

longing to Gothenburg consisted on January 1, 1878, of 65 steamships of 21,215 tons, and 156 sailing vessels of 63,913 tons. The exports in 1877 amounted in value to £2,437,200. These included 8,107,326 cubic feet of deals, boards, and battens (6,021,546 cubic feet to England); 6,065,408 cubic feet of pit-props and other timber, besides 7,246,056 pieces of oak and other staves, and laths and carpenters' work valued at £80,083; 90,460 tons of iron and steel (62,480 tons to England); 333,194 quarters of grain, chiefly oats (265,655 quarters to England); also beans and pease, lucifer matches, 2667 head of cattle, and 38,578 cwts. of butter. The imports in the same year amounted to £3,865,000, chiefly made up of cotton (14,540,996 lb) and cotton yarn (3,608,355 lb), wool and woollen yarn (3,397,757 lb), raw sugar (17,289,777 lb), refined sugar (6,512,919 lb), coffee (8,239,346 lb), molasses (4,883,021 lb), rice (3,246,247 lb), olive oil (2,443,804 lb), salt (796,208 cubic feet), coal and coke (246,205 tons), iron rails (32,059 tons), petroleum (13,243,408 lb), hides (2,346,577 lb), and paper (712,538 lb). Under the peculiar licensing system initiated in Gothenburg October 1, 1865, the town authorities contract for three years with a limited company, which takes the whole number of licences for selling *brändin*, and hands over to the town treasury the net proceeds of its trade. These amounted to £40,103 in the year ending October 1, 1876, when the company sold 383,561 gallons of spirits, 178,133 gallons of which were consumed on the public-house premises, and realized a gross profit of £52,850. The licences issued have been reduced from 119 in 1865 to 56 in 1876. All "bars" are closed from 6 P.M. on Saturday to 8 A.M. on Monday, and in the period 1866-76 apprehensions for drunkenness have on the average decreased 22 per cent., though since 1870 there has been a slight increase (in 1876, 2357 persons were fined), usually attributed to the higher rate of wages and the greater efficiency of the police. The population of Gothenburg, including suburbs, was 71,707 in 1877.

Founded by Gustavus Adolphus in 1619, Gothenburg was from the first designed to be fortified, a town of the same name founded on Hisingen (an island 44 square miles in area between the two arms of the Gotha river) having been destroyed by the Danes during the Calmar war. From 1621, when it was first chartered, it steadily increased, though it suffered greatly in the Danish wars of the last half of the 17th and the beginning of the 18th centuries, and from several extensive conflagrations (the last in 1813), which have destroyed important records of its history. The great development of its herring fishery in the latter part of the 18th century gave a new impulse to the city's trade, which was kept up by the influence of the "Continental System," under which Gothenburg became a *dépôt* for the colonial merchandise of England. After the fall of Napoleon it began to decline, but since its closer connexion with the interior of the country by the Götha Canal (opened 1832) and Western Railway it has rapidly advanced both in population and trade. It is expected that the great line now in course of construction through the mining districts will very greatly increase the importance of Gothenburg. Since the demolition of its fortifications in 1807, it has been defended only by the two redoubts of Billingen and Rya Rabba. Gothenburg was the birthplace of the poet Bengt Lidner, and of two of Sweden's greatest sculptors, Fogelberg and Molin. After the French Revolution Gothenburg was for a time the residence of the Bourbon family.

See Octavia Curlién, *Göteborg: Beskrifning öfver staden och dess närmaste omgifningar* (Stockholm, 1869), and the works therein cited; also J. Hellstenius, *Nygre blad ur Göteborgs historia* (ib. 1870); Axelsson and Fabst, *Sveriges industriella etablissemanger* (ib. 1870, et seq.); W. Malm, *Beskrifning öfver segelsteden från Stockholms kanarvagnar till Göteborg* (ib. 1873); *Bidrag till kännedom om Göteborg och Bohuslänns fornminnen och historia*, published by the Economic Society of the *län* (Gothenb. and Stockh., 1874 et seq.), and *Göteborgs Kalender*, a yearly publication.

GOTHIC LANGUAGE. See under **GOTHS**, p. 852.

GOTHFRED or **GODEFROY**, the name of a noble French family, of which many members attained distinction as jurists or historians.

The first whose name is associated with the active study of jurisprudence, at the close of the 16th century, was **DENIS GODEFROY** (1549-1621). He was born at Paris, and

studied law at the universities of Louvain, Cologne, and Heidelberg. Having embraced the Reformed religion, he found Geneva a safer abode than Paris, and became professor of law there. Some years afterwards he obtained a public appointment in one of the districts in the Jura, but was driven from his home by the troops of the duke of Savoy and retired to Basel. Thence he was induced by the offer of a chair of Roman law to go to Strasburg, but soon changed his appointment for one at Altorf, which then possessed a university celebrated for its late professor of law, Donneau. In 1600 the elector palatine appointed him professor of Roman law in Heidelberg, where he spent the greater portion of the remainder of his life, and was placed at the head of the faculty of law. The most flattering offers from several universities failed to induce him to leave his adopted country, but the invasion of the Palatinate by Tilly's troops forced him to take refuge again at Strasburg, where he died in 1621. His most important work is his edition of the *Corpus Juris*. The text given by him was very generally adopted and used in quotation. More than twenty editions of the work were published in various towns of France, Germany, and Holland. Godefroy's other writings are very numerous; but they are for the most part either editions of classical authors or compilations which display great industry and learning, but are of little use to the modern student.

