

(vii) Lastly, there remains an unexplained difficulty. The eastern church had long observed a festival in honour of the invention of the Cross,⁵⁷ celebrated on 14 September,⁵⁸ and did not apparently introduce a new celebration to commemorate its restoration, but joined this to the older rite. This new celebration was, however, introduced in the west, and such a commemorative festival can be traced as early as c. 650.⁵⁹ This was observed on 3 May. Why was this date chosen? Is it possible that the fragment of the true Cross sent by the emperor to Constantinople reached the capital on this date?⁶⁰

We are at the end of our discussion, and as a result it would appear that we may safely accept the date given by Antiochus Strategos for the solemn restoration of the Cross in Jerusalem, viz. 21 March, and further that this took place in the year 629.

NORMAN H. BAYNES.

Burgundian Notes

II. CISALPINUS AND CONSTANTINUS¹

FLODOARD of Rheims is conspicuous among mediæval annalists for his orderliness and precision. He relates facts as they came to his knowledge. He does not think it his business to examine the relations of cause and effect: he simply sets down the in-

⁵⁷ So rightly the pilgrim Theodosius about 530: P. Geyer, *Itinera Hierosolymitana Saeculi IIII-VIII*, Vindobonae, 1898 (*Corpus Scriptorum Eccles. Lat.* xxxix. 149). More usually the festival is known as the ἑξουσία τοῦ τιμίου καὶ φηροσίου σταυροῦ ὁ τῶν ἁγίων ἐλλῶν; thence its western name Exaltatio Crucis: cf. Arculf in Adamnanus, *De locis Sanctis*, 3. 3; Geyer, *op. cit.*, pp. 286. 22, 287. 3 *seqq.*, 288. 11, 295. 21, 322. 14.

⁵⁸ This festival was only known in the west in the eighth century, and won its way to acceptance slowly and partially. It was received quite late in many churches, e. g. in Milan in 1035.

⁵⁹ Cf. K. A. Heinrich Kellner, *Heortology*, London, 1908, pp. 333-41; and for further information on the subject see von Maltzew, *Myesyatseslov pravoslavnoi Katoicheskoi Vostochnoi Tserkvi*, pt. i, pp. 81, 93, Berlin, 1900; G. Debol'sky, *Dni Bogoluzheniya prav. Kath. Vost. Tserkvi*, Kniga i, pp. 84, 91, St. Petersburg, 1846. It is interesting to notice that in the west the festival celebrated for the victory of Heraclius on 12 December 627 continued to be observed for a longer period than in the east, and was kept on the same day as the commemoration of the exaltation of the Cross. For the evidence of this compare S. A. Morcelli, *Μηρολόγιον τῶν Εὐαγγελίων Ἑορταστικόν εἰς Calendarium Ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae*, Rome, 1788, i. 266-7; and Sergy, *Polnuy Myesyatseslov Vostoka*, Moscow, 1876, II. i. 327; and Zamyetki, II. ii. 289 *seqq.*, 2nd ed., Vladimir, 1901, II. i. 383, II. ii. 374 *seqq.*

⁶⁰ I am unable to offer any suggestion why the Egyptian and Abyssinian Synaxaria give for 6 March a Manifestatio S. Crucis per Heraclium Imp.

¹ The first of these notes appeared last year (xxvi. 310-17). The present paper was in part written very long ago, but I have only recently had the opportunity of putting my materials into shape. I am again under great obligations to my friend the Rev. W. A. B. Coolidge, who has directed me to a good deal of evidence which would probably have otherwise eluded me; but I have no reason to suppose that he shares the views which I here advocate.

formation he received in the order in which he received it. He has to speak of a number of persons, of whom not a few bear the same name; and he constantly guards against any possible confusion by carefully attaching to each distinctive epithets or descriptions. I propose in the light of these two characteristics to seek the identification of a person whom Flodoard describes as Hugo Cisalpinus, and to suggest an explanation of the epithet Constantinus which he applies to Charles, count of Vienne. But if the negative arguments which I present obtain acceptance, I am the first to admit that my positive inferences must remain in the present state of our knowledge hypothetical.

i. *Cisalpinus*

1. As for Hugh the Cisalpine, who is introduced in the *Annals* under 939, it is not necessary to go into the entire history of a very complicated year of warfare; we have only to try to ascertain how much of that history Flodoard knew. I begin by giving a summary of what he records.

