

Flodibor rex Francorum

Hermann Moisl

Introduction

From the later sixth century onwards there was a complex web of secular and ecclesiastical interaction linking Merovingian Francia, Anglo-Saxon England and Ireland.¹ One episode in this interaction was the exile of the Merovingian prince Dagobert to Ireland not long after the death of Sigibert III in 656 (or possibly 651),² and his return and reinstatement as Dagobert II, king of Austrasia in 675 or 676.³ This episode is reported in the *Liber Historiae Francorum*, completed in 727 by an unknown author working in a Neustrian monastery:

‘Pippin having died, Sigibert king of Austrasia established Grimoald, Pippin’s son, as mayor of the palace. As time passed and King Sigibert died, Grimoald had Sigibert’s little son Dagobert tonsured and instructed Dido, the bishop of the city of Poitiers, to take him on pilgrimage to Ireland, making his own son king.’⁴

While not doubting the fact of Dagobert’s exile to Ireland, historians have found the labyrinthine Merovingian political context in which this episode is embedded problematic. Various reconstructions of that context have been proposed,⁵ one of which, that of Picard,⁶ includes an entry taken from the Irish *Annals of Ulster* (hereafter AU) for the year 659, the date of which needs to be corrected to 658.⁷ ‘The killing of Orc Doth mac Sechnusaigh and of Concu mac Laidhgnein and Flodubuir king of the Franks’.⁸ No Merovingian king Flodubuir is known,⁹ and the name does not look very Merovingian in any case.¹⁰ Assuming that ‘Flodubuir’ is not a figment of the annalist’s imagination but rather a corruption of the name of an historical figure, the question is: who of the possible candidates among known Merovingian kings was Flodubuir? Various views have been expressed. In their edition of the *Annals of Ulster*, Hennessy and MacCarthy

suggested that he was Chlothar III,¹¹ and Moody et al. followed them in this.¹² Picard proposed an identification of Flodubuir with one of two Merovingian kings, the Austrasian Childebert II or the Neustrian Clovis II, and thought Childebert the more likely of the two.

The aim of the present discussion is to attempt to settle the matter. On the basis of evidence different from that used by existing commentators, the argument is that Flodubuir was in fact Clovis II. The discussion is in two main parts. The first part reviews Picard’s argument and the second presents my own attempt at identification.

Flodubuir: Picard’s identification

Picard prefaced his attempt at identification of Flodubuir with the observation that there is a syntactic ambiguity in the annal entry. At first glance the passage appears to mean ‘The slaying of Orc Doth mac Sechnusaigh and of Concu mac Laidhgnein and of Flodubuir king of the Franks’: ‘Orcdoith’ and ‘Concenn’ are Irish genitive proper noun forms,¹³ and ‘Flodubuir’ looks like the genitive form of ‘Flodubur’ comparable to, for example, the genitive form ‘Conchobuir’ of ‘Conchobur’, the king of the Ulstermen in the vernacular Irish Ulster Cycle texts. On this interpretation, however, one would expect ‘Flodubuir regis Francorum’, with ‘rex’ in the genitive rather than in the nominative singular. The alternative is to take ‘Flodubuir rex Francorum’ as syntactically independent of the preceding part of the entry, with ‘Flodubuir’ a nominative form agreeing with ‘rex’, and to read the entry as meaning that Flodubuir became king of the Franks in that year.¹⁴ To identify Flodubur/Flodubuir we are, therefore, looking for a Frankish king who was either killed or acceded to the Frankish throne in or about 658.

