

I A N N . W O O D

## Ethnicity and Language in medieval and modern versions of the Attalus-saga

In 1994 Herwig Wolfram children's book, *Plötzlich standen wir vor Attila*, was printed for the first time.<sup>1</sup> He had written it some while before, to entertain his youngest son, but his students rightly decided that it should be published, and arranged for it to appear on his sixtieth birthday. It is a masterly piece of time-travel, drawing on the sources for the fifth century and especially on Priscus' account of his embassy to the court of the Hunnic king. As such it shows the importance of narrative both for the academic historian, and also as a means of making the past accessible to a more general public.

In this paper I want to look at another story that has been of equal importance to scholars and to a wide public, that of Attalus, the nephew of Gregory of Langres, who was helped by the bishop's cook to make a daring escape from captivity in the Trier region. It was originally told by an early medieval historian, Gregory of Tours, himself a great-grandson of the bishop of Langres, and it was also used extensively in the nineteenth century by academics (most especially Jacob Grimm) and by men of letters (above all Franz Grillparzer). The story raises questions about language and identity (both early medieval and modern), some of them negative questions, for one of the most striking aspects of our early medieval narrative sources is quite how rarely they tell us about problems of linguistic comprehension. By taking both Gregory's account and the nineteenth-century retellings I hope both to show how the story was used and abused by scholars and writers at the start of the modern period, and also – through an awareness of that misuse – to cast light on some implications of the story as originally told.

Occasionally, of course, language is central to anecdotes related by our late antique authors. Walter Pohl has written memorably about Procopius' account of the fate of Gilakios, an Armenian whose inability to talk to his Gothic captors hastens his death.<sup>2</sup> Sidonius Apollinaris' objection to the sounds of his Burgundian guards is also well known.<sup>3</sup> At a more rarefied level, problems in communication between Greek and Latin speakers were a recognised factor in diplomatic and theological exchange.<sup>4</sup> A number of narratives in the early medieval history of mission pause to raise the question of linguistic difference. Bede was certainly sensitive to the issue of language: he famously describes Britain as an island of five languages, English, British, Irish, Pictish and Latin,<sup>5</sup> though of these he has most to say about the first and last: he makes occasional reference to Irish, but neglects the other two. It may well be that, in doing so, he draws a veil over a good deal of linguistic tension.<sup>6</sup> He does tell us, however, that Aidan, an Irishman, needed an interpreter when he first started his missionary work in Northumbria, and that the king, Oswald, who had been in exile in Ireland, was more than happy to translate for him.<sup>7</sup> The Anglo-Saxon historian also claims that the fact that bishop Agilbert of Wessex,

<sup>1</sup> Herwig Wolfram, *Plötzlich standen wir vor Attila* (Wien 1994).

<sup>2</sup> Procopius, *De Bello Gothico* VII, 26, 24–27 (ed. Henry B. Dewing, London 1924) 384–387. Walter Pohl, *Social language, identities and the control of discourse*, in: *East and West: Modes of Communication*, ed. Evangelos Chrysos/Ian Wood (*The Transformation of the Roman World* 5, Leiden 1999) 127–141, at 128–30.

<sup>3</sup> Sidonius Apollinaris, *carm.* 12 (ed. André Loyen, 1–3, Paris 1960–1970) vol. 1, 103–104.

<sup>4</sup> See Avitus of Vienne, ep. 49 (ed. Rudolf Peiper, *MGH AA* 6, 2, Berlin 1883) 77–78. See also the comments in Danuta Shanzer/Ian N. Wood, *Avitus of Vienne: Letters and Selected Prose* (Liverpool 2002) 141–142.

<sup>5</sup> Bede, *Historia Ecclesiastica Gentis Anglorum* I, 1 (ed. Bertram Colgrave/Roger A. B. Mynors, Oxford 1969) 16–17.

<sup>6</sup> For example, Fred Orton/Ian N. Wood/Clare Lees, *Fragments of History. Rethinking the Ruthwell and Bewcastle Monuments* (Manchester 2007) 124.

<sup>7</sup> Bede, *Historia Ecclesiastica* III, 3, ed. Colgrave/Mynors 220–221.

being a Frank, was a non-native speaker led king Cenwalh to divide the West Saxon see, because he could not abide the bishop's pattern of speech.<sup>8</sup> Closer in spirit to Bede's account of Aidan, Helmold of Bosau, writing in the twelfth century, talks of Gottschalk preaching in Slavonic.<sup>9</sup> So too, Bruno of Querfurt and his missionary friends a century and a half earlier than Helmold were fully aware of the advantages of knowing the language of the peoples to be evangelised.<sup>10</sup> These stories tell us what we might expect to find – that linguistic difference caused difficulties in preaching the gospel – and historians have rightly built the question of language into the history of mission. Turning away from religious matters to that of secular and regional identification, language appears in texts relating to Charlemagne, Louis the Pious and to the latter's sons, not least in the famous Strasbourg oaths.<sup>11</sup> What is striking is not that these stories exist, but that there are so few of them, especially for the pre-Carolingian period.

The relative absence of references to language in our narrative sources is certainly no proof that Germanic languages were rarely spoken within the Roman Empire and the political units that came to be established in what had been Roman territory. One would dearly like to know what was the *lingua franca* of the forts of Hadrian's Wall in the third and fourth centuries, garrisoned, as many of them were, by troops whose family origins lay on either side of the Rhine frontier.<sup>12</sup> The introduction and establishment of Germanic languages in Britain, and especially in the Roman military zone, may have begun long before the settlement of the Anglo-Saxons. Nor was it only England that became a Germanic linguistic province: the long-standing debates about the linguistic frontier within Belgium are testimony to the dominance of Germanic language to the north and east of the Charbonnière – and they were to become a central and indeed poisonous aspect of arguments about the appropriate frontier for the Third Reich.<sup>13</sup> Place-names, especially in the Low Countries<sup>14</sup> and Alsace-Lorraine, but also in Franche-Comté and Burgundy, imply some use of Germanic vocabulary, among Franks, Alamans and Burgundians.<sup>15</sup> So too, a study of personal names from Lombard Italy can give some indication of the continuing use of Langobardic.<sup>16</sup>

Non-narrative sources are also clear that there were some figures of political importance who spoke a form of Germanic in the continental successor states. Most obvious is the evidence from Ostrogothic Italy – Theodoric, speaking through Cassiodorus, comments on his *comes sacrarum largitionum* Cyprianus knowing Gothic, and Athalaric praised him for having his sons learn the language.<sup>17</sup> And, of course, there is the manuscript of Ulfilas, which shows that there were Goths who thought it worth transcribing a translation of the Bible in their mother tongue a century and more after the translation had been made. One can parallel Cassiodorus's comment on Cyprianus with Sidonius' reference to Syagrius learning the Burgundian language.<sup>18</sup> The Malberg glosses on Lex Saliica would seem to suggest that Frankish was used in some official circles in West Francia in the sev-

<sup>8</sup> Bede, *Historia Ecclesiastica* III, 7, ed. Colgrave/Mynors 234–235.