THEODORE GODEFROY (1580-1649), the eldest son of Denis, forsook the religion which his father had adopted, and obtained the office of historiographer of France, as well as several important diplomatic posts. His historical works are very numerous. The character of his labours will be judged from the title of his most elaborate production—*Le Cérémonial de France*. Many of his smaller works are devoted to questions of genealogy.

JACQUES GODEFROY (1587-1652), the younger brother of Theodore, has a real claim to the remembrance of students of the history of Roman law, in his edition of the *Theodosian Code*, at which he laboured for thirty years. It was this code, and not the *Corpus Juris* prepared under the direction of Justinian, which formed the principal, though not the only source from which the lawyers of the various countries which had formed the Western empire drew their knowledge of Roman law, at all events until the revival of the study of law in the 11th century at Bologna. Hence Godefroy's edition was of real value. Jacques Godefroy also completed the difficult and useful task of collecting and arranging those fragments of the *Twelve Tables* which can be discovered, and so an important step was taken towards representing the Roman law in its first definite form. His other works are very numerous, and are principally devoted to the discussion of various points of Roman law. He died in 1652, having served the republic of Geneva both as its principal magistrate and in undertaking important missions to the court of France.

A list of the works of the various members of the family of Godefroy, whose activity extends over a period of nearly 200 years, may be found in the *Biographie Générale*, and fuller particulars of its history in Moreri's *Dictionnaire historique*.

GOTHS. The historical position of the Gothic nation needs to be marked out with special care, both on account of various lax popular uses of the Gothic name, and also on account of much legendary history and many rash ethnological speculations, ancient and modern, which have gathered round the true history of the Gothic people. An ignorant age used the words *Goth* and *Gothic* as vague names of contempt for anything that was thought rude and barbarous. A hardly less ignorant but better disposed age used the word *Gothic* in an equally vague way, but without the same feeling of contempt, for anything which was thought to be mediæval or "romantic," as opposed to

"classical." The name came also to be used as a philological or ethnological term; we heard of "Gothic nations," "Gothic languages," &c., meaning "Teutonic" in the widest sense. The name was also, first scornfully, then respectfully, applied to a style of architecture which has some claim to be called Teutonic as opposed to Greek or Roman, but which has nothing whatever to do with the Goths as a nation. Long before this, two European sovereigns who had nothing whatever to do with the national Goths, took the title of King of the Goths out of a mere accidental likeness of names. All these uses of the Gothic name must be carefully distinguished from the history of the true national Goths who play so great a part in Europe from the 3d to the 8th century of our era. The Goths may on many grounds claim the foremost place among the Teutonic nations which had a share in the break-up of the Roman power. They were among the earliest, if not quite the earliest, of the Teutonic nations to establish themselves within the empire, as distinguished from merely ravaging its frontiers. Their history too is closely connected with the geography of the whole empire. Their first historical appearance was in the East; their great historical settlements were made in the West. No Teutonic people fills so great a place in the political and military history of the 4th, 5th, and 6th centuries, and no Teutonic people has left behind it such early remains of a written native literature. The real greatness of the Goths quite accounts for the many vague uses of the Gothic name. Alike in scorn and in honour, the Goths have been, not unreasonably, taken as the representatives of the whole Teutonic race. The wonderful thing is that a people who played so great a part for several ages should have wholly passed away. The Goths have not for many ages existed anywhere as a distinct nation, nor have they given an abiding name to any part of Europe. Franks, Angles, Saxons, Burgundians, Frisians, Thuringians, Lombards, Bavarians, perhaps Vandals, are all visible in the modern map. So several parts of Europe have at different times been known as *Gothia*; but the name was never borne by any large country, and it has nowhere lasted down to modern times.

The chief ancient authority for the early history of the Goths is their national historian Jordanis, who chiefly followed the Gothic history of Cassiodorus the minister of Theodoric, and the lost history of Ablavius. (On the value of Jordanis's writings see Pallmann, *Geschichte der Völkerwanderung*, i. 23.) But he is careless and uncritical, and, like other national historians, is full of mythical elements in the early part. He has to be tested throughout by the contemporary Roman and Greek writers from the 3d century to the 6th. Among these, perhaps the first place is due to Ammianus in the 4th century and to Procopius in the 6th.