Picard assumed that ‘Flodubuir’ is a corruption of a Merovingian name and attempted to identify possible candidates by looking at Frankish history in the mid

seventh century. The chronology of Merovingian kings at this time has been controversial, but according to Wood the sequence was as follows:¹⁵ Sigibert III, king of Austrasia, had appointed Grimoald as his mayor of the palace; on Sigibert's death in 656, Grimoald placed his own son on the throne under the Merovingian name Childebert II, but this went down badly with the Neustrian nobility – Grimoald was seized, taken before Clovis II king of Neustria for trial and executed on Clovis' orders; Childebert managed to hold onto power in Austrasia until 662, however; in 657 Clovis II died and was succeeded by his son Chlothar III in late 657 or early 658.¹⁶ There are, therefore, four candidates for identification with Flodubur/Flodubuir: Sigibert III, Childebert II, Clovis II and Chlothar III, all of whom either died or acceded to kingship at about the time of the AU entry.

Picard points out that there are only two other references to Frankish kings in the Irish annals, the deaths of Charlemagne and Louis the Pious, and that none of our four candidates had anything approaching the pan-European stature of these two kings. Inclusion of Flodubur/Flodubuir must therefore be an artefact of some particular connection between Ireland and Francia. As already noted, Picard argues that this connection had to do with the despatch of the Merovingian prince Dagobert to Ireland. Confirmation comes from Stephen's early eighth-century *Life of Wilfrid*,¹⁷ which says that Dagobert had been in Irish exile in his youth, and that, after some years, had returned 'well supplied with weapons'¹⁸ from Ireland with the help of everyone's favourite fixer, Wilfrid,¹⁹ to be installed on the Austrasian throne; this happened in 675 or 676. Given Stephen's corroboration, therefore, we can take it as certain that a major Frankish cleric and a Merovingian prince arrived in Ireland around 651/6, and that the prince remained there for two decades or so. If one assumes that (i) Dagobert, who was only a child in 651/6, had a Frankish retinue with him, (ii) the Franks were staying in some important place in Ireland, like a royal court or a monastery, and (iii) the Franks would have kept in touch with events back home, then we have a good explanation for the insertion of the Flodubur/Flodubuir entry: the death or accession of a Merovingian king would have been noteworthy for the Franks, and its importance would have been conveyed to their Irish hosts and duly noted in the Irish annals for that year.

This gives a plausible explanation for the inclusion of Flodubur/Flodubuir in AU, but gets one no further with identification. Picard goes on to argue that the involvement of the monastic *familia* of St Fursey in the Dagobert affair makes it possible to narrow identification of Flodubur/Flodubuir to two of the four possible contenders.²⁰ The argument is as follows. The Irish monk Fursey and his brothers Foillan and Ultan founded a group of monasteries in Francia during the mid seventh century under the patronage of Merovingian kings and the Frankish

aristocracy. They also retained contact with their home monasteries of Louth and Slane. Ultan, in particular, was involved in arranging the exile of Dagobert, harbouring him in a Fursean monastery in Ireland – most likely Slane – and then arranging for his return. The Fursean *familia* was, in short, deeply involved in Frankish politics, and had its own monastic interests to protect. As such, it would have had reason to note the accession of Childebert II or the death of Clovis II, its patrons in Austrasia and Neustria respectively, but no particular reason to note the death of Sigibert III or the accession of Chlothar III. Flodubur/Flodubuir is, consequently, to be identified with either Childebert or Clovis, with Childebert the more likely, as already noted.²¹

Flodubuir: proposed identification

In attempting to relate AU's 'Flodubuir' to the candidate Frankish name forms, two possible types of source for the entry have to be reckoned with. On the one hand is the possibility that a documentary source was brought to Ireland at some stage and then used by the annalist; Bishop Dido is a plausible provider, but others are, of course, possible because the entry is not necessarily contemporary – monks returning to Ireland from one of the Fursean monasteries in Francia could have brought a documentary source with them, for example. On the other hand, the source might have been reported to the Irish annalist orally. Dido is the obvious medium, but again this is not necessary; it could have come from an English intermediary rather than directly from a Frankish speaker.²²

