

Romanorum Pontificum (ed. Sickel, formula 76, p. 80).⁶⁹ In England this ancient invocation was employed in the records of the Councils of Hertford and Hatfield in 673 and 680;⁷⁰ in our earliest original royal charter, that of Hlotharius of Kent, 679,⁷¹ and in four eighth-century contemporary texts,⁷² and in two charters of that century preserved in early ninth-century copies,⁷³ and in several chartulary texts of the eighth century that seem to be genuine.⁷⁴ It is found in a ninth-century charter the date of which has been altered by erasure from *dcclx* to *dcxc*⁷⁵ of Æthelberht of Kent.⁷⁶ The invocation occurs in dubious or spurious charters between 675 and 826.⁷⁷ The later examples from 888 to 944⁷⁸ are spurious, and the group of St. Paul's and Chertsey charters of the tenth and eleventh century⁷⁹ are the work of one forger. The invocation with the insertion of 'Sancti' before 'Salvatoris' appears in four genuine texts of 813 and 814.⁸⁰

Charles Constantine of Vienne

MUCH doubt exists over the precise birth and name of Charles Constantine, the son of the Emperor Lewis III. He appears first, apparently as grown up, in 923. He is count of Vienne, doubtless by his father's grant in 927, and he held the county at least as late as 962.¹ But he did not succeed Lewis III in the kingdom of Provence, and M. Poupardin finds the explanation of his disinheritance in the belief, suggested by a phrase of Richer, that he was a bastard. His by-name of Constantine has likewise been a subject of discussion. Dr. Poole² proves it was not a surname proper, and considers it a mere local appellative, invented by Flodoard, to describe his connexion with Provence—Arles being

* See also Gaetano Marini, *I Papiri diplomatici*, Rome, 1805, 343 b; ninth- and tenth-century examples, 126, 155, 162, 165, 166, 195, 201.

⁶⁹ Bede, iv, cc. 5, 15 (17).

⁷⁰ Brit. Mus. Facs. i, plate 1; Birch, i. 70.

⁷¹ Birch, i. 215, 231, 281, 511.

⁷² Brit. Mus. Facs. ii, plates 1, 2; Birch, i. 220, 266: cf. Traube, *Perrona Scottorum*, 509.

⁷³ Birch, i. 59, 60, 67, 106, 113 (cf. 114), 206, 216, 229 (cf. 253), 274 (cf. 294), 352, 358, 363, 413; ii. p. viii; iii. 666.

⁷⁴ This may have been done in order to identify it with Birch, i. 358, dated 789, with which it agrees in invocation and preom. Both are grants to the two Bishops Wermund of Rochester of the respective dates.

⁷⁵ Brit. Mus. Facs. ii, plate 35, written in a somewhat later hand than 860, but not eleventh century, as stated by Birch, ii. 109.

⁷⁶ Birch, i. 64, 92, 93, 105, 116, 123, 143, 146, 156 (cf. 157), 163, 165, 166, 212, 279, 281, 539, 547; ii, p. v.

⁷⁷ Birch, ii. 79, 194, 553.

⁷⁸ Birch, ii. 451; Kemble, iv. 250; Birch, iii. 469; Kemble, iv. 151.

⁷⁹ Birch, i. 478, 481, 483, 485.

¹ See for these facts Poupardin, *Provence*, pp. 209, 225, 229, 234, and *Bourgogne*, pp. 247-9.

² *Ante*, xxvii (1912), pp. 308-9.

occasionally called *Constantina urbs*. A better solution, which will explain both the name Constantine as a sobriquet, though not derived from a place-name, or invented by Flodoard, and the singular phrase of Richer, can, however, be deduced from a suggestion of Dr. Hofmeister.³ Dr. Hofmeister draws attention to a passage in a letter of the patriarch of Constantinople, Nicholas Mysticus, to Pope Anastasius III between 911 and 913, where reference is made to a marriage, which was at least projected between a daughter of the Byzantine emperor, Leo VI the Philosopher, and a Frankish king. It runs (Nicholas is reporting a speech of his to Leo VI on the occasion of Leo's fourth marriage):

