothe him with the necessary authority: it was the same rank as that borne by Odovacar. Later, like Odovacar, he aspired to something higher and like him he was to fail in his attempts to obtain it. Zeno had no intention of yielding up his rights over Italy, and recognized no one other than himself as the lawful heir of Theodosius.

In 488 Theodoric crossed the frontier at the head of his Goths; it was the first step in the conquest which took five years to complete. Odovacar opposed him at the head of an army not less formidable but less homogeneous than that of his adversary. He was defeated on the Isonzo; he retreated on Verona, was once more beaten and fled to Ravenna. Theodoric profited by this error of tactics to make himself master of Lombardy, and Tufa, Odovacar's lieutenant in that district, came over to his side. This was merely a stratagem, as when Tufa was sent with a picked body of Goths to attack Odovacar, he rejoined him with his Ostrogoths at Faventia. In 490 Odovacar again took the offensive; he sallied from Cremona, retook Milan and shut up Theodoric in Pavia. The latter would have been destroyed if the arrival of the Visigoths of Widimir, and a diversion made by the Burgundians in Liguria, had not left him free to rout Odovacar in a second battle on the Adda and to pursue him up to the walls of Ravenna. In August 490 Theodoric camped in the pine forest which Odovacar had occupied in his campaign against Orestes and a siege began which was to last three years. In 491 Odovacar made a sortie in which, after a first success, he was finally defeated and the siege became a blockade.

Theodoric, while keeping the enemy under observation, proceeded to capture other towns and to form various alliances. He seized Rimini and so destroyed the means of provisioning Ravenna, after which he opened negotiations with the Italians.

Without asserting that Theodoric owed all his success to the Church, the facts show pretty clearly that she afforded him—Arian though he was, like Odovacar—valuable assistance. It was Bishop Laurentius who opened for him the gates of Milan and it was he who, after the treason of Tufa, held for him that important city; Epiphanius bishop of Pavia acted in similar fashion. In a letter written in 492, Pope Gelasius takes credit to himself for

having resisted the orders of Odovacar, and finally it was another bishop, John of Ravenna, who induced Odovacar to treat.

Theodoric like Clovis understood to the full the advantages which would accrue to him from the good offices of the Church. From his first arrival in Italy he showed in his attitude towards her the greatest consideration and tact. He was lavish in promises, he took pains to conciliate and he did not despise the use of flattery. Thus when he saw Epiphanius for the first time he is said to have exclaimed: "Behold a man who has not his peer in the East. To look upon him is a prize, to live beside him security". Again, he entrusts his mother and his sister to the care of the bishop of Pavia, an act of high policy by which he added to the friendly feelings already exhibited towards him. The conquest of Italy was practically achieved between 490 and 493, and the various members of the nobility such as Festus and Faustus Niger and the chief senators rallied to his cause; with the capitulation of Odovacar, which took place at this latter date, the victory of Theodoric was complete.

On 27 February 493, through the good offices of John bishop of Ravenna who acted as official intermediary and negotiated the terms of the treaty, an agreement was concluded between Odovacar and Theodoric. It was arranged that the two kings should share the government of Italy and should dwell together as brothers and consuls in the same palace at Ravenna. Odovacar as a pledge of good faith handed over his son Thela to Theodoric, and on 5 March the latter made his state entry into Ravenna.

Theodoric broke the agreement by an act of the basest treachery. A few days later he invited Odovacar, his son and his chief officers to a banquet in that part of the palace known as the Laetum. At the end of the feast Theodoric rose, threw himself on Odovacar and slew him together with his son. The chief officers of Theodoric's army followed his example and massacred the Rugian leaders in the banqueting hall, while in the interior of the palace and as far as the outskirts of Ravenna the Gothic soldiery attacked the soldiery of Odovacar. It was clear that all acted on orders from headquarters.

Theodoric had now no rival in Italy: he was not however equally successful in his attempts to obtain recognition as king by the Emperor. He had already, during the first year of the siege of Ravenna, dispatched Festus to Constantinople, hoping that his position as chief of the Senate would favor the success of his mission. On the completion of his conquest, Festus having in the meantime failed, Theodoric sent a fresh envoy, Faustus Niger; the second enterprise was however no less abortive than the first. The Anonymus Valesii tells us, indeed, that "peace having been made" (had Theodoric then in the eyes of the Emperor been guilty of disobedience?), "Anastasius sent back the royal insignia which Odovacar had forwarded to Constantinople"; nowhere, however, do we find it stated that the Emperor had authorized Theodoric to assume them. In a letter written to Justinian to beg for his friendship, Athalaric records the benefits conferred by the Court of Byzantium on his ancestors, he mentions adoption and the consulate and in referring to the question of government he merely recalls that his grandfather had been invested in Italy with the toga palmata, the ceremonial robe of clarissimi of consuls who triumphed. However that may be, Theodoric took that which was not conferred upon him. He abandoned military dress and assumed the royal mantle in his capacity of "governor of the Goths and the Romans" (Jordanes); but officially he was not, any more than Odovacar had been, king of Italy. Even his panegyrist Ennodius who styles him "our lord the king", refers to the Italians as "his subjects", accepts him as "lord of Italy" and de facto "Imperator" and speaks of him as clothed with the imperialis auctoritas, nowhere calls him king of Italy or king of the Romans. He was at once a Gothic king and a Roman official: Jordanes has called him quasi Gothorum Romanorumque gubernator.

We have proof of this double position in the two letters which he wrote to Anastasius and which are quoted by Cassiodorus. In the first Theodoric expresses to the Emperor the respect which he feels for the latter's counsels and especially for the advice which he had

given him to show favour to the Senate. If he uses the word *regnum* (a word which may also mean nothing more than government) it is to tell the Emperor that his object is to imitate the latter's system of governing. In the second letter, his tone is that of a lieutenant who begs his superior officer to approve the choice of a consul. It is the tone neither of a rebel on the one hand, nor of an independent sovereign on the other.

As the *Anonymus Valesii* saw very clearly, Theodoric made no attempt to found a new State: he ruled two nations together without seeking to blend them, to allow one to absorb the other, or to make either subordinate. The Goths retained their own rights, their own laws, and their own officials; the Italians continued to be governed as they had been in the past, and the rule of Theodoric offers us the spectacle of a government purely Roman in character.

The Goths had established themselves almost imperceptibly in Italy, as their king had been careful to maintain continuity of government, and Theodoric appears in the pages of contemporary writers as a sovereign whose habits and traditions were altogether Roman. The works of Ennodius abound in evidence of this: his *Panegyric* in particular, in which he represents Italy and Rome as loud in their praise of Theodoric because he had revived the old tradition and because he himself was a Roman prince whose ambition it was to place Italy in harmony with her past; this is the idea which dominates the pages of the famous *prosopopoeia* of the Adige.

The government of Theodoric was then wholly Roman; he published laws and appointed consuls. He maintained and enforced Roman law and the *edictum Theodorici* was derived exclusively from Roman sources. He even imitated the imperial policy of encouraging barbarians in Italy, as when, for example, he established the Alemanni as guardians of the frontier. He also had a Court, officials and an administrative organization similar to that of Byzantium; he respected the Senate, restored the consular office, and though himself an Arian intervened as arbitrator, much as a Caesar would have done, in the affairs of the Church. Theodoric had a royal palace at Ravenna and there held his Court (*Aula*) surrounded by the chief men of Italy and his Gothic nobles. To enjoy interest at Court was all-important. No career was open to the man who did not attend there. "He was unknown to his master", says Ennodius. The Court was at once the home of good manners and the source of enlightenment, the centre of state affairs and a school of administration for the younger men.

The Court and the service of the *palatium* entailed certain functions nearly all of which were discharged by Romans: the *comes rerum privatarum* (*Apronianus* held the office in the time of Ennodius) had charge of the privy purse, and in his double capacity of censor and magistrate was responsible for the preservation of tombs and the administration of private justice: the *comes patrimonii* (*Julianus*) as steward of the royal domains, had under his orders the troublesome band of farmers of the revenue (*conductores*) and inspectors (*chartularii*); he had moreover supreme charge of the royal commissariat. The palace with its magnificent gardens and sumptuously decorated apartments was thronged with Roman nobles who came there in search of preferment. It was guarded by picked troops, and Ravenna was the headquarters of an important military district where the chief commands were filled by such men as *Constantius*, *Agapitus* and *Honoratus*. There was not a Goth among them.

If from the Court we turn to the officials we find again that they are all Romans. Among the ministers of the Court of Theodoric, as would have been the case under the Roman administration, the most important was the praetorian praefect *Faustus*, a personage of high consequence who in right of his office enjoyed a considerable police authority and extensive patronage; he was at the head of the postal administration, and to him was the final appeal in all criminal matters which arose in the provinces. His powers were almost legislative in character; in the forum his jurisdiction was supreme and his person sacred. The *comes sacrarum largitionum* discharged the duties of finance minister; the quaestor, *Eugenetes*, was responsible in matters relating to jurisprudence and the framing of laws. Then came the



treasury counsel Marcellus, who filled a position coveted by the rising members of the Bar, and who acted as a sort of attorney-general with respect to the estates of intestates and unclaimed assets; next came the magister officiorum and then the peraequator whose business it was to adjust the incidence of taxation in the royal cities. Finally the vicarius, the deputy in each diocese of the praetorian praefect.

We have here only specified some of those officials whose personal characters have been depicted for us in the letters of Ennodius. If we complete—and with the help of Cassiodorus it is possible to do so—the catalogue of government departments, both administrative and provincial, which existed in Italy under Theodoric we might well imagine it to be a record, not of the reign of a barbarian king, but of the times of Valentinian and Honorius. It was the Romans alone who struggled—and they did so with the greatest eagerness to obtain these posts. Did, for example, the office of Treasury Counsel fall vacant, the whole province was agitated by intrigues, and even bishops joined in the contest. The crowd of candidates for a minor office such as peraequator was so great that Ennodius could not refrain from bantering Faustus on the subject.

The *cursus honorum* of the principal officers of state, during the forty years from Odovacar to the death of Theodoric, proves that very little was altered in Italy during that period, except the nationality of the ruler of the country. We find, for instance, that Faustus was successively Consul, Quaestor, Patrician, and Praetorian Praefect, and was moreover entrusted with missions to Anastasius; while Liberius, who had remained faithful to Odovacar, and had even refused to surrender Caesena to Theodoric, was nevertheless employed by the latter sovereign, who made him a Patrician and Praefect of Ligurian Gaul. Senarius, again, was employed first as a soldier, and then as a diplomatist, and Count of the patrimonium; Agapitus, another official, obtained the rank of Patrician, held a military appointment at Ravenna, and was in turn Consul, Legate in the East, and Praefect of the city; while Eugenetus, whom Ennodius styles ‘the honour of Italy’, became a *vir illustris*, and was employed as an advocate, a Quaestor, and as Master of the Offices; other examples might also be quoted. The readiness of these Italian noblemen to serve successively under both Odovacar and Theodoric arose from no feeling of indifference on their part, but must rather be attributed to the fact that these rulers were in no sense hostile to tradition, and because they continued the form of administration established by the Roman Empire.

The Senate and the consulate, those two institutions with which the whole history of the past had been so intimately connected, especially engaged the attention of Theodoric. Ever since the time of Honorius, the part played by the Senate in the government of Italy had been growing more and more important. After the death of Libius Severus, it had asked Leo for an emperor; while both Augustulus and Odovacar had entrusted it with a similar mission to Zeno. In a well-known novel, Majorian may be found thanking the Senate for his election, and promising to govern according to its counsels; and when Anthemius was endeavoring to involve Ricimer in the struggle that was to end so fatally for himself, he leant for support upon the Curia. Examples such as these show that the Senate represented tradition; it was the single authority that remained unchanged through every vicissitude, and to it accordingly Theodoric at once made overtures. He entrusted a mission of considerable importance to two Senators, Festus and Faustus, the former of whom occupied the position of chief of the Senate; and on making his entry into Rome his first visit was to the Senate-house. In fact, to make use of a saying of his own, as recorded by his panegyrist, he adorned the crown of the Senate with countless flowers. He enrolled a few Goths among its members, but he only did this on rare occasions, for he preferred, as a rule, to recruit the senatorial ranks from among the old aristocracy of the country. During his reign men became senators in three ways; they might either be co-opted, or else selected from a list of candidates nominated by the king, or they obtained the rank because they had been advanced to some dignity which conferred the

title of 'illustrious'. In Rome indeed the Senate at this time was the supreme power. In conjunction with the praefect, it had the control of the municipal police; it organized the games in the circus; and exercised authority over the city schools and working men's corporations. Without abandoning any of its legislative power it assumed the functions of the Aediles; nor could a royal edict become law until it had received the senatorial sanction. The *Varia* of Cassiodorus are full of letters from Theodoric to the Senate. Indeed, he never made a nomination of any consequence, or filled up an important office, without immediately communicating the fact to the senators in the most deferential terms, and even soliciting their advice and approbation. A great deal of this deference was no doubt a mere form, but to a certain extent it was also sincere. The king's respect could hardly have been altogether feigned, for he invariably addressed even those senators who held aloof from his government in a kindly manner. Festus, for instance, although he remained in Rome and never visited Ravenna, obtained the rank of Patrician, and received no less than four letters from Theodoric, all expressed in the most flattering terms; while Symmachus, another Patrician who refused to leave his native city, was favored with a royal letter praising the buildings which he had erected.

In spite of these friendly relations, some opposition was aroused in the Curia by the question of the Arian schism; indeed towards the end of the king's reign, the behavior of the senators over this matter even provoked against him the hostility of Byzantium. Not only was this opposition a source of serious trouble to Theodoric, but it rendered him suspicious and cruel, and caused him to act with great severity against some of the senatorial families, and several victims, among whom Boethius was the most illustrious, were executed by his command.

In the opinion of Theodoric, the consulship was as valuable as ever, though in reality it had lost a great deal of its former importance. As Justinian justly observes in an *Authenticus*, this office had originally been created to defend the State in time of war, but since the emperors had undertaken the business of fighting, the consulship had deteriorated into a means of distributing largess among the people. Under these circumstances, candidates for the office were not very numerous. Ennodius mentions the small number of aspirants for the consulship; while Marcian, in an official communication, expresses his indignation at the stinginess of the men holding this high office, and obliges them to contribute a hundred pounds weight of gold, for the purpose of repairing the aqueducts. The consulship indeed at this period had degenerated into a mere name. A formula of nomination, which has been preserved for us by Cassiodorus, merely recalls the fame of this magistracy in the past, and then goes on to point out that a consul's sole duty is to be magnanimous, and not to be sparing with his money. However, the consul has no more authority. "By the grace of God", the formula declares, "we govern, while your name dates the year. Your good fortune, indeed, is greater than that of the prince himself, for though endowed with the highest honours, you have been relieved of the burden of power". On the other hand, as if to make up for this loss of authority, the dress of a consul was sumptuous and magnificent; a spreading cloak hung from his shoulders; he carried a scepter in his hand, and wore gilded shoes. In addition, he possessed the right of sitting in a curule chair, and was allowed to make the seven processions in triumph through Rome of which Justinian speaks in one of his novels.

Theodoric would have liked to restore the consulship to a somewhat more respected position. An eloquent letter on the subject of this magistracy was addressed by him to the Emperor Anastasius, and when Avienus, the son of Faustus, became consul in 501, Ennodius, who shared the opinion of his master, wrote as follows: "If there are any ancient dignities which deserve respect, if to be remembered after death is to be regarded as a great happiness, if the foresight of our ancestors really created something so excellent that by it humanity can triumph over time, it is certainly the consulship, whose permanence has overcome old age,

and put an end to annihilation”. In his Panegyric, moreover, Ennodius praises Theodoric because, during his reign, “the number of consuls exceeded the number of candidates for the office in previous times”.

The main outlines of Theodoric’s government have now been described: and it will be seen that they were all of Roman origin. We must next inquire in what manner he administered this government. A judicious policy and gentle means had been employed to supplant Odovacar, and at the beginning of his reign he governed by similar methods. He endeavoured to help the Italian officials with whom he had surrounded himself, and to whom he had entrusted the high offices of State, in their task of pacifying and reorganizing the country. When Epiphanius described the miserable plight of Liguria to him, and told him in moving terms how the land there lay uncultivated owing to its husband-men having been carried away captive by the Burgundians, the king replied: “There is gold in the treasury, and we will pay their ransom, whatever it may be, either in money or by the sword”. He then suggested that the bishop should himself undertake negotiations for ransoming the captives. Epiphanius accepted this mission; and, the king having placed the necessary funds at his disposal, triumphantly brought home six thousand prisoners, whom he had either ransomed or whose liberty he had obtained by his eloquent pleading in their behalf. The effect produced in Italy by such an act of liberality, followed by so satisfactory a result, can be imagined. The king’s aim, indeed, as he told Cassiodorus, was to restore the old power of Italy, to re-establish a good government, and to extend the influence of that Roman civilitas upon which he desired to model his own administrations.

As ministers, he selected men capable of inspiring confidence, such as Liberius, for instance, whose official work had been attended with such excellent results. In his opinion, fidelity to a vanquished patron was a virtue, nor was he afraid of praising it; indeed, in his administration, the value of a post given to a son would be in proportion to the deserts of the father. He attracted young men capable of making good officers of state to his Court; in a word, he acted like a sovereign who desires to be loved by his subjects, and at the same time to give stability to his rule. As Ennodius remarks: “No man was driven to despair of obtaining honors; no man, however obscure, had to complain of a refusal to his demands provided that they rested on substantial foundations; no man, in fact, ever came to the king without receiving liberal gifts”; but at this point we detect the panegyrist.

As we shall see before long, the end of his reign differed from the beginning, but during the chief part of it, at any rate, he governed with singular prudence. When Laurentius begged Theodoric to pardon some rebellious subjects, the king answered him as follows: “Your duty as a bishop obliges you to urge me to listen to the claims of mercy, but the needs of an Empire in the making shut out gentleness and pity, and make punishments a necessity”. Nevertheless, we find that he allowed some mitigation to be made in the punishment of the culprits.

Theodoric could be a just as well as a politic ruler, and he showed his sense of justice when he had to deal with financial questions. At the request of Epiphanius, he remitted two-thirds of the taxes for the current year to the inhabitants of Liguria; levying the remaining third, it is said, “in order that the poverty of his treasury might not impose fresh burdens on the Romans”. During his reign even the Goths were obliged to submit to taxation, and he also made them respect the public finances. At Adria, for instance, he forced them to give back what they had taken from the fiscus; in Tuscany he ordered Gesila, the Sajo, to make them pay the land tax. Moreover, if in any province the servants of the Gothic Count or his deputy behaved violently to the provincials, we find Severianus giving information against them; while in Picenum and Samnium we find him ordering his compatriots to bring grants made to the king to Court, without keeping back any portion of them.

Nevertheless, contemporary chroniclers have all declared that Theodoric, like Odovacar, distributed a third part of the land in Italy among his soldiers. Their statement appears to have

been almost invariably accepted by later historians, who have repeated it one from another. A theory, that the barbarians despoiled the conquered people of their estates, is commonly believed, and indeed has hardly ever been contradicted. But in addition to the fact that such a proceeding would certainly have led to some disturbance, of which we can find no evidence in any part of the country, another circumstance renders such a conclusion unreasonable. This is that neither Odovacar's soldiers, nor Theodoric's, were in reality sufficiently numerous to occupy a third part of the land in Italy. Greek chronicles, it is true, speak of the "tritimorion ton argon", Latin writers of the *tertia*. But what are we to understand by these expressions? Among the few scholars who have attempted to dispute the current theory, some, like de Rozière, believe that the chronicler's words denote an act of confiscation for which compensation was made to the owners by a tax levied at the rate of one-third of the annual value. Others, like Lécivain, consider that they mean a surrender of unappropriated land, in return for which a tribute was exacted equal to a third of the annual produce. At no period, not even during the agrarian troubles in the far away days of the Republic, had it ever been the custom to eject legal proprietors from their estates. On the contrary, on every occasion when land had been required for the purpose of making grants to the plebeians, to veterans or praetorians, or even to barbarians, it had invariably been taken from land owned by the community, that is to say from the land around the temples, from unoccupied land, or from the property of the Treasury. Whenever indeed a distribution of land took place, it was made exclusively from the lands belonging to the Treasury, which, at certain periods, multiplied exceedingly owing to escheated successions or confiscations. In our own opinion, it was a third of these state lands, this *ager publicus*, that was assigned to the barbarians during the reigns of Odovacar and Theodoric. In addition to the fact that not one of the texts actually contradicts this theory, it appears to be sufficiently proved by the following words, addressed by Ennodius to Liberius, when the latter was ordered to allot the land of Liguria to the Goths: "Have you not enriched innumerable Goths with liberal grants, and yet the Romans hardly seem to know what you have been doing." Even the courtier-like Ennodius would not have expressed himself in this manner in a private letter, or even in an official communication, if private estates had been attacked for the benefit of the conquerors.

During the early years of the Roman Empire, the annual food supply of Italy had always been one of the government's chief anxieties; and the writings of Cassiodorus constantly show us that Theodoric was not free from a similar care. His orders to his officials, however, on this subject, appear to have been attended with excellent results. During his reign, according to the Anonymus, sixty measures of wheat might be purchased for a solidus, and thirty amphorae of wine might be had for a like sum. Paul the Deacon has remarked the joy with which the Romans received Theodoric's order for an annual distribution of twenty thousand measures of grain among the people. It was, moreover, with a view to making the yearly food supply more secure, that the king caused the seaports to be put into good repair; and we find him especially charging Sabiniacus to keep those in the vicinity of Rome in good order.

At the same time, Theodoric gratified the ruling passion of the Italians for games in the circus; and Ennodius, the Anonymus, and Cassiodorus, are unanimous in praising him for reviving the gladiators. From their pages, we learn that he provided shows and pantomimes, that he endeavoured to shield the senators from the abusive jests of the comedians, and that he brought charioteers from Milan for the Consul Felix. But, in the eyes of his contemporaries, the most striking of all Theodoric characteristics seems to have been his taste for monuments, for making improvements at Rome and Ravenna, and for works of restoration of every kind. Such a taste, indeed, was very remarkable in a barbarian. According to the Anonymus he was a great builder. At Ravenna, the aqueducts were restored by his order; and the plan of the palace which he constructed there has been preserved for a mosaic in Sant Apollinare Nuovo. At Verona, also, he erected baths and an aqueduct. Cassiodorus tells us how the king sought



out skilled workers in marble to complete the Basilica of Hercules; how he ordered the Patrician Symmachus to restore the theatre of Pompey; how he bade Artemidorus rebuild the walls of Rome, and how he desired Argolicus to repair the drains in that city. We find him, moreover, requesting Festus to send any fallen marbles from the Pincian Hill to Ravenna; and giving a portico, or piece of ground surrounded by a colonnade, to the Patrician Albinus, in order that he may build houses on it. Count Suna received directions to collect broken pieces of marble, in order that they might be used in wall-building; while the magistrates of a tributary town were required to send to Ravenna columns, and any stones from ruins that had remained unused. In fact, Ennodius' statement that "he rejuvenated Rome and Italy in their hideous old age by amputating their mutilated members", is perfectly correct in spite of its rhetorical style. Not a few of his orders, moreover, bear witness to a care for the future: the Goths of Dertona, for instance, and of Castellum Verruca, were commanded to build fortifications; the citizens of Arles were directed to repair the towers that were falling into decay upon their walls; and the inhabitants of Feltre were ordered to build a wall round their new city. He even looked forward to his own death, building that strange mausoleum now become the Church of Santa Maria della Rotonda, whose monolithic roof is still an object of wonder.

Ennodius also tells us that Theodoric encouraged a revival of learning, nor is this eulogy by any means undeserved, for a real literary renaissance did in fact take place during his reign. In addition to Cassiodorus himself, to Ennodius, who was at once an enthusiastic lover of literature, an orator, a poet, and a letter-writer, and to Boethius, the most illustrious and popular writer of his day, quite a number of other distinguished literary men flourished at that time. Rusticus Helpidius, for instance, the king's physician, has left a poem entitled the Blessings of Christ; Cornelius Maximianus wrote idyllic poetry; while Arator of Milan translated the Acts of the Apostles into two books of hexameters. The greatest poet of this period was Venantius Fortunatus, who became bishop of Poitiers; and mention should also be made of the lawyer Epiphanius, who wrote an abridgment of the ecclesiastical histories of Socrates, Sozomen, and Theodoret.

Theodoric was himself an Arian, yet he was always ready to extend his protection to the Catholic Church. Indeed, as we have already noticed, it was his policy to win over the bishops of northern Italy. Accordingly he granted complete liberty of worship to all Catholics; while so long as papal elections were quietly conducted, as in the cases of Gelasius and Anastasius II, he took no part in them. But should a pontifical or episcopal election lead to disturbances of any kind, more especially if such disturbances were likely to end in a schism, Theodoric at once intervened in them, in the character of arbitrator or judge. For he claimed to be dominator rerum, that is to say the sovereign, responsible for the maintenance of order in the State; the successor, indeed, of the Caesars, who had always considered the task of maintaining the integrity of the faith as their most especial prerogative. And he assumed such a position at the time of the Laurentian schism.

In the year 498, two priests, Laurentius and Symmachus, had been simultaneously elected by rival parties to the Roman See. As neither prelate was willing to resign his claim to profit by the election, the dispute was referred to the Gothic king, who decided that whichever candidate had obtained a majority of votes should be proclaimed bishop of Rome. This condition being fulfilled by Symmachus, he was accordingly recognized as Pope, while Laurentius was given the bishopric of Nuceria as a compensation. By this arrangement peace, it was believed, was again established; and, in the year 500, Theodoric paid a visit to Rome, where he was enthusiastically received by Pope, Senate and people.

But the schism was by no means at an end. On the contrary, the enemies of Symmachus lost no time in renewing their attack with redoubled vigour; and accusations of adultery, of alienating church property, and of celebrating Easter on the wrong date, were successively

brought against the Pope. Theodoric summoned the accused Pontiff to appear before him, and when Symmachus refused to comply with this command, the case was referred to an assembly, over which Peter of Altinum presided as visitor. No less than five synods were convoked for the purpose of settling this question, and it was eventually terminated by the acquittal and rehabilitation of Symmachus.

The debates held in these ecclesiastical assemblies were very stormy. The partisans on both sides appear to have been equally unwilling to give way, nor did they scruple to promote their cause by exciting riots in the streets, or by slanderous libels. Both parties indeed seem to have been mainly occupied with justifying themselves in Theodoric's eyes, in order that they might obtain his support; in fact, from the second Synod onwards, the friends of Laurentius adopted the tactics of attempting to prove that Symmachus and his adherents had disobeyed the orders of the king.

In every phase of this controversy, so full of information respecting the relations of Church and State at that period, Theodoric, it will be seen, occupies an important place. In Rome, troubles were temporarily smoothed over by his presence, while his departure, on the other hand, proved the signal for a fresh outbreak. Appeals for a peaceful settlement, expressed with increasing vigour, and mingled with reproofs of increasing sternness, fill his letters at this time. When the hostile parties, unable to come to any decision on their own account, referred the question to their sovereign, he reminded them of their duty in the following severe words: "We order you to decide this matter which is of God, and which we have confided to your care, as it seems good to you. Do not expect any judgment from us, for it is your duty to settle this question". Later, as a verdict still failed to make its appearance, he writes again: "I order you to obey the command of God". And this time he was obeyed.

The fact that Theodoric was himself an Arian never seems to have limited his influence in any way during this long quarrel, so celebrated in the history of the Church. His prerogative as king gave him a legitimate authority in ecclesiastical matters, nor does that authority ever appear to have been called in question on the ground that he was a heretic. On the contrary, we find him giving his sanction to canons and decrees, exactly in the same manner as his predecessors had done in the days of the dual Empire. But, though his words were sometimes haughty and peremptory, he was careful not to impose his own will in any matters concerning faith or discipline; indeed the most extreme action that can be laid to his charge is the introduction into the Roman Synods of two Gothic functionaries, Gudila and Bedculphas, for the purpose of seeing that his instructions were not neglected.

A similar wise impartiality, mingled with firmness, distinguished his dealings with the clergy. When a priest named Aurelianus was fraudulently deprived of a portion of his inheritance, restitution was made to him by order of the king. He assisted the churches to recover their endowments; he appreciated good priests, and did them honour. Occasionally, indeed, he deposed a bishop for a time, on account of some action having been brought against him, but he always had him reinstated in his see as soon as he had proved his innocence. When he desired to give some compensation to the inhabitants of a country over which his troops had marched, he placed the matter in the hands of Bishop Severus, because that prelate was known to estimate damages fairly; and when a dispute arose between the clergy and the town of Sarsena he ordered the case to be tried in the bishop's court, unless the prelate himself should prefer to refer it to the king's tribunal. Finally, he made it a rule that ecclesiastical cases were only to be tried before ecclesiastical judges.

The foreign policy of Theodoric was conducted in the same masterly manner as his home government, or his dealings with the Church. He appears to have exercised a kind of protectorate over the barbarian tribes upon his frontiers, especially over those of the Arian persuasion, nor did he hesitate to impose his will upon them, if necessary, by force of arms. As he had only daughters he was obliged to consider the question of his successor; and the

marriages which he arranged for his children, or other relations, were accordingly planned with a view to procuring political alliances. Of his daughters the eldest, Arevagni, was married to Alaric, king of the Visigoths; the second, Theudegotha, became the wife of Sigismund, son of Gundobad, king of the Burgundians; and the third, Amalasantha, was given in marriage to one of Theodoric's own race, the Amal Eutharic. Other alliances were formed by the marriage of his sister Amalafriada to Thrasamund, king of the Vandals, and of another sister, Amalaberga, to Hermanfred, king of the Thuringians; while Theodoric himself wedded Childeric's daughter Audefleda, the sister of Clovis.

These alliances were all made with the definite object of extending Theodoric's sphere of action; but when, as for example in the case of the Franks, they failed to attain the end desired by the king, they were never permitted to hamper schemes of an entirely contrary nature.

A simple enumeration of Theodoric's wars is alone sufficient to prove the firmness of his will. When he found that Noricum and Pannonia, two provinces on the Italian frontier, were not to be trusted, he attacked and killed a chieftain of freebooters, named Mundo, in the former province. As the Emperor Anastasius was supporting Mundo, and had recently dispatched a fleet to plunder on the coasts of Calabria and Apulia, such an attack gave Theodoric an opportunity of asserting his independence. Moreover, in order to render his demonstration even more effective, he collected a fleet of his own, which he sent to cruise in the Adriatic. At the same time, he took Pannonia from the Gepid chief Trasaric, and thus effectually secured his north-eastern frontiers. Those on the north-west next engaged his attention, and here he protected the Alemanni from the attacks of Clovis, and eventually settled them in the province of Rhaetia. Finally he took advantage of the wars between the Franks and the Burgundians to secure the passes of the Graian Alps.

Theodoric had striven to prevent hostilities from breaking out between the Franks and the Visigoths; but after Alaric's death at the battle of Vouillé (507), he found himself obliged to take the latter people under his own protection. In the war that ensued, Ibbas, one of his generals, defeated the eldest son of Clovis near Arles (511); took possession of Provence; secured Septimania for the Visigoths; and established Amalaric in Spain. Among more distant nations we find the Esthonians on the shores of the Baltic paying him a tribute of amber, while a deposed prince of Scandinavia found a refuge at his Court.

History, as may be seen from these events, fully corroborates the legends in which Theodoric is represented as a protector of barbarian interests, and chief patron of the Teutonic races. In the Nibelungenlied, for instance, we find him occupying a distinguished place under the name of Dietrich of Bern (Theodoric of Verona). At the time of his death his dominions included Italy, Sicily, Dalmatia, Noricum, the greater part of what is now Hungary, the two Rhaetias (Tyrol and the Grisons), Lower Germany as far north as Ulm, and Provence. Indeed, if his supremacy over the Goths in Spain be also taken into account, it will be seen that he had succeeded in re-establishing the ancient Western Empire for his own benefit, with the exceptions of Africa, Britain, and two-thirds of Gaul.

So far as we have examined it, Theodoric's government has been found invariably broad-minded and liberal, but it was destined to undergo a complete change during the latter years of his reign. Whether this change was the consequence of a relapse into barbarism, or whether, as seems more probable, it must be attributed to the persecution under which the Arians were suffering in every part of the Empire, is not easy to determine, for no definite information on this point is to be found in any of the texts. In any case, however, there can be no doubt that it was the religious question that produced this complete change of policy. On this point the Anonymus is perfectly clear; and if we disregard the severity and the cruelty of his punishments, and at the same time make due allowance for intrigues of the Byzantine

Court, and of the Church itself, the precise nature of which cannot be determined, it does not appear that the king was himself to blame.

During his reign we find the Jews enjoying an extraordinary amount of protection; and, in one of his edicts, he testifies with what obedience this people had accepted the legal position assigned to them by the Roman law. His son-in-law Eutharic, however, appears to have been addicted to persecution; and during his consulship the Christians of Ravenna made an attempt to force all the Jews in their city to submit to the rite of baptism. As the Jews refused to comply, the Christians flung them into the water, and in spite of the king's decrees, and the orders of Bishop Peter, attacked and set fire to the synagogues. Upon this, the Jews complained to the king at Verona, who ordered the Christians to rebuild the synagogues at their own expense. This command was carried out, but not before a certain amount of disturbance had aroused Theodoric's suspicions; and in consequence the inhabitants of Ravenna were forbidden to carry arms of any kind, even the smallest knife being prohibited.

While these events were in progress, in the year 523, the Emperor Justin proscribed Arianism throughout the Empire. Such an action was a direct menace to the Goths, and Theodoric felt it very acutely. The painful impression which it produced on him was probably much increased by the fact that Symmachus' successors in the papal chair had not been as tolerant as their predecessor; while one of them in particular, John I, had shown a most bitter enmity towards heresy. We have no certain knowledge as to whether the Senate was in sympathy with Theodoric on this occasion, or whether it approved of Justin's measure, but the most probable theory seems to be that the Curia was on Justin's side, and that Theodoric moreover was aware that this was the case. At any rate, when the Senator Albinus was denounced by Cyprian for carrying on intrigues with Byzantium the accusation found ready credence at Court. The Anonymus declares, besides, that the king was angry with the Romans; and it is difficult to see why he should have been thus angry unless the Romans had been approving of Justin's religious decrees. On the other hand, if any plot had existed in the real sense of the term, it is not probable that such a man as Boethius, the master of the offices, that is to say one of the chief officers of the Crown, would have endeavoured to shield Albinus by saying, "Cyprian's accusation is false, but if Albinus has written to Constantinople he has done so with my consent and that of the whole Senate." He might perhaps have spoken in such a manner for the purpose of expressing his own and his colleagues' approval of a religious decree promulgated by a sovereign to whom they owed allegiance. Boethius indeed had himself just published a work against Arianism, entitled *De Trinitate*, but it does not seem likely that he would have talked in this fashion had a conspiracy really been brewing. In any case, he was at once thrown into prison; and is said to have composed his work *De Consolatione* while in captivity. In the end, after a brief trial, he was put to death with every refinement of cruelty, while not long afterwards his father-in-law, Symmachus, met with a similar fate.

Theodoric, indeed, understood very well that his whole life-work was likely to be compromised by this readiness on the part of his subjects to accept Justin's edict. For what would become of his authority if it became the fashion to criticize him on account of his faith? It was in the hope of finding some remedy for this situation that he summoned Pope John to Ravenna, and from thence dispatched him, accompanied by five bishops and four senators, on an embassy to Constantinople. The king charged this mission, among other things, with the task of requiring the Emperor to reinstate the outcast Arians within the pale of the Church. But the Emperor, though willing enough to make concessions on any other subject, would concede nothing to the Arians, and the mission was forced to leave Constantinople without obtaining any redress on this point. As for Pope John, he died almost immediately after his return to Italy, and as his biographers tell us that he worked numerous miracles after his death, we may conclude that this sectarian quarrel must have been very



acute. The failure of this embassy made Theodoric so furious that he allowed an edict to be published during the consulship of Olybrius by Symmachus, the chief official in the Scholae, which stated that all Catholics were to be ejected from their churches, on the seventh day of the Kalends of September. But on the very day fixed upon by his minister for the execution of this act of banishment, the king died, apparently from an attack of dysentery, in the year 526.

The Byzantine historian Procopius—though he was himself an opponent of the king’s—has summed up Theodoric and his work in the following verdict, which remains true in spite of the errors committed by him during the latter years of his reign. “His manner of ruling over his subjects was worthy of a great Emperor; for he maintained justice, made good laws, protected his country from invasion, and gave proof of extraordinary prudence and valour.”

Theodoric’s work was not destined to survive his death. He left a daughter, Amalasantha, the widow of Eutharic, who was not unlike him; and who now became guardian to her son Athalaric, to whom his grandfather had bequeathed the crown on his death-bed. She had been educated entirely on Roman lines, and understood the value of her father’s work; but she had to reckon with the Goths. During Theodoric’s lifetime this people had done nothing to excite attention, and had lived side by side with the Romans without showing any desire to obtain the upper hand; but under the regency of a woman we find that they soon aspired to play a more important part. Their first step was to take Athalaric from the guardianship of his mother. He died, however, in 534. Amalasantha was now confronted once again with her former difficulties; and in the hope of overcoming them, she attempted to share the crown with Theodoric’s nephew Theodahad, a man of weak and evil character. The new king’s first care was to get rid of Amalasantha, and he had her shut up on an island, in the lake of Bolsena. From her prison, she appealed to Justinian for assistance.

When this came to Theodahad’s ears, he had her strangled. But her cry for help had not been unheeded. By the death of Anastasius the situation at Constantinople had been completely changed; it was no longer the imperial policy to allow Italy to be governed by a vassal, more especially if that vassal were an Arian; and political and religious motives alike urged Justinian to intervene. A struggle began accordingly which was to last from 536 to 553, which was to devastate Italy with fire and bloodshed, and which ultimately opened the door for a new invasion by the Lombards.

## CHAPTER XVI

### THE EASTERN PROVINCES FROM ARCADIUS TO ANASTASIUS

BY the death of Theodosius the Eastern throne passed to his incapable elder son, Arcadius, then 17 years old, while the practical administration was in the hands of the *praetorian praefect*, Rufinus of Aquitaine, a man of vigour and ability who in the pursuit of ambition and avarice was not limited by scruples. Under these circumstances a conflict was likely to arise between Rufinus and Stilicho, who was the guardian of the Western Emperor Honorius, and husband of Theodosius' niece, who also asserted that Theodosius had on his death-bed committed both his sons to his care. Rufinus proposed to counterbalance the advantage which his rival possessed in his connection with the imperial family by marrying Arcadius to his own daughter; but, unfortunately for him, he had a rival at Court in the eunuch Eutropius, a former slave who had risen to the position of *praepositus sacri cubiculi*; who now profited by the praefect's absence to thwart his scheme. Lucian, whom Rufinus had made count of the East, had refused a request of Eucherius, the Emperor's great-uncle; and, upon Arcadius complaining of this, the praefect, to show his own loyalty, made a hasty journey to Antioch and put Lucian to a cruel death. Meanwhile Eutropius induced Arcadius to betroth himself to Eudoxia, daughter of Bauto the Frank, who had been brought up by a son of Promotus, an enemy of Rufinus; who thus had the mortification of seeing his master united not to his own daughter but to one who from her upbringing would be bitterly opposed to him (27 Apr. 395).

The inferiority of Rufinus was increased by the fact that the best of the Eastern troops had accompanied Theodosius to the West, and of these only some of the less efficient had been sent back. The Visigothic *foederati* had however returned to Moesia; and their leader Alaric, who was now proclaimed king, was quick to profit by the weakness of the government. Professing indignation at not being appointed *magister militum*, he invaded Thrace and advanced to Constantinople, while Rufinus, having also to meet an incursion of Caucasian Huns into Asia Minor and Syria (July), where Antioch was threatened and Old Tyre abandoned by its citizens, had no forces to oppose to him. He therefore went to the Gothic camp, and, after some negotiations, Alaric withdrew to Macedonia, and after a check from local forces at the Peneus passed into Thessaly. Stilicho, who, besides desiring to overthrow Rufinus, wished to reunite eastern Illyricum to the Western power, treated this as a pretext for interference; and, starting in early spring, he marched with considerable forces to Thessaly, and met the Goths in a wide plain. Probably, however, he did not wish to crush them; and, after some months had been spent in skirmishes or negotiations, Rufinus, who feared Stilicho more than Alaric, sent him in the Emperor's name an order to evacuate the dominions of Arcadius and send back the Eastern troops. To break openly with the East at this time did not suit Stilicho's purpose; and, as the Eastern forces, which comprised a large Gothic contingent, were devoted to him, he could attain his primary object in another way. He therefore returned at once, while the Eastern army under Gainas the Goth marched to Constantinople. In accordance with custom the Emperor, accompanied by Rufinus, came out to meet the troops, and the soldiers, at a signal from Gainas, fell upon the praefect and cut him in pieces (27 Nov.).

The Emperor's chief adviser was now Eutropius, who appropriated a large part of Rufinus' property and procured the banishment of the two most distinguished generals in the East, Abundantius and Timasius (396), while he entrusted positions of power to such obscure

men as Hosius the cook and Leo the wool-comber. He also gained much obloquy by selling offices, though as the prices were fixed and there was no system of public loans, this was only a convenient method of raising money. As a eunuch, he could not hold any state office; but for this he partly compensated by transferring some of the powers of the *praefect* to the master of the offices and by interfering in matters altogether outside the functions of a chamberlain. Thus he is said to have acted as a judge, probably on a special commission, and to have gone on embassies to the Goths and Huns, from which he returned with military pomp. Finally he was made a patrician and assumed the consulship (399), though his name was not admitted to the Western *Fasti*. At first he was necessarily on good terms with the army, and therefore with Stilicho; but he was no more inclined than Rufinus had been to allow the Western regent to direct Eastern affairs, and the previous position therefore soon recurred.

After Stilicho's retreat Greece lay at Alaric's mercy, for, perhaps because the army was too much under Stilicho's influence, no force was sent against him, and through the unguarded Thermopylae he marched plundering into Boeotia. Thebes indeed was too strong to take, and Athens he entered only under a capitulation. Megara however was taken, and, the Isthmus being left undefended, Corinth, Argos, and Sparta also. During 396 Peloponnesus lay under his heel; but early in 397 Stilicho, secure in the support of the Eastern army, thought that the time had come for another campaign. This time he came by sea to Corinth, and, marching westwards, blockaded the Goths at Pholoe in Elis. But Eutropius opened negotiations with Gildo, count of Africa, whose loyalty had long been doubtful, to induce him to transfer his allegiance to Arcadius; and, the threatening state of affairs making it necessary for Stilicho to return, he allowed Alaric to withdraw to Epirus, probably on the understanding that he would keep the Eastern Court occupied. Eutropius however preferred to satisfy him by the post of *magister militum* in Illyricum, and on these terms peace was concluded. Such being the relations between the two Courts, it is not surprising to find that some of the eunuch's enemies conspired with the Gothic soldiers, the allies of Stilicho, against his life, and that, with the fate of Rufinus before him, he tried to prevent such plots by a law of extraordinary severity (4 Sept.). Perhaps for the same reason that no army was sent against Alaric no support was given to Gildo; but his revolt occupied Stilicho's attention during most of 398. The pacification of Africa was however soon followed by Eutropius' fall.

Gainas, now *magister militum*, had been strengthening his own position by filling the army with Goths from Moesia; and in spring 399 an opportunity for action presented itself. Tribigild, commander of the Gothic colonists in Phrygia, having been refused a donative by Eutropius, revolted and ravaged the country, upon which Eutropius offered the money; but Tribigild raised his demands and insisted upon the eunuch's deposition. Gainas, with Leo, the satellite of Eutropius, was sent against him; but, while Leo advanced toward the disturbed district, Gainas remained at the Hellespont. Tribigild on hearing of Leo's approach marched through Pisidia into Pamphylia, where a large part of his army was cut to pieces by a rustic force under Valentinus, a citizen of Selga, and the rest blockaded between the Eurymedon and the Melas. Leo moved to the support of the local force: but, as he was too indolent and dissolute to maintain discipline, Tribigild was able by an unexpected attack to make his way through, while the disorderly force scattered in all directions, Leo himself perishing in the flight. Tribigild then returned to Phrygia, which he again plundered. Nor was he the only enemy with whom the Empire had to contend; for, besides the constant incursions of the desert tribes into Egypt and Libya, the Huns were ravaging Thrace, and Vram Shapuh of Armenia was, at the instigation of the Persian king, attempting to annex the five satrapies north of the Tigris.

Accordingly Gainas with much show of reason represented to Arcadius that his best course was to grant Tribigild's demand; and, as Eudoxia urged the same, his consent was

easily obtained. Eutropius was deposed from his office, and, though he had abolished by legal enactment the right of sanctuary possessed by the churches, fled to the altar of St Sophia, where the bishop, John Chrysostom, who owed his appointment to the eunuch, made use of his presence to preach on the vanity of earthly things, but resisted all attempts to remove him. Finally he left the church on a promise that his life should be spared, but was deprived of property and honours, and banished to Cyprus (July or Aug.). As however Gainas insisted upon the necessity of his death, he was, on the pretext that the promise applied only to Constantinople, brought back to Chalcedon, tried on a charge of using imperial ornaments, and beheaded.