<sup>9</sup> Helmold, *Chronica Slavorum* I, 20 (ed. Johann M. Lappenberg, MGH SS 21, Hannover 1868) 1–250, hier 26–27.

<sup>10</sup> Ian Wood, *The Missionary Life: Saints and the Evangelisation of Europe 400–1050* (London 2001) 240; *ibid.* 257–258.

<sup>11</sup> Nithard, *Historia* III, 5 (ed. Reinhold Rau, *Quellen zur karolingischen Reichsgeschichte* 1, Darmstadt 1968) 385–461, at 438–441.

<sup>12</sup> Orton/Wood/Lees, *Fragments of History* 110–115.

<sup>13</sup> Karl Ditt, *The idea of German cultural regions in the Third Reich: the work of Franz Petri*, in: *Journal of Historical Geography* 27, 1 (2001) 241–58, at 249; Hubert Fehr, *Germanen und Romanen im Merowingerreich* (Berlin 2010) 404–514.

<sup>14</sup> The debate was already under way following the publication of Godefroid Kurth, *La frontière linguistique en Belgique et dans le nord de la France*, 1–2 (Bruxelles 1896/98); Fehr, *Germanen und Romanen* 232–251.

<sup>15</sup> Wolfgang Haubrichs, *Ein namhaftes Volk – Burgundische Namen und Sprache des 5. und 6. Jahrhunderts*, in: *Die Burgunder. Ethnogenese und Assimilation eines Volkes*, ed. Volker Gallé (Worms 2008) 135–184: for the use to which it was put, Wolfgang Freund, *Burgund in den nationalsozialistischen Planungen*, *ibid.*, 395–420; Katalin Escher, *Genèse et évolution du deuxième royaume burgonde (443–534). Les témoins archéologiques* (BAR International Series 1402 [II], Oxford 2005) 810–817.

<sup>16</sup> Wolfgang Haubrichs, *Langobardic personal names: given names and name-giving among the Langobards*, in: *The Langobards before the Frankish Conquest*, ed. Giorgio Ausenda/Paolo Delogu/Chris Wickham (Woodbridge 2009) 195–236, esp. 210–211.

<sup>17</sup> Cassiodorus, *Variae* V, 40: VIII, 21 (ed. Theodor Mommsen, MGH AA 12, Berlin 1894) 166f., 252f.

<sup>18</sup> Sidonius Apollinaris, *ep.* V, 5, 3, ed. Loyen vol. 2, 181.

enth and eighth centuries.<sup>19</sup> But the spoken languages may not have been limited to various forms of Germanic and Latin: Sidonius refers derogatively to Celtic speech,<sup>20</sup> while Gregory of Tours' description of the sanctuary called *Gallica lingua Vasso Galate*, suggests some continuing awareness of Gaulish vocabulary in the Auvergne.<sup>21</sup> This, however, only amounts to the survival of Gaulish words, not of the language as such, and, as Fustel de Coulanges remarked of Sulpicius Severus' phrase *Celtice aut si mavis gallice loquere*, this might imply nothing more than that someone's the Latin was bad.<sup>22</sup> There is, however, a much-debated variant reading in the *Passio Symphoriani* that might indicate some survival of Gaulish dialect in the Autun region.<sup>23</sup>

Yet despite the clear indications that Germanic languages were employed, there is little evidence of linguistic conflict in the Gothic, Frankish or Burgundian West. Avitus of Vienne, who comments on the problems of communicating with Byzantines,<sup>24</sup> and on the dangers of mispronouncing Latin,<sup>25</sup> never once mentions a Germanic or a Celtic word, although he does discuss Hebrew terms, probably because of their liturgical connotations,<sup>26</sup> though there were certainly Jews in the Gibichung kingdom.<sup>27</sup> And he is silent on the use of any Germanic speech despite the fact that his relative Sidonius talks of Syagrius learning the Burgundian language. Further, there is practically nothing in Gregory of Tours to suggest that language was ever a cause of disagreement in the Frankish kingdom, parts of which must surely have been bilingual or even multilingual, although there may be a tone of disapproval in the bishop's account of king Guntram's entry into Orléans, when the king heard the voices of Syrians and Jews.<sup>28</sup> The possibility that more than accent was involved might be suggested by Avitus's comments on Hebrew vocabulary.<sup>29</sup> Gregory's comments on king Chilperic attempting to add letters to the Latin alphabet may tell us something about changes in pronunciation in the sixth century,<sup>30</sup> but he signally fails to suggest that there was a significant Germanic-speaking population. Indeed, so striking is the absence of any comment on the Frankish language in Gregory of Tours and other writers of the Merovingian Age that, as early as 1735, the Abbé Du Bos could conclude that the Franks must have been speaking Latin.<sup>31</sup> Du Bos was no fool, and, with regard to the Merovingian upper classes, his suggestion has never really been disproved – although toponymics and onomastics, and indeed the existence of the Malberg glosses, would seem to suggest that his case needs modifica-

<sup>19</sup> Rudolf E. Keller, The language of the Franks, in: *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 47 (1964) 101–122. Significant study of Germanic linguistic elements in *Lex Salica* goes back at least to Jacob Grimm's introduction to Merkel's edition of the legal text.

<sup>20</sup> Sidonius Apollinaris, ep. III, 3, 2 ed. Loyer vol. 2 86.

<sup>21</sup> Gregory of Tours, *Decem Libri Historiarum* I, 32 (ed. Bruno Krusch/Wilhelm Levison, MGH SS rer. Merov. 1, 1, Hannover 1951) 24–25: see the commentary in Edgar C. Polomé, The Linguistic Situation in the Western Provinces of the Roman Empire, in: *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt: Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung* 29, 2 (Prinzipat), ed. Hildegard Temporini/Wolfgang Haase (Berlin 1983) 509–53, at 530, with note 65.

<sup>22</sup> Numa Denis Fustel de Coulanges, *Histoire des Institutions Politiques de l'ancienne France*, 1: *La Gaule Romaine*, ed. Camille Jullian (Paris 1929) 125–34, esp. 127.

<sup>23</sup> For the reading *nate, nate Synforiane, mentobeto to diuo*, which is not given in the *Acta Sanctorum* edition of *Passio Symphoriani* 11 (AASS 4, August 22<sup>nd</sup>, Paris 1867) 497, see the website <http://forum.arbre-celtique.com>. On the survival of Gaulish see also David Stifter on Old Celtic Languages, [http://www.univie.ac.at/indogermanistik/download/Stifter/oldcelt2008\\_6\\_gaulishA.pdf](http://www.univie.ac.at/indogermanistik/download/Stifter/oldcelt2008_6_gaulishA.pdf).

<sup>24</sup> Avitus, ep. 49, ed. Peiper 77–78.

