

# Leeds Studies in English

## Article:

Cecily Clark, "'France" and "French" in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle', *Leeds Studies in English*, n.s. 3 (1969), 35-45

## Permanent URL:

[https://ludos.leeds.ac.uk:443/R/-?func=dbin-jump-full&object\\_id=122570&silos\\_library=GEN01](https://ludos.leeds.ac.uk:443/R/-?func=dbin-jump-full&object_id=122570&silos_library=GEN01)



*Leeds Studies in English*  
School of English  
University of Leeds  
<http://www.leeds.ac.uk/lse>

## “FRANCE” AND “FRENCH” IN THE *ANGLO-SAXON CHRONICLE*

By CECILY CLARK

Ʒus he ferde into France . . .

ASC 1131<sup>1</sup>

Ten years ago I assumed this phrase to mean that the subject, Henry, abbot of Saint-Jean d'Angély and of Peterborough, left Cluny, in Burgundy, for the French royal domain,<sup>2</sup> since that is what “*Francia*” or “*France*” often denotes in texts of this date; apparently analogous expressions include Eadmer’s “*transita Francia, Burgundiam intravimus*” and “*relicta Burgundia, Anselmus Franciam ivit*.”<sup>3</sup> Such a sense fits the context well enough: Henry had just promised the abbot of Cluny to go to Peterborough and bring the abbey there into the Cluniac Order, and his route from Cluny to Peterborough might well have crossed the French royal domain.

Now, however, maturer consideration leads me to question this interpretation, partly because of the form of the sentence, “Ʒus he ferde into France & Ʒær wunode eall Ʒet gear.” The other sentences beginning with “Ʒus” in this group of annals (neither, admittedly, identical in syntax with the one under investigation) — 1127/53 “Ʒus earmlice wæs Ʒone abbotrice gifen . . .” and 1128/28 “Ʒus earmlice wearð eall Ʒet folc swengt” — both summarize episodes just described. For sentences indicating further development the usual headwords are “*siððon*,” “& swa,” “*Ʒa*” (with inversion), or “& Ʒeonen”; “Ʒus” seems not to be used here for this purpose. If, then, this sentence, “Ʒus he ferde into France, & Ʒær wunode eall Ʒet gear,” summarizes the preceding episode, the sense “royal domain” for “*France*” is out of the question. Henry, having left Peterborough before Easter, had gone first to Normandy, then to his other abbey in Poitou, and then to Cluny, where he stayed for an unspecified time before returning to England in 1132. To summarize this journey — and that the sentence is a summary is supported by its second half “& Ʒær wunode eall Ʒet gear” — the sense required for “*France*” would be “the realm feudally subject to the king of France.” The question is whether such a sense for “*France*” is possible in early twelfth-century English.

The term “*Francia*,” coined for “land of the Franks,” was current at least from the time of Gregory of Tours.<sup>4</sup> In early Franco-Latin writings it is applied only to the territories the Franks had first conquered and settled in Gaul, not to those they later acquired. Thus, for the late eighth-century

continuator of the so-called *Chronicle of Fredegar* it can exclude on the one side Luxeuil and on the other Bourges and Thouars.<sup>5</sup> Such restricted senses remain current even after the later vast extension of the Carolingian Empire:<sup>6</sup> for instance, the *History of the Sons of Louis the Pious*, by Charlemagne's grandson Nithard, uses "Francia" by no means synonymously with "Gallia," let alone with the Empire, but to denote only the area between the Loire and the Rhine, excluding not only Aquitaine but Touraine as well.<sup>7</sup>

The *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, however, although apparently compiled in the ninth century, long after the establishment of the Frankish hegemony, refers in its earlier annals only to "Gallia" and "Galwalas," even describing the Frankish bishop Agilbert as "of Galwalum" and siting his bishopric of Paris "on Galwalum bi Signe."<sup>8</sup> In this it is following its main source for this period, Bede's *Ecclesiastical History*. Bede, even though he often uses "Franci," "gens Francorum," "regnum Francorum," "regio Francorum" (but never "Francia" itself), will also use "Gallus" and "Gallia" even for referring specifically to Franks, so that Agilbert is called "nattione quidem Gallus" and said to return to "Galliam" to become bishop of Paris, and likewise certain princes are sent "in Galliam" to be fostered by King Dagobert.<sup>9</sup> And, like the *Chronicle*, the ninth-century *Old-English Bede* also keeps the original terminology in such contexts.<sup>10</sup> In these works usage was no doubt governed by respect for the source and its classical style; but similar usage can be found about the same date in the *Old-English Martyrology* also, where not only towns outside Nithard's "Francia," such as Limoges, Vienne, Epagny (near Dijon) and Tours, are said to be "in Gallia mægðe" or "on Galwala mægðe," but also others in its very heart, such as Amiens and the near-by Péronne (*dép. Somme*).<sup>11</sup>