The fall of Eutropius had been effected by a combination between Eudoxia and Gainas; and during the absence of the Goth, who had returned to Phrygia, the Empress secured the appointment of Aurelianus to the *praefecture* in preference to his brother Caesarius, who was supported by Gainas. After Eutropius' death she further had herself proclaimed Augusta (9 Jan. 400); and by an innovation which called forth a protest from Honorius her busts were sent round the provinces like those of emperors. But Gainas had not designed to set Eudoxia in the place of Eutropius; accordingly he sent Tribigild, with whom he had joined forces, to Lampsacus, while he himself returned to Chalcedon, and demanded the surrender of three of the principal supporters of the empress, Aurelianus the praefect, Saturninus an ex-consul, and Count John, her chief favourite. Resistance was useless; and Aurelianus and Saturninus crossed to Chalcedon, while John hid himself, probably in a church; but his hiding-place was discovered, and the bishop's enemies afterwards asserted that he had betrayed him. The three men were ordered to prepare for death; but, when the executioner's sword was at their necks, Gainas stayed his hand and had them conveyed by sea towards the Adriatic, perhaps intending to place them in the hands of Stilicho or Alaric. He next demanded a meeting with the Emperor; which took place at Chalcedon, where they gave mutual oaths of good faith in the church of St Euphemia. Both the Gothic leaders then crossed to Europe. Caesarius was made praefect, and in consequence of the recent troubles was compelled to increase the taxation; but in systematizing the sale of offices by limiting the tenure of each he seems to have performed an act of advantage to the State and justice to the purchasers. Meanwhile Gainas was so distributing the Roman troops in the city as to place them at the mercy of the Goths; and then, thinking his will law, he asked that a church within the walls should be given to the Arians. This time however the strong orthodoxy of Arcadius and the influence of the bishop caused the demand to be refused. The violent hostility aroused by these events made men believe that the Goths intended to attack the palace; while they on their side were seized with a panic which led them to expect an attack from forces which did not exist. Accordingly Gainas, alleging ill-health, retired to the suburban church of St John, instructing his men to come out singly and join him. After the greater part had left the city, a trivial occurrence brought on a scuffle between the Goths and the citizens, who attacked the already panic-stricken barbarians with any weapons they could find, and at last the gates were shut, and the Goths, enclosed within the city, without cohesion and without leaders, offered little resistance and were mercilessly massacred, while Arcadius found courage to declare Gainas a public enemy and send his guards to support the populace. Next day the survivors, who had fled to a church that the bishop had given to the orthodox Goths, were surrounded by the soldiers; and, though none dared to attack them in the church, the roof was stripped off and burning wood thrown in until all perished, in spite of the appeals of Caesarius for a capitulation (12 July).

The Roman troops were now collected and placed under Fravitta, a loyal pagan Goth who had distinguished himself in the time of Theodosius. The attempts of Gainas on the Thracian cities failed, Tribigild was killed, and lack of provisions compelled the Goths to withdraw to the Chersonese in order to cross to Asia; but Fravitta had already placed a fleet on the Hellespont to intercept them. They were however forced to attempt the passage in rafts,



and, these being sunk, most of them were drowned, while Gainas with the survivors retreated across the Danube, where he was attacked and killed by Uldin the Hun (23 Dec.), who sent his head to Constantinople, where it was carried through the city (3 Jan. 401). Shortly before the victory Aurelianus and the other hostages escaped from their guards in Epirus, and returned to the capital; and early in 401 Caesarius was deposed and imprisoned, and Aurelianus restored. Some deserters and fugitive slaves, who continued to ravage Thrace, were put down by Fravitta. But he was accused of not pressing his advantage against the Goths, and, though acquitted, incurred Eudoxia's enmity, and afterwards fell a victim to the machinations of her satellites.

Stilicho's hopes of directing Eastern affairs through the army were thus destroyed; and soon afterwards the government was delivered from Alaric, who, having exhausted eastern Illyricum, invaded Italy, and after an indecisive battle at Pollentia (402) was established in western Illyricum as *magister militum*, probably on the understanding that he would help Stilicho to annex eastern Illyricum when opportunity arose. In other directions things went less fortunately. By the annihilation of the Goths the East was left almost without an army; and the Isaurian robbers terrorized eastern Asia Minor and Syria, where they took Seleucia (Feb. 403), and even crossed to Cyprus. Arbazacius the Armenian indeed gained some successes; but he was suspected of corruption and recalled, though by the influence of the empress he escaped punishment (404).

The chief power in the State was now Eudoxia; but there was one man who dared to oppose her, John Chrysostom. As early as 401 he offended her by complaining of some act of oppression; and not only was he constantly preaching against the prevailing luxury and dissipation among the ladies of fashion of whom she was leader, but he used the names Herodias and Jezebel, and in one of his sermons employed the word "*adoxia*", with an application that could not be mistaken. His popularity was so great that she would hardly have attacked him on this ground alone; but, with the help of the ecclesiastical jealousy of the bishop of Alexandria and the discontent which his high-handed proceedings in the cause of discipline aroused among some of the clergy, she procured his deposition (c. July 403). Popular clamour however and a building collapse in the imperial chamber frightened her into recalling him after a few days and excusing herself by throwing the blame upon others. This reconciliation did not last long. Two months later a statue of Eudoxia was erected on a spot adjoining the church of St Irene during divine service, and John, regarding the festivities as an insult to the church, preached a violent sermon against those responsible for them, which the empress took as an attack upon herself. The bishops were therefore again assembled; but the proceedings were protracted, and Arcadius, who in religious matters had something like a will of his own, was hard to move. On 20 June 404 however the bishop was finally expelled. That night some of his fanatical partisans set fire to St Sophia, which was destroyed with the adjoining Senate-house: in which many ancient works of art perished.

Less than four months afterwards Eudoxia died from a miscarriage (6 Oct.); and the period of active misrule from which the East had suffered since 395 came to an end. The praefecture was now entrusted to the capable hands of Anthemius: but the government had still no force to repress the incursions of the Libyan tribes or the Isaurian brigands, whose raids continued to the end of the reign. The relations with the West had been further embittered by the affair of John Chrysostom; and, while Stilicho lived, a good understanding was impossible. After delays not easy to explain Stilicho prepared to carry out his compact with Alaric, and, as an earnest of his intention, closed the ports against Eastern ships, while Alaric invaded Epirus. But, hearing that the usurper Constantine had crossed to Gaul, Stilicho again postponed his Eastern expedition, and Alaric in anger evacuated the dominions of Arcadius and threatened Italy. At this juncture Arcadius died (1 May 408), leaving a son, Theodosius, aged seven, who since 10 Jan. 402 had been his father's colleague, and three

(perhaps four) daughters; and Stilicho, thinking the time come to carry out his old project of bringing the East under his rule, proposed to send Alaric to Gaul and go himself to Constantinople as the representative of Honorius; but a hostile party secured the Emperor's ear, and he was put to death (Aug. 408). The ports were then opened and amity restored.

The care of the Emperor's person was in the hands of Antiochus, a eunuch with Persian connections; but the direction of affairs fell to Anthemius, whose chief adviser was the sophist Troilus; and the period of his administration was one of the most fortunate in the history of the East. The danger from the West had been removed by Stilicho's fall; and on the eastern side the best relations were maintained with Yezdegerd the Persian king, with whom a commercial treaty was made. The military power of the Empire had suffered too much to be quickly restored; but we hear no more of Isaurian raids, and it was found possible to send a small force to support Honorius against Alaric. It was only however by a combination with subject tribes that the Huns were driven across the Danube, while their tributaries the Sciri were captured in vast numbers, and enslaved or settled as *coloni* in Asia Minor (409). To prevent such incursions the fleet on the Danube was strengthened (412). Other salutary measures were the relief given to the taxpayers of Illyricum and the East (413-14), the restoration of the fortifications of the Illyrian cities (412), and the re-organization of the corn supply of Constantinople (409). But the work for which the name of Anthemius was most remembered is the wall built from the Propontis to the Golden Horn to enclose the portion of the city that had grown up outside the wall of Constantine, a wall which substantially exists to this day (413).

In 414 the administration of Anthemius came to an end, probably by death; and on 4 July Pulcheria, the daughter of Arcadius, was proclaimed Augusta, a title that had not been granted to an emperor's sister since Trajan's time; and henceforth, though only two years older than Theodosius, she exercised the functions of regent, and her bust was placed in the Senate-house with those of the emperors (30 Dec.). At the same time Antiochus was removed from the palace.

The Court of Pulcheria was a strange contrast to her mother's. For political rather than religious reasons she took a vow of perpetual virginity and induced her sisters to do the same, and the princesses spent their time in spinning and devout exercises. She herself was a ready speaker and writer in Greek and Latin; and she had her brother trained in rhetoric, as well as horsemanship and the use of arms, in ceremony and deportment, and the observances of religion. Hence he grew up a strict observer of ecclesiastical rules, a fair scholar with a special interest in natural science and medicine, a keen huntsman, an excellent penman, exemplary in private life, mild and good-tempered; but, as everything likely to make him a capable ruler was excluded from his education, the Emperor remained all his life a puppet in the hands of his sister, his wife, and his eunuchs.

The transference of the regency to a girl of 15 could not be effected without a change in the methods of administration; and it is therefore not surprising to find the government accused of fiscal oppression, while the sale of offices, which was restricted under Anthemius, became again a matter of public notoriety. In Alexandria, which, being almost equally divided between Christians, Jews, and heathens, was always turbulent, the change gave occasion for a serious outbreak. After prolonged rioting between Jews and Christians the bishop Cyril instigated his followers to expel the Jews. This the praefect Orestes reported to the Emperor, while Cyril sent his own account; and, Orestes refusing to yield, some fanatical monks attacked and stoned him. The chief perpetrator was tortured to death, whereupon Cyril treated him as a martyr, and both parties appealed to Constantinople. It now came to be believed among Cyril's partisans that Orestes was acting under the influence of the celebrated mathematician and philosopher, Hypatia, who was in constant communication with him: accordingly a party of *parabolani* (sick-attendants) pulled her from her chariot, dragged her

into the church called *Caesarium*, and beat or scraped her to death with tiles (Mar. 415). At first the government acted with some vigour. No personal punishment was inflicted, but the *parabolani* were limited to 500, and the selection made subject to the approbation of the *Augustal* and *praetorian praefects*, while they were forbidden to appear in the council-house or law-courts or at public spectacles (29 Sept. 416). It was not long however before the influence or bribes of Cyril procured the restoration of the freedom of selection (3 Feb. 418). The increase of anti-pagan feeling was also shown by a law excluding pagans from high administrative office and from the army (7 Dec. 416). Other disturbances were the rebellion of Count Plintha in Palestine (418), an attack on the city praefect Aetius (23 Feb. 419), and a mutiny in the East (420). In Armenia, Yezdegerd having appointed his brother as king, the Roman portion of the country was definitely annexed and placed under a count (415-16).

It was now time for Theodosius to marry; and it was Pulcheria's object to prevent the choice of a wife with powerful connections, who would be likely to endanger her ascendancy. She had by some means made the acquaintance of Athenais, daughter of the Athenian sophist Leontius, a woman of high education and literary ability, who had come to Constantinople through a dispute with her brothers about their father's property. As a friendless girl dependent on herself, yet fitted by education for the part of an empress, she seemed exactly suited for the purpose. The Augusta therefore introduced her to Theodosius, who declared himself willing to make her his wife; Athenais made no objection to accepting Christianity, and was baptized under the name of Eudocia, Pulcheria standing sponsor; and on 7 June 421 the marriage was celebrated. The new empress bore no malice against her brothers, but summoned them to Court, where one became *praefect* of Illyricum and the other master of the offices; in this however she perhaps showed worldly wisdom rather than Christian charity. After the birth of a daughter she received the title of Augusta (2 Jan. 423).

About the time of the marriage the peace with Persia was broken. Yezdegerd had always shown himself friendly to the Christians; but at the end of his reign the fanatical act of a bishop drove him to severe measures. Some Christians fled to Roman territory, and when their surrender was refused, the position became so critical that permission was given to the inhabitants of the exposed provinces to fortify their own lands (5 May 420). After Yezdegerd's violent death (late in 420) a more extended persecution was begun by Warahran V; and the Court of Constantinople began the war by sending the Alan Ardaburius through Roman Armenia into Arzanene, where he defeated the Persian Narsai (Aug. or Sept 421), who retreated to Nisibis. Ardaburius with numerous prisoners advanced to Amida to prevent an invasion of Mesopotamia; and here, as the prisoners were starving, Bishop Acacius melted the church plate, ransomed them with the price, gave them provisions, and sent them home. Ardaburius then besieged Nisibis, and Warahran prepared to march to its relief, while he sent Al Mundhir, sheikh of Al Hira, to invade Syria. Many of the Arabs were however drowned in the Euphrates, and the rest defeated by the general Vitianus. On the king's approach Ardaburius burnt his engines and retreated, and the Persians, crossing the frontier, vainly attacked Rhesaina for over a month; but, though the Romans gained some successes, no decisive victory was obtained, and Theodosius thought it best to propose terms. Warahran was also inclined for peace; but, wishing to gain a success first, he ordered an attack upon a Roman force, while he kept the ambassador with him. The Romans were surprised; but during the battle another division under Procopius, the son-in-law of Anthemius, unexpectedly appeared, and the Persians, taken on both sides, were defeated. Warahran then took up the negotiations in earnest; and, on his undertaking to stop the persecution and each party binding itself not to receive the Arab subjects of the other, peace was made for 100 years (422). This victory was celebrated by Eudocia in an epic poem. It was probably a result of the transference of troops from Europe to meet the Persians that the Huns this year invaded Thrace, though in consequence of the prudent measures of Anthemius the Danubian frontier

was rarely violated before 441. The provinces had however not recovered from the calamities of Arcadius' time, and constant remissions of taxation were necessary.

The relations with the West were again disturbed through the refusal of Theodosius to recognize the elevation of Constantius (421); and when, after the death of Honorius (Aug. 423) the obscure John was proclaimed emperor in prejudice of the claims of the young Valentinian the son of Placidia, there was an open breach. When John's envoys arrived to ask for recognition, Theodosius threw them into prison. Placidia now received anew the title of Augusta (424), which Theodosius had before ignored, Valentinian was declared Caesar at Thessalonica, mother and son were sent to Italy with a large army under Ardaburius, his son Aspar, and Candidianus; and, John having been overthrown, Valentinian was invested with the empire (Oct. 425). The concord between the two divisions of the Empire was confirmed by the betrothal of Valentinian to Theodosius' daughter Eudoxia, and the victory celebrated by the building of the Golden Gate, through which the emperors made their formal entries into Constantinople. In 431, when Placidia needed assistance against the Vandals, an army under Aspar was sent to Africa; but Aspar returned three years later without success, probably after an understanding which made him ever after a friend of the Vandals.

In 427 some Ostrogoths who had seceded from the Huns were settled in Thrace, and other tribes were received in 433; while a raid was made by the Huns, and a more serious attack only prevented by abject submission to their demands (434). At sea a pirate fleet entered the Propontis, but in 438 the pirate Contradis was captured. At home stones were thrown at Theodosius in a riot after a famine in 431, and there were bitter complaints of the extortion of the eunuchs.

Two matters of internal administration deserve special mention—the codification of the law (438), and the foundation of a university at Constantinople as a counterpoise to the schools of Athens (27 Feb. 425). In this university there were 28 professors of Greek and Latin grammar and rhetoric, and two of law, but only one of philosophy, and all other public teaching in the city was forbidden.

Eudocia was at first of necessity subservient to her sister-in-law; but that she would always accept this position was not to be expected. A difference appeared at the time of the synod of Ephesus (431), when Pulcheria was victorious; but afterwards her influence declined, and at last a palace intrigue drove her to retire from court. Under Eudocia's patronage a large share in the administration fell to Cyrus, an Egyptian poet and philosopher, who became city-praefect in 435, and in 439 combined this office with the praetorian praefecture. Cyrus was the first praefect who published decrees in Greek, and he also distinguished himself by renovating the buildings of the city, especially by an extension of the sea-wall to join the wall of Anthemius, which the capture of Carthage by the Vandals had made desirable (439). Antiochus, the emperor's old guardian, was restored to favour and made *praepositus*.

The capture of Carthage caused the dispatch of a fleet to Sicily in 441: but in consequence of an irruption of Huns into Illyricum the force was recalled in 442 and peace made; but not before the expedition had led to a war with Persia. Under the capable direction of Anatolius, the *magister militum per Orientem*, the defence of the eastern frontier had been strengthened by stricter rules of discipline in the army (25 Feb. 438) and by the building of the fortress of Theodosiopolis in Armenia. This last the new king, Yezdegerd II, probably considered a menace; and he therefore took advantage of the troubles in the West to begin war, crossing the frontier from Nisibis and sacking several towns, while another force raided Roman Armenia (441). He was however hampered by bad weather and threatened by the Ephthalites beyond the Caspian; hence, though the Romans had no army to oppose to him, Anatolius and Aspar by a large sum of money and a promise to surrender some Christian refugees persuaded him to make a truce for a year. As the troubles with the Ephthalites



continued, this was followed by a definite peace on the terms that neither party should build a fort within a certain distance of the frontier, and the Romans should renew an undertaking made by Jovian to contribute to the defences of the Caucasian Gates. One of the last acts of Cyrus was to provide that the Armenian frontier lands should be held on condition of supplying horses, wagons, and pikemen for the army (26 June 441).

After her daughter's marriage (21 Oct. 437), for which Valentinian came to Constantinople, Eudocia went on pilgrimage to Jerusalem (438), and on the way gained much popularity at Antioch by a speech in which she boasted of her Greek blood. She returned in 439; and meanwhile some hostile influence seems to have been at work, for in 440 Paulinus, ex-master of the offices, was beheaded at Caesarea in Cappadocia on suspicion, as was popularly believed, of an intrigue with her, and soon afterwards she asked leave to retire to Jerusalem, and left Constantinople for ever (441?). With her fell Cyrus, who through the popular acclamation, "Constantine founded, Cyrus restored", had incurred the Emperor's jealousy. Being charged with paganism, he took orders to save his head, and was made bishop of Cotyaeum, where four bishops were said to have been murdered. By his discreet conduct he succeeded in retaining his see till the time of Leo, when on some unknown charge he was deprived and came back to Constantinople, where he remained in possession of large property. Antiochus was also deposed and compelled to take orders. Pulcheria returned to Court; but the chief influence was for the rest of the reign exercised by the eunuch Chrysaphius. Eudocia was not left in peace at Jerusalem; but Saturninus, count of the *domestici*, was sent to spy upon her, and for some reason beheaded two clergymen who attended upon her (444). She in revenge assassinated Saturninus and was deprived of her imperial train, though she still disposed of ample revenues, which she spent on the erection of churches and monasteries. She composed several poems, of which large portions are extant, and died in 460 (20 Oct.).

The good administration introduced by Anthemius had been in some measure maintained under the ascendancy of Pulcheria and Eudocia; but under Chrysaphius the days of Arcadius seemed to have returned. The Huns overran Thrace and Illyricum, and the murder of the *magister militum* of Thrace, John the Vandal (apparently by order of Chrysaphius), did not strengthen the resistance. The Romans suffered a severe defeat (447), and Chrysaphius could only grant Attila's terms and send emissaries to assassinate him. In 447 the walls of Constantinople were shattered by an earthquake, and in consequence of the terror caused by the Huns the praefect Constantine rebuilt them in 60 days, and the Isaurians, who had renewed their raids in 441, were called in under their leader Zeno to defend the city. Zeno afterwards extorted the office of *magister per Orientem*, and demanded the surrender of Chrysaphius; and, though this was not granted, the danger from the Huns prevented an intended campaign against the marauders. Bands of Tzani, Saracens, and Caucasian Huns had invaded the Empire during the Persian war, and we hear of Saracen raids again several years later (448), while Yezdegerd showed signs of a desire to renew hostilities. Libya too was again harassed by the frontier tribes, and the Vandals terrorized the Ionian sea.

On 26 July 450 Theodosius broke his spine by a fall from his horse while hunting, and died two days later. The appointment of a successor was left to the Augusta Pulcheria; and her choice fell upon Marcian, a veteran soldier from Thrace of high character who had held the post of *domesticus* (chief of the staff) to Aspar, to whose influence the selection must be ascribed. Pulcheria crowned Marcian in the presence of the Senate (24 Aug.), and gave him her hand in nominal marriage.

The first act of the new rulers was to put Chrysaphius to death. The sale of offices was prohibited, though it is unlikely that the prohibition was strictly carried out; and attempts were made to lighten the burden of taxation by a remission of arrears, by reducing the number of praetors to three and relieving non-resident senators from the burden of the office (18 Dec.

450), and by enacting that the consuls instead of squandering money on the populace should make a contribution towards the repair of the aqueducts (452), an obligation which was extended to honorary consuls by the Emperor Zeno. Marcian also put an end to a system under which the possessors of certain lands which had been sold by the State in the time of Valens escaped their share of taxation. The popularity of his rule is shown by the words "Reign like Marcian", with which the citizens in 491 greeted Anastasius.

In external relations the reign was a fortunate one. As Attila was preparing for his western expedition, his demands for money could safely be refused; and, when after his return he repeated them with threats, death prevented him from carrying these out (453). From Zeno, who was appealing to heathen support, the Emperor was delivered by his death following a fall from his horse. Envoys from the Armenian insurgents had come before Theodosius' death to ask for help; but Marcian refused to break the peace with Persia. With the Vandals also peace was maintained; for, though after the sack of Rome (455) Marcian tried to obtain the release of Eudoxia and her daughters, the possession of these hostages as well as Aspar's influence secured Gaiseric from attack. In Syria the *magister militum*, Aspar's son Ardaburius, was in 452 fighting with Arab raiders near Damascus, after which negotiations were begun, but with what result is not known. At the same time Egypt was suffering from incursions of the Blemmyes, who gave hostages to the imperial envoy Maximin, and made peace for 100 years, but on his sudden death recovered the hostages by force and renewed their raids till put down by Florus, praefect and count of Egypt. A more serious position arose on the Danubian frontier, where after the collapse of the Hun empire (454) some of the Huns and other tribes were settled in the north of Illyricum and Thrace as *foederati*. Of these the most important was a body of Ostrogoths, who under three brothers of the Amal family, Walamir, Theodemir, and Widimir, settled in eastern Pannonia, of which they received a grant from Marcian, who did not recognize Valentinian III's successors: they also received pay as *foederati*.

In 453 Pulcheria died, leaving all her property to the poor, a bequest which Marcian faithfully carried out. By a former wife Marcian had a daughter, whom he had given in marriage to Anthemius, grandson of the praefect Anthemius; but, when he died (27 Jan. 457) at the age of 65, he had taken no steps to secure his son-in-law's succession, and the throne lay at the disposal of Aspar the patrician and *magister militum*, who as an Arian and barbarian could not himself assume the crown, but might reign in the name of some puppet-emperor. He therefore chose Leo, a military tribune from Dacia and his own steward, a man of some capacity but little education; and the choice was ratified by the Senate. As there was no elder emperor or Augusta to perform the coronation, Leo was crowned by the patriarch Anatolius (7 Feb.). This precedent was henceforth followed whenever an emperor was not merely being associated with a senior colleague.

One of the first acts of the new reign was the recognition of Majorian (April), after whose death (461) Leo, though not recognizing Severus, accepted the Western consuls, and, while sending an embassy to Gaiseric to secure the liberation of the widow and daughters of Valentinian, urged him to cease attacking Italy and Sicily. Gaiseric refused to make peace with the West or to release Eudoxia, whom he married to his son, but on receiving a share of Valentinian's property released his widow and her other daughter Placidia, who came to Constantinople. Some years later Eudoxia escaped (471) and ended her days at Jerusalem. Leo also induced Marcellinus, who had set up an independent power in Dalmatia, to keep peace with the Western Emperor; but further embassies to Gaiseric effected nothing.

About this time the migration of the Avars from the east caused a movement among the Hunnic tribes of the Caucasus, in consequence of which the Saragurs asked for Roman protection, and obtained it, though some trouble with the fugitive peoples followed. But when

the Saragurs invaded Persian territory, an embassy arrived from King Piroz to complain of the treatment of Magians in the Empire and the reception of fugitives, and to ask for the stipulated contribution in money or men towards the defence of the Caucasian Gates, and money for the war against the Ephthalites; to which an answer was sent through the ex-praefect Constantine that the complaints were unfounded and the contribution could not be given. Meanwhile Gobazes, king of Lazica (Colchis), had offended the government, and a campaign in his country was undertaken (464), the troops returning to Roman territory for the winter. The coast-road was however so difficult that the Romans were thinking of asking leave to pass through Persian territory; accordingly, on receiving an embassy from Gobazes, Leo granted peace on the nominal condition that he and his son should not reign conjointly; and Gobazes, having failed to obtain help from Piroz on account of the Ephthalite war, consented to retire in his son's favour. A certain Dionysius, who was known to Gobazes from previous negotiations, was at his request sent to Lazica and brought the king back with him to Constantinople (466), where by plausible words and the wearing of Christian emblems he obtained favour, so that his abdication was not insisted on. His submission drew upon him the enmity of Piroz, and a force under Heraclius was sent to his support; but, as the Persians were occupied elsewhere and the maintenance of the troops was expensive, Gobazes sent them back. Leo was meanwhile negotiating with Piroz through Constantine; but Piroz, having overcome the Ephthalites, sent to announce the fact and turned against Gobazes, who had meanwhile taken some forts from his north-eastern neighbors, the Suani, who were in alliance with Persia. Gobazes asked that part of the Armenian frontier force might be sent to his support; but Leo, being occupied with the African expedition, refused assistance (468).

Meanwhile the relations between Leo and Aspar had become strained. A difference between them had arisen in 459, when Leo appointed Vivianus praefect in preference to Aspar's candidate, Tatianus; and again in 460 Leo expelled the patriarch Timothy of Alexandria in spite of Aspar's opposition. Another dispute arose over the affairs of Illyricum. The Pannonian Ostrogoths, whose subsidy had been withheld by Leo, raided Illyricum and took Dyrrachium (459), but were obliged to give Theodemir's son, the boy Theodoric, as a hostage before obtaining the pay which they claimed. They then turned against the neighbouring tribes, and after a time became involved in a war with the Sciri. Both parties appealed to the Emperor for help, and, though Aspar advised neutrality, Leo insisted on supporting the Sciri, who gained a victory, Walamir falling in the battle.

The Emperor was alarmed by the condition of the West, which after Majorian's death fell under the domination of Ricimer; and he determined, if possible, to save the East from a similar fate: but, as Aspar was surrounded by a large body-guard of Goths and other dependants and the Thracian Goths, whose chief, Theodoric, son of Triarius, was his wife's nephew, were in alliance with him, it was necessary to raise a force from some other quarter to overthrow him. Accordingly Leo turned his eyes towards the Isaurians, who had done so much injury to the Empire in the days of Arcadius and Theodosius, but might now be used to rescue it from more dangerous enemies. His elder daughter, Ariadne, was therefore given in marriage to the Isaurian Tarasicodissa, who in memory of his countryman of the time of Theodosius took the name of Zeno and brought with him an Isaurian body-guard to set against that of Aspar (467?).

Meanwhile disturbances had arisen in Thrace. From about 460 the command there was held by Ardaburius, but it was afterwards transferred to Basiliscus, brother of Leo's wife Verina. In 467 trouble arose with Attila's son Dengizic, and a force of Huns crossed the Danube with a large body of Goths; but the two nations were surrounded by a Roman army, and induced by a trick to fight one another, so that a general slaughter followed, from which only a few escaped.

In 467 Ricimer, requiring the Eastern fleet for protection against the Vandals, asked Leo to nominate an emperor; whereupon he chose Marcian's son-in-law, Anthemius, and, having persuaded Marcellinus to submit to the new emperor, prepared a great expedition by land and sea (468): but the fleet was by the mismanagement of Basiliscus almost annihilated; and Aspar, the Vandals' friend, was believed to have induced him to betray his trust. After his return he took refuge in St Sophia, but at Verina's intercession escaped punishment.

Meanwhile Zeno was sent to Thrace; and the soldiers, instigated, as was supposed, by Aspar, tried to murder him, and he with difficulty escaped to Sardica. The command was then given to Anagast, who soon afterwards rebelled (469). Having been persuaded to submit, he accused Ardaburius of prompting his rebellion. Zeno now strengthened the Isaurians in Constantinople by introducing a band of marauders who had been driven from Rhodes (469), and their arrival was, on account of the unpopularity of the Isaurians, followed by a riot. He was then sent to the East, as *magister militum*, and as such was compelled to remove the Isaurian robber Indacus, son of Papirius, from his hereditary stronghold of Cherris.

The rise of Zeno and the strength of the Isaurians forced Aspar to act vigorously if he was not to be altogether ousted from power; and he pressed Leo to make his second son Patricius Caesar and give him his daughter Leontia in marriage. In spite of the opposition of the monks, who were horrified at the prospect of an Arian emperor, Leo thought it best to comply (470), and the new Caesar for some reason went to Alexandria, where he displayed himself with great pomp. Something more than titles was however needed to make Aspar secure; and Ardaburius tried to cut the ground from under the Emperor's feet by tampering with the Isaurians in Constantinople. This was revealed to Zeno, who had returned to Constantinople in the latter half of 471; and it was resolved to make an end of the supremacy of the Alans. Aspar and his two elder sons were accordingly treacherously cut down in the palace, though Patricius is said to have recovered from his wounds (471): the youngest son, Hermanric, had received warning from Zeno and was not there. Some of Aspar's guards under Ostrui broke into the palace, but were expelled by the *excubitores*, a new force instituted by Leo, perhaps for some such purpose. They succeeded however in escaping, and after doing some damage in Thrace joined Theodoric; but an attack on the city by the Goths was repulsed. Leontia was now given in marriage to Marcian the son of Anthemius.

Before the attack on Aspar, Leo had thought it desirable to gain the support of the Goths of Pannonia, and therefore released Theodoric (the Amal), who returned with great gifts to his father. His first act was to defeat the Sarmatians and recover Singidunum, which however he did not restore to the Emperor. So far from assisting Leo, Theodemir, now released from restraint, thought the disturbances in both divisions of the Empire a good opportunity to acquire new territories. Accordingly he sent Widimir to Italy, while he himself marched southeast and occupied Naissus. Leo thereupon sent Hilarianus, master of the offices, to offer him settlements in Lower Moesia. On these terms peace was made; and soon afterwards Theodemir died and was succeeded by Theodoric (471).

As Theodoric the son of Marius remained in arms, an ambassador was sent to ask his terms (473), and through his envoys whom he sent to Constantinople he demanded Aspar's property, his post of *magister militum*, and a grant of the whole of the province of Thrace. As Leo would only agree to the second of these demands, Theodoric sent a force to Philippi, which however only burned the suburbs, while he himself reduced Arcadiopolis. But, as the Goths were straitened for food, he sent another embassy, and peace was made on the conditions that he was made *magister militum* and paid 2000 lbs. of gold a year, and that Leo recognized him as chief of all the Thracian Goths and did not receive deserters from them, while he undertook to assist the Emperor against all enemies except the Vandals, who had been Aspar's friends.



The reign of Leo was afterwards remembered for the law by which all legal process and all spectacles in the theatre, amphitheatre, and circus were forbidden on Sundays (9 Dec. 469). Similar laws had been passed by Constantine, Theodosius, and Arcadius, but had probably remained little more than dead letters; and it is unlikely that even this law, at least the latter portion, was ever fully carried out. But in spite of the increasing Christian tendency of the government and of laws to the contrary, heathens continued to hold high offices of state and enjoy the favour of the Court. Prominent among these was James the physician, philosopher, and man of letters, son of a Syrian father and Greek mother, whose medical skill made him indispensable. Isocasius also, a Cilician philosopher, was made *quaestor*. Being deprived of his post and arrested under the law which forbade the tenure of office by a heathen, he was at the intercession of James sent for trial before Pusaeus the praefect, who was known to be in sympathy with him, and allowed to escape by submitting to baptism. The philosopher Eulogius also received a pension.

One of Leo's last acts was to surrender the island of Jotaba at the northern end of the Red Sea to the Arab Amrul Kais. This man, coming from Persian territory, had reduced several Arab tribes and occupied the island, driving out the Roman tax-collectors. He then sent the bishop of his tribe to ask for a grant of the island and the chieftainship of the tribes in the province of Palestine III; and, though this was contrary to the treaty of 422, Leo sent for him, treated him with honour, and granted his requests (473). During this year the Emperor was attacked by a serious illness, which made it necessary to settle the succession. Fearing (on account of the unpopularity of the Isaurians) to declare Zeno his successor, he made his grandson, Zeno's son Leo, a boy of five, Caesar, and later crowned him Augustus in the circus (18 Nov.). Less than three months afterwards he died at the age of 63 (3 Feb. 474); and, as it was probably known that the child was unlikely to live, he was directed by Ariadne and Verina to place the crown upon his father's head (9 Feb.). On his death nine months later (10 Nov.) Zeno became sole emperor in the East.

The new government began with a great success, the end of the disastrous Vandal war. One of the last acts in this war was the capture of Nicopolis by the Vandals very soon after Leo's death; and about the same time Zeno sent Severus to treat for peace, who greatly impressed Gaiseric by refusing to accept presents for himself and saying that the most acceptable present would be the release of the captives; whereupon the king gave him all the captives belonging to himself and his sons, and allowed him to ransom as many more as he could. Shortly afterwards a perpetual peace was made (474), which after Gaiseric's death (477) was confirmed by his son. The Vandal danger was at an end.

The peace was the more necessary on account of the disturbances in other quarters. The Arabs were making one of their raids in Syria, the Bulgarians appeared for the first time south of the Danube, and the accession of the Isaurian led to a serious rising of the Thracian Goths, who took prisoner Heraclius, the *magister militum* of Thrace, and held him to ransom. Zeno levied the sum from the general's kinsmen and sent it to the Goths; but after receiving it they killed their captive. Illus, one of the many Isaurians who came to Constantinople after Zeno's accession, a man whose large native following and influence with his countrymen made him a power in the State, was now appointed to the command and succeeded in holding the Goths in check. But the favour with which these Isaurian adventurers were received increased the Emperor's unpopularity; and his son's death was soon followed by a plot. Verina's brother Basiliscus, who was living in retirement at Heraclea, opened negotiations with Illus, and no doubt by large promises induced him to betray his patron; and Verina joined the conspiracy, which the son of Triarius also supported. Verina frightened Zeno into escaping by night with his wife and mother (9 Jan. 475) and fleeing to Isauria; and the conspirators gained possession of the city without fighting. The Empress had been led to believe that she would be allowed to raise Patricius, master of the offices, to the throne, which she intended to share as his wife;

but Basiliscus did not intend to act for anyone but himself, and, having the strongest support, was proclaimed emperor, the proclamation being followed by a massacre of Isaurians. Patricius was put to death; and Verina tried to get up a conspiracy for Zeno's restoration. This being discovered, she fled to St Sophia; but her nephew, Armatus, conveyed her away and kept her in safety till Zeno's return. Meanwhile Illus and his brother Trocundes were sent against Zeno, blockaded him in Sbite, and captured his brother Longinus.

But soon things turned again in his favour. In the first place Basiliscus had offended Theodoric by transferring the post of *magister militum* to his own nephew Armatus, a man of fashion who posed as a soldier and was supported by the favour of the Empress Zenonis; and in the second place he favoured the Monophysites, and, not content with abrogating the theological decree of Chalcedon, was induced by Timothy of Alexandria to abolish the patriarchate of Constantinople created by that synod, thereby making a bitter enemy of the bishop Acacius, a man who cared little about theology, but knew well how to stir up popular fanaticism. So threatening was the aspect of affairs that Basiliscus recalled his decrees: but it was too late; Illus and Trocundes went over to Zeno, and the combined force marched on Constantinople while Trocundes with some Isaurian guards was sent to Antioch. Armatus marched to Nicaea to oppose Zeno's advance; but he had no mind to fight in a losing cause, and on receiving the promise of the office of *magister militum* for life and the rank of Caesar for his son Basiliscus, left the road open; and as Theodoric held aloof, Zeno entered Constantinople without opposition (Aug. 476). Basiliscus and his family fled to St Sophia; but they were handed over to some of his enemies, who took them to Cappadocia and beheaded them all. The promise to Armatus was kept; but, as he was entering the circus, where Zeno and the young Caesar were watching the games, he was assassinated by Onoulf, a man who had received great kindness from him and been raised by his influence to the military command of Illyricum. His son was ordained a reader, and afterwards became bishop of Cyzicus. Theodoric the Amal, who from rivalry with his namesake had supported Zeno, was made *magister militum* and adopted in Teutonic fashion as Zeno's son in arms. It was perhaps these commotions which enabled the Samaritans to set up as emperor the robber Justasa, who took Caesarea, but was defeated and killed by the duke of Palestine.

Leo left the treasury full; and at the beginning of Zeno's reign the burdens were considerably lightened by the praefect Erythrius; but, as the sums wanted for the Isaurian favourites could not be raised without extortion, he resigned, and his successor Sebastian earned a bad reputation by selling offices to the highest bidder. His administration was however distinguished by an act providing that all civil and military governors should remain in their districts for fifty days after the termination of office, in order that anyone with a grievance might prefer an accusation against them (9 Oct. 479).

One of Zeno's first tasks after his return was to decide what policy to follow with regard to the affairs of the West. The concord between the Courts had been broken by the murder of Anthemius (472); but Leo shortly before his death nominated as emperor Nepos, the nephew and successor of Marcellinus, and gave him Verina's niece in marriage. The fiction of the unity of the Empire was however in part abandoned, since Nepos' name does not appear in Eastern laws. After his expulsion (475) and the dethronement of his successor (476) the Roman Senate asked Zeno to grant Odovacar the title of patrician, and Nepos begged for help to recover his throne. Zeno advised Odovacar to apply to Nepos for the title, but styled him *patrician* in a letter, while declining to help Nepos.

The son of Triarius, wishing to obtain pay for his men, sought to make his peace (477): but the Senate, to which Zeno referred the matter, said they could not pay both Theodorics and left it to him to choose between them. Zeno then made a violent speech to the army against the son of Triarius. He did not however immediately break with him, but protracted negotiations. At last, finding that his strength was increasing, while that of his rival was

diminishing, he summoned troops from all quarters and announced the appointment of Illus to the command; which was however, probably because of his growing jealousy of Illus, afterwards transferred to Martinianus. As this change led to disorder among the Isaurian soldiery, Zeno summoned the Amal to his aid, promising that, if he would take the field, Martinianus should meet him at the passes of Mt Haemus and another force at the Hebrus, and on this understanding Theodoric set out; but either from treachery or from lack of discipline no army met him, and his Roman guides led him to a place where he found the heights in front occupied by his rival, who then easily persuaded him to make common cause against the Emperor. Both sent to Constantinople to state their terms, the Amal demanding land and provisions for his men and the emoluments of his office, and the son of Triarius the terms granted by Leo with the arrears of pay and the restoration of any living members of Aspar's family. Zeno promised the former in case of victory a large sum down, a yearly pension, and the hand of Valentinian's granddaughter Juliana, or any other lady whom he might name, and, this offer being refused, announced that he would lead the army himself. But circumstances now caused a change of plan.

The part played by Illus in 475, together with his retention of Longinus as a hostage and his influence with the Isaurian soldiers, made him something of a thorn in Zeno's side, and the jealous ambition of Verina rendered her his deadly enemy. In the summer of 477 Paul, one of the Emperor's slaves, tried to assassinate him and was surrendered for punishment. In 478 another attempt was made by an Alan, who under torture confessed that he had been instigated by Epinicus the praefect, a client of Urbicius the eunuch-chamberlain and favored by Verina. Zeno thereupon surrendered Epinicus also to Illus, who sent him to Isauria, and then, having obtained leave on the ground of the death of a brother, withdrew to his native country. Fearing a rebellion on the part of Illus, Zeno now resolved to secure the support of the son of Triarius and renounced his intention of taking the field; and, as this caused disaffection in the army, he on Martinianus' advice recalled it to winter quarters. Peace was then made. The son of Triarius was to receive food and pay for 13,000 men, the command of two regiments of *scholarii*, the office of *magister militum*, and the property that had been taken from him, while any surviving members of Aspar's family were to retain their property and live in any city that Zeno might choose.

The imperial troops succeeded in expelling the Amal from Thrace; but Macedonia was left to his mercy (479). He sacked Stobi; and on his approaching Thessalonica the citizens, thinking themselves betrayed, transferred the keys from the praefect to the bishop. Heraclea he was at first persuaded by large gifts to spare; but on the refusal of a demand for corn and wine burnt the greater part of it. He was repulsed from Lychnidus, but took Scampia, which was deserted, and occupied Dyrrachium, which a confederate had induced the garrison by a trick to abandon. Meanwhile Zeno had again opened negotiations, and the patrician Adamantius, the son of Vivianus, was sent to treat. At Thessalonica he put down a military tumult directed against the praefect; and at Edessa handed to Sabinianus the Emperor's commission as magister of Illyricum in place of Onouf. From Lychnidus he invited Theodoric either to come to Lychnidus or to send hostages for his own safety if he went to Dyrrachium. As Sabinianus, who accompanied him, refused to secure the return of the hostages by oath, this plan failed; but Adamantius went with a small escort to a wild spot near Dyrrachium and invited Theodoric to meet him. Theodoric came and stood on the opposite bank of a river, and Adamantius offered him a settlement in the district of Pautalia in Dardania, where he would act as a check on his namesake and be between the Thracian and Illyrian armies. Theodoric refused to move before spring, but offered, if supported by a Roman army, to destroy the Thracian Goths on condition that he might then be made magister militum and live in Constantinople, or, if preferred, to go to Dalmatia and restore Nepos. Adamantius however declined to make terms until he left Epirus. Meanwhile Sabinianus,

having received reinforcements, captured 5000 Goths, and Zeno was encouraged to break off negotiations. For the next two years Sabinianus held the Goths in check.

On 25 Sept. 479 the walls of Constantinople were greatly damaged by an earthquake; Zeno in fear of the Goths begged Illus to return, in order that his Isaurians might assist in defending the city; and the Emperor and the chief officials came out beyond Chalcedon to meet him. Having learned from Epinicus that Verina was the author of the plot against his life. Illus refused to enter Constantinople unless she was surrendered; and Zeno, who was clearly in fear of him and was perhaps not sorry to be rid of his mother-in-law, complied. She was conveyed by Illus' brother-in-law, Matronianus, to Tarsus, where she was compelled to become a deaconess, and kept in custody at the Isaurian Dalisandus. Illus was made master of the offices, Epinicus was at his request recalled, and his client, Pamprepius the philosopher, who had been expelled on account of his open paganism and the suspicion of inciting his patron to treason, returned with him and was made quaestor.

The predominance of Illus soon led to a vigorous attempt to throw off the Isaurian rule. On the pretext of Verina's banishment Marcian, the son-in-law of Leo, having secured the adhesion of the son of Triarius and the support of a force of barbarians and a large number of citizens, rose against Zeno and claimed the crown for himself on the ground that Leontia was born in the purple while Ariadne was born before Leo's accession (end of 479). During the day the insurgents, aided by the people, who hurled missiles from the houses at the soldiers, carried all before them; but in the night Illus brought some Isaurians over from Chalcedon, and on the next day the rising was suppressed, though Illus' house was burnt. Marcian, who fled to the church of the Apostles, was compelled to take orders and sent to Caesarea in Cappadocia, while his brothers, Procopius and Romulus, escaped to Theodoric's, camp, and Leontia sought refuge in a convent. Marcian however escaped and with a rustic force attacked Ancyra, but was captured by Trocundes and confined in the castle of Cherris, whither his wife and daughters were now brought to join him. Immediately after the rising Theodoric the son of Triarius appeared before Constantinople under pretence of assisting the Emperor, thinking that, as the towers and battlements had been overthrown by the earthquake, he could easily take it; but, finding the Isaurians manning the wall and ready to burn the city in case of defeat, he accepted Zeno's gifts and promises and withdrew. He refused however to surrender the fugitives, and was thereupon superseded in the office of *magister militum* by Trocundes. He then plundered Thrace, and Zeno could only call in the Bulgarians against him. Having defeated the Bulgarians, Theodoric again appeared before the capital (481); but, finding the gates strongly guarded by Illus and his Isaurians, tried to cross to Bithynia and was defeated at sea. Receiving news of a conspiracy against him, he returned home and put the conspirators to death; after which he marched towards Greece to seek new territory, but on the way was accidentally killed. His son Rekitach, who by killing his uncles became sole ruler of his people, returned to Thrace and continued to ravage the country. In 481 Sabinianus died a violent death, some said by Zeno's contrivance, and Theodoric (the Amal) plundered Macedonia and Thessaly and sacked Larissa (482). John the Scythian and Moschianus were sent against him; but no great success was obtained. In consequence of the threatened revolt of Illus Theodoric was invited to Constantinople, made patrician and *magister militum*, and designated consul, and received territory in Dacia and Lower Moesia (483). His rival Rekitach, who was in the city at the same time, he was allowed to assassinate, and the Thracian Goths ceased to maintain a separate existence.