The first certain historical appearance of the Goths is in the lands north of the lower Danube in the 3d century of our era. For any earlier account of them we have to go either to mythical stories or to ingenious guesses and inferences. There are a remarkable number of national and legendary names which have more or less of likeness to the name *Goth*; and this likeness has naturally led to an unusual number of theories. The Goths first appear in history in the ancient land of the *Getæ*; and this geographical fact, combined with the likeness of the names, has naturally caused *Getæ* and *Goths* to be looked on as the same people. The identification is as old as our first historical mention of the Goths (*Ælius Spartianus, Ant. Car.*, 10). Claudian always speaks of the Goths as *Getæ*. So does the national historian Jordanis (*cap. v.*). The identity is mentioned doubtfully by Procopius (*Bell. Vand.*, i. 2; *cf. Bell. Goth.*, v. 4). It is strongly maintained by Jacob Grimm (*Geschichte der Deutschen Sprache*, *capp. ix.*, xviii.), but is rejected by

nearly all later writers. A more famous legend, which has derived its chief currency from Jordanis, brings the Goths first of all from Scandinavia. (see Gibbon, c. x.; Geijer's *History of Sweden*, c. x.). There is a so-called East and West Gothland in Sweden, but the connexion of these lands with the Goths of Roman history is more than doubtful. Ptolemy (*ii. 11, 35*) places the *Goïra* in Scandia, and Procopius (*Bell. Goth.*, ii. 15) knew the *Tavro* among the inhabitants of Thoule; but he clearly did not look on them as Goths (see Zeuss, *Die Deutschen*, 500, 511; Grimm, p. 312). Then there is the god *Geat* (see Kemble's *Saxons in England*, i. 370), and the *Geatas*, who figure in Beowulf, and elsewhere in Old-English writings. The Traveller's Song (34, 115, 177) distinctly distinguishes *Goths* and *Geatas*, and couples the latter with the Swedes. Pliny (*Nat. Hist.*, iv. 11) places *Getæ* and *Gaudæ* together on the lower Danube. His *Gaudæ* may possibly be Goths; if so, they are distinguished from the *Getæ*. Then there are the *Jutes* of Old-English history, the *Guttones*, *Gothones*, *Gothini* (see Latham, *Germania*, Epilegomena xxxviii. et seq.). Pytheas, according to Pliny (*Nat. Hist.*, xxxvii. 7; *cf. iv. 14*) placed the *Guttones* on the south coast of the Baltic (that seems to be his meaning), and rules them to be a German people. This carries the name back to the time of Alexander. Ptolemy also (*iii. 5, 20*) has *Γόθωνες* in Sarmatia on the Vistula. Tacitus (*Germania*, 43) distinguishes the German *Gothones* in the same region from the Celtic *Gothini*, whom he places seemingly nearer to the Carpathians. Tacitus moreover not only speaks of the *Gothones* or *Gotones* as a people, but mentions (*Ann.*, ii. 62) a particular man of the nation, Catualda by name, as having restored the independence of his people after it had been overthrown by Maroboduus. With this hint, it is perhaps not too much to infer with Aschbach (*Westgothen*, 2d ed.) and Zeuss (136) that for *Boïroves* in Strabo (*vii. 1*), who are mentioned among the nations subject to Maroboduus, we should read *Γόθροves*. And there is no doubt that names like *Getæ*, *Gethæ*, *Gudæ*, even *Gothi*, lived on almost to modern times, first as national names, then as names of contempt, in Poland, Lithuania, and Prussia (see Latham, and Zeuss, 672). Latham asserts the identity of the names *Getæ*, *Gothi*, and *Gothones*, but he holds (see especially p. 42 of his Epilegomena) that both *Gothones* and *Getæ* were Lithuanian, and that the Teutonic Goths took the name of the people whom they had conquered. They would, on this view, be Goths only in the sense in which Englishmen are Britons.

On the whole, it seems that there is no trustworthy evidence for a migration of the Goths from Scandinavia, and that the idea was suggested only by the likeness of name between the true Goths and the *Gauts* or *Geatas* of Swedish history. The application of the name *Gothland* to the island *Gotland*, as well as to the continental *Gauthiod*, is a further mistake. Nor does there seem to be any reason for making *Goths* and *Getæ* the same. But the identification of the Goths with the *Gothones*, *Γόθροves*, *Guttones*, on the south coast of the Baltic (which is accepted by Pallmann and Dahn) has much more to be said for it. *Gothi* and *Gothones* are strictly the same name; the double form is usual in the Latin shapes of Teutonic names. But the whole history of the Goths in their northern seats is summed up in the personal history of Catualda, who, after delivering his people from Maroboduus, was himself overthrown by the Hermunduri. The continuous and certain history of the Gothic nation begins in the Roman Dacia.

The question now comes, Which of the nations which are historically connected with the Goths had any closer connexion with them than that of common Teutonic origin? Setting aside *Getæ* and other doubtful theories, the real

