

orthodoxy; secondly, that the arenga of no. 96 (*Audientes orthodoxam vestrae dilectionis in Christo constantiam*) and expressions in no. 97 such as *habeto pro nihilo eorum infrunitas insidias* shows that he now knows that the rumours are false. These do not seem very good arguments<sup>16</sup>): a better one might be derived from the wording of the second part of the exordium of no. 96, in which it is declared that *mentem christianae deditam veritati nullatenus inficerent prevaricatorum vicina contagia*, if *prevaricatorum* were taken as a reference to Egila's false accusers (more or less the Classical sense), but it seems more likely — particularly in the context — that it has the patristic sense of 'traitors to the faith, heretics'<sup>17</sup>); and similarly, those whose wiles Egila is being told to ignore in no. 97 have previously been specified as *procaces ac aereicos homines*, that is, exponents of false doctrine rather than intriguers.

The slight but significant variations in wording in the otherwise identical portions of nos. 95 and 96 provide strong reasons, in fact, for making the latter the earlier of the two. In no. 95 the opening words of this section are: *Pervenit nostris apostolicis auribus*; a later 'paragraph' begins with the words: *Verum etiam et hoc de partibus vestris audivimus*; and another begins: *Porro, dilectissimi, diversa capitula quae ex illis audivimus partibus*. In the first letter to Egila the corresponding phrases are: *Ferebatur siquidem in ipsis vestris apicibus*; *Insinuavit dilectio vestra*; and *Porro, dilectissimi, diversa capitula, quae nobis innotuistis*. The natural interpretation is that the words quoted from no. 96 mean precisely what they say and that is on the basis of information supplied by Egila in letters in which he proclaimed his own orthodoxy<sup>18</sup>) that Hadrian wrote to the Spanish clergy to warn them against the false teaching of some of their number. Such arguments fall short of being conclusive but they create the strong presumption (in spite of the slight objection that Egila's assistant John is named in nos. 95 and 96 but not in no. 97) that the correct sequence of the letters is 96, 97, 95 and not 95, 96, 97. There is very little in the first two letters that helps us to date them more precisely. No. 97 must be later than April 781 because Charles is referred to as *spiritalis conpater* of the Pope and it must be sufficiently later than no. 96 for this to have got lost and news of the fact to have been brought back to Rome via the Frankish court. The close connection between the content of nos. 96 and 95 forbids our supposing too long an interval between them: datings c. 784/5 for no. 96 and c. 785 for no. 97 have strong probability in

---

(A b a d a l's supposition, op. cit. p. 49, that "la adjudicación a favor de Egila" was the direct result of a "pacto Egila-Migecio" seems quite unwarranted by the available evidence).

<sup>16</sup>) They evidently did not convince de A b a d a l, who reverted to the sequence adopted by J a f f é (*Batalla del Adopcionismo*, p. 38—40) without giving any reasons.

<sup>17</sup>) In Christian Latin of the third to fifth centuries *praevaricator* is used frequently in the general sense of "betrayor, revealer"; in Ambrose, Hilary and Gelasius it is used specifically of an "apostate, heretic": see the citations in A. B l a i s e, *Dict. Latin-Français des auteurs chrétiens*, S. 658—9. It is in the more specific sense that it is used in the letters of Pope Gregory I, Reg. V, 6 (Epp. 1, 286), VIII, 24 (Epp. 2, 25), IX, 149 (Epp. 2, 150).

<sup>18</sup>) The words *Ferebatur . . . apicibus* come immediately after the opening section which describes Egila's ordination and the Pope's conviction that he was firmly orthodox.