

Die Arbeit des Verfassers, die 1959 erschienen ist, hat jetzt zum ersten Mal eine — wenn auch nur sehr summarische — Würdigung in einer wissenschaftlichen Zeitschrift gefunden<sup>45</sup>). Es wäre aber zu wünschen, daß die kunstgeschichtliche Forschung, die, solange das Rätsel der Leuchter noch ungelöst war, wie im Falle der Goldkanne von St. Maurice nicht zu einem allgemein anerkannten Zeitansatz gelangen konnte, zum Ergebnis der Untersuchung eingehend Stellung nähme. Da der Verfasser ihr ohnehin die wichtige Frage, wo die Werkstatt des Stabes gesucht werden muß, zu klären überlassen hat, wäre Gelegenheit gegeben, die in der Diskussion über die Leuchter von Kremsmünster bisher gegen ihre karolingische Zeitstellung ins Feld geführten stilistischen Kriterien auf ihre datierende Eigenschaft hin zu überprüfen.

## The Dating of Codex Carolinus Nos. 95, 96, 97, Wilchar, and the Beginnings of the Archbishopric of Sens<sup>1</sup>)

By

Donald Bullough

In 791, to avoid further loss and damage, the texts of the Papal letters available at the Frankish court were transcribed into a single volume, the so-called Codex Carolinus, of which a unique early copy survives<sup>2</sup>). All but a very few of the letters in question were addressed to the Carolingians — as mayors of the palace and subsequently as kings. The exceptions are those that figure as nos. 95, 96 and 97 in Gundlach's edition. In the manuscript they constitute only two letters: the second of these (representing the printed edition's 97 + 96) reproduces verbatim an earlier letter which had never reached its destination. These are addressed respectively to 'all the orthodox bishops throughout Spain' (95) and to the Spanish bishop Egila (97 + 96)<sup>3</sup>). How they came to be available for copying at Charles' court is not apparent and does not seem to have been discussed: either the messengers sent with them had travelled via the Frankish court, where copies were made at the time — which seems highly implausible — or the Pope had subsequently sent copies from his own chancery to Charles, which is unexpected and not, I think, paralleled

<sup>45</sup>) (G. W a c h a), *MIÖG.* 69 (1961) 213.

<sup>1</sup>) My warmest thanks are due to Professor F.-L. G a n s h o f who not only read a first draft of this note and drew my attention to the important book of R a m ó n d e A b a d a l, cited below (n. 5) but also generously sent me his own copy.

<sup>2</sup>) Best edition by W. G u n d l a c h, *MG. Epp.* 3, 476—653.

<sup>3</sup>) To be precise, no. 96 was addressed to bishop Egila and his helper the presbyter John, no. 97 to Egila alone.