Gothic name is used by the Greek and Latin writers in a wider and in a narrower sense. We must also bear in mind the vague way in which the ancient writers used national names, and their fondness for using obsolete names. Thus the Goths and other Teutonic nations are spoken of as Scythians and Samaritans. Procopius, in an evidently well-considered passage (*Bell. Vand.*, i. 2), speaks of the Goths as having been formerly called *Σαυρομάται καὶ Μεγάλλωνοι*, names which come out of Herodotus's description of the regions where the Goths first appear. But he gives it as the definite result of his own observations that Goths,—by this name he always means specially the East-Goths,—Vandals, West-Goths, and Gepidæ (*Γήπαιδες*, with an evident intention to give the word a Greek meaning) were originally one nation, speaking one Gothic language. The only question is about the Vandals. The Gepidæ are commonly acknowledged as a branch of the Goths, and Jordanis (17) has a legend which implies their kindred. The Taifalæ (Ammianus, xxxi. 19), the Bastarnæ, Peucini, and other tribes are also reckoned among the Gothic races. In other passages Procopius speaks of several other nations, as the Alans, Rogi, and Scirri, as Gothic, but he does not seem to be in the same way pronouncing a definite judgment. Among all these, the historical Goths, who play a part in European history by that name, consist of the East and West Goths, and of the small division called Tetraxite. The division into East and West Goths does not appear in the earlier writers, as Ammianus and Zosimus, but we find it both in Procopius and in Jordanis. Instead of East-Goths and West-Goths, we read in Ammianus, Zosimus, and Claudian of *Greuthungi* and *Tervingi*. These seem to be (see Aschbach, 21; Zeuss, 406; Köpke, 103) the strictly national names of the two divisions, which took the names of East and West Goths from their geographical position in the lands which they entered. There is an exact parallel in England, where the national name of the *Geuissas* gives way to the geographical name of *West-Saxons*. Jordanis indeed doubts whether the East-Goths were so called from their eastern position, or from a king Ostrogotha. Strange to say, this Ostrogotha seems to be a real person, and not a mere mythical eponym. *Οὐστρουγόθος* (Procop., *Bell. Goth.*, iv. 27) is an historical person at a later date, and the name is borne in a feminine shape by one of the daughters of Theodoric. The history of the East and West Goths, as far as the empire is concerned, falls naturally into three periods. In the 3d century they are still settled outside the empire, and appear as invaders and ravagers of the Roman territory from outside. After an interval in which they almost sink out of notice, they appear again within the bounds of the empire, in various relations of alliance and enmity, marching to and fro, but not making any lasting settlement. It is not till the 5th century that they begin to form settled powers. During their wandering stage they appear mainly in the Eastern empire. But neither they nor any other Teutonic people founded any permanent settlement within its borders. The historical settlements of the Goths are the short and brilliant dominion of the East-Goths in Italy, and the more lasting dominion of the West-Goths in Gaul and Spain.

After the first vague mention of the Goths under Antoninus Caracalla, they begin to play a distinct part in the reign of Alexander Severus. They were then in Dacia, and received a tribute or subsidy of some kind (Petrus Patricius, 124, ed. Bonn). The next emperor, Maximin, is claimed by Jordanis (15) as himself of Gothic birth, but we may suspect the usual confusion with the *Getae*. The narrative of Jordanis begins from this point to put on a more historical character, and his account is helped out by various notices in the Augustan History. In the reign of Philip (244–248 A.D.) they passed the Danube and ravaged Mœsia,

and in 251 the emperor Decius fell in battle against them (see Zosimus, i. 19 *et seqq.*). From this time they ravaged eastern Europe and western Asia far and wide (251–268). They carried on their warfare by sea, and reached as far east as Trebizond. And it seems to have been now that the first permanent Gothic settlement was made, though not strictly within the lands of the empire. This was in the Tauric Chersonesos or Crim. Here their settlement lasted for many ages, and they became allies rather than subjects of the empire in the reign of Justinian. Within the empire the Gothic inroads met with repulses at several points, especially from the local forces of Athens under the historian Dexippus (Trebilius, Gallienus 13, and the fragment of Dexippus himself). At last, in 269, the Goths suffered a decisive defeat from the emperor Claudius at Naissus in Dardania, which formed an epoch in Gothic history. It answers to the repulse of the Saxons from Britain by the elder Theodosius. The first attempt at Gothic settlement south of the Danube had been premature. It had to be repeated at a later time with greater success.

Further victories over the Goths are attributed to Aurelian. But the chief event of his reign was one which amounted to a legal acknowledgment of Gothic occupation north of the Danube. The Roman legions were withdrawn from Dacia, and the name of Trajan's great conquest was transferred to the land south of the Danube (274). That is, the great river was established as the boundary between the Roman and Gothic dominions. The wisdom of this cession is shown by its being followed by a period of ninety years in which the peace between the Goths and the empire was seldom seriously broken. The chief interruption was during the reign of Constantine, when the Gothic king Araric invaded the empire, and, after some momentary successes, was driven back. In the middle of the 4th century a great power arose under the East-Gothic king Ermanaric (less correctly *Hermanric*; the name is the same as *Eormearic*, in the royal line of Kent), of the house of the Amali, which was reckoned to be the noblest among the Goths. Ermanaric has become a great figure in Teutonic legend, and it is not easy to say how far legend has built upon history, and how far so-called history has drawn from legend. But that Ermanaric was a real man, and the founder of a great dominion, is plain from the few words of Ammianus (xxxii. 3). Yet there is something unsatisfactory in the way in which we read vague accounts of the greatness of his power, with hardly a glimpse of himself personally. The period assigned to his reign is full of stirring events, in which we get a clear conception of much lesser Gothic chiefs, but none of Ermanaric himself. Jordanis (23) claims for him a vast dominion stretching from the Danube to the Baltic, and he is specially emphatic on the subjection of the Slavonic nations to the rule of the Gothic overlord. With regard to the Gothic nations, we can see that the rule of Ermanaric was a mere overlordship. The West-Goths appear as a distinct people, with the power of making war and peace on their own account. But they had no kings; their great chief Athanaric appears only as "judge" (Ammianus, xxvii. 5; xxxi. 3), answering to our *ealdorman* or *heretoga* (cf. Jordanis, 26); and along with him are other West-Gothic chiefs, specially his rival Frithigern. We hear of a civil war between these two rivals (Socrates, iv. 33), and it is more certain that Athanaric made war within the Roman border as an ally of the usurper of Procopius in 365, and afterwards made peace with the emperor Valens. By this time Christianity was making swift advances among the Goths. According to the view of some modern writers (Köpke, 123; Pallmann, ii. 63), the outlying Gothic settlement in Crim had been Christian and Catholic from the beginning; but now Christianity in its Arian form began to be gradually accepted by the great