If one postulates a documentary source for the entry, then the first step must be to determine what the putative basis for 'Flodubuir' might have looked like. This can be established by a survey of the relevant name-forms in Frankish documents covering the Merovingian period. Three documents are here selected for this purpose: Gregory of Tours' late sixth-century *Historia Francorum*,²³ the later seventh-century *Chronicle of Fredegar*,²⁴ and the *Liber Historiae Francorum*,²⁵ completed in 727 as already noted. Together these give a good random sample of Merovingian name spellings from the late sixth to the early eighth century. There are three caveats, however. Firstly, there is no guarantee that the three texts chosen exhaust all spelling possibilities. Secondly, seventh-century Frankish orthography was not standardized. At this early stage in the development of post-classical scriptoria in Europe individual writing centres developed their own house styles, and these were often at variance with classical Latin orthography.²⁶ There is, in other words, always the possibility that the spelling in the supposed documentary source underlying 'Flodubuir' was different from that in the above sample texts. Finally, most of the manuscript copies of these sample texts date from Carolingian (and later) times, when there was a conscious policy of correcting what was perceived

to be the faulty Latinity and orthography of Merovingian-period texts. This policy is, moreover, known to have been unevenly applied across texts and even within individual documents.²⁷ One cannot, therefore, be certain whether a given name-form is contemporary with the date of the text or a Carolingian correction.

The following forms are attested in the sample texts for our four candidate Merovingians (Table 26.1).

The only orthographic forms even remotely similar to ‘Flodobuir’ are the forms ‘Flodoveus’ and ‘Flodovechus’ for Clovis, which, given the foregoing range of candidates, indicates that Flodobuir was Clovis II. It has, however, to be noted that all the names, without exception, end in the Latin suffix ‘-us’. Any documentary source for the AU entry is therefore very likely to have had that suffix, but ‘Flodobuir’ does not. One might argue that the annalist was sufficiently

Latinate to have understood that the ‘-us’ suffix had to be removed in order to arrive at the name in common usage; a less speculative alternative is to consider the possibility that the Irish annalist’s source was oral, and this is addressed in what follows.

Any attempt to relate ‘Flodubuir’ to orally-transmitted forms of possibly-corresponding Frankish names has to address the following two issues: first, how did native Frankish Romance or possibly Germanic speakers of the mid seventh century pronounce the Merovingian names in question? And secondly, how would a native Irish speaker hearing the Germanic name pronounced have perceived it, and how would he have rendered his perception of it orthographically? Definitive resolution of these issues requires a conjunction of competences in Late Latin, early medieval French, early medieval continental Germanic, Old Irish, and possibly Old English phonetics. This conjunction must be exceedingly rare in any one individual, and I can claim only a subset, but using that subset a few relevant observations can be made.

Table 26.1 Spellings of the names of the candidate kings in the sample Frankish documents

Clovis	
<i>Historia Francorum</i>	Chlodovechus, Flodovechus
<i>Chronicle of Fredegar</i>	Chlodovechus, Chlodoveus, Chlodovius, Clodoveus, Clodovius, Ghlodoveus, Glodoveus, Glodovius, Flodoveus, Hludowius, Hludowicus, Ludovicus
<i>Liber Historiae Francorum</i>	Chlodovechus, Chlodoveus, Chlodovius, Clodoveus, Clodovius, Ghlodoveus, Glodoveus, Glodovius, Flodoveus, Hludowius, Hludowicus, Ludovicus
Chlothar	
<i>Historia Francorum</i>	Chlothacharius, Chlotcharius, Chlotharius
<i>Chronicle of Fredegar</i>	Clotacharius, Chlotharius, Chlotarius, Clotharius, Lotharius
<i>Liber Historiae Francorum</i>	Clotacharius, Chlotharius, Chlotarius, Clotharius, Lotharius
Childebert	
<i>Historia Francorum</i>	Childeberthus, Childiberthus, Childebertus
<i>Chronicle of Fredegar</i>	Childebertus
<i>Liber Historiae Francorum</i>	Childebertus
Sigibert	
<i>Historia Francorum</i>	Sigiberthus, Sigyberthus, Sygiberthus, Syghiberthus, Syghibertus, Sigibertus
<i>Chronicle of Fredegar</i>	Sigobertus, Sygibertus, Sigibertus
<i>Liber Historiae Francorum</i>	Sigibertus

