

**DIVISION OF THE HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES**  
**CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY**  
**PASADENA, CALIFORNIA 91125**

FRANKISH RIVALRIES AND NORSE WARRIORS

Eleanor Searle

To appear in The Battle Conferences on  
Anglo-Norman Studies, v. 8



# HUMANITIES WORKING PAPER 118

© Eleanor Searle May 1986

## FRANKISH RIVALRIES AND NORSE WARRIORS

Eleanor Searle

We would all be agreed, I expect, that there is a consensus about the question of what one may call the "continuity/discontinuity model" of early Norse Normandy.<sup>1</sup> Continuity of administration and institutions holds the day, though the adjective "dented" may be its current qualifier.<sup>2</sup> Bear with me even so if I look again at the early evidence questioningly. I think that the "model" is still in need of modification.

Let me remind you briefly of the current picture of Normandy in the early tenth century. It is this: Normandy can be said to have begun in 911 with the treaty of St-Clair-sur-Epte between Charles the Simple and the viking Rollo. Charles ceded land to Rollo for his promise to defend Francia from other invading vikings. There had been, we are taught, a Carolingian count still in Rouen in 905. We can therefore assume that "Rollo could have received almost from the hands of his predecessor certain traditions of Frankish administration," and was "the new count."<sup>3</sup> There was still, so the picture has it, a bishop at Coutances in 906.<sup>4</sup> By 933 Normandy had already taken its shape, by means of other grants made in good faith by the Frankish kings, Charles the Simple and Raoul. From that time on, and certainly

from 940, one ruler, a Carolingian count of, perhaps, little Norse blood himself, and whose people were becoming rapidly gallicized, ruled the ancient pagi from the Pays de Caux to the Couesnon. In a word: "continuity," though under different management. But there is another possible reconstruction of the beginning of Normandy. If we intertwine the internal politics of northern Francia with the supposed cession of Normandy to Rollo and his successors, it is possible that the story looks a more complicated one than that of continuity.

If we are interested in the creation of a Carolingian count out of a viking, then it is well to be aware of the probable reputations of the Carolingians and the vikings in one another's minds, and their conceptions of the constraints appropriate in their mutual dealings. For this, we must go back briefly. In 843 the Treaty of Verdun divided the empire into realms for the three surviving sons of Louis the Pious: that of Louis the German east of the Rhine, of Charles the Bald in the west (Burgundy, Aquitaine and Neustria), and that of eldest, the emperor Lothar I, a kingdom that stretched from Frisia in the north (between the Rhine and the Scheldt) to Southern Italy. Lothar had already legitimized the earliest viking occupation -- that of Walchern at the mouth of the Scheldt.<sup>5</sup> For the rest of his life he used them as mercenaries and suffered from their unreliability. Lothar I died in 855, and his kingdom was divided. Lothar II received the districts between the Rhine and the Scheldt, from Frisia to the Alps, the territory that came to take its name from his: Lotharingia, Lorraine. It included the ancient Carolingian

homeland and the ancient loyalties. It was the beloved land of the Carolingians. Both his uncles coveted the realm of Lothar II.

The opportunity came, as you will know, through the childless marriage -- if marriage it was -- of Lothar II and Theutberga, contracted after the fruitful marriage -- if marriage it was -- of Lothar and Waldrada. It would take us too far afield to consider the famous divortio Lotharii, which Dr. Nelson has so splendidly characterized as a "Hincmargate."<sup>6</sup> The affair ended with Lothar's death in 869 during one of the intervals in which he was still married to Theutberga, and Charles the Bald dispossessed his children (a boy and two girls) and captured Lorraine.

For some years the children are not heard of, but within a decade the boy Hugh was causing trouble. Lothar's two daughters seem to have been in the guardianship of Louis the German's son and successor, Charles the Fat. One, Berthe, was married to Count Thietbald, nephew of the very Theutberga of her parents' tragedy. The other, Gisla, was married, in 882, to Gotfrid, "king of the Norsemen," as part of the concession ceremony in which Gotfrid was baptized, with Charles the Fat as godfather, bestowing upon him the province of Frisia.<sup>7</sup>

In 883, the supporters of Lothar II's son Hugh had grown to include a number of powerful Lotharingian magnates, Count Thietbald among them, and he was in hope of gaining his father's realm, so ran the story at Prüm.<sup>8</sup> Two years later he sent secretly to his brother-in-law Gotfrid, calling upon the Norseman in the name of their

affinity to aid him in taking his patrimony, promising then to share it between them. Gotfrid sent instead to the emperor Charles the Fat asking that he be given certain imperial estates that lay near the confluence of the Ahr and the Rhine and produced excellent wine. Charles, sensitive to the dangers of vikings in "the bowels of the kingdom" rather than at its edge, where they would defend it against their own people, as Regino tells us, determined to extirpate them. An elaborate ruse was planned, which is outlined in great detail by Regino, writing at Prüm nearby. Gotfrid and his wife were lured to a parlay. Gotfrid was murdered with his warband, Gisla was captured and sent to a convent. Finally, Hugh was lured to a separate parlay by the emperor's order. There he was captured, blinded, sent to the monastery of St Gall, and at last to Prüm, where Regino, who told his tale, himself tonsured the prince.<sup>9</sup> Carolingians blinded Carolingians. They murdered Norsemen. And tales travelled, as the vikings travelled, throughout the Scandinavian north. A generation later, the viking Hrólfr was offered a cession of land by Charles the Simple. He could scarcely have been innocent of Frankish rivalries, and of the fate of Norsemen serving those rivalries.

A word next about the land that eventually became Normandy. It may be that because so long before it had been divided into pagi, it has been thought of as more actually organized and more responsive to centralized commands than it was. In truth no area in Francia is so vaguely referred to in the Annals of St-Bertin as "the country between Seine and Loire, with the march of Brittany."<sup>10</sup> Between the rival

Franks and Bretons, it was denied peace enough for prosperity or sustained administration. The supposed bishop of Coutances in 906 turns up once only: in a dubious twelfth-century cartulary entry.<sup>11</sup> The supposed count of Rouen of 905 turns out upon examination to be an unsustainable conjecture by the editor of Charles the Simple's charters.<sup>12</sup> There are no recorded counts of Rouen during the invasion period. There were bishops only. In the 840s there had been "keepers of the river." The nearest count who mattered was upstream, at Paris.<sup>13</sup> No noble found it worthwhile defending, unlike Robert the Strong and the lesser nobles who defended the Loire. The area was safe for no one.