Lewis IV of France paid a visit to Hugh, son of Richard [the duke of Burgundy, his only vassal on whose loyalty he could constantly depend]. The two returned from Burgundy together, and marched against Hugh, son of Robert [Hugh the Great, duke of the French], and William the Norman. . . . Hugh gave hostages to observe an armistice until 1 June.

The men of Lorraine rebelled against King Otto [of Germany] and came to Lewis, who deferred receiving them on account of the amity which had been arranged between them [the two kings].

Count Arnulf [of Flanders] captured Montreuil, the castle of Erluin, and sent his wife and children oversea to King Athelstan. Soon afterwards Erluin, with the help of the Normans, recovered Montreuil.

The nobles of Lorraine, headed by their duke, came again to King Lewis and commended themselves to him; but the bishops for a time held aloof.

King Otto crossed the Rhine and plundered Lorraine. An English fleet was sent by Athelstan to the assistance of Lewis, but it did nothing more than ravage parts of the French coast.

King Otto had a meeting with Hugh [the Great], Herbert [count of Vermandois], Arnulf, and William the Norman; and they all took oaths to a treaty with him: then he returned beyond the Rhine.

These detached notices may be presumed to be written down in chronological order. In order to fix the dates we have to turn to the German evidence. It is known that Otto the Great marched against the rebels led by his brother Henry and Gilbert, duke of Lorraine, and defeated them at Birten, near Xanten; but it is unlikely that he then crossed the Rhine.³ He was recalled to

³ Wilhelm von Giesebrecht (*Gesch. der Deutschen Kaiserzeit*, i, 5th ed., 1881, p. 283) thought that Otto made a short pursuit into Lorraine, but was recalled by the news

Saxony by a rising in its eastern regions, and he besieged Merseburg for nearly two months.³ A document proves that he was at Magdeburg on 7 June.⁴ It was after this that Otto set himself to put down the rebellion in Lorraine. He crossed the Rhine and besieged his brother and Duke Gilbert at Chèvremont, near Liège. This seems to be the only possible time in the year in which he could have had the meeting with the four French feudatories mentioned by Flodoard; and that meeting must have taken place between 7 June and 11 September, when he is found again in Saxony, at Werla, near Dortmund.⁵

At this point, after the mention of Otto's recrossing the Rhine, occurs the critical passage in Flodoard :

Rex interea Ludowicus Virdunensem pagum petit, ubi quidam regni Lothariensis episcopi sui efficiuntur. Indeque in pagum proficiscitur Elisatium, locutusque cum Hugone Cisalpino, et quibusdam ad se venientibus receptis Lothariensibus, nonnullis quoque Othonis regis fidelibus trans Rhenum fugatis, Laudunum revertitur.

Now we have seen that, according to Flodoard, Hugh the Great engaged to observe an armistice until 1 June. After that two separate embassies from the Lorrainers are recorded, and then the fact that Hugh made treaty with Otto, who did not leave Saxony until after 7 June. 'Meanwhile' Lewis moved in a south-easterly direction through the country of Verdun into Alsace; he had a meeting with Hugh the Cisalpine and then returned to Laon. This Hugh is believed by almost all modern scholars to be Hugh the Black, duke of Burgundy. Lewis's route, however, would not approach at any point the border of the duchy, but Alsace would lead him directly to the kingdom of Burgundy, in the upper valley of the Doubs. It is true that at a somewhat later date Hugh the Black is found exercising authority in these parts;⁶ but I conclude from Flodoard's use of names that if he had meant him he would not have described him as Hugh the Cisalpine.

Two charters tell us something of King Lewis's movements

from the east. There is, however, no evidence for this. Adalbert, the continuator of Regino's Chronicle, alone mentions such a movement: but he relates the siege of Chèvremont as the immediate sequel of the battle of Birten, and was unaware of the events which followed in the east of Saxony.