[F]lodubuir

Historically, three of the four candidate names began with a voiceless velar fricative [χ], as in the Scottish pronunciation of ‘loch’ or the German pronunciation of the composer’s name ‘Bach’: the first element of Childerich’s name comes from the Indo-European (hereafter ‘IE’) root [**kelədh-* / **klād-*], ‘Kampf, Krieg’,²⁸ which became [χild] in Germanic,²⁹ and the first element in the names Chlodowech (modern ‘Clovis’) and Chlothar corresponds to IE [**k^hlu-*], ‘hören, Ruhm’³⁰ with *-to-* suffix, which became [χloð] in Germanic.³¹ Most of the name forms in Table 26.1 spell this sound ‘ch’, but there are several examples of spelling as ‘f’ – ‘Flodovechus’ as against ‘Chlodovechus’, for example. These are not random spelling errors but are rather symptomatic of general Frankish scribal practice from the late sixth century, where alternation between initial ‘F’ and ‘Ch’/‘C’ in the spelling of royal names was, if not frequent, then at least attested often enough to show that it was not accidental. Table 26.2 gives a selection of examples.

My layman’s view is that this alternation in scribal practice probably reflects phonetic usage, but that is for a Romance specialist to decide.

In Old Irish [f], [χ], and [s] were phonemic in initial position and were kept distinct in the orthography.³² If the above scribal ‘ch’/‘f’ alternation does indeed reflect early medieval Romance phonetics, therefore, an Irish scribe hearing one of the names ‘Flodowech’, ‘Flothar’, or ‘Fildebert’ would have written ‘f’, making ‘Flodubuir’ compatible in this respect with contemporary pronunciations of ‘Chlodowech’, ‘Chlothar’, and ‘Childebert’. Sigibert is, however, ruled out on this criterion.

Table 26.2 'F' spellings of initial [χ] in Frankish documents

Gregory of Tours, <i>Historia Francorum</i> ¹	Alternation of 'Chlodomer' and 'Flodumir'
A letter of Desiderius, bishop of Cahors c. 630–655 ²	'Flothari principis' for 'Chlothari principis'
<i>Vita Fursei</i> , ³ later seventh century	Variants 'Chlodoveus' and 'Flodoveus' depending on manuscript (ninth–eleventh century)
<i>Vita Desiderii</i> , ⁴ eighth–ninth century	'Flotarius' and 'Flodoveus' for 'Chlotarius' and 'Chlodoveus' throughout

Notes: ¹Krusch & Levison 1951, 94, 95; ²Arndt 1892, i, 9;

³Krusch 1902, 423–51; ⁴Ibid., 546–602, at 563ff and 592

F[l]odubuir

Chlodowech (Clovis) and Chlothar both have the liquid [l] in second position, represented in all spellings in Table 26.1 and corresponding to the 'l' in 'Flodubuir', but Childebert and Sigibert are ruled out.

F[l]o]dubuir

Chlodowech and Chlothar both have the back vowel [o] in second position, represented in all spellings in Table 26.1 and corresponding to the 'o' in 'Flodubuir', but Childebert and Sigibert both have front vowels, also represented in the spellings, and are again ruled out.

Flo[d]ubuir

The IE voiceless stop [t] became the Germanic voiceless fricative [þ] by the Germanic consonant shift, and by Verner's law this was voiced to [ð] in voiced surroundings,³³ yielding [χlodð] as the first component of the names Chlodowech and Chlothar, as above. In the orthography of the Old Irish period, intervocalic 'd' represents a voiced fricative,³⁴ and therefore accurately represents what the Irish scribe would in principle have heard in the Germanic name. In practice, this voiced fricative is variously spelled 'd', 't', and 'th' in Table 26.1, and this might well represent a Romance pronunciation. The Childebert examples also have the 'd' spelling, though with a preceding 'l' which is absent from 'Flodubuir', and Sigibert does not have this segment, so both are once again ruled out.