Ariadne, urged by her mother, pressed Zeno to recall Verina; but he referred her to Titus, who refused compliance. A third attempt upon the life of Illus was then made by a scholarian, who succeeded in cutting off his ear, while he was going to the palace to receive some barbarian envoys at the Emperor's request. The assassin was put to death, and Zeno denied on oath all knowledge of the matter; but Illus, feeling himself unsafe, asked for leave



of absence on the ground of needing change of air. Zeno then made him *magister militum per Orientem* with the right of appointing dukes, and, taking with him Matronianus, Marsus, who had commanded the land force in the expedition against the Vandals, Pamprepius, and other powerful men, and a large military force, he withdrew to Antioch (early in 482), where he set himself to gain popularity by largesses and lavish expenditure on public buildings. The patrician Leontius, who was sent to ask for Verina's release, was induced to remain.

That a civil war was imminent must have been clear to both parties; and after the accommodation with Theodoric Zeno demanded the surrender of Longinus, and on receiving a refusal, sent John the Scythian to supersede Illus, expelled his friends, and confiscated their property, which he gave to the Isaurian cities. Illus now openly revolted, proclaimed Marcian emperor, and sent envoys to Odovacar, who refused assistance, and to the Persians and the satraps of the five provinces annexed in 298, who promised support to any force that appeared in their neighbourhood (484). It is clear that he did not intend to head a mere Isaurian revolt, which could not have any lasting success, but to form a powerful combination against the Emperor; for which purpose he held out hopes to the heathens through Pamprepius, while he was also on friendly terms with the Chalcedonians, who had been offended by the issue of the Henoticon, whereby Zeno soon after his departure tried to placate the Monophysites (482).

At first, to prevent a revolt in Isauria, Zeno sent a small force under Illus' bastard brother, Linges, and the Isaurian Conon, who had exchanged a military life for the bishopric of Apamea; whereupon Illus for some reason dropped Marcian, and brought Verina, who as Augusta might advance some claim to appoint an emperor, to Tarsus, where she formally crowned Leontius (19 July), who eight days later entered Antioch. The inhabitants of Chalcis refused to accept the new Emperor's busts, and he attacked the city for 45 days; while at Edessa the citizens shut the gates against Matronianus. About the same time the great victory of the Ephthalites precluded all hope of support from Persia.

Theodoric was now sent with a force of Romans and Goths to join John the Scythian; but Zeno changed his mind and recalled him, though his Goths remained with the army; and in his place Hermanric the son of Aspar, who had once revealed a conspiracy to Zeno and had married a daughter of his illegitimate son, was sent with a contingent of Rugians. When the force which Illus sent against the imperial army was defeated, he hastily summoned Leontius from Antioch (Sept.), and they fled to the stronghold of Cherris, to which Verina had already been sent. His confederates then shut themselves up in different fortresses, and many of his men deserted. Zeno recalled the Goths, who were no longer needed, and made the Isaurian Cottomenes *magister militum* in place of Theodoric, while another Isaurian, Longinus of Cardala, was made master of the offices. Nine days after the beginning of the siege Verina died, and a month later Marsus, and Illus left the defence to the owner of the fortress, Indacus, Trocundes' brother-in-law. Trocundes, who had been sent to collect reinforcements, was captured by John and beheaded, and Zeno's brother Longinus was allowed to escape (485).

Theodoric had perhaps been occupied during 485 by a Bulgarian invasion; but in 486 he raided Thrace, and Odovacar in spite of his previous refusal showed signs of wishing to assist Illus, who now in vain made proposals for peace, while Zeno stirred up the Rugians against Odovacar. In 487 Theodoric advanced close to Constantinople, and an agreement was made under which he set out to wrest Italy from Odovacar, who had defeated the Rugians, and the East was rid of the Goths for ever (488).

All hope for the besieged was now at an end; Pamprepius, who had prophesied success, was put to death, and at last Indacus and others betrayed the fort. Illus' requests with regard to the burial of his daughter, who had died during the siege, and the treatment of his family were granted, and he and Leontius were beheaded, and their heads exposed at Constantinople (488). The traitors were all killed during the assault, perhaps by the besieged. Verina's body was taken to Constantinople and buried with Leo's. Most of the Isaurian fortresses were

dismantled. As the satraps of the five provinces had been in communication with Illus, the hereditary tenure of the four most important satrapies was abolished, though the satraps retained their native forces.

Zeno had by his first wife a son, Zeno; but he had killed himself by his excesses at an early age, and the Emperor wished to leave the crown to his brother Longinus. The infamous character of Longinus and the unpopularity of the Isaurians hindered him from declaring him Caesar; but he appointed him *magister militum*, in the hope that his military authority and the strength of the Isaurians in the army would secure him the succession. On 9 April 491 Zeno died of dysentery at the age of 60.

In accordance with the precedent of 450 the choice of a successor was left to thy Augusta Ariadne; and on the next morning, by the advice of Urbicius, she nominated the *silentiary* Anastasius of Dyrrachium, a man of 61, who had shortly before been one of the three candidates selected for the see of Antioch. He was crowned the next day; and, when he appeared before the people, they greeted him with the acclamation "Reign as you have lived". On 20 May he married Ariadne.

The new Emperor began by the popular measures of remitting arrears of taxation and refusing facilities to informers, and he is credited with abolishing the sale of offices; but his reign was constantly disturbed by serious outbreaks. No immediate opposition was offered to his elevation; but in Isauria a revolt on a small scale broke out, and at Constantinople some unpopular action on the part of Julian the city-praefect led to an uproar; and on an attempt to restore order by force the rioters threw down the pedestals on which stood the busts of the Emperor and Empress in front of the circus, and many were killed by the soldiers. To avoid more bloodshed Anastasius deposed Julian, who had been appointed by Ariadne on the day of Zeno's death, and named his own brother-in-law Secundinus to succeed him. Thinking that peace was impossible while the Isaurians were in the city, he expelled them and deprived them of the pay assigned by Zeno. Longinus the brother of Zeno was compelled to take orders and exiled to the Thebaid, where he died, it is said, of hunger, eight years later, while his wife and daughter retired to Bithynia and lived the rest of their life on charity. The property of the late Emperor, even his imperial robes, was sold by auction, and the castle of Cherris, which had not yet been occupied by the rebels, was dismantled. Longinus of Cardala and a certain Athenodorus, who were among those who had been expelled from the capital, joined the insurgents in Isauria, among whom were now to be found Linginines, count of Isauria, Conon the ex-bishop, and another Athenodorus. Reinforced by discontented Romans and others who served under compulsion, they advanced to Cotyaeum. Here John the Scythian and John the Hunchback, who had succeeded Longinus as *magister militum in praesenti* met and defeated them. Linginines fell in the battle, and the Isaurians fled to their native mountains (end of 492); but the generals waited till spring before crossing the Taurus. In 493 Diogenes, a kinsman of Ariadne, took Claudiopolis, but was besieged in it by the Isaurians, and his men were nearly starved. John the Hunchback however forced the passes, and by a sudden attack, aided by a sortie on the part of Diogenes, routed the enemy, Bishop Conon being mortally wounded. The Isaurians were henceforth confined to their strongholds, and a certain Longinus of Selinus, who resided in the strong coast town of Antioch and had a large fleet, supplied them with provisions by sea.

The Emperor's attention was now distracted by an incursion of barbarians, perhaps Slavs, in Thrace, during which Julian, the *magister militum* of Thrace, was killed. Moreover, as his Monophysite opinions made his rule distasteful to the Chalcedonians, who were strong in Constantinople, there was perhaps communication between them and the insurgents, a charge on which the patriarch Euphemius was deprived in 495. At last in 497 Longinus of Cardala and Athenodorus were taken and beheaded by John the Scythian and their heads sent to Constantinople, while the head of the other Athenodorus, who was captured the same year,

was exhibited at the gates of Tarsus. Longinus of Selinus held out till 498, and was then made prisoner by Priscus, an officer serving under John the Hunchback, exhibited in chains at Constantinople, and tortured to death at Nicaea. Large numbers of Isaurians were settled in Thrace, and the population of Isauria, which had been greatly thinned by the two wars, was thereby yet further reduced, so that the necessity which had made the mountaineers the terror of Asia Minor no longer existed. The Isaurians had done their work of saving the East from the fate of the West; and, though they still provided useful recruits for the army, their day of political power was over. The importance of looking at home for soldiers instead of trusting to the barbarians had been learned and was never forgotten.

Besides the Isaurian war Anastasius had also been troubled by incursions of Blemmyes in Egypt (491); and in 498 bands of Saracens invaded the eastern provinces. The followers of Numan of Al Hira, who owed allegiance to Persia, were after an inroad into Euphratesia defeated by Eugenius, a duke stationed at Melitene, and parties of Taghlibi and Ghassani Arabs under Hugar and Gabala, the latter at least a Roman subject, were routed by Romanus, duke of Palestine, who also recovered Jotaba, which was leased to a company of Roman traders for a yearly tribute. In 502 a more successful raid was made by Hugar's brother, Madi Kharb; but the outbreak of the Persian war made it possible to turn the raids in another direction, and peace was made with the Taghlibi chief, Al Harith, father of Madi Kharb (503). In 502 the Tzani also raided Pontus.

Immediately after the accession of Anastasius, Kawad, who became king of Persia in 488, demanded a contribution towards the defences of the Caucasian Gates. This was refused; but the Armenian rising prevented further action, though Anastasius refused to aid the insurgents. Kawad took advantage of the Isaurian troubles to repeat his demand, but was soon afterwards deposed (496). Having been restored by the king of the Ephthalites under a promise of paying a large sum of money (499), he again applied to Anastasius for help. The Emperor would only agree to lend the money on a written promise of payment; and Kawad, refusing this, entered Roman Armenia (22 Aug. 502) and took and sacked Theodosiopolis, which was surrendered by the treachery of Constantine, the count of Armenia, who went over to the Persian service. Having occupied Martyropolis, he passed on to Amida (5 Oct.), where, though there was no military force in Mesopotamia except the garrison of Constantina, a stubborn defence was made by the citizens. Anastasius sent Rufinus to offer him money to withdraw, but he kept the ambassador in custody. A Persian force, accompanied by Arabs and Ephthalites, was sent to the district of Constantina, and, after a small party had been cut to pieces (19 Nov.), routed Eugenius of Melitene and Olympius, duke of Mesopotamia, while Numan's Arabs plundered the territory of Carrhae (26 Nov.) and advanced to Edessa. Eugenius however retook Theodosiopolis. Meanwhile Kawad, despairing of taking Amida, was willing to retire for a small sum; but the governor and the magistrates refused this and demanded compensation for the crops that had been destroyed. The siege therefore continued, until on a dark night the Persians found access by some aqueducts to a part of the wall which was guarded by some monks who were in a drunken sleep. They thereupon scaled the wall, and after hard fighting made themselves masters of the town (11 Jan. 503), which for three days was given up to massacre. Rufinus was then released, and Kawad at the beginning of spring retreated to the neighbourhood of Singara, leaving 3000 men under Glon in Amida. Further demands for money were rejected by Anastasius (April), who, having immediately after the fall of Amida sent men to defend the fortified places, now despatched a considerable army from Thrace to Mesopotamia under Patricius, *magister militum in praesenti*, Areobindus, *magister militum per Orientem*, great-grandson of Aspar, and his own nephew Hypatius (May), accompanied by Appion the praefect, who took up his quarters at Edessa to look after the commissariat. Patricius and Hypatius laid siege to Amida, while Areobindus encamped near Dara to stop a new invasion, and for some time prevented an advance on the

part of the Persians from Singara, and even drove them in confusion to Nisibis; but, when the enemy, reinforced by Arabs and Ephthalites, prepared to attack him in greater strength under the traitor Constantine (July), he retreated to Harram near Mardin to be near his colleagues: his request for assistance being however disregarded, he was compelled to abandon his camp and flee to Constantina and Edessa. Patricius and Hypatius on hearing of Areobindus' flight raised the siege of Amida and met the Persians under Kawad himself at the neighbouring fort of Apadna (Aug.), but were routed and fled to Samosata. Hypatius was then recalled. Kawad's attempts to take Constantina, Edessa, and Carrhae by assault were unsuccessful, and Patriciolus, who was bringing reinforcements, destroyed a small Persian force at the Euphrates, while the Persian Arabs, having ravaged the country up to the river near Batnae, crossed into Syria. A second attempt upon Edessa fared no better than the first, and Kawad then advanced to the Euphrates.

Anastasius now sent Celer, the master of the offices, with large reinforcements; and, though he had hitherto followed a civil career and was not formally appointed to the chief command, his personal position gave him practical authority over the other generals and replaced division by unity. On his approach Kawad marched down the river to Callinicus, where a detachment was cut to pieces by Timostratus, duke of Osrhoene. Hearing of an invasion of Caucasian Huns, Kawad then returned home, upon which Patricius, who was wintering at Melitene, returned to Amida and routed a force sent against him by Kawad. Celer, and afterwards Areobindus, then joined Patricius before Amida, where Glon had been captured by a stratagem and put to death. Seeing how things were going, Constantine returned to his allegiance (June 504) and was allowed to take orders and live at Nicaea. Adid the Arab and Mushel the Armenian also went over to the Romans. The whole army was now no longer needed at Amida; accordingly Areobindus raided Persian Armenia, while Celer crossed into Arzanene, where he cut some cavalry to pieces, and burnt the villages, killing the men and taking the women and children prisoners. Similar raids were made by the Roman Arabs. Kawad then sent his *spahpat* (commander-in-chief) to Celer to propose peace, returning the most important prisoners. Celer at first refused terms in the hope of taking Amida, and an attempt to revictual it failed; but during the winter, which was a severe one, there were many desertions in the army, and he agreed to pay a sum of money for the surrender of the town, a definite peace being postponed till the Emperor's pleasure should be known. Hostilities were however considered to be ended, and some Arab sheikhs on the Persian side who had raided Roman territory were put to death by the Persian *marzban*, and some sheikhs of the Roman Arabs who had raided Persian territory were treated in the same way by Celer, who after a visit to Constantinople had returned to Syria. Anastasius granted remissions of taxes throughout Mesopotamia, gave largesses to the districts which had suffered most, restored the fortifications, and built a new fortified position on the frontier at Dara. As this was contrary to the treaty of 442, the Persians tried to prevent it; but Kawad, being engaged in war with the Huns and the Tamuraye, a tribe of unknown geographical position, was unable to take active steps in the matter. In April 506 Celer came to Edessa on his way to meet the *spahpat*, but, hearing from Persian envoys of his death, he waited till a successor should be appointed, while his Gothic soldiers caused much trouble to the citizens: he then went to Dara (Oct.) and made peace for seven years with the new *spahpat* (Nov.), the Emperor agreeing to pay compensation for the breach of faith involved in the fortification of Dara.

In Thrace and Illyricum the departure of the Goths left the way open to the more savage Bulgarians. In 499 they inflicted a disastrous defeat on Aristus, *magister militum* of Illyricum, at the Tzurta; and in 500 Anastasius thought it wise to give a donative to the Illyrian army. At an unknown date his nephew Pompeius was defeated by some enemy at Hadrianople; and in 507 the long wall across the peninsula on which Constantinople stands was built to secure the city from attack by land. In 512 the Heruli after their defeat by the Lombards were settled in



the Empire, but afterwards rebelled and had to be put down by force of arms. In 517 the Slavs plundered Macedonia, Thessaly, and Epirus, and carried off captives, whom Anastasius ransomed. Libya also suffered from the incursions of the Mazices.

Though there was little serious hostility with the Goths, relations were for a large part of the reign unfriendly. In 493 the Emperor refused Theodoric's request for confirmation of his title to Italy, though by accepting his consuls he tacitly recognized him. In 498 however he gave the desired recognition and returned the imperial insignia which Odovacar had sent to Zeno. But in 505 a conflict was brought about by a certain Mundo, who had been expelled by the king of the Gepids and received as a *foederatus* in the Empire, but afterwards became a captain of robbers, and being attacked by Sabinianus, *magister militum* of Illyricum (son of the Sabinianus who held the same office under Zeno), with Bulgarian allies, called in a Gothic force which had been fighting the Gepids. In the battle which followed at Horrea Margi the Romans were routed; but no further fighting seems to have taken place, and Mundo entered Theodoric's service. The assistance given to Mundo caused ill-feeling at Constantinople, and in 508 a fleet raided the coast of Italy, by which Theodoric was hindered from supporting the Visigoths against the Frankish king, on whom Anastasius conferred the insignia of the consulship. Shortly afterwards peace was restored, no doubt by concessions on the side of Theodoric, who wished to be free to deal with the Franks.

The domestic administration of Anastasius was distinguished by several popular measures. The most celebrated of these was the abolition of the *chrysargyron* (May 498), a tax on all kinds of stock and plant in trade, instituted by Constantine, which pressed heavily on the poorest classes. Instead of this he imposed a land-tax called *chrysoteleia*, which he applied to the support of the army, abolishing the right of requisition. He also attempted by several enactments to ensure that the soldiers received their full pay. But his chief financial reform was the abolition, by the advice of the Syrian Marinus, of the system under which the *curiales* were responsible for the taxes of the municipalities, and the institution of tax-collectors called *vindices*. The burdens of the *curiales* were not however wholly removed, for they existed in some form under Justinian. These measures were no doubt primarily intended to increase the revenue, and at the end of his reign under the administration of Marinus complaints were made of heavy extortion; but the immediate financial success of the policy is proved by the fact that at the time of his death the treasury was full. His humanity was shown by the abolition of fights between men and beasts (Aug. 499); but this did not extend to the practice of exposing criminals to beasts, which existed as late as the time of Maurice.

But, although Anastasius is almost universally praised for mildness and good administration, his Monophysite opinions were distasteful to the population of the capital, and the peace was constantly disturbed by serious riots. In 493 his refusal to release some stone-throwers of the Green faction who had been arrested by the city-praefect produced an outbreak, during which a stone was thrown at the Emperor, part of the circus buildings burnt, and the statues of Anastasius and Ariadne dragged through the streets. Many of the rioters were arrested and punished, and the thrower of the stone, a Moor, was killed by the *excubitores*; but the Emperor was compelled to appoint a new praefect in the person of Plato. An occasion for rioting was also provided by the ancient pagan festival of the Brytae, which was celebrated by dancing performances every May. Such a riot occurred in the praefecture of Constantine (501), when the Greens attacked the Blues in the theatre and many were killed, among them an illegitimate son of Anastasius. After this an order was issued that the celebration of the Brytae should cease throughout the Empire (502). In 512 the Monophysite addition to the *Trisagion*, made at the instigation of Marinus, caused the most dangerous outbreak of the reign (6 Nov.). The rioters killed the Monophysite monks, threw down the Emperor's statues, and proclaimed emperor the unwilling Areobindus, whose wife Juliana represented the Theodosian house. When Celer and Patricius were sent to appease them, they

drove them away with stones, burnt the houses of Marinus and Pompeius, and plundered Marinus' property. On the third day Anastasius showed himself in the circus without his crown and begged them to refrain from massacre, whereupon they demanded that Marinus and Plato should be thrown to the beasts; but the Emperor by promising concessions persuaded them to disperse. The banishment of Ariadne's kinsman, Diogenes, and the ex-praefect Appion (510) may, as they were recalled by Justin, have been caused by religious troubles. In Alexandria and Antioch also riots were frequent.

In 513 the religious differences culminated in an armed rising. The military administration of Hypatius (not the Emperor's nephew) had caused discontent in the Thracian army, especially among the Bulgarian *foederati*. These *foederati* were commanded by Vitalianus (son of the Patricius who held a command in the Persian war); who had a grievance on account of the expulsion of the patriarch Flavianus of Antioch (512), with whom he was on terms of close friendship. Making use of the discontent in the army, he murdered two of the general's staff, bribed the duke of Moesia, and, having seized Carinus, one of the chief confidants of Hypatius, forced him to place the town of Odessus in his hands. By means of the money there found he collected a large force of soldiers and rustics, and, with the cry of justice for the banished patriarchs and abolition of the addition to the *Trisagion*, marched on Constantinople, whither Hypatius had fled. Anastasius, having no army at hand, could only provide for the defence, while he set up crosses on the gates and announced the remission of one-fourth of the animal-tax in Asia and Bithynia. Patricius the *magister militum*, to whom Vitalianus in large measure owed his promotion, was sent to confer with him; and next day some of Vitalianus' chief officers entered the city; who on receiving a promise that just grievances should be remedied and the Pope asked to send representatives to settle the religious differences took the oath of allegiance, returned to Vitalianus, and compelled him to withdraw. Cyril, a man of some capacity, was now appointed to succeed Hypatius, and, having entered Odessus, from which Vitalianus had retired, was believed to be planning an attack on him. Hearing of this, Vitalianus made his way into the town by night, surprised Cyril while asleep in his house, and killed him. He was thereupon declared a public enemy by decree of the Senate, and a large force collected and sent against him under Hypatius, the Emperor's nephew, though the office of *magister militum* of Thrace was given to the barbarian Alathar. Hypatius fought for some time with varying success, and gained at least one victory (autumn 513). Finally he encamped at Acris on the coast, where, being attacked by the enemy and routed, he was captured in the sea, into which he had fled. Alathar was also captured, and was ransomed by Vitalianus himself from the Bulgarians, whom he permitted to sell the prisoners. Vitalianus occupied all the fortresses in Scythia and Moesia, among them Sozopolis, in which he captured some envoys sent with a ransom for Hypatius. It was now expected that he would be proclaimed emperor; and further rioting occurred at Constantinople, in which the praefect of the watch was killed. Meanwhile he advanced on the capital by land and sea; but on receiving 5000 lbs. of gold, the Thracian command, and a promise of satisfaction upon the religious question, he again retired and released Hypatius, though he refused to disband his army (514). It was clear that neither party was likely to observe the peace; and in 515 Vitalianus, having probably promises of support from inside the city, where another riot had occurred, again appeared before Constantinople, but was defeated by land and sea and retired to Anchialus, though still remaining at the head of his barbarian force. Hypatius was sent to the East as *magister militum*, and in July 517 went on an embassy to Persia.

On 9 July 518 Anastasius died suddenly, Ariadne having died three years before.

## CHAPTER XVII

### RELIGIOUS DISUNION IN THE FIFTH CENTURY

THE importance of the religious controversies of the fifth century must strike the most casual reader of history: but when we approach the subject closely, we find it a tangled skein. Questions of dogmatic theology and of ecclesiastical authority are intermingled with the conflict of national ideals and the lower strife of personal rivalries. Only later are the lines of separation seen to indicate ancient ethnic differences. Nor does this century, more than any other century, form for our purpose one connected and distinct whole. The antagonistic forces had been gathering to a head during the preceding period and they had to fight the battle out in the days that came after. Nevertheless, it is possible, within limits, to distinguish the more important of the elements making for ecclesiastical disunion, and also to mark the chief acts of the drama that fall within the limits assigned.

First, then, we have to do with the opposition of two rival schools of thought, those of Alexandria and of Antioch, the homes of allegorical and of literal interpretation respectively. Next we have the emphatic assertion of authority; and rejection of external interference, by the great sees, which before the end of our period have obtained the title and status of patriarchates. So far, we seem to be concerned with forces already known in the Arian controversy. But in both respects there is a difference. The dogmatic difference between Alexandria and Antioch was, in the fifth century, quite unlike that of Athanasius and Arius in the fourth, though the theologian may discern hidden affinities in the parties severally concerned. The disputants on both sides in the controversies we are to consider were equally ready to accept the creed of Nicaea, and indeed to accuse their opponents of want of loyalty to that symbol. And with regard to spheres of authority, a new complication had arisen. At Nicaea (325), the rights of the great sees of Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch had been maintained. Byzantium counted for nothing. In fact, authorities differ on the question who was bishop at that time, and whether he attended the Council in person or by deputy.

But at the Second Council (that of Constantinople in 381) besides a strict injunction against the intervention of bishops in places beyond their jurisdiction, there was an assertion of the prerogative of the bishop of Constantinople next after the bishop of Rome; “because, Constantinople is New Rome”. The last clause asserted an important principle, that might easily lead to Caesaro-papacy. For the other great sees were supposed to hold their high position in virtue of apostolic tradition, not of coincidence with secular dominion. Constantinople might—and did—discover that it, too, had an apostle for its patron—namely St Andrew. But St Andrew’s claims were vague, and the imperial authority and court influence were pressing. The decision was but doubtfully accepted in the East, and the distinction, if allowed at all, was taken as purely honorary. In Rome it was never received at all. We cannot wonder that the bishops of Alexandria, in their far-reaching aims and policy, were unwilling to allow such power or prestige to the upstart see of the “queenly city”, and that sometimes the bishops of Old Rome might support their actions.

It is not, of course, to be supposed that all the ecclesiastical dissensions of the period can be comprised in the quarrels between the great sees, although, for our present purpose, that series of conflicts seems the best to choose as our guiding line. Though the Arian heresy lived vigorously all through the century, it had become for the most part a religion of barbarians. It was not so much a source of disunion within the Empire as a serious—perhaps

insuperable—obstacle to a good understanding between the Roman and the Teuton. The Arianism of the Ostrogoths was at least one of the most prominent weaknesses of their kingdom in Italy. But the Empire, generally speaking, was Nicene. The only regions which had not adopted or were not soon to adopt the definitions of the First General Council, lay in the far East, beyond the limits of undisputed imperial sway. When these are brought into the general current of church history, they take one side or another in the prevalent controversies, with very conspicuous results. Again, the Pelagian controversy on free will and original sin will not here concern us in proportion to its theological and philosophical interest. Though its roots lay deep, and ever and anon put forth new shoots, it did not result in a definite schism.

Taking then the main lines of controversy as already indicated, we may distinguish four phases or periods within the fifth century. In the first we have an attack on a bishop of Constantinople, a representative of the Antiochene school, by an archbishop of Alexandria. Rome sympathizes with Constantinople, but Alexandria triumphs for a time, in great part by court influence. (Chrysostom controversy).

In the second, Alexandria again advances against Constantinople, the bishop of which is again Antiochene. Rome, in this phase of the conflict, sides with Alexandria, which prevails. Court influence is divided, but gradually comes over to the Alexandrian side. (Nestorian controversy).

In the third, Alexandria is again aggressive, and prevails over Constantinople by violence. Rome fails at first to obtain a hearing, but helps to get the doctrinal points settled in another Council. (Eutychian or Monophysite controversy).

In the fourth, the controversy is caused by an abortive attempt, started by an emperor, but manipulated by the bishops of Constantinople and of Alexandria working together, to reunite some at least of the parties alienated by the decision of the last conflict. Rome disapproves strongly, and the result is a serious blow to imperial authority in the West. (Henoticon controversy).

I. The chief persons, then, in the first controversy, are Theophilus of Alexandria and Chrysostom of Constantinople. The doctrinal question is not to the front, and the interest is in great part personal. This is in fact the only one of the controversies in which one side at least—here the one on defence—has an imposing leader. But perhaps it is the one in which it is least possible to find any reasons beyond motives of official ambition or of personal antipathy.

The beginner of the attack, Theophilus, who held the Alexandrian see from 385 to 412, has earned a bad name in history for violence and duplicity. He was probably not more unscrupulous than many leading men among his contemporaries, and excelled most of them in scientific and literary tastes. But he has incurred the odium which attaches to every religious persecutor who has not the mitigating plea of personal fanaticism. Another excuse might be alleged in extenuation of his unjust actions: the excessively difficult position in which he was placed. The peculiar character of the government of Egypt—its close and direct connection with the imperial authority—and the absence, except in the city itself, of any civic and municipal institutions, always rendered a good understanding between bishop and praefect one of the great desiderata. The history of the see and of its most eminent occupants had given it a prestige which was not easily kept intact without encroachments on the secular power. Alexandria had from the beginning been a city of mixed populations and cults, and at this time the factions were more numerous and the occasions of disturbance as serious as in the days of Athanasius. Arianism may have been quelled, but paganism was still vigorous, and had adherents both in the academies of the grammarians and philosophers and also among the most ignorant of the lower classes, who even anticipated disaster when the measuring gauge was moved from the temple of Serapis to a church. The Jewish element was large, and



the broad toleration of Alexander, the Ptolemies, and the pagan Emperors was hardly to be expected in the stormy days which had followed the conversion of Constantine. But more difficult to deal with than praefects, town mobs, philosophers or Jews, though a more powerful weapon to use if tactfully secured, was the vast number of monks that dwelt in the “desert” and other regions within the Alexandrian see. These did not constitute one body, and were very dissimilar among themselves. The rule of those who had a rule will be set forth in the following chapter. Here we have to notice the difficulties which the soaring speculations of some, the crass ignorance of others, and the detachment of all from worldly convention and ordinary constituted authority, placed in the way of any attempt to bring them within the general system of civil and ecclesiastical order.

Theophilus was himself a man of learning and culture, eclectic in tastes, diplomatic in schemes. He had used his mathematical knowledge to make an elaborate table of the Easter Cycle. He favoured, in later days, the candidature of a philosophic pagan (Synesius of Cyrene) for the bishopric of Ptolemais. He could read and enjoy the works of writers whose teaching he was publicly anathematizing. He appreciated the force of monastic piety, and endeavored, by vigorous and even violent means, to impose episcopal consecration on some leading ascetics. He showed his powers as a pacificator in helping to compose dissension in the church of Antioch (392) and in that of Bostra (394). He obtained from the civil authority powers to demolish the great temple of Serapis, which was done successfully, though not without creating much bitterness of feeling. The great campaign of his life, however, began with an attack on the followers of Origen at the very beginning of the fifth century.

There seems some paradox in the circumstance that the strife between the Alexandrian and the Antiochene should have begun (as far as our present purpose is concerned) by an attack made by an Alexandrian patriarch on the principles of the most eminent of all Alexandrian theologians. Theophilus was, both before and after the controversy, an appreciative student of Origen. He had already aroused a tumultuous opposition from some Egyptian monks who were practically anthropomorphites by insisting on the doctrine laid down by Origen as to the incorporeality of the Divine nature, that God is invisible by reason of His nature, and incomprehensible by reason of the limits of human intelligence. The line he now took up may have been due to the influence of Jerome, at that time organizing an anti-Origenistic crusade in Palestine; or else, in his opposition to the philosophic paganism of Alexandria, he may have become nervous of any concessions as to *aeons* and gnosis and final restitution; or again, as seems most probable, he saw a powerful ally in his ambition for his see in the grossest and least enlightened theology of his day—that of the unhappy monk who wept that “they had taken away his God”—when in the earlier stage of the controversy the doctrines of the anthropomorphites were condemned by the man who was now their champion.

Having determined to combat Origenism, Theophilus called a synod to Alexandria, which decreed against it. He followed up the ecclesiastical censure by securing from the praefect the support of the secular arm. An attack was made by night on the settlement of those monks, in the district of Nitria, who were supposed to be imbued with Origenistic doctrine. The leaders of them were the four “tall brethren”, monks of considerable repute, formerly treated by Theophilus with great respect. Hounded out by soldiers and by the rival “Anthropomorphite” monks, the Tall Brothers fled for their lives, and after many vicissitudes arrived in Constantinople and appealed to the protection of the bishop, John Chrysostom.

In position and in character Chrysostom bears a marked contrast to his opponent Theophilus. Both, it is true, were men of learning and culture; both were exposed to the caprices of a pleasure-loving and much-divided populace. But Chrysostom had one disadvantage more: he was under the immediate eye of a Court. It was by court influence, unsought on his part, that he had been elevated, and the same influence could easily be turned

against him. The Emperor Arcadius was of sluggish temperament, but his wife, Eudoxia, a Frankish lady, was violent in her likes and dislikes, sensitive, ambitious, and inspired by a showy and aggressive piety. John had held the see since 397. In early days he had studied under the pagan Libanius at Antioch, and later he had been trained in the theological school of that city. He was an intimate friend of Theodore of Mopsuestia, the most eminent leader of Antiochene thought, whose principles in the next stage of the controversy came to the front. Himself a practical teacher rather than a theological systematiser, he had devoted his power and eloquence, both in Antioch and Constantinople, to the restraint of violence and the denunciation of vice and frivolity. He had in earlier days followed for some years the monastic life, and was always ascetic in self-discipline, and tactless towards those under his authority. He had been brought into public prominence, during the anxious time in 387 at Antioch, after the riot. On his appointment at Constantinople, he showed great firmness in resisting the demands made upon him by the minister Eutropius, and subsequently in negotiations with the Gothic general Gainas. He preached much, and his sermons were intensely popular, for the people of Byzantium, however mixed, were sufficiently Greek to enjoy good speaking. But John seems to have done more than excite a transient enthusiasm. A good many Constantinopolitans, particularly some wellborn women, devoted their lives to the works he commended to them. By his clergy, as might be expected, he was both well beloved and well hated.

Just at the time when Theophilus was beginning his attacks on the Origenistic monks, Chrysostom was starting on an expedition which was the beginning of all his troubles. Complaints had been brought to him of the bad conduct of the bishop of Ephesus. He sent to make inquiries, and though the accused bishop had in the meantime died, Chrysostom was requested by the clergy and people of Ephesus to come and settle their affairs. Accordingly the first three months of the year 401 were spent by him in a visitation of Asia, in the removal of many clergy, and the putting down of much corruption. No doubt he considered that he was acting within his rights, according to the canon of Constantinople and the precedent set by the previous bishop. But he had given a handle to the rival see of Alexandria. Worse than this, his absence had led to difficulties at home, where Severianus, a wandering bishop whom he had left as locum tenens, and Serapion, Chrysostom's archdeacon and friend, had quarreled beyond hope of reconciliation. On his return, Chrysostom judged Severianus to be in fault, and thereby affronted the Empress, who had taken delight in Severianus' sermons. With so much of combustible elements about, the arrivals from Egypt were likely to cause a general conflagration.

Chrysostom received the Tall Brethren courteously, and admitted them to some of the church services, though he hesitated to receive them into full communion till the charge of heresy hanging over them had been removed. He seems to have wished to avoid any provocative measures. But the Brothers, anxious to remove the slur, or perhaps stirred up by some sinister interest, appealed to the Empress, as she rode down the streets in her chariot. The result was that Theophilus himself was summoned to Constantinople to stand a charge of calumny and persecution, with darker accusations in the background. He came, but, though nominally accused, he actually took the role of accuser.

Before Theophilus himself arrived in Constantinople, he showed the measure of respect in which he held that see by inducing his friend Epiphanius, bishop of Constantia in Cyprus, to go thither on the business of Origen. Epiphanius had a reputation for piety and zeal, but seems to have traded on that reputation and on his advanced years in going beyond all bounds of courtesy and even of legality. He came with a large following of bishops and clergy, began his mission by the ordination of a deacon an act of defiance to Chrysostom's authority refused the hospitality offered by the bishop, and endeavored, by colloquies with the clergy and harangues to the people, to obtain the condemnation of Origen which Chrysostom refused to

pronounce. He returned baffled, but soon after Theophilus himself appeared at Constantinople, and speedily gathered a party among those who had from any reason a grudge against Chrysostom. Strange to say, the Origenistic question retired into the background. Some of the bishops and clergy at Constantinople were greatly attached to the writings of Origen, with which, as we have seen, Theophilus had a secret intellectual sympathy. The charge of Origenism was brought against some of John's adherents, the charges preferred against himself were either trivial or very improbable. If any of them were founded on fact, the utmost we can safely gather from them is that John may have erred occasionally by severity in discipline, and that his ascetic habits and delicate digestion had proved incompatible with generous hospitality.

It is hardly necessary to say that Theophilus was acting without a shadow of right. He had thirty-six bishops with him and many more were coming from Asia at the Emperor's bidding. Chrysostom had forty who kept by his side. The strange phenomenon of a dual synod will be met again in the next conflict. Theophilus had the support of the Court, but he did not venture to pass judgment within the precincts of the capital. A synod was held in the neighbourhood of Chalcedon, on the Asiatic side of the Bosphorus. Theophilus was present and presided, unless the presidency was held by the old rival see of Heraclea. John refused four times to appear, and judgment was passed against him. As to the Tall Brethren, two had died and the other two made no opposition. A tumultuous scene followed in Constantinople, but John, rather than become a cause of bloodshed, withdrew under protest.

But he did not go far from the city, and in three days he was summoned back. Constantinople suffered at this time from a shock of earthquake, which seems to have alarmed the Empress, and the dislike of Egyptian interference stimulated the desire of the people of Constantinople to recover their bishop. Arcadius sent a messenger to summon John home. John at first prudently declined to come without the resolution of a synod, but his scruples were overcome, and he was reinstated in triumph.

But his return of good fortune was not of long duration. What the Court had lightly given, it might lightly withdraw. The new cause of offence was a remonstrance made by Chrysostom, who objected to the noise and revellings consequent on the erection of a statue of the Empress close to the church where he officiated. Eudoxia's blood was up. Report said that the bishop had compared her to Herodias. He had possibly compared his duty to that of John the Baptist, and his hearers had pressed the analogy further. He had previously made a quite pertinent comparison of her court clergy to the priests of Baal, who "did eat at Jezebel's table", and the inference had seemed to be that the Empress was a Jezebel. A synod was hastily convoked. Theophilus did not appear this time, but John's opponents were now sufficient. He was accused of violating a canon of the Council of Antioch (341) in having returned without waiting for a synodical decree. Insult was here added to injury. The canon had been passed by an Arian council, the violation of it had been due to imperial pressure. But there was no way of escape. Amid scenes of confusion and bloodshed, John was conveyed to Cucusus, on the Armenian frontier, and afterwards to Pityus, in Pontus.

His steadfastness under persecution, the letters by which he sought to strengthen the hands of his friends and disciples, and the efforts of his adherents, besides producing a great moral effect, seemed likely to bring about a reversal of the sentence. Pope Innocent I wrote a letter of sympathy to Chrysostom and one of strong remonstrance to Theophilus, to whom a formal deputation was sent. To the clergy and people of Constantinople he wrote a vigorous protest against the legality of what had been done, and asserted the need of a Council of East and West. But for such a council he could only wait the opportunity in faith and patience. He did all he could by laying the matter before the Emperor Honorius at Ravenna. A deputation of clergy was sent from Emperor and Pope to Constantinople. On the way, however, the messengers had their dispatches stolen from them, and they only returned from their bootless

errand after many dangers and insults. Meantime the fire was allowed to burn itself out. The sufferings of Chrysostom were ended by his death in exile in September 407. There were still adherents of his in Constantinople, who refused to recognize his successor, as did also many bishops in the West. The breach was healed when Atticus, second bishop after Chrysostom, restored the name of his great predecessor to the diptychs (or tablets, on which the names of lawful bishops were inscribed).

It can hardly be said that this part of the controversy was ecclesiastical in the strict sense of the word. It made no new departure in church doctrine and discipline. But it revealed the more or less hidden forces by which succeeding conflicts were to be decided.

II. In the second period the Alexandrian leader was Cyril, nephew of Theophilus, who had succeeded him as bishop in 412. The Byzantine bishop was Nestorius, who succeeded Sisinnius in 428. Both of these prelates were more distinctly theological controversialists than were the chiefs in the last encounter. But theology apart, they succeeded to all the difficulties in Church and State that had beset their predecessors, and neither of them was gifted with forbearance and tact. Cyril's episcopate began with violent conflicts between Christians and Jews, in which the ecclesiastical power came into collision with the civil. The story is well known how the bishop canonized a turbulent monk who had met his end in the anti-Jewish brawls, how the praefect Orestes opposed him in this and other high-handed acts, and fell a victim to the Alexandrian mob. The murder of Hypatia in 415 is not, perhaps, to be laid directly to Cyril's charge; but it illustrates the attitude of anti-pagan fanaticism towards the noblest representatives of Hellenic culture. Perhaps we may see here the effects of the policy of Theophilus when he stirred up the more ignorant of the monks to chase away or to destroy those more capable of philosophic views.

The monks were indeed becoming a more and more uncontrollable element in the situation. Cyril allied himself with a very powerful person, the archimandrite Senuti, who plays a large part in the history of Egyptian monasticism and also in the Monophysite schism. At present he was orthodox, or rather his views were those that had not yet been differentiated from orthodoxy, and his zeal was shown chiefly in organizing raids on "idols", temples and pagan priests, and in attacks, less reprehensible perhaps, but no more respectful of private property, on the goods of wealthy landowners who defrauded and oppressed the poor.

Nestorius came from Isauria. His education had been in Antioch, and the doctrines with which his name is associated are those of the great Antiochene school carried to their logical and practical conclusions. But this association has a pathetic and almost a grotesque interest. Much labour has of recent years been devoted to the task of ascertaining what Nestorius actually preached and wrote, and the result may be to acquit him of many of the extravagances imputed to him by his opponents. To put the case rather crudely: experts have contended that Nestorius was not a Nestorian. He seems to have been a harsh and unpleasant man, though capable of acquiring friends, intolerant of doctrinal eccentricities other than his own. He made it his mission to prevent men from assigning the attributes of humanity to the Deity, and boldly took the consequences of his position. Like Chrysostom, he suffered from the proximity and active ecclesiastical interest of the imperial family. When Nestorius became bishop of Constantinople in 428, the Emperor Theodosius II was in the twenty-seventh year of his age and the twentieth of his reign. Though his character and abilities offer in some respects a favorable comparison with those of his father, he suffered, partly through his education, from a too narrowly theological outlook on his empire and its duties. For fourteen years a leading part in all matters, especially ecclesiastical, had been taken by his elder sister Pulcheria, who had superintended his education and seems to have maintained a jealous regard for her own influence. This influence was at times more or less thwarted by her sister-in-law Eudocia, the clever Athenian lady, whom she had herself induced Theodosius to take



in marriage. Nestorius had somehow incurred the enmity of Pulcheria. The cause is too deeply buried in the dirt of court scandal to be disinterred. Eudocia, though she is often in opposition to her sister-in-law, does not seem to have had any leanings to the party of Nestorius, and in the end, as we shall see, she took a much stronger line against it than did Pulcheria. But both ladies, in addition to personal feelings, had decided theological leanings, and to these the Alexandrians were able to appeal.

The theological principles of Cyril were those of the Alexandrian school. To him it seemed that the doctrine of the Incarnation of the Logos is impugned by any hesitation to assign the attributes of humanity to the divine Christ. It was this theological principle which was the cause, or at least the pretext, of his first attack on Nestorius. The distinctions between the Alexandrian and Antiochene schools have their roots far back in the history of theological ideas. One of the main differences lies in the preference by the Alexandrians for allegorical modes of interpreting Scripture, while the Antiochenes preferred—in the first instance, at least—a more literal method. This is not unnatural, so far as Alexandria is concerned. That city had seen the first attempt at amalgamation of Jewish and Hellenic conceptions, by the solvent force of figure and symbolism, while underneath there worked the mind of primeval Egypt. The speculations of Philo and his successors, both Christian and Pagan, carried on the tradition into orthodox theology. The Christology of Alexandria had produced the *Omousius*, and now it regarded that term as needing further development—as pointing to an entire union (enosis) of divine and human in the nature of Christ, beyond any conjunction (*sinatia*) which seemed to admit a possible duality. On the other side, the Antiochene school is well represented by Theodore of Mopsuestia, the friend of Chrysostom, and the teacher, whether directly or indirectly, of Nestorius. He was a learned man and a great commentator, who insisted on the need of historical and literary studies in elucidating Holy Scripture. His eminence in this respect is to be seen in the fact that we often find him cited in quite recent commentaries. In his Christology, he held that the union of the divine and human in the person of Jesus was moral rather than physical or dynamical. He was, however, very careful to avoid the deduction that the relation of divine and human was similar in kind though different in degree, in Christ and in His followers. The actions and qualities ascribed to Christ as man, and particularly His birth, sufferings and death, were not to be attributed to the Deity without some qualifying phrase.

This question might have seemed to be one of purely academic interest, if it had not obtained an excellent catchword which appealed to the popular mind: the title of Theotokos (Mother of God) as applied to the Virgin Mary, vehemently asserted by the Alexandrians, rejected, or accepted with many qualifications, by the Antiochenes. The fierceness of the battle over this word suggests analogies and associations which are easily exaggerated. In some sermons preached on behalf of the Alexandrian view there are remarks which seem to foreshadow the Virgin cult in medieval and modern times. And the great glory of Cyril, as we find in superscriptions of his works, was that of being the chief advocate of the Theotokos. Again, and this is a more important point, and one that will meet us again, both the word and the conception could be interpreted in harmony with one of the strongest elements in revived paganism. The worship of a maternal deity, such as seems to have prevailed widely in the earliest civilization of Mediterranean lands, had again come to the fore in the last conflict of Paganism with Christianity. The mysteries of Isis and of Cybele were widespread. Julian wrote a mystic treatise in honor of the Mother of the Gods; and as he blames the Christians for applying the term ‘Mother of God’ to the Virgin Mary, he seems here to be following his ordinary policy of strengthening Hellenism on its devotional side by bringing in such elements from Christianity as might be found compatible with it. The reverse process, by which Christianity among both the educated and the uneducated was assimilating pagan ideas, was of course going on at the same time, consciously in some quarters, unconsciously in

others. But it would be a mistake to look on the Nestorian controversy as chiefly, or even as greatly, connected with the honor of the Virgin. Nestorius himself, in one of his sayings, probably uttered in a testy mood, protested “anyhow, don't make the Virgin a Goddess”; but this is, I believe, almost the only utterance of the kind during the controversy.