Charles the Bald's grandson, Charles the Simple, was a boy when his imperial predecessor died in 887, and he was passed over. Furthermore, he was not passed over for a Carolingian kinsman. The magnates elected Odo of Neustria, son of the effective Robert the Strong, and himself the hero of a long viking siege of Paris. Odo ruled and fought vikings for ten years, and, dying, urged the claims of the nineteen-year old Charles as king of the western Franks.<sup>14</sup>

By the beginning of the tenth century, the fragments of empire that Charles had inherited had become in effect the patrimonies of the counts of Flanders and Vermandois, of the marquis of Neustria and of the duke of Burgundy. The Robertians and the counts of the north, relying upon kinship-alliances to coordinate their activities when it suited them, had the power of their armies, supported by the profits of estates royal or not -- within their territories.

Their politics, without a doubt, were to a great extent shaped by the magnates' relation to their territories. A line between a region as public responsibility and the region as family property had been acknowledged in earlier generations by both the imperial family and the magnates. Imperial estates and monastic foundations were known to be parts of the imperial fisc, and it was accepted that the emperor could give them or take them away from his official. By the reign of Charles the Simple the distinction seems to have all but disappeared. In 900, when he was free to act as king, Charles attempted the politics of his ancestors, and "took away" from Baldwin of Flanders the abbey of St. Vaast, "which Count Baldwin held with the castrum of Arras," and transferred the abbey to his faithful advisor, Archbishop Fulk. The abbey had to be taken in a siege, apparently by Fulk's men. Furthermore it led only to Fulk's murder by an ally of Baldwin's and the retaking of the abbey by its regional ruler, Baldwin.<sup>15</sup> The abbey had ceased to be part of the royal fisc. St. Vaast was Baldwin's because he willed it so and could defend it.

When the Norse became the king's men, they entered this world of rivalries, where politics were concerned with establishing family territory, increasing it, and splitting it amongst competing heirs, each eager to repeat the ancestor's success. Aggressive and competitive magnates and counts looked at brothers, neighbors and even kings as competitors and as prey.<sup>16</sup> Further, the norms of Frankish noble inheritance exacerbated the competition. The claims of offspring required a continual expansion of the family resources, or they bred

often-violent competition among claimants to constant resources. Their ethos had become that peculiar combination of restraint and brutality that characterized early Frankish knightly society. Charles, their king, was in a weak position to pursue his own interests, being virtually without fighters primarily loyal to him rather than to the local magnates. In such circumstances, his need of allies is evident. It is less evident that he had anything tangible with which to buy them. The vikings of the Seine were the only fighters near enough and sufficiently unattached to be tempted by the questionable authority of a Carolingian concession.

In Charles' boyhood, bands of raiders had again and again overrun the regions reached by the Seine between Rouen and Reims.<sup>17</sup> But by the end of the ninth century they were no longer the scourge they had been. They were unable to establish themselves on Breton territory or near the centers of Frankish forces. But they did not go away. Their own legend, as Dudo retold it, described them now as wearying, as wanting a safe haven rather than the loot the earlier generation had come for.<sup>18</sup> They could however live off the land of the Seine valley and the territory that was watered by the rivers of eastern "Normandy," "committing robbery, with no one resisting them."<sup>19</sup> Frankish/Gallic farmers still raised crops, and the Norse took part of the harvest. Just so did the warriors of Francia. In "Normandy" it was still "robbery" to the chronicler; not yet was it the right of lords. Yet there they were. And Charles, while still under the tutelage of King Odo in the mid-890s, was negotiating for an

alliance with a group of vikings. If they were the Seine vikings, as is likely, this was some time before they were sufficiently weary to accept the necessary condition of Carolingian alliance, conversion to Christianity. Not that Charles the Simple objected to their paganism. He was only nominally king, without power to object to anything. But Archbishop Fulk (883-900) objected. He thought the situation dangerous enough (and Charles weak enough) to threaten to ruin the young man if he persisted in these negotiations. The archbishop was furious that the ill-advised prince was trying to ally himself with the Norse in order to have the glory of a realm. "Who of those who should be faithful to you," he wrote, "would not be terrified that you wish friendship with enemies of God and take up pagan arms and a detestable alliance, to the destruction and ruin of the Christian name?" Charles' ancestors, once they had been converted, the archbishop went on, had been upheld by God. Charles was now deserting God, since he was allying himself with His enemies. In case the prince did not draw the inference, the archbishop put the matter bluntly: "Better you had not been born than to wish to rule a devil's patrimony, and to aid those whom you ought to fight every inch of the way. Be clear about it, if you do this and accept such counsels, you will never have me as your faithful man. And I shall recall from their fidelity to you as many as I am able!"<sup>20</sup> Fulk's letter sets Charles' later grant to the Seine Norse in an unfamiliar light: not as a legitimation and a bulwark against other Seine invaders, but as an access to a force independent of the magnates who had passed over his claims once, and who had no

pressing need of his presence anywhere on "their" territories. He was in the 890s a prince looking desperately and dangerously for power. In 898 he got the throne, but little power.

In that context, Flodoard's emphasis upon the labors of the archbishop's successor, Archbishop Harvey (900-922), for the conversion of the Seine vikings may be interpreted as help given by a worried church to a king still desperately weak. Such long labors may imply negotiations over months or even years for a Christian alliance. Certainly no contemporary or near-contemporary chronicler has commemorated a moment when such an alliance was made formal. No doubt the settlement occurred after 905, the date of the charter in which Charles the Simple granted part of the royal fisc in an area in which no Frank would be likely to oppose it -- at Pitres, near Rouen.<sup>21</sup> Significantly enough, no mention is made of Norsemen.