<sup>25</sup> Avitus, ep. 57, ed. Peiper 85–87.

<sup>26</sup> Avitus, ep. 1, ed. Piper 12–15.

<sup>27</sup> *Liber Constitutionum*, 102: *Forma et expositio legum Romanorum*, 19, 4 (in: *Leges Burgundionum*, ed. Rudolf von Salis, MGH LL nationum Germanicarum, 2, 1, Hannover 1892) 114, 143.

<sup>28</sup> Gregory, *Decem Libri Historiarum* VIII, 1, ed. Krusch/Levison 370–371.

<sup>29</sup> Avitus, ep. 1, ed. Peiper 12–15.

<sup>30</sup> Gregory, *Decem Libri Historiarum* V, 44, ed. Krusch/Levison 252–254; Michel Banniard, *Viva voce: communication écrite et communication orale du IVe au IXe siècle en occident latin* (Paris 1992). Intriguingly Suetonius, *Life of Claudius* 41, also relates that the Roman emperor added three new letters to the alphabet. Gregory is unlikely to have been borrowing this from Suetonius, who is not an author he seems to have made much use of (though this may be an indication that he did): some manuscripts present examples of Chilperic's new letters. This does raise the possibility, however, that Chilperic was deliberately copying the action of a Roman emperor.

<sup>31</sup> Abbé Jean-Baptiste Dubos, *Histoire critique de l'établissement de la monarchie françoise dans les Gaules* 3 (Amsterdam 1735) bk. 6, 314, 379.

tion. Certainly, there can be no question that the courts of almost all the early Germanic kingdoms of continental Europe (though not Britain, at least until one reaches Aldhelm's Wessex and Bede's Northumbria), and in North Africa, promoted Latin culture: one need look no further than the writings of Avitus, Cassiodorus, Dracontius, Luxurius, Venantius Fortunatus, and the authors whose letters are preserved in the *Epistolae Austrasiacae*.<sup>32</sup>

Du Bos has been described as one of the first of the Romanists in the long academic war between Romanists and Germanists that has raged since the early eighteenth century down to the present day.<sup>33</sup> His view of the Merovingian world as politically and culturally Roman was set out before the real development of the study of Germanic culture, which in many respects had to wait until the nineteenth century, and above all for the contribution of Jacob Grimm. Leaving aside, for the moment, the question of language, the brothers Grimm scoured the early medieval narrative sources in their search for 'deutsche Heldensagen', which they published in 1829. Jacob was well aware of the Germanic texts: he contributed significantly to the early debates about the origins of Beowulf.<sup>34</sup> But he and his brother also looked in Greek and Latin works for traces of early Germanic sagas: Procopius and Priscus feature alongside Jordanes, Gregory of Tours, Bede and Paul the Deacon in the collection that the Grimm brothers made of heroic tales of supposedly Germanic origin.<sup>35</sup> Their search for a tradition of Germanic story-telling was followed up by, among others, Gustav Freytag, between 1859 and 1867,<sup>36</sup> and also by the Belgian scholar Godefroid Kurth, in his *Histoire poétique des Mérovingiens* of 1893, where he tried to reconstruct the contents of supposed Frankish epics from the narratives contained in Latin sources.<sup>37</sup> Grimm's search for 'deutsche Heldensagen', however, had nationalist overtones that Freytag may not have entirely shared, and which Kurth most definitely would have rejected had he realised what influence they would have – for linguistic maps would come to play a role in German views of where the frontier of the Reich should lie both in 1914 and in 1939, and they pointed in the direction of the annexation of Flemish Belgium, at the very least.<sup>38</sup>

One of the stories picked up by Grimm and repeated by Freytag in his *Bilder aus der deutschen Vergangenheit*, is that of Attalus.<sup>39</sup> According to Gregory of Tours, this young aristocrat, who was the nephew of the bishop of Langres, was among a number of hostages given to ensure that a truce between the Merovingian kings Theuderic I and Childebert I was preserved. When it failed, Attalus found himself looking after horses as a public slave (*ad publicum servitium mancipatus est custosque equorum destinatus*) in the region of Trier. His uncle attempted to ransom him, but the price was too high. One of the bishop's servants, however, the cook Leo (he was ex *cocina* and subject *a iugo servitutis*), offered to free the hostage. To do so, he had himself sold as a slave to Attalus' Frankish owner.<sup>40</sup> Then, after more than a year, in which he ingratiated himself into the lord's favour, on the night following the betrothal of the Frank's daughter, when all were lavishly wined and dined, he made his escape with the young Attalus. At the end of an adventurous journey in which they were nearly caught, the two arrived at Rheims, where they were hidden and then helped on their way by a priest, who happened to be a friend of the bishop of Langres. The bishop was, of course, delighted at the return of his young nephew, and rewarded Leo with his freedom.

<sup>32</sup> Yitzhak Hen, *Roman Barbarians: the Royal Court and Culture in the Early Medieval West* (London 2007).

<sup>33</sup> Michel Foucault, *Society Must be Defended* (London 2003) 199; Claude Nicolet, *La fabrique d'une nation: La France entre Rome et les Germains* (Paris 2003) 57; Agnès Graceffa, *Les Historiens et la question franque. Le peuplement franc et les Mérovingiens dans l'historiographie française et allemande des XIXe–XXe siècles* (Turnhout 2009) 23; Fehr, *Germanen und Romanen im Merowingerreich* 54–55.

<sup>34</sup> Tom A. Shippey/Andreas Haarder, *Beowulf: the critical heritage* (London 1998).

<sup>35</sup> Jacob and Wilhelm Grimm, *Deutsche Sagen* 2 (Berlin 1911) 69–73, n. 427: Sage von Attalus dem Pferdeknecht und Leo dem Küchenjungen.

<sup>36</sup> Gustav Freytag, *Bilder aus der deutschen Vergangenheit*, 1: *Aus dem Mittelalter* (Leipzig 1903) 309–313.

<sup>37</sup> Godefroid Kurth, *Histoire poétique des Mérovingiens* (Paris 1893).

<sup>38</sup> Fehr, *Germanen und Romanen im Merowingerreich* 404–514.

<sup>39</sup> Gregory of Tours, *Decem Libri Historiarum* III, 15, ed. Krusch/Levison 112–116.

<sup>40</sup> On Frankish slavery, albeit without consideration of the Attalus story, see now, Alice Rio, *Freedom and unfreedom in early medieval Francia: the evidence of the legal formulae*, in: *Past and Present* 191 (2006) 7–40; id., *High and low: ties of dependence in the Frankish kingdom*, in: *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 6th series 18 (2008) 43–68.