Generally speaking, on its speculative side, the controversy was Christological. The Nicene Fathers had finally pronounced on the relation of the Father to the Divine Logos, but within the limits of orthodoxy there was room for a difference as to the relation of the Logos to the human Christ. Some, on the Antiochene side, dreaded lest the idea of the humanity should be entirely merged in that of the Logos. Others (leaning towards Alexandria) would avoid any contamination of the Logos by the associations of humanity. Meantime the unphilosophical minds that took part in the dispute imagined in a vague way that it was possible for human beings to commit the crime of literally confusing the nature of the Deity or of cutting Christ in pieces.

The position of Nestorius himself and of those who followed him most closely is summarized in a saying of his that was often quoted and oftener misquoted: “I cannot speak of God as being two or three months old”. He regarded it as impiety to attribute to a Person of the Trinity the acts and accidents of human, still more of infant, life. The Alexandrians, on the other hand, considered this view as virtually implying the existence of two Christs, a divine and a human. Naturally the opponents made no efforts to understand one another's position, and if they had their efforts could hardly have been successful. During this unhappy century, the mind of man had gone hopelessly astray as to its limitations. Intellectual courage had survived intellectual contact with facts, but that courage was often directed against chimaeras.

The Pope of Rome at this juncture was Celestine I (422-432). He seems to have been a conscientious and active ruler, a strict disciplinarian, yet averse to extreme rigor in dealing with delinquents. As we have already said, in this conflict Rome is not on the side of Constantinople and Antioch, but on that of Alexandria. Among the many reasons that may be assigned for the change, two considerations are prominent: first, that the relations between the sees of Rome and of Constantinople had been somewhat strained through rival claims to ecclesiastical supremacy in the regions of Illyria; and secondly, that Celestine was a devoted admirer of Augustine and anxious to put down the Pelagian heresy. Nestorius, we may safely say, was not himself a Pelagian. In some, at least, of his extant discourses he strongly opposes that teaching. But it is clear that the most eminent Antiochene theologians were not so pronounced as was Augustine in their doctrine of original sin and of predestination. Theodore of Mopsuestia was accused of the same tendency, though he avoided the heretical deductions from his principles, and Nestorius himself once wrote a sympathetic letter (though the obscurity of the text makes it doubtful as evidence) to Coelestius the notable follower of Pelagius. Again, a few years before our present date (at the Council of Carthage, 426), a monk named Leporius of Marseilles, who has been called a “Nestorian before Nestorius”, was condemned as a Pelagian.

The Antiochene see was more definitely than it had previously been on the side of Constantinople. It was now occupied by a certain John, who plays an ambiguous part, but seems to have been favourable to Nestorius. But the most eminent person on this side was Theodoret, bishop of Cyrus, in the province of Euphratensis, a learned theologian, a good fighter, and a man of generous impulses, though he did not keep by his friend Nestorius to the bitter end. In these Eastern bishops we see a growing jealousy of the overweening power of Alexandria. The Church of Edessa, which had, generally speaking, lived a life apart, was drawn into the controversy. The bishop Rabbulas, though not inclined to urge the adoption of the disputed terms, took the anti-Nestorian side. His successor however, Ibas (435), upheld the Nestorian position, and retained for centuries the reverence of the Nestorian Christians of the East.

To take up briefly the main events of the controversy: It was most probably during the Christmas festival of the year 428, or else early in 429, that Proclus, bishop of Cyzicus, but resident at Constantinople, preached a sermon in which he used and expounded the term Theotokos. Nestorius replied to this discourse by another, in which he warned the people to distinguish between the Divine Word and the temple in which the Deity dwelt, and to avoid saying without qualifications, that God was born of Mary. Nestorius seems to have been more guarded in his language than some of his clergy, especially a priest called Anastasius, who condemned the word Theotokos altogether and even denounced as heretics those who used it. It is extremely difficult to determine how widely the Antiochene or Nestorian view prevailed, and whether it had yet reached Egypt, and on this question depends the conviction or acquittal of Cyril in regard to the charge of aggressive violence generally brought against him. In the Easter of 429 he issued an encyclical to the Egyptian monks, warning them against the dangers ahead. Men were teaching doctrines, he said, which would bring Christ down to the level of ordinary humanity.

Soon after, he wrote a long letter to the Emperor, “image of God on earth”, against heresies in general and the new one—with which, however, he does not couple the name of Nestorius—in particular. He followed this up by two very long treatises to “the most pious princesses” (Pulcheria and her sisters), in which he cites many Fathers to justify the term Theotokos, and makes out that the new heretics would assert two Christs. The appeal to these ladies does not seem to have pleased Theodosius, who resented Cyril's use of the discord in the imperial family. Cyril, when once he had begun, spared no pains to succeed. He had agents in Constantinople and adherents whom, at much trouble and expense, he had attached to his cause. Especially he had the support of a large following among the monks. We have his letters written both to Nestorius himself and to Celestine, bishop of Rome. In all of them he takes the ground of one having authority, of one also who, in spite of personal affection for Nestorius as a man, is bound to consider the supreme interests of the Truth. Nestorius in return eulogizes Christian *epiikia*, a grace in which he does not himself seem to have excelled, but maintains an independent bearing. He somewhat superfluously accuses Cyril of ignorance of the Nicene creed, and reassures him as to the satisfactory state of the Church in Constantinople. Nestorius was meantime in correspondence with Celestine on another matter. Certain bishops from the West, accused of heresy, had come to Constantinople. How was he to deal with them? He had to write a second time before a rather curt answer came; that of course they were heretics and so was Nestorius himself: they are known from other sources to have been Pelagians. Cyril had by this time sent to Rome a Latin translation of the communications that had passed between him and Nestorius with regard to the whole Christological question. A synod was consequently held at Rome which approved of Cyril's action and position, and the Pope wrote to the clergy of Constantinople, as well as to Cyril and to Nestorius himself. Ten days were given to Nestorius to make a satisfactory explanation, after which he and those holding with him were to be held excommunicated. Letters announcing this decision were sent to the bishops of Antioch, Jerusalem, Thessalonica and Philippi. To Cyril the Pope delegated the power to take necessary action against Nestorius and his followers. In a synod held at Alexandria, a series of propositions condemnatory of the doctrine taught by Nestorius and insisting on that of the ‘physical union’ were drawn up. In consequence of these actions, Nestorius, urged by John of Antioch, Theodoret of Cyrus and others, made certain explanations so as to tolerate the figurative use of the word Theotokos. But he stood his ground as to the main principles, and issued, with the support of his adherents, a list of counter-anathemas to those of Cyril.

It may seem strange that local councils and leading bishops or patriarchs should have gone so far without insisting on a General Council. One person evidently took this view—the Emperor Theodosius himself. The builder of the Theodosian Wall and the promulgator of the

Theodosian Code can hardly have been the mere weakling that some historians would paint him. He seems to have been a man of some energy and love of fair play, though he had not the strength to carry out a policy to the end. Now, however, jointly with his cousin Valentinian, he issued a writ summoning Eastern and Western bishops to a Council to be held the following Whitsuntide (431) at Ephesus. He did not attempt to go himself, but he sent as his emissary the count Candidianus, to keep order, by military force if necessary, and especially to prevent monks and laymen from intruding. Pope Celestine sent two deputies, instructed to act along with Cyril. Cyril himself went largely accompanied. Among his monastic followers was the wild ascetic Senuti of Panopolis, already mentioned, though the stories of Senuti's conduct at the Council are not easily brought into accordance with the facts we have. Nestorius and his Constantinopolitan friends went there, but kept at a prudent distance from 'the Egyptian'. John of Antioch and forty Asiatic bishops came likewise, but at slow pace. Their delay, whether accidental or designed, determined the character and events of the Council. The weak point about the Council of Ephesus was that the presiding judge and the principal prosecutor were one and the same person, in an assembly which, though supposed to be primarily legislative, had also to exercise judicial functions. From the very first, Nestorius had no chance, and he declined to recognize the authority of the Council till all its members were assembled. Cyril was in no mind to allow this plea, and perhaps, in refusing to wait for the Eastern bishops, he overreached himself, and brought subsequent trouble on his own head. Celestine's delegates had not arrived, but there was no reason to wait for them, as it was known that they had been instructed to follow the Alexandrian lead. John of Antioch and the other Eastern bishops were, of course, an essential part of the Council, but a message of excuse which John had sent was tacitly construed into acquiescence with what might be done before his arrival. Accordingly, in spite of remonstrances from Nestorius, from a good many Eastern bishops who had already arrived, and from the imperial Commissioners, the Council was opened sixteen days after the appointed time, without the Antiochenes or those who were in favour of any kind of compromise with Nestorius. Messengers were sent to Nestorius, who refused to attend. It was the work of one day, the first session of the Council, to condemn him and deprive him of his see. This was done on the testimony of his letters, his reported speeches, and his rejection of the messengers from the Council. One hundred and ninety-eight bishops signed these decrees. The populace of Ephesus received the result with wild enthusiasm, and gave the champions of the Theotokes an ovation on their way to their lodgings. Perhaps it is not mere fanciful analogy to recall the two-hours' shouting of an earlier city mob: "Great Artemis of the Ephesians".

Five days afterwards, John of Antioch arrived. He had with him comparatively few bishops, and when he was joined by the Nestorians, the number of his party only amounted to forty-three. There seems a touch of irony in the assertion which he made afterwards that the reason of his scanty numbers was to be found in his strict injunctions to follow out the Emperor's directions. Similarly, when he justifies the delay by the necessity that the bishops should officiate in their churches on the First Sunday after Easter, we may seem to have a covert hit at Cyril's large numbers who found no difficulty in absenting themselves from their flocks.

From the first, John took his stand against the acts of Cyril. He rejected the communications of the Council and joined forces with Nestorius. The imperial officials afforded him protection and support. In the 'Conciliabulum', as his assembly was contemptuously called, Cyril and Memnon of Ephesus were in their turn deprived and excommunicated. Meantime the original Council, now joined by delegates from Rome, continued its sessions, deposed John and all his adherents, and continued to pass decrees against the Pelagians and other heretics. Whether or not the precise articles anathematizing Nestorius, which had been drawn up at Alexandria, were passed by the Council is a disputed



matter and one of inferior importance. Their sense was certainly maintained, and they were answered by counter-anathematisms on the other side.

The situation was becoming intolerable. Two rival assemblies of bitterly hostile factions were sitting in conclave through the sultry days of an Eastern summer, in a city always given to turbulence, and now stirred up by long and eloquent discourses such as a Greek populace ever loved to hear. Count Candidianus and the other imperial delegates had a hard task. He had, after the first session, torn down the placards declaring the deposition of Nestorius. He tried to prevent the Egyptian party from preaching inflammatory sermons, and from communicating the fever of controversy to Constantinople. This, however, he could not do, as Cyril found means of corresponding with the monks of Constantinople.

The Emperor himself was hardly equal to the emergency. The difficulty as to Nestorius was partly removed by the offer of Nestorius himself to retire to a monastery. With regard to the other leaders, Cyril and Memnon were for a time imprisoned. The Emperor received embassies from both sides, and finally decided to maintain the decisions of both councils. Maximian, a priest of Constantinople, was appointed to the vacant see of that city. Then Cyril and Memnon were liberated and restored to their sees, and the remaining members of the council were bidden to return home, unless they could first find some means of accommodation with the Orientals.

The means by which the Emperor's partial change of front and the yet more clearly marked prevalence of anti-Nestorian feeling at Court were brought about can only be brought to light by untangling a most involved skein of ecclesiastical diplomacy. From a letter of one of Cyril's agents, as well as from the recently published account of Nestorius himself, there was a profuse distribution of gratuities among notable persons, including the princesses themselves. But Cyril appealed to zeal as well as to avarice. It would appear that a good many people in Constantinople were favourable to Nestorius, but that the clergy and the monks were generally against him. The union between Egyptians and Orientals was brought to pass sooner than we might have expected. It was based on an explanation not wholly unlike that urged on Nestorius by John of Antioch near the beginning of the difficulties, an acknowledgment of two natures united into one, with a recognition, in virtue of the union, of the propriety of the term Theotokos. It was a triumph for Cyril, but some of the most independent of his opponents still held out. Especially Theodoret, the best theologian of the party, and the most faithful—a slight distinction—to his friends, refused to be included in an arrangement which did not restore all the sees of the dispossessed bishops to their rightful occupants. It was only to a special decree of the Emperor, enforcing ecclesiastical agreement in the East, that he gave at last a qualified assent. But the indignant protest widely raised against Alexandrian ambition was expressed in a playful letter which he wrote after Cyril's death in 444, in which, along with more charitable wishes that we might expect for the final judgment on his soul, he recommends that a large stone be placed over the grave, to keep quiet the disturber who had now gone to propagate strange doctrines among the shades below. The last efforts of Cyril had been towards the condemnation of the great commentator, the father of Antiochene philosophy, Theodore of Mopsuestia. The reverence in which the memory of Theodore was held caused the scheme to fail, only to be renewed, with baneful consequences, by the Emperor Justinian.

We may now narrate the end of Nestorius. For some years he lived in peace in a monastery near Antioch, but his relations with its bishop appear to have cooled. In 435, he was banished to Petra in Arabia, but instead of going thither, he seems to have been sent to one of the oases of Egypt. There a wandering horde of Libyans, the Blemmyes, made him prisoner. Soon after he was released, and fled to Panopolis in Egypt. Thence he wrote a pathetic letter to the Praeses of the Thebaid, begging for protection "lest to all time the evil report should be brought that it is better to be a captive of barbarians than a fugitive suppliant

of the Roman Emperor". But Nestorius had fallen into the very hotbed of fanatical monasticism. The Praeses caused him to be removed by 'barbarian' soldiers to Elephantine, on the borders of the province. There is some evidence that the blow which put an end to his sufferings was dealt by the hand of Senuti himself. This was however some years later.

Nestorius was not a great leader of men, nor a very striking figurehead for a great cause. His whole story illustrates the perversity and blind cruelty of his opponents, and it is only in comparison with them that he sometimes appears in an almost dignified character. This character is greatly emphasized by the lately discovered writings in which Nestorius was employed shortly before his death. He seems to have approved the final arrangement of Chalcedon, and even to have acquiesced, with a magnanimity hardly to be expected, in the compromise by which his own name was left under the cloud while the principles for which he had striven were in great measure confirmed.

III. The Monophysite or Eutychian Controversy may be regarded as a continuation of the preceding one, yet as some of the leading parties were different, as well as their objects and methods, it may be better to take it apart.

The main difference as to character and issue of this conflict compared with the last lies in the character of the champions of Rome and of Alexandria respectively. Now there was a Pope of commanding character and ability. Leo I stands out in history as a great ruler of the Church, who crushed a premature movement towards Gallicanism; as a moral power in Rome itself in times of demoralizing panic; and as the shepherd of his people, who—in ways known and unknown—stopped the Romeward march of Attila the Hun. Here we have to deal with him as a firm and successful assertor of the claims of St Peter's chair over all others, and as a great diplomatic theologian who could mark out a permanent *via media* between opposite dogmatic tendencies.

Dioscorus, the champion of Alexandria, had succeeded Cyril in AD 444. The fact that he was subsequently condemned as a heresiarch, whereas Cyril was canonized as a saint, has necessarily led to differences of opinion as to the relations between the two. He may be regarded, with respect to his dogmatic position, either as a deserter of Cyril's position between the heresies of Monophysitism and Dyophysitism, or else as the real successor of Cyril in pressing the Alexandrian Christology to its natural conclusions. Personally he seems to have dissociated himself from Cyril by making foes of Cyril's family, although according to one account, he was himself of Cyril's kin. The charges made against his morals, both in public and in private life, may have been well founded, but in three respects, at least, he was a real follower of Cyril—in his zeal for the prerogatives of the see of St Mark; in the remarkable pertinacity and unscrupulousness with which he pursued his ends; and in his reliance on the monastic element among his followers, particularly on the part of it that was most violent and fanatical.

Of Flavian, bishop of Constantinople, there is less to be said. He enjoyed a reputation for piety, and seems to have acted with some independence in his relations with the Emperor. But he does not show enough dignity and moderation in the early stages of the dispute to obtain the sympathy which his cruel treatment at the end might seem to claim.

The premonitory symptoms of the controversy are to be seen in the complaints made by Dioscorus against Theodoret of Cyrus, who, as we have seen, had come into the general agreement without renouncing his hostility to the 'Egyptians' and all their ways. On the promotion of Dioscorus, he had written him a congratulatory and conciliatory letter. Since Theodoret almost alone in his generation seems to have had a sense of humor, we may suspect a grain of sarcasm in singling out for commendation a virtue—that of humility—which the dearest friend of Dioscorus could hardly claim for him. Dioscorus soon charged Theodoret with having gone beyond justice in helping to restore an ex-Nestorian bishop in

Tyre, of having himself preached a Nestorian sermon in Antioch, and of having, by appending his signature to a document issued by the late patriarch of Constantinople, acknowledged too widespread a jurisdiction in that see. Dioscorus secured an imperial prohibition served on Theodoret against departing from his diocese. Considering the events which followed, he could hardly have conferred on him a greater benefit.

The central controversy, which broke out in 448, may have likewise originated from Dioscorus. Another source assigned is a court intrigue. The eunuch Chrysaphius is said to have found the Patriarch Flavian an obstacle in his way. Flavian had incurred the ill-will of Theodosius by breaking a custom of sending complimentary gifts, and also by refusing or at least avoiding the task of forcing Pulcheria to retire into religious seclusion. The figure-head in the controversy is a poor one. Eutyches, an archimandrite (or abbot of some monastery) in or near Constantinople, was an aged man, who according to his own statements never left his monastery. But he had been a strong opponent of Nestorius, and now he was accused of disseminating errors of the opposite kind—of trying to propagate the doctrine of the One Nature. His accuser, Bishop Eusebius of Dorylaeum, induced Flavian, at first reluctant, to call him to account. This was done at the half-yearly local council of the bishops who chanced to be at Constantinople. The accusations were made, and Eutyches was with difficulty brought from his seclusion to make his defence. He did not shine as a theologian, and wished to fall back on the decisions of Nicaea and of Ephesus. On being hard pressed, he stated his belief in the words that he confessed Christ as being of two natures, before the union in the Incarnation, of one nature afterwards, being God Incarnate. On this point he refused to go back, and he was accordingly condemned and degraded. He afterwards tried in vain to prove that the reports of the synod had been falsified. He appealed to the Emperor, to Pope Leo, and to the monks of Constantinople. His friends, especially. Chrysaphius, stirred up Dioscorus on his behalf. Suggestions were made of a larger council, to revise the decision recently made at Constantinople, and the Emperor decided that such a council should be held, and that Dioscorus should preside.

But if it was the opportunity of Alexandria, it was likewise the opportunity of Rome. Leo had received the communication of Eutyches with courtesy, and was at first somewhat irritated at Flavian's delay in keeping him informed and asking his counsel. But as soon as he had made inquiries into the whole affair, he became convinced that Flavian was right and Eutyches wrong. He at once urged his views in letters to Flavian, Theodosius, Pulcheria and others. There were three principles which determined his action: first, that it was not a case for a General Council at all. The Emperor however had decided otherwise. Secondly, that if there were a Council, it ought to be called in the West. Here again he failed to secure his point. Thirdly, that it was for him, as successor to St Peter, to draw up for the Church an authoritative statement (or Tome) as to the points in controversy. Here he succeeded, though only in part. When the Council was finally decided upon he sent three delegates, a bishop, a priest, and a deacon, to represent him, and to communicate his Tome to the fathers present.

The Council was summoned to meet at Ephesus on 1 August 449. Dioscorus, as president, was to have as assessors Juvenal of Jerusalem and Thalassius of Caesarea. Both in composition and in procedure, to say nothing of state interference, it was exceedingly irregular. Many conspicuous bishops, such as Theodoret, were absent. An archimandrite, Barsumas, was allowed to come accompanied by a host of wild Syrian monks. The authority of the Roman see was so far neglected that Leo's Tome was not even allowed to be read, and by an unblushing terrorism the signatures of over one hundred and fifteen bishops were obtained. Flavian who had condemned Eutyches, and Eusebius who had accused him, were deposed. Eutyches himself was reinstated and declared orthodox. Several bishops who had been more or less friendly with Nestorius, or who had some grudge against the Alexandrian see, were condemned and deprived on the strength of sayings attributed to them in public or

private, and of many improbable moral offences. Among the deprived were Theodoret of Cyrus and Ibas of Edessa. The papal legates were not present during the whole time of the Council; indeed with regard to two of them the question of their presence at all is doubtful. A single protest—*Contradicitur*—was made by the Roman deacon Hilary, who escaped for his life and brought tidings of what had been done to Rome. Many suffered severe treatment. Flavian succumbed and died very soon after. The nominee of Dioscorus, Anatolius, was appointed to succeed him.

The violence of Dioscorus and his party may have been somewhat exaggerated by those who afterwards brought him to account. Yet there can be little doubt that the name given to the whole proceeding by Leo, the Robber Council, which has clung to it all through the course of history, was one that it richly deserved. It is difficult to understand how Dioscorus could have so far overshot the mark. Either he must have been an utterly vain and foolhardy man, who could not appreciate the strength of his antagonists, or he must have relied on the forces at his command, especially the monks and the Emperor. The Egyptian and Syrian monks were certainly to be relied on, and Theodosius upheld him and the decisions of his Council to the very end, even after a court revolution in which Chrysaphius had been degraded. (Eudocia had some years previously been obliged to leave the city). Leo acted with decision and promptitude. He called a synod at Rome, and endeavored to secure a revision of the acts of the irregular Council by one that should be full and legal. He refused to recognize Anatolius till he should have given satisfaction as to orthodoxy. He wrote to Pulcheria, asking again for her influence. He also used influence with the Western Court, and induced the Emperor Valentinian, his mother Placidia, and his wife Eudoxia—the cousin, the aunt and the daughter respectively of Theodosius—to write to him and urge a new Council. Before the death of Flavian was known, his restoration was also demanded. The council should be held in Italy. At first there was no result. But the whole aspect of affairs was changed when, in July 450, Theodosius died from the effects of a fall from his horse. Pulcheria, with the orthodox husband Marcian, whom ambition or stress of circumstances led her to choose, ascended the imperial throne. She had, as we have seen, disliked Nestorius, but she had no sympathy with the extreme party on the other side. She had always greatly interested herself in theological matters, and was quite ready to avail herself of the opportunity now offered to give power and unity to the Church.

The change in governors necessitated with Leo a modification not of strategy but of tactics. If no new Council was necessary, the calling of one was not, from the Roman point of view, desirable. The memory of Flavian must be rehabilitated, but Pulcheria was quite ready to order the removal of the martyred bishop's bones. Dioscorus must be called to order and his victims reinstated, and the rule of faith must be laid down. But for these objects, again, a Council seemed superfluous, since according to Leo's view of papal authority, which the sufferers, especially Theodoret, were willing to acknowledge, he was competent to revise their cases on appeal, and as to the faith, Leo's Tome had been prepared with the express view of making a settlement. Accordingly he wrote to Marcian against the project of a Council. As was natural, Marcian and Pulcheria took a somewhat different view. Some circumstances, it is true, would make them ready to receive Leo's suggestions. Piety apart, they would naturally desire peace and unity, and also freedom from Alexandrian interference. Rumour said that Dioscorus was plotting against them. This may be false, though the friendly relations between the Monophysites and the exiled widow-Empress Eudocia might render such a suggestion not improbable. But on the other hand the Emperor and Empress were not likely to avoid Scylla in order to fall into Charybdis—to liberate their ecclesiastical policy from Alexandrian dictation merely to bow beneath the yoke of Rome. With regard to the appointment of Anatolius, Leo had, by the appointment of a patriarch of Constantinople, attacked the independence of the Emperor as well as the dignity of the patriarch himself. A Council must



be called, Leo or his legate might preside, and his Tome might serve as basis for a confession of faith. But the Council must be held in the East, not, as Leo now vainly requested, in the West, and measures must be taken in it to secure the prestige of the Byzantine see against that of either St Mark or St Peter. This policy however was not all to be declared at once.

The Council was summoned to assemble at Nicaea, the orthodox associations of that place being of good omen. It was to be larger and more representative than any hitherto held, comprising as many as six hundred and thirty-six bishops (twice as many as those at Nicaea), though the Emperor and Empress took strong measures to exclude a concourse of unauthorized persons, who might come to make a disturbance. Seeing, however, that military and civil exigencies prevented Martian from attending meetings at a distance from his capital, he adjourned the Council to Chalcedon. The wisdom of this step soon became evident. Chalcedon was sufficiently near to Constantinople to allow a committee of imperial Ministers, with some distinguished members of the Byzantine Senate, to undertake the general control of affairs, and the Emperor and Empress were able, at least once, to attend in state, as well as to watch proceedings throughout.

When we consider the composition of the Council of Chalcedon and the state of parties at the time, we are surprised less at its failure to secure ecclesiastical unity than at its success in accomplishing any business at all. It can hardly be said that anyone wished for unity except on conditions that some others would pronounce intolerable. On the one hand were the ex-Nestorian bishops, Theodoret of Cyrus and Ibas of Edessa, who, though they had repudiated Nestorius himself, were strongly attached to the school from which he had sprung, and had suffered on many occasions, but worst at the Robber Council, from the injustice and violence of the Eutychian party. These, being dispossessed, could not of course take part in the proceedings till they had been reinstated, but they had been summoned to the spot, and their very presence was very likely to inflame the passions of their opponents. At the opposite extreme was Dioscorus, supported but feebly by the bishops who had assisted him at Ephesus, or rather by such as had not already submitted to Rome, yet backed up vigorously by a host of Syrian and Egyptian monks, who had managed to secure admittance in the character of petitioners. Between these parties stood the legates and the party of Leo, determined on urging the Roman solution of the problem and no other. In the church of St Euphemia, where the Council sat, the central position was held by the imperial Commissioners. Immediately on their left were the Roman delegates, who were regarded as the ecclesiastical presidents: the bishops Paschasinus and Lucentius, and the priest Boniface; and near them the bishops of Antioch, Caesarea, and Ephesus; then several from Pontus, Thrace, and some Eastern Provinces. To the right of the Commissioners were the bishops of Alexandria and Jerusalem, with those from Egypt, Illyria, and Palestine. These seem to have been the most conspicuous members of the Council, and were ranged like government and opposition parties in parliament. A certain number walked over from the Egyptian to the Roman side in the course of the first session, and before the whole business was over, the right must have been very much weakened. There were no restraints set to the expression of agitated feelings, and cries of "turn him out", "kill him", as an objectionable person came in sight were mixed with groans of real or feigned penitence for past errors, and imprecations against those who would either "divide" or "confuse" the Divine Nature.

The first and third sessions were devoted to the case of Dioscorus, the second, fourth, and fifth, to the question of Belief, the others chiefly to minor or personal matters. At the very first, the papal legates refused to let Dioscorus take his seat, stating that Leo had forbidden it. The first charge against him was that he had held a Council without the consent of the Roman see. It is difficult to see how this could have been maintained, since Leo had certainly sent his representatives to the Second Council of Ephesus. But other charges were soon brought forward by Eusebius of Dorylaeum as to his behavior with regard to Flavian and Eutyches.

The acts of the Robber Council, as well as those of the synod at Constantinople at which Flavian had condemned Eutyches, were read, a lengthy process which lasted till after night had fallen and candles had been brought in. Theodoret, amid cheers from one side and groans from the other was brought in to witness against his enemy, now at bay. The bishops who had signed the decrees at Ephesus told ugly stories of terrorism and begged for forgiveness. Finally, the secular judges declared Dioscorus deposed. But a further examination was made in the third session, from which, since the subjects to be discussed were of technical theology, the imperial Commissioners were absent. This fact gave Dioscorus an excuse for declining to obey the summons sent him. Charges against his private life were made at some length. After his third refusal to appear, the sentence of deprivation was passed. A similar decree was passed against Thalassius, Juvenal, and others who had assisted him, but on due submission these were not only pardoned but allowed to take part in the business of the Council. A similar indulgence was extended to all who, by force or guile, or possibly of their own will, had joined in the action which they were now ready to condemn.

Yet Dioscorus was not wholly without a following. Perhaps the demand made in the fourth session, by certain Egyptian bishops, that according to usage, they might not be forced to consent to anything important without the consent of the Alexandrian see, may not have shown much loyalty to the late occupant of that see. But there can be no doubt that the petition presented by a body of monks, chiefly Eutychian, showed serious disaffection. The request was for a truly ecumenical council, such as this one could hardly be without the presence of an Alexandrian patriarch. It is needless to say that the petitioners were angrily repelled. Yet they alone, of all who had been concerned in the Robber Council, had at least retained something of thieves' honour.

The discussions on the question of the Faith were long and stormy. The practical problem might seem to be comparatively simple, if it consisted in marking out safe ground between dyophysitism and Monophysitism. Neither of these forms of belief had advocates in the Council. For we have seen that Nestorius was not an uncompromising dyophysite and Eutyches was not an entire monophysite. Even had it been otherwise, Nestorianism had been trampled in the dust, and Eutychianism might seem to have received its death-blow. Those who said that further definitions were unnecessary, that the doctrines of Cyril and of Leo were in full accord, had some show of reason on their side. But the need for further definition was urged, and nearly led to a collapse of the whole Council. A general agreement was obtained without great difficulty. The creeds of Nicaea and of Constantinople, the letters of Cyril to Nestorius and to John of Antioch, and finally the Tome of Leo, were read and approved. It was this last document that the Roman delegates regarded as sufficient to put a stop to all further controversy. It has always remained a classical monument in the history of Christology, and has been far more widely read and studied than the declaration finally made at Chalcedon. Perhaps it seemed insufficient to some because the word Theotokos was not contained in it, though the idea implied in that word is set forth in unmistakable terms. And again, though very many present had subscribed to the Tome, it was not unnatural that in many quarters there should be a reluctance to accept as possessing peculiar authority a document emanating from a Western source. Anatolius and certain other bishops accordingly drew up a formula which was presented to the Council. But this only roused fierce opposition from the Roman legates, and even to a threat that they would withdraw altogether, and cause a new Council to be assembled in Italy.

The obnoxious creed has not come down to us, but we gather that it contained the expression: Christ is of two natures instead of the phrase in two natures. Those who would regard the theological difference as rooted in philosophical distinction may suggest a rational apprehension in the minds of Leo and his supporters, that whatever might be the principle of

union or separation in divine and human nature, it could not, as Eutyches supposed, be dependent on a merely temporal relation.

It would, of course, have been fatal to the policy of the Emperor and Empress if Rome had seceded at this juncture. As a compromise, Anatolius and a chosen representative committee of bishops were bidden to retire into the oratory of St Euphemia and prepare a new creed. The document, when produced, proved to be based on that of Leo. But it contained on the one side the word *Theotokos*, and on the other—there can hardly be any doubt, in spite of what seem to be clerical errors.

After the question of the Faith had been settled, the Emperor came himself to the Council and congratulated the bishops on the success of their labours in the cause of unity and truth. Sundry matters of local yet not unimportant interest were transacted in the last sessions. Thus Ibas and Theodoret were reinstated in their sees. In the case of Theodoret, a natural reluctance to anathematize the memory of his quondam friend Nestorius was overcome by threats. The only conceivable excuse is that the anathema may have been drifting into a mere *façon de parler*, and that, as shown above, Nestorius had himself generously expressed a wish that his own reputation might not be preferred to the cause of truth.

Finally, a list of canons, thirty in number, were drawn up, mostly on points of less burning interest, and the imperial authorities undertook to add the force of the secular arm to the decrees of the Council. But before the members dispersed, a stormy discussion arose which might seem to give the lie to the Emperor's pious hopes, especially as it was but the beginning of a fresh breach. This was the dispute as to Canon XXVIII. It is certain, from the remonstrance made by the Roman delegates, that neither they nor the imperial Commissioners had been present when the one in question was put to the vote; also that a comparatively small number of bishops had subscribed it. The canon is so important that it had better be given in full:

“Following in all things the decisions of the holy Fathers and acknowledging the canon, which has just been read, of the One Hundred and Fifty Bishops beloved-of-God (who assembled in the Imperial city of Constantinople, which is New Rome, in the time of the Emperor Theodosius of happy memory), we also do enact and decree the same things concerning the privileges of the most holy Church of Constantinople, which is New Rome. For the Fathers rightly granted privileges to the throne of Old Rome, because it was the imperial city. And the One Hundred and Fifty most religious bishops, actuated by the same consideration, gave equal privileges to the most holy throne of New Rome, justly judging that the city which is honoured with the Sovereignty and the Senate and enjoys equal privileges with the old imperial Rome, should in ecclesiastical matters also be magnified as she is, and rank next after her; so that in the Pontic, the Asian, and the Thracian Dioceses the metropolitans only, and such bishops also of the Dioceses aforesaid as are among the barbarians, should be ordained by the aforesaid most holy throne of the most holy Church of Constantinople; every metropolitan of the aforesaid dioceses, together with the bishops of his province, ordaining his own provincial bishops, as has been declared by the divine canons; but that, as has been above said, the metropolitans of the aforesaid Dioceses should be ordained by the archbishop of Constantinople, after the proper elections have been held according to custom and have been reported to him”.

It is hardly necessary to say that all the earlier or theoretical part of this document clashed entirely with Leo's views as to the supremacy of Rome and the relations of Church and State, while the latter or practical part seemed to give dangerously wide powers to the see of New Rome. When the Roman delegates objected, they were allowed a hearing, but reminded that it was their own fault that they had not been present when the canon was passed. They lodged a formal protest, supported by a phrase which had been interpolated into the Nicene canons. The result was nugatory. The canon was maintained. Leo supported the

action of his delegates, or rather, they had rightly gauged his mind. A long and stormy correspondence which he kept up with Marcian, Pulcheria, and Anatolius led to no final settlement. Leo acknowledged the validity of what had been done at Chalcedon with regard to the Faith, but held out tenaciously against the claims of the Byzantine see. There seems a touch of unconscious irony in his championship of the ancient rights of Alexandria and of Antioch, as well as in his inculcations on Anatolius to practice the virtue of humility. He only became reconciled to Anatolius three years later, after receiving from him a very apologetic letter, laying the blame on the Byzantine clergy, and stating that the whole case had been reserved for Leo's decision. But Anatolius could not bind the Eastern churches. Canon XXVIII continued to be accepted by the East, though unrecognized by the West.

We may ask which cause, or which party, profited by the Council of Chalcedon. The Papacy had put forth great claims, and in part had realized them, yet it seemed at the last to have been overreached by the East. A certain uniformity of belief had been imposed on a great part of the Christian world, but this belief was not supposed to add anything to the authoritative declarations of former councils, and so far as it wore any semblance of novelty, it served only to embitter party strife in the regions that most required pacification. The most active and ambitious disturber of the peace had been got rid of, but only with the result that his see had become the prey of hostile factions. There was some gain to the far East, in the restoration of learned and comparatively moderate men, like Theodoret and Ibas; but they had still to encounter active opposition. Perhaps the Emperor was the chief gainer; but he had overstrained his authority. The best that can be said for the Council is that things might have been worse if no council had met.

We may take briefly, as Epilogue to the Council of Chalcedon, the disturbances and insurrections consequent on the attempts to enforce its decisions: (a) in Palestine; (b) in Egypt; (c) in Provinces further to the East.

(a) Juvenal, bishop of Jerusalem, had played a sorry part in the whole business. It is not surprising that when he returned, pardoned and rehabilitated, to his bishopric, his flock was not unanimous in welcoming him back. His opponents, the most vigorous of whom came from the monastic bodies, set up in opposition to him a certain Theodosius, a monk who had been at Chalcedon and who had returned full of wrath and of determination to resist the new decisions. Juvenal fled back to Constantinople, while Theodosius acted as patriarch, appointing bishops of Monophysite views, and bidding defiance to imperial as well as to conciliar authority. The recalcitrant monks had the sympathy, if not the active assistance, of the ex-Empress Eudocia, who was still residing in Palestine. Pope Leo, it need scarcely be said, was vigorous with his pen on the other side. Martian determined on armed intervention. Forces were sent under the count Dorotheus, and Juvenal was reinstated. Theodosius was brought prisoner to Constantinople, and liberated during the next reign. The undercurrent of Monophysitism was, however, only covered for a time, not permanently checked.

(b) In Alexandria, as might be expected, the resistance was more prolonged and more serious. Whatever the faults of Dioscorus, he still had partisans among the monks and the common people. His successor Proterius was chosen, we are told, by the *nobiles civitatis*, and aristocratic management did not always succeed in Alexandria. Here again recourse was had to military force. Proterius had not the art of making himself popular; and when Dioscorus died at Gangra, his place of banishment, a clever schemer came to the force. This was Timothy, a Teuton whose tribal name, the Herul, was appropriately twisted into Aelurus, the Cat. He is said to have gone by night to the bedsides of those whom he wished to persuade and to have, told them, as they lay between sleep and waking, that he was an angel, sent to bid them provide themselves with a bishop and, in particular, to choose Timothy. On the death of Marcian, he obtained his desire and was chosen bishop by the people, and consecrated in the great church of the Caesarium, once the scene of the murder of Hypatia. A fate very much like



that of Hypatia befell the bishop Proterius, whose mangled body was dragged through the streets and then committed to the flames. How far the actual murder was instigated by Timothy it is impossible to say. The Emperor Leo, who had succeeded Marcian in 457, could not, of course, sanction the result of such proceedings. One scheme which suggested itself was the calling of a new Council. Any notion of the kind was, however, frustrated by Leo of Rome, who probably thought that an assembly held in the East at that juncture might prove even more antagonistic to Roman authority than the Council of Chalcedon. Accordingly, by his advice, the Emperor sent round circular letters to a large number of bishops and ascetics (Simeon Stylites had a copy) asking for their opinion and advice. The result was a general condemnation of Timothy Aelurus, and a confirmation of the Chalcedonian decrees. One bishop declared against Chalcedon, but even he was opposed to Timothy. Aelurus was accordingly driven out and succeeded by another Timothy, called Salophaciolus. But Aelurus maintained his influence, and on the wave of Monophysite reaction under the pretender Basiliscus he returned to his see. From about this time we may date the practical nullity of the orthodox Alexandrian patriarchate and the rise of the Coptic Church. But, as is seen by the whole course of events from the days of Theophilus and earlier, the causes of disruption were not entirely due to the difference between *ék* and *en*. Alexandria itself might be Greek and cosmopolitan, but Egypt had a peculiar and national character, which was chiefly evident in its language and its institutions, particularly its monasticism. If it seems surprising that violent ecclesiastical rivalries and the turbulence of the most unrestrained city mob to be found in all history should have led to the growth of a church which, with all its faults, has maintained itself ever since in the affections of the common people, the clue is to be found in the separation of Greek and Egyptian elements, which were incapable of a satisfactory and wholesome combination. But the separation naturally led in time to the fall of the Roman power in the chief seat of Hellenic civilization in the East.

(c) In the East, on the other hand, in Syria and Mesopotamia, there was less opposition to the Chalcedonian settlement, but a few years later a latent discontent broke into revolt. Domnus, bishop of Antioch, had played an undignified and unhappy part in the controversy. Though a friend of Theodoret and of Ibas, and an Antiochene in theology, he had been forced to subscribe the decisions of the Robber Council, and even after that humiliation had been deprived of his see. He was therefore pardoned at Chalcedon, but he was pensioned, not restored to office. His successor Maximus had been practically appointed by Anatolius of Constantinople. Leo thought best to confirm the appointment, and Maximus justified the hopes placed in him by proclaiming the decrees of Chalcedon on his return. But a few years after, for some unknown reason, he was deposed. In 461 a violent Monophysite, Peter the Fuller, succeeded in intruding into the see. His contribution to the Monophysite cause was of the kind always more effectual than argument in winning popular sympathy—a change in ritual. He introduced into the Trisagion “Holy, holy, holy is the Lord God of Hosts” the phrase: “who was crucified for us”. The imputation of suffering to one of the Trinity seemed to go further in the doctrine of One Nature than even the ascription to the Deity of birth in time. The catch-phrase excited the more passion because of the opportunity it afforded for rival singing or shouting in the church services. Peter was twice expelled from Antioch, but returned in triumph, and took an active part in the Henoticon scheme, to which we shall come directly.

Meantime, Ibas had returned to Edessa. The part taken by this city in the next period of the conflict is so interesting and important that it may seem desirable to notice here the circumstances which had made it theologically prominent. Edessa was the capital of the border-province of Osrhoene, belonging to the Empire, but close to the Persian frontier. According to tradition, it had received Christianity at a very early period, and there is no doubt that the people of those regions, speaking a Syrian tongue, and but little acquainted

with Greek philosophy, held a theology different in many respects from that of the Catholics or of Greek-speaking heretics of the fourth and early fifth centuries. All this, however, came to be changed by two events: the foundation of a school, chiefly for theological studies, at Edessa (circ. AD 363) and the active efforts of Bishop Rabbula (d. AD 435) to bring the church of Edessa into line with those of the Empire. These two forces, on the present occasion, acted in contrary directions. The school, which had been founded soon after the abandonment of Nisibis to the Persians (363), had become a nursery of Antiochene thought. For some time Ibas had presided over it, and laboured hard at the translation and promulgation of the theology and exegesis of Theodore of Mopsuestia, the real founder (as is sometimes stated) of Nestorianism. Rabbula the bishop was an uncompromising Cyrillian. On his death Ibas was raised to the bishopric, and thence exerted his influence in the same direction as formerly, supported by a faithful and singularly able pupil, Barsumas or Barsauma, who shared his fortunes and returned with him to Edessa after the Council of Chalcedon. On the death of Ibas, however, there came a Monophysite reaction. Nonnus, who had held the see while Ibas was under a cloud, re-ascended the episcopal throne (457). In his anxiety to purge the city of Nestorianism (though Ibas had anathematized Nestorius more than once), he made an attack on the school, and banished a large number of “Persian” teachers, i.e. of the orientals who had kept by Ibas. Barsumas came to Nisibis, now under Persian rule, and there devoted himself to the task of freeing the Syrian Church from the Western yoke, and of combating Monophysite doctrine. It will shortly appear how an unexpected turn of events greatly assisted him in both these objects. What has chiefly to be noticed here is that a few years after the Council of Chalcedon, Nestorians and Eutychians, or those to whom their adversaries would respectively apply these names, were in unstable equilibrium in various parts of the East.

IV. We now come to the fourth stage in the controversy, or series of controversies, which both manifest and also enhance the religious disunion of this century: the attempt of the Emperor Zeno, along with the bishops of Constantinople and Alexandria, to bring about a compromise. A few words about the character and position of each of the three parties in this attempt may fitly precede our examination of their policy and the reason of its failure.

Zeno the Isaurian (history has forgotten his original name—Tarasicodissa the son of Rusumbladestus) was son-in-law of Leo I, and succeeded his own infant son Leo II in 474. As to the part of his policy which concerns us here, we have Gibbon’s often-quoted remark that “it is in ecclesiastical story that Zeno appears least contemptible”. We shall see directly that this opinion is open to controversy. But there is no doubt that Zeno found himself in a very difficult position. Scarcely was he seated on his throne when Basiliscus, brother of the Empress-dowager, raised an insurrection against him (475), and he went into exile. Basiliscus appealed to the Monophysite subjects of the Empire, anathematized the Tome of Leo and the Council of Chalcedon, and recalled the disaffected bishops, including Timothy the Cat and Peter the Fuller. The circular letter in which he stated this decision is a remarkable assertion of the secular power over the Church. It was, however, of no lasting effect. The storm it aroused forced Basiliscus to countermand it. After about two years of banishment, Zeno fought or bought his way back. The bishops who had assented to the Encyclical of Basiliscus made very humble apology, and for a time it seemed as if the Chalcedonian settlement would prevail. The fact that it did not, is to be attributed mainly to the bishops of Constantinople and Alexandria, Acacius and Peter.