A truce and an alliance between the king and the vikings of the Seine were forged in the second decade of the tenth century. We can be sure that the alliance and a grant of the right to settle came before 918, for in that year an extant charter of Charles the Simple, granting the abbey of La Croix-Saint-Leufroy and all its possessions to St. Germain, makes an exception of "the part of this abbey that we have given to the Norse of the Seine, namely Rollo and his company, pro tutela regni," whatever meaning we wish to assign that ambiguous phrase.<sup>22</sup> La Croix-Saint-Leufroy was a deserted little abbey on the river Eure, unlikely to have had far-flung possessions. But the monks of St-Germain had already enough confidence in the Norse to be hopeful

about the profitability of expanding their interests into the Evrecin, with Rollo's band as neighbours, presumably along the Seine.<sup>23</sup>

As to the supposed meeting and the treaty at St-Clair-sur-Epte in 911 -- a traité en forme as it has been called, taken virtually always as the beginning of Normandy -- in fact we know neither the year nor the place, supposing there was a formal ceremony of reconciliation. The Norman duke's panegyrist, Dudo of St. Quentin, shows us vividly the ford at St-Clair-sur-Epte, the armies camped on either side, the negotiators hurrying between them, conversations, advice. The king's daughter Gisla is handed over to Rollo as a legitimizing bride, and the Norse chieftain botches the homage-ceremony hilariously and to the humiliation of the pretentious king. It is a wonderful story, but that is exactly what it is: a light moment in a noble and serious saga of the Norman ruling family. No Frank knew of such an event, and Dudo's Gisla was drawn, we must suspect, from the documented tragedy of the Norse Gotfrid. Trust no Frank, even bringing daughters, Dudo warns. Gisla harbored her father's spies in her quarters at Rouen.<sup>24</sup>

We can be sure that Rollo and whatever men he controlled accepted his foes' religion, for the unenviable bishop of Rouen was sent a collection of thirty-three capitula from various papal authorities on how the Norse were to be managed.<sup>25</sup> Unenviable, to say the least. Sometime shortly after 914 the pope was commiserating with the bishop on the continuance of pagan worship and the murders of Christian priests paganorum more, and urging him to rejoice over those whose conversion seemed stable.<sup>26</sup> The Franks were unsure about just

what was going on in the spiritual life (so to speak) of the Norse. The information they have left about the territory ceded to them is equally vague. The most precise description is Flodoard's: "some coastal districts along with Rouen...and some other (places) dependent upon it."<sup>27</sup> Dudo, unreliable as ever, gives two accounts, but the discrepancies are valuable. He speaks of two eastern borders of Rollo's land -- the Epte in one place, and the Andelle in another. Here we have some justification for inferring the existence of a no-man's-land. Both the Epte and Andelle are Seine tributaries on the right bank and lie on either side of the wild forêt de lyon.<sup>28</sup> He adds only that the area was given as an allod, which is merely to say that the Norse of the late tenth century acknowledged some sort of treaty, but felt very little inclined to recognize any conditions of tenure.

Whether, on his side, Charles thought of the agreement as little more than a temporary expedient, is, in the circumstances, impossible to say. What did Robert of Neustria mean in 921 when he conceded "Brittany along with the pagus of Nantes to vikings of the lower Loire"?<sup>29</sup> The terms meant as little as possible, we may plausibly guess. These were bargains between enemies and made in circumstances in which there was no law. The royal charter of 918 does not place Rollo within an aristocratic Frankish polity: it speaks merely of "Rollo and his companions." Never once does the contemporary Flodoard refer to Rollo or William Longsword as "count." Flodoard is punctilious about titles; to him Rollo and his son were both "chieftain of the Norse," or, once "the Norseman," and the territory confirmed to

William's son Richard was "the land of the Norsemen." Carolingian continuity, in the sense of an authorized comital official administering for the king, was not in Flodoard's mind. Keeping his powerful fideles busy and threatened -- without threat to himself -- not continuing Carolingian administration under a Norseman, had become, one may postulate, the imperative of Charles' policy.

For the year 911 was important to Charles the Simple, not because of a treaty with vikings, but because in 911 he was elected King of Lorraine. It was arguably the most important factor in allying with Rollo. He was being offered the ancient heartland of his lineage, with the old family demesnes that he might actually control, and with loyalties to his lineage.<sup>30</sup> From 911, his charters resume the oldest Carolingian style of title -- vir illustris -- that went back beyond kingship and empire to family and the "mayors of the palace," who created Carolingian preeminence.<sup>31</sup> If he were to recreate his lineage's preeminence, the Norse of the Seine could be of the greatest use to him, planted as they were at the backs of his western rivals, the count of Vermandois, and the dukes of Burgundy and Neustria, ideally not as active, but potential enemies, whose presence would not require his own frequent presence. Perhaps then it is no coincidence that the Rouen Norse remained quiet, consolidating their foothold in the Pays de Caux, until he called them. As for Charles, his charters show that from 912, he devoted much of his energy and interest to Lorraine, and spent much time at the royal palaces there. His Lotharingian friend and advisor, Queen Frederuna's kinsman Hagano, was

preferred by him above the western magnates, so the chroniclers said.<sup>32</sup>

By 920 the western magnates had had enough. They met at Soissons and, says Flodoard, had it not been for the active and loyal archbishop, they would have withdrawn their loyalty then and there. Two years later the matter had deteriorated to fighting between Charles with his Lotharingians, and the Robertian forces, in part over the king's attempt to exercise patronage on behalf of Hagano within Robert's territory.<sup>33</sup> In that year, 922, the archbishop lay dying and the Frankish magnates now elected Robert of Neustria their king. Charles could scarcely give up without a fight, and supported by his Lotharingians, he invaded briefly in 923. In the battle that ensued, Robert was killed. But the battle was not lost by the Franks because of the loss, in a mêlée, of a stopgap king. Robert's son Hugh and his son-in-law Herbert of Vermandois put the Lotharingians to flight, and they retreated into Lorraine, having, in Flodoard's phrase, "left Charles within the realm of Francia."<sup>34</sup> Desperate perhaps -- at least deserted -- Charles implored Herbert and the new Archbishop Seulf to return to him. It was too late. Defying him, they sent for Raoul, duke of Burgundy, who rode to meet them with a strong band. Their concern, according to Flodoard, was chiefly that Charles had sent for (unidentified) Norse allies to come to him, as well he might have, alone as he was. The Frankish forces set guards along the river Oise, so that the Norse could not help him, and, capturing the deposed king, they imprisoned him in Herbert's castrum of Château-Thierry on the

Marne.<sup>35</sup> They then elected Raoul of Burgundy king.

The death of the archbishop and the deposition of Charles left their own resources and the royal rights in the hands of a magnate triumvirate of brothers-in-law that had been the creation of Robert of Neustria: his son Hugh (the Great); Raoul of Burgundy, now elected rex; and Herbert II of Vermandois. Such kinship-alliances had become the very stuff of Frankish politics, and more or less valuable, just as the participants desired. Such alliances could not affect the real divergence of interest among the kinsmen. The situation was exacerbated by the presence of the Norsemen, whose only loyalty, such as it was, was to the imprisoned king.