Flod[u]buir

The spellings of the back vowel in unstressed position for Chlodowech are consistently 'o' in Table 26.1 and consistently 'a' or null for Chlothar, which may or may

not reflect a phonetic difference; if so, Chlodowech has the advantage relative to 'Flodubuir'. The spellings for Childebert and Sigibert are consistently front vowels, ruling them out.

Flodu]buir

The '-vech-' and similar in the spellings of Chlodowech represents IE [*weik-], 'energetic, specifically hostile display of strength',³⁵ where the IE voiced continuant [w] remains in Germanic in initial and medial intervocalic positions,³⁶ the IE diphthong [ei] became Germanic [ī],³⁷ and the IE voiceless stop [k] became a voiceless velar fricative [χ] in early Germanic, which in the historical period was weakened to an unvoiced glottal fricative.³⁸ In Old Irish orthography 'b' represents a voiced fricative in intervocalic position,³⁹ and 'ui' represents a raised and fronted schwa in unstressed position.⁴⁰ Thus far, therefore, 'bui' represents the Germanic name well. The Germanic form does not, however, have a final 'r', either in the putative Germanic form or in the orthographical representations of Table 26.1, so in this respect 'Flodubuir' is against Chlodowech.

The '-ar-' / '-char-' and similar in the spellings for Chlothar comes from IE [*korjo-], 'war, war band' (Krieg, Kriegsbeer),⁴¹ where the IE voiceless velar stop [k] became a voiceless velar fricative [χ] in early Germanic, which tended to disappear in medial position in dialects of the historical period;⁴² in the spellings listed in Table 26.1 it is sometimes represented ('Clothacharius') and sometimes not ('Chlotharius'), which suggests that this was happening in the Frankish of our period. IE [o] becomes Germanic [a],⁴³ and IE [r] remained in Germanic.⁴⁴ In Old Irish orthography the voiceless velar fricative was written as 'ch' or 'c' in intervocalic position,⁴⁵ not 'b' as in 'Flodubuir', which counts against Chlothar as a candidate. On the other hand, the putative form of the Germanic name and spellings of Chlothar all have final 'r', as does 'Flodubuir'.

Finally, the spellings of Childebert and Sigibert have both the 'b' and the 'r' of 'Flodubuir', but add a final 't' which is missing in the Irish form.

Childebert and Sigibert have too much against them to be viable as the names underlying 'Flodubuir'. Of the remaining two, Chlodowech and Chlothar are both good but not perfect fits, and both therefore remain candidates, but no more. To summarise, the assumption of an oral source for the Irish annal entry indicates that 'Flodubuir' could have been Clovis II or Chlothar III, and the assumption of a documentary source that he was Clovis II, but there are problems with both. One further piece of evidence remains.

There is a version of the AU 'Flodubuir' entry for the year 658 in another set of early Irish annals, the *Annals of Tigernach* (hereafter 'AT'), to which none of the earlier commentators on the entry, including Picard, referred: 'The killing of Ercdot mac Sechnusaigh and

of Conchu mac Laidhgnen. Flodibor king of the Franks died.⁴⁶ The AT entry resolves the syntactic irregularity and attendant ambiguity of AU: ‘Flodibor’ died in 658, and so ‘Flodubuir’/‘Flodibor’ was Clovis rather than Chlothar. The AT editor moreover suggested an emended reading ‘leg. Flodobuis i.e. Clovis II?’, which seems reasonable given the probable unfamiliarity of the Frankish name to the Irish annalist and the similarity of the graphs for ‘r’ and ‘s’ in Insular minuscule, and would resolve both the orthographic and phonetic problems discussed above. Why should one trust AT over AU, however?