Ἔδει, τέκνον ἡμῶν, καὶ βασιλεῦ, . . . τρισὶν ἀρκεσθῆναι γάμοις· τάχα γὰρ καὶ ὁ τρίτος ἀνάξιος ἦν πῆς σῆς βασιλείας· ἀλλ' ἐκεῖνος ἔχει συγγνώμην, ἴσως τὰ πρὸς τὸν Φράγκον σύμφωνα, διότι συμπεφωνημένον ἦν ὑπὸ σοῦ τὴν σὴν θυγατέρα ἦν μόνην ἐκέκτησο, νύμφην ἀποστέλλειν αὐτῷ. Ἦν δὲ ὁ τῆς Βέρτας ἀνεψιός, ᾧ συνέπεσε δυστυχῆσαι οἷα δεδυστύχηκε. Καὶ ἐπειδὴ συμπεφώνηται τὴν σὴν θυγατέρα πρὸς τὴν Φραγκίαν ἀπιέναι, δεῖ δὲ γυναῖκα τῷ παλατίῳ προσεῖναι τὴν διοικοῦσαν τὰ ἐπιβάλλοντα τῶν σῶν ἀρχόντων ταῖς γυναῖξιν, ἔστι συγχώρησις τῷ τρίτῳ, τῆς θυγατρὸς ἐκδίδοσθαι μελλούσης.

And he adds that the canons do not absolutely forbid a third marriage. There is no doubt as to what persons are meant. Leo's only surviving child before his third marriage was Anna, daughter of his second wife Zoe, the daughter of Zaoutzes. The Frankish king, cousin of Bertha, who met an ill fate, can only be the Emperor Lewis III, who was first cousin once removed of Bertha, countess of Tuscany, a great figure of the time. He was blinded by his rival King Berengar I of Italy in 905. M. Gay thought that the marriage remained a project only. But the reason he alleges for his view, viz. that Anna was declared Augusta by her father at a later date than the betrothal, is shown by Dr. Hofmeister to rest on a misconception, since Anna was made Augusta shortly after her mother's (the Empress Zoe's) death in 896, and the betrothal took place just before the emperor's third marriage in 899.⁵ Dr. Hofmeister further points out that Charles's by-name of Constantine would be easily accounted for by the fact that his mother was the Byzantine Anna, but he leaves the question whether Anna really married Lewis III in suspense.

The passage of Richer, above mentioned, however, furnishes evidence which goes to prove the marriage did take place. It is no simple assertion of Charles's bastardy, which indeed it hardly states, but a slur on his entire descent. It runs: ⁶ 'Karolus

³ *Deutschland und Burgund*, p. 38, n. 2.

⁴ Migne, *Patrol. Graec.* cxi. 197-200; cf. Gay, *L'Italie méridionale et l'empire byzantin*, pp. 153-5.

⁵ See Hofmeister, *loc. cit.*, and his authority De Boor, *Vita Euthymii*, pp. 95-110, 126-7, where the chronology of Leo VI's reign is made out.

⁶ Richer, *Hist.* ii. 98, p. 85, ed. Waitz.

Constantinus . . . ex regio quidem genere natus erat, sed concubinali stemmate usque ad tritavum sordebat, vir grandevus, &c. This is a singular scandal. There is no justification for it in Lewis III's pedigree, and it is not likely that the descent of a low-born concubine would be known in such detail. But when we turn to Anna's pedigree, allowing for a little exaggeration in Richer, we find a remarkable correspondence with the insult. Leo VI had wished to marry her mother Zoe before he ascended the throne, but was forced by his father Basil I to marry the Saint Theophano instead, while Zoe was equally forced into marriage with Theodore Guzuniates. When Theophano's only child Eudocia died in 892-3, if not before, Leo made Zoe his concubine. Theophano died in November 893, and Theodore was poisoned shortly after. Leo then, c. 894, married Zoe, who died in her turn about 896. Thus the doubtful birth of Anna, or rather her mother's position as a concubine, is clearly established.⁷

Leo VI himself, however, was similarly placed. His mother, Eudocia Ingerina, was concubine of the last Amorian emperor, Michael III. He gave her in marriage to his favourite Basil I, who later murdered him, but scandal said that he kept up his relations with her and even asserted that Leo VI was really his son and not Basil's.⁸ However this may be, we have at least the *concubinal stemma* in another generation. The *usque ad tritavum* may pass for an exaggeration of Richer or of his informant. It may again be noticed that Richer does not expressly state that Charles was a bastard, only that he was descended, though royal, from concubines, and this, with Anna for his mother, would be true.