mass of the Gothic nation. This was mainly the work of the teaching of Ulifila (see ULIFILA), the Gothic apostle and translator of the Scriptures into the Gothic tongue (Sozomen, iv. 24). According to some accounts (Pallmann, i. 71), he had, to avoid persecution, led a Christian colony south of the Danube (348), who settled peaceably at Nicopolis, and are hence known as Mœsogoths (seemingly the *Gothi Minores* of Jordanis, 51). Later, in 370, there was another great persecution, in which Athanaric, the special enemy of everything Roman, appears also as the enemy of the Christians, while Frithigern is their friend (Sozomen, vi. 37; Socrates, iv. 33). The distinction between Christian and heathen Goths remains of political importance for some time. But both East and West Goths had fully embraced Arianism long before the end of the 5th century, while the Goths of Crim seem to have remained Catholic, and received Catholic bishops from Saint John Chrysostom, and afterwards from Justinian.

Towards the end of the reign of Ermanaric several causes joined together to break his great dominion asunder. There were clearly signs of division between East and West Goths, between Christians and heathens, as well as discontents among the subject nations. These causes of division were now strengthened by pressure from without. Now began the first of those movements of the Turanian races into the lands north of the Danube, which have had such an effect on the history of south-eastern Europe down to our own time. The Huns pressed on the new dominion of the Goths, which was already beginning to break in pieces. Ermanaric died at the age, it is said, of 110, by the hands of subject princes stirred to wrath by his cruelties (Jordanis, 24). All thought of a lasting Gothic dominion north of the Danube died with him. With his fall the movements south of that river begin again on a great scale.

From this time the history of the East and West Goths parts asunder, to be joined together again only incidentally and for a season. The great mass of the East-Goths stayed north of the Danube, and passed under the overlordship of the Hun. They do not for the present play any important part in the affairs of the empire. The great mass of the West-Goths crossed the Danube into the Roman provinces, and there played a most important part in various characters of alliance and enmity. The great migration was in 376, when they were allowed to pass as peaceful settlers under their chief Frithigern. His rival Athanaric seems to have tried to maintain his party for a while north of the Danube in defiance of the Huns; but he had presently to follow the example of the great mass of the nation. The peaceful designs of Frithigern were meanwhile thwarted by the ill-treatment which the Goths suffered from the Roman officials, which led first to disputes and then to open war. In 378 the Goths won the great battle of Adrianople, in which the emperor Valens was killed. His successor Theodosius the Great made terms with them in 381, and the mass of the Gothic warriors entered the Roman service as *federati*. Many of their chiefs were in high favour; but it seems that the orthodox Theodosius showed more favour to the still remaining heathen party among the Goths than to the larger part of them who had embraced Arian Christianity. Athanaric himself came to Constantinople in 381; he was received with high honours, and had a solemn funeral when he died. His saying is worth recording, as an example of the effect which Roman civilization had on the Teutonic mind. "The emperor," he said, "was a god upon earth, and he who resisted him would have his blood on his own head."

The death of Theodosius in 395 broke up the union between the West-Goths and the empire. Dissensions arose between them and the ministers of Arcadius; the Goths threw off their allegiance, and chose Alaric as their

king. This was a restoration alike of national unity and of national independence. The royal title had not been borne by their leaders in the Roman service. Alaric's position is quite different from that of several Goths in the Roman service, who appear as simple rebels (see Köpke, 128). He was of the great West-Gothic house of the Balti (bold), a house second in nobility only to that of the Amali. His whole career was taken up with marchings to and fro within the lands, first of the Eastern, then of the Western empire. The Goths are under him an independent people under a national king; their independence is in no way interfered with if the Gothic king, in a moment of peace, accepts the office and titles of a Roman general. But under Alaric the Goths make no lasting settlement. In the long tale of intrigue and warfare between the Goths and the two imperial courts which fills up this whole time, cessions of territory are offered to the Goths, provinces are occupied by them, but as yet they do not take root anywhere; no Western land as yet becomes *Gothia*. Alaric's designs of settlement seem in his first stage to have still kept east of the Adriatic, in Illyricum, possibly in Greece. Towards the end of his career his eyes seem fixed on Africa (see Köpke, 128).