From his prison Charles repeatedly entreated Norse aid, if only in raiding his captors' lands. The first call went, in 923, not to the Rouen chieftain, but, so it was thought in Reims, to "Rögnvald, chieftain of the Norsemen on the Loire."<sup>36</sup> We could scarcely be more forcibly reminded that Rollo and his Rouen warband were not the only, nor even the most prominent, Norsemen with ties to the king. Rollo's raids into Francia appear to have ceased since the truce with the king some ten years earlier. But they had made no pact with the new king Raoul, and "their" king still lived. Now therefore many of Rollo's men joined the Loire warband in a raid or raids east of the Oise. So much only could Charles the Simple achieve, for the Norse were insufficiently strong to restore him. King Raoul, in Burgundy, was alerted. He rode to Compiègne, crossed the Oise westward and thence crossed the Epte into the Pays de Caux. There he "entered the land

that a short while ago had been given to the Norsemen who entered into the Christian faith, that they might nourish that faith and have peace. Because the Norse had broken the peace they had promised on account of Charles' promises (who had offered them an extent of land), the king with the Franks devastated part of this land with slaughter and with fire."<sup>37</sup> The familiar quotation reads differently when we realize that the Norse had been obeying King Charles' command.

Relations between the Norse and the Franks had shifted in the previous decade. The Norse of the Seine had become vulnerable in the way that the Franks were: they had settlements that could be raided. They came swiftly to terms. In the negotiations they asked for a grant that has gone virtually unnoticed because it has been assumed that they had long since been amply and formally endowed. "The Norse having raided our pagos beyond the Oise and our men their land, they promised peace to Count Herbert and Archbishop Seulf, along with other Franks who were camped with them against the Norse, on condition however that land as spacious be given them beyond the Seine."<sup>38</sup> As much on the left bank as on the right: Flodoard thought that only lands in the Pays de Caux attached to Rouen had been given earlier. At the beginning of the following year a money-tax was even collected throughout Francia, to buy them off.<sup>39</sup> That same year, 924, they received a response to their demand: "the Norse made peace with the Franks by oath to counts Hugh and Herbert and to Archbishop Seulf, in the absence of King Raoul; but with his consent (their) land was enlarged: Le Mans and Bayeux (were) conceded to them in a peace

pact."<sup>40</sup> In the light of the Frankish political situation, it looks as if Charles the Simple's captors were offering the Norse an alternative to raids eastwards in the king's interest. In perhaps the same spirit, faced with the absence of a Breton war leader to defend the Loire basin from Nantes, Robert of Neustria in 921 had formally ceded the Cotentin, Avranchin and Brittany with the pagus of Nantes to the Norse of the west. Just so perhaps, Hugh the Great and Herbert renewed the grant of Nantes to the Loire war band in 927.<sup>41</sup> No one aided the grantees when, as tradition had it, Alain Barbetorte returned from exile in 937 and drove Norse settlers out.<sup>42</sup> Maine, which Flodoard, possibly quite rightly, thought had been conceded to the Rouen Norse in 924, was in fact successfully defended by Hugh, count of Le Mans. When in 924 the Seine vikings were urged to look westward and were given more than they could chew, "Rögnvald with his Norsemen, because they had not yet received a possession within Gallia, depopulated Hugh's land between the Loire and the Seine."<sup>43</sup> The Norse bands were divided, and Rollo was by no means in control. In the Pays de Caux he was a great chieftain. Even there he appears to have been merely a chieftain in an area of independent, fragmented Scandinavian settlement. Dudo himself reflects the situation with his dialogue between the Franks and the earlier Norse ships on the Seine: "By what name does your leader go?" "By none for we are of equal power."<sup>44</sup> As I shall argue, Longsword had rivals nearby, and there were pagan bands well into Richard's reign. By 925 the Norse had constructed a wooden castrum at Eu. But a fort on the Bresle was too far east, too

much a challenge to the lords of the "coastal Franks" to be successfully defended in the 920s. In great detail Flodoard describes the storming of the fort, its burning and the slaughter of the Norse.<sup>45</sup>

Soon however, the Frankish magnates in their mutual determination to block one another's bids for preeminence, began to pull the Rouen Norse into serving the stratagems of their endemic rivalries. At first, as when Charles the Simple called them, they could bring only their ill-disciplined ferocities. Gradually, after Rollo's death, around 930, as their new chieftain began to ride with the Frankish nobles and to devastate in noble fashion, he came, perhaps, to approximate a noble himself. The conflicts in which he now joined Hugh the Great and Herbert of Vermandois were not serious wars, aimed at overthrow, defeat and death, but at the capture of resources, the widening of territory and the weakening of rivals. In these cavalry *chevauchées* and selective pillaging, the Norse had perhaps their first important lessons in Carolingian continuity.

Between 930 and 933, Rollo's successor, William Longsword, commended himself first to Charles, affirming at the same time formal friendship with Charles' gaoler, Herbert of Vermandois, then to Hugh of Neustria and to Herbert again, and at last in 933, Charles having died, to King Raoul. Raoul responded, with a grant that, from his point of view, was cheap enough. In 933 William received (so, at least, it was thought at Reims) "the land of the Bretons lying on the seacoast," whatever that phrase means.<sup>46</sup> This was as idle as the same grant made by Hugh the Great in 921 to the Loire vikings. But it might turn Rouen

attention westward, encouraging any pretensions William might have to preeminence over the Loire vikings and such newcomers as were trying to settle, and were encountering fierce but disorganized resistance.<sup>47</sup>

Longsword's part after 933, is and will no doubt remain, little known, but it is true that without a unifying war leader eastern Brittany did lie open to Norse settlement between ca. 913 and 937.<sup>48</sup> The single "coin" or medallion found at Mont-Saint-Michel, stamped +VVILIEDMU+IRB, or VVILIEDMU+IRB+, or IRB+VVILIEDMU+ is evidence of a presence on the Breton coast at the Couesnon estuary, of some group with access to a Celtic moneyer (one Riualon) working, it appears, within an Insular tradition (the "coin" could have been a product of the Chester mint) and with a paymaster whose name was probably William. The "coin" is as bizarre and frustrating a piece of evidence as may be imagined.<sup>49</sup> It may well be evidence of William Longsword's claim to a chieftainship. Some Norse war leaders and Breton *machtierns* may have recognized Longsword in the mid-930s as some sort of superior. But his capacity to command there would have been limited by his capacity to establish individual relationships with local chiefs, and by the powers of those local chiefs.<sup>50</sup> Such relationships must have been tenuous at best and when Alain Barbetorte began to reconquer his native Brittany in the late 930s, the relationships snapped entirely. In 939, the year of Alain's signal victory at Trans near Dol (the battle was fought in August), William seems to have been entirely absorbed in his role as a Frankish mercenary/ally. That summer he was campaigning with Hugh in Flanders.<sup>51</sup>