³ Widukind, *Res gestae Saxonicae*, ii. 19.

⁴ *Diplomata Ottonis I*, no. 21 (*Monum. Germ. Hist.*, 1879); Böhmer, *Regesta Imperii*, ii (ed. Ottenhal, 1893), no. 77.

⁵ *Dipl. Otton.* no. 22; Böhmer, no. 78.

⁶ See H. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher des Deutschen Reichs unter Konrad II* (1884), ii. 34 f.; R. Poupardin, *Le Royaume de Bourgogne* (1907), pp. 208 ff. At a much earlier date, 914, Charles the Simple granted to Hugh certain property which he possessed 'in comitatu Warasco, ex suo videlicet comitatu' (*Recueil des Hist. de France*, ix. 521); but there is no evidence to show that he retained it. He is not found again in this neighbourhood until 951.

in the summer. On 20 June he was just within the frontier of Lorraine, in *Querceto iuxta Dotiacum villa*, near Douzy, on the Chiers, not far from Sedan, and there he granted a charter to the abbey of Cluny at the petition of *quidam fidelis noster Hugo filius Richardi, vir illustrissimus et marchio*,⁷ that is to say, Hugh the Black. The second charter proves that the king was back at Laon on 2 August. It is difficult to fit in these dates with Lewis's march into Alsace, which cannot well have begun until July at the earliest, and it is more natural to consider his visit to Douzy to have taken place in connexion with the negotiations with the Lorrainers already mentioned and before Otto was in the west at all. In this case he would not have set out for Alsace until after 2 August. That such was the order of events was clearly pointed out by Dümmler, who held that on each occasion the king's interview was with Hugh the Black.⁸ M. Philippe Lauer, on the other hand, who also identifies Hugh the Cisalpine with Hugh the Black, thinks that there was only one interview, namely, that at Douzy; and in order to prove that there was no meeting with Hugh (the Cisalpine) in the course of Lewis's expedition to Alsace, he adopts the bold device of suppressing the words *locutusque cum Hugone Cisalpino*, without any indication of the omission, in his quotation of the passage from Flodoard which I have given above, and blames Richer for making substantially the same statement as Flodoard.⁹ It was in fact, to all appearance, the alliance which was formed between King Otto and the four great French princes, about July, that led King Lewis to make a plundering raid into Lorraine and Alsace, and while there to seek the assistance of Hugh the Cisalpine. On the news of his movement Otto broke up the siege of Chèvremont and turned to meet him. Some misunderstanding has been caused by the perfectly correct statement that he went first to Saxony, and was at Werla, near Dortmund, on 11 September. But this was only just within the border of Saxony. He had to make a détour in order to avoid the parts of Lorraine which had been raised against him, and probably also to get reinforcements: so he crossed the Rhine and then hastened southwards, recrossing the river so as to attack Lewis. On his advance towards him Lewis 'returned to Laon'. So says Flodoard, who knows nothing of Otto's doings all this time. Adalbert speaks more plainly:

Interim Ludowicus, rex Galliae Romanae, . . . Alsatiam petit; ubi, quaeque poterat, plus hostiliter quam regaliter gessit. Quod rex Otto

⁷ *Chartes de l'Abbaye de Cluny*, i. (1876) 483 ff., no. 499.

⁸ Köpke and Dümmler, *Kaiser Otto der Grosse* (1876), pp. 86, 88.

⁹ *Le Règne de Louis IV* (1900), p. 43, n. 6; cf. n. 3.

patienter non ferens Caprimontem obsidione absolvit, et Alsatiam petens Ludovicum regem expulit.¹⁰

I lay stress upon this Alsatian campaign, which seemed to Otto important enough to cause his abandonment of his operations in the north-west, because it may help us to find out who Hugh the Cisalpine was. He was a man who was to be approached by way of Alsace and whose support Lewis desired to gain. The young Conrad, king of Burgundy, had been carried off by Otto not long before, when Hugh of Italy attempted to annex his kingdom, and was now living under the German king's protection: Otto would have every reason for wishing to frustrate any negotiations which might bring the Burgundian kingdom into alliance with France.