In these ninth-century texts conservatism is by no means due to ignorance of the Franks and their affairs, for contacts between the two peoples were frequent. King Æthelwulf, for instance, was not only, at the end of his life, briefly married to the Frankish princess Judith but he also employed a Frankish monk called Felix as his secretary and was in correspondence with at least one Frankish abbot.<sup>12</sup> And in the Alfredian period Frankish influence grows, with the presence in England of Continental scholars such as Grimbold of Saint-Bertin, a native of what is now the Pas-de-Calais.<sup>13</sup> Thus, Asser, who may himself have travelled on the Continent, modelled his *Life of Alfred* on Einhard's *Life of Charlemagne*.<sup>14</sup> And in the *Chronicle* itself the late ninth century produced a group of entries giving detailed accounts of the "Franca" and of their country, now called "Francland."<sup>15</sup> What "Francland" denotes here can hardly be defined at all closely: Ghent and the Meuse it certainly includes, but what it may exclude there seems nothing to show; but perhaps the way "westrice" is used in the annal for 885 may imply that Old English "Francland" denotes the whole Frankish Empire rather than "Francia" in Nithard's restricted sense.<sup>16</sup>

Then, during the whole tenth century, and this in spite of the frequent and close contacts between the two countries during the Benedictine Revival, the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* hardly mentions "Francland" at all.<sup>17</sup> Elsewhere, however, in works of this period "Francland," "Francena rice," do occur, with at least one example confirming the suspicion that "Frankish Empire" was a possible sense for these terms. For Ælfric, in his *Life of St Oswald*, uses "Francland" to render Bede's "Germaniae . . . partes" in a context

where the reference to "sanctissimum Fresonum gentis archiepiscopum Uilbrordum" shows that the Frisian mission-field, which was part of the realm of Charles Martel and his sons, is meant.<sup>18</sup> Moreover, elsewhere Ælfric can use "Francland," "Francena rice," to mean neither "Frankish Empire" nor yet "Francia" in the narrow sense but "Gallia": thus, in his *Life of St Maurice* and his *Life of St Denis*, both of which are set in Roman times, "Francland" and "Francena rice" appear regularly, with "Francan," for the people to whom Denis preached,<sup>19</sup> whereas corresponding Latin *Lives* speak only of "Gallia."<sup>20</sup> So far, then, evidence for the meaning of Old English "Francland" seems to be pointing away from a restricted sense like that of Nithard's "Francia."

By the eleventh century, nevertheless, Old English does seem to have had means of expressing quite fine distinctions in Continental nationality. In the code of laws known as *IV Ethelred*, unfortunately extant only in the twelfth-century Latin compilation *Quadripartitus*, a list of nations paying certain trading dues distinguishes minutely between "Homines de Rotomago qui ueniebant cum uino uel craspice . . . Flandrenses et Ponteiensens et Normannia et Francia . . . Hogge et Leodium et Nivella . . . Et homines imperatoris. . . ."<sup>21</sup> Not only is "Francia" distinguished from Flanders, Ponthieu and Normandy but the Norman town of Rouen and the Lotharingian ones of Huy, Liège and Nivelles are singled out; all these distinctions were presumably originally made in the vernacular — the pity is that we do not know how.

Here, of course, the way "Francia" (and by implication the original Old English term, whatever it may have been) is contrasted with the northern provinces shows that the meaning is no longer the post-Carolingian one "area between the Loire and the Rhine" but the contemporary Capetian one "royal domain." This sense for "Francia" and "France" remains common in Continental usage during the eleventh and twelfth centuries, even though by this time a generalized sense, "the realm feudally subject to the king of France," had also been developed;<sup>22</sup> the narrow sense appears, for instance, in charters of Philip I of France,<sup>23</sup> and also in Suger's *Life of Louis le Gros* (written between 1138 and 1145), where "Francia" regularly excludes the great fiefs held from the French crown, Aquitaine, Normandy, Berry, Auvergne.<sup>24</sup> In the vernacular likewise, although the *Chanson de Roland* does give "dulce France" the widest possible meaning,<sup>25</sup> Wace's twelfth-century Norman-French still represents "France" as excluding Normandy:

Quant io de France repairai,  
A Chaem longues conuersai. . . .<sup>26</sup>

After the first extant appearance of "Francia" from an English source in *IV Ethelred*, the terms "Francia," "Francland," "Francrice," "France" for "royal domain" become well-established in England by the late eleventh century, both in the vernacular and in Anglo-Latin. They are common in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*. Thus, in 1087 the Conqueror's last raid across his own frontier into the region of Mantes is thus described: "For Willelm cyng of Normandige into France mid fyrde, & hergode uppan his agenne hlaford, Philippe þam cyngē," where the juxtaposition of the two names brings out their contrast. So, too, in 1090 it is said of Philip of France, who,