Dudo, for all his faults, is revealing about the extent of the Norse chieftainship Longsword exercised. Writing at the end of the century for the ruling family, he certainly calls Longsword "duke of Brittany." But although he would, I think, have retailed any story his patrons wanted, in fact he never pictures him as lord of any lands much beyond the Seine.<sup>52</sup> In this, his story of the rebellion of Riulf is instructive. Just as his history pictures the chieftains combining to oust Rollo on account of incapacity in old age, so his Riulf convinces a coalition of chieftains that Longsword's connection with the Franks was a danger to themselves, for he might invite them to reoccupy Norse territory. The story is wonderfully told, but we can touch it only briefly. William is depicted as negotiating from a weak position, and conceding point after point until he is made to fight, on the very outskirts of Rouen. And who was Riulf, and where was his chieftainship? He has been placed, by some modern scholars, in the Cotentin; by others in the Bessin. Orderic, on the other hand, thought him an Évrecin chieftain.<sup>53</sup> And that makes sense. For what Riulf wanted was to be given land up to the river Risle -- to get away from the Franks. And that is scarcely what a chieftain of the west would have achieved by the demand. Longsword first replies that he is unable to give them the land. Instead he offers horses, arms, armor, and the power of being his counselors, nay his rulers, for he will execute their decisions in everything. The tale, read without the preconception that Longsword controlled Normandy to the Couesnon, is of a prestigious chieftain, but one who cannot control even the Évrecin:

he cannot control the chieftains there, and he cannot reward his men with land there.<sup>54</sup> One might even say that the lesson that the family saga was intended to transmit in the episode was that stability lay in cultivating the trust and cooperation of the other Norse chieftains, and in nothing else. Longsword's Frankishness is not the point of the story. The danger of his Frankishness is the point.

It has been assumed that the Mont-Saint-Michel "coin" is evidence for Longsword as a chieftain in the west. In fact, there is no way of knowing. Some eighty years after his death, the monks of Mont-Saint-Michel persuaded Richard II to give them a group of hamlets in the Avranchin that they claimed had been given them originally by Longsword, and subsequently taken from them. By and large, these villulas cluster around the mouth of the Couesnon, within a kilometer or two of the channel shore.<sup>55</sup> Now, Mont-Saint-Michel dates its refoundation from the reign of Richard I, not from that of Longsword. Just who, if anyone, might have been inhabiting the island-in-peril-of-the-sea in the 930s we do not know, but there may have been a few canons left of the old community. If so, they needed the nearby hamlets for provisions, and one can imagine the Christian viking supporting their claims. But this is very dubious evidence for Longsword as a donor or chieftain. The real lesson of the charter is that properties in the Cotentin and Avranchin could not be protected from the distance of Rouen even at the end of the tenth century. There is no convincing evidence that Normandy had taken shape by 933 or that the viking leader of Rouen had any authority, Carolingian or

Scandinavian, among the settlers of the Cotentin.

The possessions with which Longsword and his father are associated in the charters of Jumièges, St-Ouen, and Rouen cathedral, the (probable) existence of his house at Fécamp, and the dower of his wife Leyarde show clearly enough what the first Norse Rouen rulers thought they could actually protect. Rollo was credited with the gift to St-Ouen of hamlets just west of the confluence of the Epte and the Seine, on its right bank.<sup>56</sup> To these Longsword was credited with adding the Seine island of St-Pierre and properties on the left bank within a few kilometers of the island.<sup>57</sup> Rouen cathedral, in a thirteenth-century cartulary, associated Longsword with the gift of three groups of properties: one near Les Andelys, one near the confluence of the Seine and Epte (thus both on the right bank of the Seine), and three properties in the French Vexin and the Beauvaisis.<sup>58</sup> To these we may add the dower of his wife (a hamlet probably near Vernon), the gifts to Jumièges that all lie on the banks of the Seine, seawards of Rouen, and finally the residence with which Dudo credits him, in Fécamp.<sup>59</sup> This is no more than the wedge of the Pays de Caux, and Seine valley which we can be fairly sure from Frankish sources that the Norse of Rouen possessed in about 920. Surely Rollo's and Longsword's most valuable asset was Rouen, potentially a commercial center, and its immediate provisioning neighborhood.<sup>60</sup> The evidence for control in the west is too ambiguous to trust, and we require blinkers to ignore the powerful Alain Barbetorte if we wish to think that the Rouen Norse had pushed their authority overland to the

Cotentin by the 930s. More likely, especially in view of the place-name evidence, the peninsula was settled by Norse-Gaelic newcomers, and from the sea.<sup>61</sup> Indeed in light of the lands that Rollo and Longsword actually could control, we must consider that their power radiated very unevenly out from Rouen, and that Norse leadership even in the east was exceedingly fragmented. In 940, after all, the new king, Louis d'Outremer, allowed Longsword only the land that his father Charles had ceded to Rollo.<sup>62</sup> That much only did Longsword control.

The evidence should rather cause us to look eastward from Rouen, for (with all its difficulties) that evidence suggests that William himself looked east. Richer and closer opportunities for expansion lay in the maritime districts of Ponthieu than the Cotentin. The Norse and the Flemish had been rivals over Eu. In the late 930s Longsword and Arnulf of Flanders came to be active rivals over Ponthieu, and specifically over which would be the master of that lesser lord, Herluin, whose stronghold was Montreuil.

William's activities among the Frankish nobles received ample attention at Reims. Between 939 and 942 he and his men rode in company with Hugh the Great and Herbert of Vermandois in those sieges and skirmishes over resources in northern Francia, where every resource had at least two claimants, and every claimant could turn to a protector seeking to add client to client. By 942 it may well have seemed to William that his acceptance was complete and that he could, to his advantage, play the Frankish noble game with the same immunity as the magnates among whom he now moved. In that year he actually

"received King Louis royally at Rouen."<sup>63</sup>

But the dux pyratum, welcome enough as a partner in sieges and harrying, was not welcome to interfere in a Frankish magnate's control of Montreuil's minor lord. It was Gotfrid's miscalculation all over again: wanting land not at the border, but actually among the Franks. As Richer says (and he is speaking of Longsword's "royal" reception of the king at Rouen in 942) "Hugh and Arnulf were deliberating what they should do about William."<sup>64</sup> The solution was the old one. Arnulf lured William to a parlay and had him murdered.

