

elsewhere but by no means impossible⁴). They were included in the Codex Carolinus presumably because they reflect an attempt made in the 780s by Charles to win control over the church south of the Pyrenees⁵), an episode for which they are indeed the only source. To the historian of this period they are also of interest firstly, because they illustrate both the final phases of the Migetien heresy and the initial stages of the Adoptianist heresy (which greatly preoccupied Frankish churchmen in the next decade⁶); secondly, because they are among the very few texts that throw any light on the activity of the *archiepiscopus (provinciae) Galliarum* Wilchar⁷); and thirdly, because Gundlach n. 97 contains the one unambiguous reference to Bishop Peter (II) of Pavia and is therefore a key text in any attempt to establish the much-discussed sequence and chronology of the bishops of Pavia in the second half of the eight century⁸).

Gundlach did not attempt to date the group of three letters any more closely than '785/91', although the order in which he printed them represented the order in which (following Hauck)⁹) he believed that they were written. It seems possible to date no. 95 a little more precisely than this. The first hint in the writings of Bishop Elipand of Toledo of the heretical notion that Christ was a pure man 'adopted' by God as His Son is to be found in his letter to Migetius which is generally regarded as being of 785 or earlier and possibly very much earlier¹⁰). The reference to Ascaricus in conjunction with Elipand

4) The most serious objection to the second view is that no. 96 is transmitted only as part of no. 97 and not separately as we would expect if copies had been sent from Rome: for we are specifically told in no. 97 that the 'lost' no. 96 has been copied out from the Register. No conclusion can be drawn from the omission of the formal Farewell (which would presumably have been something like *Deus vos incolomes custodiat, dilectissimi fratres*) from all three of these letters: a similar omission is found in other parts of C. C. although it is certainly unusual (see nos. 29, 33, 44); and Steinacker has made it likely that the Papal Registers of this period included both protocoll and eschatacoll in full: *MIOG.* 23 (1902) 1—49; *ibid.* 52 (1938) 171—194. At least as regards the protocol, this is of course confirmed by C. C. no. 96, which does not seem hitherto to have been referred to in this connection.

5) D. Ramón de Abadal y de Vinyals, *La batalla del Adopcionismo en la desintegración de la Iglesia visigoda* (1949) p. 38—50, although here as elsewhere the author strains the evidence to justify his theories.

6) Comprehensive accounts of these heresies may be found in, e.g., A. Hauck, *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands* 2 (1890) 251 ff. (Migetius), 255 ff.; Z. García Villada, *Historia eclesiástica de España* 3 (1936), *passim*; and (for Adoptianism) Ramón de Abadal, p. 51—164. For the background to Elipand's unorthodoxy see also J. F. Rivera, *Elipando de Toledo: nueva aportación a los estudios mozárabes* (1940) (to be used with caution).

7) The best account of his career is still that of E. Lesne, *La hiérarchie épiscopale 742—882* (*Mem. et Trav. des fac. cath. de Lille*, 1; Lille-Paris, 1905) p. 57—61, following L. Duchesne, „*Wilchaire de Sens, archevêque des Gaules*“, *Bull. de la soc. archéologique de Sens* 7 (1895) 15 ff.

8) The most recent reconstruction is that of E. Hoff, *Pavia u. seine Bischöfe im Mittelalter* (1943), esp. 3 ff., 11 ff.; but this is mistaken in several important respects as I hope to show in a forthcoming number of *Riv. stor. della chiesa in Italia*. Hoff's dates for Peter II are 787—805, mine are ?781—a. 795.

9) *Op. cit.* p. 254 n. 4.

10) *Epistola Elipandi ad Migetium*, Migne PL. 96, 859 ff.; Hauck, p. 258; Rivera, p. 47.