Acacius who had succeeded Gennadius (third after Anatolius) on the episcopal throne of Constantinople in 471, was a man of supple character, forced by circumstances to appear as a champion of theological causes rather than in the more congenial character of a diplomatist. He seems to have been drawn into opposition to Basiliscus, to whose measures he had at first

assented, then to have headed the opposition to them and to have earned the credit of the Anti-encyclical and of the final surrender of the usurper. In this crisis, Acacius had found his hand forced by the monks of the capital. The monastic element is very strong in all the controversies of the period, but it is not always on one side. In Egypt, as we have seen, the monks were Monophysite. In Constantinople, the great order of the Acoemetæ (sleepless—so called from the perpetual psalmody kept up in their churches) was fanatically Chalcedonian. Possibly the recent foundation (under the patriarch Gennadius) of their great monastery of Studium by a Roman, may partly account for their devotion to the Tome of Leo. In any case, they formed the most vigorous resisting body to all efforts against the settlement of Chalcedon. The policy of Acacius seems to have been determined by the influence acquired over him by Peter Mongus of Alexandria, although, in his earlier days of Chalcedonian orthodoxy, he had regarded Peter as an arch-heretic.

Peter Mongus, or the Stammerer, had been implicated in many of the violent acts of Dioscorus, and had been archdeacon to Timothy the Cat. On the death of Timothy he was, under circumstances somewhat diversely related, chosen as his successor, though the other Timothy (Salophaciolus) was still alive. On the death of Salophaciolus, a mild and moderate man, there was a hotly disputed succession, and Zeno obtained the recognition of Peter as patriarch of Alexandria (A.D. 482). Peter had already sketched out a line of policy with Acacius, which was shortly embodied in the document well known as the Henoticon or Union Scheme of Zeno.

The object of the Henoticon was stated as the restoration of peace and unity to the Church. The means by which such unity was to be obtained were, however, unlikely to satisfy more than one party. We have seen that Gibbon eulogizes it, and more recent historians have followed his opinion. But since a theological *eirenicon* drawn up by men of shifty character and no scruples must be judged by the measure of its success, we may hesitate to congratulate the originators of a document which, though approved by the patriarchs of the East, was certainly not so by all their clergy and people, and therefore caused a schism of thirty-five years between Rome and Constantinople, and forced the Church of the far East into counter-organization under the aegis of the Great King. Like the Emperor Constantius before him, who sought to settle the Arian difficulty by abolishing the *omousion*, and the Emperor Constans after him, who wished to allay the bad feelings of the Monotheletes and their opponents by disallowing their distinctive terminology, Zeno tried the autocratic short cut out of controversy by the prohibition of technical terms. Like the other would-be pacifiers, he aroused a great storm.

The Henoticon is in the form of a letter from the Emperor to the bishops and clergy, monks and laity, of Alexandria, Egypt, Libya, and Pentapolis. It begins by setting forth the sufficiency of the faith as declared at Nicaea and at Constantinople, and goes on to regret the number of those who, owing to the late discords, had died without baptism or communion, and the shedding of blood which had defiled the earth and even the air. Therefore, the above-mentioned symbols which had also been confirmed at Ephesus are to be regarded as entirely adequate. Nestorius and Eutyches are anathematized and the “twelve chapters” or anathemas of Cyril approved. It declares that Christ is “consubstantial with the Father in respect of the Godhead and consubstantial with ourselves as respects the manhood; that He, having descended and become incarnate of the Holy Spirit and Mary, the Virgin and Mother of God, is one and not two ... for we do in no degree admit those who make either a division or a confusion or introduce a phantom”. It goes on to say that this is no new form of faith, and that if anyone had taught any contrary doctrine, whether at Chalcedon or elsewhere, he was to be anathematized. Finally, all men are exhorted to return into the communion of the Church.

On its face, the document may seem reasonable enough. If all men could be brought to an agreement on the basis of the creeds of 325 and 381, the less said about Chalcedon the

better. But the very mention of Chalcedon in the document, with the suggestion that it might have erred, destroys the semblance of perfect impartiality. As might naturally be expected, the Alexandrians and Egyptians generally were ready to adopt it, though there was an exception in the “headless” party (acephali), the right wing of the anti-Chalcedonians, who were not satisfied because it did not directly condemn the Tome of Leo. But these people were extreme. In general, the apparent intention of leaving the authority of Chalcedon an open question was interpreted as giving full liberty to repudiate that authority. This was certainly the view taken by Peter Mongus, and in all probability by Acacius likewise. Certain letters purporting to be from these prelates show a more compromising spirit, but in a lately discovered correspondence handed down from Armenian sources, we find Peter denouncing the “infamous Leo”, and exhorting Acacius, as he celebrates mass, to substitute mentally for the names of Marcian, Pulcheria, and others whom he is bound outwardly to commemorate, those of Dioscorus, Eudocia, and other faithful persons.

As might naturally be expected, the Henoticon policy received strenuous opposition in Rome, where Simplicius, the next pope but one after Leo the Great, was determined to lose none of the ground gained by his predecessors. After a very bitter and unsatisfactory correspondence with Acacius, and two nugatory embassies to Constantinople, Simplicius solemnly excommunicated the Patriarch of Constantinople, as favourer of heretics, at a synod in Rome. An Acoemete monk took charge of the notification and fastened it to the mantle of Acacius during service. A similar sentence was passed on Mongus and on Zeno himself.

During the long period of the schism, a good many efforts were made for the restoration of peace, which proved abortive by reason on the one hand of the high demands of the Roman see, which always required the erasure of the name of Acacius from the diptychs, and on the other, the growth in power and assurance of Eastern Monophysitism. Anastasius, Zeno’s successor (491-518), generally bore a character for piety and moderation, but towards the end of his life, when he was very aged, appears to have been committed to a Monophysite policy. He seems at least to have been regarded by the Monophysites of later days as friendly to their party. He was influenced in this direction by a refugee of great force of intellect and will, Severus the Pisidian, formerly a pagan and a lawyer, later an uncompromising Monophysite, and head of the once “headless party” to whom the Henoticon seemed not to go far enough. Under his influence, the people of Constantinople were agitated by the singing in church of the Trisagion with addition, while their rivals shouted Peter’s Theopaschite in its original form. Anastasius showed some firmness in withstanding the Roman demands, but he was unfortunate in his dealings with his own patriarchs. The first of these, Euphemius, who was eager for peace with Rome, he degraded from office, only to replace him by another advocate (Macedonius) of the same cause, and after Macedonius in turn had been degraded, a patriarch was appointed (Timotheus) who gave no confidence to either party. With a large section of the people, Anastasius, in spite of his conscientious devotion to duty, made himself intensely unpopular. He made a last attempt to come to an agreement with Pope Hormisdas, but it failed in the same way as previous efforts. The task of making terms with Rome was left to his successor Justin, who became emperor in 518. A solemn ceremony was held in rehabilitation of the Council of Chalcedon. Shortly after, legates arrived from the Pope, and union was restored on the condition, formerly refused, of the erasure of Acacius’ name from the diptychs. Strange to say the two patriarchs whom Anastasius had displaced for their Romeward inclinations, were, in virtue of their schismatic appointment, struck off likewise. Zeno and Anastasius received a kind of post-mortem excommunication. All the leading members of Monophysite and other heretical sects were anathematized.

The end of the schism can hardly be regarded as terminating the series of controversies which are the subject of this chapter. East and West were never again to be reunited with any cordiality. But now, for a time, the outward dissension ceases, and in the struggle not far



distant with Vandals in Africa and Goths in Italy, the Empire represents the side of the Catholic Faith against either persecuting or tolerant Arianism.

Meantime, in the East, the Henoticon and the semi-Monophysite policy of the Emperors had far-reaching results. Mention has already been made of the school of Edessa, once presided over by Ibas, and of the reaction in Osrhoene, after Ibas' death, in a Monophysite direction. In 489 Zeno, regarding Edessa as still a hotbed of Nestorianism, closed the school there. The result was that a good many scholars migrated across the Persian frontier to Nisibis where, as already stated, Barsumas was bishop. In this city a very flourishing school was founded, in which the works of the great Antiochene doctors, Diodorus of Tarsus and Theodore of Mopsuestia, might be studied in peace, and where even the memory of Nestorius himself was honoured. The great episcopal see of the Persian Church had since 410 been fixed at Seleucia-Ctesiphon, and the bishop (catholicos) of that see was fairly independent of those who, from his point of view, were regarded as the "western fathers" of the Syrian churches. Christians in Persia enjoyed peace and patronage, with intermittent persecutions, under the great kings of the Sassanid dynasty. It seems to have been part of the Nestorian policy of Barsumas to convince the king that Monophysitism meant inclination to side with the Empire whenever war broke out, while Nestorianism was consistent with loyalty to Persia. Under these circumstances, the Nestorian Church in Persia grew and flourished. Beside its school at Nisibis, it had, in course of time, one at Seleucia. Its character was greatly determined by its monastic institutions. Its missionary zeal made itself felt in India and even in China. Altogether, though the time of its greatness was not of very long duration, it acquired, by its intellectual and religious activity, a very respectable place among the Churches which the dissensions of the fifth century alienated from Catholic Christendom.

While Christianity in Persia was becoming Nestorian, Syria was becoming Monophysite. The whole story of the process does not fall within our present limits, but it may be remarked that the great organiser of the Monophysite communities, both in Egypt and Syria, was Severus the Pisidian who held the see of Antioch from 512 till his deposition in 519, and whose active and productive life ended about 540. The reorganiser of the Monophysite Church after the persecution which followed the reunion of Rome and Constantinople was Jacobus Baradaeus, who died about 578, and from whom the Syrian Monophysites are sometimes called Jacobites. His history, however, does not concern us here.

Historically viewed, the interest of these controversies lies not so much in the motives by which they were inspired as in the dissolutions and combinations to which they gave birth. The alienation of churches seems in many cases to be at bottom the alienation of peoples and nations, the religious difference supplying pretext rather than cause. And sometimes the asserted cause of the dispute is lost sight of when the difference has been made permanent. So it was, apparently, with the Jacobite-Syrian and the Nestorian-Persian Churches. Also we may notice that the Christianity of the Copts has become more like a reversion, with differences, to the popular religion of the old Egyptians than an elaboration of the principles of Cyril and Dioscorus. And again the breach between Greeks and Latins was sure to break out again, however often the ecclesiastical dispute which had served as the occasion of a temporary alienation might be settled. The fruits of the disunion we have been examining became evident enough in the days of the Mahommedan invasions, yet had the actual occasions of the disunion been entirely absent, we can hardly feel sure that a united Christendom would have stood ready to repel the Saracen advance. Even if the Empire had never lost its unity, it could hardly have retained in permanent and loyal subordination the populations of Egypt and of the East. They had been but superficially connected with Byzantium, while, perhaps unconsciously, they remained under the sway of more ancient civilizations than those of Hellas and of Rome.



## CHAPTER XVIII

### MONASTICISM

CHRISTIAN Monasticism was a natural outgrowth of the earlier Christian asceticism, which had its roots in the gospel. For it is now recognised that such sayings as: “If thou wouldest be perfect, go sell that thou hast, and give to the poor ... and come, follow me”; and: “There are eunuchs, which made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven's sake: he that is able to receive it, let him receive it”; and the teaching of St Paul on celibacy, did as a matter of fact give an impetus to the tendency so common in seriously religious minds towards the practice of asceticism. These tendencies are clearly discernible among Christians from the beginning; and not only among the sects, but also in the great Church. Celibacy was the first and always the chief asceticism; but fasting and prayer, and the voluntary surrender of possessions, and also works of philanthropy, were recognized exercises of those who gave themselves up to an ascetical life. This was done at first without withdrawal from the world or abandonment of home or the ordinary avocations of life. At an early date female ascetics received ecclesiastical recognition among the virgins and widows, and there are grounds for believing that at the middle of the third century there already were organized communities of women—for in the Life of Anthony we are told that before withdrawing from the world he placed his sister in a *pantheon* or house of virgins, the name later used for a nunnery. At this date there was nothing of the kind for men; but, at any rate in Egypt, the male ascetics used to leave their homes and dwell in huts in the gardens near the towns. For when, c. 270, St Anthony left the world, it was this manner of life he embraced at first.

St Anthony was born in middle Egypt about the year 250. When he was twenty, on hearing in church the gospel text “If thou wouldest be perfect”, as cited above, he took the words as a personal call to himself and acted on them, going to practice the ascetical life among the ascetics who dwelt at his native place. After 15 years so spent, he went into complete solitude, taking up his abode in a deserted fort at a place called Pispir, on the east bank of the Nile opposite the Fayum, now called Der-el-Memun (c. 285). In this retreat Anthony spent twenty years in the strictest seclusion, wholly given up to prayer and religious exercises. A number of those who wished to lead an ascetic life congregated around him, desiring that he should be their teacher and guide. At last he complied with their wishes and came forth from his seclusion, to become the inaugurator and first organizer of Christian monachism.

This event took place about the beginning of the fourth century —305 is the traditional date; only a few years later did Pachomius found, in the far south, the first Christian monastery properly so called. It will be convenient to trace separately the two streams of monastic tradition that flowed respectively from the two great founders, Anthony and Pachomius.

The form of monachism that drew its inspiration from St Anthony prevailed throughout Lower or Northern Egypt. All along the Nile to the north of Lycopolis (Asyut), and in the adjacent deserts, and on the sea-board near Alexandria, there were at the end of the fourth century vast numbers of monks, sometimes living alone, sometimes two or three together, sometimes in large congregations — but even then the life was semi-eremical.

Antonian monachism reached its greatest and most characteristic development in the deserts of Nitria and Scete, and it is here that we have the most abundant materials for forming a picture of the life of these monks. Palladius and Cassian both lived in this district for many years during the last decade of the fourth century; St Jerome, Rufinus, and the writer of the *Historia Monachorum* visited it; and they have left on record their impressions. Nitria, the present Wady Natron, is a valley round some nitre lakes, lying out in the desert to the west of the Nile, some 60 miles due south of Alexandria. Those who began the monastic life here were Amoun and Macarius of Egypt, himself a disciple of Anthony. A few miles from Nitria was the desert called Cellia from the number of hermits' cells that studded it, and further away still, out in the "utter solitude", was the monastic settlement of Scete. Rufinus and the writer of the *Historia Monachorum* describe Cellia: "The cells stood out of sight and out of earshot of one another; only on the Saturday and Sunday did the monks assemble for the services; all the other time was spent in complete solitude, no one ever visiting another except in case of sickness or for some spiritual need". Palladius says that 600 lived in Cellia.

This was a purely eremitical life; but in Nitria it was otherwise. The following is Palladius' account, as he saw it in 390.

"In Mount Nitria 5000 monks dwell following different manners of life, each according to his power and desire; so that anyone could live alone, or with another, or with several. In the mountain there are seven bakeries and a great church by which stand three palm trees, each with a whip hanging from it; one is for the monks who misbehave themselves, one for thieves, and one for chance corners: so that anyone who offended and was judged worthy of stripes, embraced the palm tree and made amends by receiving on the back the fixed number of blows. Close to the church is the guest house, and any guest who comes is entertained until he goes of his own accord, even if he stay for two or three years. For the first week they let him stay, in idleness, but after that they make him work, either in the garden or the bake-house or the kitchen. Or if he be a man of position they give him a book to read, but do not allow him to have intercourse with anyone till noon. Physicians dwell in this mountain, and confectioners; they use wine, and wine is sold. They all make linen with their hands, so that they have no needs. And about three in the afternoon one may stand and hear how the psalmody arises from each habitation, and fancy oneself rapt aloft into Paradise. But they assemble at the church only on Saturday and Sunday".

Palladius tells, too, of one Apollonius, a merchant, who became a monk in Nitria, and being too old to learn a handicraft, purchased medicines and stores at Alexandria and cared for all the brotherhood in their sicknesses, for twenty years going the round of the cells from daybreak till three in the afternoon, knocking at the doors to see if anyone was sick: and of another who on becoming a monk retained his money and devoted it wholly to works of hospitality towards the poor, the aged and the infirm, and was judged by the fathers to be equal in merit to his brother, who had dispossessed himself of his belongings and given himself up wholly to a life of strict asceticism.

What has been said will bring out the special feature of this type of monasticism—its voluntariness: even when the monks lived together, there was not any common life according to rule. A large discretion was left to each one to follow his own devices in the employment of his time and the practice of his asceticism. In short, this form of monachism grew out of the eremitical life, and it retained its eremitical or semi-eremitical character even in the great monastic colonies of Nitria and Scete.

We may now pass to the Pachomian monachism dominant in the southern parts of Egypt. Pachomius was a pagan by birth; he was born about 290, and became a Christian at the age of twenty. He adopted the eremitical life under Palaemon, a hermit who lived by the Nile in the diocese of Tentyra (Denderah). The legend of his call to be the creator of Christian cenobitical life is thus told by Palladius.



“Pachomius was in an extraordinary degree a lover of mankind and a lover of the brotherhood. While he was sitting in his cave an angel appeared unto him and said: Thou hast rightly ordered thy own life; needlessly therefore dost thou sit in the cave; come forth and bring together all the young monks and dwell with them, and legislate for them according to the exemplar I will give thee. And he gave him a brazen tablet whereon was engraved the Rule”. There follows what probably is the most authentic epitome of the earliest Christian Rule for Monks.

St Pachomius founded his first monastery at Tabennisi near Denderah c. 315-320, and by the time of his death in 346 his order counted nine monasteries of men and one of women, all situated between Panopolis (Akhmim) to the north and Latopolis (Esneh) to the south, and peopled by some 3000 monks in all. After his death other monasteries were founded, one at Canopus near Alexandria, and several in Ethiopia; so that by the end of the century Palladius tells us there were 7000 Pachomian or Tabennesiot monks—St Jerome’s 50,000 may safely be rejected.

Palladius visited the Pachomian monastery at Panopolis (Akhmim) and has left us what is by far the most actual and living picture of the daily life. He tells us that there were 300 monks in this monastery, who practiced all the handicrafts and out of their superabundance contributed to the support of nunneries and prisons. The servers of the week got up at daybreak and some worked in the kitchen while others laid the tables, getting them ready by the appointed hour, spreading on them loaves of bread, mustard leaves, olive salad, cheeses, herbs chopped up, and pieces of meat for the old and the sick.

“And some come in and have their meal at noon, and others at 1 or at 2 or at 3 or at 5, or in the late evening, and others every second day. And their work was in like fashion: one worked in the fields, another in the garden, another in the smithy, another in the bakery, another at carpentry, another at fulling, another at basket-making, another in the tanyard, another at shoemaking, another at tailoring, another at calligraphy”; he mentions also that they keep camels and herds of swine: he adds that they learn by heart all the Scriptures. From the Rule it appears that they assembled in the church four times a day, and approached Communion on Saturday and Sunday.

Here we have a fully constituted and indeed highly organized cenobitical life, the day being divided between a fixed routine of church services, Bible reading, and work seriously undertaken as an integral factor of the life. Herein lies one of the most significant differences between Pachomian and Antonian monachisms. In the latter the references to work are few, and the work is of a sedentary kind, commonly basket-making and linen-weaving, which could be carried on in the cell; and the work was undertaken merely in order to supply the necessaries of life, or to fill up the time that could not be spent in actual prayer or contemplation or the reading of the Bible. Palladius’ picture of the Pachomian monastery, on the other hand, is that of a busy, well-organized, self-supporting agricultural colony, in which the daily religious exercises only alternated with, and did not impede, the daily labour that was so large an element of the life: and so this picture is of extraordinary value. Whatever may be thought of the life led by the hermits or quasi-hermits of northern Egypt, there will hardly be two opinions as to the strenuousness and virility of the ideal aimed at by St Pachomius. The Antonian ideal is the one that (even in accentuated forms) has been in all ages dominant in the East, and it was the form of monachism first propagated throughout Western Europe. It was not the least of St Benedict’s contributions to Western monachism that he introduced, with the modifications called for by differences of climate and national character, a type of monachism more akin to the Pachomian, in which work of one kind or another, undertaken for its own sake, forms an essential part of the life.

Having thus traced in the briefest manner the external phenomena of the earliest Christian monachism, we must say a word on its inner spirit. The theory or philosophy of

primitive Christian monachism finds its fullest expression in Cassian's Collations. These are 24 conferences of considerable length, which purport to be utterances of several of the most prominent of the Nitriot and Scetic monks, made in response to queries and difficulties put by Cassian himself and his, friend Germanus, who lived for a number of years in Scete between 390 and 400. The Collations were not written till 25 years later, and the question has been raised how far they reproduce actual discourses uttered by the various monks named; or are compositions of Cassian's, a literary device for presenting the teaching and ideas current in Scete. In any case, there can be no reasonable doubt that they do faithfully represent the substance and spirit of that teaching — and this is all that is of historical importance. Cassian puts into the foreground, in his first Collation, an exposition of the purpose or scope of the monastic life: Abbot Moses declares it to be the attainment of Purity of Heart, so that the mind may rest fixed on God and divine things: for this purpose only are fastings, watchings, meditation of Scripture, solitude, privations to be undertaken: such asceticisms are not perfection, but only the instruments of perfection. This conference supplies the key to the fundamental conception of the monastic state. It is a systematic and ordered attempt to exercise the tendencies symbolized by the terms Mysticism and Asceticism—two of the most deeply rooted religious instincts of the human heart, but which beyond most others need regulation and control. Egyptian monachism was probably at its highest point of development about the year 400, just when Cassian and Palladius came in contact with it. Without accepting the probably apocryphal figures given by some of the authorities, there can be no doubt that there were at that date very many thousands of monks in Egypt. And the original enthusiasms and spirituality of the movement still, on the whole, held sway. But with the fifth century the decay set in, which has gone on progressively till our day. The Egyptian monks, who had been the great adherents of the Catholic faith in the Arian times, became the chief supporters of Dioscorus in making the Egyptian Church Monophysite. As the Mahommedan invasion swept over Egypt the monasteries were in great measure destroyed, and Egyptian monasticism has ever since been gradually dying out; at the present day only a few monasteries survive, and the institution is in a moribund condition, unless some unlooked-for revival come about.

When we pass from Egypt to the oriental lands, we find that in Palestine monastic life was introduced from Egypt by Hilarion early in the fourth century. He had been a disciple of Anthony, and the life he led in Palestine was purely eremitical. There are traces of cenobitic monasteries in Palestine during the fourth century, especially those established under Western influences—as by St Jerome and Paula, Rufinus and the two Melanias. But the glimpses of Palestinian monachism the end of the century given us by Palladius in the *Lausiac History*, reveal the fact that it remained in large measure eremitical.

In Syria and Mesopotamia, whether in the Roman or in the Persian territories, there was at the beginning of the fourth century what appears to have been an indigenous growth of asceticism analogous to the pre-monastic asceticism found in Egypt and elsewhere. The institution was known as the Sons of the Covenant, and the members were bound to celibacy and the usual ascetical practices, but they were not monks properly so called. We hear much of them from Aphraates (c. 330); and Rabbula, bishop of Edessa a century later, wrote a code of regulations for priests and Sons of the Covenant. As he wrote also a Rule for monks, it seems clear that the Sons of the Covenant did not develop into a monastic system, but the two institutions existed alongside of each other till at any rate the middle of the fifth century. The beginnings of monachism proper in the Syrian lands are difficult to trace. It is probable that the story of Eugenius, who was said to have introduced monasticism from Egypt in the early years of the fourth century, must be rejected as legendary. Theodoret opens his *Historia Religiosa*, or lives of the Syrian monks, with an account of one Jacob who lived as a hermit near Nisibis before 325; but as this was a century before Theodoret's time, the facts must

remain somewhat doubtful. He gives accounts of a number of Syrian monks in the end of the fourth century and the beginning of the fifth: most of them were hermits; and even when disciples gathered around them, the life continued to be strongly individualistic and eremitical. This has continued to be the tendency of Syrian monachism, both Nestorian and Monophysite. Cenobitical life was commonly only the first stage of a monk's career; the goal aimed at was to be a hermit; after a few years each monk withdrew to a cell at a distance from the monastery, to live in solitude, frequenting the monastic church only on Sundays and feasts. Rabbula's Admonitions for Monks (c. 425) are of great interest: he lays down that no one is thus to become a hermit until he has been proved in a monastery for a considerable time. The following regulation is of special interest: "Those who have been made priests and deacons in the monasteries, and have been entrusted with churches in the villages, shall appoint as superiors those who are able to rule the brotherhood; and they themselves shall remain in charge of their churches". The practice here indicated, of monks serving churches, is probably unique in the East; it has been done in the West in later times, but has always been regarded as abnormal.

Thus while in Egypt the tendency was to abandon the eremitical life for the cenobitical, in Syria the opposite tendency set in. In another respect, too, Syrian monachism developed along lines different from those that prevailed in Egypt. Egyptian monks practiced, it is true, austerities and mortifications of the severest kind; but they were what may be called natural, as prolonged abstinence from food and sleep, exposure to heat and cold, silence and solitude, heavy labour and physical fatigue. In Syria on the contrary austerities of a highly artificial character became the vogue: the extraordinary life of the pillar hermits, who abode for years on the summits of pillars, at once presents itself in illustration. Theodoret and the other authorities speak as if it were a common practice that monks should carry continually fastened to their backs great stones or iron weights—Rabbula forbids this except to hermits. Sozomen tells us of a kind of Syrian monk called 'Grazers', who used to go out into the fields at meal-times and eat grass like cattle. A good picture of the lines on which Syrian monachism settled down after the sixth century is afforded by Thomas of Marga's *Book of the Governors*, or history of the great Nestorian monastery of Beth Abhe in Mesopotamia.

All the evidence shows that the ingrained oriental hankering after asceticism, still found in Hindu fakirs, asserted itself in Syrian monachism from the beginning, and it has there at all times been a characteristic feature of the system.

Monasticism seems to have made its entry into Greek-speaking lands from the East. It first appears in the Roman province of Armenia in connection with Eustathius of Sebaste, c. 330-340. The claim has been made, indeed, that monasteries were established in Constantinople by Constantine, but this must be regarded as legend; there probably were none there before the end of the fourth century. The monasticism of Eustathius was of a highly ascetical character, with strongly developed Manichaean tendencies, which were condemned at the Council of Gangra, c. 340. Similar in character, but carrying the same tendencies to still greater extremes, were the Messalians or Euchitae, in Paphlagonia, described by Epiphanius.

The real father of Greek monachism was St Basil. After spending a year in visiting the monks of Egypt and Syria, he retired, c. 360, to a lonely spot near Neocaesarea in Pontus, and there began to lead a monastic life with the disciples who quickly gathered round him. His conception of the monastic life was in many important points a new departure, and it proved epoch-making in the history of monachism: it has continued to this day the fundamental conception of Greek and Slavonic monasticism; and St Benedict, though he borrowed more in matter of detail from Cassian, in matter of principles and ideas owed more to St Basil than to any other monastic legislator. Thus in the monasticism of both East and West, St Basil's ideas still live on. For this reason it will be proper to give a somewhat full account of his monastic legislation. The materials are to be found chiefly in the two sets of Rules (the Longer and the

Shorter), the authenticity of which is now recognised, and in certain of his Letters, supplemented by letters of St Gregory Nazianzen to him.

St Basil's construction of the monastic life was fully cenobitical, in this respect advancing beyond that of St Pachomius. In the Pachomian system the monks dwelt in different houses within the monastery precincts; the meals were at different hours; and all assembled in the church only for the greater services. But St Basil established a common roof, a common table, a common prayer always; so that we meet here for the first time in Christian monastic legislation the idea of the cenobium, and common life properly so called. Again, St Basil declared against even the theoretical superiority of the eremitical life over the cenobitical. He asserted the principle that monks should endeavour to do good to their fellow men; and in order to bring works of charity within reach of his monks, orphanages were established, separate from the monasteries but close at hand and under the care of the monks, in which apparently children of both sexes were received. Boys also were taken into the monasteries to be educated, and not with the view of their becoming monks. Another new feature in St Basil's conception of the monastic life was his discouragement of excessive asceticism; he enunciated the principle that work is of greater value than austerities, and drew the conclusion that fasting should not be practiced to such an extent as to be detrimental to work. All this represents a new range of ideas.

The following is an outline of the actual daily life in St Basil's monasteries. A period of novitiate or probation, of indeterminate length, had to be passed, at the end of which a profession of virginity was made, but no monastic vows were taken: Palladius, writing in 420, says in the Prologue to the Lausiac History, that it is better to practice the monastic life freely, without the constraint of a vow. But though there were no vows, St Basil's monks were considered to be under a strict obligation of persevering in the monastic life, and of abiding in their own monastery. Their time was divided between prayer, work, and the reading of Holy Scripture. They rose for the common psalmody while it was still night and chanted the divine praises till the dawn; six times each day did they assemble in the church for prayer. Their work was field labour and farming—St Gregory Nazianzen speaks of the ploughing and vine-dressing, the wood-drawing and stone-hewing, the planting and draining. The food and clothing, too, the housing and all the conditions of life, he describes as being coarse and rough and austere. The monastic virtues of obedience to the superior, of personal poverty, of self-denial, and the cultivation of the spiritual life and of personal religion, are insisted on.

The Basilian form of monachism was the one that spread in the adjacent provinces of Asia Minor and in Armenia; and under the influence of the Council of Chalcedon, which passed several canons regulating the monastic life, and of the civil law, it gradually made its way and became recognised throughout the Greek portion of the Empire as the official form of monastic life. But the Eastern tendency towards the practice of extreme austerity and the eremitical life has always struggled to find expression, and to this day there are hermits on Mount Athos and at other monastic centers of the Orthodox Church.

In the fifth century the Holy Land became the head centre of Greek monachism, and monasteries of two kinds arose in considerable numbers. There were the *cenobia*, or monasteries proper, where the life was according to the lines laid down by St Basil; and there were the *lauras*, wherein a semi-eremitical life was followed, the monks living in separate huts within the enclosure. St Sabas, a Cappadocian, was the great organizer of this manner of life—he founded no fewer than seven *lauras* in Palestine, and drew up a *Typicon* or code of rules for their guidance.

Sabas was appointed Exarch of all the *lauras* of Palestine, while his compatriot and contemporary Theodosius became Archimandrite of all the *cenobia* of Palestine. Under the stress of the Origenistic controversy and of the Arab invasion Palestinian monachism waned, and in the seventh century the centre of gravity of Greek monasticism shifted to



Constantinople, where in the early years of the ninth century it underwent a reorganization at the hands of Theodore, abbot of the monastery of the Studium. In the eleventh and twelfth centuries the centre of gravity again shifted, this time to Mount Athos, where it has ever since remained.

Since the time of Theodore the Studite Greek and Slavonic monachism has undergone little change: it is still St Basil's monachism, but the elements of hard labor and of works of charity have been almost wholly eliminated from the life, and intellectual work has not, as in the West, taken their place on any large scale — indeed, it has usually been discouraged; so that for the past thousand years Greek and Slavonic monks have been almost wholly given up, in theory at any rate, and in great measure in practice too, to a life of purely devotional contemplation. They do not call themselves Basilians, but simply Monks, and St Basil's Rules scarcely hold a leading place in the code of monastic legislation that regulates their life.

While the monastic system was in its primitive unorganized state it lent itself to certain obvious abuses. Anyone who chose could become a hermit and live according to his own devices. Impostors and charlatans under the guise of pretended austerities deceived the simple and lived upon alms received on false pretences. These abuses seem to have attained a great magnitude in Syria at the middle of the fifth century, if we may judge from the vigorous protests of Isaac of Antioch; but they existed everywhere. They led to the gradual regulating of the monastic life and the subjecting of the monks to the authority of the bishops. In this way a body of legislation, both ecclesiastical and civil, grew up, which restricted the voluntariness of the system, and made it an integral part of the general polity of both Church and State.

This 'ecclesiasticizing' of the monks is often deplored; but it was part of the inevitable march of events and a condition of the continued existence of the institution. In the fifth and sixth centuries other tendencies made themselves felt, and the monks in great numbers became embroiled in the ecclesiastical politics and the theological controversies of the time. Sometimes they were on the orthodox side, sometimes on the heterodox; but on whatever side they stood, they were only too often violent and fanatical, and some of the most discreditable episodes of Church history in those days were the work of Eastern monks — as the murder of Flavian at the Robber Synod of Ephesus.

Before we pass to the West, it will be well to speak of the nuns in Egypt and the East. It has already been said at the beginning of this chapter, when speaking of the premonastic Christian ascetics, that communities of women existed at an earlier date than communities of men—in Egypt as early as the middle of the third century. The records of Egyptian monachism agree in representing women as taking part in great numbers in every phase of the monastic movement. There were women who lived as hermits and as recluses, shut up in tombs; there are various stories of women disguising themselves as men and living in monasteries, and being discovered only after death. Pachomius founded two nunneries, one, under his sister, at Tabennisi, the other, which numbered 400 nuns, near Panopolis (Akhmim); and after his death many others were founded in his order. The famous Coptic abbot Senuti of Atripè governed a great community of nuns in addition to the monks of the White Monastery. We learn from Palladius that at the end of the fourth century there were numerous nunneries in all parts of monastic Egypt, and the glimpses he lets us see of their inner life are graphic and interesting. He tells us of one Dorotheus who had the spiritual charge of a nunnery, and used to sit at a window overlooking the convent, "keeping the peace among the nuns"; also of an old nun, Mother Talis, superioress of a convent at Antina, so beloved by her nuns that there was no need of a key in that convent, as in others, to keep the nuns from wandering, "as they were fast tied by love of her".

In Syria there were at the beginning of the fourth century 'Daughters of the Covenant', analogous to the 'Sons of the Covenant', spoken of above. Whether they led a full community

life is uncertain; but in one of Rabbula's regulations, at the beginning of the fifth century, it is prescribed that 'Sons or Daughters of the Covenant who fall from their estate be sent to the monasteries for penance', which implies the existence of convents of women. In all probability there were in Syria, as elsewhere, fully organized nunneries, though there is not much Syrian evidence concerning them. Certainly in Palestine at this time there were many convents of women, including those established under the influence of the Roman ladies Paula and Eustochium and the Melanias. When St Basil began his monastic life about 360, his mother and sister were already living in a community of nuns in the immediate vicinity, with a river between them; and throughout Greek-speaking Christendom, in Asia Minor and above all in Constantinople, women practiced the monastic life hardly less than men. No Eastern nuns, however, have at any time devoted themselves to external works of charity like the modern active congregations of women in the West.

There is a considerable body of evidence showing that the ascetical life was pursued in the West—notably at Carthage and Rome—as in the East, before the introduction of monasticism proper; but there is no sufficient reason for questioning the tradition that attributes the knowledge of the monastic life in Western Europe to the influence of St Athanasius. In the year 339 he came to Rome, accompanied by two Egyptian monks, and thus spread in the City and its neighbourhood the knowledge of the manner of life that was then being practiced in Egypt. Many candidates presented themselves, and we learn from Ambrose, Jerome, and Augustine that in the last quarter of the fourth century there were numerous monasteries of men and of women in Rome. Among the high-born patrician ladies the movement had a great vogue and became so fashionable that an agitation against it arose, of which St Jerome had to bear the brunt. These ladies, brought up in every luxury, gave up all things and surrendered themselves to lives of hardship and devotional exercises. The most famous of them, as Paula and Melania, even left Rome and went to the Holy Land, where they established sisterhoods. Monasteries rapidly spread over Central and Southern Italy, and the islands of the Tyrrhenian Sea were peopled by hermits. In North Italy, too, monasteries existed by the end of the fourth century at the chief cities—at Aquileia, where Rufinus and Jerome were trained in the monastic life; at Milan, where Ambrose had a great monastery of men; at Ravenna and Pavia and many other towns.

Eusebius, bishop of Vercelli (d. 371), introduced a change in the idea of the monastic life that merits for him a more prominent place among monastic legislators than is commonly accorded to him: he combined the clerical and monastic states, making the clerics of his cathedral live together in community according to the monastic rule. This was the starting-point of the practice destined to prevail both in West and East, whereby monks as by ordinary rule become priests, though it was several centuries before the custom was established.

It was in the form initiated by Eusebius at Vercelli that the monastic life was introduced into Africa by St Augustine on his return from Italy in 388. In 391 he was ordained presbyter at Hippo and established a community of clerics living together according to rule; and when in 396 he became bishop of Hippo, he continued to follow the same manner of life along with his clerics. Several bishops went forth from this community to other sees, and in most cases they established similar monasteries of clerics in their episcopal cities. This union of the clerical and monastic lives was widely prevalent in Africa, and it became the exemplar both of the institution of secular canons in the Carolingian reform, and of that of canons regular, or Augustinian canons, in the Hildebrandine.

Monasteries of the type normal in those days also arose in Africa. In the times of Tertullian and Cyprian veiled virgins were recognised; but it is doubtful whether they had developed into a proper monastic system before St Augustine's time. During his episcopate there certainly were many nunneries, one being presided over by his sister; and his Letter 211—the only authentic 'Rule of St Augustine'—was written for the guidance of a nunnery.

Thus in the early years of the fifth century monachism was strong and flourishing in the African Church.

The beginnings of Spanish monachism are obscure, and the records scanty. The first reference is a canon of the Council of Zaragoza in 380, forbidding clerics to become monks: this shows that the monastic institute must by that date have spread considerably in Spain; but there seems to be no extant evidence of the existence of a monastery in Spain till the beginning of the sixth century. There is a tradition that then one Donatus carried monasticism from Africa into Spain; but the names to be associated with early Spanish monachism are Martin, bishop of Braga, a Pannonian and the apostle of the Arian Sueves, who died in 580, and Fructuosus, also bishop of Braga, about a century later. The latter was the great organizer and propagator of monachism in the Peninsula, establishing several monasteries and writing (probably) two rules for their guidance. It is chiefly from these rules that we get glimpses of the earlier Spanish monachism. It seems to have been a common practice for a man to call his house a "monastery," and to live in it with his wife, children and servants: against this abuse, and others, St Fructuosus legislates. One feature of his Rule is unique: it contains a pact between the abbot and monks, whereby the latter bind themselves to the performance of the duties of the monastic life under the abbot, and empower him to inflict specified punishments for certain offences; and on the other hand reserve to themselves, in case the abbot should act in an arbitrary or tyrannical way, the right of appeal to other abbots or to the bishop. St Fructuosus lived a century after St Benedict's death; but throughout the Gothic period there is no trace of Benedictine monachism in Spain. In the extant rules of Spanish origin—those of Leander, of Isidore, and of Fructuosus—it is possible to discern certain reminiscences which betray a knowledge of the Benedictine Rule; but Mabillon greatly exaggerates their significance. These rules are in no sense declarations or commentaries on St Benedict's, and Spanish monachism was not at all Benedictine before the time of the Christian Reconquest. Early Spanish monachism was indigenous, and it retained its individuality till the fall of the Gothic kingdom. Our only glimpses of it have to be obtained through these later rules, and so it has been necessary to carry our view forward beyond the strict limits of this survey. It may be doubted whether monasteries were numerous in the Gothic period: the Councils of Toledo throughout the seventh century used to be attended by fifty or sixty bishops; but there were never more than ten abbots present, and often only six, or five, or four.

We have little information concerning the origins of monachism in the Celtic lands, though the system played a prominent part in the Christianizing of most of them. It seems that the earliest Celtic monasteries were missionary stations, closely connected with the tribal system. St Patrick, who had passed some years as a monk in Lerins, built up the Irish Church in large measure on a monastic framework, and this initial tendency became more and more accentuated, till the bishops came to be subordinated to the abbots of the great monasteries. Our first definite knowledge of an organized cenobitical life in Ireland comes to us from the sixth century, during the course of which several great monasteries were established in various parts of the island, some of them counting more than a thousand monks. But any full knowledge of early Irish monachism has to be gathered, not on Irish soil, but from the documents connected with St Columba, who towards the end of the sixth century established a great monastery in the island of Iona or Hy, the missionary influence whereof spread over southern Scotland and northern England; and from the documents connected with St Columbanus, who early in the seventh century founded a number of Irish monasteries in Central Europe. St Columbanus' Rule is the only Irish monastic rule, properly so called, that has come down to us from the early period of Irish monachism: it was not composed in Ireland, but undoubtedly it embodies the Irish traditions of monasticism and ascetical discipline. Irish cenobitical life as seen in these documents, was one of extreme rigor and

austerity. At all times the eremitical life had a great vogue in Celtic monachism; and in spite of all difficulties of climate, the Irish hermits successfully rivaled in their extraordinary penances and austerities and vigils, the hermits of Egypt, and even those of Syria. In Ireland, where the population continued purely Celtic, the Irish rules and Irish monasticism maintained themselves throughout the Middle Ages; but in England and on the Continent, where they came into contact with populations Teutonic or teutonized, they succumbed before the Roman Rule of St Benedict.

Gaul is the country of Western Europe in which early monachism was most widely propagated and flourished most, and for which the records of pre-Benedictine monachism are the most abundant. It is said that St Athanasius introduced the knowledge of the monastic life at Trier during his exile there (336-7); and the well-known story of St Augustine's conversion shows that before the end of the century there were monks living an eremitical life there.

But it is with the name of St Martin of Tours that the beginnings of Gallic monachism are rightly associated. A Pannonian by race, born early in the fourth century, he had practiced the monastic life for some years before becoming bishop of Tours in 372. Nearly ten years earlier he had established a monastery near Poitiers, and on becoming bishop of Tours he formed one just outside of his episcopal city, at the place afterwards called Marmoutier. Here he gathered together eighty monks, and lived with them a life of great solitude and austerity. They dwelt singly in caves and huts, meeting only for the church services and for meals; they fasted rigorously and prayed long — it was indeed a reproduction of the life of the Egyptian monks. Our information concerning this earliest Gallic monachism is mainly derived from the writings of St Martin's biographer, Sulpitius Severus, and from his correspondence with St Paulinus of Nola. From these sources we learn that by the end of the fourth century monasteries and monks and nuns were already numerous not only in the province of Tours, but in Rouen and the territory that afterwards became Normandy and Picardy.

The beginning of the fifth century witnessed the inauguration of monachism in Provence, at Marseilles under the influence of John Cassian, and in the island of Lerins under that of Honoratus. From Lerins went forth a number of monk-bishops, who throughout the fifth and sixth centuries, by the monasteries they set up in their episcopal cities, and by the monastic rules they composed for their government, spread far and wide through south-eastern Gaul the influence and ideas of Lerins. In other parts of Gaul, too, monasteries arose in the fifth century, the most famous being Condat in the Jura mountains.

After the Frankish conquest of Gaul and under the early Merovingian kings the monastic movement continued throughout the sixth century to spread all over Frankland. A twofold tendency set in—one towards relaxation of life and observance; the other towards the eremitical life and the extremest forms of asceticism, such as are met with among the Syrian hermits. Gregory of Tours gives numerous examples of hermits, especially in Auvergne, who in their fantastic austerities equalled those of Syria; and his evidence is corroborated by other documents. It was not till the seventh century that Benedictine monachism got a foothold in Gaul, and about the same time St Columbanus imported his Rule and manner of life from Ireland. For a time the three forms of monachism—the old Gallic, the Columbanian, and the Benedictine—existed side by side in Gaul. In order to understand why the Benedictine gradually and inevitably supplanted the earlier monachisms in France, in Italy, and in England, and was destined to become the only monachism of Teutonic Europe, it is necessary to survey the character of the earlier types. The early African and Spanish monachisms were swept away by Vandals and Moors; the Irish remained insular and isolated from the great currents of monastic development; so that Italy, France and England are the countries in which the transformation of the earlier types of Western monachism into the Benedictine was worked out.



It has to be remembered that in those days neither in the West nor in the East, outside the Pachomian system, was there anything resembling the present Western idea of different 'Orders' of monks—there was only the monastic order. Monasteries were autonomous, each having its own practices and its own rule, or selection of rules, depending mainly on the abbot's choice. Before St Benedict's time there were current in the West translations of certain Eastern rules—that of Pachomius, translated by Jerome; that of Basil, translated by Rufinus; and a rule attributed to Macarius. There was a rule made up out of the writings of Cassian; there was St Augustine's Letter (No. 211) on the government of a nunnery. It is doubtful whether Honoratus of Lerins wrote a rule. The only extant Western rules, properly so called, which are certainly earlier than St Benedict's, are that of Caesarius of Arles for monks and his somewhat longer rule for nuns; but these are quite short, and not one of the rules that came into contact with St Benedict's in his own time, or for a century afterwards, not even the Rule of Columbanus, could claim to be an ordered and practical code of laws regulating the life and working of a monastery. This St Benedict's Rule pre-eminently was; and the fact that it supplied so great a want doubtless was one of the chief reasons why it supplanted all its rivals.

But there was another and still more powerful reason: St Benedict was the man who adapted monasticism to Western ideas and Western needs. Monasticism in Italy and Gaul was an Eastern importation, and up to St Benedict it bore the marks of its origin. The life of the hermits of the Egyptian deserts, with their prolonged fasts and vigils and their other bodily austerities, was looked upon as the highest ideal—the true ideal—of the monastic life; and the monks of Italy and Gaul endeavoured to emulate a manner of life hard enough in oriental climes, but doubly hard in Western Europe. This straining after severe bodily austerities can clearly be discerned in the fragmentary records that have survived of pre-Benedictine monachism in Italy and France, where the practice of a purely eremitical life was very common.