The story was first told by Gregory of Tours, and was repeated in the Middle Ages by Aimoin of Fleury.<sup>41</sup> In the nineteenth century it was retold by Grimm and Freytag, as well as by the Viennese playwright Franz Grillparzer in his ‘Lustspiel’: *Weh dem, der lügt!* of 1838.<sup>42</sup> It is not very clear why Grimm should have considered this to be a ‘deutsche Heldensage’: it is self-evidently a story told by a Gallo-Roman, about a Gallo-Roman, the hero of which is a cook, whose ethnicity is never stated, but it is highly likely that, being called Leo, he too was a Roman. Being set down by Gregory of Tours, it is also, of course, a tale that is recorded by a relative of the hostage, who saw himself as a member of a family of particularly distinguished Gallo-Roman lineage. And to judge by its prominence in book III of Gregory’s *Historiae*, it was a story that was of particular importance in the collective memory of his maternal family.<sup>43</sup>

The fact that the tale is concerned essentially with Gallo-Romans was clearly recognised by the great French student of Gregory of Tours, Augustin Thierry, who provided a translation of most of the passage (with lengthy citation of the Latin in his footnotes) in the eighth of his *Lettres sur l’histoire de France* of 1827, where it is set alongside the history of Sidonius’s grandson Arcadius, in one of a pair of ‘lettres’ that deal with “l’état des Gaulois après la conquête”.<sup>44</sup> Although the word ‘Gaulois’ points towards the interests of Augustin’s brother Amédée (who was central to the development of research into the Gauls)<sup>45</sup> rather than to any ethnic signifier used by Gregory of Tours, Thierry’s reading of the story is largely appropriate, despite a certain amount of elaboration.<sup>46</sup> Fustel de Coulanges would go rather further, and claim that Gregory knew of no Germanic tradition.<sup>47</sup> This almost certainly went too far, although his scepticism is a good deal more sober than the intellectual optimism of Kurth. Yet Grimm’s acquisitive nature, defining as much as he possibly could as ‘deutsch’, went beyond the bounds of any common, or indeed of any scholarly, sense, in claiming the Attalus adventure to be a German heroic tale – though the brothers Grimm achieve this by failing to ascribe any ethnicity to Gregory, Attalus and Leo, while specifying that the lord to whom Attalus was assigned was a Frank.<sup>48</sup>

Gustav Freytag, it should be said, does not fall into the same nationalist trap, despite calling the Germanic lord ‘deutsch’ – which is the term he uses in place of Grimm’s ‘Franke’.<sup>49</sup> And while he does see the story as essentially Germanic, its German-ness, as he presents it, has to do with its depiction of a Germanic community: for him the story was the most ancient account “welche von dem Leben auf einem deutschen Landgute berichtet”,<sup>50</sup> and above all it was die “alte Dorfgeschichte aus dem trierer Land”.<sup>51</sup> Although he was famously interested in the ‘Ahnen’, the ancestors of present day Germans,<sup>52</sup> his horizons were less politically aggressive than were those of Grimm. In so far as the story is set on the estate of a Germanic landowner of the sixth century, Freytag’s is a viable reading of

<sup>41</sup> Aimoin of Fleury, *Historia Francorum* II, 11 (ed. Migne, PL 139) 627–798, at 671–673. For Aimoin’s account, see Gilbert Waterhouse, *The sources of Grillparzer’s ‘Weh’ dem, der lügt!*, in: *Modern Language Review* 17 (1922) 50–61, at 57–58.

<sup>42</sup> Franz Grillparzer, *Weh dem, der lügt!* For convenience I have used the edition in the *Hamburger Lesehefte Verlag* (Hamburg 2005), which has the advantage of publishing related material in appendices. For the sources used by Grillparzer, see Waterhouse, *The sources of Grillparzer’s ‘Weh’ dem, der lügt!*

<sup>43</sup> On the significance of family history to Book III of Gregory’s *Histories*, see Ian N. Wood, *Clermont and Burgundy* 511–534, in: *Nottingham Medieval Studies* 32 (1988) 119–125.

<sup>44</sup> Augustin Thierry, *Lettres sur l’histoire de France*, VII and VIII, in: id., *Œuvres d’Augustin Thierry* (Bruxelles 1839) 443–451.

<sup>45</sup> Amédée Thierry, *Histoire des Gaulois*, 1–3 (Paris 1828–1845).

<sup>46</sup> Waterhouse, *The sources of Grillparzer’s ‘Weh’ dem, der lügt!* 58–59, 60, rightly notes the elaboration.

<sup>47</sup> Numa Denis Fustel de Coulanges, *Histoire des Institutions Politiques de l’ancienne France*, 2: *L’Invasion Germanique et la Fin de l’Empire*, ed. Camille Jullian (Paris 1891) 233. The section on 226–247, addresses the problem of identifying Germanic tradition from Roman and later sources, in a perhaps over-critical, but nevertheless clear-sighted way.

<sup>48</sup> Grimm, *Deutsche Sagen* 2 69, 70, 72. Waterhouse, *The sources of Grillparzer’s ‘Weh’ dem, der lügt!* 60, argues that the fact that only the barbarians are given an ethnic identity implies that Gregory, Attalus and Leo were Gallo-Romans. This rather underestimates the implication of publishing the story as a *Deutsche Sage*.

<sup>49</sup> Freytag, *Bilder aus der deutschen Vergangenheit*, 1: *Aus dem Mittelalter* 312, 313.

<sup>50</sup> Freytag, *Bilder aus der deutschen Vergangenheit*, 1: *Aus dem Mittelalter* 308.

<sup>51</sup> Freytag, *Bilder aus der deutschen Vergangenheit*, 1: *Aus dem Mittelalter* 313.

<sup>52</sup> See his sequence of historical novels entitled *Die Ahnen* (Frankfurt am Main 1872–1880).

Gregory's narrative (if one makes some allowance for the fact that the word 'Dorf' is not exactly appropriate), which is something that cannot be said of Grimm's presentation.

Gregory describes the lord in his story neither as Frankish nor as Germanic, but as a *barbarus*. The word in sixth-century Gaul can be a straight descriptor without pejorative overtones. The Burgundians had, after all, used it of themselves in their law-book, the *Liber Constitutionum* of 517.<sup>53</sup> This usage may be relevant, since the Burgundian kingdom included the region where Gregory of Langres was bishop, and where Attalus originated. Indeed, before becoming bishop, Gregory held the office of *comes* of Autun under the Gibichungs.<sup>54</sup> There is in fact something distinctly odd about the employment of the word *barbarus* (or the related *barbaries*) in chapter 15 of Book III of the *Decem Libri Historiarum*. According to the CETEDOC files Gregory uses versions of the word *barbarus/barbaries* only twelve times in the entirety of his *Historiae*. Six of the appearances of the word, a full fifty percent, occur in this one chapter. Elsewhere Gregory uses it to describe the barbarian following (*cometatu gentium barbararum*) of the usurper Gerontius, in a passage that he quoted directly from Renatus Profuturus Frigeridus:<sup>55</sup> it occurs twice in the context of barbarian drinking habits,<sup>56</sup> and once when the bishop of Tours commented on *dux* Claudius (surely a Roman) following the barbarian propensity to consult auguries.<sup>57</sup> It is also used to describe a group of thugs who ransacked the monastery of Latte.<sup>58</sup> In addition, Gregory puts the word into the mouth of Gundobad in a discussion with his counsellor Aredius, following his defeat by the Franks, who he describes as *barbari*<sup>59</sup> – a usage that takes us back to the Burgundian kingdom. That the six other uses of variants of the word appear in the chapter on Attalus, five of them describing the keeper of the young hostage, while the sixth, *barbaries*, is used to describe the expression employed by the barbarian to describe Sunday, seems to be significant, and to suggest that Gregory here was using a vocabulary which was not normally uppermost in his mind: it is hard to resist speculation that he was remembering the vocabulary used by his relatives when they told him the story.