until bought off, had been besieging a castle in Normandy, that he "ferde ongean to France." Elsewhere it is clear that a frontier runs between the two territories: in 1111 Henry I "ferde ofer sæ into Normandig for unsehte þe wið him hæfdon sume be þam gemæran of France"; and in 1116 there is mention of "castelas genumene betwux France & Normandig." "France" is similarly distinguished from other provinces: in 1076 Bretons besieged in the castle at Dol-de-Bretagne "hine heoldon þet se cyng com of Francland" ("from France": until 1090 the title is invariably "Franca cyng" or "Francena cyng," with "cyng of France" not appearing until 1094); in 1085 a similar distinction between "France" and Brittany is made in the phrase "of Francrice and of Brytlande"; in 1102, in one of the Peterborough Interpolations, a double distinction is drawn in "sum of Aluearnie, sum of France & sum of Flandres." Then in 1119 there is an implied distinction highly relevant to the present argument, when Calixtus II, who (although the *Chronicle* does not specify these places in these contexts) had just been elected at Cluny and crowned at Vienne,<sup>27</sup> is then said to travel "into France to Ræins"; but unfortunately the annalist does not make clear just what is here contrasted with "France."<sup>28</sup> A narrow sense is again used in the entry for 1129, which the handwriting shows to have been written at the same time as the one for 1131 from which we started, in the sentence "& Hugo [Gerueises sunu] ferde ham to his agen land to France." Now, according to Ordericus, Hugh FitzGervase, although closely associated with the Norman baronage because of his maternal descent from the Montgomery-Bellême family, was lord "de Novo Castello,"<sup>29</sup> which Le Prévost identifies as Châteauneuf-en-Thimerais (dép. Eure-et-Loir);<sup>30</sup> and Châteauneuf-en-Thimerais, in the county of Dreux, was in the French royal domain.<sup>31</sup> Thus a narrow sense of "France" was current in the later annals of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, both in those composed at Peterborough and in the earlier ones copied from a source of uncertain provenance. And so it is in Anglo-Latin writings. Eadmer, for instance, apart from the sentences already quoted in which he distinguishes "Francia" from "Burgundia," can say "per Angliam, Franciam et Normanniam";<sup>32</sup> and Hugh the Chantor too speaks of "Francia, Normannia, Anglia."<sup>33</sup> Yet, considering the frequency of the English phrase "se cyng of France" (and sometimes also in Latin "rex Francie" beside the normal "rex Francorum"), with its implications of the widest sense, this restricted sense of "France" can by no means be held to have had the field to itself.

For determining what range of senses "France" may have had in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* those of the corresponding adjective "frencisc" may be relevant. This first appears in English<sup>34</sup> in the annal for 1003 (CDEF), just after Æthelred's marriage to Emma of Normandy had begun that series of alliances with Normandy which was to end in the Conquest, in an entry which says, with a touch of xenophobic petulance, "Her wæs Exacester tobrocen þuruh þone Franciscan ceorl Hugan ðe seo hlæfdige hire hæfde geset to gerefan."

Now, in Continental usage "Francus," and "Francigena," commonly bear a narrow sense corresponding to that of "Francia." Thus, William of Poitiers, for instance, whose earlier material gave him the best of reasons for distinguishing "Franci" from "Normanni," lists "Francigenae" as just

one of the many regional groups represented at Hastings: "Institerunt eis Cenomanici, Francigenae, Britanni, Aquitani, sed cum praecipua virtute Normanni."<sup>35</sup> As for Suger, he even uses "Franci" to denote specifically the king's army as distinct from other men no less his immediate subjects for being momentarily rebellious.<sup>36</sup> French vernacular material shows a similar range of meanings: thus, in the *Chanson de Roland*, where "France" and "Franceis," like "dulce France," often bear the very widest sense,<sup>37</sup> the "Franceis" can nevertheless (just as also in the late twelfth-century *Lais* and *Fables* of Marie de France)<sup>38</sup> still be simply one regional group among many:

Bavier e Saisnes sunt alet a conseil  
 E Peitevin e Norman e Franceis;  
 Asez i ad Alemans e Tiedeis;  
 Icels d'Alverne i sunt li plus curteis . . . .<sup>39</sup>

Why, then, does the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, in an entry more or less contemporary with *IV Ethelred* and its fine distinctions, call this Hugo, in Norman service, "frencisc"? It might, of course, be that, although serving Normans, Hugo was not himself a Norman and that the *Chronicle* was punctiliously recording this. On the other hand, the corresponding entries in the twelfth-century renderings by Henry of Huntingdon and by the *Chronicon ex Chronicis* (both admittedly made long after any living memory of people or events of 1003 had been lost) speak respectively of "Hugonem vero Normannum"<sup>40</sup> and "Nortmannici comitis Hugonis."<sup>41</sup> Possibly, since at much the same time Ælfric could use "Francland" for "Roman Gaul," there seemed in 1003 nothing incongruous, at any rate when legal points were not involved, in giving "frencisc" a sense wide enough to embrace that of "Norman" also. Certainly a rather lax view of foreign nationality seems suggested when 1048 E (for 1051) simply calls the French colony in Herefordshire led by Earl Ralph "the Timid" (not a Norman, as his father was Dreux, count of the French Vexin) "þa Welisce menn," with no attempt to particularise their nationality.<sup>41a</sup>