St Benedict, while recognizing the eremitical life, says definitely that he legislates for cenobites only; moreover, he did away with the oriental spirit of rivalry in asceticism, whereby the monks used to vie with one another in their mortifications. St Benedict laid down the principle that all should live by the Rule and conform themselves in all things to the life of the community; and even during Lent, when the undertaking of some extra mortification was recommended, it was all to be under the abbot's control. Moreover, the common community life which St Benedict established in his monasteries was not one of great severity: a hard life it was of course, and one of self-denial; but if judged by the ideals and ideas current in his day, his Rule must have appeared to his contemporaries to be in the matter of diet, of sleep, of work, and of hours of prayer, nothing else than what he describes it—"A little rule for beginners". Italian and French monks were at that time trying to live up to ideals that were impossible for most in the Western lands, and the general failure was producing a widespread disorganization and decay. St Benedict came and eliminated these incongruous Eastern elements, and made a reconstruction of the monastic life admirably suited to Western, and especially to Teutonic, conditions. To this must be attributed in greatest measure the success achieved by his Rule.

#### *St Benedict's Life*

St Benedict was born in Nursia, near Spoleto, probably about the year 480; he was of a noble Umbrian family, and he was sent to Rome to follow the courses in the schools. The licentiousness there prevalent made him determine to withdraw not only from Rome, but also from the world, and to become a monk. Full of this idea he fled away from Rome to the Sabine hills, and buried himself in a cave overlooking Nero's artificial lake on the Anio at Subiaco, forty miles from Rome. It is probable that he was not a mere boy, but a youth old enough to have become enamoured with a lady in Rome: consequently the date was within a

few years of 500. There can be no doubt that the Sacro Speco at Subiaco is the cave inhabited by St Benedict during the first years of his monastic life; its solitude was complete, and the wild severe grandeur of the surrounding scenery was well calculated to inspire his young heart with deep religious feeling. In this cave he lived for three years, only a single monk of a monastery in the neighbourhood knowing of his existence and supplying him with the necessaries of life. It is not a little remarkable that he who was destined to turn Western monasticism definitely away from the eremitical ideal, should himself, as a matter of course, have gone to live as a hermit on determining to become a monk: it was only after very thorough personal experience of the hermit's life that St Benedict decided it was not to be for his disciples.

In another matter also did he turn his back on his own early ideas: after passing three years of solitude in his cave, his existence gradually became known and disciples flocked to him in such numbers that he was able to establish not only a monastery ruled over by himself, but also twelve others in the neighbourhood, over which he exercised the sort of control which the superior-general of a group or congregation of monasteries would now be said to exercise. But when he was compelled to leave Subiaco, and migrated to Monte Cassino, he confined himself exclusively to the government of his own community there, without continuing to exercise control over the other monasteries he had founded. And so his Rule is concerned with the government of a single monastery only, without any provision for the grouping of monasteries into congregations or orders, as became the vogue later on in the West. This continued the Benedictine practice for many centuries; during the greatest period of Black Monk history the great Benedictine houses stood in isolation, each self-governed and self-contained. It was not till the thirteenth century that, under the inspiration of Cluny and Citeaux, the policy was adopted of federating the Benedictine abbeys of the different ecclesiastical provinces; and to this day the essential autonomy of each house is the foundation stone and central idea of Black Monk polity.

It is impossible to fix the date at which St Benedict founded his monastery at Monte Cassino — probably about 520. He lived there till his death, and Monte Cassino is the place above all others associated with his name. The rest of his life was quite uneventful; in 543 he was visited by Totila, and he died about the middle of the century.

As Benedictine life soon became, and for well-nigh seven centuries continued to be, the norm of monastic life in the Latin Church, it will be to the point to give a rough picture of the daily life that obtained in St Benedict's monasteries, as it may be reconstructed from the Rule.

St Benedict's monks rose early in the morning—usually about 2, but the hour varied with the season of the year. They had had, however, an ample period of unbroken sleep, usually not less than 8 hours: the midnight office between two periods of sleep, so common a feature of later monasticism in the West, had no place in Benedictine life as conceived by St Benedict. The monks repaired to the church for the night office, which consisted of fourteen psalms, and certain readings from Scripture; it was chanted throughout, and must have taken from an hour to an hour and a half. It was followed by a break, which varied from a few minutes in the summer to a couple of hours at midwinter, and which was devoted to private reading of Scripture, or prayer. The Matin office, now called Lauds, was celebrated at dawn, and Prime at sunrise; each took about half an hour. Prime was followed by work —i.e. field work for most of the monks—or reading, according to the time of the year; and these exercises filled up the time till dinner, which was at 12 or at 3, the short offices of Tierce, Sext, and None being celebrated in the church at the appropriate hours. In summer, when the night sleep was short, the usual Italian siesta was allowed after dinner. The afternoon was passed in work and reading, like the forenoon. Vespers or Evensong was sung some time before sunset, and in the summer was followed by an evening meal. Before dark, while there yet was enough light to read by, they assembled once again in the church, and after a few

pages had been read, Compline was said, and they retired to rest in the dusk, before there was need of an artificial light. On Sundays there was no work, and the time assigned to the church services and to reading was considerably lengthened.

According to St. Benedict's scheme of the monastic life, work occupied notably more time daily than either the church services or reading; and this work was manual, either in the fields or garden, or about the house. This element of work was intended to be an integral part of the life; not a mere occupation, but a very real factor of the monk's service of God, and from six to seven hours were devoted to it daily. These long hours of manual labour, coupled with the unbroken fast till midday, or 3 p.m., or even till sunset during Lent, and the perpetual abstinence from flesh meat, may convey the impression that, after all, the life in St Benedict's monastery was one of great bodily austerity. But it has to be remembered that though members of patrician families were to be found in his community, still the great majority was recruited from the ranks of the Italian peasantry, or from those of the Goths and other barbarians who were then overrunning Italy. Neither the fasting nor the abstinence from meat would appear to Italian peasants in the present day, and still less in the sixth century, so onerous as they do to us in northern climes.

The other exercise of the monks, outside the direct worship of God, was reading, to which from three to five hours were assigned daily, according to the season. There can be little doubt that this reading was wholly devotional, confined to the Bible and the writings of the fathers, St Basil and Cassian being recommended by name. Out of this germ grew in the course of ages those works of erudition and of historical science with which the Benedictine name in later ages became associated: the first step forward along the path of monastic studies was taken not by St Benedict, but by his younger contemporary Cassiodorus in his Calabrian monastery at Squillace.

But the chief work of the monk was, in St Benedict's eyes, neither field work nor literary work: all the services of Benedictines to civilization and education and letters have been but by-products. Their primary and essential work is what St Benedict calls the 'Work of God'—Opus Dei—the daily chanting of the canonical Office in the choir. To this work he says nothing is to be preferred, and this principle has been the keynote of Benedictine life throughout the ages. The daily "course" of psalmody ordinarily consisted of 40 psalms with certain canticles, hymns, responses, prayers, and lections from Scripture and the fathers. It was divided into the eight canonical hours, the Vigils or night office being considerably the longest. It is probable that this daily common prayer took some 4 hours, being chanted throughout, and not merely recited in a monotone. Mass was celebrated only on Sundays and holydays. Private prayer was taken for granted, and was provided for, but not legislated for, being left to personal devotion.

The abbot governed the monastery with full patriarchal authority. He was elected by the monks, and held office for life. All the officials of the monastery were appointed by him, and were removable at his will. He should take counsel with his monks—in matters of moment with the whole community, in lesser matters with a few seniors. He was bound to listen to what each had to say; but at the end, it rested with him to decide what was to be done, and all had to obey. The great—in a sense it might be said, the only—restraining influence upon the abbot to which St Benedict appeals, was that of religion—the abiding sense, impressed on him again and again by St Benedict, that he was directly and personally responsible, and would have to answer before the judgment seat of God for all his actions, for all his judgments, nay, even for the soul of each one of his monks as well as for his own. But his government must be according to the Rule, and not at his own mere will and pleasure, as had been the case in the earlier forms of monachism; and he is warned not to overburden his monks, or overdrive them, but to be considerate always and give no one cause for just complaint. The chapters specially written for the abbot (2, 3, 27, 64) are the most

characteristic in the Rule, and form a body of wise counsel, not easily to be surpassed, for anyone in office or authority of any kind. This formation of a regular order of life according to rule, this provision for the disciplined working of a large establishment, was St Benedict's great contribution to Western monachism, and also to Western civilization. For as Benedictine abbeys came gradually to be established more and more thickly in the midst of the wild Teutonic populations that were settling throughout Western Europe, they became object-lessons in disciplined and well-ordered life, in organized work, in all the arts of peace, that could not but impress powerfully the minds of the surrounding barbarians, and bring home to them ideals of peace and order and work, no less than of religion.

Another point of far-reaching consequence was that St Benedict laid upon the monk the obligation of abiding till death, not only in the monastic life, but in his own monastery in which he was professed. This special Benedictine vow of stability cut off what was the very common practice of monks, when they grew dissatisfied in one monastery, going to another. St Benedict bound the monks of a monastery together into a permanent family, united by bonds that lasted for life. This idea that the monks of each Benedictine monastery form a permanent community, distinct from that of every other Benedictine monastery, is a characteristic feature of Benedictine monachism, and a chief distinction between it and the mendicant and other later Orders; without doubt it has also been the great source of the special influence and strength of the Benedictines in history.

Another distinction lies in the fact that St Benedict, in common with the early monastic legislators, set before his monks no special object or purpose, no particular work to be done, other than the common work of monks—the living in community according to the ‘evangelical counsels’, and thereby sanctifying their souls and serving God. "A school of the service of the Lord" is St Benedict's definition of a monastery, and the one thing he requires from the novice is that “in very deed he seek God”. Nothing probably was further from his thoughts than that his monks were to become apostles, bishops, popes, civilizers, educators, scholars, men of learning. His idea simply was to make them good: and if a man is good, he will do good. The ascetical side of the training in the Rule lies chiefly in obedience and humility. The very definition of a monk is “one who renounces his own wishes, and comes to fight for Christ, taking up the arms of obedience”; it is the temper of renunciation and obedience rather than the actual obeying that is of value. The chapter on humility (7), the longest in the Rule, has become a classic in Christian ascetical literature; it embodies St Benedict's teaching on the spiritual life. The general spirit of the Rule is beautifully summed up in the short chapter “on the good zeal which monks ought to have” (72): “As there is an evil and bitter emulation which separates from God and leads to hell, so there is a good spirit of emulation which frees from vices and leads to God and life everlasting. Let monks therefore practice this emulation with most fervent love; that is to say, let them in honour prefer one another. Let them bear most patiently with each other's infirmities, whether of body or of character. Let them contend with one another in their obedience. Let no one follow what he thinks most profitable to himself, but rather what is best for another. Let them show brotherly charity with a chaste love. Let them fear God and love their abbot with sincere and humble affection, and set nothing whatever before Christ, Who can bring us unto eternal life”.

In view of the great influence exercised on the course of European history and civilization in things both ecclesiastical and civil, from the sixth century to the thirteenth, by St Benedict and his sons, it seemed proper to supply the foregoing somewhat detailed account of the Benedictine Rule and life. With an outline sketch of the steps whereby St Benedict's supremacy in Western monachism was achieved, this chapter will be concluded.

Though the Rule was written as a code of regulations for the government of one monastery, it is evident that St Benedict contemplated the likelihood of its being observed in different monasteries, and even in different countries. Besides Monte Cassino, his own



monastery at Subiaco, and perhaps the twelve others, continued after he had left them; and there is mention of one founded by him from Monte Cassino, at Terracina. These are the only Benedictine monasteries of which there is any record as existing in St Benedict's lifetime, for the stories of the missions of St Placidus to Sicily and St Maurus to Gaul must be regarded as apocryphal. It is said of Simplicius, the third abbot of Monte Cassino, that "he propagated into all the hidden work of the master"; and this has been understood as indicating that the spread of the Rule to other monasteries began in his abbacy. But the historical determining point was the sacking of Monte Cassino by the Lombards about 580-590, when the monks fled to Rome, and were placed in a monastery attached to the Lateran Basilica, in the heart of Latin Christendom, under the eyes of the Popes. It is now generally agreed by critical students of the period that the monachism which St Gregory the Great established in his palace on the Coelian Hill, wherein he himself became a monk, was in an adequate and true sense Benedictine, being based on that Rule which St Gregory eulogises as "conspicuous for its discretion". From the Coelian Hill it was carried to England by Augustine, the prior of the monastery, and his companions (596), and it is probable that the monastery of SS. Peter and Paul, later St Augustine's, Canterbury, was the first Benedictine monastery out of Italy. As has been said above, it was not till the seventh century that Benedictine monachism got a foothold in Gaul; but during that century it spread steadily and at last rapidly throughout Gaul and England, and from England it was carried into Friesland and the other Germanic lands by the great English Benedictine missionaries, Willibrod, Boniface, and the rest. Being well adapted to the spirit and character of the Teutonic peoples then overrunning Western Europe, the Benedictine Rule inevitably and quickly absorbed and supplanted all those previously in vogue—so completely that Charles the Great could ask the question, if there had ever been any other monastic Rule than St Benedict's? The Benedictines shared fully in the effects of the Carolingian revival, and from that date, for three centuries, St Benedict's spirit ruled supreme throughout Western monachism, Ireland alone excepted.

All through the Benedictine centuries, Benedictine nuns flourished no less than Benedictine monks, and nowhere more than in England.

## CHAPTER XIX

### SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC CONDITIONS OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE IN THE FOURTH CENTURY

THE ancients saw in the stupendous destiny of the Roman State the clue to the history of the Universe and a revelation of the plans of Providence in regard to the world. "Italy" wrote Pliny the elder in the time of Vespasian, "has been selected by Deity in order to collect dispersed power, to soften customs, and to unite by the communion of one language the various and barbarous dialects of so many nations, to bestow on men the intercourse of ideas and humanity, in a word—that all the races of the world should have one fatherland". For Christians the conquest of the world by Rome had even a deeper meaning.— "Jesus was born in the reign of Augustus, who as it were associated in one monarchy the immense multitude of men dispersed about the earth, because a plurality of kingdoms would have been an obstacle to the diffusion of Christ's doctrine through the whole world". But Augustus was a heathen and his successors persecuted Christianity, so that the Roman Empire served the Gospel for a long while unconsciously and in spite of its desires. This conception of universal history made a further stride when Constantine the Great proclaimed Christianity the religion of the State. In ancient times" says Eusebius of Caesarea, "the world was divided according to countries and nations into a multitude of commonwealths, tyrannies, principalities. Hence constant wars and the devastations and depredations following thereon ... The origin of these divisions may certainly be ascribed to the diversity of the gods worshipped by men. But when the instrument of salvation, the most holy body of Christ ... was raised ... against the demons, forthwith the cause of demons has vanished and states, principalities, tyrannies, commonwealths have passed away ... One God has been announced to the whole of mankind, one empire obtained sway over all men — the Roman Empire".

But the unification of the inhabited world which forms the meaning and the greatness of the Roman Empire, is a process presenting two different sides to the observer. Celts, Iberians, Rhaetians, Moors, Illyrians, Thracians were to some extent civilized by the culture of Greece and Rome, and achieved by its help a great advance in economic and civic organization as well as in education; Syrians, Egyptians, the inhabitants of Asia Minor only modified to a certain extent their manners and views in order to meet the requirements of the Empire. But if the intermixture of tribes and their permeation by Graeco-Roman culture was in one sense a great progress, it was at the same time, but from another point of view, a decline; it was accompanied by a lowering of the level of the culture which exerted the civilizing influence. While conquering barbarism and native peculiarities, Graeco-Roman culture assumed various traits from its vanquished opponents, and became gross and vulgar in its turn. In the words of a biographer of Alexander Severus: good and bad were promiscuously thrust into the Empire, noble and base, and numbers of barbarians.

The unification and transformation of tribes standing on low grades of civilization leads to consequences characterized by one common feature, the simplification of aims—degeneration. This process is concealed for a while by the political and economic advantages following on the establishment of the Empire. The creation of a central authority, upholding peace and intercourse (*Pax Romana*), the conjunction of the different parts of the world into one economic system enlivened by free trade, the spread of citizenship and civil culture in

wider and wider circles of population—all these benefits produced for a time a rise of prosperity which counterbalanced the excess of barbarous, imperfectly assimilated elements.

But a series of political misfortunes set in rather rapidly in the third century: invasions of barbarians, conflicts between rival candidates to the throne, competition between armies and provinces put an end to order and prosperity and threatened the very existence of the Empire. In these calamities the barbarization of Roman culture became more and more manifest, a backward movement began in all directions, a backward movement, however, which was by no means a mere falling back into previous conditions, but gave rise to new and interesting departures.

It suffices to glance at the names of the Roman citizens of the Empire in order to notice that we are in very mixed company. Instead of the *nomina* and *cognomina* of earlier days we find strange barbaric appellations hardly whitewashed by the adjunction of *es* or *er* at the end. A T. Tammonius Saeni Tammoni filius Vitalis, and a Blescius Diovicus do not look very pure ‘Quirites’. Such barbarians had first of all to learn Latin as the common tongue of the Western Empire, and they did learn to use Latin. But what Latin! As St Jerome has it: “Latin language gets transformed according to countries and to epochs”. Common speech, the *lingua vulgaris*, with a former Celt, Iberian, or Rhaetian became gradually a new Romance language, the sounds and forms of which were deflected from the original Latin in consequence of the physiological and intellectual peculiarities of Celts, Iberians, Rhaetians.

We may be allowed to give a few instances of this curious process of transformation from the well-known history of French phonetics and grammar. The Latin *u* was kept up in Italian but softened into the French *u* (*ü*), e.g. *durus*—*duro*—*dur*, and we cannot wonder at that, because the population of Gaul when yet speaking Celtic sounded *u* as *ü* and not somewhat like the English *oo* in ‘poor’. The French ‘*liaison*’, the habit of sounding the otherwise mute consonant at the end of a word before a vowel in order to avoid a ‘hiatus’, may be traced to the Celtic habit of joining separate words into compounds. In Celtic dialects the accent makes one or the other syllable so prominent that other syllables become indistinct and may get slurred over. This stress put on the accentuated syllable has called forth in French a characteristic deterioration of unaccentuated parts of words. Sometimes whole groups of sounds disappear, as in ‘*Août*’ (Augustus), sometimes they are represented only by a mute *e* as in ‘*vie*’ (*vita*). The French habit of marking the last syllable by an accent even in the pronunciation of Latin goes back ultimately to this trait. In reading the Latin text of the Salic Law we are struck by the complete dislocation of the system of declensions—the ablative case is constantly used instead of the accusative, the accusative instead of the nominative, etc. But this degeneration was prepared by the practice of vulgar Latin even in the first and second centuries when the genitive case disappeared. The dative followed suit somewhat later.

It is not however to be supposed that Latin was imposed even in its vulgarized forms on the entire population of the Empire. It is needless to remind the reader of the fact that in the whole eastern half Greek was the language of the educated classes. But both in the East and in the West there were many backward regions in which vernacular speech held its own stubbornly against Greek and Latin. The Copts, Arabs, Syrians, Armenians never gave up their native languages, and the oriental undercurrents continued to play an important part in the social life of Asia and Egypt. There are many vestiges of a similar persistency of barbarian custom and speech in the West. Roman law admitted expressly that valid deeds could be executed in Punic and, judging from the story about a sister of Septimius Severus, Punic must have been very prevalent among well-to-do families of knightly rank in Africa: when the lady in question came to visit her brother in Rome, the Emperor had often to blush on account of her imperfect knowledge of Latin. The letters and sermons of St Augustine show that this state of things had by no means disappeared in Romanized Africa in the fifth century: the great African bishop repeatedly urged the necessity for dignitaries of the Church

to be acquainted with Punic, and he had recourse himself to illustrations drawn from this language. In Spain and Gascony one living remnant of pre-Roman civilization has survived to our days in the 'Es-c-aldunac' speech of the Basques, the offspring of the Iberian race, while Brittany exhibits another block of pre-Roman custom in the speech and manners of its Breton population. St Jerome testifies to the fact that in the neighbourhood of Treves, one of the mightiest centres of Roman civilization, a Celtic dialect was spoken by the peasants in the fourth century, so that a person reared there possessed a clue to the speech of the Galatians, the Celtic tribe of Asia Minor. In the Latinized north-west of the Balkan peninsula the vernacular Illyrian was never driven out or destroyed, and the present speech of the Albanians is directly derived from it in spite of a sprinkling of Latin words and expressions. In the west of England Celtic speech and custom runs on uninterruptedly through the ages of Roman, Saxon, and Norman conquest. Not to speak of Welsh, which has borrowed many Latin words, especially technical terms, but remains a purely Celtic language, Cornish was spoken in Cornwall up to the eighteenth century, while in Cumberland and Westmorland the custom of shepherds to count their sheep in Celtic numerals was the last vestige of the separate existence of a 'Welsh' population.

These traces of stubborn national life forming a kind of barbarian subsoil to Roman culture are important in many ways: they help us not only to understand the history of dialects and of folklore, but they account for a good many spontaneous outbursts of barbarism in the seemingly pacified and Romanized provinces of the Empire at a time when the iron hand of the rulers began to relax its grip over the conquered populations. Berber, Punic, Iberian, Illyrian, and Celtic tribes come forward again in the calamitous years of the fourth and fifth centuries. Usurpers, riotous soldiers, and brigands gather strength from national aspirations, and in the end the disruption of the Empire becomes inevitable on account of internal strife as well as of foreign invasions. Nowhere perhaps has this subliminal life of the province to account for so much as in England, where the arts and crafts of Rome were introduced in the course of three centuries and a half of gradual occupation, and Latin itself was widely spoken by the upper classes, but where nevertheless the entire fabric of Roman rule crumbled down so rapidly during the fifth century, and Celts were left to fight with the Teutons for the remnants of what had been one of the fair provinces of Rome.

A transformation similar to that expressed in language is clearly perceivable in the history of Art. Christianity introduced into the world a powerful new factor, the strength of which may be gauged in the paintings of the Catacombs and in the rise of new styles of architecture—the Byzantine and the Romanesque. Thus we have to deal not with mere deterioration and decay, but also with the lowering of the level of culture and the barbarization of art which make themselves felt in various ways. When Rome had to raise a triumphal arch to the conqueror of Maxentius, a great part of the reliefs for its adornment were carried over from the Arch of Trajan, while some sculptures were added by contemporary artists. And the latter perpetuate the decay of art and of aesthetic taste. The figures are distorted, the faces deformed. On the so-called discus of Theodosius the symbolical figures of the lower part were copied from ancient originals and are handsome. The upper half was filled with representations of living people, and it is evident that the gross, flat, ugly faces, the heavy embroidered uniforms, were reproduced with fidelity, while the handling of the figures strikes the observer by its clumsiness and faulty designs. The chief thing in the pictorial and plastic arts of the third and fourth centuries is not beauty or expression, but size and costly material. Gallienus, whose unfortunate reign was nicknamed the "period of the thirty tyrants", ordered a statue of himself 200 feet in height: it was planned on such a scale that a child was able to ascend by a winding staircase to the top of the Emperor's lance. Instead of marble, precious porphyry, a stone exceedingly difficult to cut,



was used for plastic purposes; the contractor and polisher were more important persons than the sculptor for the purpose of making statues of this material.

It is of special importance for us to notice the gradual degeneration or rather transformation of economic life. Towards the beginning of our era a great circuit of industrial and commercial intercourse is formed under the protection of the Empire: it reminds us in some ways of the world-market of the present time. The different provinces exchanged goods and developed specialties fitting into one whole through mutual support; the excellent roads made quick exchanges possible, considerable capital sought employment in productive enterprises, firm political power and mutual confidence fostered the growth of credit. From the third century onwards the picture changes. The subjection of conquered peoples by Roman citizens ceases and the greater part of the population of the Empire is admitted to the rights of citizenship. This meant that masses of people, over whom governors, publicans and contractors had exercised almost uncontrolled sway, were enabled to come forward with their interests and legal claims. Provincial forces began to assert themselves, and in husbandry local needs and the requirements of small people made themselves more and more felt. As a consequence, the wide organization of world intercourse gives way before more direct and modest economic problems—each social group has to look out primarily for itself in regard to food, clothing, housing, furniture. On the other hand the supply of slaves gets more and more hampered by the fact that wars of conquest cease. In the beginning of the third century we hear already of a price of 200 *aurei* or 500 *denarii* of full ancient coinage for a slave—a very high price indeed, which shows indirectly how difficult it was to get slaves. During the protracted defensive wars which had to be fought on all the frontiers prisoners were frequently made, but these Germans, Slavs, Huns were difficult to manage and made clumsy laborers when settled for agricultural purposes: it was more profitable to leave them a certain independence on their plots, and therefore to cut up large estates into small holdings. Lastly, the rise of provincial and local interests and the change in the condition of the labouring classes coincided with the terrible political calamities which I have already had occasion to mention. The dislocation of the commonwealth rendered all widely extended economic plans insecure and contributed by itself to the tendency of each separate locality to live its own life and to work for its own needs without much help from the outside. As a result of the working of these different causes society falls back from a complicated system of commercial intercourse to the simpler forms of “natural economy”. This movement is not arrested by the restoration of the Empire in the fourth century, but rather strengthened by it. Political power is indeed restored, but it has to be maintained by straining every nerve in social life, and this straining hampers free movement and free contract, fastens everyone to a certain place and to a certain calling.

In an “Exposition of the whole world and of nations” translated from Greek in the time of Constantius (soon after 345) much attention is still paid to the economic intercourse between the different parts of the Empire. Greece itself is said to be unable to satisfy its own needs, but in regard to many of the other provinces it is expressly noted that they are sufficient unto themselves. Besides, most of them produce goods which are exported to other places. Ascalon and Gaza, for example, are said to provide excellent wine for Syria and Egypt; Scythopolis, Laodicea (in Syria), Byblus, Tyre, Berytus send out linen wares all round the world, while Caesarea, Tyre, Sarepta and Neapolis are famous in the same way for their purple-dyed tissues. Egypt supplies Constantinople and the Eastern provinces with corn and has a monopoly in the production of papyrus. From Cappadocia furs are obtained, from Galatia different kinds of clothing. Laodicea in Phrygia has given a name to garments of a special kind. Asia and the Hellespont produce corn, wine, and oil; in Macedonia and Dalmatia, iron and lead mines are noted; in Dardana (Elyria) pastoral pursuits are prevalent and bacon and cheese are sent to market, while Epirus is distinguished by its large fishing

trade. The Western provinces are not described in such a minute way but fine Italian wines are mentioned, the trade of Arles for imports into Gaul is noted, and Spain is extolled on account of its oil, cloth, bacon and mules. Oil is also said to be largely supplied by the African province, while clothing and cattle come from Numidia. Pannonia and Mauretania are the only provinces mentioned as carrying on the slave trade.

Some forty-five years before this commercial geography of the Empire was drawn up, another curious document shows the imperial authorities engaged in a wearisome struggle in order to protect easy intercourse and to ward off the rise of prices—I mean the famous edict of Diocletian and of his companion emperors establishing maximum prices in the Empire. Such measures are not taken without cogent reasons, and, indeed, we are told that prices had risen enormously, although it is hardly probable that the reason of the dearth had to be sought in the iniquities of the rulers. The enactment itself dilates on the evil greed of avaricious producers and venders, and declares in the name of the "fathers of human kind" that justice has to arbitrate and to intervene. The Emperors are especially incensed at the hard bargains which are extorted from soldiers quartered in the provinces or moving along the roads: prices are screwed up on such occasions not to four or eight times the ordinary value, but to an extent that could not be expressed in words. If such things happen in times of abundance what is to be expected from seasons when actual want is experienced? Without attempting to fix normal prices the Emperors threaten with capital punishment merchants engaged in supplying the different provinces with wares: Lactantius reports that blood flowed and that the impossibility of enforcing cheapness by the hands of executioners was only recognised after fruitless attempts to terrorize tradesmen into submission.

Let us look, however, at some of the details of the edict, fragments of which have been preserved in several copies in the Balkan peninsula, Asia Minor, and Egypt, viz., in the provinces under the direct sway of Diocletian.

Traces of commercial intercourse of the same kind as that described in the *Expositio* frequently meet the eye. We hear again of the high class wines of Italy, of linen vestments from Laodicea, Scythopolis, Byblus, of purple-dyed garments manufactured on the Syrian coast and fetching very high prices, and of somewhat less expensive kinds from Miletus: a piece of purple linen for ornamental stripes (*clavi*) weighing six ounces may be sold for 13,000, 23,000 and even 32,000 denarii, 50,000 of the latter corresponding to one pound of gold. Cloth garments came from Laodicea in Phrygia, from Modena in Italy and in the shape of coarse, warm mantles from Flanders. In a word the lines of commercial intercourse are clearly traced, but the difficulties encountered by trade under new conditions are also very visible. Some comparisons with extant valuations of goods ordered for soldiers enable us to form a judgment as to the fluctuations of prices which Diocletian's enactment tried to moderate. We hear, e.g., that in one case 80 pounds of bacon were estimated at 1 solidus (6000 copper denarii) and in another instance 20 pounds at 1000 denarii. According to the tariff of Diocletian the maximum price for bacon of the best kind, would have been in the first instance 96,000, and in the second 16,000 copper denarii, the latter being about 16 times more than the ordinary price.

It is important to notice that while the ordinary agricultural labourer is not allowed to receive higher wages than 25 silver denarii (about 120 copper denarii) per day besides board, the maximum price of a double sextarius (roughly, about a quart) of wheat was fixed at 100 silver denarii, and that of a pound of pork at 12 silver denarii.

One cannot wonder at the failure of Diocletian's attempt, which according to contemporary testimony only increased the evils it was meant to suppress, the penalties against the merchants leading to concealment of goods and interruptions of trade. But it is characteristic of the methods of compulsory legislation constantly employed by the emperors

of the fourth century that Julian made a similar and quite as unsuccessful attempt to coerce the citizens of Antioch into fair trade.

It is impossible to suppose that such measures were dictated by a kind of “Caesar madness”, prompting the rulers of the civilized world to affirm their will and wisdom as against economic laws. However faulty in its conception, the policy indicated by the edicts of Diocletian and Julian had its roots in a well-meaning though ineffectual desire to regulate trade and to protect fair intercourse. It may be likened, as most attempts to impose maximum limits to prices, to the police supervision of trade in necessities of life practiced in besieged cities. The emperors and their bureaucracy had come to look on the whole civilized world subject to their authority as upon a besieged city, in which all civil professions had to conform to military rule.

The same kind of evolution from free intercourse to compulsion may be observed in the legislation on commercial and industrial corporations. Roman law passed through several stages in this respect. At the time of the Republic guilds of artisans and merchants could be formed by private agreement if their statutes and activity did not infringe the laws of the State. During the civil conflicts of the last years of the Republic and in the early Empire organized corporations were several times dissolved and forbidden on account of the political agitation carried on by their members, and from Augustus' time concession by the Senate and confirmation by the Prince had to be applied for when a new college or guild had to be formed. But police supervision by the State did not alter the main feature of the corporations, namely their spontaneous origin in the needs of society and the wish of private persons to carry on profitable trade and to form unions for mutual support and social intercourse. The imperial Government was often inclined to repress these spontaneous tendencies, as we may gather, *e.g.*, from Trajan's correspondence with Pliny.

The first indication of a further change in the relations between government and corporations may be noticed in the reign of Alexander Severus. This Emperor, instead of restricting the rise of trade guilds, actually favoured the formation of corporations of wine merchants, grocers, shoemakers, and other crafts. We may suspect that at this time, that is in the second quarter of the third century, the Government began to perceive a slackening in the energy of trade and commerce and chose to exert its authority in patronizing trade guilds. The restoration of imperial power under Aurelian brought about another and more powerful attempt in the same direction. One of the measures of this Emperor was the assumption of a wide-reaching guardianship over the alimentation of Rome. The supply of corn from Egypt was increased; lists of paupers (*proletarii*) entitled to be fed by the State were drawn up, and the privilege of living at the cost of the commonwealth was made hereditary; instead of corn, bread was distributed, and along with bread—oil, salt, and pork. In connection with this system of alimentation of the poorer classes in Rome Aurelian reorganized the service of the merchants responsible for the transport of corn on the Nile and on the Tiber. This throws light on the immediate reason for the transformation of corporations in the ensuing age: trades and crafts which had a bearing on vital needs of social intercourse were taken under the tutelage of the Empire and carried on henceforth, not as free professions but as compulsory services.

This is clearly seen in the legislation of Constantine and remains characteristic of the legal treatment of trade during the whole of the fourth and of the fifth century.

In the Lex Julia of 747 *UC* (Roman Era) enacted by Augustus the principle was already formulated that a combination of individual workmen or traders into a college had to be warranted not only by their wishes and interests but by public utility. The public element assumes now a preponderating influence. Bakers are authorized to form a craft guild not because they see an advantage in being organized in this way, but because the State wants their services in regulating the trade in bread and providing for the needs of the inhabitants of

cities. The result of this enlisting of trades and crafts into public service is a system entirely at variance with our conceptions of supply and demand, and of economic intercourse.

To begin with, all freedom in the choice of professions came to an end. Corporations are required to hold their members to their occupations all through life. All attempts of single members to leave their place of abode and customary work are considered as a flight from duty and severely forbidden. In 395, e.g., Arcadius and Honorius decree heavy fines against powerful people who conceal and protect fugitive members of *curiae* and *collegia*. For each one of the latter the patron has to pay a fine of a pound of gold. The codices are full of enactments against fugitives of this kind, and such legislation would prove, by itself, that a regime of caste was being gradually established in the Empire. It is certain that the invasions of barbarians, such as those of Alaric for example, contributed powerfully to scatter the working population, but, apart from these, one of the motives of flight was the heavy burden of taxation. It is probable that the initiative in regard to the measures of stern compulsion came not from the bureaucrats of the Empire, but from the corporations themselves which were made liable to the requirements of the State in case of the flight of their members. Of course, the consistent enforcement of such a policy actually blocked the natural selection of professions and the development of independent enterprise.

Let us, to take a concrete example, attend somewhat closer to the discipline imposed on the important college of *navicularii*. During the first two centuries of our era the term designated all ship-owners engaged in the carrying trade by sea; gradually it came to mean shippers employed by the State for the transport of goods, especially of corn. Most of the corn necessary for the population of Rome was derived from Egypt and Africa, and we hear of a large fleet starting from Alexandria for the purpose of carrying over the supply. There is good evidence to show that during the second century A.D. the college was composed of men who had joined it as voluntary members and sought the privileges which were conceded to it in return for its services to the State. All this appears changed in the fourth century. The *navicularii* are to devote themselves primarily to the transport of goods belonging to the State, more particularly corn and oil for Rome and Constantinople, while African *navicularii* were bound to bring wood for fuel to the public baths of Rome. The Egyptian *navicularii* received their cargo from the collectors of the *annona*, the corn tribute in the province. The season for the voyages of their ships was reckoned from the first of April to the 15th of October, the other months being held free on account of stormy weather. Each *navicularius* had to send his ships to the fleet once in two years. When the ship weighed anchor it had to proceed by the shortest route and not to stop anywhere without absolute necessity. Should one of the ships of the corn fleet be delayed in a port the governor and Senate of the place were bound, if necessary, to use force, in order to send the merchants out to sea again. Outside these official journeys they had the right to move on their own behalf, but evidently their right did not outweigh the uncomfortable limitations imposed on them during their service period, as we find the emperors endeavouring in every way to keep the *navicularii* to their task and to prevent them from slipping out of the college. A curious letter of St Augustine tells how the bishop refused to accept the bequest of a certain Bonifacius, an African *navicularius*, on behalf of the see of Hippo. Bonifacius had disinherited his son and wanted to pass over his property to the Church. St Augustine refuses to accept the gift, because he does not wish to entangle the Church with the dealings of the *navicularii*. In case of shipwreck the Government would order an inquiry, the sailors rescued from the wreck would be put to torture, the Church would have to pay for the lost cargo, etc. The members of the college evidently had to be rich men and, sometimes, if there were gaps to be filled, the State would compel rich men to join the *corpus naviculariorum*. The service was hereditary, and if any member absconded, his property was forfeited to the college. These facts may be sufficient to show to what extent the commerce of those days suffered under the stringent discipline



imposed by the requirements of the State, and what a queer mixture of a business man and of an official a shipowner of those days was. I may add that, although we know most about *navicularii*, bakers, purveyors of pork, and similar merchants engaged in supplying the capitals with food. The provisioning of the smaller towns and the management of all crafts and trades were carried on more or less on similar principles.

An important chapter in the history of the decline and fall of the Empire is constituted by the gradual decay of municipal institutions. The ancient world took a long time to exchange its organization of free cities for that of a great power, governed by a centralized bureaucracy. Even after the conquest of its provinces the Roman commonwealth remained substantially a confederation of cities, and municipal autonomy prospered for a long while. We see the cities of the first and second centuries vying one with the other in local patriotism, in the munificence of leading citizens, in generous contributions of private men towards the welfare of poorer classes, public health, and order. The economic progress brought about by the establishment of the Empire made itself felt primarily in the increased activity and prosperity of city life. But threatening symptoms begin to appear even in the second century A.D. Municipal self-government, bereft of its political significance, restricted to the sphere of local interests and local ambitions, is apt to degenerate into corrupt and spendthrift practices: the wealthier provincial citizens ruin themselves by lavish expenditure on pageants and distributions, municipal enterprise in matters of building and philanthropy often turns out to be extravagant and inefficient. The emperors find no other means of remedying such defects than the institution of curators of different kinds—commissioners for the correction of the condition of free cities. In the correspondence between Pliny and Trajan the imperial commissioner is already seen to interfere in the most minute questions of city administration and, at the same time, he is constantly applying for direction to his imperial master. The ideal of centralization is clearly expressed in this intimate intercourse of two well-meaning and talented statesmen: the Emperor appears in the light of an omniscient and all-powerful Providence watching over all the dealings and doings of his innumerable subjects. In order to embody such an ideal the central power had to surround itself with helpers and executive officers, and Hadrian laid the foundations of a Civil Service more comprehensive and better organized than the rudimentary administrative institutions of the Commonwealth and of the early Empire. Later on Diocletian and Constantine multiplied the number of bureaucratic organs and combined them into one whole by the bands of constant supervision and iron discipline.

But even before this ultimate completion of bureaucracy in the fourth century, in the very beginnings of the system of central tutelage, a kind of vicious circle formed itself: central authority was called upon to interfere on account of the deplorable defects of municipal administration, while municipal life was disturbed and atrophied by constant interference from above. It is impossible to say precisely what was cause and what was effect in this case: the process was, as it happens in many diseases, a constant flow of action and reaction. The jurists of the third century find already a characteristic formula for corporative town organization in an analogy with the condition of a minor under tutelage, and this analogy is followed up into all sorts of particulars as to rights and duties. No wonder that for many citizens municipal life loses its interest, that they try to eschew the burdens of unremunerated and costly local administration, and that as early as the time of the Severi compulsion has sometimes to be used to bring together a sufficient number of unwilling magistrates and members of municipal senates.

A circumstance which in itself would have hardly been sufficient to overthrow municipal organization, certainly contributed to divert people's minds from the customary trend of local patriotism and to make the performance of certain duties difficult—I mean the spread of Christianity. Municipal institutions were intertwined with cults of Roman and local

gods, including religious devotion to the Deity of the Emperors. The new faith, on the other hand, did not admit of sacrifices or prayer to the false gods of heathendom: hence a conflict which did not admit of a ready solution. Let us listen to the somewhat exaggerated statement of Tertullian—"We concede" he says, "that a Christian may without endangering salvation assume the honour and title of public functions—if he does not offer sacrifices nor authorize sacrifices, if he does not furnish victims, if he does not entrust anybody with the upkeep of temples, if he does not take part in the management of their income, if he does not give games either at his own or at the public expense, if he does not preside at them, if he does not announce or arrange any festival, if he avoids all kinds of oath and abstains, while exercising power, from giving sentence in regard to the life or the honour of men, decisions as to money matters being excepted; if he does not proclaim edicts, nor act as a judge, nor put people into prison or inflict torture on them. But is all this possible? As a matter of fact the heathen State did certainly not go out of its way to make all these exceptions possible, and conflicts between law and religious conviction arose every day. On many occasions Christians of a softer mould submitted to what they considered to be inevitable, and performed most of the duties challenged by the fiery African. The Church had to work out a penitentiary code for those among its members who had sullied themselves by heathen practices (see *e.g.* the canons of the Synod of Elvira in Spain). Sometimes again the more firm among the Christians made a stubborn stand and were martyred for their protest as enemies of the Roman State. Altogether there can be no doubt that the inherent contradiction between Christian religion and the pagan practices of municipal life did put an extra strain on the latter and could not but increase the disorder which was setting in. The bold step taken by Constantine in recognizing Christianity as a state religion saved the situation to some extent, but it could not do away at a stroke with all the pagan elements of municipal life: the strife between religions assumed a new aspect, and as the vital connection between local self-government and local cults was never restored, that unity of conception which marked antiquity when at its best had to be replaced by a deep dualism tending towards new solutions of political and moral problems. The greatest representative of conquering Christianity, St Augustine, recognizes the defeat of the material world of antiquity and has to fashion his ideals according to a scheme of two cities in which only the heavenly one appeals to his devotion and energy.

Apart from this complication arising out of peculiarities of religious history, the middle class of the citizens was undergoing a transformation similar to that of the merchants and craftsmen. When the chaotic conditions of the second half of the third century were arrested by the statesmanship and military power of Aurelian and Diocletian, the policy of compulsion was brought to bear with full weight on the well-to-do inhabitants of cities. They were mostly not only house owners in our sense, but also owners of lands in the vicinity of the towns, although distinctions which it is somewhat difficult for us at the present time to formulate in detail were drawn between them and the *possessores* or landowners properly so called. However, the bulk of the well-to-do townsmen was considered as a separate class, the *curiales*, out of which the actual members of city senates, the *decuriones*, as well as its executive officials and justices, were selected. Yet the connection between the *curiales* group and the actual office-holders was so close, there were so few members of the former who had not to serve in one way or the other, that the enactments of the Codes currently confuse the two distinct terms—*curiales* and *decuriones*. This confusion of itself points to the overburdening of the middle class in the towns with service. And we find indeed that its members are compelled to take over without salary the various personal *munera*, or charges, of local government, to administer the town, to act as petty justices, to take part in deputations, to arrange games, to inspect public buildings, to provide fuel for baths, to superintend postal and transport service (*cursus publicus*), to collect rates, etc.

The most burdensome of their obligations were connected with the collection of taxes. They were chiefly responsible for assessing the town population, and out of their number were selected the inspectors of public stores (*horrea*) and the *decemprimi* (Searporrot.), who had to collect the land tax and the tribute in kind (*annona*). Both heathen and Christian authors testify to the crushing burden of taxation during the fourth and fifth centuries, and the unfortunate *curiales*, who were made the instruments of collection under the watchful and extortionate supervision of state officials, were not only suffering from the unpopularity of their functions, but had constantly to fall back on their own resources in order to make good deficiencies and arrears. The *decemprimi* were primarily responsible as collectors, and when they vacated their office they had to nominate their successors and to stand security for their good behaviour. Not content with this the provincial authorities commonly made the town, that is, primarily the town senate (*curia*), liable for deficiencies in the full sum required. The emperors sometimes intervened to forbid such collective liability, but on other occasions they enforced it in the most sweeping manner, as for instance when Aurelian, and later on Constantine, decreed that the town senates (*ordines*) should be made responsible for the taxes of deserted estates, and in case they should be unable to support the burden it should be distributed among the various local districts and estates.

In consequence of such oppressive burdens laid on the *curiales* we witness the curious spectacle of widely spread attempts on the part of the citizens to escape into more privileged professions—into the clergy or the army—and even of their flight into the country, where they were sometimes glad to live and work as simple *coloni*. The Codex Theodosianus and the Codex Justinianus are full of enactments forbidding the *curiales* to leave the place of their birth, condemning them to a hereditary subjection to municipal charges (*munera*) in fact turning their condition into a kind of serfdom. All the sons of a *curialis* had to follow their father's career, they were deemed *curiales* from the date of their birth. If there was not a sufficient number of persons of this class to uphold all its obligations, owners of estates (*possessores*), denizens (*incolae*), well-to-do plebeians, were pressed into it.

The wretched townspeople were suspected of wanting to escape by flight from their onerous condition and had to apply to the governor for special leave of absence when they left the place of their birth for the sake of business or travel. If one of them wanted to change permanently his place of abode he was bound to provide a substitute or to leave a great part of his fortune to the curia. This epoch of imperial legislation does away, for fiscal and administrative purposes, with some of the fundamental principles of Roman law in its better times. A *curialis*, though a Roman citizen in the exercise of full civil rights, is unable freely to bequeath his fortune to another Roman citizen belonging to a different city: property passing out of the jurisdiction of one *curia* into that of another is charged with a heavy special payment to the former senate, and in fact remains "obnoxious" to it; a later constitution enacted that at least one-fourth of the property should remain in the hands of the original curia. If a *curialis* wanted to sell land or slaves employed in the cultivation of his estate he had to obtain leave from the governor of the province. Heiresses were much hampered in the right to marry strangers outside their late father's curia and had in such cases to relinquish one-fourth part of their property.