Greece was the scene of his great campaign in 396, the second Gothic invasion of that country. In this campaign the religious position of the Goths is strongly marked. The Arian appeared as an enemy alike to the pagan majority and the Catholic minority; but he came surrounded by monks, and his chief wrath was directed against the heathen temples (Hertzberg, *Geschichte Griechenlands*, iii. 391). His Italian campaigns fall into two great divisions, that of 402–3, when he was driven back by Stilicho, and that of 408–10, after Stilicho's death. In this second war he thrice besieged Rome (408, 409, 410). The second time it suited a momentary policy to set up a puppet emperor of his own, and even to accept a military commission from him. The third time he sacked the city, the first time since Brennus that Rome had been taken by an army of utter foreigners. The intricate political and military details of these campaigns are of less importance in the history of the Gothic nation than the stage which Alaric's reign marks in the history of that nation. It stands between two periods of settlement within the empire and of service under the empire. Under Alaric there is no settlement, and service is quite secondary and precarious; after his death in 410 the two begin again in new shapes.

Contemporary with the campaigns of Alaric was a barbarian invasion of Italy, which, according to one view, again brings the East and West Goths together. The great mass of the East-Goths, as has been already said, became one of the many nations which were under vassalage to the Huns; but their relation was one merely of vassalage. They remained a distinct people under kings of their own, kings of the house of the Amali and of the kindred of Ermanaric (Jordanis, 48). They had to follow the lead of the Huns in war, but they were also able to carry on wars of their own; and it has been held (see Köpke, 139; Pallmann, ii. 173, 277) that among these separate East-Gothic enterprises we are to place the invasion of Italy in 405 by Radagaisus (whom Pallmann writes Radiger, and takes him for the chief of the heathen part of the East-Goths). One chronicler, Prosper, makes this invasion preceded by another in 400, in which Alaric and Radagaisus appear as partners. The paganism of Radagaisus is certain. The presence of Goths in his army is certain, but it seems dangerous to infer that his invasion was a national Gothic enterprise.

Under Ataulf, the brother-in-law and successor of Alaric, another era opens, the beginning of enterprises which did in the end lead to the establishment of a settled Gothic monarchy in the West. The position of Ataulf is well

marked by the speech put into his mouth by Orosius. He had at one time dreamed of destroying the Roman power, of turning *Romania* into *Gothia*, and putting Ataulf in the stead of Augustus; but he had learned that the world could be governed only by the laws of Rome, and he had determined to use the Gothic arms for the support of the Roman power. And in the confused and contradictory accounts of his actions (for the story in Jordanis cannot be reconciled with the accounts in Olympiodorus and the chroniclers), we can see something of this principle at work throughout. Gaul and Spain were overrun both by barbarian invaders and by rival emperors. The sword of the Goth was to win back the lost lands for Rome. And, amid many shiftings of allegiance, Ataulf seems never to have wholly given up the position of an ally of the empire. His marriage with Placidia, the daughter of the great Theodosius, was taken as the seal of the union between Goth and Roman, and, had their son Theodosius lived, a dynasty might have arisen uniting both claims. But the career of Ataulf was cut short at Barcelona in 415, by his murder at the hands of another faction of the Goths. The reign of Sigeric was momentary. Under Wallia in 418 a more settled state of things was established. The empire received again, as the prize of Gothic victories, the *Tarraconensis* in Spain, and *Novempopulana* and the *Narbonensis* in Gaul. The "second Aquitaine," with the sea-coast from the mouth of the Garonne to the mouth of the Loire, became the West-Gothic kingdom of Toulouse. The dominion of the Goths was now strictly Gaulish; their lasting Spanish dominion does not yet begin.

The reign of the first West-Gothic Theodoric (418-451) shows a shifting state of relations between the Roman and Gothic powers; but, after defeats and successes both ways, the older relation of alliance against common enemies was again established. At last Goth and Roman had to join together against the common enemy of Europe and Christendom, Attila the Hun. But they met Gothic warriors in his army. By the terms of their subjection to the Huns, the East-Goths came to fight for Attila against Christendom at Châlons, just as the Servians came to fight for Bajazet against Christendom at Nicopolis. Theodoric fell in the battle (451). After this momentary meeting, the history of the East and West Goths again separates for a while. The kingdom of Toulouse grew within Gaul at the expense of the empire, and in Spain at the expense of the Suevi. Under Euric (466-488) the West-Gothic power again became largely a Spanish power. The kingdom of Toulouse took in nearly all Gaul south of the Loire and west of the Rhone, with all Spain, except the north-west corner, which was still held by the Suevi. Provence alone remained to the empire. The West-Gothic kings largely adopted Roman manners and culture; but, as they still kept to their original Arian creed, their rule never became thoroughly acceptable to their Catholic subjects. They stood therefore at a great disadvantage when a new and aggressive Catholic power appeared in Gaul through the conversion of the Frank Chlodwig. Toulouse was, as in days long after, the seat of an heretical power, against which the forces of northern Gaul marched as on a crusade. In 507 the West-Gothic king Alaric fell before the Frankish arms at Boulogne, near Poitiers, and his kingdom, as a great power north of the Alps, fell with him. That Spain and a fragment of Gaul still remained to form a West-Gothic kingdom was owing to the intervention of the East-Goths under the rule of the greatest man in Gothic history.