There is nothing in the few lines of speech given to the Franks in Gregory's account of Attalus' escape to suggest that they were particularly uncouth – though one could conclude that they were greedy: when the bishop of Langres' men offered the Frankish lord *munera* in return for his nephew's freedom, *respuit ea, dicens: 'Hic tali generatione decem auri libras redimi debet'*. Even this, however, might just as easily be read as an appropriate demand, given attitudes towards the valuation of individuals that one sees in the Frankish law codes.

Yet Gregory was capable of ridiculing the culture of the Merovingian king Chilperic, whose understanding of verse was, in his eyes, lamentable.<sup>60</sup> The crucial issue here, however, may have been the king's pretensions. Gregory was only too aware of the extent to which his own Latin failed to live up to the classical ideal.<sup>61</sup> Attalus' Frankish master may have spoken almost as well as the bishop of Tours. The fact that he was entrusted with a noble hostage would seem to imply that he was a man of some status, and one might guess that he was attached to the court of Theuderic from the fact that the servitude to which the hostage was subjected was public (*servicium publicum*), and that a hostage as noble as the grandson of Gregory of Langres was placed in his safe-keeping. That the *barbarus* had court connections is surely what Gregory wants us to think, for he says that the Frank hoped that his relatives and neighbours would be so impressed by a banquet prepared by Leo, that they would say

<sup>53</sup> For the use of *barbari* in the *Liber Constitutionum*, see *prima constitutio*, 11: 2, 1: 8, 1: 10, 1: 17, 5: 22: 44, 1: 47, 1: 52: 60, 1–2: 61: 79, 1.

<sup>54</sup> Gregory of Tours, *Liber Vitae Patrum* VII, 1 (ed. Bruno Krusch, MGH SS rer. Merov. 1, 2, Hannover 1885) 211–294, at 237.

<sup>55</sup> Gregory, *Decem Libri Historiarum* II, 9, ed. Krusch/Levison 52–58.

<sup>56</sup> Gregory, *Decem Libri Historiarum* IV, 35, ed. Krusch/Levison 167 (for Cautinus' supply of drink to barbarians: *et plerumque inebriabat barbaros*): VIII, 31, ed. Krusch/Levison 399 (for a poisoned drink sent by Fredegund: *absentium cum vino et melle mixtum, ut mos barbarorum habet*).

<sup>57</sup> Gregory, *Decem Libri Historiarum* VII, 29, ed. Krusch/Levison 347 (on Claudius consulting auguries: *ut consuetudo est barbarorum*).

<sup>58</sup> Gregory, *Decem Libri Historiarum* IV, 48, ed. Krusch/Levison 184–185.

<sup>59</sup> Gregory, *Decem Libri Historiarum* II, 32, ed. Krusch/Levison 78–80.

<sup>60</sup> Gregory, *Decem Libri Historiarum* V, 44; VI, 46, ed. Krusch/Levison 252–254, 319–321.

<sup>61</sup> Gregory of Tours, *Liber in Gloria Confessorum*, praef.; id., *Liber de virtutibus sancti Martini* 1, praef. (ed. Bruno Krusch, MGH SS rer. Merov. 1, 2, Hannover 1885) 134–211, 294–370, at 135–136 and 297–298.

that they had never eaten better with the king – which implies that they had at least occasionally dined at the royal table: *et dicant, quia in domo regis melius non aspeximus*. The phrase may be more significant than appears at first sight, since there survives a cookery book critical of the food served to Theuderic.<sup>62</sup> Not that the Austrasian court necessarily compared at this moment in cultural terms with that of the Burgundian kings of a decade earlier.<sup>63</sup> One must wait for the accession of Sigibert in 561, his subsequent marriage to Brunhild, and the arrival of Venantius Fortunatus, before one can be sure that the easternmost of the Frankish kingdoms was a significant cultural centre.<sup>64</sup> Yet, Trier could still boast cultured individuals in the 470s, to judge by Sidonius' letter to the *comes* Arbogast – a man whose name suggests Germanic origins, who had asked Sidonius for a work of scriptural commentary, in a letter whose style the Gallo-Roman praised extravagantly, and probably excessively.<sup>65</sup> And two or three generations later, even before the arrival of Fortunatus, the Austrasian court under Theuderic and Theudebert may well have been a place of some cultural pretension – or so the sources for Theudebert's diplomacy and administration (including his coinage) would suggest.<sup>66</sup> Holding estates in the Trier region, and consorting with the royal court, Attalus' Frankish master is unlikely to have been a wild backwoodsman – he may well have been less boorish than the jumped-up slave Andarchius, presumably of Gallo-Roman origin, whose pretensions so aggravated the household servants of Ursus that they killed him.<sup>67</sup> Attalus' master and his fellow Franks are, however, portrayed in a more alarming light towards the end of the story, when they are hunting for the escaped slaves. But the cruelty we see here is no more than we can find in other lord-master relationships in the pages of Gregory's *Historiae* – above all that of Rauching's treatment of his servants.<sup>68</sup>

Language and culture, in other words, do not appear as markers of difference in the original version of the Attalus story which brings together Gallo-Romans and Franks from the regions of Burgundy and eastern Austrasia. Gregory does, however, pause to make a point about vocabulary, for he explains that the barbarians use the phrase *dies solis* to refer to Sunday: the Frankish master says '*Ecce enim dies solis adest*' – *sic enim barbaries vocitari diem dominecum consueta est*. It is less than clear what is at stake here, though the fact that Gregory stops to point out the choice of words suggests that it has some importance, for him at least. And the significance of the choice of words seems to be reinforced by the fact that when Leo and Attalus enter Rheims *signum ad matutinus motum est – erat enim dies dominica*.

It is just possible that underlying Gregory's statement there is a matter of linguistic difference: that the Franks of the story were actually speaking in some form of Germanic, and that what they were really talking of was not *dies solis* but *sunniŋtag*. If Gregory were trying to make such a point, one can only say that he did so in such an oblique manner that he left it in total obscurity.