The climax of this legislation of servitude is reached when the emperors actually condemn people for some crime or misdemeanour to be enrolled as members of a curia: sons of veterans, e.g. who, by chopping off their fingers, had rendered themselves unfit to serve in the army, were stuck into the *curia*, and the same fate awaited unworthy ecclesiastics.

The policy of compulsion and the spread of caste were undoubtedly responsible to a great extent for another social process of great moment, namely, for the formation of the *colonate*, an institution destined to play an important part in medieval peasant life. Its roots stretch far back into the earlier history of Roman husbandry. Columella, a writer on

agriculture of the first century A.D., instructs his readers that it is advantageous for owners of estates of insufficient fertility and difficult cultivation to employ free farmers, *coloni*, instead of slaves. The tenants were sometimes settled on the *métayer* system (*colonia partiaria*), the farmer sharing crops with the owner. Juridically the relation was regulated by the rules of the law of lease (*locatio conductio*) and the Digest often refers to the various problems arising under this contract; custom and tacit agreement played a great part in the treatment of such questions in practice. By the side of contractual relations between private landlords and tenants stood administrative regulations as to the management of vast domains of the Crown and of the private patrimony of the Emperor. Crowds of tenants were settled on these estates who had to look for a guarantee to the possession of their holdings rather to the equity and properly understood interest of their imperial masters than to formal contractual right. Lastly, a good many slaves were put into a position similar to that of the tenants of free birth, and as a matter of fact, it got to be more and more difficult to distinguish between *coloni* by contract and quasi-*coloni* by long usage and customary tenure. One trait which tended to reduce the distance between the different groups was the heavy indebtedness of most free farmers: they had often to take their agricultural outfit from the landowner along with the farm; in case of economic difficulties they turned to him as to their natural protector and a capitalist near at hand, and when once debts had been made, it was exceedingly difficult to pay them off.

Fourth-century legislation approaches these relations in its usual despotic manner. A law of Constantine dated A.D. 332 gives us the first glimpse of a new order of men standing between the free and the unfree and treated, in fact, as serfs of the glebe. It runs thus: "With whomsoever a *colonus* belonging to someone else (*alieni juris*) may be discovered, let the new patron not only restore the *colonus* to the place of his birth (*origini*), but let him also pay the tax for the time of his absence. As for the *coloni* themselves who contemplate flight, let them be put into fetters after the manner of slaves, so that they should perform duties worthy of freemen on the strength of a servile condemnation". But from Constantine again we have another enactment marking the other side of the condition, namely, the legal protection afforded to the *colonus* against possible exactions. About AD 325 the Emperor laid down in a rescript to the vicarius of the East that, "a *colonus* from whom a landlord exacted more than it was customary to render and than had been obtained from him in former times, may apply to the judge nearest at hand and produce evidence of the wrong. The person who is convicted of having claimed more than he used to receive shall be prohibited to do so in the future after having given back what he extorted by illegal superexaction".

The legal protection afforded to the *coloni* was not suggested by principles of humanity, but by the necessity of keeping up at least some portion of the previous personal freedom of these peasants in order to safeguard the interest of the State which looked upon this part of the population as the mainstay of its fiscal system. If the emperors made light of the right of free citizens to choose their abode and their occupations as they pleased and did not scruple to attach the *coloni* to their tenures, the absolute right of landowners to do what they pleased with their land was not more sacred to them. Constantine imposed the most stringent limitations on their power of alienating plots of land. "If someone wants to sell an estate or to grant it, he has not the right to retain *coloni* by private agreement in order to transfer them to other places. Those who consider *coloni* to be useful, must either hold them together with the estates or, if they despair of getting profit from these estates, let them also give up the *coloni* for the use of other people". In the reign of Valentinian, Valens, and Gratian, about A.D. 375, this principle is characteristically extended to the very slaves. "As born cultivators (*originarii*) cannot be sold without their land, even so it is forbidden to sell agricultural slaves inscribed in the census rolls. Nor must the law be evaded in a fraudulent manner, as has been often practiced in the case of *originarii*, namely, that while a small piece of land is handed over to the buyer, the cultivation of the whole estate is made impossible. But if entire estates or



portions of them pass to a new owner, so many slaves and born cultivators should be transferred at the same time as used to stay with the former owners in the whole or in its parts". The fiscal point of view is clearly expressed on many occasions. Valentinian and Valens entrust the landowners with the privilege of collecting the taxes of their *coloni* for the State with the exception of those tenants who have besides their farms some land of their own. This right and duty might be burdensome, but it certainly gave the landlords a powerful lever in reducing their free tenants to a condition of almost servile subjection. Perhaps the most drastic expression of the process may be seen in the fact that *coloni* lose their right to implead their masters in civil actions except in cases of superexaction. In criminal matters they were still deemed possessed of the full rights of citizens.

But it would be wrong to suppose that the condition of the farmers in the fourth and fifth centuries is characterized by mere oppression and deterioration. In the case of rustic slaves it is clearly seen that their fate was much improved by the course of events and by legislation. Their masters lost part of their former absolute authority because the State began to supervise the relations between master and slave for the sake of keeping cultivators to their work and thereby ensuring the coming in of taxes. Considerations of a similar nature exerted an influence on the fate of *coloni*, and they made themselves felt not only in social legislation, but also in husbandry. The tremendous agrarian crisis through which the Empire was passing could not be weathered by mere compulsion and discipline. On a large scale, it was a case like the one described in Columella's advice to landowners: if you want to get your land cultivated under difficult conditions, do not try to manage it by slave labour and direct orders, but entrust it to farmers. The great *latifundia* of earlier times were parcelled up into small plots, because only small cultivators could stand the storm of hostile invasion, of dislocation of traffic, of depopulation. Nor was it possible for the landowner to demand rack-rents and to avail himself of the competition between agricultural laborers. He had to be content if he succeeded in providing his estates with tenants ready to take care of them at moderate and customary rents, and both sides—the lord and the tenant—were interested in making the leases hereditary if not perpetual. Thus there is a second aspect to the growth of the colonate. The institution was not only one of the forms of compulsion and caste legislation, but also a 'meliorative' device, a means for keeping up culture and putting devastated districts under the plough. Among the earliest roots of the *colonate* we find the license given to squatters and peasants dwelling in villages adjoining waste land to occupy such land and to acquire tenant right on it by the process of culture. The Emperor Hadrian published a general enactment protecting such tenants on imperial domains, and the African inscriptions testify that his regulations did not remain a dead letter.

This feature—cultivation of waste and amelioration of culture—is seldom expressed in as many words in the enactments of the Codex Theodosianus and of the Codex Justinianus, because the laws and rescripts collected there are chiefly concerned with the legal and fiscal aspects of the situation. The legislators had no occasion to speak directly of low rents and remissions in their payment. Yet even in these documents some indications of the 'emphyteutic' tendency may be gleaned. I will just call attention to one of the earliest "constitutions" relating to the *colonate*, namely, to the decree of Constantine of AD 319. It is directed against encroachments of *coloni* on the lands of persons who held their estates by the technical title of *emphyteutae*, of which we shall have to say more by and by. It is explained that *coloni* have no right to occupy lands for the culture of which they have done nothing. "By custom they are allowed to acquire only plots which they have planted with olives or vines". This ruling is entirely in conformity with the *Lex Hadriana de rudibus agris* and testifies to the peculiar right of occupation conceded to cultivators of waste.

The technical requirement of making plantations of olive trees or vines corresponds exactly to the Greek expression, *thytefiy* which reappears in the term *emphyteusis* so much in

use in the later centuries of the Empire. Of course, cultivation of the waste was not restricted in practice to the rearing of these two kinds of useful trees, nor can the view so clearly formulated in this case have failed to assert itself on other occasions, especially in the relations between landlord and tenant. But the luxuriant growth of *emphyteusis* as a widely prevalent contract is very characteristic of the epoch.

The *emphyteusis* of the later Empire is distinguished from other leases by three main features: it is hereditary; the rent paid is fixed and generally slight; the lessee undertakes specific duties in regard to amelioration on the plot and may lose the tenancy if he does not carry them out. These peculiarities were so marked that there was considerable doubt whether the relation of *emphyteusis* was originated by the sale of a plot by one owner to the other with certain conditions as to the payment of rent, or by a downright lease. A constitution of Zeno, published between 476 and 484, decided the controversy in the sense that the contract was a peculiar one, standing, as it were, between a sale and a lease. The meaning of such a doctrine was, of course, that in many cases rights arose under cover of *dominium*, (Roman absolute property), which amounted in themselves to a new hereditary possession, and arising from the labour and capital sunk by the subordinate possessor into the cultivation of the estate, and leaving a very small margin for the claims of the proprietor. Such hybrid legal relations do not come into being without strong economic reasons, and these reasons are disclosed by the history of the tenure in question. Its antecedents go far back into earlier epochs, although the complete institution was matured only towards the end of the fifth century. One of the roots of *emphyteusis* we have already noticed in the occupation of waste land by squatters or cultivators dwelling on adjoining plots. In the fourth and fifth centuries the emperors not only allow such occupation, but make it a duty for possessors of estates in a proper state of cultivation to take over waste plots. This is the basis of the so-called *epibole* of the "imposition of desert to fertile land", an institution which arose at the time of Aurelian and continued to exist in the Byzantine Empire. It is worth noticing that a law of Valentinian, Theodosius, and Arcadius gives everyone leave to take possession of deserted plots; should the former owner not assert his right in the course of two years and compensate the new occupier for ameliorations, his property right is deemed extinguished to the profit of the new cultivator. In this case voluntary occupation is still the occasion of the change of ownership, but several other laws make the taking over of waste land compulsory. An indirect but important consequence of the same view may be found in the fact that the right of possessors of estates to alienate portions of the same was curtailed: they were not allowed to sell land under profitable cultivation without at the same time disposing of the barren and less profitable parts of the estate; the Government took care that the "nerves" of a prosperous exploitation should not be cut.

A second line of development was presented by *leases* made with the intention of ameliorating the culture of certain plots. The practice of such leases may be followed back into great antiquity, especially in provinces with Greek or Hellenized population; and it is on such estates that the terms *emphyteusis* first appear in a technical sense. A good example is presented by the tables discovered on the site of Heraclea in the gulf of Tarentum, where land belonging to the temple of Dionysos was leased to hereditary tenants about B.C. 400 on the condition of the construction of farm buildings and the plantation of olives and vines. *Emphyteutic* leases of the same kind, varying in details, but based on the main conditions of amelioration and hereditary tenancy, have been preserved from the second century A.D. in the Boeotian town of Thisbe. Roman jurists, e.g. Ulpian, mention distinctly the peculiar legal position of such 'emphyteutic' tenancies, and there can be no doubt that as the difficulties of cultivation and economic intercourse increased, great landowners, corporations, and cities resorted more and more to this expedient for ensuring some cultivation to their estates even at the cost of creating tenancies which restricted owners in the exercise of their right.

A third variety of relations making towards the same goal may be observed in the so-called perpetual right (*jus perpetuum*). It arose chiefly in consequence of conquest of territories by the Roman State. The title of former owners was not extinguished thereby but converted into a possession subordinate to the superior ownership of the Roman people and liable to the payment of a rent (*canon*). The distinction between Roman land entirely free from any tax and provincial land subject to tax or rent was removed in the second century A.D. when land in Italy was made subject to taxes. But the legal conception of tenant right subject to the eminent domain of the emperor remained and the *jus perpetuum* continued as a special kind of tenure on the estates of cities and of the Crown, as we should say nowadays, until it was merged into the general right of *emphyteusis* together with the two other species already mentioned.

These juridical distinctions are not in the nature of purely technical details. The great need of cultivation and the wide concessions made in its interest in favour of effective farming are as significant as the subdivision of ownership in regard to the same plot of land, one person obtaining what may be called in later terminology the useful rights of ownership (*dominium utile*), while the other detains a superior right nevertheless (*dominium eminens*). In this as in many other points the peculiarities of medieval law are foreshadowed in the declining Empire.

This observation applies even more to the part assumed by great landowners in the fourth and fifth centuries. A great estate in those times comes to form in many respects a principality, a separate district for purposes of taxation, police, and even justice. Already in the first century AD Frontinus speaks of country seats of African magnates surrounded by villages of their dependents as if by bulwarks. By the side of the *civitas*, the town forming the natural and legal centre of a district, appears the *saltus*, the rural, more or less uncultivated district organized under a private lord or under a steward of the emperor. The more important of these rural units are extraterritorial, outside the jurisdiction and administration of the towns.

By and by the seemingly omnipotent government of the emperor is driven by its difficulties to concede a large measure of political influence to the aristocracy of large landowners. They collect taxes, carry out conscription, influence ecclesiastical appointments, act as justices of the peace in police matters and petty criminal cases. The disruptive or rather the disaggregating forces of local interests and local separatism come thus to assert themselves long before the establishment of feudalism, under the very sway of absolute monarchy and centralized bureaucracy.

If the formation of the *colonate* means the establishment of an order of half-free persons intermediate between free citizens and slaves, if *emphyteusis* amounts to a change in the conception of ownership, the rise of the privileges and power of landowners corresponds to the appearance of a new aristocracy which was destined to play a great part in the history of medieval Europe.

Besides what was directly conceded to these lords by the central authority we must reckon with their encroachments and illegal dealings in regard to the less favoured classes of the population. The State had to appeal to private persons of wealth and influence because it was not able to transmit its commands to the inert masses of the population in any other way. Aristocratic privilege was from this point of view a confession of debility on the part of the Empire. But the inefficiency of the State was recognised by its subjects as well and, as a natural result, they applied for protection to the strong and the wealthy, although such a recourse to private authority led to the infringement of public interests and to the break-up of public order. Private patronage appears as a threatening symptom with which the emperors have to deal. In the time of undisputed authority of the commonwealth it was a usual occurrence that benefactors of a town or village, persons who had erected waterworks, built

baths, or founded an alimentary institution for destitutes should be honoured by the title of *patroni* and by certain privileges in regard to precedence and ceremonial rights. The emperors of the fourth and of the fifth century had to forbid patronage because it constituted a menace to law and to public order. We hear of cases of "maintenance"; parties to a trial being protected by powerful *patroni*, who seek to turn the course of justice in favour of their clients. Libanius, a professional orator of the epoch of Valentinian II and Theodosius I, gives a vivid description of the difficulties he had to meet in a suit against some Jewish tenants of his who refused to pay certain rents according to ancient custom. If we are to believe our informant, they had recourse to the protection of a commander of troops stationed in the province, and when Libanius came into court and produced witnesses, he found the judge so prepossessed in favour of his opponents that he could not get a hearing, and his witnesses were thrown into prison or dismissed. In another part of the same speech Libanius inveighs against officers who prevent the collection of taxes and rents and favour brigandage. There may be a great deal of exaggeration in the impassioned account of the Greek rhetor, but the principal heads of his accusation can be confirmed from other sources, especially from imperial decrees. A company of soldiers gets quartered in a village and when the curiales of the next town appear to collect taxes or rents, they are met by violence and may be called fortunate if they escape without grievous injury to life and limbs. In the Theodosian Code enactments directed against patronage in villages go so far as to forbid the acquisition of property in a rural district by outsiders for fear the strangers should prove powerful people capable of opposing tax collectors. According to the account of Salvian, a priest who lived in the fifth century in southern Gaul, patronage had become quite prevalent in that region. People turned to private protection out of sheer despair and surrendered their land to the protector, rather than face the extortions of public authorities. There can be no doubt that patrons and protectors of the kind described, if they were helpful to some, were dangerous and harmful to others, and the State in the fourth and fifth centuries had good reasons to fight against their influence. But the constant repetition of the same injunctions and prohibitions proves that the evil was deeply rooted and difficult to get rid of. The Sisyphean task undertaken by the Government in its struggle against abuses and encroachments is well illustrated by various attempts to create special authorities to repress the exactions of ordinary officers and to correct their mistakes.

One of the principal expedients used by Diocletian and his successors was to institute a special service of supervising commissaries under the names of *agentes in rebus* and *curiosi*. They were sent into the provinces more particularly to investigate the management of the public post, but, as a matter of fact, they were employed to spy on governors, tax collectors, and other officials. They received complaints and denunciations and sometimes committed people to prison. A decree of Constantius tries to restrict the latter practice and to impress on these *curiosi* the idea that they are not to act in a wanton manner but have to produce evidence and to communicate with the regular authorities. But the very existence of such a peculiar institution was an incitement to delation and arbitrary acts, and in 395 Arcadius and Honorius try to concentrate the activity of the *agentes in rebus* on the inspection of the post. "They ought not to levy illicit toll from ships, nor to receive reports and statements of claims, nor to put people into prison". The service of the *agentes* and of the *curiosi* was deemed to be as important as it was dangerous, and those who went through the whole career were rewarded by the high rank of counts of the first class. It is hardly to be wondered at that these extraordinary officials provided with peculiar methods of delation did not succeed in saving the Empire from the corruption of its ordinary officers.

And yet the emperors found that the only means of exercising some control over the abuses of the bureaucratic machinery and the oppression of influential people was in pitting extraordinary officials against them. The *defensor civitatis* was designed to act as a protector of the lower orders against such misdeeds. The office originated probably in voluntary



patronage bestowed on cities by great men, but it was regularized and made general under Valentinian I. An enactment of Gratian, Valentinian II, and Theodosius lays chief stress on the protection afforded by *defensores* to the plebs in regard to taxation. The *defensor* ought to be like a father of the plebs, to prevent *superexaction* and hardships in the assessment of taxes both in regard to the town population and to rustics, to shield them against the insolence of officials, and the impertinence of judges. Not merely fiscal oppression was aimed at, but also abuses in the administration of justice, and the emperors tried to obviate the evils of a costly litigation and inaccessible tribunals by empowering the *defensores* to try civil cases in which poor men were interested. It was somewhat difficult to draw the line between such exceptional powers and ordinary jurisdiction, but the Government of the later Empire had often to meet similar difficulties. An important privilege of the *defensores* was the right to report directly to the emperor, over the governor of the province: this was the only means for making protests effective, at least in some cases. As to the mode of electing the *defensores* we notice some variation: they are meant to represent the population at large and originally the people took part in the election, though it had to be confirmed by the emperors. In the fifth century, however, the office became a burden more than an honour, a quantity of petty police functions and formal supervision was tacked on to it, and the emperors are left no choice but to declare that all notable citizens of the town have to take it in turn. This is certainly a sign of decline and there can be no doubt that the original scope of the institution was gradually lost sight of.

A third aspect of the same tendency to counterbalance the evil working of official administration by checks from outside forces may be noticed in the political influence assigned to the Church. Here undoubtedly the emperors of the fourth and fifth centuries reached firm ground. It was not a mere shuffling of the same pack of cards, not a pitting of one official against the other by the help of devices which at best answered only for a few years. It was an appeal from a defective system to a fresh and mighty force which drew forth the best capabilities of the age and shaped its ideals. If anywhere, one could hope to find disinterested effort, untiring energy, and fearless sense of duty among the representatives of the Church, and it is clear that both government and people turned to them on especially trying occasions. We need not here speak of the intense interest created by ecclesiastical controversies or of the signal evidence of vigorous moral and intellectual life among the clergy. But we have to take these facts into account if we want to explain the part assumed by Church dignitaries in civil administration and social affairs. A significant expression of the confidence inspired in the public by the ecclesiastical authorities may be seen in the custom of applying to them for arbitration instead of seeking redress in the ordinary courts. The custom in question had its historical roots in the fact that before the recognition of Christianity as a state religion by the Empire the Christians tried to abstain as far as possible from submitting disputes and quarrels to the jurisdiction of pagan magistrates. There was a legal possibility of escaping from such interference of pagan authorities by resorting to the arbitration of persons of high moral authority within the Church, especially bishops. When Christianity conquered under Constantine, episcopal arbitration was extended to all sorts of cases and an attempt was made, as is shown by two enactments of this emperor to convert it into a special form of expeditious procedure, well within reach of the poorer classes. Episcopal awards in such cases were exempted from the ordinary strict forms of compromise accompanied by express stipulation; the procedure was greatly simplified and shortened, the recourse of one party to the suit to such arbitration was held to be obligatory for the other party. At the close of the fourth century Arcadius considerably restricted this wide jurisdiction conceded to bishops and tried to reduce it to voluntary arbitration pure and simple. But the moral weight of their decisions was so great, that the ecclesiastical tribunals continued to be overwhelmed with civil cases brought before them by the parties. Not only Ambrose of Milan, who lived in the

time of Theodosius the Great, but also Augustine, who belongs chiefly to the first quarter of the fifth century, complain of the heavy burden of judicial duties which they have to bear.

The bishops had no direct criminal jurisdiction, but through the right of sanctuary claimed by churches and in consequence of the general striving of Christian religion for humanity and charity, they were constantly pleading for grace, mitigation of sentences, charitable treatment of prisoners and convicts, etc. Panic stricken and persecuted persons and criminals of all kinds flocked for refuge to the churches; famous cathedrals and monasteries presented curious sights in those days: they seemed not only places of worship but also caravanserais of some kind. Fugitives camped not only in the churches but at a distance of fifty paces around them. Gangs of these poor wretches accompanied priests and deacons on their errands and walks outside the church, as in such company they were held to be secure from revenge and arrest. The Government restricted the right of fiscal debtors to take sanctuary in order to escape from the payment of taxes, but in other respects it upheld the claims of ecclesiastical authority. Certain compromises with existing law and custom had undoubtedly to be effected. The Church did not attempt, for instance, to proclaim the abolition of slavery. It merely negotiated with the masters in order to obtain promises of better treatment or a pardon of offences. But it countenanced in every way the emancipation of slaves and protected freedmen when once manumitted. The Acts of Councils of the fourth century are full of enactments in these respects.

Another domain in which the authority of the bishops found ample scope for its assertion was the sphere of moral police, if one may use the expression. To begin with, pious Christians were directed by the Gospel to visit prisoners, and this commandment of Christ became the foundation for a supervision of the Clergy over the state of prisons, their sanitary conditions—baths, food, the treatment of convicts, etc. In those times when terrible need and famines were frequent, parents had the legal right to sell their children directly after their birth and a person who had taken care of a foundling was considered its owner. It is to ecclesiastical authorities that the emperors turn in order to prevent these rights from degenerating into a ruthless kidnapping of children. The Church enforces a delay of ten days in order that parents who wish to take back their offspring should be able to formulate their claims. If they have not done so within the days of respite, let them never try to vindicate their flesh and blood any more: even the Church will treat them as murderers (Council of Vaison, cc. 9, 10). Again, ecclesiastics are called upon to prevent the sale of human beings for immoral purposes: no one ought to be forced to commit adultery or to offer oneself for prostitution, even if a slave, and bishops as well as secular judges have the power to emancipate slaves who have been subjected by their masters to such ignominious practices. They are also bound to watch that women, either free or unfree, should not be constrained to join companies of pantomime actors or singers against their will.

In conclusion it may be useful to point out once more that the social process taking place in the Roman Empire of the fourth and fifth centuries presented features of decline and of renovation at the same time. It was brought about to a great extent by the increased influence of lower classes and the influx of barbarous customs, and in so far it expresses itself in an undoubted lowering of the level of culture. The sacrifice of political freedom and local patriotism to a centralized bureaucracy, the rigid state of siege and the caste legislation of the Constantinian and Theodosian era produced an unhealthy atmosphere of compulsion and servility. But at the same time the Christian Church asserts itself as a power not only in the spiritual domain, but also in the legal and economic sphere. Society falls back to a great extent on the lines of local life and of aristocratic organization, but the movement in this direction is not a merely negative one: germs appear which in their further growth were destined to contribute powerfully towards the formation of feudal society.

## CHAPTER XX

### THOUGHTS AND IDEAS OF THE PERIOD

THE fourth and fifth centuries A.D. were marked by the rise of no new school of metaphysics and were illustrated by only one preeminent philosopher. In theology the period can boast great names, perhaps the greatest since the Apostles of Christ, but in philosophy it is singularly barren. Plotinus (*AD* 205-270), the chief exponent and practical founder of that reconstruction of Greek philosophy known as Neo-Platonism, had indeed many disciples; but Proclus the Lycian (*AD* 412-485) is the only one of them who can be said to have advanced in any marked degree the study of pure thought. The mind of the age was inclined towards religion, or at least religious idealism, rather than towards metaphysics. Nor is this matter for surprise when we remember the spiritual revival of the centuries preceding, a movement which began under the Flavians and had by no means spent its force when Constantine came to the throne.

From an early period in the Empire, and more especially under the Severi, men were turning in disgust and disillusion to religion as a refuge from the evils of the world in which they lived, as a sphere in which they could realize dreams of better things than those begotten of their present discontent. This fact explains the quickening of the older cults and the ready adoption of new ones, which issued in a promiscuous pantheon and a bewildering medley of religious rites and practices. Then came philosophy and sought to bring order out of chaos. It tried, and with some success, to clear away superstition and to raise the believer in gods many to a living communion with the One divine of which they were but different manifestations. There is no doubt that Proclus, who unified to some extent the heterogeneous system of Plotinus, was engaged in the proper business of philosophy, viz. the contemplation of metaphysical truth; there is equally no doubt that in practice the philosophy of the age was addressed to the same human need as its religion. And that need was a better knowledge of God. It is most significant that the final rally of the old religions was under the banner of a philosophy: Julian and his supporters were Neoplatonists.

We may therefore claim that the temper of the times was on the whole religious, concerned chiefly with man's relation to God; and the fact that the Church had recently achieved so signal a victory is in itself an indication that the best intellects had gravitated towards her. Thus the highest thought was Christian, finding expression in those systematized ideas about God which are summed up in the word theology.

It would however be a grave mistake to suppose that the age which saw the triumph of the Christian idea and the establishment of Christianity as the state religion was entirely of one mind and Christian to the core. Side by side with the great current of Christian thought and belief, that was now running free after a long subterranean course, there flowed a large volume of purely pagan opinion or preconception, such interfiltration as took place being carried on by unseen channels. Thus, while eager and courageous spirits were contending for the Faith with all kinds of weapons against all kinds of foes throughout the Empire, men (and some of them Christian men) were writing and speaking as though no such thing as Christianity had come into the world. And the age that witnessed the conversion of Constantine and inherited the benefits of that act was an age that in the East listened to the interminable hexameters of Nounus' *Dionysiaca*, which contain no conscious reference to Christianity; that laughed over the epigrams of Cyrus; that delighted in many frankly pagan

love-stories and saw nothing surprising in the attribution of one of them (the *Aethiopica*) to the Christian bishop Heliodorus; that in the West applauded the panegyrists when they compared emperor and patron to the hierarchy of gods and heroes; and that in extremity found its consolation in philosophy rather than in the Gospel.

This persistence of paganism in the face of obvious defeat was due to a number of cooperating causes. Roman patriotism, which saw in worship of the gods and the secret name of Rome the only safeguard of the eternal city; the cults of Cybele, Isis, Mithra, and Orpheus, with their dreams of immortality; the stern tradition of the Stoic emperor Marcus; the lofty ideals of the Neoplatonists—all these factors helped to delay the final triumph. But probably the strongest and most persistent conservative influence was that of the rhetoric by which European education was dominated then as it was by logic in the Middle Ages, and as it has been since the Renaissance by humane letters. Rhetoric lay in wait for the boy as he left the hands of the grammarian, and was his companion at every stage of his life. It went with him through school and university; it formed his taste and trained or paralyzed his mind; but more than this, it opened to him the avenues of success and reward. For although by the fourth century oratory had lost its old political power, rhetoric still remained a bread-winning business. It was always lucrative, and it led to high position, even to the consulship, as in the case of Ausonius the rhetor (AD 309-392), who was Gratian's tutor and afterwards quaestor, praefect of Gaul, and finally consul. Here is cause enough to account for the long life and paramount influence of rhetoric in the schools. Now the instrument with which both schoolmaster and professor fashioned their pupils was pagan mythology and pagan history. The great literatures of the past supplied the theme for declamation and exercise. Rules of conduct were deduced from maxims that passed under the names of Pythagoras, Solon, Socrates, and Marcus Aurelius.

It was inevitable that the thoughts of the grown man should be expressed in terms of paganism when the education of the youth was upon these lines. And this education was for all, not only for the children of unbelievers. Gregory of Nyssa himself informs us that he attended the classes of heathen rhetoricians. So did Gregory of Nazianzus and his brother Caesarius, and so did Basil. John Chrysostom was taught by Libanius, the last of the Sophists, who claimed that it was what he learnt in the schools that led his friend Julian back to the worship of the gods. Even Tertullian, who would not suffer a Christian to teach rhetoric out of heathen books, could not forbid his learning it from them. They were indeed the only means to knowledge. Efforts were made to provide Christian books modelled upon them. Proba, wife of a praefect of Rome, compelled Virgil to prophesy of Christ by the simple means of reading Christianity into a cento of lines from the Aeneid. Juvenecus the presbyter dared, in Jerome's phrase, to submit the majesty of the Gospel to the laws of metre, and to this end composed four books of Evangelic history. The two Apollinarii turned the O.T. into heroic and Pindaric verse, and the N.T. into Platonic dialogues; Nonnus the author of the Dionysiaca rewrote St John's Gospel in hexameters; Eudocia, consort of Theodosius II, composed a poetical paraphrase of the Law and of some of the Prophets. But as soon as Julian's edict against Christian teachers was withdrawn, grammarians and rhetors returned to the classics with renewed zest and a sense of victory gained. Jerome and Augustine, both of them students and teachers, pointed out the educational capacity of the sacred books; but some 80 years after the publication of the *de doctrina christiana*, in which Augustine as a teacher urged the claims of Scripture, we find Ennodius the Christian bishop speaking of rhetoric as queen of the arts and of the world. It was reserved for Cassiodorus (AD 480-575), the father of literary monasticism in the West, to attempt the realization of Augustine's dream.

Like Ennodius his older contemporary, Cassiodorus loved and practiced rhetoric, but he had visions of a better kind of education, and in 535-6 he made an abortive attempt to found a school of Christian literature at Rome, "in which the soul might gain eternal salvation, and the



tongue acquire beauty by the exercise of the chaste and pure eloquence of Christians". His project was ill-timed; it was the moment of the invasion of Belisarius, and Rome had other business on hand than schemes of education and reform. The schools were pagan to the end, and it may be said with truth that rhetoric retarded the progress of the Faith, and that Christianity when it conquered the heathen world was captured by the system of education which it found in force. The result of rhetorical training is very plainly seen in all the literature of the period and in the characters of the writers. Even the Fathers are deeply tinged with it, and Jerome himself admits that one must always distinguish in their writings between what is said for the sake of argument and what is said as truth. Though perjury and false witness were heavily punished, lying was never an ecclesiastical offence, and rigid veracity cannot be claimed as a constant characteristic of any Christian writer of the period except Athanasius, Augustine, and (outside his panegyrics) Eusebius of Caesarea.

Reference has already been made to some of the Eastern authors who wrote in the full current of Christianity but with no sensible trace of its influence. Passing West, we find ourselves in better company than that of the novelists and epigrammatists, and among men who even more effectively illustrate the tendencies of the time. By Macrobius we are introduced to a little group of gentlemen who meet together in a friendly way for the discussion of literary, antiquarian, and philosophic matters. Most of the characters of the Saturnalia are known to us from the history of the day and from their own writings, which express opinions sufficiently similar to those which Macrobius lends them in his symposium to make it a faithful mirror of fourth century thought and conversation. There is Praetextatus, at whose house the company first assembles to keep the Saturnalia. He is a scholar and antiquary, a statesman and philosopher, the hierophant of half-a-dozen cults, formerly praefect of the city and proconsul of Achaia, his dignity and urbanity, his piety, his grave humour, his overflowing erudition, his skill in drawing out his friends, render him in all respects the proper president of the feast of reason.

There is Flavian the younger, a man of action and of greater mark in the real world than Praetextatus, who however plays but a small part on Macrobius' stage. There is Q. Aurelius Symmachus, the wealthy senator and splendid noble, the zealous conservative and patron of letters, who opposed Ambrose in the affair of the Altar of Victory and brought Augustine to Milan as teacher of rhetoric.

There are two members of the house of Albinus, chiefly remarkable for their worship of Virgil. There is Servius, the young but erudite critic, who carries his scholarship with so much grace and modesty. There is Evangelus, whose rough manners and uncouth opinions serve as a foil to the strict correctness of the rest. There is Disarius the doctor, the friend of Ambrose, and Horus, whose name proclaims his foreign birth. These persons of the Saturnalia we know to have been living men. What are the topics of their conversation? The range is astonishing, from antiquities (the origin of the Calendar, of the Saturnalia, of the *toga proetextata*, linguistics (derivations and wondrous etymologies), literature (especially Cicero and Virgil), science (medicine, physiology and astronomy), religion and philosophy (a syncretism of all the cults), ethics (chiefly Stoical, e.g. the morality of slavery and suicide), down to table manners and the jokes of famous men. In a word, everything that a Roman gentleman ought to know is treated somewhat mechanically but with elaborate fullness—except Christianity, of which there is no hint. And yet one of the Albini had a Christian wife and the other was almost certainly himself a Christian.

This silence on a topic which must have touched all the characters to whom Macrobius lends utterance is equally felt when we pass to fact from fiction. Symmachus in the whole collection of his private letters refers but rarely to religion and never once to Christianity. Claudian, the poet courtier of Christian emperors, has only one passage which betrays a clear consciousness of the new faith, and that is in a lampoon upon a bibulous soldier. It is the same

with the panegyrist, the same with allegorist and dramatist. Martianus Capello, whose manual of the arts, entitled *The Nuptials of Mercury and Philology*, represents the best culture of the epoch and enjoyed an almost unexampled popularity during the Middle Ages, passes over Christianity without a word. The anonymous Querolus, an agreeable *comédie à thèse* written for the entertainment of a great Gallican household and obviously reflecting the serious thought of its audience, is entirely dominated by the Stoical and heathen notion of Fate. This general silence cannot be due to ignorance. Rather it is due to Roman etiquette. The great conservative nobles, the writers who catered for their instruction and amusement, would seem to have agreed to ignore the new religion.

We must now consider in some detail the character of this persistent paganism, especially as it is presented to us by Macrobius, either in the *Saturnalia* or in his *Commentary on the Dream of Scipio*, to which last we owe our knowledge of the treatise of Cicero bearing that title.

The philosophy or religion of these two works is pure Neoplatonism, drawn straight from Plotinus. Macrobius seems to have known the Greek original; he gives actual citations from the *Enneads* in several places, and one passage contains as good a summary of the Plotinian Trinity as was possible in Latin.

The universe is the temple of God, eternal like Him and filled with His presence. He, the first cause, is the source and origin of all that is and all that seems to be. By the overflowing fertility of His majesty He created from himself Mind (*mens*). Mind retains the image of its author so long as it looks towards him; when it looks backward it creates soul (*anima*). Soul in its turn keeps the likeness of mind while it looks towards mind, but when it turns away its gaze it degenerates insensibly, and, although itself incorporeal, gives rise to bodies celestial (the stars) and terrestrial (men, beasts, vegetables). Between man and the stars there is real kinship, as there is between man and God. Thus all things from the highest to the lowest are held together in an intimate and unbroken connection, which is what Homer meant when he spoke of a golden chain let down by God from heaven to earth.

Then Macrobius describes the soul's descent. Tempted by the desire for a body, it falls from where it dwelt on high with the stars its brethren. It passes through the seven spheres that separate heaven from earth, and in its passage acquires the several qualities which go to make up the composite nature of man. As it descends it gradually in a sort of intoxication sheds its attributes and forgets its heavenly home, though not in all cases to the same extent. This descent into the body is a kind of temporary death, for the body is also the tomb, a tomb from which the soul can rise at the body's death. Man is indeed immortal, the real man is the soul which dominates the things of sense. But although the body's death means life to the soul, the soul may not anticipate its bliss by voluntary act, but must purify itself and wait, for "we must not hasten the end of life while there is still possibility of improvement". Heaven is shut against all but those who win purity, and the body is not only a tomb; it is a hell (*infera*). Cicero promised heaven to all true patriots; Macrobius knows a higher virtue than patriotism, viz. contemplation of the divine, for the earth is but a point in the universe and glory but a transient thing. The wise man is he who does his duty upon earth with his eyes fixed upon heaven.

If beside this pure and lofty idealism, grafted upon Roman patriotic feeling, we set the somewhat crude syncretism of the *Saturnalia*, we have a true reflection of all the higher thought of fourth century Paganism—except demonology and its lower accompaniment, magic. Of the former we have no direct indication beyond a doubtful etymology. The latter is present, but only in its least objectionable form, viz. divination. The omission is the more remarkable since demonology was a salient feature of the Neoplatonic system, and magic was its inevitable outcome. For the god of Neo-Platonism was a metaphysical abstraction, yet a cause, and therefore bound to act, since a cause must have an effect. Being above action

Himself, there must be a secondary cause or causes. And the Platonic philosophy provided a host of intermediary beings who bridged the chasm between earth and God, and who interpreted and conveyed on high the prayers of men. The ranks of these divine agents were largely supplied by the old heroes and daemons, who in the popular imagination were omnipotent, watching over human affairs. All daemons however were not equally beneficent. At the bottom of the scale of nature lurked evil daemons, powers of darkness ceaselessly scheming man's destruction. It was to these supernatural beings, good and bad, that his mind turned in hope or fear. He dreaded the evil daemons and sought to charm them; he loved the good and addressed to them his prayers and worship. Plotinus indeed forbade but could not prevent the worship of daemons, for he admitted their real existence. With Porphyry (d. 305) the tendency towards demonological rites is clearly marked; with Proclus the habit is established.

Thus upon a monotheistic basis there arose a new polytheism, in which the Olympian deities, whose credit had been shaken by rationalistic philosophy, were largely replaced by daemons and demigods. Theology, which is presented on its purer side by Macrobius, degenerated in popular usage into theurgy; the ethical and intellectual aspirations after union with the divine were replaced by mere magic. Yet magic had the countenance of the philosophers, who, distinguishing carefully between white and black magic (to borrow later terms) repudiated the latter while they allowed the former. And although theurgy was a sharp declension from the principles of Platonism, whether old or new, it was very natural. It was extremely venerable and it was able to take the colour of science. The doctrine of the sympathy of the seen and the unseen worlds, together with the gradual recognition of the mighty power of cosmic law, even when controlled by spirits or daemons, resulted necessarily in an attempt to coerce these beings by means of material things, almost, one might say, by means of chemical reagents. So, the larger the knowledge of nature and its operations, the wider the spread of magical practices. Magic had a living force which Christianity was for ages powerless to break.

Another potent factor in keeping alive the flame of Paganism was the belief in the eternal destiny of Rome. Christian writers in the second century, like Tertullian, held that Rome would last as long as the world and that her fall would coincide with the Day of Judgment. Christian writers before whose eyes the city fell without the coming of the Day, stood bewildered and in part regretful. The news dashed the pen from the hand of Jerome in his cell at Bethlehem: "the human race is included in the ruins", he wrote; and Augustine, while he looks for the founding of an abiding and divine city in the room of that which had disappeared, and taunts the Romans with the poor protection afforded them by their gods, declares that the whole world groaned at the fall of Rome and is himself proud of her great past and of the qualities of Roman endurance and faith that gave her so high a place among the nations. Orosius, again, who carried on the plan and thought of the *de civitate Dei*, to whose mind the Roman Empire was founded upon blood and sin, yet proclaims, as Augustine his master had proclaimed, that Roman peace and Roman culture were greater and would last longer than Rome herself.

If such were the sentiments of Christian writers towards the imperial city, which had been much more of a step-mother than a mother to their faith, what must pagans have felt for the home of their religion, upon which Plutarch had exhausted his store of eulogistic metaphor (cf. *de fortuna Rom.*), which to Julian was "dear to the gods, invincible", whose piety might surely claim divine protection? To discover this we have but to turn the pages of Claudian and Rutilius Namatianus. Claudian (*AD* 400) was not a Roman born, but a Greek-speaking native of Egypt. Yet he has Juvenal's contempt for "Greek Quirites" and an unconcealed hatred of New Rome, and he finds his true inspiration in the great city on the Tiber whom he addresses as *Roma dea*, consort of Jupiter, mother of arts and arms and of the

world's peace. "Rise, reverend mother" he cries, "and with firm hope trust the favouring gods. Lay aside old age's craven fear. O city coeval with the sky, iron Fate shall never master thee till Nature changes her laws and rivers run backward". But it is not only the city with her pomp and beauty, her hills and temples, the home of gods and Fortune, that compels his praise. The empire of which she was the visible head, an empire won by bloodshed, it is true, but kept together by the willing love of all the various races that have passed into the fabric—this is Claudian's real theme, the mighty diapason that runs through all his utterance and redeems his panegyric of Roman noble and emperor from the charge of mere servility.

We have said that Claudian hardly ever refers directly to Christianity, and indeed echoes of spiritual language in his verse are faint and uncertain. The hostility which he must have felt against the religion that was sapping the seats of the ancient worship is to be gathered from hints rather than from direct expression. That hostility lies nearer the surface in the Return from exile (*AD* 416) of Rutilius Claudius Namatianus, a great Gaulish lord and friend of Roman lords, who betrays more clearly than Claudian the sentiments of the ruling class. But even in Rutilius the allusions to Christianity are veiled. As a high official (he was praefect of the city) he could not openly attack the religion of the emperor, and must content himself with fulminations against Judaism, 'the root of superstition', and the monks whose life is a voluntary death to life, its pleasures, and its duties.

It is almost needless to say that Rutilius the Gaul shares the belief of Claudian the Egyptian in the destiny of Rome. The sight of the temples still shining in the sun after the Gothic invasion was to him an earnest of her perennial youth. "Allia did not keep back the punishment of Brennus". Rome will rise more glorious for her present discomfiture. *Ordo renascendi est, crescere posse malis*. This faith in Rome meant of course faith in the gods who had made her great, and good Romans all believed in them and were eager to maintain the national cult with which Rome's welfare was bound up. Roman worship was at all times directed mainly towards the attainment of material blessings, and the material disasters which, despite the optimism of Rutilius and his circle, lay heavy on the city, were attributed to the anger of forsaken deities. How, asked Symmachus, could Rome bring herself to abandon those under whose protection her conquests had been made and her power established? The appeal to the gods was already more than two centuries old, and now the disaster seemed to justify it. In answer to it Augustine took up his pen and wrote the City of God. It occupied the spare moments of his episcopal life for thirteen years (*AD* 413-426), and, with all its defects, it remains a noble example of the new philosophy of history, and sets in vivid contrast the two civilizations from whose fusion sprang the Middle Ages. He answers the heathen complaints one by one. Christianity was not responsible for Rome's disaster. The Christian enemy even tried to mitigate it, and Christian charity saved many pagans. Had Rome been really prosperous? Her history is dark with calamity. Had the gods really protected her? Remember Cannae and the Caudine Forks. These boasted gods have ever been but broken reeds, from the fall of Troy onwards. The glory of Rome (which he admits) is due, under the Christian's God, to Roman courage and patriotism. This God has a destiny for Rome and He means her to be the eternal city of a regenerate race. Such is the main subject of the first ten books. The next twelve develop the contrast between the city of men and the city of God, the one built upon love of self to the exclusion of God, the other built upon the love of God to the exclusion of self. The history of the world is briefly sketched, but the elaboration of the historical theme, on which he set great store, was entrusted to his disciple, Orosius, a young Spanish monk who came to Hippo in A.D. 414. Orosius' cue was this: the world, far from being more miserable than before the advent of Christianity, was really more prosperous and happy. Etna was less active than of old, the locusts consumed less, the barbarian invasions were no more than merciful warnings. Here is an optimism as false in its way as that of Rutilius; but it shows the spirit that carried Europe safe through the darkness that was coming.



Thirty years later the situation had changed; optimism was difficult; it could no longer be said with Orosius that the world was “only tickled with fleas”, and none the worse for it. Under the almost universal dominion of the barbarian, the old complaints of the heathen against heaven were now heard on the lips of the Christians. Why had a special dispensation of suffering accompanied the triumph of the Cross? Salvian the Gaul takes up the theme and in his treatise *On the Government of the World* compares Roman vice with barbarian virtue. His brush is too heavily charged: he protests too much; but he undoubtedly helped his contemporaries to recover tone, to bear the burdens laid upon them with resignation, and to see the guiding hand of Providence in their misfortunes.

Salvian has not the faith of Augustine and Orosius in the future of the Empire; for him the future was with the new races. But Sidonius Apollinaris (c. 430-489), who perhaps saw them closer and at any rate describes them more minutely, is very loth to allow the ascendancy of the "stinking savages" over Rome, which is still the one city where the only strangers are slaves and barbarians. Thus even when Roman citizens were bowing their heads to fate, even seeking help and an emperor from the hated Greeks, the old love of Rome was strong, the sense of her greatness hardly dimmed. It is not difficult to see how a city which could command so much affection even from Christians served as a strong support to those who for her sake strove to uphold her gods.