At all events, "frencisc," fairly common in the *Chronicle* from the mid-eleventh century onwards, continues to be used in contexts implying a comprehensive sense, as, for instance, when applied to the Confessor's Continental followers, including Robert of Jumièges.<sup>42</sup> True again, not all these men were Normans and the *Chronicle* might be acknowledging this; but, on the other hand, some at least of the twelfth-century versions, including those of "Florence,"<sup>43</sup> of William of Malmesbury,<sup>44</sup> and of Gaimar,<sup>45</sup> again say "Norman" where the *Chronicle* says "French." Furthermore, the *Chronicle* also uses "frencisc" of William of Normandy's men, both in 1052 D (for 1051)<sup>46</sup> and again in 1066 D, where the outcome of the Battle of Hastings is that "þa Frencyscan ahton wælstowe gewæld":<sup>47</sup> a context where both Henry of Huntingdon and William of Malmesbury consistently speak of "Normanni."<sup>48</sup> After the Conquest "frencisc" is still the only term the *Chronicle* knows for the Conqueror's men.<sup>49</sup>

Why English persists in ignoring the distinction so many Continental and Anglo-Latin writers draw between "Franci" and "Normanni" is not at first sight clear; any pre-Conquest vagueness about Continental nationality would hardly have survived the Norman settlement. The separate identity

of the province of Normandy is certainly recognised: after one early reference to "Ricardes rice,"<sup>50</sup> the term "Normandige" is firmly established in *Chronicle* usage by the time of the Conquest and is thenceforward common, often, as we have seen, in contrast with "France." To some extent the reason why a corresponding adjective was lacking may have been linguistic since, at least as late as the times when the C and D entries for 1066 were written,<sup>51</sup> "Normen" was still current in English in the sense "Norwegians" (Latin "Norici" or "Norwagenses"; Old French "Norreis"), so that an English equivalent of "Normannus" might not have been easy to fit into the linguistic pattern. But, awkward though this homonymic clash might have been, insuperable it was not; for in the English text of certain laws promulgated by the Conqueror, probably early in his reign, and preserved in the early twelfth-century *Textus Roffensis* there occurs the phrase "æfter Norðmandiscere lage,"<sup>52</sup> proof that when precision in such a respect was needed in English it was attainable now just as it seems to have been in *IV Ethelred*. Yet, outside such legal contexts linguistic difficulty might perhaps have been allowed to hinder the adoption of an adjective "Norman." But the case is less simple. For this same legal text shows that for the Anglo-Norman administration too a broad distinction between "French" and "English" served: "Gif Englisc man beclypað ænigne Frænciscne mann . . .," with the Latin of *Quadripartitus* likewise saying, "Si Anglicus homo compellet aliquem Francigenam . . .," and so consistently throughout both versions. Similar usage also occurs in other Anglo-Norman documents, such as the Conqueror's charter to the burgesses of London<sup>53</sup> and Henry I's Coronation charter.<sup>54</sup> This suggests that the broader term may in fact have been the more precise: since by no means all the Conqueror's followers were Norman,<sup>55</sup> to have addressed charters only to "Normans and English" or to have drafted laws so to apply would have left loopholes for those who could claim to be neither. So, with the Anglo-Norman chancery calling the Conqueror's men "Franci," or "Francigenae," there would have been little call for English writers, already accustomed to use "frencisc" comprehensively, to devise a more analytic terminology. Anglo-Latin writers also will use "Franci" interchangeably with "Normanni";<sup>56</sup> and Gaimar and Wace likewise (though the latter less often) hesitate between "Norman" and "Franceis".<sup>57</sup>

Yet, comprehensive though it was, the *Chronicle's* "frencisc" did not embrace those from all the great fiefs of the French crown, not even when such men were settled in England under the Norman banner. Thus, in the annal for 1080 "frencisce & flemisce" seem to figure as mutually exclusive terms, even though the Flemings concerned had settled in Durham as allies of the Normans. And in 1075 a contrast between "frencisc" and "bryttisc" (in the sense "Breton"), although not made explicit, seems implied by the consistent use of "Bryttas" to refer to Ralph of Gaël and his associates, former close allies of the Normans though they were; perhaps the more specific term was chosen here to distinguish the dissident "Breton" element from the loyal Norman settlers.<sup>58</sup> At all events, the pattern of these distinctions, French/Flemish/Breton, raises the question whether, in spite of opinions that have been expressed to the contrary,<sup>59</sup> linguistic differences were already governing awareness of nationality; whether "frencisc," elastic though its sense was, applied only to Romance-speakers as distinct from speakers of Celtic or Germanic languages.

However that may be, the *Chronicle's* "frencisc" certainly had a wide sense, so that in so far as it reacted on that of "France" it could only have strengthened the wide sense of the latter implicit in the phrase "se cyng of France."

Before deciding whether the entry for 1131, "Þus he ferde into France," uses the wide or the narrow sense of "France," we must consider how detailed a grasp of political geography can be expected of an English annalist of this period.