2. Flodoard is invariably careful to distinguish between different rulers of the same name, and where necessary between the different territories over which they ruled. The following are, I believe, all the instances which bear upon the question before us. I group them under the territories and add the year under which the notice is given.

Duke of the French: Hugo filius Rotberti (or Rotberti filius) 922, 923, 924 twice, 925 thrice, 926, 927 twice, 928 twice, 936, 939; Hugo comes 923, 924, 929 twice, 934, 936, 948, 949 thrice, 952; Hugo princeps 937, 942, 945, 946 twice, 947 thrice, 948 four times, 949, 950, 951 twice, 953, 954 twice, 955, 956; Hugo princeps filius Rotberti 938, 940; Hugo Albus 939, 941 twice; Hugo dux Francorum 943, 944, 946; Hugo dux 943 five times, 944 thrice, 945 four times, 946; Hugo Transsequani (*v.l.* trans Sequanam) dux 960.

Duke of Burgundy: Rodulfus filius Richardi 922, 923; Hugo frater regis Rodulfi 936, 938; Hugo filius Richardi 922, 936, 939; Hugo Niger 940 twice, 941, 950.¹¹

King of Burgundy: Rodulfus Cisalpinæ Galliae rex (or Cisalpinæ rex Galliae) 922, 923, 924, 926; Rodulfus Iurensis et Cisalpinæ Galliae rex 937; Rodulfus rex Iurensis 935, 940; Conradus Cisalpinæ Galliae rex 946; Conradus rex Iurensis 951.

Count of Vienne and king of Italy: Hugo de Vienna 924; Hugo Viennensis 924; Hugo filius Bertae 926; (Wido frater Hugonis regis 928); Hugo rex Italiae 933, 936, 942, 945, 946 twice.

Nothing can be more plain than that Flodoard intends to distinguish between Hugh the White, son of Robert, whom we call Hugh the Great, duke of the French, and Hugh the Black, son of Richard, who is never in terms described as duke¹² of Bur-

¹⁰ *Contin. Regin.* s. 939. This is not a contradiction of Flodoard, as M. Lauer says (*ibid.* n. 6), but an addition to what he records.

¹¹ Under 946 'Hugo Nneigro filio Richardi' is anomalous both in grammar and spelling.

¹² His usual style is *comes* or *comes et marchio*, but *dux* is also found in charters: see Poupardin, *Le Royaume de Bourgogne*, p. 207.

gundy, though he is always mentioned in connexion with the Burgundian duchy. In like manner Hugh the Black's brother, Rodulf, who for a time was king of France, is distinguished as son of Richard, while Rodulf, king of Burgundy, is styled king of Cisalpine Gaul. Moreover, in the Annals, Cisalpine Gaul is used definitely to mean the kingdom of Upper Burgundy; it is not used of the kingdom of Provence. Were it not that once in the History of the Church of Rheims Flodoard speaks of the Carolingian Charles, king of Provence, as *Cisalpinæ Galliae regis*,¹³ we might conclude that Flodoard designedly reserved the epithet Cisalpine for the Upper kingdom. But in no case can it be understood of any region outside the kingdom of Burgundy. Arguing from this evidence Freeman,¹⁴ who was followed by Carl von Kalkstein,¹⁵ maintained that Hugo Cisalpinus must be Hugh of Vienne, better known as Hugh of Arles, marquess of Provence and king of Italy; but this opinion can hardly be reconciled with the ascertained facts of Hugh's history and is now universally abandoned.¹⁶ We have then to seek for another Hugh holding an influential position in the Burgundian kingdom to whom Flodoard may refer.