Meanwhile the religion which men of letters and Roman patriots passed over in silent contempt or attacked with covert hatred had been gathering notions from the very sources which fostered opposition to it. "Spoil the Egyptians" was Augustine's advice, and not a few distinctive Neoplatonist tenets were borrowed by Christian theologians and lived on through the Middle Ages. The Church indeed rejected from her authoritative teaching the Pantheism and Nihilism to which those tenets lead if held consistently, and affirmed a personal triune God, intelligent and free; a world created out of nothing and to return to nothing; mankind redeemed from evil by one sole mediator; a future life to be enjoyed without the sacrifice of the soul's individual nature.

But the Neoplatonists supplied illustration of church doctrine and interpretation of Christian truth, and thinkers who saw danger in anthropomorphism found support for their metaphysic in the heathen school of Alexandria. The time is past when men spoke of fourth century Christianity as a mere copy of Neo-Platonism, but the object and principles of the two systems are so much alike that it is not surprising to find points of close resemblance in their presentment. The resemblance is most marked in the writings of the Greek and Syrian fathers. The Eastern element in Neoplatonism could not but appeal to Eastern theologians; this appeal and its response explain the large welcome extended to the works of two supposed disciples of St Paul, Hierotheus and Dionysius the Areopagite, whose rhapsodies were received as Pauline truth not only by their credulous contemporaries but by the mystics of the medieval Church. In these writings the personal existence of God is threatened and the direct road to Him is closed. “God is the Being of all that is”. “The Absolute Good and Beautiful is honoured by eliminating all qualities, and therefore the non-existent must participate in the Good and Beautiful”. God, who can only be described by negatives, can only be reached by the surrender of all personal distinctions and a voluntary descent into uncreated nothingness. As has been well said, the name God came to be little more than the deification of the word “not”. All this is the language of Brahmanism or Buddhism, and, but for the corrective influence of Christian experience on the one hand and of Greek love of beauty on the other, it would have led to Oriental apathy and hatred of the world which God called good. The Cappadocian fathers—Basil and the two Gregorys—who were Platonists at heart, and were driven, by the argument that God being simple must be easily intelligible, to assert in strong terms the essential mystery of the divine being, yet maintained that imperfection does not render human knowledge untrue, and that the wisdom displayed in the created universe

enables the mind to grasp, by analogy, the divine wisdom and the uncreated beauty. This habit of tracing analogies between the seen and the unseen is characteristic of Platonism, Christian or heathen, and, we may remark in passing, it bears pleasant fruit in that love for natural beauty that marks the writings of the Cappadocians.

The mind of Plotinus is seen still more clearly in Synesius of Cyrene (*AD* 365-412), country gentleman, philosopher, and bishop, who was in every sense a Neoplatonist first and a Christian afterwards. All his serious thought is couched in the language of the schools, while his hymns are merely metrical versions of Neoplatonist doctrine. When he was chosen bishop he was reluctantly ready to give up his dogs—he was a mighty hunter—but not his wife, nor his philosophy, although it contained much that was opposed to current Christian teaching on such important points as the end of the world and the resurrection of the body. He probably represents the attitude of many at this transition period, though few possessed his clearness of mind and boldness of speech.

The influence of Neo-Platonism in the West is less marked, but it is there. Hilary's curious psychology, according to which soul makes body, is Plotinian, though he may have taken it from Origen; and his own sketch of his spiritual progress from the darkness of philosophy to the light gives evidence that he first learnt from Neo-Platonism the desire for knowledge of God and union with Him.

Augustine was yet more deeply affected by “the philosophers”, especially in his early works. It was Plato, interpreted by Plotinus, whom he read in a Latin version, that, as he himself tells us, delivered him from materialism and pantheism. Thus the ecstatic illumination recorded in the Confessions was called forth by the perusal of the *Enneads* and is indeed expressed in the very words of Plotinus. Again, in more than one passage there is a distinct approach on his part to the Plotinian Trinity (one, mind, soul), or at least a statement of the Christian Trinity in terms of being, knowledge, and will, that seems to go beyond the limits of mere illustration or analogy.

Again, Augustine accepts and repeats word for word the Neoplatonic denial of the possibility of describing God. “God is not even to be called ineffable, because to say this is to make an assertion about Him”; but, like the Cappadocians, his feet are kept from the hopeless *via negativa* by an intense personal conviction of the abiding presence of God and by a real vision of the divine. His mind and heart taught him the real distinction between the old philosophy and the new religion, but all his deepest thoughts about God and the world, freedom and evil, bear the impress of the books which first impelled him “to enter into the inner chamber of his soul and there behold the light”. The appeal away from the illusion of things seen to the reality that belongs to God alone, the slight store set by him on institutions of time and place, in a word, the philosophic idealism that underlies and colours all Augustine's utterance on doctrinal and even practical questions and forms the real basis of his thought, is Platonic. And, considering the vast effect of his mind and writings on succeeding generations, it is no exaggeration to say with Harnack that Neo-Platonism influenced the West under the cloak of church doctrine and through the medium of Augustine. Boethius, the last of the Roman philosophers and the first scholastic, certainly imitated Augustine's theology, and thought like him as a Neoplatonist. At the same time it must be remembered that Platonism was the philosophy that commended itself most naturally to Christian or even to heathen thinkers. Aristotle had had no attraction for Plutarch, while Macrobius deliberately set out to refute him. The influence of Aristotle is certainly seen in the treatment of particular problems by individual writers, but the only school that deliberately preferred his method to his master's is that of Antioch. To the mystical and intuitive movement of Alexandria the Antiochenes, especially Diodorus and Theodore of Mopsuestia, opposed a rationalism and a systematic treatment of theological questions which is obviously Aristotelian.

But there were two articles of the old religion that went deeper and spread further into the new than any philosophic method. These were, first the mediators between God and man that were so prominent in Neo-platonism, and secondly the magic that was its inseparable accompaniment.

It is mere futility to find a pagan source for every Christian saint and festival, but a study of hagiographic literature reveals a very large amount of heathen reminiscence, and even of formal adoption, in the Church's Calendar. Doubtless there were other factors in the growth of the *cultus* of the saints and their relics—human instinct, the Jewish theory of merit, the veneration of confessors and martyrs, and the strong confidence which from an early date was placed in the virtue of their intercessions. But the extraordinary development of the *cultus* between AD 325 and 450 can only be explained by the polytheistic or rather the polydemoniac tendencies of the mass of Gentile converts with the memories of hero and daemon worship in their minds. Again, Neo-Platonism involved the use of magic; the Christianity of the day admitted belief in it; for while the Bible forbade the practice, it did not deny its potency. Closely connected with magic stood divination, whether by astrology and haruspication, or by dreams and oracles. The Neoplatonists, following earlier thinkers, were committed to a theory of inward illumination, and ascribed the various phenomena of divination to the agency of spiritual forces working upon responsive souls. Christians allowed the supernatural inspiration of pagan oracles but held that it came, not from God like the inspiration of the Prophets, but from the fellowship of wicked men with evil demons, of whose real existence they had no manner of doubt.

The fact that Scripture used the word *daemonion* of an evil spirit was immediate evidence of his existence and his wickedness. Philosophers might plead that there were beneficent daemons. *Daemons* had only one sense in the Bible, and that was enough to condemn all that bear the name. The daemons, in the worship of whom, as Eusebius said, the whole religion of the heathen world consisted, were the object of the Christian's deepest fear and hate as being the source of all material and spiritual evil, and the avowed enemies of God. To them were due all the errors and sins of men, all the cruelty of nature. Wind and storm fulfilled God's word; but when mischief followed in their train, it was the work of Satan and his angels. Intercourse with these was stringently forbidden, but no one questioned its possibility. Augustine records the various charms and rites by which daemons can be attracted; he was a firm believer in his mother's dreams and in her power to distinguish between subjective impressions and heaven-sent visions. And Synesius (writing, it is true, before his conversion) states his conviction that divination is one of the best things practiced among men. Magic had been the object of penal legislation from the early days of the Empire, but the very violence of the laws passed by Christian emperors against it points to the prevalence of the belief in it, a belief which the lawgiver shared with his subjects. Constantine and Theodosius may have really looked to their antimagical measures as a means to destroy polytheism and purify the Church, but the former emperor expressly excluded from the scope of his edict rites whose object was to save men from disease and the fields from harm, while his son Constantius, and Valens and Valentinian, were persuaded that magic might be turned against their life or power, and by way of self-defence fell to persecuting the magicians as fiercely as their predecessors had persecuted the Church. The title, enemies of the human race, formerly applied to Christians was now transferred to the adepts in magical arts.

But present punishment and future warning were powerless to check practices that were the natural results of all-prevailing credulity. What this was in heathen circles may be learnt from the pages in which Ammianus Marcellinus (A.D. 325-395) describes the Rome of his day; "many who deny that there are powers supernal will not go abroad nor breakfast nor bathe till they have consulted the calendar to find the position of a planet". In Christian circles the credulity took also another form, that of an easy belief in miracles, not only of serious

import such as the discovery of the bodies of Gervasius and Protasius—which is still a problem to the historian—but trivialities such as the winning of a horse race through the judicious use of holy water, the gift of reading without letters, and all the marvels of the Thebaid. The truth is that amid the universal ignorance of natural laws men were ready to believe anything. And it must be confessed that what greatly fostered credulity and error among educated Christians was the literal interpretation of Scripture which held the field in spite of Alexandrian allegorism. The scientific and the common sense of Augustine were alike shocked by the interminable fables of the Manichaeans concerning sky and stars, sun and moon; but it was their sacrilegious folly that finally turned him from the sect. “The authority of Scripture is higher than all the efforts of the human intelligence” he wrote, and the words exactly express the mind of churchmen whenever there was a conflict between physical theory and the faith.

The erroneous speculations of early philosophers, from whatever source derived, were taken up and readily adopted, provided that they did not contradict the Bible. There are already anticipations in the fourth century of the marvellous scheme of Cosmas Indicopleustes in the sixth, whereof the chief features were a two-storied firmament and a great northern mountain to hide the sun by night—all duly supported by scriptural quotations. The results to which Greek speculation had by a supreme intellectual effort arrived were cast aside in favour of the wildest Eastern fancies, because these latter had the apparent sanction of Genesis and the Psalms. The heliocentric theory of the universe, which although not universally admitted had at least been propounded and warmly supported, was deliberately refused, first on the authority of Aristotle, and a system adopted which led the world astray until Galileo. Genesis demanded that the earth should be the centre, and the sun and stars lights for man's convenience.

Again, the notion of a spherical earth was favoured in classical antiquity even by *geocentricians*. But the words of Psalmist, Prophet, and Apostle required a flat earth over which the heavens could be stretched like a tent, and the believers in a globe with antipodes were scouted with arguments borrowed from Lucretius the epicurean and materialist. Augustine denies the possibility not of a rotund earth but of human existence at the antipodes. “There was only one pair of original ancestors, and it was inconceivable that such distant regions should have been peopled by Adam's descendants”. The logic is fair enough; the false premise arises from the worship of the letter. The fact is that while as spiritual teachers the fathers are unrivalled, common sense interpretation is rare enough in our period; it is not often that we find such sober judgment as is shown by Basil. “What is meant”, he writes, “by the voice of the Lord? Are we to understand thereby a disturbance caused in the air by the vocal organs? Is it not rather a lively image, a clear and sensible vision imprinted on the mind of those to whom God wishes to communicate His thought, a vision analogous to that which is imprinted on our mind when we dream?”

In connection with the unquestioning trust in the letter of Scripture as the touchstone for all matters of knowledge some mention must be made of attempts to adjust universal history by the standard of Biblical dates, although the results, in one instance at least, bear witness to no uncritical credulity but to a singular freedom from prejudice and to love of truth.

The science of comparative chronography, so greatly developed by the Byzantines, was really founded by Sextus Julius Africanus in the early third century. The beginning which he made was carried out with far greater knowledge and with the use of much better material by Eusebius, bishop of Caesarea (*AD* 265-338). Former critics were inclined to belittle Eusebius' work and qualify him as a dishonest writer who perverted chronology for the sake of making synchronisms (so Niebuhr and Bunsen). It is certainly true that he manipulates the figures supplied by his authorities and employs conjecture and analogy to control the incredible length of their time-periods. But his reductions are all worked in the sight of the reader, who



if he cannot allow the main contention, viz. the infallibility of the Biblical numbers, must confess the honesty of the method and the soundness of the process. In dealing with Hebrew chronology Eusebius shows candour and judgment. There was need of both, for even when the discrepancies between the Hebrew and the LXX texts were removed by claiming for the latter a higher inspiration, there remained contradictions enough between the covers of the Greek Bible. For instance, the time between the Exodus and Solomon's Temple is different in Acts and Judges from what it is in Kings. On this point Eusebius, after a fair and sensible discussion, decided boldly and to the dismay of his contemporaries against St Paul in favour of the shorter period, remarking that the Apostle's business was to teach the way of salvation and not accurate chronology. The effect of this decision is to lessen the antiquity of Moses by 283 years. This was clean against the whole tendency of previous apologists, who desired to establish the seniority of the Hebrew over all other lawgivers and philosophers.

Eusebius, although conscious that the reversal of preconceived opinion demands some apology, is content to place Moses after Inachus. The work in which these novel conclusions were set forth consists of two parts, of which the first (*Chronographia*) contains the historical material—extracts from profane and sacred writers—for the synthetic treatment of the second part (*Canones*). Here the lists of the world's rulers are displayed in parallel columns showing at a glance with whom any given monarch is contemporary. Side-notes accompany the lists, marking the main events of history, and a separate column gives the years of the world's age, reckoned from the birth of Abraham. The choice of this event as the starting-point of the Synchronism distinguishes the work of Eusebius from that of his predecessors and does great credit to his historical sense and honesty. As a Christian he felt that his standard of measurement must be the record of the scriptures; but as a historian he saw that history really begins with Abraham, the earlier chapters of Genesis being intended for edification rather than instruction. At a time when the Jews were a despised race, it was no slight achievement to place their history on a footing with that of proud and powerful monarchies, and although Eusebius' work cannot at all points stand the test of modern science, it is of permanent value today both as a source of information and as a model of historical research. The Canons were translated by Jerome and thus obtained at once, even in the West, a position of undisputed authority. The Latin medieval chronicle is founded on Eusebius, whose name, together with his translator's, quite overshadowed all other workers in the same field whether earlier or later, such as Africanus or Sulpicius Severus.

But although the learned labours of Eusebius bear witness to a strong individual regard for truth and a vast range of secular knowledge, the solid contributions to thought on the part of Christian writers must be looked for in other directions. The period which we must admit to have been marked by so much credulity and error in matters of science is the period of the ecumenical councils, of the conciliar creeds and the consequent systematization of Christian doctrine. Councils gathered and expressed in creed and canon the common belief and practice of the churches. Their aim was, not to introduce fresh doctrine, but precisely the reverse, to protect from ruinous innovation the faith once delivered. Nor were the creeds, which served as tests of orthodoxy, intended to simplify or explain the mystery of that faith. Rather they reaffirmed in terms congenial to the age the inexplicable mystery of the revelation in Christ. It was such heretics as the Arians who tried to simplify and explain the difficulties that confronted the Christian believer. This intellectual effort was met by an appeal to experience, to man's need of redemption and the means by which that need is satisfied. The great advance made by Athanasius was really a return to the simple facts of the Gospel and the words of Scripture. "He went back from the Logos of the philosophers to the Logos of St John, from the god of the philosophers to God in Christ, reconciling the world to Himself". In a word, the great victories of the fourth and fifth centuries were the victories of soteriology over theological speculation. Into the thorny labyrinth of the Arian and Nestorian conflicts there is

no need to enter in this chapter. We have only to consider what contributions to general thought were made by the victorious party.

The process of fixing the terminology in which the results of the Arian controversy were expressed and the doctrine affirmed of One God in three Persons of equal and coeternal majesty and Godhead could not be carried through without a serious attempt to deal with the problem of personality. Pre-Christian thinkers had no clear understanding, or at least had not formulated a clear view, of human personality in its two most essential features, viz. universality and unity. These were necessarily brought out by Christianity, first in the historic figure of its founder and His unexampled life, and then in the development of the doctrine of His person. In that development the Cappadocian fathers were pioneers. The formula in which they declared the eternal relations existing within the Godhead marks a great advance in scientific precision of thought and language. Up to AD 362 *ousía* and *hipostasis* were interchangeable terms. Athanasius in one of his latest writings says that they both mean Being. Misunderstanding and confusion inevitably followed. But after the Synod of Alexandria in A.D. 362 *ousía* in Christian documents means the Being which is shared by several individuals and *hipostasis* the special character of the individual. For this happy settlement Basil of Caesarea was largely responsible. He distinguishes between the terms and defines *ousía* the general, *hipostasis* as the particular, in application to both human and divine existence. "Every one of us both shares in existence by the general term of *ousía* and by his own properties in such and such a one. Similarly the term *ousía* is common, like goodness or Godhead, while *hipostasis* is contemplated in the special quality of Fatherhood, Sonship, or the power to sanctify."

The way was thus prepared for Boethius' great definition of person as the individual substance of a rational nature (*persona est naturae rationalis individua substantia, contra Eut. et Nest. III*) which was accepted by Thomas Aquinas and held good throughout the Middle Ages. But between the times of Basil and Boethius a great controversy had arisen which carried forward the recognition of the facts of human personality—the controversy concerning the will and its freedom.

To understand this we must know what were the current opinions concerning the origin of the soul. The Platonic doctrine of pre-existence, as taught by Origen, had had its day; the only traces of it within the period are to be found in the pages of Nemesius the philosophic bishop of Emesa, and, less certainly, in those of Prudentius the Spanish poet. Thus the field was divided between Creationism and Traducianism. The former view, according to which each soul is a new creation, the body alone being naturally begotten, emphasized the essential purity of the spiritual principle, the evilness of matter, and the unity of man's physical nature. Traducianism, on the other hand, maintained the transmission from the first parents through all succeeding generations of both soul and body, and sin therewith. Creationism left room for the exercise of a free will, enfeebled but not destroyed by the Fall; Traducianism seemed to exclude free will and to posit a total corruption of soul and body. Creationism was held by most of the Eastern fathers, and by Jerome and Hilary in the West; Traducianism, by the Westerns generally and by Gregory of Nyssa. Augustine, without definitely declaring himself on either side, was so far traducianist that he regarded the Fall as an historical act resulting in such a complete disablement of man's will that a special divine operation was required to start him again on the Godward path from which Adam's sin had driven him. Without Grace man can only will and do evil. To this conclusion Augustine was led in large measure by his own experience. He had undergone a twofold conversion, first intellectual and then moral. The former brought him a conviction of divine truth and beauty; the latter, a recognition of human weakness. He had seen God, but the cloud of sin obscured the vision, the power of the world still enthralled his will; for the surrender to which he felt himself called meant surrender of all his habits, hopes, and desires. The conflict between his will and his reluctance was terrific.

The world must have won, had not God come to his aid and set his will free to serve. Looking back at his life, the long enslavement of his will and the final victory, he is compelled to confess that he himself contributed nothing towards the restoration of his will and the recovery of peace. He had always believed in God's Grace, but once he held that man's own Faith, fruit of Free Will, went forth to meet it. Now he felt, and St Paul confirmed the conviction, that the whole movement was from God, that Faith as much as Grace is His gift, and That both are determined by the inscrutable decree of His predestinating counsel. Henceforth (this conversion took place in AD 386) the sense of God's guidance colours all his thought—a guidance unseen at the time but recognizable in a retrospect. What was true for him must be true for all. Augustine's character and circumstances are the clue to his later doctrine and his controversies. Thus it was the passionate cry of the Confessions for help against self, *da quod jubes et jube quod vis*, that evoked the Pelagian controversy. Pelagius, quiet inmate of the cloister, hardly knew what temptation is, and protested against words that discouraged moral effort and fostered fatalism. "Grace was good and a help; sin was widespread; but the latter was due not to an inherited taint but to the influence of Adam's bad example. Man can overcome temptation, if he sets his will to it". Augustine met the charge of fatalism by a scornful repudiation of the superstitions that attend the system, and of the impiety which confuses blind and indiscriminating Fate with Grace working with infinite wisdom on vessels of choice. But God's Predestination involves necessity, and this he coordinates with man's Free Will in a scheme that clearly betrays the influence of Roman jurisprudence. The synthesis is incomplete, the facts are stated scientifically and empirically, but the legal cast given to a purely metaphysical conception clouds rather than clears the issue.

Here was material for debate. The fight began in AD 411 and lasted with varying fortune until A.D. 418 when Pelagianism was condemned by Councils in Africa and at Rome, the infirmity of the Will and the vital need of Grace for the fulfilment of God's purposes being affirmed against all compromise. But a strong body of Christian sympathy, due partly to the prevalence of the monastic ideal and partly to a confusion between sin and atrocious sin, remained and still remains on the side of the Pelagians. Attempts were made to mediate between the two extremes by Cassian and Faustus of Riez, both of them monks, who were in great fear of fatalism and who, whilst condemning Pelagius as a heretic, urged the need of man's co-operation in the work of Grace. The predestination of a few they regarded as simple impiety, though they could not deny God's foreknowledge as to who are to be saved. It is plain that Foreknowledge raises more difficulties than it answers. A further and a bold attempt at explanation is offered by Boethius, who saw very clearly the danger of measuring the arm of God by the finger of man. He starts with the thesis, "all things are foreseen but all do not happen by necessity". But how can human freedom be really free if it is already foreseen by God? The answer lies in a recognition of the difference between the divine and human faculties of knowledge. "God's knowledge is a present consciousness of all things, past, present, and to come. Human knowledge as regards things future is called prescience. The divine knowledge of things future is rather called providence than prescience, because, transcending time, it looks down as from a lofty height upon a time-conditioned world. Such knowledge is no more incompatible with human freedom, than human knowledge is incompatible with present free acts".

The thought of man's fallen nature and consequent alienation from God, which is the starting-point of the Free Will controversy, leads naturally to the thought of Atonement through the death of Christ, and Atonement involves the theory of the Church and its sacraments, whereby the benefits of the Atonement are secured. On all these topics our period throws fresh light.

Two of the main aspects under which the earliest Christian writers regarded the Atonement were those of a sacrifice to God and of a ransom from evil. They did not specify to whom the price was paid. The third century had tried to remedy their indefiniteness by the unfortunate addition of the words “to Satan”, and the proposition thus enlarged held its own for nearly 1000 years until it was discredited by Anselm. The notion that the arch-enemy had overreached himself, and, while receiving the ransom, found no advantage in it (inasmuch as Christ's death saved more souls than His life), appealed to the mind of the age, and Gregory of Nyssa's grotesque image of the devil caught by the hook of the Deity, baited with the Humanity, was taken up and repeated with applause. But not by all. The “harrowing of Hell”, in the form current in the fourth century, describes deliverance of souls by the triumphant Christ without a word of ransom. Gregory of Nazianzus rejects with scorn the notion of ransom paid to Satan or to God; the views of Athanasius and Augustine are entirely free from bad taste and extravagance. They start from the thought of God's goodness and justice. Goodness required that man should be delivered from the bondage of misery; justice required something more than mere repentance in order to effect that deliverance, nothing less than the offering up of the human nature which contained the sinful principle. This was achieved by Him who assumed human nature and represented man. Thus far Athanasius. Augustine, who is equally insistent on the fact of the sacrifice of Christ, goes deeper than Athanasius into the reason for the particular form that it took and the effects that it wrought. He shares Athanasius' admiration of the divine goodness exhibited in the long-suffering of God and the voluntary humility of the God-man; he is even more jealous for the divine justice. It was just that Satan who had acquired right over the race should be satisfied in respect of his claims. But Satan took more than his due, slaying the innocent. It was therefore just that he should be forced to relinquish the sinners in behalf of whom the sinless suffered.

The controversy concerning Free Will and Grace also affected the idea of the Church and sacraments. Until the rise of Pelagianism a very wide scope was allowed here to Free Will. The Grace conveyed by the sacraments, which were not to be had outside the Church, was considered to be conditioned by the faith and life of the recipient. It was tacitly assumed that these factors were within the control of the will. That is to say, Grace preceded Election. This, according to Augustine's mind matured by reflection and controversy, was an inversion of the truth. His theory of Predestination demanded that Election should precede Grace. And thus side by side with his practical belief in an external society in which good and bad, wheat and tares, were growing together, partaking of the means of grace, i.e. the visible church, he conceived the novel idea of a spiritual society of elect, the communion of saints, the invisible church, whose members were known to God alone, whether they were within the fold of the external society or not. Of this body it might be affirmed without a trace of bigotry, *extra ecclesiam nulla salus*. The two conceptions are not kept strictly apart, and the characteristics of the invisible church are constantly transferred by Augustine to the visible church. This body, whose growing nucleus is thus supplied by the invisible church, is the *civitas Dei* on earth. Over against it stands the *civitas terrena*, the earthly polity. The two states, separate in idea, origin, purpose, and practice, are yet dependent the one on the other, giving and taking influence. The *civitas Dei* needs the practical support of the *civitas terrena* in order to be a visible state. The *civitas terrena* needs the moral support of the *civitas Dei* in order to be a real state, for a *civitas* only exists on a basis of love and justice and by participation in the sole source of existence, which is God. The city of God is the only real *civitas*, gradually absorbing the *civitas terrena* and borrowing its authority and power in order to carry out the divine purpose. Magistrate and legislator become the sons and servants of the church, bound to execute the church's objects. We have here the germ of the medieval theory of the church as the kingdom of God on earth, but it must be noted that Augustine does not start with the assumption of identity, does not use church and kingdom of God as interchangeable terms,



despite the assertion *ecclesia iam nunc est regnum*, which he is the first of Christian writers to make. Even in this phrase he does not mean that the church is actually the kingdom, but only that it is so potentially. The full and perfect *realisation* he reserves until the consummation of all things.

From the earliest days of Christianity the words sacrament and mystery were borrowed to denote any sacred secret thing, and especially the means of grace. The number of these was not distinctly specified, for Christians, believing that the Church was the store-house of unlimited grace, were not careful to count the means. Two however stood out preeminent, Baptism and the Lord's Supper. With regard to the doctrine underlying these two, it may be said that it was in the fourth and fifth centuries essentially what it had been before. No doubt Christian experience and the struggle with paganism and heresy tended to produce explanations, but the main thought was always simply that of life bestowed and life maintained. The early believers had not asked how, but the question could not but arise, and that rather in connection with the Eucharist than with Baptism. For the water of Baptism did not invite speculation to the same degree as did the bread and wine, and their relation to the Body and Blood of Christ. Not that Baptism was ever regarded merely as a ceremony of initiation; it was the fear of losing, through post-baptismal sin, the grace conveyed by Baptism that in our period kept many from the font. Other causes such as negligence, reluctance to forgo the world, and various fancies and superstitions, combined to render Baptism, as in Constantine's case, the completion rather than the commencement of Christian life. Such delay was not the intention of the Church, and the necessity of checking slackness, together with the Western doctrine of prevenient grace helping the first step Godward, brought about a strict insistence on the necessity of Baptism and a readiness, in the West at least, to allow the Baptism of heretics, provided the right form of words was used. But both wisdom and generosity were shown by the refusal to tie down the operation of the Holy Spirit to ritual action, and by the admission of faith, repentance, or martyrdom, as substitutes for formal Baptism when this could not be had. It must not be forgotten however that Augustine, when he found the Donatists proof against persuasion, advocated a resort to violence —*coge intrare*.

The Eucharist was more obviously mysterious, and at a time when the rite was attended by many who were more conscious of its mysterious experience than of any effect it might have upon life, speculation was active, and teachers laboured to assist inquiry by analogy and illustration which often grew to something more. Thus from Gregory of Nyssa came an impulse which finally developed into the doctrine of transubstantiation. Not that Gregory means to teach this; the passage in his works containing the germ is not a definition. His style is highly imaginative and the *Oratio catechetica* is full of similes. One of these is borrowed, but without hesitation, from physiology. Gregory draws a parallel between the change of bread and wine, by digestion, into the human body, and the change of the sacramental elements, by consecration, into Christ's immortal body. Using Aristotelian terms, he says that in each case the constituents are arranged under a fresh form.

This is not transubstantiation but trans-elementation. The image commended itself, and it was repeated and elaborated by other writers until at length the complete identification of the bread and wine with the Body and Blood of Christ became the authoritative doctrine of the Eastern Church. The Roman doctrine of transubstantiation has points of resemblance with Gregory's illustration, but it is expressed in terms of a different and later philosophy. Gregory teaches a change of form; the schoolmen, a change of both material and form, which they explain by the help of the distinction between *substantia* and *accidentia*. The great contribution of the age to the doctrine of the Sacraments is the view that in a real sense they continue the process of the Incarnation. Human nature first became divine in the person of Christ by union with the divine Word, and subsequently and repeatedly in the person of the

individual believer through union with Christ in the Sacraments. This is the teaching of both East and West as represented by Hilary and Gregory of Nyssa. As in Baptism the soul is joined to Christ through faith, so in the Eucharist is the body, being transformed by the Eucharistic food, joined with the Body of the Lord. Thus the special purpose of the Incarnation, viz. the deification of man, is being constantly fulfilled. The language in which this noble conception is expressed, especially in the East, tends to encourage a superstitious reverence for the outward symbols, which the Greek fathers frequently have occasion to correct.

Augustine earnestly desired that the *civitas terrena* should help to establish the *civitas Dei*, and that the *civitas Dei* should leaven with moral influence the *civitas terrena*. It remains for us to see how far his dream was realized, in other words how far the Christian Empire affected the Church and was in turn affected by it.

The influence of the Empire upon the internal and external structure of the Church had been felt from the first. Thus, the development of the monarchical episcopate was doubtless due in great measure to the example of Roman law, which required all corporate bodies to have a representative. The mark of Roman law is also seen in the Western doctrines of Free Will, Sin and its transmission, and Atonement. The language in which these problems are stated is the phraseology of the courts, and recalls the Roman penal code, theory of contract and delict, debt, universal succession, etc.

The effect of civil order is seen in certain pieces of church administration which though themselves practical are the expression of underlying theory, and therefore call for notice here.

(1) The Church was organized in ‘dioceses’ (with exarchs or patriarchs), provinces (with metropolitans or primates), and cities (with bishops), much in the manner of the Empire. This arrangement was not directly imposed upon the Church by the Empire nor did it exactly correspond to the imperial distribution. But the sudden rise of the see of Byzantium from a subordinate position into the next place of honour after Rome proves that civil importance was a factor in determining ecclesiastical precedence.

(2) The bargain proposed by Nestorius to Theodosius II, “Give me the world free from heretics and I will give thee heaven”, was in a fair way of fulfilment. The emperors from being foes became powerful friends to the Church, able to give the material support that Augustine desired. Constantine would no doubt gladly have enjoyed the same controlling relation towards his adopted religion as he held towards the religion of which he and his successors till Valens remained chief pontiffs. But the Church was too strong for that, and the rescript of AD 314, in which he declared that the sentence of the bishops must be regarded as that of Christ Himself, shows what their power was, and hints what they might have done with it. Still, he was allowed to style himself (perhaps in jest), and he set the example of convoking general councils, the decrees of which were published under imperial authority and thus acquired a political importance. Those only who accepted their rulings could enjoy the rights of state favour, and civil penalties were presently threatened in the interest of civic peace against all who declined to acknowledge them.

(3) Pagan teachers, priests, and doctors were already exempt from certain civil charges on the ground of professional usefulness. To this list Constantine added first the African, and later all Christian, clergy; and then he allowed to engage in trade untaxed because they could give their profits to the poor. Clerical families and property were likewise excused all the ordinary responsibilities of *curiales*. Many citizens sought this immunity from taxation, even after the State, fearing the loss of useful service, had forbidden the ordination of *curiales*; and the Church came to welcome the exclusion of the well-to-do from her ministry as a protection against unworthy ministers, as she also did the removal of exemption from trade-taxes, for the age was averse from any interference with the spiritual duties of the clergy. But the fact that

privileges were withdrawn from the heathen priesthood and bestowed on the clergy enhanced the position of the latter as a favoured class.

(4) The Church was distinguished as a corporation capable of receiving donations and bequests. Earlier confiscations and restorations prove that the Church had held property long before the time of Constantine. But Constantine bestowed upon it a more extensive privilege than was known to any heathen religious foundation. Whereas the latter could only be endowed under special circumstances, and, with few exceptions, never acquired the right to receive bequests, “the sacred and venerable Christian churches” might be left anything by anybody. Abuse of the privilege gradually led to its withdrawal under Valentinian III, and Christian writers deplore the cause more keenly than the result; but the growing wealth was as a rule generously applied to philanthropic work started by the Church, and Augustine was justified in calling upon churchmen to remember Christ as well as their sons. They were the more likely to listen, since the old Jewish belief that alms win heaven had taken root and sprung up in the doctrine of merit.

(5) The Church secured another prerogative, which was fraught with serious consequences, in the establishment of episcopal courts as an integral part of the secular judicial system with final jurisdiction in civil cases. But it had analogy with the Roman institution of *recepti arbitri*, an extrajudicial arrangement allowing the civil authority to step in and enforce the decision of the arbitrator. At a time when, as we learn from Salvian and Ammianus, the courts were monuments of justice delayed and of chicanery, it was no small boon to be allowed to carry a civil suit to the arbitration of a bishop whose equitable decision had the force of law. The early history of this remarkable legislation is obscure and complicated, but it clearly contained in germ the clerical exemption from criminal procedure which formed one of the most difficult problems in medieval politics. The episcopal jurisdiction underwent considerable limitations and bishops lost their position of privilege before the law; but appeal to the episcopal court became a tradition in the Church.

(6) There are other indications of the great influence acquired by bishops in the administration of justice. Into their hands passed the right of intercession formerly exercised in behalf of clients by wealthy patrons or hired rhetoricians. One of their duties, according to Ambrose, was to rescue the condemned from death, and he himself was active in its discharge. So Basil interceded for the unfortunate inhabitants of Cappadocia at the partition of the province in AD 371. So Flavian of Antioch, with better success, stood between his flock and the emperor, not unjustly irritated by the riot of 387.

(7) Closely connected with episcopal intercession was the right of asylum, transferred from heathen temples to Christian churches, which afforded protection to fugitives, pending the interference of the bishops. One out of many instances, and that the most romantic, is the case of the miserable Eutropius (AD 399), who benefited by the privilege which he had himself in the previous year sought to circumscribe.

Such are some of the points at which the Empire touched the Church. The effect of the Church upon the Empire may be summed up in the word ‘freedom’. Obedience to authority was indeed required in every department of public and private life, provided that it did not conflict with religious duty. But the old despotic attributes were gradually removed, the Roman *patria potestas* suffered notable relaxation, and children were regarded no longer as a *peculium* but as “a sacred charge upon which great care must be bestowed”. In a word, authority was seen to be a form of service, according to God's will, and such service was freedom. This great principle found expression in many ways, and first in respect of literal bondage. The better feeling of the age was certainly already in favour of kindness towards the slave. Stoicism, like Christianity, accepted slavery as a necessary institution, but no one ever more clearly discerned its baneful results than Seneca. And Seneca was still listened to. It is in his words that Praetextatus in Macrobius’ Saturnalia pleads the slave's common humanity,

faithfulness, and goodness, against the old feeling of contempt of which there were still traces in Christian and pagan writers. It was, however, not from Seneca but from Christ and St Paul that the fathers took their constant theme of the essential equality of men, before which slavery cannot stand. Not only do they establish the primitive unity and dignity of man, but, seeing in slavery a result of the Fall, they find in the sacrifice of Christ a road to freedom that was closed to Stoicism. They offered a more effective consolation than the philosophers, for they pointed the slave upward by recognizing his right to kneel beside his master in the Lord's Supper.

Close upon the Church's victory follows legislation more favourable to the slave than any that had gone before. Constantine did not attempt sudden or wholesale emancipation, which would have been unwise and impossible. Nor is there any sign that he recognised the slave's moral, intellectual, or religious needs. But he sought to lessen his hardships by measures which with all their inequalities are unique in the statute-book of Rome. He tried to prevent the exposing of children, though he could not stop the enslavement of foundlings; he forbade cruelty towards slaves in terms which are themselves an indictment of existing practice; he forbade the breaking up of servile families; he declared emancipation to be 'most desirable'; he transferred the process of manumission from pagan to Christian places of worship in a way and with words that testify to his view of it as a work of love belonging properly to the Church. But the Church was not content to influence the lawgiver and preach to master and slave the brotherhood of man and the duties of forbearance and patience. She struck at all the bad conditions that encouraged slavery.

The stage and the arena had always been the objects of her hate as hotbeds of immorality and nurseries of unbelief. Attendance there was forbidden to Christians as an act of apostasy. Julian caught the feeling and forbade his priests to enter theatres or taverns. Yet Libanius, Julian's friend and mentor, defends not only comedy and tragedy but even the dance, exalting it above sculpture as a school of beauty and a lawful recreation. But dancing, as Chrysostom points out, was inseparable from indecency and, far from giving the mind repose, only excites it to base passions. The ban of the Church accordingly was proclaimed against the ministers of these arts upon the public stage; it followed them into private houses when they went to enliven wedding or banquet, forbidding them baptism so long as they remained players. This apparent harshness, which can be matched from civil legislation, was in reality a kindness. The actor's state was at this time incompatible with purity, and the Church sought to deliver a class enslaved to vice. A notable victory was won when it was ruled that an actress who asked for and received the last sacraments should not, if she recovered, be dragged back to her hateful calling. The only way of escape from it in any case lay in the acceptance of Christianity. As the theatre gratified low tastes, so the arena stimulated tigerish instincts. Both Pliny and Cicero apologized for it as being the proper playground of a warrior race; it certainly held the Roman imagination. The story of Alypius (a friend of Augustine) is well known, whom one reluctant look during a gladiatorial show enslaved completely to the lust for blood.

Attempts to suppress the shows were made, doubtless under Christian influence. They met with little response, except in the East, where the better spirits (like Libanius) repudiated them as a Roman barbarity, unworthy of a Greek. But the action of Constantine in forbidding soldiers to take part in gladiatorial shows, and of Valentinian in exempting Christians from suffering punishment in the arena, prove that earlier regulations were a dead letter. The show which Alypius attended was at Rome in *AD* 385. Symmachus as urban praefect speaks with pride of the games he gave, and when the Saxon captives with whom he had hoped to make a Roman holiday committed suicide in prison he had to turn to Socrates and his example for consolation. The sums spent on these games is an index to the wealth of noble Romans. The same Symmachus spent £80,000 on the occasion of his son's praetorship; a festival given in



the reign of Honorius lasted a week and cost £100,000. Ammianus Marcellinus and Jerome paint the same picture, and even when their charges have been discounted by the more sober pages of Macrobius, it is still clear that the dying Roman civilization was marked by general luxury and self-indulgence. The Church could not stop this waste; sumptuary laws lay outside her competence; but leaders practiced and encouraged simplicity and frugality and reprobated the tendency towards ecclesiastical display. Jerome meets the argument that lavish hospitality would strengthen the hand of clerical intercessors by answering that judges will honour holiness above wealth, and simple clergy more than luxurious ones. "Golden mediocrity" doubtless had its devotees. There were many Christian men of the world to whom monasticism was a riddle, as it was to Ausonius, whose prayer was, "give me neither poverty nor riches". But better than moderation was renunciation of the world, and the ascetic element of early Christianity, reinforced by the example of all exponents of high thought, led many to turn their faces from the luxury around them and flee to the desert. To those who remained behind the Christian writers tried to teach the view of poverty as a probation and of wealth as a trust, the mutual dependence of rich and poor, and the lesson that men should be one in heart as they are one in origin. They frequently recall the communion recorded in the Acts, and now that change of conditions had rendered community of goods impossible, a new means of applying the principle was sought, first in feasts of charity and regular collections for the poor, in the private munificence of the bishop, or in a proportionate and elaborately organized distribution, under the bishop, of church revenues. These by dint of careful administration and continual accessions grew to an immense property, till by the fifth century the Church had become the greatest landowner in the Empire. In general, promotion to a bishop's stool meant merely entry into a large fortune. "Make me Bishop of Rome and I will become a Christian", was Praetextatus' reply to Damasus, and it reflects the public opinion.

Ammianus Marcellinus waxes scornful over the episcopal splendour and extravagance at Rome, but he qualifies or points his sarcasm by the admission that there were bishops in the provinces who, "moderate in eating and drinking, simple in dress, show themselves worthy priests of the Deity". Instances of fine and unselfish philanthropy are equally common in the theory held by great churchmen and in their practice.

Perhaps the most striking justification of the common claim that bishops are the proper and recognised helpers and guardians of the poor, the widow, and the orphan, is found in their readiness to convert the communion plate into money for the distressed. "It is better to save living souls than lifeless metals ... the ornament of the sacraments is the redemption of captives", are the words with which Ambrose defended himself against the charge of sacrilege. Refuge from the tax-burdened world was afforded by the monasteries, which are too often judged, not by the circumstances which called them into being, but by the abuses which attended their decay. And side by side with the strictly religious houses there sprang up innumerable charitable institutions: *orphanotrophia*, *ptochotrophia*, *nosocomia*, *gerontocomia*, *brephotrophia*, intended to relieve the wants of every class and every age and not merely those of citizens, as had been the case in heathen Rome and Athens. Not the least of the debts which the world owes to fourth century Christianity is this invention of open hospitals. Julian felt its power and summoned his followers to imitate in this respect the hated Galilaeans. But with superior organization the old spirit of voluntary charity waned. Individual effort disappeared; a steward discharged the philanthropic activities of the bishops; deaconesses waited less on the poor and more on the worship of the Church. Charity became less discriminating and aped the pagan largesses. Begging now finds a place in the statute-book, and the first law against mendicancy was issued by a Christian Emperor (Valentinian II). Yet the Church sought to meet this evil also by restoring labour to honour. Slavery had degraded it, and commerce had always been despised at Rome. Before the eyes of an idle and unprofitable multitude was now displayed the example of Christ and his apostles, workmen

all, an example which was actually followed in the monasteries where the "perfect" life joined prayer with work, both to charitable purposes. The Pachomian houses, as self-sufficing communities, provided regular work, not merely as a penitential exercise, but as an integral part of the life. Basil would have his ascetics despise no form of labour; Augustine reproved African monks who were deserting work for prayer. Sloth was assuredly no inmate of the cloister then, though the work done cannot be described as always useful or rational.

But the efforts of Christianity in behalf of the weak are nowhere seen more clearly than in the uplifting of women. The Church gave them a place of consideration in her ministry, not however the privilege of preaching or administering the sacraments, though a deaconess was allowed to assist in the baptism of women. Besides the carefully regulated orders of deaconesses, virgins, and widows, there arose towards the end of the fourth century classes of widows and virgins of higher rank who gave themselves to voluntary work under church auspices, without taking regular vows or living in communities. Such were Jerome's friends and correspondents, Paula and Eustochium. In the East, where this class attained a position of greater prominence than in the West (the Roman spirit was averse from the public ministry of women), they approximated to an order and were finally assimilated to the deaconesses.

Outside the ministry of the Church women were made the subject of special legislation. Constantine was austere in morals. The age was loose. The antique ideal of the Roman nation had long since disappeared. Constantine determined to restore it. The severity of his measures against adultery and rape shows his zeal in the cause of morality, while the terms of those which regulate the relations of women to the courts exhibit his care for their good fame and the *matris familiae majestas*. Thus to spare their modesty wives were forbidden to appear in court at all. His tenderness is also seen in his forbidding a son to disinherit his mother, and in the exemption of widows from the penalties visited on coiners. On the other hand there are signs, both in contemporary legislation and literature, of unchristian and brutal contempt for the women who had most need of protection. Tavern-keepers and barmaids are set free from the operation of the laws against adultery, "since chaste conduct is only expected of those who are restrained by the bonds of law, and immunity must be extended to those whose worthless life has set them beyond the pale of the laws". Again, it is difficult to understand the mind of Augustine, who loves his natural son Adeodatus as David loved the child of Bathsheba, and who yet has regret, but no word of pity, for the mother whom he cast off. So Sidonius Apollinaris, the aristocratic bishop of Auvergne, is very lenient towards the irregularities of a young noble, and quite heartless towards the victim. But in the latter case it must be remembered that the Christianity of Sidonius was not very deep, that the girl was a slave, and that for all their good intentions and growing instincts of humanity the Church and churchmen did not yet regard slaves as free; and in the former, that concubinage, i.e. the association of one man with one woman, was recognised by Roman law and by the Council of Toledo (AD 400) and hardly differed from wedlock except in name. What is astonishing to modern notions in the case of Augustine and his mistresses is not so much his own conduct as the line taken by his friends and the saintly Monnica, and too readily adopted by himself. Something like a *mariage de convenance* was projected for him while he was still attached to a woman whom there is no reason to suppose unworthy to become his wife, in the hope that as soon as he was married he might be washed clean in saving baptism. Monnica was indeed more concerned by his Manichaeism than by his irregular life. The incident reveals a flaw in a great character. But if that were all it would have no place here. It is of value to our purpose as illustrating the view of the relation between the sexes held at this time, and as a witness to the vastness of the task that lay before the Church in purifying and uplifting society.

[www.cristoraul.org](http://www.cristoraul.org)

EL VENCEDOR EDICIONES