A Frank even composed a Lament for the Death of William Longsword.<sup>65</sup> But the fact remained that while Frank rarely murdered Frank, they did murder Norsemen. "The Norseman" is what Flodoard consistently calls William Longsword, and that is what he turned out to be. He had the inestimable asset of commercial Rouen, and in Rouen he had an archbishop. But so far as we know, the archbishop had no bishops who could reside in their dioceses. The episcopal lists of the Gallia Christiana show either gaps, or a bishop living in a Rouen church throughout the tenth century, and in the west, still longer.

Lord of the Pays de Caux William was, and of parts of the northern Eyrecin. Lord of anything like "Normandy," or even Upper Normandy, he was not. What he dared to forget was that he was not, to the Frankish nobles, even the legitimate count of Rouen we have been calling him. He was an expendable instrument in the rivalries of the Franks. If this be the case, then the continuity we seem to see in mid-eleventh century evidence followed a long, slow extension of

political control after his death, and was based upon future generations' readiness to be educated (perhaps in Rouen cathedral archives) in administrative means of control. There was not continuity, but reclamation: the reclamation of a tradition of centralized governance that had lost most of its life long before the Norse arrived. But that achievement was still a long way off on the day Longsword was alive and dead.

NOTES

I wish to record my particular gratitude to Dr. David N. Dumville for his careful and helpful comments on this paper.

<sup>1</sup> The most recent and influential presentation of the "continuity model" is that of Jean Yver, "Les Premières Institutions du Duché de Normandie," I Normanni e la loro Espansione in Europa Nell'Alto Medioevo, Settimane di Studio del Centro Italiano di Studi sull'Alto Medioevo XVI, Spoleto, 1969, 299-366.

<sup>2</sup> The recent summary of the model is that of David Bates, Normandy before 1066, New York, 1982, chapter one. For "dented," see p. 11. Bates modifies the model as it applies to settlement, giving a very useful and thoughtful analysis of recent evidence of Scandinavian settlement, and concluding that "continuity of this kind is . . . a delicate animal." He proposes an "initial Scandinavian impact," but rapid and steady assimilation to Carolingian practices as those were evolving among the Franks: "It remains undeniable that Rollo, in assuming the title of count of Rouen, was identifying himself and the province he ruled with Frankish forms," pp. 16, 23. Our differences concern the forms of power, and the spread of the early Rouen chieftain's power. They may be summed up immediately: I see no evidence that Rollo assumed the title count, nor that he ruled a province, nor that he identified in any way with the Franks.

<sup>3</sup> Yver, "Institutions de Normandie," 331-32, 591-93.

<sup>4</sup> David Bates, Normandy, ll. For the charter see below, n. ll.

<sup>5</sup> Annales de Saint-Bertin, ed. F. Grat et al., Paris, 1964, 39, s.a.

841: "Herioldo, qui cum ceteris Danorum pyratis per aliquot annos Frisiae aliisque christianorum maritimis incommoda tanta sui causa ad patris iniuriam invexerat, Gualacras aliaque vicina loca huius meriti gratia in beneficium contulit. Dignum sane omni detestatione facinus, ut qui mala christianis intulerant, idem christianorum terris et populis Christique ecclesiis praeferrentur, ut persecutores fidei christiana domini christianorum existerent, et daemonum cultoribus christiani populi deservirent!" The author of this outraged sarcasm was Bishop Prudentius of Troyes.

<sup>6</sup> Janet Nelson, "The Annals of St. Bertin," in Charles the Bald, Court and Kingdom, eds. M. Gibson and J. Nelson, BAR International Series 101, 1981, 27.

<sup>7</sup> Reginonis Abbatis Prumiensis Chronicon, ed. F. Kurze, MGH, 1870; in usum schol., 120-1, s.a. 882, Hannover, 1978. Gotfrid was one of two reges Nortmannorum who had taken the town of Haslon (now Maastricht) and were raiding into Lorraine with an "innumerable multitude of foot and mounted warriors," Regino, 118, s.a. 881. The other king, Sigfrid, and his men were given a "huge weight of gold and silver" to leave the realm. Charles the Fat had collected a host of Lombards, Bavarians, Alamans, Thuringians, Saxons and Frisians to drive out the Norse, but

"to little effect" in Regino's words. He had had therefore to come to terms, and to "concede" territory to Gotfrid.

<sup>8</sup> Regino, 121, s.a. 883.

<sup>9</sup> Regino, 123-5, s.a. 885, gives the details of Hugh's plot and Charles' counterplot.

<sup>10</sup> Annales de Saint-Bertin, 32, and see also 24-5, 66, 80, 151.

<sup>11</sup> Recueil des Actes de Charles III le Simple, ed. Philippe Lauer, Paris, 1949, no. 53. Any twelfth-century pretended copy of a tenth-century charter must be suspect, for it is likely to have been "retouched" if only to add verisimilitude to a genuine grant. In the case of this charter, the name of the bishop cannot be acceptable for it is otherwise unknown, and the charter is particularly self-serving. It claims to establish near Laon in Frankish territory a new church with lands, as the repository of the relics of St. Marcoul, a Cotentin saint. The bishop is cited as assenting. This may have been the case, but whether it was or not, such an assent was most desirable by the twelfth century. The bishop, incidentally, is not, as has been claimed, pictured as at Coutances in the charter.

<sup>12</sup> Recueil Charles le Simple, no. 51, n. 3. This charter, dated in December, 905, at Laon, is an original, and therefore has an authority that cartulary copies do not have. It is often used as evidence that as late as 905, a Carolingian count still administered Rouen, since the grant (at Pîtres) is said to have been made at the request of Raoul,

bishop of Laon, and "Count Odilard," who is otherwise unknown. This was the tentative opinion of the editor, but since any confirming evidence is lacking, and since "requesters" were not otherwise local to the property involved, the inference is too tentative to carry any weight. We do not know enough about the late Carolingian counts to be sure that "Odilard" was not at the time a count of Laon, for example, or any comes in Charles' entourage at Laon.