3. It is necessary first to inquire by whom the government of the kingdom of Burgundy was administered in the time following the death of Rodulf II in July 937. The historians give us very little information on the subject. Liutprand says that Hugh of Italy forthwith married his widow Bertha, and affianced his son to her daughter Adelaide.¹⁷ This no doubt implies a visit to Burgundy. Flodoard on his side tells us that Rodulf's young son, Conrad, was carried off by Otto of Germany and kept in his charge.¹⁸ We have to fill in the date by means of two charters, in which Hugh made a wedding gift to Queen Bertha.¹⁹ They

¹³ *Hist. Rem. Eccl.* iii. 26; Migne, cxxxv. 239 b.

¹⁴ *Hist. of the Norman Conquest*, i. (3rd edition) 229, n. 3.

¹⁵ *Gesch. des Französischen Königthums unter den ersten Capetingern*, i. 218, n. 4, 1877.

¹⁶ See, e.g., Köpke and Dümmler, *Otto der Grosse*, p. 88, n. 3; Lauer, p. 43, n. 3.

¹⁷ *Antapodosis*, iv. 13.

¹⁸ 'Quem iam dudum dolo captum sibiq; adductum retinebat.' *Ann.* s. 940.

¹⁹ See Dümmler, in the *Forschungen zur Deutschen Geschichte*, x. (1870), 305-7, and *Codex diplomaticus Langobardiae* (*Monumenta Historiae Patriae*, xiii., 1873), 942-5. The charters bear date 12 December 938, *anno regni Hugonis XII, Lotharii VII* [M. Poupardin, p. 67 n. 2, accidentally says VIII], *Indictione XI*. The regnal years indicate 937, which agrees with the eleventh Indiction of September and the year reckoned in the Pisan style from the 25th March preceding what we call the current year. The usage in Hugh's chancery was irregular; but the September Indiction appears in his first year (*Cod. dipl. Langob.* p. 890), and the *calculus Pisanus* is found three times in 936 and 937 (*ibid.* pp. 933, 938; and Dümmler, *ubi supra*, p. 302). On the other hand the Indiction of Christmas occurs in 931 (*ibid.*, p. 301); and in two documents of the same year (pp. 299, 301) and in one of 941 (p. 310) the Pisan style is not adopted. Some of these differences may be due to scriptural errors, as a document of 932 is dated 931 (*Cod. dipl. Langob.* p. 929), and the Indiction is wrong in 926 and 943 (pp. 887, 977).

were granted in *Burgundia in corte que Columbaris dicitur*, that is at Colombier, north of Morges, on the right bank of the lake of Geneva, on 12 December 937. There is no reason to doubt that Hugh took his bride and her daughter back to Italy,²⁰ where he is found in the following July.²¹ On the other hand, it is extremely unlikely that Otto himself appeared on the scene,²² and there is some probability in Giesebrecht's conjecture²³ that a party among the Burgundian nobles secured Conrad and sent him off to Germany to save him from falling into Hugh's hands.

The question then must be repeated: now that the queen-mother and her daughter were withdrawn into Italy and the young king into Germany, who had sufficient authority in Burgundy to set up and maintain some sort of government? Was it established in the interests of Conrad or in those of Hugh? Long ago it was asserted by Frédéric de Gingins-la-Sarra, in his interesting but uncritical memoirs on the history of the kingdom of Burgundy, that during Conrad's detention in Germany his dominions were administered by Queen Bertha, his mother, assisted by his uncle Hugh, the count palatine, younger son of King Rodulf II.²⁴ But the only evidence furnished for this Hugh's relationship is contained in the charter subjecting Romainmotier to Cluny by Adelaide, widow of Richard the Justiciar, duke of Burgundy in 928,²⁵ in which she speaks of her sons, King Rodulf [of France²⁶] and Hugh [the Black].²⁷ There is no mention here of any Hugh, count palatine.

But Hugh, the count palatine, really existed. In a suit heard before King Rodulf II of Burgundy 'in Cartris villa',²⁸ on 18 January 926, he is associated with Turimbert, count [in Vaud], and Anselm, count of the *pagus Equestricus* (Nyon), for the

²⁰ Cf. Liutprand, *Antapod.* iv. 14.

²¹ *Cod. dipl. Langob.* pp. 930 f.

²² Widukind alone states this (ii. 35), in a later connexion, after a notice relating to the year 943.