The bishop of Tours might, on the other hand, be making a religious point:<sup>69</sup> and such a suspicion might be strengthened by the use of *dies dominica* to describe the arrival of Attalus and Leo in Rheims. One might, then, ask whether the use of *dies solis* as opposed to *dies dominecus/dominica* is an indication that Attalus' master was a pagan – or perhaps the sort of christian Frank who put up the Niederdollendorf stone with its Germanic warrior with sword and pilgrim flask on one side and an apparently naked risen Christ on the other. Here one is faced with the question of how long paganism lasted in Austrasia after the conversion of Clovis, and opinion is divided. Some seventh- and eighth-

<sup>62</sup> Anthimus, *De observatione ciborum* (ed. Mark Grant, Chippenham 1996).

<sup>63</sup> Ian N. Wood, *The Latin culture of Gundobad and Sigismund*, in: *Akkulturation. Probleme einer germanisch-romanischen Kultursynthese in Spätantike und frühem Mittelalter*, ed. Dieter Hägermann/Wolfgang Haubrichs/Jörg Jarnut (Berlin 2004) 367–380.

<sup>64</sup> On the increasing culture of the Frankish courts in the course of the sixth century, see Ian N. Wood, *The governing class of the Gibichung and early Merovingian kingdoms*, in: *Der frühmittelalterliche Staat – Europäische Perspektiven*, ed. Walter Pohl/Veronika Wieser (Vienna 2009) 11–22.

<sup>65</sup> Sidonius Apollinaris, ep. IV, 17 ed. Loyen vol. 2 149–150.

<sup>66</sup> Wood, *The governing class of the Gibichung and early Merovingian kingdoms* 18–19.

<sup>67</sup> Gregory, *Decem Libri Historiarum* IV, 46, ed. Krusch/Levison 180–183.

<sup>68</sup> Gregory, *Decem Libri Historiarum* V, 3, ed. Krusch/Levison 196–198.

<sup>69</sup> This is implied by the translation offered in the *Hamburger Leseheft* edition of Grillparzer, *Weh dem, der lügt*, 72, which runs "Wie du weißt, ist morgen der Sonnentag (so nannte das abergläubische Volk der Heiden noch den Tag des Herrn). ..."

century texts, like the *Vita Vedastis* of Jonas of Bobbio, the *Vita Amandi* (in all its forms) and the *Vita Eligii* (which includes a sermon supposedly preached by Eligius) suggest pagan continuity, particularly in the northern parts of Austrasia<sup>70</sup> – although it has quite rightly been pointed out that the evidence is ambiguous and does not amount to much.<sup>71</sup> Indeed, Gregory makes little of paganism. He does tell the story of the stylite Vulfilaicus who destroyed a shrine of Diana at Carignan, south of Sedan, though it has been forcibly argued that this pagan cult seems to have been in a state of advanced decline at the time of his action.<sup>72</sup> If I am right in thinking that Attalus' master had some connection with the court of Theuderic, and that he was no backwoodsman, then he is rather less likely to have been a pagan than the locals of Carignan. Moreover, Gregory seems to suggest as much, for later in the chapter he puts the words *per salutem meam* into the barbarian's mouth.<sup>73</sup> Surely, had he thought that the Frank was a pagan, he would have made something of the point, to make Attalus' captivity more terrible.

Even if the choice of the words *dies solis* were deliberately non-Christian, or perhaps syncretist, and even if the phrase hides an expression in Frankish, it would seem to derive from Roman, rather than Germanic, tradition. The question of the chronology and geography of a transfer of the theophoric names for the days of the week from a Roman to a Germanic cultural context is still a matter of discussion.<sup>74</sup> We can, however, be sure that the phrase *dies solis*, along with *dies dominecus*, was being used in Latin inscriptions of the fourth and fifth centuries.<sup>75</sup> The choice of words alluded to by Gregory, thus, indicates adherence to an older Roman tradition, and cannot be used to suggest that the Frank was an illiterate barbarian. Indeed, his choice of words would seem perfectly appropriate for the Trier region in the 530s, in other words for what had been the Roman military zone only a century earlier, and before that had been a centre of Roman culture, even hosting the imperial court in the days of Constantine.<sup>76</sup> In short, Gregory's highlighting of the use of the expression clearly has some significance, but unfortunately we cannot tell what it is – though the words *sic enim barbaries vocitari diem dominecum consueta est* would seem to be intended as a criticism.

If we jump forward from Gregory's *Historiae* to the brothers Grimm, we find the story denuded of these particular problems. Even the discussion of the barbarian terminology for Sunday has been removed, although it is an issue that must have interested Jacob. Freytag, by contrast, does note the point, following on the word *Sonntag* with a paraphrase of Gregory: "denn so pflegt das fremde Volk den Tag des Herren zu nennen".<sup>77</sup> The choice of the word 'fremde' is, of course, loaded, but it is not out of line with the *barbaries* of the source. Unlike Gregory the Grimms call the barbarians of the story Franks: but they make no mention of the ethnicity of the bishop of Langres, of Attalus or of Leo – which of course has the advantage of implying that the heroes of the tale were Germanic. All in all, they present as bald a tale as possible. The main contribution of the Grimms is simply their misleading categorisation of the story as 'deutsch'.

By contrast, Grillparzer's *Weh dem, der lügt!* of 1838, creates a whole new world – which is what one might expect from a dramatist, for whom poetic licence is a rather more valid concept than it should have been for Jacob Grimm. In Grillparzer's version many of the ambiguities of the original

<sup>70</sup> Yitzhak Hen, Paganism and superstitions in the time of Gregory of Tours: une question mal posée!, in: *The World of Gregory of Tours*, ed. Kathleen Mitchell/Ian N. Wood (Leiden 2002) 229–240.

<sup>71</sup> Hen, Paganism and superstitions in the time of Gregory of Tours.

<sup>72</sup> Gregory, *Decem Libri Historiarum VIII*, 15, ed. Krusch/Levison 380–383: Hen, Paganism and superstitions in the time of Gregory of Tours 233–236.

<sup>73</sup> I am indebted to Philip Shaw for this observation.

<sup>74</sup> The most recent discussion is Philip A. Shaw, The theophoric week in the Germanic languages, in: *Early Medieval Europe 15* (2007) 386–401. Shaw prefers a seventh- or eighth-century context for the transfer of names from a Roman to a Germanic cultural milieu: unfortunately he does not discuss the Attalus story. See also Dennis Green, *Language and History in the Early Germanic World* (Cambridge 1998) 248–249, where the transfer is ascribed to the fourth century.

<sup>75</sup> Shaw, The theophoric week in the Germanic languages 390 n. 17. For the numerous inscriptions involving Sol, *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum 15* (Indices) (Berlin 1943) 123. These might be compared with the inscription from Fénay, Côte-d'Or with the phrase *diea* (sic) *sabato*, *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum 13*, 2, 1 (ed. Carl Zangemeister, Berlin 1895) 87, n. 5463.

<sup>76</sup> Eugen Ewig, *Trier im Merowingerreich: Civitas, Stadt, Bistum* (Trier 1954).