<sup>13</sup> Nithard, De Dissensionibus filiorum Ludowici Pii, ed. and trans. Philippe Lauer, Paris, 1926, 54-56, s.a. 841. For a recent appraisal of Nithard, see Janet Nelson, "Public Histories and Private History in the Work of Nithard," Speculum 60, no. 2, 1985, 251-293.

<sup>14</sup> Archbishop Fulc had had young Charles privately crowned in 892/3, presumably in an attempt to secure his eventual succession. The archbishop communicated his worries for the boy's acceptance to Pope Formosus (891; d. 896) and secured the pope's adherence to the Carolingian. Flodoard, Historiae Ecclesiae Remensis, Migne, Patrologia Latina t. 135, cols. 268-9, 273. Charters were issued in the boy's name after 893. Recueil Charles le Simple, liv. But it is quite clear from the archbishop's letters, summaries of which were preserved by Flodoard in his Hist. Eccl. Rem, that Charles was in no sense a co-ruler with Odo. The archbishop, for example, turned to Odo in suggesting candidates for vacant bishoprics. When the archbishop erected a new castellum at Epernay, Odo interpreted it as hostile to himself and as intended to strengthen Charles' position, and so he

destroyed it. Hist. Eccl. Rem., Migne, t. 135, col. 288.

15 Flodoard, Hist. Eccl. Rem., Migne, t. 135, col. 290.

16 There is an immense and rapidly growing literature on the subject.

For a bibliography on the subject, see The medieval nobility, ed.

Timothy Reuter, Amsterdam, 1979, 331-66. A recent study by Jack Goody,

The Development of the Family and Marriage in Europe, Cambridge, 1983,

118-25 considers the family and its relation to "its" property, but

sees it largely in terms of the demands of churches and monasteries for

stable endowment. For the early tenth century, and in crowded Francia,

one is dealing with a period before the church had enough power to

claim its resources as uniquely its own. Insofar as the nobility

protected the rights of churches to their properties during this

period, they appear to have done so in order to have them available to

the family, and not the other way around.

17 Archbishop Hincmar laid down his pen in despair as he prepared to

leave Reims before the viking attack in 882. The old man never

returned. The Annales Vedastini, ed. G. Pertz, MGH, i, 526, s.a. 889,

record: "Dani vero more suo Burgundiam, Neustriam atque partem

Aquitaniae, nullo resistente, igne et ferro devastant." The

chroniclers of the north are consistent in their bitter accusation that

the Carolingians refused, as on the whole they did, to defend their

people against the invaders.

18 Dudo, 167.

19 Ann. Vedast., 530 s.a. 897. There must have been at least two separate groups in 897. One had retreated before a Frankish force to the Loire, the other to the Seine.

20 In case this were not enough, the letter continues with a further threat of excommunication. Flodoard, Hist. Eccl. Rem., Migne, t. 135, cols. 276-277; also printed in Fulconis Archiepiscopi Remensis Epistolae, Migne, t. 131, cols. 13-14, there wrongly said to be a letter of 894 to Charles the Bald.

21 Recueil Charles le Simple, no. 51, see n. 12 above.

22 Recueil Charles le Simple, no. 92, again an original.

23 La Croix-Saint-Leufroy was founded at the end of the seventh century by a local man schooled at Chartres. Almost immediately after his death it was "exposed to the rapacity of men, secular (priests) and lay, who were devouring the possessions of holy places." The monks deserted it when the Norse came, and fled with the body of their founder to St. Germain, but are thought to have returned in the early tenth century when peace had been restored in the region. Gallia Christiana XI, cols. 632-33.

24 Dudo, 173. Moreover, "They have said that (Rollo) never acknowledged her as a legal wife (maritali lege)."

25 Flodoard, Hist. Eccl. Rem., Migne, t. 135, cols. 292-93.

- 26 Rollo's inability to control the Norse settlers of Upper Normandy is an indication that he was by no means the chieftain of a unified immigrant group. Adémar de Chabannes, writing later, confirms the reputation of the Norse. Adémar de Chabannes, Chronique, ed. J. Chavanon, Paris, 1897, 139-40. The pope's letter is found in Notitia Historica, Migne, t. 131, cols. 27-29. "Nam quod de his vestra nobis innotuit fraternitas, quid agendum sit quod fuerint baptizati et rebaptizati, et post baptismum gentiliter vixerint, atque paganorum more Christianos interfecerint sacerdotes trucidaverint, atque simulacris immolantes idolothyta comederint. . . ." The killings are reminiscent of the ritual murders of which the Norse were accused elsewhere. The letter assures us of a date after 914, for the pope in question was John X (914-28), not John IX, to whom the letter is attributed in Migne. See J. Hourlier, "Reims et les Normands," in Mémoires de la Société d'Agriculture, Commerce, Sciences et Arts du département de la Marne, t. xcix, 1984, 101, n. 63, and Olivier Guillot, "Des reflets contemporains à l'historiographie ultérieure (x<sup>e</sup> - xi<sup>e</sup> siècles)," Cahiers de Civilisation Médiévale xxiv, 1981, 101-16, 181-219.
- 27 Flodoard, Hist. Eccl. Rem., Migne, t. 135, cols. 292-93. As Hourlier remarks, this remains "la source la plus précise sur ce traité fort mal connu," "Reims et les Normands," 101, n. 64.
- 28 Dudo, 168-69, 254.

29 Flodoard, Annales, 6. Robert dealt only with the Loire vikings and no earlier grants to the Seine vikings are recorded.

30 See R. McKitterick, Frankish Kingdoms under the Carolingians: 751-987, New York, 1983, 307-8 and Map 18.

31 Recueil Charles le Simple, liv.

32 Flodoard, Annales, 2 and n. 2.

33 Flodoard, Annales, 7-10. Chelles, the abbey over which they fought, had been held by Charles' paternal aunt, Rohaut, and would therefore, one might expect, be peculiarly his to bestow as he liked. But as Flodoard is careful to point out, she was the mother-in-law of Robert's son Hugh, and thus, aside from the location of the monastery, Robert might consider his "family" right quite as strong as the king's.