²³ *Gesch. der Deutschen Kaiserzeit*, i. 314.

²⁴ *Archiv für Schweizerische Geschichte*, viii (1851), 87. This Hugh—'von dem man sonst nichts weiss,' as Professor Bresslau truly remarks (*Jahrbücher des Deutschen Reichs unter Konrad II*, ii. 35 n.)—has been evolved from a confusion of notices relative to Hugh the Black.

²⁵ The regnal year given in this charter indicates 928, the Indiction 929.

²⁶ This identification is certain: see Bresslau, *l. c.*

²⁷ *Chartes de l'Abbaye de Cluny*, i. 358-61, no. 379. Among the subscriptions is that 'Ugonis incliti comitis et frateri S. [sic, for 'fratris'] augusti Rodulfi regis'. The text is taken from a copy in a chartulary. In a later paper (*Archiv*, ix. 188 f., 1853) Gingins suggested that Herman, duke of Suabia, took charge of the Burgundian kingdom during Conrad's minority; but the only authority he cited (Liutprand, *Antapod.* v. 1, 10) mentions Herman only in connexion with his own duchy.

²⁸ M. Poupardin, *Le Royaume de Bourgogne*, p. 270, explains this as 'Saint-Gervais près de Genève'.

hearing of a petition²⁹; and in 927 or 928³⁰ he was one of the witnesses to the election of Libo, bishop of Lausanne:

Hugo marchio similiter consensit. Hugo comes palatinus similiter.³¹

Hugh the marquess is Hugh the Black, duke of Burgundy, who was an important personage in the Burgundian kingdom as well, though it is perhaps impossible on the existing evidence to define the territories in it over which he held authority as distinguished from those in which he possessed lands. Hugh, the count palatine, would on all analogy be the king's representative for judicial administration.³² Who was this Hugh who held the office?

In 1896 it appeared to me possible that two grants to Montiéramey, in the country of Troyes, which were described by M. Giry in the *Études d'Histoire du Moyen-Âge dédiées à Gabriel Monod*,³³ might supply the required clue. The first of these was made in 927 by *Hugo comes* and his wife Wila, and the second more than forty years later by the widow. Their special value consisted in the precise enumeration of the grantors' children. But, like M. Giry, I hesitated to pursue the identification, and it was not until the publication of M. Georges de Manteyer's brilliant essay on *Les Origines de la Maison de Savoie en Bourgogne* in 1899³⁴ that I became convinced that the clue could be successfully worked out. M. de Manteyer possesses the double advantage of a minute topographical knowledge and of a quite exceptional gift of genealogical combination. If in some directions he may be thought to have pushed his faculty of divination too far, these hypotheses do not affect the particular question before us. His results on this point may be briefly summarized as follows.

The Hugh mentioned in the Montiéramey charter was the son of Warner, viscount of Sens and count (probably of Troyes), who died fighting against the Normans in 925.³⁵ Warner married Theutberga, the sister of Hugh of Vienne, count of Arles and afterwards king of Italy, and had by her three sons, Hugh, Richard, and Manasses.³⁶ Doubtless through the influence of the powerful uncle, Manasses was made archbishop of Arles as early as 920:³⁷ how he followed him into Italy and possessed himself of three other

²⁹ *Chartes de Cluny*, i. 247-9, no. 256. The subscription is 'S. Ugoni comite palatii' [sic].

³⁰ Both dates are given in two texts of the *Annales Lausannenses*, *Monum. Germ. Hist.* xxiv. 780.

³¹ Contin. of Cono, *Gesta Episc. Lausann.*, *ibid.* p. 805.

³² See Poupardin, p. 189 f.

³³ pp. 135, 136, nos. 27 and 31.

³⁴ In the *Mélanges d'Archéologie et d'Histoire* of the École Française de Rome, xix, fasc. v.

³⁵ Manteyer, pp. 451-4.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 440 f., 446.