Certainly the main regions with which our annalists show acquaintance are those bordering the English Channel, ports such as Wissant and the various Norman strongholds and battlefields. Provinces other than Normandy and Flanders get only passing mention, with Champagne, Blois and Anjou being used only in titles;<sup>60</sup> "Mans," "Manige," or "Mannie," occurs several times in the context of Continental warfare;<sup>61</sup> and Poitou is twice mentioned in the group of annals with which we are concerned as the country from which Henry of Angély had come, with the inaccurate detail that Saintes and Angély were "five miles" apart.<sup>62</sup> There is little sign of acquaintance with the more southerly regions: we have already seen that, although the 1119 annalist was aware that the election and coronation of Calixtus II took place outside what he calls "France," he is far from precise in the matter. How weak geographical terminology could be at twelfth-century Peterborough is indeed shown by Hugo Candidus's apparent ignorance even of the normal Latin forms of many French place-names, including "Cluni" itself.<sup>63</sup>

For Burgundy, indeed, there is little evidence that any English term was readily available at this time, since "Burgundy" and "Burgundians" seem not to be recorded in Middle English until two centuries or so later;<sup>64</sup> but such a lack is never insuperable, and this one had been supplied in English before — witness not only the *Orosius*<sup>65</sup> and the *Chronicle's* own earlier reference to "Burgundia"<sup>66</sup> but also the way the *Martyrology* speaks of Langres, "on Burgunda mægðe æt Linguna ceastre"<sup>67</sup> — and could no doubt have been so again, given the will and the knowledge. But the problems concerning Burgundy go beyond mere terminology. There were at this time two "Burgundies": the duchy, held from the French crown by the Capetian dukes, and the kingdom, which from about 1038 owed a vague allegiance to the German Empire, with the boundary between the two being formed by the Rhône and the Saône, so that Cluny, with the rest of the Mâconnais, lay in the duchy,<sup>68</sup> whereas Vienne and Lyon were in the kingdom. Eadmer, it should be remembered, was not only far more widely travelled in these regions than the average English monastic chronicler but had done his travelling in the company of Anselm, who had been born and brought up on the Lombardo-Burgundian border;<sup>69</sup> yet even he is not wholly precise in dealing with this area, for sometimes his "Burgundia," including as it does not only Lyon but Aosta,<sup>70</sup> must mean the kingdom, and sometimes it must mean the duchy, as when "transita Francia, Burgundiam intravimus" leads first to encounter with the Duke, then to arrival at Cluny.<sup>71</sup> As for Ordericus, his account succeeds in being more definite only by being more limited: his "Burgundia," which he certainly differentiates from "Francia"



and which includes Fontenay, Saint-Florentin, Molesmes and Auxerre<sup>72</sup> but nothing outside this area, seems to mean only the duchy. How vague an English annalist might be about this area we have already noted from the entry at 1119. How far, then, the Peterborough annalist could be expected to draw precise distinctions concerning these regions must remain uncertain; presumably, like his predecessor, he would have less awareness of the Franco-Burgundian border than of the Franco-Norman one concerned in so many of the wars the *Chronicle* reports.

Nothing in the evidence, then, is incompatible with a wide sense, embracing Normandy, Poitou and the French duchy of Burgundy, for the term "France" in the annal for 1131. Although it is true that narrow senses for this term do predominate in the *Chronicle*, yet nevertheless the generalized sense, current in works such as the *Chanson de Roland*, is implicit in the *Chronicle's* own phrase "se cyng of France" and would have been reinforced by the frequent use of "frencisc" in a comprehensive sense. And, for general reasons as well as syntactic ones, the sentence as a whole seems likely to be offering a summary of the journey already made rather than an analytic account of a fresh stage. "France" here has, therefore (allowance being made for differences in frontiers), approximately the modern sense.<sup>73</sup>

---

## NOTES

- <sup>1</sup> C. Clark, ed., *The Peterborough Chronicle 1070-1154* (Oxford, 1958), pp. 53-4; see also note, p. 92. For that part of the text which it covers I cite from my own edition; other references are to B. Thorpe, ed., *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, I (Rolls Series, 1861), with annal-numbers as given there, not as corrected.
- <sup>2</sup> For the extent of this, see W. M. Newman, *Le domaine royal sous les premiers Capétiens 987-1180* (Paris, 1937).
- <sup>3</sup> M. Rule, ed., *Eadmeri Historia Novorum in Anglia*, etc. (Rolls Series, 1884), pp. 89 and 411 (*Vita Anselmi*); for similar passages see also 165, 317.
- <sup>4</sup> H. Omont and G. Collon, eds., *Grégoire de Tours: Histoire des Francs*, new edn., rev. R. Poupardin (Paris, 1913), p. 45.
- <sup>5</sup> J. M. Wallace-Hadrill, ed. and trans., *The Fourth Book of the Chronicle of Fredegar, with its Continuations* (1960), pp. 82/4-5, 112/15-16 and 22-23, 117/1-5.
- <sup>6</sup> Post-Carolingian senses of "Francia" are illustrated by Maps V, VI, VII (a-d) and VIII in L. Mirot, *Manuel de géographie historique de la France*, 2 vols., 2nd edn., rev. A. Mirot (Paris, 1947-50); and by Maps III (b) and IV in J. Calmette, *Atlas historique*, II: *Le moyen âge* (Paris, 1951). See also P. Lauer, "De la signification du mot 'France': aux époques mérovingienne et carolingienne," *Bulletin de la Société de l'Histoire de Paris et de l'Île de France*, XLII (1915), 53-8, and other references there given.
- <sup>7</sup> P. Lauer, ed. and trans., *Nithard: Histoire des fils de Louis le Pieux*, CHFMA (Paris, 1926), pp. 37/note 5, 46/2-8, 74/note 1, 100/9-14.