<sup>77</sup> Freytag, *Bilder aus der deutschen Vergangenheit*, 1: *Aus dem Mittelalter* 310.



story have been removed and the general context has been altered.<sup>78</sup> The Austrian dramatist follows the basic outline provided by Gregory: the story of Attalus' enslavement and of Leo's plan for organising his escape is largely that to be found in the *Decem Libri Historiarum*,<sup>79</sup> though the Germanic household is much more fully characterised than it is in Gregory: above all the Frank is given a name, Kattwald, as is his daughter, Edrita, while her suitor becomes the 'dumme' Galomir: and Grillparzer adds a crucial element of romance between Edrita, Atalus (sic) and Leo(n).

The overarching moral, of the virtue of truth-telling, which is present in the play's title, can already be found in the Latin source, even though it has been thought that it was in Montaigne that Grillparzer found the basic idea.<sup>80</sup> An ironic statement of the truth is central to Gregory's account of the exchange between Leo and the barbarian bridegroom, when the former freely admits that he is intent on escaping that very night, something that the barbarian assumes to be a joke. *Media autem nocte a convivio surgentibus et quieti datis, prosecutus est Leo generum domini sui cum potu, porrigensque ei bibere, in metatum eius. Ait ad eum homo: 'Dic tu, o creditor soceri mei, sic valeas, quando enim voluntatem adhibebis, ut, adsumptis equitibus eius, eas in patriam tuam?' Hoc quasi ioco delectans dixit. Similiter et ille ioculariter respondens viritatem, ait: 'Hac nocte delibero, si Dei voluntas fuerit.' Et ille: 'Utinam', inquit, 'costodiant me famuli, ne aliquid de rebus meis adsumas!' Et ridentes discesserunt.* Leo's truth-telling provided an ideal centre-point around which Grillparzer could develop the moral of his play: that lies do not pay. He had no need of Montaigne: his central idea he derived directly from his Latin source.

So too, the marriage of Leo, or at least the existence of the cook's wife, is referred to by Gregory, for we are told that the bishop of Langres freed his servant, who must therefore have been of servile status, together with all his family, and gave him property on which he, his wife and children lived out their days. In Grillparzer's version, by contrast, Leo ends up marrying Edrita, the daughter of the barbarian lord, who had accompanied him and Attalus back to Burgundy. The name and actions of Edrita are, of course, an invention of the dramatist, as is the boorishness of both Attalus and of her bridegroom, 'des dummen Galomir'.<sup>81</sup>

More important is the transformation of the politico-ethnic milieu in which the action of Grillparzer's play takes place. Far from being Romans in a Frankish world, Leo and Attalus are explicitly Franks in a barbarian one.<sup>82</sup> In calling the captors barbarians, Grillparzer may be following Gregory, though for the Austrian the descriptor is certainly pejorative. The playwright's distinction between Franks and barbarians carries far more weight than that between Gallo-Romans and barbarians does in Gregory. In Grillparzer the barbarians are explicitly pagan.<sup>83</sup> The background conflict ceases to be one between two named Merovingian rulers, Theuderic and Childebert, but is instead transformed into a clash between the king of the Franks and an unidentified barbarian ruler. Further, the escape of Leo and Attalus ends not in Rheims or Dijon, but at the gates of Metz, which, in Grillparzer's telling of the story, has just been liberated from the pagan barbarians by the christian Franks. Bishop Gregory makes his final entry accompanied by a procession of choristers – perhaps a deliberate echo of pope Leo's visit to Attila, in the tragedy of that name by Zacharias Werner, which Grillparzer might well have seen, since it was performed twenty-nine times at the Theater an der Wien in Vienna between 1809 and 1825.<sup>84</sup> Gregory's fast-moving adventure story, in which there is no indication of a clash of cultures, has become, in Grillparzer's version, a tale in which cultural difference is very much to the fore. There is paganism versus Christianity, and there is linguistic skill versus near-animal utterance. The speeches 'des dummen Galomir' that fall to Edrita's bridegroom are written in a

<sup>78</sup> For a recent discussion of the play, with a substantial bibliography, William C. Reeve, *Weh dem der lügt! Grillparzer's Janus faced Comedy*, in: *The German Quarterly* 77, 1 (2004) 59–75.

<sup>79</sup> Gregory, *Decem Libri Historiarum* III, 15, ed. Krusch/Levison 112–116: Waterhouse, *The sources of Grillparzer's 'Weh' dem, der lügt!*

<sup>80</sup> *Weh dem, der lügt!*, *Hamburger Leseheft* 75. For dependence on Gregory see Waterhouse, *The sources of Grillparzer's 'Weh' dem, der lügt!* 51, 55.

<sup>81</sup> Waterhouse, *The sources of Grillparzer's 'Weh' dem, der lügt!* 54, 57.

<sup>82</sup> On Leo and Attalus as Franks, ll. 732–734: Waterhouse, *The sources of Grillparzer's 'Weh' dem, der lügt!* 51, 59–60.

<sup>83</sup> Grillparzer, *Weh dem, der lügt!*, ll. 1151ss.

<sup>84</sup> James W. Porter, *Verdi's Attila, an ethnomusicological analysis*, in: *Attila: the man and his image*, ed. Franz H. Bäuml/Marianna D. Birnbaum (Budapest 1993) 45–54, at 46.

language that is practically monosyllabic.<sup>85</sup> And while the barbarian master Kattwald is a little more verbally adept, his opening line is the scarcely eloquent “Hurra! Pack an! Hallo!”<sup>86</sup>

Despite the ahistorical nature of Grillparzer’s changes, it is worth noting that the Austrian dramatist did not just seize on a story, treating it with no sensitivity towards the past. He knew his Grimm.<sup>87</sup> Since the second volume of the *Deutsche Heldensagen*, which includes the retelling of the Attalus story, appeared in 1818, it may have been there that Grillparzer first found the tale, for he started work on his play in 1820.<sup>88</sup> In the text of *Weh dem, der lügt!* he also seems to refer to Jacob Grimm’s *Deutsche Altertümer* of 1828,<sup>89</sup> and to the *Deutsche Mythologie*, which he is known to have read in 1836, a year after its appearance – and two years before the completion of his ‘Lustspiel’.<sup>90</sup> Thus, when we find that Grillparzer has gone out of his way to make the world of Kattwald and Galomir more Germanic than it is in Gregory of Tours, we may take this as a clear reflection of the development of Germanic scholarship over the previous decades. Yet Grillparzer, at least in 1849, when he pronounced his famous aphorism that “Der Weg der neuern Bildung geht / Von Humanität / Durch Nationalität / Zur Bestialität”<sup>91</sup>, had clear reservations about that development. It is worth bearing these reservations in mind when one notes how, curiously, and apparently deliberately, the Viennese playwright makes the world of the north-eastern Franks infinitely more barbarous than it is in the *Histories* of Gregory. Whilst one might have expected Grillparzer to follow the new Romantic vision of the early Germans, he effectively satirises them.<sup>92</sup> Gregory of Langres represents a far more cultured and sympathetic world than do Kattwald and Galomir. It might not be inaccurate to say that French culture (including, of course, the French cuisine of Leo) comes across as better than German. In his depiction of the cook Leo(n), and of his attraction to and for Edrita, Grillparzer also adds an element of class-consciousness which is to be found nowhere in Gregory or in the brothers Grimm: it would seem to have been one of the factors which led to the play’s failure when it opened on 6th March 1838.<sup>93</sup>