³⁷ *Cartulaire de Saint-André-le-Bas*, ed. U. Chevalier, 1869, p. 88, no. 124; Manteyer, pp. 439, 445.

bishoprics as well is notorious from the narrative of Liutprand.³⁸ After Warner's death his widow, Theutberga, married Engelbert, viscount of Vienne,³⁹ the brother of Sobo, who became archbishop of Vienne about 927. In consequence of this double connexion the centre of interest in Count Warner's family became transplanted from the north of the Burgundian duchy to the west of the Burgundian kingdom. Hugh, the eldest son, seems to have lost whatever position he held in the former, when the whole northern part of the duchy was annexed by Hugh the Great, duke of the French, in 936⁴⁰; but he retained his landed estates there. In the same year, 936, he was granted a large property of 700 manses in the Viennois by his uncle Hugh, king of Italy.⁴¹ A year later King Rodulf II died, and his old rival, King Hugh, laid claim to the succession. A count palatine named Hugh is then found in office in the region north of the lake of Geneva. It is natural to suppose that King Hugh appointed his nephew to this post. The difficulty is that, so far, Hugh, son of Warner, has not been traced in the Burgundian kingdom outside the Viennois. Could we prove that the Warner, nephew of Hugh, who was granted lands in the district of Nyon in 910⁴² was his father, the hypothesis would gain in probability; but Warner was not an uncommon name, and the charter cited does not lead to a positive conclusion.

The case therefore stands thus. Hugh was the nephew of Hugh of Vienne, king of Italy, who had been the most powerful man in the Viennois; he was nephew also of Boso, the brother-in-law of King Rodulf II; and Rodulf's widowed mother and later on his own widow were successively the wives of Hugh of Vienne.⁴³ These connexions mark Hugh, the son of Warner, as a man to whom high office was likely to be confided; and as his younger brother, Manasses, was made archbishop of Arles, so it would be in the natural order of events that he should be given some high civil post. During his absence in Italy King Hugh needed some officer who could represent him in various ways. It was most important that there should be some one, a count palatine, to preside over the judicature of the country; and whom would King Hugh be more likely to appoint to this office than his sister's son? This identification, however, remains, pending the discovery of new evidence, unproved; but if the conjecture

³⁸ *Antapod.* ii. 6, 7.

³⁹ Manteyer, p. 431.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.* pp. 454 f.

⁴¹ *Cartul. de Saint-André-le-Bas*, pp. 232 f., app. no. 22; Manteyer, pp. 442-5. The charter is dated according to the *calculus Pisanus* in 937; but the Indiction and the regnal years fix the date to 936.

⁴² *Recueil des Hist. de France*, ix. 693; Manteyer, p. 402.

⁴³ The former marriage, which took place about 912, is proved by a charter in which Hugh count and marquess speaks of 'uxoris mee nomine Villa regine': *Cartul. de Saint-André-le-Bas*, p. 223, app. no. 14; Manteyer, p. 404.

be accepted, I believe that we have found the Hugo Cisalpinus whom King Lewis of France went to meet in 939. The young Conrad was out of the way, and Hugh of Italy had asserted his authority in the kingdom of Burgundy. Lewis needed support from that kingdom, and he sought it in the man whom King Hugh had appointed as his count palatine. It may be added that one son of Hugh, whom I should like to identify with this count palatine, Theobald, became archbishop of Vienne, and another, Humbert, was the father of Humbert who is claimed to be the same person with Humbert, known to later writers as Humbert *aux Blanches Mains*, who was the founder of the House of Savoy.⁴⁴

ii. *Constantinus*

Charles, the son of the Emperor Lewis III, is styled by Flodoard and by Richer, who follows him, *Constantinus*. In all the documents in which his name appears he is simply Charles the count or the count of Vienne. *Constantinus* is peculiar to Flodoard and his copyist. Now the use of two names in juxtaposition is, I believe, without example in Charles's time. If a man bore one name by birth and another by baptism, he would be described or would describe himself as 'Carolus qui et Constantinus'. But Charles never makes any addition to his name: the addition is Flodoard's. Now Flodoard, we have seen, is extraordinarily precise in his discrimination of persons bearing the same name. This is particularly clear in the case, on which I have commented, of the numerous men named Hugh whom he has occasion to mention. There is no instance to my knowledge in the works of Flodoard in which he speaks of any one with a double Christian name, or of any one with a Christian name and a surname. He often adds a descriptive adjective, but this is always of topographical import. If we pass by the countless instances in which he mentions bishops with the adjectives of their sees, the only attributes which I have noticed in his History of the Church of Rheims are Transrhenensis, Aquitanicus, Normannus, Flandrensis, and Transmarinus (meaning 'English'). All these speak for themselves. In the Annals we have only to add Cisalpinus, on which I have said enough, and perhaps Transsequanus.⁴⁵