- <sup>8</sup> s.a. 650 A/649 BCE (cf. note 34 below); 660 ABE/659 C; compare 693 DEF only.
- <sup>9</sup> C. Plummer, ed., *Venerabilis Baedae Historia Ecclesiastica*, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1896), I, 140, 141, 126; the editor remarks how, just as there is no single word for "England," only "Britannia," so "the opposite continent of Europe, though largely occupied by the Franks, is still Gallia or Galliae" (II, 149). Note also that similar usage continues in the tenth-century Latin of Æthelweard's *Chronicle*, which has only "Gallia," not "Francia," and can use "Galli" to signify Franks (A. Campbell, ed. and trans., 1962, esp. p. 25).
- <sup>10</sup> T. Miller, ed., *The Old English Version of Bede's Ecclesiastical History of the English People*, Part I, EETS 95 and 96 (1890-91). Note that the Alfredian *Orosius*, in spite of other changes it makes here (see below, note 65), makes equally little attempt to modernize the account of "Gallia Belgica" in this respect (H. Sweet, ed., EETS 79 (1883, pp. 22, 24).
- <sup>11</sup> G. Herzfeld, ed. and trans., *An Old-English Martyrology*, EETS 116 (1900), pp. 110/7, 200/5, 204/6, 196/18, 20/20.
- <sup>12</sup> Dorothy Whitelock, ed. and trans., *English Historical Documents c.500-1042* (1955), pp. 809-10.
- <sup>13</sup> P. Grierson, "Grimbald of St. Bertin's," *EHR*, LV (1940), 529-61, esp. 530; see also J. M. Bately, "Grimbald of St. Bertin's," *Medium Ævum*, XXXV (1966), 1-10.
- <sup>14</sup> W. H. Stevenson, ed., *Asser's Life of King Alfred*, new impression, with an article by Dorothy Whitelock (Oxford, 1959), pp. lxxxi-lxxxii, xciii-xciv, cxxxiv, and lxxviii, xc, 291-2, 294, 305-6; cf. Marie Schütt, "The Literary Form of Asser's 'Vita Alfredi'," *EHR* LXXII (1957), 209-20.
- <sup>15</sup> s.a. 880 ABDEF/881 C; 881 ABDE/882 C; 882 ABDEF/883 C; 883 ABDEF/884 C; 884 ABDE/885 C; 885 ABDEF/886 C; 886 ABDE/887 C; 887 ABDEF/888 C; 890 ABDEF/891 C.
- <sup>16</sup> s.a. 880 ABDEF/881 C; 882 ABDEF/883 C; 885 ABDEF/886 C.
- <sup>17</sup> In all the tenth-century entries "Francland" is found only at 920 A.
- <sup>18</sup> W. W. Skeat, ed. and trans., *Ælfric's Lives of Saints*, 2 vols., EETS 76 and 82, 94 and 114 (1881-1900), II, 140/240; cf. Bede, ed. Plummer, I, 152.
- <sup>19</sup> *Lives of Saints*, II, 158/2, 176/132 and 137, 178/147 and 164, 180/177, 182/205.
- <sup>20</sup> For the sources of *St. Maurice* and *St. Denis*, see Grant Loomis, "Further Sources of Ælfric's Saints' Lives," *Harvard Studies and Notes in Philology and Literature*, XIII (1931), 4. "Gallia" is the term regularly used in the *Life of Dionysius, Rusticus and Eleutherius*, printed in B. Mombritius, *Sanctuarium sive Vitae Sanctorum, novam hanc editionem curaverunt duo monachi Solesmenses*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1910); in the *St Maurice* here no corresponding term seems to occur.
- <sup>21</sup> F. Liebermann, ed., *Die Gesetze der Angelsachsen*, 3 vols. (Halle, 1903-16), I, 232. For the places and political divisions concerned (apart from Ponthieu) see the map on pp. 12-13 of F. Barlow, *The English Church 1000-1066* (1963).
- <sup>22</sup> For the currency of the two senses side by side, see C. Petit-Dutaillis, *La monarchie féodale en France et en Angleterre, x<sup>e</sup> - xiii<sup>e</sup> siècle* (Paris, 1933), pp. 6-7.
- <sup>23</sup> See A. Fliche, *Le règne de Philippe I<sup>er</sup>, roi de France 1060-1108* (Paris, 1912), pp. 123-5; Fliche suggests that "Francia" can be narrowed to mean not even the whole of the small royal domain but only the chalk plateau to the north of Paris.
- <sup>24</sup> H. Waquet, ed. and trans., *Suger: Vie de Louis VI le Gros*, CHFMA (Paris, 1929), pp. 238, 240, 268; 6, 102, 110, 118, 122, 186, 196; 81, 182; 234, 236, 240.
- <sup>25</sup> See J. Bédier, *La Chanson de Roland commentée* (Paris, 1927), p. 511, s.v. FRANCE.
- <sup>26</sup> H. Andresen, ed., *Maistre Wace's Roman de Rou et des ducs de Normandie*, 2 vols. (Heilbronn, 1877-9), II, lines 5329-30.
- <sup>27</sup> U. Robert, *Histoire du Pape Calixte II* (Paris and Besançon, 1891), pp. 43-6.
- <sup>28</sup> Compare above, p. 41, on the distinction between the duchy and the kingdom of Burgundy.
- <sup>29</sup> A. Le Prévost, e.1., *Orderici Vitalis Angligenæ . . . Historia Ecclesiastica libri tredecim*, 5 vols. (Paris, 1838-55), IV, 325, 441, 455, 473; cf. G. H. White, *TRHS*, 4th ser., XVII (1934), 24.
- <sup>30</sup> *Op. cit.*, IV, 325, v, 510.
- <sup>31</sup> Newman, *Le domaine royal*, pp. 33, 91-4, 121, 131, shows the county of Dreux as consistently forming part of the French royal domain.
- <sup>32</sup> *Historia Novorum*, ed. Rule, p. 166.
- <sup>33</sup> C. Johnson, ed. and trans., *Hugh the Chantor: The History of the Church of York 1066-1127* (1961), p. 53.