When the Hunnish power broke in pieces on the death of Attila, the East-Goths recovered their full independence. They now entered into relations with the empire, and were settled on lands in Pannonia. During the greater part of the latter half of the 5th century, the East-Goths play in

south-eastern Europe nearly the same part which the West-Goths played in the century before. They are seen going to and fro, in every conceivable relation of friendship and enmity with the Eastern Roman power, till, just as the West-Goths had done before them, they pass from the East to the West. They are still ruled by kings of the house of the Amali, and from that house there now steps forward a great figure, famous alike in history and in romance, in the person of Theodoric son of Theodemir. Born about 454, his childhood was spent at Constantinople as a hostage, where he was carefully educated. The former part of his life is taken up with various disputes, intrigues, and wars within the Eastern empire, in which he has as his rival another Theodoric, son of Triarius, and surnamed Strabo. This older but lesser Theodoric seems to have been the chief (not king) of that branch of the East-Goths which had settled within the empire at an earlier time. Theodoric the Great, as he is sometimes distinguished, is sometimes the friend, sometimes the enemy, of the empire. In the former case he is clothed with various Roman titles and offices, as patrician and consul; but in all cases alike he remains the national East-Gothic king. It was in both characters together that he set out in 488, by commission from the emperor Zeno, to recover Italy from Odoacer. By 493 Ravenna was taken; Odoacer was killed by Theodoric's own hand; and the East-Gothic power was fully established over Italy, Sicily, Dalmatia, and the lands to the north of Italy. In this war the history of the East and West Goths begins again to unite, if we may accept the witness of one writer (Anon. Vales. 728) that Theodoric was helped by West-Gothic auxiliaries. The two branches of the nation were soon brought much more closely together, when, through the overthrow of the West-Gothic kingdom of Toulouse, the power of Theodoric was practically extended over a large part of Gaul and over nearly the whole of Spain. A time of confusion followed the fall of Alaric, and, as that prince was the son-in-law of Theodoric, the East-Gothic king stepped in as the guardian of his grandson Amalaric, and preserved for him all his Spanish and a fragment of his Gaulish dominion. Toulouse passed away to the Frank; but the Goth kept Narbonne and its district, the land of Septimania—the land which, as the last part of Gaul held by the Goths, kept the name of *Gothia* for many ages. While Theodoric lived, the West-Gothic kingdom was practically united to his own dominion. He seems also to have claimed a kind of protectorate over the Teutonic powers generally, and indeed to have practically exercised it, except in the case of the Franks.

The East-Gothic dominion was now again as great in extent, and far more splendid, than it could have been in the time of Ermanaric. But it was now of a wholly different character. The dominion of Theodoric was not a barbarian but a civilized power. His twofold position ran through everything. He was at once national king of the Goths, and successor, though without any imperial titles, of the Roman emperors of the West. The two nations, differing in manners, language, and religion, lived side by side on the soil of Italy; each was ruled according to its own law, by the prince who was, in his two separate characters, the common sovereign of both. The picture of Theodoric's rule is drawn for us in the state papers drawn up in his name and in the names of his successors by his Roman minister Cassiodorus. The Goths seem to have been thick on the ground in northern Italy; in the south they formed little more than garrisons. In Theodoric's theory the Goth was the armed protector of the peaceful Roman; the Gothic king had the toil of government, while the Roman consul had the honour. All the forms of the Roman administration went on, and the Roman polity and Roman culture had great influence on the Goths themselves. The

rule of the prince over two distinct nations in the same land was necessarily despotic; the old Teutonic freedom was necessarily lost. Such a system as that which Theodoric established needed a Theodoric to carry it on. It broke in pieces after his death.

On the death of Theodoric (526) the East and West Goths were again separated. The few instances in which they are found acting together after this time are as scattered and incidental as they were before. Amalaric succeeded to the West-Gothic kingdom in Spain and Septimania. Provence was added to the dominion of the new East-Gothic king Athalaric, the grandson of Theodoric through his daughter Amalasontha. The weakness of the East-Gothic position in Italy now showed itself. The long wars of Justinian's reign (535-555) recovered Italy for the empire, and the Gothic name died out on Italian soil. The chance of forming a national state in Italy by the union of Roman and Teutonic elements, such as those which arose in Gaul, in Spain, and in parts of Italy under Lombard rule, was thus lost. The East-Gothic kingdom was destroyed before Goths and Italians had at all mingled together. The war of course made the distinction stronger; under the kings who were chosen for the purposes of the war national Gothic feeling had revived. The Goths were now again, if not a wandering people, yet an armed host, no longer the protectors but the enemies of the Roman people of Italy. The East-Gothic dominion and the East-Gothic name wholly passed away. The nation had followed Theodoric. It is only once or twice after his expedition that we hear of Goths, or even of Gothic leaders, in the eastern provinces. From the soil of Italy the nation passed away almost without a trace, while the next Teutonic conquerors stamped their name on the two ends of the land, one of which keeps it to this day.