According to Flodoard's usage, then, it would appear that *Constantinus* must be a name derived from some place.⁴⁶ The adjective he takes from Constance in Suabia is *Constanciensis*.⁴⁷

⁴⁴ See Manteyer, *passim*, especially pp. 436 ff., 476-84; Poupardin, p. 262 f.

⁴⁵ See above, p. 303.

⁴⁶ After I had arrived at this conclusion I found that Freeman had suggested it as a possible alternative: i. 229 n. 7.

⁴⁷ *Ann. a.* 948.

Constantinus more naturally is the adjective of Coutances in Normandy, but there is no sort of link to connect Lewis III with that region. We can trace him from Arles, when he was king of Lower Burgundy (or Provence), into Italy, and after his troubles there back to Vienne.⁴⁸ I would suggest that Flodoard wished to indicate this Lower Burgundian connexion. There is a rare use of *Constantina urbs* for Arles. It occurs in a rescript of Honorius and Theodosius II of 418 ordering that synods should be held yearly in *Constantina urbe*. Sirmond, who first assigned this document to its proper authors, refers to Hincmar, epist. vi, in evidence⁴⁹; but I have sought in vain for any mention of it in the works of Hincmar. Still, the rescript became famous from its inclusion in more than one canonical collection; it was well known at Cologne as it was at Arles:⁵⁰ and in this way—still more if it was cited by Hincmar—the passage may have become known to Flodoard. If this suggestion appear far-fetched, I would adduce a parallel from Richer, in which a similar attempt is made to discover a Latin equivalent for Burgundy with a less successful result. Richer seems to have understood Burgundia in the limited sense of the duchy of Burgundy⁵¹: so when he had to speak of Conrad *rex Galliae Cisalpinæ*, as Flodoard calls him, he boldly searched in Horace for an Alpine folk, and, regardless that the Genauni belonged to Rhaetia, described Conrad as *rex Genaunorum*.⁵²

REGINALD L. POOLE.

The Exeter Domesday

Was the Exchequer Domesday compiled, as to the south-western counties, from the Exeter Domesday? Let us look at the evidence suggested by the collation of the two texts, for Devon by Mr. Reichel and for Somerset by Mr. Bates-Harbin, in the Victoria County Histories (vols. i, quoted as *D.* and *S.*). To keep the names distinct we will call the one manuscript Exon, the other D.B. Exon is a pretty full digest of the original returns for Somerset, nearly all Devon, and Cornwall, each of impor-

⁴⁸ Cf. Poupardin, *Le Royaume de Provence*, pp. 189 f., 1901.

⁴⁹ See his notes to Sidonius Apollinarius, p. 146 f., Paris, 1852. The rescript is also printed in G. Haenel's *Corpus Legum quae extra Constitutionum Codices supersunt* (1857), p. 238, and in the *Monum. Germ. Hist., Epist.* iii. (1892), 13 f.

⁵⁰ See an account of the manuscripts given by F. Maassen, *Gesch. der Quellen des canon. Rechts*, i. (1870) §§ 670, 786, and by W. Gundlach in the *Neues Archiv der Gesellock. für ältere Deutsche Geschichtsk.*, xiv. (1889) 277-312.

⁵¹ He once uses 'Cisalpini', *Hist.* ii. 42, for the inhabitants of the duchy. The word only occurs elsewhere, I think, in ii. 17, where he borrows 'Hugo Cisalpinus' from Flodoard.

⁵² *Hist.* ii. 53; cf. 98.