- <sup>84</sup> Clearly the occurrence of "Ægebertus se Francisca" in the version of 650 peculiar to the late bilingual epitome F cannot be regarded as earlier.
- <sup>85</sup> R. Foreville, ed. and trans., *Guillaume de Poitiers: Histoire de Guillaume le Conquérant*, CHFMA (Paris, 1952), p. 192, and cf. 22, 28, 80, 144.
- <sup>86</sup> *Vie de Louis le Gros*, ed. Waquet, p. 35, where the party opposed to the "Franci" consists of certain lords of the Laon district who expressly acknowledge the young Louis as their future king.
- <sup>87</sup> See Bédier, *La Chanson de Roland commentée*, p. 512, s.v. FRANCEIS.
- <sup>88</sup> E. A. Francis, "Marie de France et son temps," *Romania*, LXII (1951), 78-9.
- <sup>89</sup> J. Bédier, ed. and trans., *La Chanson de Roland* (Paris, 1924), ll. 3793-6, also 3026 ff., 3700-03.
- <sup>90</sup> T. Arnold, ed., *Henrici Archidiaconi Huntendunensis Historia Anglorum* (Rolls Series, 1879), p. 174.
- <sup>91</sup> B. Thorpe, ed., *Florentii Wigorniensis Monachi Chronicon ex Chronicis*, 2 vols. (1848-9), I, 156. The use of "comes" here suggests that the version of the *Chronicle* being used read "eorl" rather than "ceorl" as in all the extant texts.
- <sup>91a</sup> Cf. the use of "of Weallande" in 1040 EF; see F. P. Magoun, *MLQ*, VI (1945), 378.
- <sup>92</sup> 1051 D (for 1050), "Rotbearde þan Freoncyscan"; other instances also in 1052 D (for 1051) and 1052 D and E (not corresponding passages).
- <sup>93</sup> *Chronicon ex Chronicis*, ed. Thorpe, I, 204, 210.
- <sup>94</sup> W. Stubbs, ed., *Willelmi Malmesbiriensis Monachi de Gestis Regum Anglorum libri quinque*, 2 vols. (Rolls Series, 1887-9), I, 239-44.
- <sup>95</sup> T. D. Hardy and C. T. Martin, eds., *Lestorie des Engles*, I (Rolls Series, 1888), lines 5037-40.
- <sup>96</sup> "Ða sone com Willelm eorl fram geondan sæ mid mycclum werode Franciscra manna." The controversy as to whether this is a later interpolation (D. C. Douglas, *EHR*, LXVIII (1953), 526-45, and T. J. Oleson, *EHR*, LXXII (1957), 221-8) hardly affects the present argument.
- <sup>97</sup> Cf. 1107: "& was þet an and fowertigeðe gear þæs þe Francan biþes landes weoldan."
- <sup>98</sup> *Historia Anglorum*, ed. Arnold, pp. 201 ff.; *Gesta Regum*, ed. Stubbs, I, 282 et seq., 300 et seq.
- <sup>99</sup> See, for instance, 1070/12, 38, 41; 1073/2; 1080/3, 1088/3, 77; &c.
- <sup>100</sup> 1000 CDEF; compare "Baldewines land" for Flanders, 1045 E, 1046 E, 1046\* E, 1052 D (for 1051).
- <sup>101</sup> N. R. Ker, *Catalogue of Manuscripts Containing Anglo-Saxon* (Oxford, 1957), p. 252, dates the last entries in C as contemporaneous with the events; D he dates to the late eleventh century (253-5), but see D. Whitelock et alii, ed. and trans., *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* (1961), p. xvi, for conclusive reasons for dating it after 1100.
- <sup>102</sup> Liebermann, *Gesetze*, I, 483; this example is not noted by *OED*, which gives no example of "Norman" earlier than *Lasamon A*.
- <sup>103</sup> *Ibid.*, I, 486; cf. H. W. C. Davis, *Regesta Regum Anglo-Normannorum*, I: 1066-1100 (Oxford, 1913), no. 15.
- <sup>104</sup> Liebermann, *Gesetze*, I, 551; cf. C. Johnson and H. A. Cronne, *Regesta Regum Anglo-Normannorum*, II: 1100-1135 (Oxford, 1956), no. 488. Other examples of "Francis et Anglis" may be found in Liebermann, *op. cit.*, I, 523, 524; see also T. A. M. Bishop and P. Chaplais, *Facsimiles of English Royal Writs to A.D. 1100 Presented to Vivian Hunter Galbraith* (Oxford, 1957), nos. 6, 9 and 10 ("Francis et anglis et scottis"), 12, 15 (the London charter), 27, 29. Note also the usage of the Bayeux Tapestry, "Hic Franci pugnans," "Hic ceciderunt simul Angli et Franci" (D. C. Douglas and G. W. Greenaway, ed. and trans., *English Historical Documents 1042-1189* (1953), pp. 273, 275).
- <sup>105</sup> Cf. for instance, the passage describing the combatants at Hastings quoted above, and also note 35; see F. M. Stenton, *The First Century of English Feudalism 1066-1166* (Oxford, 1932), pp. 23 ff.
- <sup>106</sup> See, for instance, *Historia Anglorum*, ed. Arnold, pp. 205, 206, 207; such usage seems commoner here than in either *Gesta Regum* or "Florence."
- <sup>107</sup> *Lestorie des Engles*, ed. Hardy and Martin, has "Norman" at ll. 5441, 5476, 5572, 5615, etc.; "Franceis" with the sense "Norman" at 5247, 5271, 5307, 5402, 5418, 5484, etc. Cf. *Roman de Rou*, ed. Andresen, II, lines 8219-23, "Tant com Normant plus s'esloignierent/E li Engleis plus s'aprocierent/Par l'esloignement des Franceis /Quiderent e distrent Engleis/Que cil de France s'en fueient . . ."; also 8313, 8396;