There is one other crucial aspect to Grillparzer’s portrayal of the boorish Germans of the North:<sup>94</sup> he himself was no German, but an Austrian who would have severe reservations about German unification, saying of Bismarck “Ihr glaubt, ihr habt ein Reich geboren, und habt doch nur ein Volk zerstört”.<sup>95</sup> Although he makes fun of Kattwald and Galomir, Grillparzer did have sympathy for some ‘barbarian’ figures of the early Middle Ages: he was greatly attracted to Lope de Vega’s play on *La vida y muerte del Rey Wamba* (The Life and death of king Wamba), which dealt with the political history of the seventh-century Visigoths,<sup>96</sup> and he began to translate another Visigothic drama from the pen of his beloved Spanish playwright, *El último Godo de España*.<sup>97</sup> The Goths feature rather better in Grillparzer’s writings than do the North German Franks: perhaps one sees here a reflection of the longstanding association of Austrian and Goth which was already in circulation in the fifteenth

<sup>85</sup> See, for instance, Grillparzer, *Weh dem, der lügt!*, II. 1365f.

<sup>86</sup> Grillparzer, *Weh dem, der lügt!*, I. 455.

<sup>87</sup> For Grillparzer’s use of earlier writers, see Waterhouse, *The sources of Grillparzer’s ‘Weh’ dem, der lügt!*.

<sup>88</sup> Waterhouse, *The sources of Grillparzer’s ‘Weh’ dem, der lügt!*, provides a detailed examination of the play’s sources. See also, Reeve, *Weh dem der lügt! Grillparzer’s Janus faced Comedy* 60.

<sup>89</sup> *Weh dem, der lügt!*, *Hamburger Leseheft* 79, comment on I. 1406.

<sup>90</sup> *Weh dem, der lügt!*, *Hamburger Leseheft* 79, comment on I. 1478.

<sup>91</sup> Franz Grillparzer, *Sämtliche Werke 1: Briefe, Gespräche, Berichte*, ed. Peter Frank/Karl Pörnbacher (München 1960) 500.

<sup>92</sup> Reeve, *Weh dem der lügt! Grillparzer’s Janus faced Comedy* 60, 74, n. 18, citing August Ehrhard, *Franz Grillparzer. Sein Leben und sein Werk* (Munich 1902) 425.

<sup>93</sup> Reeve, *Weh dem der lügt! Grillparzer’s Janus faced Comedy* 69.

<sup>94</sup> On the lack of German chauvinism, and the corresponding Austrian disdain for North Germans, in *Weh dem, der lügt!*, see Ian F. Roe, *An Introduction to the major works of Franz Grillparzer, 1791–1872, Austrian dramatist* (Lewis-ton 1991) 198.

<sup>95</sup> See Viktor Bibl, *Der Zerfall Österreichs 2* (Wien/Berlin/Leipzig/München 1924) 293.

<sup>96</sup> See Franz Grillparzer, *Studien zum spanischen Theater*, in: id., *Sämtliche Werke 3*, ed. Frank/Pörnbacher 459–461; for the centrality of Lope de Vega’s play for Grillparzer, William E. Yates, *Grillparzer, a critical introduction* (Cambridge 1972). I owe this observation to Herwig Wolfram, see his, *Der öffentliche Gebrauch des Mittelalters in Österreich seit 1945* (forthcoming).

<sup>97</sup> For the fragment of the translation of the opening of Act I of Lope de Vega’s *El último Godo de España*, see *Der letzte Gote in Spanien*, in: *Grillparzers sämtliche Werke 13*, ed. August Sauer (Stuttgart 1892–1893) 71–74.

century,<sup>98</sup> and which would come to its fullest fruition in Felix Dahn's *Ein Kampf um Rom*, where the Goths under Theodoric in part stand for Habsburg rule in northern Italy.<sup>99</sup>

The story of Attalus is intriguing not just for what it tells us, but also for what it does not tell us. The distinction between the cultivated westerners and the boorish easterners, which is crucial in Grillparzer's version, is simply not there in Gregory's, even though one might have expected a distinction between the Gallo-Romans and the Ripuarians. Indeed, although Attalus' master is described as *barbarus* by Gregory of Tours (a term, which we have seen, may have had a particular meaning in the time of Gregory of Langres, and to have been rather less used by his great-grandson), this has no significant cultural overtones – even if Gregory's description of the barbarian's use of the phrase *dies solis* as *barbaries* may be more critical. As we have also seen, the only moment when the bishop of Tours acknowledges difference comes in this short comment on the use of *dies solis* instead of *dies dominecus*, and relates to a question of terminology, not even of language. The point would seem to be critical of the barbarians, but it is by no means clear what is being criticised. And the very fact that this point is so minor would seem to imply that linguistic difference was scarcely an issue. Yet there must have been some cultural difference between the world of Langres/Dijon and that of Trier – even at the level of the terminology preferred by an individual bishop and promoted within his see – which may, of course, be what is at stake in the quibble over the phrase *dies solis*. And the culture of Gregory of Langres, who had after all been a Roman official for forty years before his episcopal election,<sup>100</sup> and who must have had close dealings with one of the most cultured courts of the post Roman period – that of the Burgundian Gibichungs<sup>101</sup> – is unlikely to have been the same as that of a secular barbarian landowner, resident outside Trier. Moreover, as we have seen, the place-names suggest that different languages were being spoken by some in the two regions. But linguistic difference, however strong it was, rarely seems to have attracted attention. Attalus may have disliked the sound of Francians as much as Sidonius disliked that of the Burgundians billeted on him three-quarters of a century earlier, but there is nothing to say that the alien sound rankled to the ears of the sixth-century aristocrat in the same way as it had to the fifth-century senator. Language sometimes marks difference and sometimes it does not, and it seems not to have been a significant issue in the Merovingian world.

<sup>98</sup> Herwig Wolfram, *History of the Goths* (Berkeley 1988) 2.

<sup>99</sup> Ralph-Johannes Lilie, *Graecus Perfidus oder Edle Einfalt, Stille Größe? Zum Byzanzbild in Deutschland während des 19. Jahrhunderts am Beispiel Felix Dahns*, in: *Klio* 69 (1987) 181–203.

<sup>100</sup> Gregory of Tours, *Liber Vitae Patrum VIII*, 1, ed. Krusch 241.

<sup>101</sup> Wood, *The Latin culture of Gundobad and Sigismund*.