The marriage of Lewis III and Anna about 899-900 was obviously due to current religious politics. Leo VI and his patriarch Antony were striving to heal the Photian schism between Rome and Constantinople, and brought about a reconciliation with Pope John IX in 900.⁹ In that very year, Lewis III, at the invitation of Adalbert of Tuscany, Bertha's husband, and others invaded Italy and took its crown from Berengar I. In 901 he was crowned emperor. Probably intrigues to bring him into Italy had been going on since the death of the Emperor Lambert, Berengar's rival, in October 898.

One difficulty remains to be mentioned, the age of Anna and that of Charles Constantine. It does not seem possible to place Anna's birth before 893. Thus she could hardly have a son before

⁷ See De Boor, *Vita Euthemii*, pp. 128-9, 156-9, and 95-110; and *Leo Grammaticus*, Migne, cviii. 1100, 1104, 1105.

⁸ Bury, *History of the East Roman Empire from the Deposition of Irene to the Accession of Basil I*, p. 169.

⁹ De Boor, *op. cit.*, pp. 97-102, 151-4.

909, when she would be sixteen; and Charles in 951 is called by Richer *grandevus*. But Richer, writing c. 995-6, may be thinking of the age Charles subsequently attained (he lived to 962 at least); and Anna's youth explains her non-intervention in any of Lewis III's charters. Possibly she died on giving birth to her son, for Lewis in 915 appears as married to a certain Adelaide, whom M. Poupardin¹⁰ with great likelihood considers to be a princess of Jurane-Burgundy and mother of Lewis III's other son Rudolf.

It may be asked, how should Richer, living at Rheims in 995, be so well informed on the genealogy of personages living in distant Constantinople a century earlier, whom he does not once mention in his chronicle? The answer is that his father Rudolf¹¹ was a knight of Louis d'Outremer, who was at one time suzerain of and in frequent relations with Charles Constantine. Further, the Bertha, countess of Tuscany, who is mentioned by Nicholas Mysticus in connexion with Lewis III's marriage to Anna, was the mother of the very king, Hugh of Italy, who successfully prevented Charles Constantine's succession in Provence and tried to take from him the county of Vienne.¹² It can be imagined that Hugh would be careful to spread abroad his knowledge of the discreditable facts concerning his rival's ancestry.¹³

Thus the conclusion seems to be that Charles was the son of Lewis III and Anna, and that he derived the sobriquet¹⁴ of Constantine from his Byzantine connexion. It may be noted that his uncle was Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus, and, if by any chance Charles had ascended the throne of the East, his sobriquet of Constantine would most probably have been assumed as his regnal name.

C. W. PREVITÉ ORTON.

¹⁰ Poupardin, *Provence*, pp. 207-8.

¹¹ Richer, ii. 87-91 (pp. 82-3), iii. 7-9 (pp. 89-90). Thus Rudolf was in Louis d'Outremer's service in 949 and 956, while Charles Constantine did homage to Louis at Mâcon in 951 (Flodoard, *M. G. H., Script.* iii. 400, and Richer, ii. 98, p. 85.)

¹² Compare the attempted enfeoffment of Vienne to Eudes, son of Herbert of Vermandois, in 928 (Flodoard, *M. G. H., Script.* iii. 378; cf. Hofmeister, *op. cit.*, p. 50).

¹³ The difference of feeling between Greeks and Westerns with regard to maternal descent is remarked by Liutprand (*Antapodosis* v. 14, ed. Dümmler, p. 607) 'Quoniam Greci in genêseos nobilitate, non quae mater sed quis fuerit pater, inquirunt', Constantine Porphyrogenitus (*De administrando imperio*, c. 13, Migne, *Patr. Graec.* cxiii. c. 185) allows intermarriage of an Emperor's children with the Franks only of non-Roman peoples.

¹⁴ By 'sobriquet' I mean the mere appellative, e.g. Edmund 'Ironside', by surname the second, often official, name, introduced in charters and chronicles by the words 'qui et', e.g. Odelricus qui et Maginfredus, Ulric-Manfred. The conjecture is tempting that Charles acquired his sobriquet of Constantinus (for the uniqueness of which see Poole, *l. c.*) in blundering imitation of the titles of Augustus and Augusta, borne by his parents, e.g. Hludowicus Augustus.