but Wace does often, however, distinguish "Normanz" from "Franceis" (see, for instance, 7362, and cf. the lines cited above). Note also that Lazamon, although using the adjective "Norman," describes the Jerseyman Wace as "a Frenchis cleric" (*Brut*, ed. G. L. Brook and R. F. Leslie, EETS 250 (1963), l. A 20).

- <sup>58</sup> Note that "Bretons" had been distinguished from "Franks" in 890 A: "Sant Laudan, þæt is betweoh Brettum & Francum."
- <sup>59</sup> See V. H. Galbraith, "Nationality and Language in Medieval England," *TRHS*, 4th ser., XXIII (1941), 113-28, esp. 120.
- <sup>60</sup> 1096/10; 1116/8; 1110/22, 1111/5, 1112/3, 1118/3, 1119/12, 1121/10, 1123/3, 1124/3, 22, 1127/9, 12, 18, 52.
- <sup>61</sup> 1073/2, 1087/102; 1091/8, 1099/7, 1110/20, 1111/5, 1112/3.
- <sup>62</sup> 1127/23, 1128/10; 1127/41-2. The annalist is mistaken about the distance between Saintes and Saint Jean d'Angély: it is over sixteen modern miles.
- <sup>63</sup> W. T. Mellows, ed., *The Chronicle of Hugh Candidus* (1949), p. 100.
- <sup>64</sup> See *MED*, s.v. BURGOIN E, BURGOINER, BURGUINOUN.
- <sup>65</sup> Ed. Sweet, p. 22: "Profentse hæfð be norðan hyre þa beorgas þe man Alps hæð . . . & be norðan hyre & eastan synd Burgende; & Wascan be westan," where the Latin has nothing corresponding.
- <sup>66</sup> See 1046\*E, "se arceb of Burgundia."
- <sup>67</sup> Ed. Herzfeld, p. 178.
- <sup>68</sup> A. Longnon, *La formation de l'unité française* (Paris, 1922), pp. 19-20, 62-3; also E. Jarry, *Provinces et pays de France*, iii/2: Bourgogne (Paris, 1948), pp. 83, 101, 103, 115; also G. Duby, *La Société aux xi<sup>e</sup> et xii<sup>e</sup> siècles dans la région mâconnaise* (Paris, 1953), pp. 89-90.
- <sup>69</sup> *Historia Novorum*, ed. Rule, p. 314; also *Vita Anselmi*, ed. R. W. Southern (1962), p. 3.
- <sup>70</sup> *Loc. cit.*
- <sup>71</sup> *Historia Novorum*, pp. 89-90.
- <sup>72</sup> *Historia Ecclesiastica*, ed. Le Prévost, II, 125; III, 142, 156; IV, 45; III, 139; III, 143; III, 435; III, 156.
- <sup>73</sup> It is a pleasure to express my indebtedness to Professor Whitelock, who was not only kind enough to criticize the first draft of this article in great detail but also most generously supplied me with additional material, including the references to the *Laws*, to the *Martyrology* and to the *Lives of Saints*. Without her help I should never have reached valid conclusions.