The answer involves looking briefly at the development of the medieval Irish annals.⁴⁷ The Chronicle of Ireland is a hypothetical record of Irish events from the late sixth to the early tenth century which is reconstructed using a variety of still-extant annals; what follows adopts Charles-Edwards’ reconstruction.⁴⁸ Its earliest component was the Iona Chronicle begun in the monastery of that name in the second half of the sixth century and continued there. Another set of annals begun no later than 642 at a monastery associated with the Iona confederation was incorporated into the Iona Chronicle in the second half of the seventh century. Around 740 the Iona Chronicle was brought to an unidentified monastery in the Irish east midlands and maintained there, with a particular interest in the affairs of the Armagh monastic confederation, until 911; this is the Chronicle of Ireland proper. After 911 the Chronicle of Ireland split into two branches, one represented by the extant AU and the other by a group of annals which includes the AT.

In reconstructing the Chronicle of Ireland, a fundamental principle is that entries which occur both in AU and AT were very probably in the Chronicle.⁴⁹ The Flodubuir/Flodibor entry is in both AU and AT, so in accordance with that principle it was in one of (i) the original Iona Chronicle, or (ii) in the composite chronicle incorporated into the Iona Chronicle in the second half of the seventh century, or (iii) added retrospectively to the Chronicle of Ireland after c. 740 on the basis of a now-unknown source. There is some reason to favour (iii). Picard argues that, given the Fursean connection with Frankish events surrounding Dagobert’s tonsure and transportation, Dagobert would have stayed in a monastery with Fursean associations such as Slane or Louth in the Irish east midlands; the Flodubuir/Flodibor information would have come from a locally maintained record of Frankish events connected with Dagobert’s presence, and the occurrence of the Flodubuir/Flodibor reference at the end of the AU and AT entries is consistent with this. Be that as it may, though, the main reason for adopting the AT rather than the AU reading is that the latter is syntactically anomalous and looks like a corruption of the syntactically correct original in the Chronicle of Ireland, which AT preserves.

On balance, therefore, it looks like the Flodubuir/Flodibor entry in the Chronicle of Ireland recorded the death

of Clovis II in 658. This is why the AT version of the name is used in the title of the present discussion.

Conclusion

The proposal is that AU ‘Flodubuir’/AT ‘Flodibor’ was Clovis II. What are the consequences of this result? First, there may be implications for reconstruction of the events surrounding the exile of Dagobert in Ireland and the involvement of the community of Furse in them. Second, it injects what is very probably a contemporary date which is independent of Frankish documentary sources into the controversial chronology of Merovingian politics in the mid to later seventh century. And lastly, it adds another tessera to the slowly emerging mosaic of Irish interaction with the Continent in the early Middle Ages.

Notes

- 1 Löwe 1982; Picard 1991a; Richter 1999.
- 2 Wood 1994, 222.
- 3 Ibid., 231–4; Cubitt 2013, 343.
- 4 Post haec autem Sighibertus rex Auster, Pippino defuncto, Grimoaldo, filio eius, in maiorum domato instituit. Decedente vero tempore, defuncto Sighiberto rege, Grimoaldus filium eius parvolum nomine Daygobertum totundit Didonemque Pectavensem urbis episcopum in Scotia peregrinandum eum direxit, filium suum in regno constituens. (*Liber Historiae Francorum*, 43: Krusch 1888b, 315–16; my translation).
- 5 Picard 1991a; Wood 1994, 221–34; Fouracre 2008; Wood 2013, 206–7.
- 6 Picard 1991b; but see now, Fouracre 2008; 2013; Wood 2013.
- 7 McCarthy 1998, 2008.
- 8 Jugulatio Ordoith mc. Sechnusaigh & Concenn m. Laidhgnein & Flodubuir rex Francorum (McCarthy 1998, 2008); cf Charles-Edwards 2006, i, 151.
- 9 James 1983; Wood 1994; Fouracre & Gerberding 1996; Ewig 2006.
- 10 Ewig 1991.
- 11 Hennessy & MacCarthy 1887–1901, i, 115.
- 12 Moody et al. 1982, 25.
- 13 Thurneysen 1946, 176–217.
- 14 Picard 1991b, 41.
- 15 Wood 1994, Chapter 13, esp. 222–4.
- 16 Krusch & Lebecq 2015, 149, n. 337.
- 17 Stephen, *Vita Wilfridi* 28 (Colgrave 1927, 54–5).
- 18 per arma ditatum.
- 19 For Wilfrid’s involvement see Wood 1994, 231–2; Fouracre 2008, 2013; Wood 2013; Cubitt 2013.
- 20 On this involvement, see further Wood 2013, 207.
- 21 Picard 1991b, 41–2.
- 22 Cf Wood 2013, 207.
- 23 Krusch & Levison 1951.
- 24 Krusch 1888a.
- 25 Krusch 1888b.
- 26 Keller 1978; Fouracre & Gerberding 1996, 58–78.
- 27 Ibid, 58–78.