The West-Gothic kingdom lasted much longer, and came much nearer to establishing itself as a national power in the lands which it took in. But the difference of race and faith between the Arian Goths and the Catholic Romans of Gaul and Spain influenced the history of the West-Gothic kingdom for a long time. The Arian Goths ruled over Catholic subjects, and were surrounded by Catholic neighbours. The Franks were Catholics from their first conversion; the Suevi became Catholics much earlier than the Goths. The African conquests of Belisarius gave the Goths of Spain, instead of the Arian Vandals, another Catholic neighbour in the form of the restored Roman power. The Catholics everywhere preferred either Roman, Suevian, or Frankish rule to that of the heretical Goths; even the unconquerable mountaineers of Cantabria seem for a while to have received a Frankish governor. In some other mountain districts the Roman inhabitants long maintained their independence, and in 534 a large part of the south of Spain, including the great cities of Cadiz, Cordova, Seville, and New Carthage, was, with the good will of its Roman inhabitants, reunited to the empire, which kept some points on the coast as late as 624. That is to say, the same work which the empire was carrying on in Italy against the East-Goths was at the same moment carried on in Spain against the West-Goths. But in Italy the whole land was for a while won back, and the Gothic power passed away for ever. In Spain the Gothic power outlived the Roman power, but it outlived it only by itself becoming in some measure Roman. The greatest period of the Gothic power as such was in the reign of Leovigild (567-586). He reunited the Gaulish and Spanish parts of the kingdom which had been parted for a moment; he united the Suevian dominion to his own; he overcame some of the independent districts, and won back part of the recovered Roman province in southern Spain. He further established the power of the crown over the Gothic nobles, who were beginning to grow into territorial lords.

The next reign, that of his son Recared (586-601), was marked by a change which took away the great hindrance which had thus far stood in the way of any national union between Goths and Romans. The king and the greater part of the Gothic people embraced the Catholic faith. A vast degree of influence now fell into the hands of the Catholic bishops; the two nations began to unite; the Goths were gradually Romanized, and the Gothic language began to go out of use. In short, the Romance nation and the Romance speech of Spain began to be formed. The Goths supplied the Teutonic infusion into the Roman mass. The kingdom, however, still remained a Gothic kingdom. "Gothic," not "Roman" or "Spanish," is its formal title; only a single late instance of the use of the formula "regnum Hispania" is known. In the first half of the 7th century that name became for the first time geographically applicable by the conquest of the still Roman coast of southern Spain. The empire was then engaged in the great struggle with the Avars and Persians, and now that the Gothic kings were Catholic, the great objection to their rule on the part of the Roman inhabitants was taken away. The Gothic nobility still remained a distinct class, and held, along with the Catholic prelate, the right of choosing the king. Union with the Catholic Church was accompanied by the introduction of the ecclesiastical ceremony of anointing, a change decidedly favourable to elective rule. The growth of those later ideas which tended again to favour the hereditary doctrine had not time to grow up in Spain before the Mahometan conquest (711). The West-Gothic crown therefore remained elective till the end. The modern Spanish nation is the growth of the long struggle with the Mussulmans; but it has a direct connexion with the West-Gothic kingdom. We see at once that the Goths hold altogether a different place in Spanish memory from that which they hold in Italian memory. In Italy the Goth was but a momentary invader and ruler; the Teutonic element in Italy comes from other sources. In Spain the Goth supplies an important element in the modern nation. And that element has been neither forgotten nor despised. Part of the unconquered region of northern Spain, the land of Asturia, kept for a while the name of *Gothia*, as did the Gothic possessions in Gaul and in Crim. The name of the people who played so great a part in all southern Europe, and who actually ruled over so large a part of it, has now wholly passed away; but it is in Spain that its historical impress is to be looked for.

Of Gothic literature in the Gothic language we have the Bible of Ulfila, and some other religious writings and fragments (see notice of Gothic Language below). Of Gothic legislation in Latin, we have the edict of Theodoric of the year 500, lately edited by Bluhme in the *Monumenta Germanica Historica*; and the books of *Variae* of Cassiodorus may pass as a collection of the state papers of Theodoric and his immediate successors. Among the West-Goths written laws had already been put forth by Euric (466-484). The second Alaric (484-507) put forth a *Breviarium* of Roman law for his Roman subjects; but the great collection of West-Gothic laws dates from the later days of the monarchy, being put forth by King Rekisvinth about 654. This code gave occasion to some well-known comments by Montesquieu and Gibbon, and have been discussed by Savigny (*Geschichte des Römischen Rechts*, ii. 65) and various other writers. They are printed in the old collections of Lindenberg and Heineccius. They do not seem to have been yet reprinted in the *Monumenta Germanica*. Of special Gothic histories, besides that of Jordanis, already so often quoted, there is the Gothic history of Isidor, archbishop of Seville, a special source of the history of the West-Gothic kings down to Siunthala (621-631). But all the Latin and Greek writers contemporary with the days of Gothic pre-