34 Flodoard, Annales, 13-14.

35 Flodoard, Annales, 14-15, and see other references there. The Norse to whom Charles was expected to appeal were likely, but not certainly, the men of Rollo in Rouen, for the Oise, which the Franks guarded, flows into the Seine at Paris from the northeast. Soissons, where Charles fought the Frankish magnates, is east of the Oise. The Norse of Rouen might either have sailed up the Seine to the confluence of the rivers, or more likely, in view of Flodoard's wording, were expected to come by land along the Roman road from Rouen, on the right bank, and to cross the Oise at one of its fords. With the Oise secured by his

enemies, Charles fled east across the Meuse, but was tricked into returning to meet with Herbert at his stronghold of St-Quentin on the Somme. From there he was conducted, a prisoner, to Château-Thierry.

36 Flodoard, Annales, 15, s.a. 923. Charles is said to have implored Rognvald "by frequent messengers" to cross into "Francia across the Oise," which he did, adding to his force many from Rouen.

37 Flodoard, Annales, 16-17, s.a. 923.

38 Flodoard, Annales, 18-19, s.a. 923. As Lauer remarks there, this phrase signified the left bank to Flodoard. Charles' charter of 918 (see above, n. 20) implies that he had made such a grant. Flodoard's statement would seem to suggest that either Rollo's men had been unable to hold the left bank, or that they were seeking another formal agreement to what Charles had granted or that Flodoard, writing a few years later, was unsure what lands they had.

39 Flodoard Annales, s.a., 924, p. 19.

40 Flodoard, Annales, 24, s.a., 924.

41 Flodoard, Annales, 6, s.a. 921; 37-38, s.a. 927.

42 La Chronique de Nantes, 570-149, ed. R. Merlet, Paris 1986, 89-90. Flodoard, Annales, 68 does not mention Alain in this context, but he records that numerous battles were being fought between the Bretons and the Norse "qui terram ipsorum contiguam sibi pervaserant."

43 Flodoard, Annales, 24, 197, s.a. 924. That same year Hugh "came to an agreement with Rôgnvald about the security of his land, and Rôgnvald with his Norsemen departed into Burgundy." There they met heavy opposition and were very nearly annihilated. Flodoard, Annales, 26-33.

44 Dudo, 154.

45 Flodoard, Annales, 31-32, s.a. 925. Flodoard's details presumably were provided by the archbishopric's fighters, many of whom participated in the battle.

46 Flodoard, 55: "Willelmus, princeps Nordmannorum, eidem regi se committit; cui etiam rex dat terram Brittonum in ora maritima sitam."

47 Flodoard, Annales, 50, 51-52, s.a. 931.

48 The Bretons had such a leader, Alain the Great, in 907, and Dr. Dumville points out to me that only ca. 913 do signs of trouble begin.

49 For the coin, see M. Dolley and J. Yvon, "A Group of tenth-century coins found at Mont-Saint-Michel," British Numismatological Journal 40, 1971, 7-11. It may indeed have been a medallion rather than one of an issue of coins, as C. E. Blunt has suggested concerning a contemporaneous coin of Hywel Dda, produced at an English mint, probably Chester, British Numismatological Journal 52, 1982, 117-22. I am most grateful to Dr. Dumville for this reference.

50 A point made by Wendy Davies about even Breton duces. "On the Distribution of Political Power in Brittany in the mid-ninth century," in Charles the Bald: Court and Kingdom, eds. Margaret Gibson and Janet Nelson, BAR International Series 101, 1981, 99.

51 Flodoard, 74.

52 See Eleanor Searle, "Fact and Pattern in Heroic History: Dudo of Saint-Quentin," Viator 15, 1984, 119-137 for the (narrow) limits within which I think that Dudo can be used as a source for early Norman history.

53 Orderic, i, 154.

54 Dudo, 80-81, 187-191.

55 Fauroux, no. 49. The properties had been taken from Mont-Saint-Michel by Count Robert, probably the son of Richard I, for one of the three exceptional holdings is a farmstead "in the valley of the castle of Mortain." The other exceptions are Marigny, between Coutances and St-Lô, and St-Jean-le-Thomas, near the abbey, but on the north coast of the bay.

56 Fauroux, no. 53. There is no original charter. There is only a copy of the late eleventh century, so one cannot say that Rollo was more than associated with the properties in the minds of the much later monks.

57 Fauroux, no. 53; and see D. C. Douglas, "The Rise of Normandy," in Time and the Hour, London 1977, 99, and notes 32-36.

58 Fauroux, no. 67.

59 Fauroux nos. 14 bis, 36. He gave his new foundation of Jumièges the old monastic site and its dependencies between Caudebec-en-Caux and Duclair on the right bank, and to around Quillebeuf-sur-Seine on the left bank. Their economic resources are set out in a list that consists of water-meadows, woods, vines, streams and aquarum decursibus (water courses) and fisheries. To these, he added a mill, a mesnil, or homestead, several villae which are perhaps best understood as hamlets, a portum in fluvio Sequane qui dicitur Tutus (no doubt a good landing-stage) and two settlements (burgum) with churches, toll and portu. It gives an idea of the underdeveloped resources of the valley. For the existence in the tenth century of the residence at Fécamp in which Dudo pictures Longsword's son as born, and which he visited at the end of the century, see Annie Renoux, "Recherches Historiques et Archéologiques sur le Château de Fécamp, ancien palais des ducs de Normandie," Château Gaillard viii, 1975, 188-200, and her "Le Château des Ducs de Normandie à Fécamp (Xe-XII<sup>e</sup>s.). Quelques données archéologiques et topographiques," Archéologie Médiévale IX, 1979, 12-15.

60 Dudo emphasizes Rollo's control of the neighborhood peasants, pp. 172-73.

61 For place-names the fundamental source is the series of articles by Adigard des Gautries, "Les Noms de lieux de la Normandie entre 911 et 1066," Annales de Normandie i-ix, 1951-59.

62 Flodoard, Annales, 75, s.a. 940. That is, Raoul's offer of the Breton seacoast was withdrawn, as well it might have been, with Alain in control, and accepted by Louis d'Outremer as duke. Alain may well have been a friend of Louis, for both had been exiles at the English court.

63 Flodoard, 84. About the same time Longsword probably married the daughter of Herbert II of Vermandois and probably gave his sister in marriage to the count of Poitou. Neither marriage is recorded except in Dudo and eleventh-century sources, but neither is intrinsically unlikely, and as Dr. Jane Martindale pointed out in discussion, Poitou may have sought an alliance with Rouen that would pose a potential threat to Hugh the Great of Neustria.

64 Richer, Histoire de France, ed. and trans., Robert Latouche, Paris, 1937, 594.

65 Étude sur la vie et la mort de Guillaume Longue Épée, ed. J. Lair, 1893, 61-70.