- 28 Pokorny 1959, 546–7.
 29 Prokosch 1939, 37–45, 59; Krahe & Meid 1969, 83, 98–9.
 30 Pokorny 1959, 605–7.
 31 Prokosch 1939, 90–2; Krahe & Meid 1969, 96.
 32 Thurneysen 1946, 21; Russell 2005.
 33 Prokosch 1939, 60–4; Krahe & Meid 1969, 85–6.
 34 Thurneysen 1946, 21–2 and 25–9; Russell 2005.
 35 energische, bes. feindselige Kraftäusserung; Pokorny 1959, 1128–9.
 36 Ibid., 90–2; Krahe & Meid 1969, 95–6.
 37 Prokosch 1939, 96, 100; Krahe & Meid 1969, 53–4, 64.
 38 Prokosch 1939, 37–45, 59; Krahe & Meid 1969, 83, 98–9.
 39 Thurneysen 1946, 21–2 and 25–9.
 40 Ibid., 63–7; Russell 2005.
 41 Pokorny 1959, 615–16.
 42 Prokosch 1939, 59.
 43 Krahe & Meid 1969, 51.
 44 Prokosch 1939, 85, 95.
 45 Thurneysen 1946, 21–4.
 46 Guin Erdoit maic Sechnusaigh & Conchínd maic Laidhgnen. Flodibor rex Frangcorum obit (Stokes 1895–7, 195).
 47 Smyth 1972; MacNiocaill 1975; Grabowski & Dumville 1984; McCarthy 1998, 2008; Charles-Edwards 2006, i, 1–58.
 48 Ibid.
 49 Ibid., i, 7.

References

- Arndt, W. (ed.), 1892 ‘Desiderii episcopi Cadurcensis epistolae’ in W. Gundlach & E. Dümmler (ed.), *Epistolae Merovingici et Karolini aevi (I)*, Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Epistolarum 3 (Berlin)
- Charles-Edwards, T.M., 2006 *The Chronicle of Ireland*, Translated Texts for Historians 44, 2 vols (Liverpool)
- Colgrave, B. (ed.), 1927 *The Life of Bishop Wilfrid by Eddius Stephanus* (Cambridge)
- Cubitt, C., 2013 ‘Appendix 2: the Chronology of Stephen’s Life of Wilfrid’ in Higham 2013, pp 340–7
- Ewig, E., 1991 ‘Die Namengebung bei den ältesten Frankenkönigen und im merowingischen Königshaus’, *Francia* 18, 21–69
- Ewig, E., 2006 *Die Merowinger und das Frankenreich* (Stuttgart)
- Fouracre, P. & Gerberding, R. 1996 *Late Merovingian France. History and Hagiography 640-720* (Manchester)
- Fouracre, P., 2008 ‘Forgetting and Remembering Dagobert II: the English Connection’ in D. Ganz & P. Fouracre (ed.), *Frankland: the Franks and the Worlds of the Early Middle Ages* (Manchester), pp 70–89
- Fouracre, P., 2013 ‘Wilfrid on the Continent’ in Higham 2013, pp 186–99
- Gerberding, R., 1987 *The Rise of the Carolingians and the Liber Historiae Francorum* (Oxford)
- Grabowski, K. & Dumville, D., 1984 *Chronicles and Annals of Mediaeval Ireland and Wales* (Woodbridge)
- Hennessy, W. & MacCarthy, B., 1887–1901 *Annala Uladh: Annals of Ulster*, 4 vols (Dublin)
- Higham, N.J. (ed.), 2013 *Wilfrid, Abbot, Bishop, Saint: Papers from the 1300th Anniversary Conferences* (Donington)
- James, E., 1982 *The Origins of France* (London)
- Keller, R., 1978 *The German Language* (London & Boston, MA)
- Krahe, H. & Meid, W., 1969 *Germanische Sprachwissenschaft* (Berlin)
- Krusch, B. (ed.), 1888a *Fredegarii et aliorum Chronica*, MGH: Scriptorum Rerum Merovingicarum 2 (Hannover), pp 1–193
- Krusch, B. (ed.), 1888b *Liber Historiae Francorum*, MGH: Scriptorum Rerum Merovingicarum 2 (Hannover), pp 215–328
- Krusch, B. (ed.), 1902 *Passiones vitaeque sanctorum aevi Merovingici (II)*, MGH: Scriptorum Rerum Merovingicarum 4 (Hannover & Leipzig)
- Krusch, B. & Lebecq, S. (ed. & trans.) 2015 *La geste des rois des Francs* (Paris)
- Krusch, B. & Levison, W. (ed.) 1951 *Gregorii episcopi Turonensis. Libri Historiarum*, MGH: Scriptorum Rerum Merovingicarum 1 (Hannover)
- Löwe, H., 1982 *Die Iren und Europa im früheren Mittelalter* (Stuttgart)
- MacAirt, S. & MacNiocaill, G. 1983 *The Annals of Ulster (to A.D. 1131)* (Dublin)
- MacNiocaill, G., 1975 *The Medieval Irish Annals* (Dublin)
- McCarthy, D., 1998 ‘The Chronology of the Irish Annals’, *Proc. Royal Irish Academy* 98, 203–55
- McCarthy, D., 2008 *The Irish Annals: their Genesis, Evolution and History* (Dublin)
- Moody, T. & Martin, F. & Byrne, F.J., 1982 *A New History of Ireland, 8: A Chronology of Irish History to 1976* (Oxford)
- Picard, M., 1991a *Ireland and Northern France AD 600–850* (Dublin)
- Picard, J.-M., 1991b ‘Church and Politics in the Seventh Century: the Irish Exile of King Dagobert II’ in J.-M. Picard (ed.) *Ireland and Northern France* (Dublin), pp 27–52
- Pokorny, J., 1959 *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* 1 (Bern & Munich)
- Prokosch, E., 1939 *A Comparative Germanic Grammar* (Philadelphia, PA)
- Richter, M., 1999 *Ireland and her Neighbours in the Seventh Century* (London & New York)
- Russell, P., 2005 ‘What was Best of Every Language: the Early History of the English Language’ in D. Ó Cróinín (ed.) *A New History of Ireland, 1: Prehistoric and Early Ireland* (Oxford)
- Smyth, A., 1972 ‘The Earliest Irish Annals’, *Proc. Royal Irish Academy* 70, 1–48
- Stokes, W., 1895–7 ‘The Annals of Tigernach’, *Revue Celtique* 16, 374–419, *Revue Celtique* 17, 6–33, 119–263, 337–420, *Revue Celtique* 18, 9–59, 150–97, 267–303
- Thurneysen, R., 1946 *A Grammar of Old Irish* (Dublin)
- Wood, I.N., 1994 *The Merovingian Kingdoms 450–751* (London)
- Wood, I.N., 2013 ‘The Continental Journeys of Wilfrid and Biscop’ in Higham 2013, pp 200–11